DOMINION OF CANADA

OFFICIAL REPORT

OF

DEBATES

HOUSE OF COMMONS

FIRST SESSION—FOURTEENTH PARLIAMENT

12-13 GEORGE V, 1922

IN FOUR VOLUMES

Volume I: Pages 1-1015	**Volume II: Pages 1017-2033**
Volume III: Pages 2035-3039	**Volume IV: Pages 3041-3619**

VOLUME CLIV

COMPRISING THE PERIOD FROM THE SIXTEENTH DAY OF JUNE TO THE TWENTY-SEVENTH DAY OF JUNE, 1922, INCLUSIVE

OTTAWA
F. A. ACLAND
PRINTER TO THE KING'S MOST EXCELLENT MAJESTY
1922

CANADA

House of Commons Debates

OFFICIAL REPORT

Friday, June 16, 1922

The House met at three o'clock.

PRIVATE BILL

FIRST READING

Bill No. 143 (from the Senate) for the relief of Frederick McClelland Aiken.—Mr. Macdonald (Pictou).

CANADIAN WHEAT BOARD

Hon. J. A. ROBB (Minister of Trade and Commerce) moved that the House do tomorrow go into Committee of the Whole to consider the resolutions in relation to the appointment of a board to be known as the Canadian Wheat Board.

BUSINESS OF THE HOUSE

QUESTIONS AS TO OLEOMARGARINE AND AGRICULTURAL FERTILIZERS

On the Orders of the Day:

Mr. L. J. LADNER (Vancouver South): Mr. Speaker, in view of the expression of opinion of this House in the debate and vote of the 15th May last relative to the manufacture and importation of oleomargarine, I would like to ask the Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Motherwell): Is it the intention of the Government to at once bring down legislation to carry out the wishes of the House and to implement the promise made by him and other members of the Government to that effect? This is an important question and I am sure that hon. members generally will be interested to hear the minister's answer.

Right Hon. W. L. MACKENZIE KING (Prime Minister): I intimated yesterday to the right hon. leader of the Opposition (Mr. Meighen) that in the course of a day or two I would state to the House the entire remaining programme. I hope tomorrow to be able to inform the House what further legislation will be brought down this session.

Mr. LADNER: On this question?

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: Including all legislation which the Government proposes to bring down.

Mr. T. W. CALDWELL (Victoria and Carleton): Mr. Speaker, I should like to ask the Minister of Agriculture if he proposes to bring down his resolution on which to base a bill to regulate the sale of fertilizers. Due to the fact that the session is drawing to a close, and that consequently a good deal of the legislative cargo may be jettisoned, I am anxious to hear what my hon. friend (Mr. Motherwell) proposes to do in the matter.

Hon. Mr. MOTHERWELL (Minister of Agriculture): It will be taken up on the first Order of the Day.

PENSIONS BOARD

On the Orders of the Day:

Hon. H. S. BELAND (Minister of Soldiers' Civil Re-establishment): Mr. Speaker, I should like to make a statement to the House in connection with the charges which have been levelled against the Pensions Board by the Great War Veterans' Association, and which were published in yesterday's Ottawa newspapers. These charges are now under examination by the parliamentary committee on Pensions and Re-establishment, and it is presumed that the report of the committee will deal with the subject. Therefore, out of deference to the committee I would suggest that hon. members suspend judgment until such report is laid on the table, when I shall be in a position to state what action the Government is prepared to take theron.

Mr. MEIGHEN: Would the minister intimate what is the nature of the charge against the commissioners, and explain how it is that it comes under the purview of the committee on Re-establishment.

Mr. BELAND: The charges were brought to the attention of the chairman of the parliamentary committee by the Dominion Secretary of the Great War Veterans' Association.

Mr. MEIGHEN: What charges?

Mr. BELAND: The charges which have been published in the newspapers and to which reference was made in the House yesterday by the hon. member for Kootenay (Mr. Humphrey). My right hon. friend (Mr. Meighen) will remember that I made a statement in the House yesterday in the matter. I may apprise the House further that I received this morning a communication from the chairman of the Board referring to those charges in specific terms. I thought I had among my papers the charges in their exact wording, but I do not seem to have them now. At any rate, they have been published in the newspapers; the charge is, in a word, that the board conspired to deprive ex-service men of rights to which they were by statute entitled.

REVENUE AND AUDIT ACT

On motion of Hon. W. S. Fielding (Minister of Finance), Bill No. 57, to amend the Consolidated Revenue and Audit Act, was read the second time, and the House went into committee thereon, Mr. Gordon in the Chair.

Mr. FIELDING: The object of this bill was explained at an earlier stage, but I may briefly repeat my statement. The purpose is to facilitate an earlier closing of the public accounts at the end of the fiscal year. Under our practice which has prevailed for a long time, while the fiscal year ends on the 31st of March, a month is allowed for the preparation of accounts, and then there is provision that a further allowance of time may be made which, I regret to say, is usually availed of. The consequence is that there is considerable delay in the preparation and ultimately in the publication of the accounts, and that acts upon the date upon which we are able to commence the business of Parliament. I think it would be very helpful if we could get the public accounts into better shape. We propose to adopt, therefore, the English system, which is that the accounts shall close on the 31st of March just as they are. Any balances of appropriations that have not been expended, or the paying out of which has not been authorized, will lapse; if there are any credits issued against which cheques have not been drawn, they, for the time, will lapse, but provision is made that such credits may be renewed and the expenditure charged against the expenditure of the following year. The great point is to give the officials authority to close the accounts on the 31st of March. Another clause which is introduced at the request of the Justice Department is technical in its character; it has reference to arrangements for the transfer of bonds in certain cases. It involves nothing of importance.

On section 1—transmission of bonds registered in the name of person dying domiciled abroad:

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: Perhaps the Minister of Justice will explain this clause.

Sir LOMER GOUIN: I am not prepared to explain it; I did not know the matter was coming up this afternoon.

Mr. FIELDING: It it merely to facilitate the transfer of bonds in the cases of deceased persons.

Section agreed to.

On section 2—what periods accounts shall include:

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: I think the minister (Mr. Fielding) said that balances unused could subsequently be made available. How will that be done?

Mr. FIELDING: If moneys out of the appropriations have not been expended and no action has been taken on them, they will lapse. If a letter of credit has been issued which has not been fully used, the unused portion of it may be provided for by a new letter of credit chargeable to the coming year.

Section agreed to.

Bill reported, read the third time and passed.

CURRENCY ACT, 1910, AMENDMENT

On motion of Hon. W. S. Fielding (Minister of Finance) the House went into committee to consider the following proposed resolution, Mr. Gordon in the Chair:

Resolved, That it is expedient to amend the Schedule to The Currency Act, 1910, as amended by chapter nine of the statutes of 1920, by changing the millesimal fineness of silver coins from 4 to 6, and by providing that this enactment shall apply to silver coins heretofore struck since the first day of January, 1920, and also to amend the said Schedule, as amended by chapter six of the statutes of 1921, by striking out the millesimal fineness of nickel five cent coins.

Mr. FIELDING: This resolution has for its object the enactment of a bill which is desired by the authorities of the Mint. Under the act respecting the currency our silver coins are required to have a certain standard of fineness; out of every 1,000 parts 800 are required to be of pure silver.

That, in the language of the Mint, is called a "remedy"; for the sake of convenience I will call it the margin of safety. That margin of safety is at present fixed at 4 points; that is to say, if there should be a departure of more than 4 points from the standard, the currency would not be lawful. It has been found, in the experience of the Mint, that this limitation, though they have not in any case violated it, is a rather severe one, and they ask that the margin be made 6 points instead of 4. Once a year there is a test of the coins made, which is known as the trial of the Pyx, and if these coins do not conform exactly to the standard there would be a very embarrassing situation. While no coins have been cast which do not conform with the existing law, the authorities of the Mint think that in the interests of safety they should have a little larger margin, and therefore it is proposed to change the "remedy" from 4 to 6.

The second part of the resolution refers to the nickel currency. In the act as it now stands, there is provision for a certain standard of nickel. It was rather a mistake to introduce that, I think. The nickel is not looked upon as valuable as a metal. The nickel coin is merely a token; it is not esteemed for its intrinsic value but what it stands for. So it is proposed that there shall be no "remedy" needed in the case of the nickel coin, and there is no need to fix a margin of safety as in the case of the silver coin.

Resolution reported, read the second time and concurred in.

Mr. FIELDING thereupon moved for leave to introduce Bill No. 147 to amend the Currency Act.

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

PENNY BANK ACT AMENDMENT

On motion of Hon. W. S. Fielding (Minister of Finance) the House went into committee to consider the following proposed resolution, Mr. Gordon in the Chair.

Resolved, That it is expedient to amend the Penny Bank Act, chapter thirty-one of the Revised Statutes of Canada, by providing that a proportion not exceeding one-half of such moneys as are received on deposit elsewhere than at the place where the chief office of the bank is situated may be deposited by the bank in such chartered banks or other financial institutions as the Minister of Finance may designate as depositaries, and to provide for withdrawals from such depositaries.

Mr. FIELDING: This resolution is to to be the basis of a bill which has been requested by the gentlemen interested in the Penny Bank established at Toronto. The object is to allow the bank to enlarge its sphere of operations, and in the case of any places outside of Toronto in which it may engage to do business, to retain a certain amount of its deposits on hand. It is a bill introduced entirely at their request. The bank, I think, has been satisfactory in its operations, and I imagine there is no objection to what they are asking.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: I would think that perhaps any discussion we have on this should take place in committee on the bill. It is a matter of importance which we ought to consider, and I think we should hear at greater length from the minister, when the bill is under consideration.

Mr. FIELDING: I am very glad to accept the suggestion of my hon. friend. We can pass the resolution, and the bill can stand for further consideration.

Resolution reported, read the second time and concurred in.

Mr. FIELDING thereupon moved for leave to introduce Bill No. 148 to amend the Penny Bank Act.

Motion agreed to and bill read the first time.

AGRICULTURAL FERTILIZERS

On motion of Hon. W. R. Motherwell (Minister of Agriculture) the House went into committee to consider the following proposed resolution, Mr. Gordon in the Chair.

Resolved, That it is expedient to bring in a measure to regulate the sale of Agricultural Fertilizers, and to repeal The Fertilizers Act, 1909, chapter 16 of the statutes of 1909, and An Act to amend The Fertilizers Act, 1909, chapter 20 of the statutes of 1919, and to provide:—

1. That no person shall manufacture or import any fertilizer to be sold, offered or held for sale in Canada unless each brand is registered with the Minister and a registration number assigned to it, and application for registration must be made by the manufacturer or importer in such form as the Minister prescribes, and must be accompanied by a registration fee of ten dollars or twenty dollars or thirty dollars for each brand registered, according as it contains one, two or three of the following substances, that is to say, nitrogen, phosphoric acid and potash.

2. That the assignment of a registration number shall of itself authorize the sale of a fertilizer for the period continuing until the first day of July following the date upon which it is granted but such registration may be renewed

from year to year and the same registration number may be assigned to the fertilizer provided no change is made in the brand name, guaranteed analysis, materials from which it is made or the fineness thereof.

3. That the fees for a renewal of a registration shall be the same as those for the original registration.

4. That provision be made prescribing the particulars to be stated in every application for a registration number, and the conditions under which the Minister may refuse to register any fertilizer or cancel any registration.

5. That no person shall sell, offer, expose or hold for sale in Canada any fertilizer unless each package containing the fertilizer, or a tag or label durably attached thereto, or if in bulk, the invoice of sale, is branded or marked in printed characters with the name and address of the manufacturers or importer, the brand name, the guaranteed analysis and other particulars as prescribed.

6. That no person shall sell, offer, expose or hold for sale in Canada any material purported to be a fertilizer, or any fertilizer except basis slag or natural rock phosphate, unless it contains not less than two per cent of nitrogen or five per cent of available phosphoric, acid or two per cent of potash soluble in water, and not less than a total of twelve per cent of nitrogen, available phosphoric acid or potash soluble in water.

7. That no person shall sell, offer, expose or hold for sale in Canada any fertilizer which contains more than one-tenth of one per cent anhydrous borax or any other constituent poisonous to plant life when applied to the soil.

8. That these provisions shall not apply (a) to fertilizers which are manufactured and sold on a prescription received by the manufacturer in writing from a purchaser who states therein that such fertilizer is not intended for sale, unless such fertilizers are actually again sold, or (b) to the selling or offering for sale of fertilizers for manufacturing purposes.

9. That provision be made for the appointment of an advisory board to recommend regulations, and to give the minister power to make regulations, and for the analysis of fertilizers, and the appointment and powers of inspectors, and such other enactments as are necessary to enforce the proposed measure.

10. That the act to be based upon these resolutions shall come into operation on such date as may be prescribed by proclamation of the Governor in Council.

Mr. MOTHERWELL: A bill to consolidate and amend the present Fertilizer Act will be founded on this resolution. We are proposing a consolidation of the present law and will endeavour at the same time to bring it up to date, with respect to certain matters which will be fully dealt with in the bill itself. In order to save time I would suggest that the committee adopt this resolution, after which the bill itself can be introduced and referred to the Committee on Agriculture where its provisions can be thoroughly inquired into.

Resolution reported, read the second time and concurred in. Mr. Motherwell thereupon moved for leave to introduce Bill No. 149, to regulate the sale of Agricultural Fertilizers.

Motion agreed to and bill read the first time.

Mr. MEIGHEN: Is it not intended to refer this bill to the Committee on Agriculture?

Mr. MOTHERWELL: Yes.

Mr. SPEAKER: It may as well receive its second reading.

Mr. MOTHERWELL: I move that the bill be now read a second time and referred to the Select Standing Committee on Agriculture and Colonization.

Motion agreed to.

MEAT AND CANNED FOODS

On motion of Hon. E. Lapointe, (Minister of Marine and Fisheries) the House went into committee to consider the following proposed resolution.—Mr. Gordon in the Chair.

Resolved, that it is expedient to amend The Meat and Canned Foods Act, chapter twenty-seven of the statutes of 1907, and amending Acts, and to provide:—

1. (a) That "shell fish" may be included among the products prepared for food for export or stored for export in an establishment as defined in section one of chapter 31 of the statutes of 1918;

(b) That "dry lobster meat" or "dry meat" shall mean drained meat, that is, the meat remaining after a can which has been processed and allowed to cool thoroughly is opened and upturned so as to permit free drainage of the liquid therefrom for not less than one minute and not more than one and a half minutes; and,

(c) That "can" and "canned fish or shellfish" shall include any hermetically sealed glass bottle, package or container, and any fish or shellfish processed or preserved in the usual way packed in such can, bottle, package or container.

2. That section 12A, as enacted by chapter 33 of the statutes of 1917, be amended to provide that fish and shellfish packed in cans shall be subject to inspection such as may be provided by the regulations during the whole course of preparation and packing, and at any time thereafter at the cannery or at the warehouse of the first purchaser at his request, and shall be labelled with the particulars as prescribed therein, with the name and address of the packer or of the first dealer obtaining it direct from the packer.

3. That subsection 4 of the said section 12A be amended to provide that exemption from labelling of the cans of fish or shellfish may be allowed, if such labelling hinders the sale of the same in markets outside of Canada.

4. That section 12C of the said Act be amended to provide that all canned fish and shellfish shall be sound, wholesome and fit for

human food, and any unsound canned fish or shellfish found during the process of preparing and packing or at any time thereafter, at the cannery or the warehouse of the first purchaser, may be seized and confiscated on view by any inspecting officer and dealt with as provided by the regulations, and the inspector may take samples for inspection.

5. That section 12D of the said Act as enacted by chapter 22 of the statutes of 1919 (second session) be amended to provide that there shall be five sizes of cans for canning lobsters. These shall be of the sizes commonly known as three, six, nine, twelve and sixteen ounce cans. The cans of each size in the order named shall each contain not less than three ounces avoirdupois, six ounces avoirdupois, nine ounces avoirdupois, twelve ounces avoirdupois, and sixteen ounces avoirdupois of drained 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 drained lobster meat each size of can so authorized shall contain. All cans that do not contain the weight specified for each of the sizes herein named, or that may be hereafter named may be seized and held by any inspecting officer and disposed of as provided by the regulations.

6. That section 12E of the said Act as enacted by chapter 33 of the statutes of 1917 be amended to provide that for the purposes of the Act, the varieties of British Columbia salmon shall be designated, and, provided the need for such is established to the satisfaction of the Governor in Council, graded as provided in the regulations.

7. That section 12F of the said Act as enacted by the said chapter be amended to provide that in the event of the provisions of the Act or of any regulation made thereunder or the lawful instructions of inspecting officers not being compiled with in any fish or shellfish cannery, the minister may order the fish or shellfish cannery to be closed; provided, however, that any cannery in which the sanitary conditions are being neglected may be immediately closed by the inspecting officer until the defects are remedied.

8. That the provisions of section 12G as enacted by the said chapter relating to the exportation of fish not canned in accordance with law be repealed.

9. That the provisions of section 12H as enacted by chapter 22 of the statutes of 1919 (second session) be amended to provide that canned fish or canned shellfish inported into Canada to be exported again need only be labelled to show the country of origin; and no false or misleading mark or designation of the kind or variety of the contents shall be shown on any can of fish or shellfish imported for sale in Canada.

Mr. MEIGHEN: Has the Minister of Marine and Fisheries (Mr. Lapointe) called the attention of the Minister of Finance (Mr. Fielding) to clause 9, which provides that the goods shall be marked with the country of origin, provided they are fish, and, if so, how does the Minister of Finance distinguish this class of article from others, so as to provide that corresponding legislation as to other goods shall be enacted by Order in Council?

Mr. LAPOINTE: I think there is a difference between canned goods, articles of food, and articles of ordinary consumption. At all events, I do not think the Minister of Finance has any objection to this clause.

Mr. MEIGHEN: One of the great difficulties in connection with the Marking Act is just in connection with the marking of canned goods, because, when the country of origin is stamped on the can, that means that the can is produced in that country, but the impression conveyed to the purchaser everywhere is that the contents of the can have been produced in that country. That has been just one of the main obstacles in the way of the enforcement of the act, requiring further attention from Parliament, and that obstacle exists, I would think, here. If the law should now be enacted by Parliament, as regards canned goods, certainly the duty of the man shipping canned goods to Canada should be made clear.

Mr. LAPOINTE: I think the right hon. member will see that this provision as applied to canned goods, has been in operation for many years. There is only a slight change.

Mr. MEIGHEN: What is the change?

Mr. LAPOINTE: Perhaps, I might explain that these amendments have been found necessary by the officers of the department and by business men engaged in that industry. The Meat and Canned Foods' Act, in so far as it deals with fish and shellfish, is under the control of the Department of Marine and Fisheries. It was amended quite extensively in 1917. At that time, it was thought that the amendments would meet the requirements of the situation, but it has been found that minor changes are still required, and those changes are asked for by the bill which will come before the House. Those changes are recommended by the department. They have been submitted to the Lobster Canners' Association, which met at Moncton quite recently, and approved of. They have also been submitted to the salmon canners of British Columbia, who have suggested some slight changes, which have been accepted by the department. I think each of these changes will be more properly discussed when the bill is before the committee, and I would ask that the resolution be carried and any explanation that is required on each section of the bill will be given when it is discussed in committee. I think that is the more reasonable way of dealing with the matter.

Mr. MEIGHEN: The House and the committee will note that, though the minister rose to explain the effect of the amendments, that is the one thing he left out. He said these were suggested by the officers of the department and were accepted.

Mr. LAPOINTE: I have asked my hon. friend to wait.

Mr. MEIGHEN: I think the explanation should be given now. I know that a bill will be introduced, but we miss the entire effect of it if we simply say: "Let the resolution go, and never mind what it means, do not bother about its effect, we will have a discussion on the bill." I can recall the time when an hon. member asked "What is the use of passing the resolution?" the answer by the minister was, "Oh, that is called for by the rules." Certainly it is, and there is a reason for the rule. Why should we not have a very brief explanation, which will enable us to prepare for the discussion of the bill?

Mr. LAPOINTE: On what section does the hon. member want an explanation?

Mr. MEIGHEN: I mentioned the reference to clause 9, but I think the minister should give us a brief synopsis of the effect of the changes. Then we can refer to Hansard, and prepare for discussion on the bill.

Mr. LAPOINTE: As my hon. friend insists on having the character and meaning of every change given, I will deal with every one of them.

Mr. MEIGHEN: The meaning chiefly.

Mr. LAPOINTE: The first change relates to the term "fish". The term "fish" as used in the act does not include shellfish; and as the latter was omitted from paragraph (b) it is now inserted. The amendment to paragraph (e) simply provides that when the term "inspecting officer" are used they will mean an inspector appointed under the act.

Mr. DUFF: Still more important.

Mr. LAPOINTE: The amendment to paragraph "l" is intended to define more clearly the words "canned goods" to which the act applies. As to paragraph "j", I will read the change—

Mr. MEIGHEN: There is no paragraph "j", "l", or anything else here.

Mr. LAPOINTE: I am going to read the clauses of the bill itself.

[Mr. Lapointe.]

Mr. MEIGHEN: We have not the bill.

Mr. LAPOINTE: That is why I asked that the discussion should be postponed until the bill was in the hands of members of the committee. The resolution is simply a resumè—

Mr. MEIGHEN: If the minister's headings are in the same order as the clauses of the resolution—

Mr. LAPOINTE: But they are not. The sections of the bill are not the same.

Mr. MEIGHEN: I suggest that the minister go on, and I can compare the changes after they are placed on Hansard.

Mr. LAPOINTE: It is a complicated matter to some extent. I have the old bill, and I have the new bill, and, for each one of the amendments I have to refer to three or four papers and that is why I take the present bill—

Mr. MEIGHEN: If the minister's remarks apply to the bill, I can compare it after I see Hansard.

Mr. LAPOINTE: Paragraph "j" section I of the bill was intended to make clearer what was meant by "dry lobster meat". There was already a definition, and some words are added to it. It was also to give some latitude in the length of time for draining the liquid from a can before the meat is weighed. The time is at present fixed as one minute, neither more nor less. By the new bill we extend it to one minute and a half.

Section 2. At present under subsection 1 of section 12 A, canned fish and shellfish are subject to inspection during the course of preparation and packing only. The amendment provides that such fish and shellfish may be inspected at the cannery any time after they have been packed or at the first purchaser's warehouse, if he so desires. It is also proposed to substitute the word "labelled" for "marked," as being more in line with the intention of the section. The word "fish" in paragraph (a) is the result of a mistake. It is, therefore, being replaced by the word "first" as originally intended—the "first" dealer instead of the "fish" dealer.

Subsection 4 of section 12 A provides for the exemption from the labelling requirements of canned fish and shellfish exported to foreign markets or the markets of the United Kingdom. That is the law as it was. This does not include Australia and New Zealand; it says only foreign mar-

kets and the United Kingdom, hence the change in the wording of the subsection to "markets outside of Canada."

Section 3. Section 12 C, which is to be repealed, provides for the seizure of unsound fish or shellfish before packing, but does not make any provision for so dealing with unsound fish or shellfish when in the cans. As fish and shellfish found to be unsound prior to canning are amply provided for in section 12 B, the amendment to section 12 C is intended to cover unsound goods in cans. That is, we have the same right even after they are canned.

Section 4. The amendment to section 12 D is intended to fix definitely the size of each of the five sizes of cans at present legalized. They are the same sizes as before. As a matter of fact, it is especially to empower inspecting officers to seize and hold lightweight cans, pending a decision as to their disposal. We have not that right under the law as it stands.

Section 5. Section 12 E at present simply designates the different varieties of British Columbia salmon. As there has been and still is a more or less insistent call for the official grading of the different varieties of salmon when packed in the cans, the amendment provides for such being done if and when it is deemed necessary. Also, the amended section provides for transferring the naming of the varieties to the regulations, because of anticipated changes when grading takes place.

Section 6. Section 12 F gives the minister sole power to close a cannery in the event of the provisions of the Act not being complied with. That is the section as it was. It sometimes happens that an inspecting officer finds a cannery operating under such a state of filth as to call for the immediate stoppage of operations. Delays in reporting to and receiving instructions from Ottawa allow canning to go on under undesirable conditions frequently for too long a time. The amendment consequently seeks to give power to the officers to take immediate action when such conditions are discovered and, of course, to report to Ottawa.

Section 9. Section 12 G is deemed to be entirely unnecessary and, therefore, apt to lead to confusion. Consequently, its deletion is proposed. All that is provided for by section 12 G is already provided for in other sections.

Section 10. The proposed amendment to subsection 1 of section 12 H, is, in the first place, to provide that canned fish or shellfish imported into Canada to be again exported must show the name of the country of origin, in order that they may not be mistaken for Canadian goods. In the second place it is to provide that no misleading mark or name concerning the kind or variety of canned fish or shellfish imported for sale in Canada be used. The last provision is intended to stop the practice of Alaska packers sending Alaska red salmon into Canada labelled as sockeye, as this meantime permits them unfairly to compete with British Columbia sockeye, a much superior fish. I think that covers all the amendments.

Mr. MEIGHEN: Just one question. Will the minister intimate, if his notes supply the information, what the state of the law was as to the first part of clause 9 which now appears to be clause 10 of his bill, the very last?

Mr. MARCIL (Bonaventure): Is there anything on those cans, when the label is gone, to indicate the name of the packer?

Mr. LAPOINTE: No.

Mr. MARCIL (Bonaventure): That is an unfortunate thing. A case of ptomaine poisoning may occur; the label may be gone, and there will then be no way of finding out the name and address of the packer. Would it not be a wise provision to have the packer's name, number and address printed on the can itself? A label is easily torn off, and then you have no means of tracing the packer and finding out where the can comes from.

Mr. LAPOINTE: The same thing exists as regards other kinds of canned goods than fish. Section 12-H, referred to by my right hon. friend (Mr. Meighen) reads, as it is in the act:

> All cans of fish or shellfish imported into Canada shall be correctly labelled so as to indicate the kind and quality of their contents, the minimum weight in avoirdupois of the contents of the cans in the case of canned fish and of the dry meat in the can in the case of canned shellfish, the place of origin and the name and address of the person, firm or corporation by whom they are packed or by whom they are imported; provided that canned fish or canned shellfish imported into Canada to be exported again need not be so labelled.

The new proposed clause will read:

> All cans of fish or shellfish imported into Canada shall be correctly labelled so as to indicate the kind and quality of their contents, the minimum weight in avoirdupois of the contents of the cans in the case of canned fish and of the dry meat in the can in the case of

canned shellfish, the place of origin and the name and the name and address of the person, firm or corporation by whom they are packed or by whom they are imported provided that canned fish or canned shellfish imported into Canada to be exported again need only be labelled to show the country of origin; and no false or misleading mark or designation of the kind or variety of the contents shall be shown on any can of fish or shellfish imported for sale in Canada.

Mr. MARTELL: This clause will also apply to canned lobsters. For instance, there is a practice whereby lobsters which were packed say, in Newfoundland, come to Halifax, N.S., and are bought there by jobbers, repacked and exported. Supposing the label were destroyed, consciously or unconsciously, a jobber would be able to palm off those lobsters as Canadian lobsters. There is no protection for the Canadian lobster packed under strict departmental inspecton as against the Newfoundland lobster. That is a very important point which the minister should consider.

Mr. LAPOINTE: I will take that matter into consideration with the officials of my department.

Mr. MacLAREN: The paper label is not sufficiently durable or permanent; it may be destroyed or lost, either deliberately or accidentally. Therefore, as has just been stated, once the label has been removed, it is impossible to identify where the particular can came from, supposing a case of ptomaine poisoning has occurred—this is of great importance, because some cases of ptomaine poisoning are fatal. If a poisoned can is not marked in such a way that it can be identified, it is impossble to trace the factory in which the goods were put up and where there may be many other cans in the same condition. I trust that some means may be adopted of having a permanent mark on the can itself.

4 p.m.

Mr. DUFF: While it would be a very good thing to have the individual tin stamped with the name of the packer, yet I think anybody who understands this business, realizes that it would be impossible for the canner to stamp every tin with his name. As regards bad fish which may be found in cans and ptomaine poisoning occurring from those bad fish, it is a well-known fact that when fish are packed in a can by the packer, he immediately puts a label on the can and that gives it a more attractive appearance. No grocer or fish dealer will sell a can of lobster or salmon unless the label still remains on the can in proper shape. The label makes the package more attractive and, consequently, the housekeeper will not buy a package of lobster or salmon unless there is on the can a label showing the name, quality and quantity of the contents and the packer's name and address. But it is quite possible, as the hon. member for St. John says, that after the can has been opened and the contents cooked they may be found to be affected. As a rule the first thing the housewife does before putting the can in a pot of hot water is to tear off the label, and if ptomaine poisoning follows the eating of the contents the housewife naturally is so excited that she does not remember which grocer she bought the can from, let alone who packed it. So it is absolutely impossible to mark these cans so that the public will know who packed the contents.

Mr. MARTELL: Is it not a fact that in a great many cases the name of the packer never appears on the label? For instance, a lot of wholesale grocers in Nova Scotia, such as Bauld Bros., will have a particular brand put up for themselves and the label does not disclose who actually packed the lobsters.

Mr. DUFF: I think my hon. friend refers to the packers of Newfoundland. All our Canadian packers place their name and their brand on the label. Both our lobster and salmon packers are very proud of their pack.

Mr. MARTELL: Is is not also a fact that small packers do not put any brand at all upon their pack? The lobsters are sent to a jobber in the lobster business at Halifax, and he re-packs the fish, placing his own brand upon the cans.

Mr. DUFF: That is exactly what this resolution is designed to make the packer do—put his own label on the can.

Mr. LAPOINTE: And take the responsibility.

Mr. DUFF: Exactly.

Mr. LADNER: Does not the minister think it a mistake to vest authority in an inspector to close a cannery if in his judgment it is not in a sanitary condition? As those who are familiar with the canning business are aware, the pack is put out during a period of four or five weeks, when a cannery will pack perhaps a hundred thousand cases. It seems to me that the

public can be very easily protected by our providing for inspection of the pack after it has been put up. These inspectors are only human, they are not very highly paid, and it seems to me that this is altogether too great authority to put in their hands. Has the minister consulted with the canning interests in British Columbia in respect to this matter?

Mr. LAPOINTE: Yes, Mr. Chairman, and the canners themselves agree to this provision, which is necessary if the law is to be properly enforced; otherwise, too long delays are involved and the unsanitary conditions continue.

Mr. LADNER: Is the Canners' Association in British Columbia recommending this change?

Mr. LAPOINTE: This bill was submitted to the salmon canners of British Columbia, and they themselves suggested some of the provisions which we have embodied. We also submitted the bill to the canners in the maritime provinces, and this embodies their wishes.

Mr. MARCIL (Bonaventure): I think the canners can be relied on to look after their own interests. The public are being protected in this case. As the hon. member for Lunenburg(Mr. Duff) says, when a can of fish is brought home the label is torn off, the can is placed in boiling water, and if something happens after the contents are eaten it is almost impossible to discover the name of the packers.

Mr. LAPOINTE: We are trying to prevent that condition of things, and we are making the law more severe.

Mr. LADNER: I hope the minister understands the point I am trying to make clear. It is not a question of cans or labels referred to by the hon. member for Bonaventure. Suppose a cannery is in the midst of a large pack, with fifteen thousand to twenty thousand salmon in scows and on the wharf, and an inspector finds certain unsanitary conditions, does the minister realize the power which that inspector is given to immediately stop operations?

Mr. DUFF: Whose hands would the hon. member place the power in if not in the inspector's? Who else is there to see that the cannery is in proper condition?

Mr. LAPOINTE: May I say to my hon. friend from Vancouver South (Mr. Ladner) that it is in the interests of the canners themselves that these provisions should be made as stringent as they are. The canning industry is a very important one in this country and our goods enjoy a very high standing in all the markets of the world. Consequently our packers are anxious to preserve their reputation and to prevent people injuring it who are careless about observing the requirements which the bonafide canners do live up to.

Mr. BROWN: The hon. member for Lunenburg has indicated that there are some insuperable difficulties in having the packers' names stamped on the cans. Would he briefly indicate these difficulties?

Mr. DUFF: These cans are made in factories from long sheets of tin, and it is impossible to imprint the names and addresses of the various packers of the cans.

Mr. BROWN: Would it not be quite feasible to do that in the factory where the goods are packed?

Mr. DUFF: But the cans are made in the factory from long sheets of tin, and it is not feasible to put the name of the packer on the can itself, so a label is pasted on. If you stamp these cans you are likely to make holes and the contents could not be preserved.

Mr. HUGHES: There is another reason: there are only a few manufacturers of cans, but there are a great many packers. How could the manufacturer imprint or emboss the name of the packer on the cans when he does not know who is going to buy them?

Mr. BROWN: I still think it might be possible to put a mark on the can that would not be destroyed when the can is put in boiling water.

Mr. HUGHES: How would that indicate the packer when there are so many engaged in the business? It is impossible.

Mr. BROWN: I think it may be possible.

Mr. LEWIS: I do not think it is impossible at all. It might be impossible in regard to the body of the can—I know something about tin work—but the lids are stamped with a ring to increase their strength, and when that is being done certain letters could be imprinted.

Mr. DUFF: Did you ever see any canned goods so marked?

Mr. LEWIS: I have seen cans with the lids stamped.

Mr. DUFF: I mean with the name of the packer.

Mr. LEWIS: Just two or three letters.

Mr. HATFIELD: These cans are imported into our country in carloads, and distributed to the various canners throughout the district. So it would be virtually impossible to have any mark whatever put on the cans at the factory where they are made.

Mr. LEWIS: I was asked a moment ago if I know of any cans that are being stamped. I think I could mention half a dozen tobacco cans that have the lids stamped with the firm's name. I think that could be done here.

Mr. BROWN: It looks as if there is room here for the operation of someone's inventive genius. I do not see why it should not be possible to devise some indestructible mark that could be registered and that would be removed by the action of boiling water.

Mr. LAPOINTE: This bill applies only to the fishing industry. Any such change as my hon. friend has suggested would have to be made to the whole act and applied to all canned goods.

Resolution reported, read the second time and concurred in. Mr. Lapointe thereupon moved for leave to introduce Bill No. 150, to amend the Meat and Canned Foods Act.

Motion agreed to and bill read the first time.

On motion of Hon. Mr. Lapointe the bill was read the second time and the House went into committee thereon, Mr. Gordon in the Chair.

On section 1:

Mr. SUTHERLAND: I think the minister should give the committee some information with regard to this matter. Why are such careful regulations provided in regard to food for export while nothing is provided in regard to food consumed in Canada?

Mr. LAPOINTE: These provisions apply as well to food for Canadian consumption. This clause is a mere repetition of the former clause, with the addition of the word "shellfish".

Mr. SUTHERLAND: But it applies to food for export?

[M. Duff.]

Mr. LAPOINTE: This clause relates more particularly to export goods.

Mr. SUTHERLAND: Altogether.

Mr. LAPOINTE: The last part of it does.

Mr. MARCIL (Bonaventure): Can the canning of fish be carried on by persons who have not taken out a license?

Mr. LAPOINTE: No.

Mr. MARCIL (Bonaventure): What happens if it is done?

Mr. LAPOINTE: The goods are seized and the further carrying on of the business without a license prevented.

Mr. MARCIL (Bonaventure): When a license is issued to a tobacco factory a number is assigned and the cans have to bear that number. Why not apply the same principle in this case, so that when the label is gone the place where the goods were put up can be traced by the number on the can? That would afford some protection to the public; as it is now, once the label disappears a whole family could be poisoned and there would be no recourse.

Mr. LAPOINTE: That suggestion has already been carefully considered by those interested in the industry and by the officers of the department. There is much to be said in favour of it, but there are difficulties to be overcome, and so far it has not been found advisable to adopt the plan.

Mr. MEIGHEN: I think the minister would be well advised not to seek to go on with the committee work on this bill to-day. The bill is evidently fresh from the press and we have not had opportunity to consider it.

Mr. LAPOINTE: I have no desire to press the matter. If there is objection, I will move that the committee rise, report progress and ask leave to sit again.

Mr. MEIGHEN: I would point out that the resolution that forms the basis of the bill is in the name of the Minister of Marine and Fisheries; the bill as printed is in the name of the Minister of Agriculture.

Mr. LAPOINTE: That is a mistake in the first printing. It will be corrected before the bill comes up again.

Section stands.

Progress reported.

SUPPLY

MARINE AND FISHERIES

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

Fisheries — Marine Biological Board of Canada, $42,000.

Mr. LAPOINTE: The expenditure last year was $42,000.

Mr. MEIGHEN: Exactly?

Mr. LAPOINTE: Yes. This board is mainly a volunteer organization, the members and investigators not being paid. The board's investigations are to throw light on matters connected with the life history of fish, the reasons for deterioration in canned fish product, cured fish and so forth. I can give the membership of the board if the committee wishes. It includes several university professors. The board has a permanent staff at St. Andrews, N.B., and Nanaimo, B.C. The board consists of nine members, two of whom are appointed by the minister and represent the department, the other seven representing the principal universities which are provided with the most efficient research laboratories. This is the usual vote.

Mr. MARTELL: Is Mr. Andrew Halkett in the employ of the Biological Board?

Mr. LAPOINTE: No.

Mr. MARTELL: Is he is not a sort of scientific expert to the department?

Mr. LAPOINTE: Yes, he is the naturalist of the department, but he comes under the department direct, not under the board.

Mr. MARTELL: What are his qualifications from a scholastic standpoint?

Mr. LAPOINTE: I will ask my hon. friend to wait until next year so that I may have an opportunity of getting the information.

Mr. MARTELL: This man has never been educated at a university, and he has no scientific training. He is simply an accountant, or he was in the accountant's branch of the Department of Marine and Fisheries. His health broke down, and he was shifted out to tell people about the life history and functions of fish. I think it is rather an absurdity to be sending this man around the country wasting public money telling people about the life history of fish, which he knows nothing about. I may also inform the minister that some years ago an application was made for the promotion of Mr. Halkett, and his case was submitted to Professor Shortt, then Chairman of the Civil Service Commission. Professor Shortt asked to see some of the reports made by this man, and the information came back to the department that they were the sort of report a grade-eight school boy could get out. I think the sooner this farce is stopped the better.

Mr. LAPOINTE: I shall be glad to inquire into the qualifications of the gentleman. As it is, my hon. friend seems to know a great deal more about him than I do.

Mr. MacLAREN: Does this item include the cost of maintenance of the Biological Department at St. Andrew's, N.B.?

Mr. LAPOINTE: Yes.

Mr. MacLAREN: I might say that important investigations with regard to fish, their diseases, propagation, and other matters are carried on at that establishment, and so far as its work is concerned, it is on a very sound and profitable basis.

Item agreed to.

IMMIGRATION AND COLONIZATION

Immigration and Colonization—immigration contingencies, $1,170,000.

Mr. MEIGHEN: What is the minister really doing to account for the asking of what was voted last year and $300,000 more?

Mr. STEWART (Argenteuil): First let me say this is the item that was left over to meet the convenience of my hon. friend from Fort William and Rainy River (Mr. Manion). The amount required for 1922-3 is $1,170,000. The amount voted for 1921-1922 was $870,000.

Mr. CHAPLIN: How much of that was spent?

Mr. STEWART (Argenteuil): Practically all of it if I remember correctly.

With a view to inducing as great a number of desirable immigrants as possible to come to Canada during the year 1922-3, a special committee composed of ministers of the Crown has been formed with the object of studying the immigration situation and laying down a policy which will be to the greatest advantage of Canada. For this purpose the department has considerably increased the amounts under the following headings:

General expenses in the British Isles, increased by $60,000; general expenses in the United States, increased by $30,000; contingencies and general expenses in Canada, including a larger number of temporary employees at sea ports, detention hospitals, inland agencies, boundary inspection points, etc., increased by $128,000; printing and stationery, increased by $22,000; special grants to immigration and colonization societies, increased by $20,000; postage, telegrams, freight, etc., increased by $15,000; unforeseen expenses, increased by $25,000.

I could give a detailed statement of the items. Suffice it to say that there is a desire for increased immigration, but that immigration requires careful inspection as to quality rather than quantity. We are more or less hampered by the fact that we are unable to take a very large number of desirable immigrants who would come to Canada if positions could be found for them, because as you know, Mr. Chairman, there is little or no employment to be found for outside people as mechanics, artisans, or in the professional walks of life, so we are confined pretty much to agriculturists, household workers, and agricultural labour. I am hopeful, however, that that condition will improve. We have been making special efforts in the Old Land. We are trying to make the examination a little more rigid both in Great Britain and on the Continent, in order that we may not have to return so many who are unable to pass the test on this side of the water. This entails additional expense. Up to the moment, the staffs have not been increased to any very great extent. In the United States, we have an increase of about three over the staff of last year, working in the central states, and an increase of one in the New England states. In Great Britain, up to the moment we have not found it advisable to put on larger staffs. But next fall when our plans are perfected, it is our intention to put on propaganda work and to do considerable advertising both in Great Britain and the United States, and for this purpose we shall require a considerable amount of money. I can assure, you, Mr. Chairman, that it is my hope to keep well within the estimate, but I do think also that the opportunity offers, provided we have sufficient money, to get desirable settlers that we constantly hear are leaving Great Britain for Australia rather than coming to Canada.

Mr. MACLAREN: I want to ask the minister if it is not possible for immigrants, coming, say, from Glasgow, Liverpool, London and other ports, to be medically examined at those ports in such a way that they would be definitely passed as suitable for admission to Canada. I think there are many cases where immigrants could be definitely, not provisionally, passed, and given the assurance that they would be accepted by proper examination at those ports. In that way I feel that the number who would be required to be returned would be very much reduced. It will soon become known to people who propose coming to Canada that if they take the opportunity of going to suitable officers, say, in Great Britain especially, they could definitely know if they would be admitted to this country. It is too bad that they should be allowed to come out here, after selling their goods and chattels, and then be rejected. I would draw the attention to the minister to the desirability of working out suitable plans for a more definite acceptance of immigrants before they leave their native shores.

Mr. MILLAR: I would like to draw the minister's attention to a matter that was brought to my notice recently, from which it would almost seem that some of the regulations, or some of the provisions of the Immigration Act, tend to defeat the purpose of the department in trying to get settlers. The case that has been brought to my attention is that of a Russian now living in Germany. His cousin is a farmer in the constituency which I have the honour to represent, whom I know to be a good farmer and good settler. He recently made a request to the Immigration Department that his cousin be permitted to come from Germany to work for him on the farm, but at present, it seems, the law does not permit Germans to enter Canada. In his second letter to me he pointed out that his cousin, although living in Germany, was really a Russian. I would ask if it is the intention of the department to continue this arrangement, or whether there is any thought of changing it in the near future.

Mr. STEWART (Argenteuil): I will first answer the question of my hon. friend from St. John (Mr. MacLaren) with respect to medical inspection. I may say that my first thought on taking over the department was to see if it were possible to have the medical inspection at the port of embarkation, or prior to the selling by persons of their homes and immigrating to Canada, but I found it would mean that we would have to establish medical men of our own both in Great Britain and on the continent, and furthermore that such medical

inspection might not disclose some frailty in an immigrant which a sea voyage would reveal. I believe it is the opinion of the medical officers of the department that we must insist on the medical inspection taking place on this side of the water. We have done this, however. We have instructed our overseas agents to make very careful inquiry and also to place in the hands of intending immigrants to Canada sufficient data for them to realize what the medical inspection at Canadian ports will mean. Of course, they might very well submit themselves to medical inspection before embarking for Canada, and thereby lessen the chances of rejection when they reach this side. However, I think we must insist that the medical inspection shall be at the port of disembarkation and by our own medical officers. I quite well understand the hardship that is involved, but in order to avoid that as much as possible we are causing our agents in Great Britain and on the continent to disseminate the necessary information as much as possible among intending settlers. For that purpose we have established three new agencies on the continent this year, in the hope that we shall not have these difficulties arise whereby we are forced to deport people because of physical shortcomings revealed by medical inspection on this side of the Atlantic.

Mr. MacLAREN: Is the objection to the adoption of the plan due to the expense which would be involved?

Mr. STEWART (Argenteuil): Not altogether.

Mr. MacLAREN: Is that partly the reason?

Mr. STEWART (Argenteuil): It would be expensive, it is true, to carry out the plan, but I am convinced—perhaps I should not be so strong as that in my assertion; at any rate so far as I have been able to understand in making a study of this matter—we can never have an inspection in Great Britain, or on the continent, by which we can allow people to enter Canada without further inspection by our own officers.

Mr. MacLAREN: Is there not some inspection of immigrants made on board ship?

Mr. STEWART (Argenteuil): There is an inspection of the immigrant by the ship's doctor, because the steamship companies must take the immigrant back if he fails to pass inspection, and therefore they are fairly careful. We are trying, as far as possible, through our agencies to exercise every precaution. There will always be immigrants that will have to be returned, but we are trying to reduce the number as far as it is humanly possible so to do. In addition to furnishing the intending immigrants with all possible information before they dispose of their homes, or before they leave the country in which they are located, the endeavour is made to instruct them as to the nature of the medical examination to which they will have to submit themselves before entering Canada.

Now, with respect to the question of my hon. friend from Qu'Appelle (Mr. Millar) let me say that we have not, so far, taken down the barriers against German immigrants. I received an application only yesterday from a young man in Saskatchewan who desires to bring his sister from Germany. I think that we can, perhaps, permit young women who have friends here to come from Germany, but to say that at this moment we are prepared to throw down the bars altogether and admit German immigration would be incorrect—I do not think that we have arrived at that particular point as yet. However, I am quite prepared to give consideration to what appears to be deserving cases.

Mr. GOOD: What discretion has the minister in cases of that sort?

Mr. STEWART (Argenteuil): Practically all the discretion he needs. The minister has power to admit almost anyone into Canada.

Mr. GUTHRIE: I was just going to ask the minister if his attention has been drawn to an article in the June number of the Canadian Trade Congress Journal; It is an article by Mr. Tom Moore, the President of the Trades and Labour Congress, and I see that it has been copied to some extent in the Ottawa Journal of this evening. There are one or two points in the article to which I would like to direct the attention of the minister. Mr. Moore evidently thinks that too much latitude is permitted in the booking offices, or the immigration regulations are too loose, so that too many are allowed to enter Canada, nominally as farm labourers and domestic servants who are not such in reality. The article reads as follows:

"When the natural resources of Canada are free from monopolistic control and all willing to work are assured of the opportunity to do so, then will be time enough to consider freer immigration policies. The present policy is only an aid to those desiring to get rich quick through the method of labor exploitation and is detrimental to the interests of both the workers in Canada, and those being falsely led to believe that prosperity and opportunity abound for all in this country. The future of Canada demands that immigrants shall not be subject to disillusionment but on the contrary shall find conditions all that they were led to believe. It is only in this way that a contented and prosperous citizenship may be acquired. Any other method leads ultimately to discontent, unrest and revolt and surely the experience of the past few years should be sufficient warning against the adoption of policies so detrimental to the future of our country."

This is the conclusion of Mr. Tom Moore, president of the Dominion Trades and Labor Congress, in an article on Immigration to appear in the June Canadian Congress Journal.

Mr. Moore condemns the Government policy which he says has opened the flood gates and made the way easy for all and sundry to flock to Canada. The new policy will allow an almost unlimited flow of cheap labor for farms and industries, he points out, and it practically means the wages and standards of living of Canadian workers will be fixed in Europe.

Then Mr. Moore's words are again quoted as follows:

"It is assumed that any one swearing he or she is a legitimate farm worker or domestic servant, or that they have reasonable chance of employment, will have little trouble entering the country," Mr. Moore writes.

"In a recent advertisement of a booking agency, claiming to be one of the official agents of certain Canadian shipping and transportation companies, the following paragraph appears: 'We can make all the necessary arrangement to bring out your passenger. Save you money in passage fare and save your passenger inconvenience with the immigration officials. All affidavits made are free.' What a wonderful inference as to how little trouble will be experienced if experts at drawing up affidavits to comply with the regulations are allowed to book the passage of the prospective emigrant.

"The purpose of immigration restrictions should be to protect those already here, and protect against exploitation and unnecessary hardship the workers of other countries who contemplate emigrating."

That is rather a pointed article, and, if the conditions which exist in regard to immigrants seeking to come to Canada are as loose as indicated in that article, I think more stringent methods should be employed. If the basis of that article is correct, all a man has to do is to go to some shipping agent and make a formal affidavit, one of those documents prepared by a shipping agent. In nine cases out of ten, probably, the affidavit is not read over to the man, and he may not understand the language. If that is the only requirement, I submit it is not sufficient. No doubt there is a good deal of foundation for Mr. Moore's complaint. A good many people come into Canada ostensibly as farm labourers who are not farm labourers, never were, and on reaching Canada they disavow any intention of ever becoming farmers. I do not know that it is possible to devise a method by which you can exclude all such, but, I think, if more stringent rules were adopted, many who now come in breach of the regulations might be excluded. My object is to call the attention of the minister to this article, because if more stringent regulations should be put in force, let us enact them. We do not want in this country, at this time, a stream of immigration to our cities and towns, to further congest the labour market.

Mr. MANION: A statement has been made to me, of the truth of which I know nothing, that out in the western provinces, at the present time, the department are employing certain labourers to work for them temporarily, I do not know in what capacity. It was claimed that these men were employed, say, for six months, then let out for a short time, and re-employed, the purpose being to get round the Civil Service Act. This statement was made to me, and I am presenting it to the minister, to have him deny it, if it is false, or to otherwise comment upon it, if he wishes.

Mr. STEWART (Argenteuil): Under the Civil Service Act, we have the privilege of employing men temporarily for three months. I think, to a limited degree, that can be carried on, the idea being that it is purely temporary. If the employment continues for a longer period, these men must of necessity pass the examinations and become permanent employees. We have had cases of that kind, in one or two instances, but to a very limited degree. I desire to say frankly that it is a very considerable handicap in the Department of Immigration, where they have a fluctuating service and might want a few people for a few months, to have to wait for the slow process of getting them on the permanent staff. The same thing is true of the Northwest Territories. Hon. members will notice that I have a bill on the Order Paper, to provide for a little leniency in respect of the employment of officials who are thousands of miles away, in the North country. However, I think the Civil Service Commission

are prepared to grant me, in that respect, the privilege of taking care of the four or five employees who are away in that territory, and may have to move from one point to another, where oil may be discovered, or a rush for fyling may take place. Outside of that, I have no very serious complaints to make. The practice to which the hon. member refers does not prevail to any extent. There may be three or four cases in the whole department where they employ several hundred people. With respect to the point raised by my hon. friend, there is constant friction. There are to-day, printers at the boundary line, who are desirous of coming to Montreal, and yet there are many printers in that city. I mention this to show the difficulties with which we are faced. These men are refusing to work. There is a strike on. As near as I can understand the situation, these men refused to work for certain establishments, not only in Montreal, but in other parts of Canada. I am not very familiar with the situation. We try to keep closely in touch with the labour situation throughout Canada. Let me say to my hon. friends, the Progressives from western Canada, that for a period of two weeks I placed an absolute prohibition on farm labourers coming from United States into Saskatchewan, and many farmers in Saskatchewan, who might have received asistance from the United States, had to go without farm labourers and do their own work, notwithstanding the fact that in British Columbia, in Winnipeg, and in Toronto, there are a large number of men out of employment. These men will not go on the land; they refuse that kind of employment. We are trying to work harmoniously with the Labour Department in this respect, and after a period of two weeks I was forced to take off the embargo, and let more men come in from the United States.

With respect to the falsity of the affidavit, I could not for a moment deny that such a thing might occur. It is said of a certain class of people that they will come in under almost any conditions, and I am being constantly criticized because these people are coming into the cities; but I do not agree with the statement of Mr. Moore, or any one else, that we should put up the bars in Canada, and say, "We are not going to let people into Canada, and will absolutely shut them out because conditions are such in Canada that they cannot receive employment." We are forced to-day to put our bars up against immigration to Canada of a very splendid lot or artisans in Great Britain, who would make fine settlers in Canada, for we are constantly telling them that there is no place or employment for them, and we are trying to meet that situation. All you have to do, Mr. Chairman, is to look at the amount of immigration flowing into Canada at present. It is not nearly large enough. If immigration is to be one of the assisting factors in building up Canada, we have to get it on a larger scale, and I am convinced that in no respect is that stream of immigration going to affect the general situation in Canada. We are using every effort to bring people in who will go upon the land. My hon. friend says that conditions upon the land are not of such a character as to warrant our even bringing these in. There may be something to be said about that; but what we are trying to do is to encourage the farmer and the farm labourer to come into and settle in Canada. If there are men and women who are making false affidavits, I should like my hon. friend to go down to the port of entry at Quebec or Montreal or St. John—perhaps he has already done so—and he will see that we subject intending immigrants to the most rigid examination, medical and otherwise, and if such people as he speaks of get in, they get in without our knowledge. Some of them will undoubtedly get in; but I cannot agree that a very large number are passing in this way.

Mr. MANION: I had intended to make a few remarks on this subject and there were some other hon. members in this corner who intended to speak at a little length; but at this stage of the session, I do not wish to take up much of the time of the committee. I thank the minister for having advised me that he was bringing on his estimates. This subject is, perhaps, the most important one that we have in this country at the present time. We have the railway problem and the financial problem, and both of them, to my mind, can be ultimately solved, to a great extent, by a proper immigration policy. The railways need greater traffic, and the financial needs of this country make it imperative that we have more people to pay taxes.

I wish to draw to the attention of the minister a statement which appeared some time ago in the Winnipeg Free Press. In this statement, speeches by the Bishop of Birmingham and Mr. Rider Haggard, of England, were quoted. In those speeches, according to the press, both those gentle-

men suggested that not only Canada but the Dominions in general should be used as countries to which to send those of the British people, English, Irish, Scotch and Welsh, I presume, who were not physically up to the mark, as a method of "reinvigorating" them—I think that was the expression used. I do not know the attitude taken by the departmental people in England, but I am quite sure the department does not feel that this country can afford to act as a reinvigorating agency for any class of people, whether British or otherwise, because, after all, whatever people come to this country should be physically fit to take their place and make their way. There is no easy road to success in this country; hard work and effort are essential. If this has not already been done I believe it is the duty of the Government at the present time to advise publicly the people of Great Britain as to the Government's attitude on the matter, because men of the prominence of Rider Haggard, the Bishop of Birmingham and others who have made similar speeches at other times should be made aware of the fact that the Dominions do not wish people, whether British or otherwise, who are not physically fit to make their way, to come to Canada, on account of the hardships they will encounter and the efforts required to ensure success in this country.

There is another point in regard to which I wish to offer a suggestion which may not have already been brought to the minister's attention. I refer to a method by which Australia is obtaining a very good class of citizens, and which is called the "nomination system,"—I do not know whether the minister has heard of it or not. I read a good account of it recently in the Atlantic Magazine or one of the other monthly reviews. In that system the method is employed of accepting nominations from citizens who have come from the Old Land, particularly from the British Isles, and who have made good in Australia. They have the right to nominate to the Department of Immigration of Australia certain friends of theirs, whom they know and whom they can recommend as good citizens to come to Australia. It is reported in the review in which I read the account, that a very fine class of citizens is being brought out in that way, because a citizen who nominates or recommends a man, feels a sort of responsibility for him. He will not, generally speaking, advise the government to admit people who are not fit to come; he knows the necessities of settlers coming to that country; and when a settler does come in, he feels a sort of responsibility, takes an interest in him and offers suggestions to him as to the best methods of getting along in Australia. The description of this system appealed very much to me, and it might be well worth the while of the minister to look into it and perhaps bring in some such system in addition to the methods which he has in force at the present time in this country.

5 p.m.

As regards the admission to Canada of people from various parts of the world, the United States has found it necessary to restrict their immigration, and this Government is correct in putting on restrictions on certain classes of people coming into this country. We all know that we need people very much to help to solve our public problems, but we need the right kind of people brought in in such numbers that we can assimilate them. A point struck me very forcibly recently in reading an article by a very able American writer, who was giving the number of immigrants admitted into the Unted States in various years. As I checked up the report, I found that the United States, prior to some few years ago, had not admitted into its country the number of immigrants that Canada was admitting before the war. For example, in 1870, when the population of the United States was 38,000,000, the number of immigrants into the United States was only 378,000, whereas Canada, in 1914, just before the war, with a population of considerably less than 9,000,000, admitted 402,000. In other words, Canada, with a population of less than 9,000,000, admitted many more immigrants into her country than the United States had in any year prior to 1870, when the population of the United States was 38,000,000. That illustrates very markedly the necessity of Canada being very careful with her immigration policy, because, after all, the whole principles of democracy are based upon the general average of intelligence of the people comprising that democracy. If you admit such a large number of people into a country that they not only dilute your own democracy, but change its whole force by flooding it, so to speak, that would naturally change our whole Canadian citizenship. In a few words, I wish to bring those three or four points before the minister; but particularly, I wish to emphasize the speeches quoted by the Winnipeg Free Press—and, by the way, very much con-

demned by that newspaper— advocating sending out British people to "reinvigorate" them in the Dominions; and to emphasize also the method in Australia of nominating prospective immigrants into that country.

Mr. NEILL: I do not think the point raised by Mr. Moore of the Trades and Labour Council has been adequately answered by the minister. Some months ago when the question of immigration was discussed in this House, we were told by the minister that the restriction would be rigidly enforced, the immigration being confined to farm labourers and domestic servants, and we accepted that assurance. Mr. Moore complains that that has been evaded by means of affidavits more or less carelessly entered into. We presume that is the only safeguard. The minister does not deny that it is the only method. When we consider conditions in southern Europe, when we know that many of these immigrants do not speak the English language, when we consider that they are being asked or solicited to emigrate by agents of shipping companies who are interested in a monetary sense, and when we hear that the only safeguard against taking in an undesirable class—that is, other than domestic servants or farm labourers—is that they are asked to make an affidavit, we cannot but think that there is practically no restriction at all. That means that as they pass through the shipping office, they are shown a paper, a spot on it is pointed out to them and they are told to make their cross in that particular place. The emigrant regards it as part of the formality of going abroad and he does so. Ninety per cent of them do not know what the contents of the affidavits are. Everything points to too great laxity. Apparently there is no one sufficiently interested to see that the regulations are enforced. The result is that we have not—

Mr. STEWART (Argenteuil): I cannot permit the hon. gentleman to make a statement which is so far from the facts. I stated that in Great Britain every immigrant practically passes through the hands of some immigration agent. On the Continent, until quite recently, we had but one agency, and when a great number of immigrants were embarking some may have got past without conforming with the regulations. But to say that shiploads of such immigrants are being landed in Canada is to stray beyond the point of truth, and I must protest against the statement. Every single last one of these immigrants must pass the immigration officer at the port of entry into Canada. True, we cannot tell that a particular individual may not be making a false affidavit as to occupation, but I would draw the attention of my hon friend to the fact that we make a very rigid investigation Dealing with the class of people coming into my hon friend's province, I am prepared to admit a good deal of what he says—that those people managed to enter in various ways, and perhaps we are not aware how many did get in; but we are going to remedy that condition of things as far as we can. What my hon. friend states, however, is not applicable to immigrants coming through the eastern ports of Canada or through the ports of the United States.

Mr. NEILL: Did I understand the minister to state that there was only one immigration officer on the Continent?

Mr. STEWART (Argenteuil): Yes, up until a month ago; there are now three.

Mr. NEILL: I still submit that I am not very far out in my assertion. Where are these men located, in Antwerp?

Mr. STEWART (Argenteuil): There was always one located in Antwerp. That has always been a great port for immigrants.

Mr. NEILL: A man comes from Bolivia, a country in southeastern Europe—

Some hon. MEMBERS: You are slightly wrong in your geography.

Mr. NEILL: I meant to say Bavaria—I would rather see immigrants come from South America than from southeastern Europe; I am speaking of the Balkans, where they have been raising Cain for the last twenty years. Those people are not desirable immigrants. When they reach the eastern boundary of Europe what facilities have our officials to gauge their fitness for or experience in agriculture.

Mr. STEWART (Argenteuil): As a matter of fact, there are very few immigrants coming from the countries mentioned by my hon. friend. The bulk of them are coming, or attempting to come, from Poland. That is where we are having the greatest difficulty at the present time. Very few of those people are agriculturists. I wish my hon. friend was Minister of Immigration for two days; he would then realize some of the difficulties that confront us. But those people are not landing in Canada.

Mr. NEILL: We hear every day of large numbers of immigrants coming into this country. Where do they come from? And if they come from Poland, and are not farmers, what are they? I do not wish to embarrass the minister, nor to take up the time of the House, but is there any way of ascertaining whether these people are agriculturists save by an all-too-easily-evaded affidavit? Do they have to produce a certificate from the government of the country they come from that they have been engaged in agricultural life?

Mr. STEWART (Argenteuil): Yes; that is the very reason why we have men at Bucharest and Warsaw at the present time. And if an immigrant comes down to one of the eastern ports without being armed with a certificate from those agents he will not be allowed to ship. Formerly we had the difficulty my hon. friend refers to, but that is not the case to-day. However, I would not like to make my statement too definite, because these officials have only been at those posts for the past four weeks. Having that inspection close to the home of the immigrants makes it very convenient for them if they are rejected. A considerable number of farmers are coming from Poland to join their friends in western Canada, but to say there are large numbers of immigrants coming into our cities is not in accordance with the facts.

Mr. IRVINE: In view of the fact that agriculture is more or less of a seasonable occupation, and in view also of the poor economic conditions on the farm described by the representatives of the farmers in this House, does not the minister think that the immigrants who are being brought in now will very largely swell the ranks of our unemployed next winter? And is the Government prepared to accept the responsibility for that result?

Mr. STEWART (Argenteuil): Let me tell my hon. friend from East Calgary that if we are to bring no immigrants in the department would like to know. But practically every member who speaks upon the subject of immigration points to it as the main solution of our difficulties. The hon. member for Fort William and Rainy River has just made that assertion. And the Department of Immigration is being asked to bring people into this country. Well, whom are we to bring in? I have pointed out that on the prairies many of our farmers have had to go without farm help, notwithstanding the fact, as my hon. friend knows, that in the cities there are many unemployed, because these unemployed will not work on the farms. If a condition arises next winter because of the seasonal employment on the land, I think my hon. friend from East Calgary will not find in the cities a very large number of the people whom we are bringing from Great Britain and the continent. We are endeavouring to bring in farmers, not men who are looking for employment in cities, and I cannot conceive of any other policy to meet the situation than the one I have just outlined.

Mr. EVANS: By recent Order in Council has the money qualification of immigrants been abandoned? I think it was $250.

Mr. STEWART (Argenteuil): It has been abandoned except in so far as orientals are concerned.

Mr. SUTHERLAND: I was very glad to hear the minister state that the rigid inspection of immigrants at the port of landing is to be continued. I think this is very important, and notwithstanding the desirability of having immigrants examined before they come to this country, yet under present conditions I believe the responsibility rests upon the steamship companies and their booking agents to return to their homes those intending immigrants who cannot pass inspection. In that way I feel that an almost sufficient safeguard is provided. It is certainly very sad to find a family seeking admittance to this country turned back at the port of landing, and I have known cases where large families have been refused admittance under almost heartbreaking circumstances. But we cannot very well avoid such occasional hardships, and if the minister and his department exercise the precautions which they evidently intend to do, such cases will be reduced to a minimum.

Now, in regard to the remarks of the hon. member for East Calgary (Mr. Irvine) as to the seasonal occupation of those engaged in farm work, it is quite true that for the last six or eight years very little immigration has flowed into this country owing to the conditions which prevailed in the Old Land. The department may be ever so anxious to provide the necessary labour for the carrying on of farming operations in this country, but no matter what safeguards they employ, there will be people coming in who have no desire or intention to carry on farm work or to continue in it for any length

of time. I do not know that the department or the minister can be blamed if a certain proportion of these people do not remain in the occupation which they are expected to follow. And, after all, I do not know that any great hardship will ensue if they do not, provided that they are willing to fulfil some of the obligations which rest upon them as citizens of this country. The idea that everybody who comes here should take up farm work seems to have been a little overdone.

It has been stated by Mr. Moore and others that a large number of persons in this country are out of employment, but I venture to state that since the first immigrant arrived in Canada there were never so many actual demands for workers as there are at this time. Many people are out of work because they cannot get employment such as they have been engaged in in the past, and are not willing to take up any other. Calls for workers are being made from many different quarters, yet there are no workers to be found. Who is to blame for that? Have we arrived at the stage where a man who cannot get just the kind of employment he wants, though there are demands for services in many directions, simply sits down and asks the country to come to his rescue? There is no use in closing our eyes to the conditions which confront us, or in allowing our partisan inclinations to influence us. It is the duty of every citizen to come to the assistance of the minister and of the Government on this question so that it may be settled now and for all time to come. Many people have made it their business during the last few years to agitate the public mind and to make it appear that there is no work in this country, and at the same time they have been demanding that hours of labour shall be reduced, that what a workman does shall be subject to limitations, and that if he does more than that he shall be penalized by the unions which are running this country at the present time. We all know that this condition confronts us; yet we have not the courage to express our views—to spit it out; to say what is passing through our minds. This is the condition which is responsible for much of the trouble with which the country is confronted in the matter of railway transportation. I say that that is the key note of the whole trouble. The unions are in control; they are dictating to the Government and to everybody else, and as a result we are endeavouring to meet big deficits in connection with the operation of our railway lines. How long is this to continue? Yet some people say that the minister should shut out all immigration until everybody who is now unemployed can find work that suits his present requirements or desires. I say that there never was a greater demand for labour in this country than there is now, and if we can get desirable citizens from the Old Land we need have nothing to fear, provided that the minister carries out the inspection at the port of landing which he says he intends to put into effect. But we must be placed in such a position that no union shall dictate the transportation rates of this country, as is the condition at present. We are in the hands of an organization which during the war period dictated the policy of this country, and as a result of having had to submit to that organization we are confronted by our present difficulties. The sooner we throw off these shackles and give our assistance as a unit to the minister and to the Government in this respect, the better it will be for all concerned.

Mr. IRVINE: The hon. member for South Oxford (Mr. Sutherland) says that we should settle this question now and for all time. I have no objection, if he wants to do that, but I doubt very much whether he can settle any question now and for all time. He also says that we should have the courage, to use his own words, to "spit" this thing out now. Well, I do not see any great need for courage to say anything that the hon. member said, unless you have to have courage when you are talking a little beside the facts. I am sure no one in the House will agree with the statement of the hon. member that those who have been unemployed in Canada during the last year are out of work simply because they are looking for particular jobs; that is too ridiculous for comment. As to my question to the minister, I do not think the answer is satisfactory. I am not one of those who think that immigration is the solution of all our national troubles. However, I am not speaking dogmatically for or against that, neither am I opposed to immigration as such. I do not think under present circumstances it is possible to bring in farmers only, but even if we could do that, no one will say that the farmers of this country, particularly those of western Canada, are prepared to hire

help all the year round, especially in view of the fact that they find it difficult to meet their own economic needs. What, then, will become of these immigrants in the winter months? Granting that there are men in the cities who will not work on the farms, if these other people also go into the cities and look for work, will there not be more unemployment? My question is: Will the Government assume now the responsibility for the situation which this action is very likely to create?

Mr. LEADER: I would like to ask the minister what attitude the Government intends to take with regard to Hutterites coming into Canada. We have in the constituency of Portage la Prairie a unique situation. During the war this class of immigrants came into Canada from the United States; I am told that their object was to avoid naval service. Anyway, they were allowed to come here and to settle up round Elie. They are regarded by the settlers up there as undesirable citizens; they segregate into colonies and are simply impossible of assimilation. Since coming down here I have received a resolution passed by the local branch of the United Farmers of Elie and in St. Eustache, a copy of which I handed to the minister, protesting against any further immigration of this class of settlers. Is it the intention of the Government to remove the restrictions that now exist with regard to the entry of this class of immigrants?

Mr. STEWART (Argenteuil): That has already been done by Order in Council, with respect to both Hutterites and Mennonites.

Mr. LEADER: The restrictions have been removed?

Mr. STEWART (Argenteuil): Yes.

Mr. LEADER: Well, what shall I do with regard to the resolution passed by my constituents protesting against the entry of these immigrants into Canada?

Mr. STEWART (Argenteuil): No settler can come into Canada on the specific understanding that in any way he can avoid the obligations of Canadian citizenship. As I understand it, that has been the difficulty in the past. Moreover, some of these people have persisted in settling in colonies. That cannot be charged against the Mennonites, except the old colonies in Manitoba.

[Mr. Irvine.]

Mr. LEADER: Do I understand the minister to say that if these people come in with the intention of settling in colonies, that will be prohibited?

Mr. STEWART (Argenteuil): I could not say we would prohibit it, but I can say this. These people will have to assume all the obligations of a Canadian citizen, with respect to military service and everything else. But to say that they shall not settle on three or four sections of land would be going beyond that point perhaps. Every effort, however, will be made to prevent them colonizing.

It is my intention as soon as the House prorogues to visit every provincial government in Canada for the purpose of working out with them a scheme of settlement, particularly in the western provinces, and in that way give them a larger control of the individual after he arrives in Canada. The complaint has frequently been made—I have made it myself in Alberta—that the Dominion government was bringing in settlers a large percentage of whom were mentally deficient. That is why I am insisting to-day on very strict medical examination and a careful scrutiny of the family history of intending immigrants. I know I am being accused by many good people of being too strict in this connection. Friends and sometimes members of parliament object very strenuously to my action in deciding to deport people who are not physically and mentally fit.

Mr. IRVINE: Does the minister think it would be feasible for the Canadian authorities to make the examination that is made on this side of the water, before embarkation? It does seem to me that the present system puts the immigrant to a very great deal of inconvenience if he is found unfit on his arrival here and is returned.

Mr. LEADER: I am pleased to hear the remarks of the minister, and I trust that he will pay a visit to the district that I speak of and examine conditions there. If he does, he will find out that what I say is true, and that these people are living in colonies. I think they have perhaps seven or nine now. I had the opportunity of going through one of these colonies, and I do not believe that the conditions that exist there are desirable in Canada. These people are good farmers but I do not believe we shall ever be able to assimilate them. The settlers up there are protesting against their entry, and I would ask the minister

to be just a little bit careful about admitting these people. I am sure he would not think it desirable to have these foreigners settle in Canada and retain their language and customs that are not what we expect from good Canadian citizens. It is a German sect, I believe. They retain their own language and object to military service. In fact, they do not even desire the franchise, and will not vote or take any part in the government of this country. I am told they are undesirable citizens.

Mr. BEAUBIEN: I do not think I have abused the indulgence of the House this session, but I should like to make a few remarks on this subject, and I hope you will not censure me, Mr. Chairman, for taking up a few minutes. There seems to be an impression in this House that the only immigration that comes to Canada is from the British Isles. I have all the respect in the world for the people of the British Isles, but I want to say that some of our best immigrants have come from other places. When this item was up some days ago, mention was made of "the man with the sheepskin coat," and it was said that the foreign element comprised a high percentage of the jail-birds and convicts in this country. That might be true, but, nevertheless, the man with the sheepskin coat has been a big factor in developing this country. He has built our railroads, and the sewers in our cities; he has done all the dirty work. In western Canada I do not think we could get our crops threshed if it were not for the man with the sheepskin coat.

I want to say just a word or two about those we call the Ukrainians. They come from central Europe, from Galicia, I think. We as Canadians are to blame a great deal if we have these people in jail in our country. I believe that our political system has really given a great opportunity to debauch these people and lower their standards, instead of raising them to ours. I want to read a little article taken from the Ukrainian of the week of May 22. I do not want to leave the impression that I am throwing slurs at any political party, but we all know that in political parties there are unscrupulous politicians. This article says:

> The Ukrainians get the worst deal of all other nationalities inhabiting Manitoba under the party governments. In the first place because the parties—both the Conservatives and Liberals—

Of course, we were fewer.

> —never tried to enlighten the Ukrainians in political matters—

At this point, let me say that my own observation has been that just previous to an election these people are brought up and given naturalization papers by the hundred, although they do not know what they mean. I do not believe they could read one if they were asked, and that is where we fail. The editorial continues:

> —but rather demoralized them during election campaigns by lavishing money rewards, by offering strong drink, and by promising to build roads, etc. for their votes.

Mr. MARTELL: When did this naturalzation take place?

Mr. BEAUBIEN: At different times.

Mr. MARTELL: Before the last election?

Mr. BEAUBIEN: Before all elections. It goes on:

> This dishonest, unpatriotic and shameful work of the parties finally caused the Ukrainians to consider elections as opportunity for making a little money or getting some other rewards. They were granted naturalization papers without being educated as to the real value and importance of these papers; they were told that the papers entitled them to vote—although the parties bribed their votes. In short our settlers, until comparatively recent times were fine political instruments in the hands of the Anglo-Saxons; whichever party expended more money on buying their votes, that party prided in its victory and glories in its domination. Although as we say, neither party tried to get the Ukrainian settler acquainted with Canadian citizenship, with Canadian ideals and relationship; neither government cared to inform the Ukrainians of their political rights and duties; in addition they were forbidden to use their own language, the only language they could speak then, and read their own newspapers which were their only news of obtaining information concerning citizen rights and duties.

Mr. MARTELL: Were not these people disfranchised in 1917?

Mr. BEAUBIEN: I am coming to that, if my hon. friend will wait a moment. A good many of these people were given naturalization papers and made British subjects. Then in 1917 a lot of them offered for service during the war. I know some of these boys myself. Take our Mennonite settlers and even our Ukrainian settlers; in Red Cross work they were very active. Take the Mennonities in the district of Steinback in my riding. They sent tons and tons of bologna sausages over to the starving Russians.

An hon. MEMBER: Even that was better than fighting.

Mr. BEAUBIEN: As I understand, they were given a guarantee when they came to this country that they would not have to fight.

An hon. MEMBER: That is wrong.

Mr. BEAUBIEN: I may be wrong, but at any rate I do not want to take up the time of the committee in arguing the matter. I claim that the man who comes to this country in a sheepskin coat is better than the man who comes to this country wearing gloves and a white collar. Go to the city of Winnipeg during harvest time, go to the employment offices there, run, I think, by the provincial government in conjunction with the federal authorities, and if you want men to work on your farm it is the men who have worn sheepskin coats that will respond to the demand; the others professing to seek for employment do not want to work on the farm at all. The man who lives on the prairie in the winter time needs a sheepskin coat, and I may say that I wear one myself in the winter season.

Mr. EVANS: In the West we have hordes of foreigners who have settled in colonies. Many of these have made excellent settlers. I have in mind, in particular, the Galician who is ambitious from the start, from the very time he landed in this country, to become a good Canadian. The Galicians, I believe, are making good, but at the present time, particularly since the war, we have a class of people out there who are not content with our form of government and there are foreigners there to-day from the south-eastern part of Europe, foreigners settled in colonies, who are continually advocating Sovietism. I, for one, would certainly protest against letting the gates down and admitting, without any restriction, foreigners in large numbers to settle in colonies amongst us. I certainly would urge the Minister of Immigration to use every care in the selection of immigrants. I have read with interest Sir Clifford Sifton's scheme of immigration, but from what I can see his plan for settling our lands would amount to a system of slavery and I protest against bringing the calling of the agriculturist down to that level. I say, however, that those people who will not allow themselves to be assimilated and will not assume the duties and responsibilities of full Canadian citizenship should be debarred from entering this country.

[Mr. Beaubien.]

Mr. SUTHERLAND: I would like to ask the minister if the old custom of granting a bonus or subsidy to booking agents is to be revived under this vote? In years gone by a bonus was paid to booking agents in respect of desirable settlers whom they might secure, and I am not sure that the policy was not a very good one, because the booking agents are in a better position than even the agents of the governmeent to judge as to the merits of prospective settlers. The bonus was paid only in the case of those who were going on the land or were domestic servants. The demand for domestic servants. in this country to-day is possibly greater than it has been at any time in the past, and I would therefore like to know if there is any intention on the part of the government to revive the old custom referred to?

Mr. STEWART (Argenteuil): I have had no experience of booking agents, but on looking over the records of the department and discussing the matter with the immigration officials, I discovered that while there were a great many good agents, unfortunately there was a not inconsiderable number who took advantage of the system, and in fact were influenced in their efforts by the idea of number rather than quality.

Mr. GARLAND (Bow River): With regard to the question raised by the hon. member for South Oxford (Mr. Sutherland) I am in accord with some of his remarks. I am in accord with my hon. friend when he says that unemployment in this country is possibly due, to some extent, t othe fact that many of those who are unemployed do not want to go to work on farms. Now, that is their own personal business, but I want to point out to the minister that if he enters upon a large scheme of immigration in order to bring farmers or farm labourers to this country he is probably going to have the condition of affairs pointed out by the hon. member for East Calgary (Mr. Irvine). I know my own district well and I know it will not give employment to anything like the same number of men during the winter months that it possibly does in the summer months. Therefore, you will have to find employment, to that extent, for these surplus men in winter. In this I agree with my hon. friend (Mr. Irvine), and I am very anxious that the Government should answer the question he asked as to whether or not they were prepared to assume the responsibility for the unemployment that may result next winter in consequence of this policy. I

think it would be very well indeed if the department would endeavour to determine the causes of emigration from Canada. If it solved that problem and applied the remedy, there would be very little trouble in getting immigrants for Canada. That, I think, is the real problem, the serious problem, that confronts this department at the present time. Now the Minister of Immigration himself, speaking some time ago at a meeting of weekly newspaper proprietors or editors, made a remark something like this: He said that in the last decade we had lost about two millions, in round numbers, of the residents of this country, and that during the same period twenty million dollars—I think that was the figure—had been spent on immigration. He went on to say that the Government was anxious, and he himself was anxious, to find the cause for this loss. I had been under the impression that we representatives from the West had been endeavouring to show him the causes; we argue that they are economic in their nature. I am sorry that we failed to enlighten the minister, but I hope he will give patient thought and deep consideration to the cause of our loss of population. If we had maintained the immense number—amounting, I think, to two millions—that we have lost we would be in a much happier condition in this country to-day.

I deplore the policy of child immigration and I wish to go on record as protesting against it. I do not think it is fair to Canada, nor do I think it is fair to the children themselves who are coming over here. I would like to ask any member of this House how he would like to see his children hired out to unknown persons in an unknown country. To be frank with the committee I think such a policy amounts to brutality. Take farms where they are already children, and I am afraid that in the majority of cases the grossest discrimination will be displayed against the unfortunate immigrant child. I was very glad to hear the remarks of the hon. member for Fort William and Rainy River (Mr. Manion) with regard to the importance of looking after the health of our immigrants. It is quite true, as the minister himself remarked a few minutes ago, that due consideration can and should be given to the history of adult immigrants, but let us see what type of immigrants must these children be? Probably they come from orphan homes, or from the home of degenerate families. Nobody but degenerate parents would want to part with children to send them away to work in a distant country. How are you going to obtain the family history of children coming from such homes? You will be able to ascertain little or nothing about them. Therefore, I say child immigration is wrong.

I now want to call attention to an extract from the Manitoba Free Press of May 15, and I do so because I believe that gross injustice has been done to residents in foreign countries by unscrupulous agents, whether of the steamships companies or real estate companies, or other people connected even with the governmnt. This itm reads:

> Prince Rupert, B.C., May 17 (By Canadian Press.)—Protests are being received by local newspapers and government offices from British settlers in Massett, Queen Charlotte islands, who recently came over from England. The settlers arranged for the passage and settlement through a private company in England, but they are asking government assistance in clearing the land, which they say was represented to them as rich agricultural property, with no mention being made of the timber to be removed before farming could be started.
>
> They also claim they were promised that mill work would be available to assist them in making a living. This work has not been commenced, they say, and no machinery to start the mills is in sight.
>
> Shareholders say they were invited by a London company to buy plots in Massett at $300 each, and now find themselves unable either to farm the land or to earn a living in any other way.

I am sure this is worthy of the attention of the minister. In conclusion, I desire to ask the Minister this question:

Does the Government repay the immigrant who is deported on arrival on this side, because of ill-health or disease, the fare to this country which he has paid to the Canadian Pacific or some other line?

Mr. STEWART (Argenteuil): He is taken back by the shipping company.

Mr. GARLAND (Bow River): Free of charge?

Mr. STEWART (Argenteuil): But he has already paid his way out; he does not get that back. What has the Government to do with that?

Mr. GARLAND (Bow River): I think the suggestion of the hon. member for East Calgary (Mr. Irvine), that you should establish in the country from which you are inviting immigrants a place where they could be examined before embarking, is a good one.

Mr. GOOD: Is there any provision in regard to passports or certificates being furnished to the immigrants on the other side, before they can get on board a ship to come over here?

Mr. STEWART (Argenteuil): Oh, yes, they must have them.

Mr. COOTE: I wish to assure the Minister of the Interior that he is, possibly, the last minister I would wish to criticize. I simply want to point out to this committee something that has not yet been stated. I have waited till the last, hoping someone else would mention it. I say that our immigration policy is rather lopsided. Our governments have always endeavoured to bring into this country agriculturists. At present, we are producing more on our farms than we can find a profitable market for. I want hon. members to think it over. Is it good business for us to bring more farmers here to raise more produce, when we cannot find a market for what we produce to-day? It is a fact that some of the farm produce that has been obtained by hard labour is left to rot in the field, or is thrown away. I am going to leave that matter with the Government to think over. I suggest to the minister that, if it is a fact that a great number of the unemployed people in this country are in the cities and will not go to the farms, he should use part of this $300,000 to induce some manufacturers to come from Great Britain or some place where they are used to manufacturing without a protective tariff, and start factories in our cities, to provide employment for these unemployed.

Item agreed to.

CIVIL SERVICE COMMISSION

Civil Service Commission—
Salaries.. .. .. $177,630
Contingencies.. 130,000

Mr. CHEVRIER: Let me preface my remarks by saying that I hold no brief for the Civil Service Commission, nor do I hold any brief against them, nor against any members of the Civil Service. That commission is a creature of the statute, and if the members of the Civil Service Commission, or the commission themselves, when they exercise all the rights, duties and obligations cast upon them by statute, prejudicially affect the rights of any one, or the rights of the Civil Service, I say that they cannot as such be blamed, but that the blame must be placed upon those who are responsible for the creation of the commission. We are called upon to vote the sum of $300,000 for the maintenance of the Civil Service Commission during the coming year. There has been a lot of discussion about, and a great deal of dissatisfaction with, the Civil Service Commission, and I intend to treat the question more from a legal point of view; and, if the House will bear with me for a short while, I will endeavour to trace the legislation respecting the Civil Service Commission, and to point out the difficulties in the work of the commission, and, to the best of my ability, to show the remedy to be adopted for the existing state of affairs. The Civil Service Commission may be traced to the statute of 1882 with reference to the Civil Service, and that is embodied in section 3, Chapter IV of 45 Victoria.

At six o'clock the Speaker resumed the Chair, and the House took recess.

After Recess

The House resumed at eight o'clock.

PRIVATE BILLS

CONSIDERED IN COMMITTEE—THIRD READINGS

Bill No. 126 (from the Senate), for the relief of James Hosie.—Mr. Clark.

Bill No. 127 (from the Senate), for the relief of Mary Ila Cameron.—Mr. Kay.

Bill No. 128 (from the Senate), for the relief of Frank Hamilton Bawden.—Mr. Clark.

Bill No. 129 (from the Senate), for the relief of Harry Alexander Smith.—Mr. Rankin.

Bill No. 130 (from the Senate), for the relief of Allen Richard Morgan.—Mr. Rankin.

Bill No. 131 (from the Senate), for the relief of Mildred Emma Blachford.—Mr. Rankin.

Bill No. 135 (from the Senate), for the relief of James Henry Boyd.—Mr. Boyce.

Bill No. 39 (from the Senate), for the relief of Georgina Gibbings.—Mr. MacKelvie.

SECOND READINGS

Bill No. 134 (from the Senate), for the relief of Roy Wilbert Shaver.—Mr. McGiverin.

Bill No. 138 (from the Senate), for the relief of Frank Clifford Gennery.—Mr. Rankin.

Bill No. 139 (from the Senate), for the relief of Sarah Brackinreid.—Mr. Kay.

Bill No. 140 (from the Senate), for the relief of Mildred Catherine Touchbourne. —Mr. Kay.

SUPPLY

CIVIL SERVICE COMMISSION

The House again in Committee of Supply, Mr. Gordon in the Chair.

Mr. CHEVRIER: When the committee rose at six o'clock I was referring to the legislation governing the operations of the Civil Service Commission. I was just going to show that this legislation had its inception in 1882, and that from the enactment then made followed the present Civil Service Act. The act of 1882 is cited as Chapter 4 of 45 Victoria. Section 3, with which we are concerned at present, reads as follows:

> A board of examiners shall, from time to time, be appointed by the Governor in Council, who for the purposes of this act shall be known and are hereinafter referred to as "The board," consisting of three members who shall be authorized to examine all candidates for admission to the Civil Service of Canada, and to give certificates of qualification to such persons as are found qualified according to such regulations as shall be framed for the guidance of the board.

That section remained the law under which all appointments were made to the Civil Service of Canada, until the year 1908. In that year there was passed an Act to Amend the Civil Service Act, assented to on the 20th of July, 1908, and known as an Act to amend the Civil Service Act, 1908, Chapter 15 of 7 and 8 Edward VII. Section 3 contained the provision which determined the constitution of the Civil Service Commission. It provided as follows:

> The Civil Service shall be divided into two divisions, namely, the inside service which shall consist of that part of the public service in or under the several departments of the executive government of Canada—

Then it recites quite a number of names of departments; whereupon the second division of the service is described as follows:

> The outside service, which shall consist of the rest of the public service.

This act applied to the inside service only. It is simple in its inception and capable of being easily worked out. It was copied from the British Civil Service Act, and it met all the difficulties inherent to civil service administration. There is no legislation I know of that is perfect, but this legislation was as near perfect as any could be. Under section 5 the inside service was divided into three classes, each of which was divided into two more, so that the whole of the service was divided into six categories. Sections 27, 28 and 29 set out the salaries for each of these classes. The duties of the commission were set out in section 10, as follows:

> (a) to test and pass upon the qualifications of candidates for admission to the service, and for promotion in the service, and to issue certificates with respect thereto were required under this act or regulations made thereunder;
>
> (b) of its own motion to investigate and report upon the operation of the Civil Service Act or of this act, and upon the violation of any of the provisions of the Civil Service Act or of this act or of any regulation made under either of the said acts, and upon the request of the head of a department with the approval of the Governor in Council, to investigate and report upon the organization of the department.

Admissions into the service, therefore were to be by competitive examination. I will refer to this more at length when I take up the act under which we are working to-day. Appointments to the service were regulated by section 13, which stated:

> Appointment to positions in the inside service under that of deputy head shall be by competitive examination, which shall be of such a nature as will determine the qualifications of candidates for the particular positions to which they are to be appointed, and shall be held by the commission from time to time in accordance with the regulations made by it and approved by the Governor in Council.

This was a fair statement of the manner in which appointments should be made. Section 18 provides as follows:

> From the said list—

Referring to the list of successful competitors in an examination.

> —"the commission, on the application of the deputy head, with the approval of the head of any department, shall supply the required clerks, whether for permanent or temporary duty.

Under that act, therefore, fair play was assured through competitive examination, and the deputy minister could then, with the approval of the minister, appoint the person whom he wished to fill the vacant position. I think that that met all the requirements of a democratic government such as that which is now ours.

The responsibility was upon the minister to see that his department was properly administered. He had confidence in his deputy; the deputy knew the requirements of his department and could choose from among the successful candidates the man whom he regarded as best qualified to

fill the position. Under section 19 the head of the department, as in the case of the present law, might at any time after two months reject any person assigned to his department with whom he was not satisfied. Probably the only section that led to any difficulty and to dissatisfaction in the service was section 21, with reference to the appointment of technical or professional and specially qualified officers. This section provided as follows:

> If the deputy head reports that the knowledge and ability requisite for the position are wholly or in part professional, technical or otherwise peculiar, the Governor in Council upon the recommendation of the head of the department based on the report in writing of the deputy head, may appoint a person to the position without competitive examination.

That meant that if the deputy minister wanted to promote an employee over the heads of other officials, he could simply say that the officer in question was "otherwise peculiarly" qualified for the position, and the person in line of promotion would not be recognized. I say that was the only objectionable feature of the act of 1908 from the point of view of the Civil Service. Of course, the salary schedules in sections 27, 28 and 29 are obsolete. As showing the sincerity of this act, a number of appointments to inferior positions were made under section 22 without competitive examination. I wish to point out also that the act of 1918 was not the only one that recognized merit in the Civil Service. Section 24 of the act of 1908 provided:

> Promotion, other than from the third to the second division, shall be made for merit by the Governor in Council upon the recommendation of the head of the department, based on the report in writing of the deputy head and accompanied by a certificate of qualification by the commission to be given with or without examination, as is determined by the regulations of the commission.

So that promotions were fairly dealt with by that act. With certain modifications as to promotion and very material modifications as to salary schedules, an act similar to this, coupled with the Whitley Councils which the service desires, would come as near to perfection as one could wish in the administration of the Civil Service of Canada.

This act remained in force until 1918, when the government of the day, desirous of bringing the outside service under the administration of the Civil Service Commission, brought down another act, which is called the Civil Service Act, 1918, and which was assented to on the 24th of May, 1918,

Chapter 12, Statutes of George V. That act is modelled in many respects on the act which it repealed. It brought the outside service under the Civil Service Commission, and prescribed about the same duties. It was a fatal mistake to endeavour to bring in all of the outside service under a system of competitive examinations or demonstrations of skill as the act provides, when a large number of these appointments are not susceptible of competitive examinations or demonstrations of skill. The intention was very good. It was to improve civil service administration, but the method under which it was done missed the point altogether. The act provides that appointments must be made by competitive examination. I shall endeavour to show that there are a large number of appointments which are made under the Civil Service Act of 1918, and as amended later by the act of 1919, which are not susceptible of being made properly by competitive examination or demonstrations of skill, and that therefore there is a want of sincerity, a want of loyalty in the administration of the Civil Service under a law which sets out one thing and does another. Section 9 of the act of 1918 provided for the organization of the Civil Service, and classification was to follow. I have always understood, Mr. Chairman, that organization of a department meant that the minister, or the deputy minister or the Civil Service Commission, would proceed to organize that department, determine what its personnel should consist of, namely, a minister, a deputy minister, an assistant deputy minister, if the work required it, a secretary, an assistant secretary, so many clerks, so many head clerks, so many principal clerks, so many chief stenographers, so many junior stenographers, and so many messengers, and that once the number of employees in those categories that would be necessary to administer the department properly had been determined, and once the nature of the work to be done by them was known, the classification of salaries of these positions could then be proceeded with. I repeat, it was a fatal mistake to proceed with the classification before knowing what the organization of the department should consist of. The Civil Service Commission, whether on its own initiative, or acting under instructions from the administration of the day, proceeded to place the cart before the horse, and to classify the service before determining the organization. As a result, we have the chaotic conditions and

the dissatisfaction and trouble that exist in the service to-day. The present unfortunate conditions are the direct result of the poor legislation under which the commission proceeded to work, and under which the Civil Service is administered to-day. There is very little more to be said with reference to the act of 1918, except that, coming into force ten years after the act of 1908, it increased the salaries in the various grades.

Then we come to the act of 1919. There was a reason for bringing in that legislation, and it was because the government of the day had proceeded to classify, or at all events had given the Civil Service Commission instructions to classify, the Civil Service before proceeding to organize it. Under subsection (d) of section 4 of the act of 1919 the commission was given power to obtain the assistance of competent persons to assist them in the performance of their duties. Proceeding under that subsection, the Civil Service Commission asked, I suppose, for assistance to classify the service, and as a result of that demand or of something that passed between the commission and the government of the day, an Order in Council was passed placing $12,000 at the disposal of the commission for the purpose of engaging extra assistance. The only reason I have been able to find why this was done, although there may be others, is that set out in the report sent in to Council by the chairman of the commission to the effect that "the time of the secretary of the commission and his limited staff is now fully occupied with the heavy work placed on the commission by the administration of the new act, and it will therefore be necessary to secure the services of outside experts for such re-organinzation." Instead of proceeding there and then to reorganize the service, they proceeded to classify and to disorganize it.

Subsequently, after Arthur Young & Company had been engaged in this classification, another Order in Council was passed on May 31, 1920, in which I find this:

> Arthur Young and Company have transferred to Griffenhagen and Associates, Limited, that branch of their work which especially has to do with the organization of municipal and governmental services.

Then I find this in the same Order in Council:

> The committee referred to have no hesitation in commending in the strongest possible way the work of Arthur Young and Company.

They might have asked the Civil Service of Canada if they, who were the victims of the Griffenhagens and Arthur Young and Company, could recommend this company. We are now faced with this concrete fact, that as a result of the work of the Griffenhagens and Arthur Young and Company, there were six thousand appeals taken in the city of Ottawa, where there are about ten thousand civil servants, by those who were dissatisfied with their classification. Yet we are told that the committee had no hesitation in commending in the strongest possible way the work of Arthur Young and Company. This firm, after having proceeded a certain length of time, brought in a report, and it was discovered that in that report there were fifteen hundred mistakes. I give this credit to the Civil Service Commission, that they were responsible for correcting over six hundred of those mistakes. Now let us take the act of 1919 and compare it with the previous acts. The section with which we are more concerned is section 38:

> The examinations held by the commission to establish lists of persons eligible for appointment may be written or oral, or in the form of a demonstration of skill.

Section 43 provides that appointments to the Civil Service shall be upon competitive examination, and yet we find this:

> Whenever a vacancy in any position in the Civil Service is to be filled the deputy head shall request the commission to make an appointment. The commission shall thereupon appoint the person.

Now that is subversive of all principles of responsible government as I understand responsible government to be. The responsibility is taken away from the minister; the responsibility is taken away from the deputy minister: The responsibility, or I should say the non-responsibility is vested in the Civil Service Commission of Canada who are not even responsible to this Parliament. The Civil Service Commission is supreme, it is independent of this Parliament, it can make any appointment it sees fit and nobody can question it. But there is a certain section in the act which says that a deputy minister may, within six months, repudiate any person that has been placed in his department. If the Civil Service Commission sends a man to a deputy minister and he does not care to take him he may keep on refusing, and refusing, and refusing until he has exhausted this list. Is that in accordance with the principles of Civil Ser-

vice reform? But to return to the manner in which appointments are made under the two sections to which I have referred, we find that they are to be made in accordance with demonstrations of skill, or by competitive examination. Now, if the Civil Service Commission will undertake to make all appointments to the Civil Service by competitive examination or by demonstrations of skill, then I have nothing more to say. But I know that the Civil Service Commission has not in the past, and cannot in the future, comply with the terms of the law as it is to-day; and I for one do not think that, when laws are being flagrantly violated every day, we should hesitate to apply the remedy when we have the power to rectify this condition of affairs. I do not blame the Civil Service Commission for not following the law in every respect, but I blame the law itself, and I blame those who have put such a law on the statute books. Since the Civil Service Commission has been appointed there have been over five thousand appointments of postmasters in Canada, and I defy anybody to name a single instance where the law has been complied with—that is to say, where a competitive examination has been held or where a demonstration of skill has been required. Nevertheless, these appointments continue to be made. They are made by one of the agents, or one of the sub-inspectors, of the department going into a city, town or village where a vacancy exists and finding out for himself, making an oral test, as to which of the various applicants is most deserving of the position. The law says that all appointments in the Civil Service shall be made by competitive examination or demonstration of skill, and I say it is not in accordance with the law that these appointments should be made in this manner.

What is the procedure, if the Civil Service Commission or a deputy minister desires to place in a department a professional man, a lawyer, or an engineer with highly technical qualifications? The Civil Service Commission does not make the appointment by competitive examination or demonstration of skill because it has not the machinery with which to do that. What it does—here in the city of Ottawa or in any other city where an appointment is to be made—is to select three members of the legal profession, of the medical profession, or of the Royal Canadian Institute of Architects, or some other organization of the kind, for the purpose of making an appointment, and who in fact make the appointment, and then it proceeds to fill the vacant position regardless of the provisions which require an appointment to be made either by competitive examination or demonstration of skill. I ask, are demonstrations of skill made in this city, or in any other city, when it is intended to make an appointment? If the Public Works Department requires charwomen, or window cleaners, or steamfitters, or bricklayers, or masons, are demonstrations of skill made? No, anybody applying to the Civil Service Commission for these positions puts his or her name down on a list and that is called the eligible list, then the Civil Service Commission, or those acting for it, take the applicants by order of date and not by order of merit, ignorant whether the widow,—it may be of a soldier,—has any children, and ignorant of the qualifications of the particular mechanic required. It simply takes the name off the list as the persons have registered in the order in which they appear there. I repeat that if the Civil Service Commission made these appointments by competitive examination or by demonstration of skill I would have nothing further to say, but that is not practicable.

Now section 38 of the Spinney Bill of last year says that when it is impracticable, or not in the public interest, to apply the act to any position or positions the Civil Service Commission may, with the approval of the Governor in Council exclude such position or positions from the working of the act. If the Civil Service Commission desires to be loyal to itself, then there is nothing else for it to do but to return to the proper authority the filling of all those positions which are not susceptible of competitive examination or demonstrations of skill. Now just to give a concrete case. A returned man came to my colleague and myself some weeks ago and said that for months and months he had his name before the Civil Service Commission for the position of elevator man. When we pressed him a little he admitted that he could neither read nor write but he said "If you will place me in charge of any hydraulic or electrical elevator I will proceed to take it down and rebuild it". That man could not pass a competitive examination and yet could give a demonstration of skill and qualify himself for the desired position. Nevertheless, although a returned man with a large family he failed to get a place.

Before the commission proceeded to organize and classify the Civil Service they called in so-called experts. In the case of the Printing Bureau the Griffenhagens were employed. Some may say that they are not the same firm as Arthur Young & Co., but if anybody believes that let him go through the offices of the civil servants and inquire whether the clerks who worked for the Griffenhagens did not also work for Arthur Young & Co. And if any other proof were required that the Griffienhagen firm was the same as the Arthur Young Company, but under a different name, we have plenty of it. Of course, it is said a rose by any other name would smell as sweet, but it did not smell as sweet to the Civil Service of Canada. The letter transmitting the Report of Transmission is signed "The Arthur Young Company by D. O. Griffinhagen." Then, they proceeded to put out of business, and to throw onto the street 406 employees of the Printing Bureau. It was then decided to put into force a certain act, called the Calder Act, for the purpose of granting superannuation or pension to those upon whose neck the axe would fall, and I quote subsection 3 of section 2 of that act, where I find this stipulation:

> When it is decided to retire any person under the provisions of this act, notice in writing thereof, giving the reasons for such retirement, shall be sent to such person, and he shall have a right to appeal to the Civil Service Commission.

But the Order in Council compelling the retirement of these people put it in a different light. I quote from Order in Council No. 2225 of 27th June, 1921, as follows:

> "Recommendation (b), Permanent employees who do not come under the provisions of and with the allowances determined by the Retirement Act of 1920, provided that the retirements recommended with such allowances be accepted by such employees without appeal; and that failing such acceptance, the said employees, or any of them failing to accept, be retired purely and simply."

Hon. members of this House voted last night against taking away the right to appeal in the case of certain crimes, and again last year, and the year before, the administration of the day proceeded to put out on the street over 450 people, when the act itself stated that they had a right to appeal, and an Order in Council was passed stating that they must take their retiring allowance without appeal, or they would get nothing. We started out with the act of 1908, establishing six divisions in the Civil Service. There was harmony, peace and contentment, but when the report came out, instead of six divisions in the service, there were 1,500,—practically 2,000, but that is not all. Section 42 of the act of 1919 disclosed a most interesting state of affairs. That act of 1919 was passed for what purpose? To enable the report of the Griffinhagen, Arthur Young Company to be taken in. The act stated that the Civil Service was divided into certain categories, and to those categories were assigned certain schedules. The Arthur Young Company brought in their report, and the whole service had to be reorganized. What does the report say as to the finality of this classification? After having spent two years, and having cost the country pretty nearly half a million dollars, and after having thrown disorder into the service, having cost time and a good deal of sacrifice, finally it was considered that the experts from Chicago, in the light of their knowledge and genius, would bring in something that would be an everlasting monument to their ability. Section 42 of the act of 1919 says, on the contrary:

> The classes of positions, including the several rates of compensation in the classification of the Civil Service of Canada signed by the commission and dated the first day of October, one thousand nine hundred and nineteen, and submitted to Parliament, are hereby ratified and confirmed, and the Civil Service shall, as far as practicable, be classified in accordance therewith.

This act was passed in contemplation of the receipt of the classification. Ask the Civil Service, to-day, if it is practicable to classify anything under this reorganized classification—

And further—

> The commission shall hereafter, as it may from time to time deem necessary, establish additional classes and grades and classify therein new positions created or positions included or not included in any class or grade established in the said classification, and may divide, combine, alter, or abolish existing classes and grades.

Where is the finality of this Civil Service cassification? Now, to show what the classification means to the Civil Service. I am quoting from what I call the joke book, and if any hon. member wants a joke book, without any expense, he can apply to the distribution office and obtain what is called the "Classification of the Civil Service of Canada". It contains over 900 pages, and every page contains one of the most recent jokes. The qualifications of the assistant deputy minister of the Department of Fin-

ance include "supervisory ability". His remuneration is fixed at $5,100 for that supervisory ability. The assistant deputy minister of the Department of Immigration must have executive ability of a high order, and yet his salary is $4,800. Then the assistant deputy minister of the Department of Justice must have administrative ability and yet he receives $5,100. The assistant deputy minister of the Department of Militia and Defence requires the highest degree of administrative ability. He receives $5,100, and the man who has administrative ability only, receives $5,100. The assistant deputy minister of the Department of Public Works must have administrative ability only, and he receives $5,100. The assistant deputy minister of the Department of the Interior must have administrative ability, the same as the other gentleman who must have administrative ability; the first gentleman receives $5,100, and this gentleman who requires administrative ability receives $4,800. The assistant deputy minister of the Department of Naval Service, with the highest degree of administrative ability, does not get $5,100, but only $4,500. He receives the less salary, and he must have the highest degree of administrative ability. If there is any logic or consistency in this classification, the Civil Service of Canada have failed to see it, and nobody has yet been able to find it. I have said that this is a joke, and I will just refer you to one or two other matters. The entomologist is the man who classifies bugs. The assistant entomologist must have "ability to rough it", and must be "in excellent physical condition", and the chief entomologist must have "administrative ability, good address and ability in public speaking". The industrial guard-house keeper—female—must have strength and ability, honesty and sobriety.

Some hon. MEMBERS: Oh, oh.

Mr. CHEVRIER: Those are some of the things hon. gentlemen can properly regard as jokes. A machinist's boy—one would think this would be something very serious—is defined as one whose

> Ability is to pass through small apertures in boilers.

And his qualifications must be:

> Ability to pass through small apertures; alertness.

Let me see how this classification has affected the Civil Service, and I can do nothing better than to quote from one of the organs of the Civil Service itself. I am quoting from the News Letter of 14th March, 1921:

> But the Civil Service Commission has failed in its attempts to grapple effectively with problems of Civil Service administration. We do not think that this is due entirely, or even chiefly to lack of administrative ability on the part of the present commissioners. We are of the opinion that it is principally owing to the lack of democratic machinery for affording civil servants themselves a voice in the determination of policies affecting their welfare. The commission has had to arrive at decisions entirely in the light of its own information and ideas; and while it may have done the best it could, it has utterly failed to satisfy a majority of civil servants. Not only has the commission failed to evolve practical and workable policies for the Civil Service as a whole, but the subsidiary Board of Hearing and Recommendation, formed to deal with certain restricted classes of appeals, has revealed the grossest incompetence and the most unwarranted bias in its handling of the appeals which have come before it . . . . Our view is that all questions should be decided by Joint Councils.

I might read more, but I will not take up any more of the time of the committee.

Some hon. MEMBERS: Go on:

Mr. CHEVRIER: I will read just one more, leaving out a few others.

> The fact that changes affecting some 15,000 employees have already been made in reclassification and that there are almost 6,000 personal appeals now being heard shows that there must be something seriously and basically wrong with classification and even if every appeal now in were granted the erroneous principles of classification would still remain. It was framed by people who knew practically nothing about the Canadian Civil Service. An attempt is being made to patch it up and administer it by people entirely out of touch with the actual work being performed, qualifications necessary, etc., of the cases they are attempting to consider. The classification is so extremely and so unnecessarily complex as to be unworkable and in the various services the relative importance and value of positions have not been adequately considered nor could they be by a small group of men knowing nothing about the details of such positions.
>
> The attempts which have been made, and are being made to remedy this state of affairs are really nothing more than an attempt to patch up a classification system built upon false premises and principles and hence essentially unsatisfactory and unworkable and practically every such attempt being made results in a further throwing out of adjustment of some other feature of classification, giving rise to still further protests and appeals. This will continue unless steps are taken for a thorough overhauling and revision of the whole matter, carried on, as we recommend in this and other memoranda, under the Joint Council or Whitley plan.

My colleague and I have advocated those councils as a part of civil service reform, and we urge the formation of those councils. We believe, and the Civil Service believe, that there is need for reorganiza-

tion and re-classification. We know that the service is not perfect. It would be preposterous to say that, in an organization containing over 10,000 employees, there is not some difficulty; but no one more than the Civil Service themselves, will welcome an impartial reorganization and classification, and as a result of that would be brought into the service that peace and contentment to which it is entitled.

I do not know who is responsible; but there is something radically wrong in a number of examinations that are now being held by the Civil Service Commission. Let me cite just this fact. In the Department of the Interior it was necessary to fill the position of a senior clerk. On the 22nd of December a letter was written by the deputy minister to the Civil Service Commission, stating:

> On the 2nd November last, we asked you to fill by promotion from within the Dominion Lands branch, the vacant position of senior clerk, vice E. S. Forbes, retired. You sent us forms and we posted the position in the branch.

The deputy minister goes on to say:

> I have just been advised by the head of the branch that these applicants have been required to attend at the commission and write an essay on the Development of Land, Water and Aerial Transportation.

I appeal to the sense of justice of this committee and to hon. members who sit on the Progressive benches, who are familiar with homestead regulations and the laws regulating lands in the West. The paper set for that was:

> Write an 800 word essay, or more, of at least six properly constructed paragraphs, on the following subject: The Development of Land, Water and Aerial Transportation.

The result of that examination was that none of those who had been recommended by the deputy minister for that position got it, but that it went to an outsider who was well qualified under that heading, but who knew nothing about the administration of lands in the West.

The way to cure this is to be honest with ourselves and to say that all those appointments that cannot come within the purview of a written examination, all those appointments that cannot come under a demonstration of skill, be taken away from the Civil Service Commission; that is that the Civil Service Commission be loyal to itself and return them to the proper authorities, to those to whom they belong; that the Civil Service Commission divest itself of those appointments and turn them over to the authority which ought to regulate them. If that be done, the Civil Service will be contented, happy, and we shall have achieved our duty in enacting legislation which can be operated and we shall not be party to the disobeying, breaking and violating of laws which we ourselves have placed upon the Statute books of this country.

Mr. McGIVERIN: I wish to congratulate my hon. friend and colleague (Mr. Chevrier) on this, his first speech in this House. He has very ably and thoroughly discussed this subject, and I am heartily in accord with all that he has said. My colleague and I are sometimes called the long and the short of it. It is right and fitting on this occasion that the short shall be long and the long shall be short. I shall, therefore, be brief. I had the honour of representing the city of Ottawa in this House from 1908 to 1911. After that I suffered twice for the faith; but I came back in the last election. In 1908, the first movement in regard to civil service reform was instituted, and the inside service in Ottawa was brought under the commission. The act, as my hon. friend has said, is founded on the British Civil Service Act, and it worked well. Civil service reform was founded on the entry into the service by a fair competitive examination, and as long as you have it on that basis it is all right; but when you reach the stage where you cannot get a fair competitive examination, as is the case in hundreds of appointments all over the country, you must of necessity get influence of some kind. I am in favour of civil service reform, but I want honest reform, and where you cannot get honest reform I prefer that the responsibility for appointment should be with the administration or heads of departments.

The other objection I have is that the act of 1919 gives altogether too much power to the Civil Service Commission in regard to appointments, promotions and classification. It takes away from the departmental heads the responsibility of handling the work of their departments. They are responsible to the ministers, the ministers are responsible to this House, and this House is in turn responsible to the people. The classification was not satisfactory. The Civil Service Commission themselves should have classified the service in co-operation with the heads of the departments instead of bringing in foreigners who had no idea of Canadian or any other civil service conditions. Under the 1908 act the Civil Service Commission

co-operated with the departmental heads; under this act the commission supersede them and are absolute in power. I do not believe in that.

In closing, I wish to say that the Government should inquire into the powers of the Civil Service Commission. Closely allied with this question is the revision of salaries. I shall have an opportunity next week of discussing that very important question when the cost of living bonus comes up. I feel confident that I shall then be able to show my fellow-members that civil servants are underpaid, and that the retention of the bonus is a most serious question and should meet with the sympathy of every member.

The Government should also deal with the question of superannuation and the desirability of establishing what are known as Whitley or inter-departmental councils.

If an investigation is made into these four matters I have every confidence that when the facts are brought before my fellow-members they will pass such legislation as will make for greater efficiency and contentment in the service. I am convinced that our Civil Service is efficient and hard-working, and in every way entitled to our support, and that it is incumbent upon us to see that its personnel is equitably treated.

Mr. McBRIDE: The hon. member who has just sat down stated that he did not think a single satisfactory postmaster had been appointed by the Civil Service Commission. I might tell him that three appointments have been made in my constituency since I was elected and the appointees are entirely satisfactory.

Mr. CHEVRIER: Will the hon. member permit me?

Mr. McBRIDE: I have the floor now. The hon. member may poke fun at—

Mr. CASGRAIN: Cannot you answer a question?

Mr. McBRIDE: The hon. member (Mr. Chevrier) made fun of the fact that a helper had to be able to go through a small hole of a boiler, but those who know anything about boilers are aware that this is absolutely essential in the process of cleaning.

Mr. PUTNAM. Will you permit a question?

Mr. McBRIDE: The hon. member stated that he thinks we ought to get back to the old patronage system. I do not want to continue a member of this House if I am to be responsible for the appointment of civil servants throughout my constituency. I do not desire to assume that responsibility, for my duties here are sufficiently onerous without adding the burdens of patronage. My hon. friend also stated that in some cases returned men did not get a chance of appointment. My experience in my constituency has been that returned men have been given a chance every time, with one exception, and that was the case of the widow of a soldier who to-night sleeps over in France.

Mr. MARCIL: Mr. Chairman, I was a member of this House when civil service reform was introduced by the late Hon. Sydney Fisher, and naturally since then I have followed every phase of the subject with considerable attention. It must not be forgotten that we can overdo even a good thing. Last year a special committee of this House made a report on the Civil Service, and I am going to read only a few lines to emphasize that point. This is the paragraph to which I wish to draw the attention of hon. members:

> It is to be noted in taking this action in the direction of Civil Service reform Parliament has gone very much farther than the governments of Great Britain or the United States. In brief, Canada now has on its statute books a more radical and advanced measure of Civil Service reform than any other country in the world.

Canada is my native land and I am anxious to do all I can for her, but I do not consider that we possess all the wisdom in the world; indeed, I begin to suspect that if we have gone farther than Great Britain and the United States in this important matter we have perhaps gone too far.

Confederation had been consummated for forty years before Civil Service reform was introduced. We had got along very well without it, but as the country developed the responsibilities of our public men became so numerous and so onerous that in 1908 it was felt the time had come to institute a commission for the purpose of dealing with the inside service. Accordingly the Civil Service Commission came into being and was composed of Mr. Adam Shortt and Mr. Larochelle. Later on Mr. Shortt resigned and two of my former colleagues in this House, Mr. Roche and Mr. Jamieson, were appointed commissioners, Mr. Larochelle continuing in office with them.

The two hon. members for Ottawa have given you an idea to-night of how this

civil service reform has worked in this city. I do not want to dwell any further on that point, but I would like to take a glimpse of the Civil Service as it affects a rural constituency. The original Civil Service Act applied only to the inside service, but in 1918 the outside service was brought in. We are here as representatives of the people. This is the parliament of the nation. The electors of my constituency cannot all come here, so they have delegated me to represent them, and my position is that of every member of this House. When election day comes along they vote for or against me. I am responsible for everything that happens, the actions of the Civil Service Commission included. I believe that the foundation stone of our political system is responsible government. I do not believe in shirking my duties. When the electors of my constituency write to me and point out certain grievances or ask for certain reforms, it is my duty to attend to those requests and to try to meet their legitimate demands, not to answer them by saying that I have nothing to do with the matter, that they must apply to the Civil Service Commission or to some other commission. That is simply shirking one's duty. A humble farmer down in my constituency who is not au fait with all the red tape machinations here naturally concludes, when he receives a reply like that, "Well, what is the use of sending members to represent us in Parliament if they have nothing to say in what concerns us?" There are about ninety-four post offices in my constituency. From 1911 to 1921, between fifty and seventy-five of the postmasters in these offices were changed. I do not wish to speak ill of the dead, but the late Hon. L. P. Pelletier, who became Postmaster General when the Borden government was formed in 1911, was a believer in the maxim: "To the victors belong the spoils," and every postmaster in my constituency who had any Liberal leanings was simply thrown out. The same thing was done in the Marine Department. In the archives of the Post Office Department to-day are to be found the records of these dismissals, the reasons being purely political in their character. I believe in a civil servant having the right to vote. I believe in a civil servant having the right to be Conservative or Liberal or Progressive, and that no man should be expelled from the service merely because of his political views.

Mr. MANION: My hon. friend does not mean that he would permit them to take part in politics?

Mr. MARCIL (Bonaventure): No, there is a provision in the act under which offensive political partizanship is to be punished by dismissal from the service. But in the cases I refer to, the allegations were very general, and the offices were simply handed over to the followers of the other party. That is an abuse that I do not want to see restored. I do not want to be in that position; on the other hand I realize that I am responsible to my electors. I do not want to be a dummy in this House; and my position is the position of every member of Parliament. When my electors tell me that a post office is badly managed or that a post office is or is not required, I do not want to have to say that I have nothing to do in the matter; that it is in the hands of the Civil Service Commission. The special committee of the House which went into this matter at the last session states in one of the paragraphs of its report that the appointment of postmasters in the rural parts of Canada rests practically with employees of the department; that the action of the Civil Service Commission in that respect is purely perfunctory. Here is what happens: A vacancy occurs. The Post Office Department is notified. The Post Office Department in turn, notify the Civil Service Commission, who are asked to make an appointment—and by the way, the salaries range from the princely sum of $60 a year up. One appointment was made a few months ago in my constituency; the vacancy occurred on the 15th of January and the appointment was made on the 20th of April. The postmistress in this case will receive $60 a year. I do not know how much was spent in making the appointment, but it could have been made in five minutes. Well, the Civil Service Commission, having been notified that a vacancy exists, sends a notice to the post office in question asking for applications. These applications come back to the commission and they are referred by it to the post office inspector for the district. The post office inspector for the district will treat these à tour de rôle; if he is overworked he will take his time about it. If it is important enough he will visit the locality or send a substitute, and in the course of time—two or three months—he will make a report to the commission. Now, the commission invariably accept the report of the post office inspector or

his substitute, which means that the appointment rests with an official of the department and that the representative of the constituency is not even informed that that a vacancy exists and has nothing to do in the matter. Believing, as I do, in responsible government, it is my view that the members representing these constituencies should have the say in this matter. The Civil Service Commission cannot, owing to the magnitude of the work and to the manner in which the commission is constituted, attend to appointments in connection with 18,000 post offices scattered all over Canada. They have not the knowledge; they have not the advantage of familiarity with local conditions, and it is not in the public interest that these appointments should be made in that way. There is no hon. member in this House who would be interested in making a bad appointment; if he did, he would pay the penalty when election day came around. He is interested, I say, in having a good appointment made, in making a good selection, in having the public satisfied, in seeing that the public interest is served. The amount of money expended in making these appointments under the present system must be very large, and I am sure that hon. members would be amazed at the amount that has been spent in connection with the classification of the service. For these reasons I consider that appointments to the outside service, with the exception of professional, technical or otherwise peculiar positions, should not remain with the Civil Service Commission. In the case of my constituency—and I assume it is the case of the average constituency in Canada—such appointments as district engineer, superintendent of lights, and post office inspector should be made by the Civil Service Commission, because these officials are really civil servants. But the man who gets $75 a year for lighting a lamp at night and extinguishing it in the morning can hardly be placed in the category of a civil servant; to appoint him in the roundabout way that I have mentioned is not in the public interest, and the method should be done away with. I know that there have been abuses in connection with the Civil Service, and that a hue and cry was raised throughout the whole country that patronage would have to be done away with. But patronage exists at present, though it is not exercised by those who have the right to exercise it; and those who have the right to exercise that patronage are the representatives of the people. The member of the constituency is the connecting link between the people and the government of the day, and it is my view that nothing should be done in that constituency until its representative has been advised of what is proposed to be done. He should at least be given an opportunity to express the wishes of his constituents. That, in substance, is what I claim for the outside service, and I hope that the Government of the day will—

Mr. McQUARRIE: In case the government candidate was defeated, would the hon. member say that he should be consulted rather than the opposition member?

Mr. MARCIL: I think the member for the constituency should be consulted. From 1911 to 1921, for those ten years that I was in opposition, I never received one letter from any department of government, never was consulted on anything. I was simply ignored, and my position was simply that of every other member of the opposition. If any man contends that that is in the public interest, I shall not agree with him. The members elected are the representatives of the people, and they are here to carry out the wishes of the people, but they cannot carry them out unless they are given a voice in the administration of public affairs. Naturally the party in power may give the preference to its supporters; that is only fair. It is a principle long recognized, and will no doubt continue to be recognized under the system of party government that we have, but the member for the constituency even if he is on the opposition side, should not be ignored. In the case of appointments to the outside service, I contend that the commission themselves and those in charge of departments will admit that the present system is unsatisfactory, awkward, burdensome and very costly, and that it should be discontinued. I think that means should be found under the present legislation whereby the Government of the day could come to an understanding with the Civil Service Commission that certain classes of the outside service, and even of the inside service, such as have been mentioned by the hon. members for Ottawa, should be removed entirely from the operations of the act, which requires the Government to call on the commission to appoint charwomen, window cleaners, floor scrubbers, labourers and other help of that kind. The commission

should give its time to the civil service proper, as was the intent of Parliament in 1908, when the late Hon. Mr. Fisher introduced his act. Let us not maintain a system that countries like England and the United States have not been able to follow.

Mr. WOODSWORTH: We ought to distinguish very clearly between the Civil Service Commission and anything that would do away with that commission, and, on the other hand, a criticism of the organization of that commission or of classification and administration under that commission. So far as my part of the country is concerned, we stand absolutely opposed to any return to the patronage system. That does not mean that we have necessarily arrived at the final form of civil service reform. It does seem to me, as I said the other night in this House, that there should be provision in some way that the work of the Civil Service Commission could be reviewed by this House. It is intolerable, I think, that any public body in this land should exist who would be entirely irresponsible, that is, in the sense of not being reponsible to the Parliament of this country. The work of this body should come under review in some form by the House, and I take it that here we should decide some of the underlying principles that should guide the commission in making appointments, promotions, and so on. That is an altogether different position from returning to the old patronage system and to the making of appointments largely as a matter of favour.

As a new member of the House, I hardly venture to suggest just exactly how this could be accomplished. It has seemed to me that we might have some sort of permanent parliamentary committee to deal with the Civil Service. That committee could review the work of the Civil Service Commission, bring reports and any outstanding grievances before the House. I think we could enunciate here certain principles which would guide the commission in its future work. That is one thing that I would advocate.

There is another suggestion that has been made by one of the representatives for Ottawa with respect to competitive examinations. It may well be that those in charge have made the examinations too academic in some respects, but that is not to say that we should have no competitive examinations at all. It would rather simply look to making the examinations more practical in character.

There are one or two other matters I should like to mention in connection with the Civil Service. There is the question of wages. In my own constituency we have a very large number of postal employees. As all the members of the House know, these postal employees, or the majority of them, are paid at a low rate, and what is true of them is true of the great body of civil servants. There was published a few days ago some figures with regard to the Civil Service showing that some 7,700 civil servants were receiving smaller salaries than $800, and 13,500 receiving $960 per annum or less. It seems to me that this is very little less than a disgrace to the government and the people of Canada. I take it that this Government, if anything, should try to be a model employer, and the first thing in connection with the employees is to see that they have at least a living wage. As we all know, that wage of $800 or $900 or $1,000 does not begin to come up to the minimum wage laid down by the Department of Labour as that which is essential in order that a man may support his family and give them the ordinary physical necessities of life. This great country is paying its own employees less than is sufficient to provide for the ordinary necessities of life. That is one of the abuses that ought to be remedied.

Further than that, there is the wide spread between the lower grade and the higher grade employees. That, too, is something which ought to be remedied. I know there are certain people who have a certain type of professional or organizing ability who have been able because of their high organization to secure in the past a certain high standard of living, but at this time, when we are urging that people should be reasonable in their demands, and when there is a tendency to standardize salaries, and to see to it that men are rewarded not so much in accordance with what they are able to press on the community as in accordance with the service rendered, it seems to me we might very well have a complete revision of these salaries, so that some people will not be receiving $6,000 or $8,000 or $9,000 a year, while other civil servants are receiving only $600, or $800, or $900. There is altogether too wide a spread in the salaries paid by this Government to its officials. I submit that this Parliament ought to have the power of de-

ciding these things. We should not be told time and again by members of the Government, who I believe are quite sincere when they put forward that position, that they have nothing to do with these matters as they are in the hands of the Civil Service Commission.

There is another thing, it would seem to me, that we might expect the Government to do. I think the Prime Minister himself has expressed his convictions already along this line, namely, that employees should have some voice at least in the conduct of their own affairs.

We have had put forward by the Minister of Labour at this very session the suggestion that we ought to have Whitley councils established. It would seem to me a reasonable thing to expect that the Government of Canada would be the first to institute councils of that character. It would be a great deal easier for the Government of Canada to do it—say in the Civil Service Departments—than it would be for a great many of the private firms to do it; and if this system can be administered in connection with the public departments it would certainly be a great leverage for some of us who want to see it carried out in the industries of the country. We believe that to-day no private employer or public corporation can say that a business is his own. We believe that, since we live in an age in which necessarily we must work in co-operation with one another, those who are termed employees have a vital part to play in the carrying on of industry and ought to have a real voice in the decision with regard to conditions of work, wages, and so on. So I would submit that in some way or other we should have a revision of the regulations with regard to the Civil Service which will make provision for a review of the work of the service before this House, and for the decision of big matters of public policy by this House, and that will provide such machinery as to details that the civil servants themselves will have a voice in carrying the work forward. It seems to me that these things would all tend to greater efficiency in the Civil Service itself.

Mr. HUGHES: The Civil Service Commission, as at present constituted and in its operation, appears to me to violate one of the first principles of responsible government, and one of the first principles of common sense. A hundred years ago we did not have responsible government in Canada and in those days the people considered it a very serious matter. At that time the collection and expenditure of the public revenue was left to an irresponsible body. The same body had the power of appointing men to carry on the public business, and the representatives of the people had nothing, or very little, to say in the matter. Against that condition of things the people actually rose in rebellion and to-day we look back in history and admit that the men responsible for that uprising were amply justified. We are proud of the steps they took to bring responsible government to Canada; we are proud of those who took part in those strenuous times; and we recall with pride the report of Lord Durham and the statesmanship of Lord Elgin. Well, in a measure we have got away from that position to-day. The people of Canada, through their representatives have surrendered their rights, have surrendered one of the functions of responsible government; and I would ask my Progressive friends to reflect upon that view of the situation. During the present session we have actually heard minister after minister declare that he cannot carry on the business of his department efficiently and economically because his hands are tied. Is that a proper condition of things? Did those ministers make statements that were correct? Do we really want to place members of the Government in that position? Is that really responsible government? As a member of Parliament I do not want ministers of the Crown to take that position. On the contrary I want to hold them responsible for the proper, efficient and economical management of their departments. As a member of Parliament I owe a duty to the country. My hon. friend from Bonaventure (Mr. Marcil) said a short time ago that the whole of the people of Canada cannot come to Parliament; they must of necessity elect certain representatives to come here and do their business. My hon. friend was quite right in his statement and I would say this much further: The government of the day is a committee of Parliament. The Government is responsible to Parliament, and Parliament is responsible to the people. That is responsible government, and yet how can you have it in its entirety if the ministers of the day have no voice in the selection of the men who will assist them in carrying on the business of their departments, and no voice in promoting capable men in their departments? Now when that is the case, how can you expect efficiency in the public

service? There is not a business house in Canada that would introduce, or tolerate, such a system as that. I put that view of the matter to my Progressive friends who sit opposite. The patronage system may perhaps have been abused in the past, but even in its worst state it was not as bad as the present system. I take the ground that members of Parliament do not become corrupt as soon as they enter our legislative halls—

Mr. LAPOINTE: They have the temptation.

Mr. HUGHES: There are a great many temptations. That is what some people say but I have not experienced them. Now let us look at the matter from a common sense point of view. A member of Parliament is a man of some standing in the community. He must be such a man; he must be an honourable man and a man of integrity; otherwise no political party—Conservative, Liberal, or Progressive—would nominate him.

Mr. GARLAND (Bow River): Hear, hear.

Mr. HUGHES: My hon. friend says "hear, hear", very well. Such a man is elected to Parliament, and yet we say that a person of that stamp should not be allowed to advise the government of the day in the selection in his county of a postmaster although he may be well acquainted with someone possessing the necessary qualifications, or a lighthouse keeper or as to who should fill some other small position. Why the situation is simply ridiculous. If the member of Parliament abuses his privileges he will not long remain in public life. We know, as a matter of fact, that in nine cases out of ten members of Parliament did not abuse their privileges in this respect. I do not care what party was in power it was not done as a rule. Now, as I have already stated, there is not at the present time a business house in Canada that would permit its business to be carried on in the way the government of Canada is obliged to conduct its business under the Civil Service Commission, and a remedy must be found. Last year this commission cost the country $360,000. That, I think, was but a small portion of the actual amount, because the Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Motherwell) stated here a few days ago certain facts which would go to show that the commission cost the country three, four or five times the amount that appears in the public accounts. The minister mentioned certain facts to show that when he applied to the Civil Service Commission for men to do certain necessary work in his department the time for doing the work had passed before he could get the appointments made, and then it could not be done at all. Can government be carried on under such circumstances? It cannot be carried on efficiently and properly. This is not a partisan matter at all. It is not a view coming from Liberal members alone. A few days ago I was reading in the Montreal Gazette, a newspaper whose views can be relied upon by members in this House, and by people in this country—

Mr. CRERAR: On all things?

Mr. HUGHES: On a great many things—on matters of this kind, at any rate. On the 26th April last the Gazette published an editorial dealing with the Civil Service, and the closing paragraph reads:

> The present system is fundamentally defective in that it creates and maintains a government service which the government does not control. No great private administrative or industrial organization could be carried on efficiently upon any such basis, and the principle of responsibility applies equally to the business of government. The ministry which, for the time being, is charged with the conduct of the country's affairs ought to have the fullest measure of authority over the personnel of the service upon whose efficiency depends the success of the practical work of administration. The responsibility rests and must always rest upon the government, and, that being so, the government ought not to be divested of authority over its own staff, the selection of capable men for employment in the civil service is a duty which properly appertains to the government and belongs to the functions of government. No system which does not recognize that principle can be called a reform.

No sounder words can be uttered on this question. We have very large expenditures in this country over which the Civil Service exercises no control at all. It is only over a small portion of the public service that they exercise any control. For instance, the railways have the collection and expenditure of some three hundred and thirty or three hundred and forty million dollars a year, and the hiring and promotion of a vast number of employees, and the Civil Service Commission has no control over them. If it had there would be chaos.

When we take out of the public revenue the $140,000,000 of interest and some other statutory expenditures, what is left is very much less, indeed, than the expenditure on the National Railways. Yet we have a commission costing three or four hundred thousand dollars a year, interfer-

ing with the proper functions of the public service, embarrassing the ministers, and the government, and necessarily so. They cannot help it under the act. The Civil Service Commission, might, perhaps, if properly constituted, give some assistance to the government of the country, but, as constituted at the present time, and in the operations they are now performing, they are a positive injury to the efficient and economical management of the public business.

Mr. McQUARRIE: Is the hon. member opposing this estimate and going to vote against it?

Mr. HUGHES: I am advocating a reform in the administration of the country. Under the late administration, there were far too many commissions appointed, and this was one of them. A member of the late administration made the statement that the commissions were more numerous than huckleberries in Kalamazoo. It was government by commission.

Mr. McQUARRIE: That is not the question. Is the hon. member going to vote to reduce this amount?

Mr. HUGHES: The hon. member will have a chance to speak and tell the House what he intends to do. I am stating what I think should be done, and the position that the members of Parliament ought to take upon this matter. It is not a political question at all, in my judgment, and should not be made one. It is eminently a business question, having to do with proper administration and the carrying on of the functions of government, and I would ask my Progressive friends, who want to contribute their share towards the proper administration of public affairs, to take this matter into their serious consideration. Some change has to be made, it is overdue, and it ought to be made with the very least possible delay.

Mr. CRERAR: This question, which has engaged the attention of the House for the last hour and a half, is one of great importance and interest, not only to members of Parliament, but to the whole country. The need of an efficient, and loyal Civil Service is very essential to the successful carrying on of the administration of the country's affairs. I cannot agree with all that has fallen from the lips of my hon. friends opposite. With some of it I do agree. For one, I am unalterably opposed to anything in the nature of a return to the old patronage system in filling the service of this country. The Civil Service Commission may not be all that it should be. I take it that my hon. friend from Prince Edward Island (Mr. Hughes) is not quite satisfied with the personnel of the Civil Service Commission. That may be or may not be—

Mr. HUGHES: No, I beg pardon, I did not make that statement.

Mr. CRERAR: I am glad I misunderstood the hon. member. Upon that point I do not wish to pass an opinion, but, rather to deal with the principles underlying the law, as it is at the present time, and, if possible, to suggest wherein the law might in some respects be improved. If I were offering a criticism of the Civil Service Act, as we have it in practice now, since it was practically remade in 1919, it would be that the Civil Service Commission have altogether too much to do with the control of a civil servant after he enters the employ of the Government. I recognize that there are certain positions of a temporary character, such, for instance, as the services required to do work that is more of a daily character, where there is no permanency in the employment. In such cases as those, the securing of the people necessary to do that work might very well be taken out of the hands of the Civil Service Commission. That is an arguable point. But, as far as the permanent service of the country is concerned—and I care not whether it is the inside service or the outside service—that service should be placed, and maintained on the basis of competitive examination.

Once a person is in the service, he should have the fullest opportunity and encouragement to rise to the highest position, if his merits and ability warrant it. That is the condition that, I think, should obtain. I, therefore, hold this position, that all those filling situations of this character should enter the service through the gate of the Civil Service Commission, who would be entrusted with the duty and responsibility of seeing that the person coming into the service had the necessary qualifications. But, after that is done, it seems to me that, on the whole, we would, perhaps, get better results if ministers and deputy ministers in charge of the various departments had greater latitude in control of the service than they have at the present time. If a minister or a deputy minister in a department wishes to promote someone in his

department, if he wishes to transfer him from one branch of his department to another, that should certainly rest in his hands. If, indeed, for inefficiency or insubordination or for any other good reason, he wishes to dismiss a civil servant, then I think the power to do so should rest, if not altogether, at any rate, very largely in his hands. I know the Civil Service Act, as it stands at the present time, gives a civil servant a right to appeal to the Civil Service Commission. In that respect it puts the Commission in more or less of an administrative capacity which it should not occupy.

Mr. BUREAU: Does the hon. member claim that a civil servant who is dismissed has the right of appeal to the commission?

Mr. CRERAR: I am sorry I failed to make myself clear, because I was arguing that that was a weakness in the present Civil Service Act.

Mr. BUREAU: He has not.

Mr. CRERAR: I do not quite understand my hon. friend.

Mr. BUREAU: The question is this. Supposing I dismiss a man in my department, does the hon. gentleman claim that he has a right of appeal to the commission on account of the dismissal?

Mr. CRERAR: No, I say that that is one of the defects in the present Civil Service Act, because you cannot get the directness of control that is necessary to efficient administration of a department of government under such conditions as that. The appointment of those servants who are engaged more or less temporarily in looking after canals, who are engaged as charwomen, as postmasters in rural districts, might, perhaps, be exempted from the scope of the Civil Service Commission.

Mr. BUREAU: Lighthouse keepers.

Mr. CRERAR: This could apply to all those duties or services of this kind that are in remote districts and that are not of a permanent character. The question has arisen that this is or should be a part of the duties of the member in the constituency, and some of my hon. friends opposite have argued that it is a negation of the principle of responsible government that the member for a constituency has not the right to say who will fill a position in a certain lighthouse or a certain post office. I do not so understand the matter. I do not think that is necessary to, or a part of, responsible government at all. It does appear to me, that the less the member of Parliament has to do with such appointments, the better for the service in the long run and the better for the member of Parliament. You ask me then: How are those positions to be filled? As regards rural postmasters, since I have been a member of Parliament, I have never recommended any person for the position of rural postmaster. On one or two occasions I was asked, and I said: I do not know who is the best person in that community to fill the position. You have an inspector somewhere in that territory, and if he knows his job, he can surely make the necessary inquiry and recommend the person who is the best man for the position. If he selects a man who is not qualified or competent to discharge the duties, public opinion in that district will very soon assert itself, and you will know that such is the case. If that practice can be adopted in the filling of those positions, holding the servants in the department who have to fill the positions or make the appointments strictly to account for the character of the people whom they select, then, I think, in the long run, you are going to get the highest state of efficiency that it is possible to get in the service. The difficulty with leaving to members of Parliament to make these recommendations is that it places the member in a very unfair position. One of the fundamental defects of the old method of making these appointments lay just in this, that the member almost invariably was under the pressure or, at any rate, under the temptation to fill the position with someone who had been a friend or a worker of his, in his political affairs—

Mr. CASGRAIN: Why not?

Mr. CRERAR: Because I do not conceive that to be part of the business of a member. Are we to fill any position, no matter how small the emolument attached to it may be, on the basis of a reward for party service?

Mr. PUTNAM: Is that not the way in which the Senate is filled?

Mr. CRERAR: If my hon. friend wishes to make some changes as regard the method of appointments to the Senate, he will have my hearty support. But because the Senate is filled in that way and because the Senate might be filled upon a bad principle, is no reason why you should extend that

principle to the administrative services of the country. In making an appointment too, the member is almost certain to get into trouble. The hon. member for Bonaventure (Mr. Marcil) instanced what happened after 1911, and he spoke very truly. I know from personal knowledge that in case after case in western Canada, postmasters who were non-partisans, who had taken no part in politics, who were efficient officers, who were giving satisfactory services to their community, were displaced from their jobs and the position given to some person who had been a party worker. That method of appointment is not sound. It does not tend to efficiency in the country's business, and does not tend to a sound development of political and public morality.

Mr. PUTNAM: Just to be practical, does the hon. member think that, generally throughout the rural districts of Canada, postmasters, whose positions have been filled in the past by what we might call, for short, the patronage system, are not giving really good satisfaction?

Mr. CRERAR: I do not know. I know of cases where they did not give satisfaction. I know in many cases where good men were displaced and inferior men put in their place.

Mr. PUTNAM: Generally?

Mr. CRERAR: I judge only by what has come under my observation and from what I know, gleaned in that way. I do not think that method of practice is a sound one in the selection of people for the public service.

Mr. LOVETT: I think the hon. member stated a short time ago that the Post Office Inspector was the best man to select a man to fill the position of postmaster in a rural district. Am I right in that?

Mr. CRERAR: Yes.

Mr. LOVETT: How does the Post Office Inspector know the man suitable for such a position in a rural district when he lives miles away from that district? In the case of Nova Scotia, how could you expect an inspector living in Halifax to know whom to appoint down in Digby? Can you explain that?

Mr. CRERAR: That is not very difficult. If the inspector or other official has not the capacity to find out who is a suitable man to appoint as postmaster, he is not qualified for his job.

[Mr. Crerar.]

Mr. LOVETT: How can he find out?

Mr. CRERAR: He would take his own means of finding out.

Mr. TURGEON: Whom would he go to?

Mr. LOVETT: Is not that patronage?

Mr. CRERAR: No, it is not.

Mr. LOVETT: What is it?

Mr. CRERAR: It is the only way to get efficiency.

Mr. MACDONALD (Pictou): It depends on who advises the inspector.

Mr. HATFIELD: Under the conditions—

Mr. CRERAR: I perceive, Mr. Chairman, that I have stirred up something.

Mr. HATFIELD: I think my hon. friend will admit that I have not bothered the House very much this session.

Mr. CRERAR: Quite so.

Mr. HATFIELD: Under the conditions that my hon. friend from Digby-Annapolis (Mr. Lovett) mentioned, where there is a vacancy in a rural district and it becomes necessary for the inspector to select a suitable man, is it not within the bounds of reason that the elected representative of the people would be in a good position to give a recommendation which should carry weight?

Mr. CRERAR: I see no objection to inquiry being made of the member for the district as to who would be a suitable person, but the responsibility for the recommendation should lie with the officials in the department, and I think they can discharge that responsibility. Further, if there is any dissatisfaction with appointments made in that way, it will very soon be voiced by people in the district who are not getting the service they should get, and in that way you will develop throughout your services an efficiency and a singleness of purpose to secure the best men possible that in a few years will bring those services to a much higher plane of efficiency than can be maintained on any patronage basis. That is the argument I am trying to make. I think there are defects, as I stated a moment ago, in the Civil Service Act, and in my judgment those defects should receive the attention of Parliament and, if possible, be cured.

Let me repeat that I adhere absolutely to my opposition to anything that savours of a return to the patronage system as far

as the administration of this country's affairs is concerned. Lay down the conditions under which people shall come into the service. If your Civil Service Commission is not functioning as it should, if it is not efficient—and I am passing no reflection upon the present commission—then get a commission which is efficient, but do not charge any defect in administration against the soundness of the principle. That is the point I wish to make.

Mr. BUREAU: The present commissioners are life appointees.

Mr. CRERAR: In any case Parliament is supreme in the matter. I shall deal now with an observation or two made by my hon. friend from Centre Winnipeg (Mr. Woodsworth). I think one of the defects of the service is that it is over-staffed and over-manned. I believe that applies not only to the inside service, but very often to the outside service. That is inevitable when your service is built up, as it has been largely in the past, under the patronage system, because jobs were often found for people whether they were necessary to the service or not.

Mr. MARTELL: Would not my hon. friend also admit that this over-manning is due to improper organization, that one person will not touch another person's work as he would be compelled to do in an ordinary business establishment?

Mr. CRERAR: I think my hon. friend is probably right in that observation, but when I contemplate the increase in the cost of running our civil government, it makes me reflect that something must surely be wrong. My hon. friend from Centre Winnipeg has stated that there are a great many servants underpaid. That may be. He also criticized the difference that exists between the salaries of low-paid and high-paid civil servants. I do not think his criticism in that respect is well founded. Objection has been taken at times in this House to paying government officials good salaries. Take, for instance, the department of my hon. friend, the Minister of Finance—possibly the greatest single administrative department in the country, having to do with the collection of hundreds of millions of dollars every year. Can you say that it would not be profitable for the minister to get one, two or three men, if necessary, and pay them $12,000, $15,000 or $18,000 a year—men with the business ability to organize that great tax-collecting machine all over this Dominion and have it run more efficiently and economically than is the case at the present time? I think many of our higher and more responsible public servants are underpaid rather than overpaid, and I believe it would be money in the treasury in the long run to secure men of marked organizing capacity and business ability to handle our service in an effective and efficient manner.

I have had some experience in business administration, Mr. Chairman,—not in a very large way perhaps, but still in a considerable measure,—and I have invariably found that when I selected a man because he was cheap and put him in a responsible position, he turned out to be an expensive man in the end. My experience has been that the greatest efficiency can be secured only by paying the necessary salary to get the man who possessed the requisite ability to fill the position. And the same thing will apply to government administration. You cannot always put government administration on the same basis as the administration of a private business, because the two things are often in their nature essentially different, but nevertheless it is possible to go a very considerable way towards placing the administration of the government service upon the same basis as the administration of private business and have the same considerations obtain.

I believe it is the desire of every hon. member to have the administration in the inside services here at Ottawa as well as in the broader field outside, placed upon a thoroughly efficient basis, and the cost of running the government machine cut down to the lowest point possible consistent with maintaining the necessary efficiency. That is very essential when we consider the terrific tax burdens the people are carrying to-day. Every thousand dollars, every million dollars that can be cut from the cost of administration is that much saved for the tax-payers. In my address on the budget I offered some suggestions to the Government in regard to the reorganization of the government service. In considering the estimates not only this year but in previous years I have been struck with the evident overlapping of work in the various departments. If the whole proposition is tackled in a broad, vigourous way I think great economies can be effected, and unquestionably the people of Canada are expecting this Parliament and Government to practise economy in the public services wherever it is possible to do so.

Mr. MARTELL: Does my hon. friend not think that it is the duty of the Civil Service Commission to see that governments do not put half a dozen men in to do the same work in different departments —work that should be coordinated? Does he not think that in the fulfilment of its proper functions the commission should see that that sort of thing is not done? That is what they are there for.

Mr. CRERAR: No, I do not concede that that is the business of the Civil Service Commission. I do not think that the commission should in any sense be an administrative body.

Mr. MARTELL: It is to-day.

Mr. CRERAR: That may be; I am stating what I think—that it should not in any sense be an administrative body. Its duty should be to see that only persons with the necessary qualifications are admitted to the Civil Service; that being done, the responsibility for the efficiency and economic management of the various departments must rest upon the Government and the ministers in charge of those departments.

Mr. TURGEON: Mr. Chairman, if I take the liberty to express my views upon this important subject, it will be only to repeat what I said in the last Parliament; for I have not changed my opinion since. This matter must be considered from many angles. We have to secure not only the efficiency of the service, but the greatest possible economy in the making of appointments as well as in the general administration of departments. Since 1918, when the disposition of appointments was put entirely in the hands of the Commission, the cost of administering the Civil Service has tremendously increased. It is well known that before that time appointments to the outside service did not cost the Government one cent. The recommendation of a person for appointment to a position in the Government service is a great responsibility on the part of the member of Parliament. I had the patronage of my county for many years, and I have been elected on each occasion with increased majorities; had I used bad judgment or recommended the appointment of inefficient or dishonest persons, I would have been defeated when the next election came on. I say it is a great hardship to have the exercise of patronage in your county. A member has to be on his guard all the time; when a vacancy occurs he has to be sure to select a man who is capable and efficient, but one who is in public life should be prepared to give his best energies to his county and to his country; if he is not prepared to assume that responsibility, let him stay at home. From the aspect of economy, I may point out that when a postmasters in a rural district dies or leaves his position, it takes two or three months for the Commission to appoint another man in his place, and the cost runs up to two or three hundred dollars. Under the old system, during the fifteen years that I had the patronage of my county I simply wrote a letter to the Postmaster General or to the minister of the department concerned, and the appointment was made without one cent of cost to the country. In the last four years it has cost thousands of dollars to appoint men in my county who have no more right to the positions than anybody else. We are responsible for the expenditures of public money, and we should protest against such a system as this. During the last three or four years I have had a rest because I have not been consulted in matters of patronage in my constituency; and in the case of some of the appointments made the officers are certainly not the most efficient. But there would have been no use in my complaining to the commission; I would not have been listened to. In the earlier years following the placing of all these matters in the hands of a commission, I took the trouble to make recommendations for appointments, naming men whom I personally knew to be well qualified for the positions concerned, but not one man recommended by the member for Gloucester was appointed. The hon. member for St. John (Mr. Baxter) knows that I know very well every man in the county of Gloucester, his qualifications and his efficiency. The member for the county is the one who best knows his constituents. I do not know the families in the constituency of my hon. friend (Mr. Baxter); I could not make recommendations for appointments in his constituency, neither could he make selections for appointments in mine. The post office inspector, to whom the hon. member for Marquette (Mr. Crerar) referred, is in the same position; if he lives in the city of Halifax, what does he know about the local conditions in Amherst and other places? Now, what should be done? Men appointed to positions in the outside service must be efficient and of good character. Take the case of fishery officers; every fishery inspector or guardian occupies, in his own little district, a judicial position. He has power

to impose fines, he must be a man of sterling honesty. But how does the Commission know of his qualifications in that respect? They find out whether he knows that two and two make four—that is what it amounts to.

An hon. MEMBER: A small man for a small hole.

Mr. TURGEON: The commission has lately stated that it might be well if appointments to positions involving a salary under $200 were recommended by the member for the county. It may not have been so intended, but I look upon that as the greatest insult that could be offered to the representatives of the people in Parliament. It is an insult for a member of Parliament to be told that he is not fit to make appointments carrying a salary of over $200. I see the ex-Minister of Agriculture in his seat. It is an insult to him and hon. gentlemen opposite just as much as it is to me. If I am not qualified to nominate a man for a position worth $1,000 or $2,000, I do not want to choose a man for a position worth $200. My hon. friends of the Progressive party, led by my hon. friend from Marquette, say, let us do away with patronage, but in ten years' time they may find that the public service in the prairie provinces has been degraded because no responsibility for it attaches to members of Parliament, and before that time comes, it will have cost millions of dollars to the country. If a member is not willing to accept this responsibility, let him not seek to be elected to Parliament. He is the only one who can be held to account for the proper carrying on of the public service in his constituency, and he should be ready to accept that responsibility. This same Government that after 1911 put out every public official in the Dominion of Canada who was a Liberal or Liberal appointee—and they cannot deny that, every such official was dismissed, and the only exceptions in my county were the postmasters in five or six places where there were no Conservatives in existence—

Mr. BOYS: Does the hon. member say that that state of affairs existed throughout the whole of Canada?

Mr. TURGEON: Certainly.

Mr. BOYS: In my riding from 1911 to the present time not one official was dismissed who was a Liberal.

Mr. TURGEON: Perhaps they were all Conservatives.

Mr. LAPOINTE: They were all dismissed in my riding.

Mr. MANION: In justice to the party, I would like to say the same for my riding as the hon. member for South Simcoe has said for his. I was not of this party in 1911, so I am not a biassed witness, and I do not know of a dismissal in my section of the country since 1911. I know one postmaster, a very well known man, who was appointed by the Liberals, and who has been kept in by the Conservatives ever since, and he is still in that position, though he is opposed to both parties now so far as I know.

Mr. BOYS: I just want to make good my assertion. One of the first things brought to my notice when I came in at the by-election in 1912, was a request to dismiss the postmaster at Thornton who had been a Liberal all his life, but I declined to have anything to do with it.

Mr. TURGEON: There may be exceptions, where there were no Conservatives to be found, but we all know that the outside service was practically eliminated after the election of 1911, and that thousands and thousands of Liberals were dismissed all over the country.

Mr. MICHAUD: And dismissed without any investigation.

Mr. TURGEON: I admit that in constituencies in Ontario which were largely Conservative the axe may not have been applied so ruthlessly, but it is well known that Liberals all over the country were dismissed.

Mr. TOLMIE: Does that refer to the Department of Agriculture too?

Mr. TURGEON: We have very few officials of the Department of Agriculture in my constituency or in the province of New Brunswick, but I believe it applies to that department also.

Mr. TOLMIE: With regard to the constituency of Victoria City I know of no such dismissals, and with regard to the Department of Agriculture, it is a well known fact that nearly all the branch heads are Liberals or Liberal appointees, and excellent men they are. None of them were shifted; they are there still, and are rendering good service.

Mr. TURGEON: I am only speaking of the outside service.

Mr. BOYS: I will make this assertion, and I would be very glad to see the Government take it up, that since 1911 down to the present time, not one per cent. of the officials of Liberal faith throughout the province of Ontario have been dismissed.

Mr. DUFF: Mr. Chairman, this is being turned into an experience meeting.

Mr. TURGEON: I have already said that in Ontario the axe was not used to the same extent.

Mr. BOYS: I spoke of Ontario because I really do not profess to know very much about the other provinces.

Mr. TURGEON: In 1911, there were only eight or ten Liberal constituencies in Ontario, and the ministers representing the province of Ontario took good care to keep their friends in office. That accounts for the comparatively small number of dismissals in Ontario. In 1919, this same government that dismissed these officials after 1911, thinking that they had their oppointees nominated all over the country and the outside service filled with their supporters, brought the outside service under the commission in order to keep their appointees in the service. That is what was done. I protested at the time, and I am only repeating to-night what I said two or three years ago in this Parliament. I say that in the best interests of the country, in the interests of the Civil Service, and more particularly for the sake of economy, for which my hon. friend from Marquette has made such a strong appeal, the responsibility for making appointments should be with the members of Parliament, whose duty it is to accept that responsibility. I am prepared to take the responsibility. If I have made a mistake and a man has been appointed who is not doing his duty, could I let that man stay in office? No, I would be the first to ask for his dismissal in the interests of the service. The outside service is not in the same position as the inside service, which has responsible heads. In the departmental offices here in Ottawa all the clerks are under the different heads. If a clerk does not know enough of his arithmetic or of his grammar—which is all that is required most of the time—the deputy minister or his chief puts him out—

Some hon. MEMBERS: Oh, no.

[Mr. Tolmie.]

Mr. TURGEON: Or relegate him to his old position.

Mr. MARTELL: When a man is not fit for his job they put him in the Marine Department to stamp lobster labels.

Mr. TURGEON: As I said a few moments ago in some of the minor positions in the service the responsibility is not large neither does any large amount of money pass through the hands of the office holder. On the other hand in the case of the customs service many officers become the custodians of very large sums. Such a man is under the supervision of his member, to use an expression that is quite common in the country constituencies; he is under the supervision of the man who formerly was responsible for his appointment and therefore he conducts himself with great circumspection. Now the action of the late government in bringing the Outside Service under the control of the Civil Service Commission was done without serious consideration, and is not likely to commend itself to the people when they think over the present situation. The government which is charged with the responsibility of looking after the larger interests of the country should be in a position to care for the smaller interests as well. Because, after all, it is very often the small things which play an important part in the happiness and prosperity of the people. In closing let me say that I think I have given utterance to nothing that is opposed to the principles of true democracy.

Mr. McQUARRIE: My hon. friend who has just taken his seat has not described the situation quite correctly. If this discussion proves anything it proves that the late government actually did abolish patronage.

Mr. LOVETT: If the late government abolished patronage it did so by placing a man in the Civil Service Commission who took the pains before he was put there to sweep the board clear of every Liberal in my constituency.

Mr. McQUARRIE: I have heard various statements of that kind to-night but I can only speak from knowledge of my own district and my own province, and as far as I am aware there was no wholesale dismissal of Liberals in our country. During the last Parliament we were told by hon. members who are now sitting on the government side that patronage had not been abolished at all; that the claim that it had been was a farce, and that it still

existed in the same old form. Now they are finding out that such is not the case. When we hear ministers of the Crown standing up here and saying "For God's sake give me power," and when we hear hon. gentlemen opposite complaining to-day about the situation in which they now find themselves, we know that the pledge of the government which was elected in 1917 was really carried out, and that patronage was abolished. Now as far as I am concerned I would not like to see patronage restored, particularly now—

Some hon. MEMBERS: Oh, oh.

Mr. McQUARRIE: We used to hear about the abolition of patronage. That was one of the planks in the platform of the Union Government—abolition of patronage including patronage for Conservatives. Now, conditions have changed and we hear a cry for the restoration of patronage, which I suppose means the restoration of patronage for Liberals.

Some hon. MEMBERS: Not patronage but justice.

Mr. McQUARRIE: The hon. member for Bonaventure (Mr. Marcil), for whom I have a great deal of respect, expressed the view that members of Parliament should be consulted about appointments regardless of their political views, but he was frank enough to say that the appointment should go to supporters of the government of the day. Well, that is a fair statement on his part.

Mr. MARCIL (Bonaventure): If the hon. member will pardon me, I said that the party in power ought to give the preference to its friends but that I did not approve of the principle of ignoring the representative of a constituency as was done in my case for ten years.

Mr. McQUARRIE: I think the hon. member will also be frank enough to say that previous to that time the Conservatives were ignored by the Liberal government. But the point I am coming to is this: The principle involved here is not that the member for the constituency should have something to say, but that the members supporting the government, or the defeated candidates for that matter, should have the say and that patronage for the Liberals should be restored.

Mr. TURGEON: Does my hon. friend expect the Liberal party to remain in power for eternity?

Mr. DUFF: Certainly.

Mr. TURGEON: Well perhaps my hon. friend is right. But chances will come and the party of the hon. member (Mr. McQuarrie) will have its turn.

Mr. McQUARRIE: It may be time for a change in my hon. friend's constituency but his constituents do not seem to think that; he has been there for a long time now. Hon. members opposite doubtless will say that this is the psychological moment for the restoration of patronage because their party may not be in power for a very long time. That is quite probable. All indications or signs point to that and I will agree with my hon. friend (Mr. Turgeon) to that extent. As a matter of fact this Government has not a majority at all.

Mr. LAPOINTE: Any fool can govern with a majority.

Mr. McQUARRIE: It is quite evident that hon. gentlemen opposite want to get back to the patronage system. I am opposed to that, I do not think it would be a good thing at all. I certainly would not like to see them carry out wholesale dismissals so as to enable them to give appointmente to their friends. I say it would be a very bad thing indeed to do or to interfere with the Civil Service Commission at all.

Mr. LOVETT: Did not the Tory party do that kind of thing after 1911?

Mr. McQUARRIE: I have already said that so far as I know they certainly did not.

Some hon. MEMBERS: Oh, oh.

Mr. McQUARRIE: The hon. member from Hants (Mr. Martell) smiles. A few minutes ago he said that when the civil servants were no good they put them in the Marine Department. He should know, because he was in the Marine Department himself. Personally, I am very much opposed to the restoration of patronage. I think appointment by the Civil Service Commission is the proper system to adopt; I have no criticism to make of the present members of that commision, and I have not heard any criticism here to-night. No one seems to have taken that stand. Apparently, they are doing their duty conscientiously, and doing it well—to the best of their ability at all events. But I have always thought that members of Parliament, irrespective of what party they be-

long to, might be consulted or, referred to more than they have been in reference to appointments, because in most cases they know something about the applicants for positions, and will be able to say whether they are suitable for appointment or not. I do not say that the recommendation of members should necessarily be accepted, but I think they might be referred to, in the case of some of the appointments, and they might be asked for their recommendation, and if they had any objections to raise, those objections should be taken into consideration. I wish to put myself on record as being in favour of the continuation of the Civil Service Commission. It may be that certain classes of appointments might very well be taken away from that commission. That matter was the subject of an act passed last session, and some arrangement might be made whereby some of the classes which have been referred to might be taken out of the jurisdiction of the commission, but I say, do not restore patronage, particularly patronage for the Liberals.

Mr. CARRUTHERS: For the benefit of my innocent friends across the way, these doubing Thomases, I wish to say that I stand here to-night as a living example of the Grit officials who were beheaded in 1911.

Mr. LOGAN: And in Ontario, too.

Mr. CARRUTHERS: In Ontario, too—cut off very close to the shoulder, with only 30 days' notice given me and not even the semblance of an investigation. This was done by a gentleman whom a number of hon. members know, W. R. Smythe, ex-member of Parliament for East Algoma, a gentleman employed a little later, and still employed, at a salary of some $4,000 per annum. He was appointed in October, just previous to the election. I understand he refused to go into East Algoma to support my opponent, Mr. Nicholson, unless he got the appointment. Within a week or two after, he got the appointment from the late government—and yet there was no patronage!

Mr. SIMPSON: What is the source of my hon. friend's information when he makes the statement that Mr. Smythe refused to go into East Algoma during the last election campaign?

Mr. CARRUTHERS: Well, he went there immediately after. I might say, in regard to East Algoma, that I know of only one or possibly two unimportant offices held, in the whole of that large riding of 40,000 square miles by Liberals today. The great majority of Liberals holding office were summarily dismissed after the election of 1911, and that cannot be contradicted. I wish, for the benefit of my hon. friends on the Government benches, to refer to the trouble they are liable to get into with the civil service in Ottawa. I wish to give concrete examples that I have run across since I came down here, as a member, to show that there is no continuity in the departments. It seems to be a pigeon hole service, a hole here and a hole there, and there is no connection between them. I came here and laid before the Post Office Department a claim for $178 owing to residents of my riding, and the inspector did not know anything about it. I said to him. "These men who make this claim are strictly honest business men, and I do not think they would make the claim unless they were entitled to the money." I left him then and in two weeks' time, I was called down to his office, and he said: "Doctor, you were right and I was wrong; we owe that money". That was on the 8th day of May. He gave instructions to have that cheque issued by the department. A day or two ago I got a letter from one of these gentlemen, saying that they had never received the cheque. I went to the department, and the superintendent looked up the files and showed me where his order had been issued that the money should be paid on the 18th May. It was never paid. On the 13th June that cheque had not been issued. There is an example of the overmanned Civil Service of the City of Ottawa. Someone is responsible for that. That money had been owing by the government to these people for nearly a year, and yet payment was delayed from the 18th May, and I do not know whether it is paid yet. It may go back into the pigeon hole, and I may get a letter a month hence, asking about that cheque.

I wish to refer to another matter in connection with the Marine Department. I do not like to make these complaints, but I think the minister should know, because he will get the blame, and not the subordinates. It was in connection with a derelict tug boat that was sunk in the channel of Little Current, last fall. This tug boat went upon a shoal, and lay in such a position that logs could not be towed through the channel, and millions of feet of logs have to be towed through every summer. Mr. Burke, of the Mid-

land Towing Company, wrote me in the winter. I came here early in March, to have the matter rectified, and I went to the department. Just before the towing season began, I got a wire from Mr. Burke, saying that his tug would be at the head of the channel in one week, and no move had been taken to remove the derelict from its position in the channel. I went down to the department and asked them to show me the files, in order to see what had been done, and what did I find? The department had written one letter to the insurance company, who held insurance on that tug, and had written one letter to the owners of the tug, and the matter dropped. It was never followed up: There should be some driving force to keep those things in motion, and therefore, as I say, I think I should bring this matter to the attention of the Government so that the minister may take action in the matter. Those are two concrete cases that, as I say, I find fault with. I do not know whether the trouble is due to the Civil Service Commission or not, but I do not wish my friends in the Government to get the blame of it.

Mr. MANION: I did not intend to take part in this debate; but the thought has struck me that it is rather extraordinary that, throughout the whole discussion, so far as I have heard—and I have been here during the most of it—not one word of praise has come from my hon. friends opposite for the Civil Service Commission. Apparently, many of them have been hit very hard or have been approached very strenuously since the election, and I understand the position must be difficult for a government getting into power after it has been out. I have never had the experience of being in Parliament when patronage existed. I came here in 1917 and when I look back I can think of no position that was filled in my constituency since I came into the House in which appointment I had any power whatever.

Mr. MARTELL: Can the hon. member point to a single instance where the government of which he was a member, or the so-called Union Government of 1917 to 1921, ever gave a position of any sort to a person who was known to be a Laurier Liberal?

Mr. MANION: I do not know of any appointments being given to Laurier Liberals, but I know of a number that were given to Liberals.

Mr. MARTELL: Of the Union variety.

Mr. MANION: I can name Senate appointees of the Liberal faith who, in the recent election, got out and fought against members of the late Union Government. That, however, is not the point.

Mr. STANSELL: I think I can give the hon. member a case if he wishes it. I have in my constituency a man who was a life-long supporter of the Conservative government. He was retired and he had appointed in his place in 1921 a strong Laurier Liberal.

Mr. MANION: What I was going to say was that I had never anything to do with any appointment in my constituency, and I have never had a complaint from my constituency because I have not had anything to do with the appointments. I have no complaint to make of the fact that I have had nothing to do with appointments, and I am very glad to be rid of that occupation. I remember my predecessor and many in this House of the older members will remember Jim Conmee. He was a member in the old days when patronage existed on both sides. Whenever a government was Conservative, the Conservatives got the favours, and whenever a government was Liberal, the Liberals got the favours. I remember a joke told on him and I rather think it was true, that one day he came into my constituency and was told that during the election So-and-so was working against him. He said: "That is rather a funny thing; I have never done him a favour." The idea is the same as my experience has been that, wherever I have been able to do favours—I am not speaking in a political sense—in most cases the man for whom I have done favours has been very apt to be the first man to oppose me. I remember a case of a man in my constituency who was appointed by the same Jim Conmee in 1907, and given a good position. After 1911, the Conservative party kept him in the same position and his salary gradually increased, until to-day he is getting a pretty good salary. During the last election, not openly, but privately, this gentleman supported the Progressive who was opposing me, so that he went back on both the Liberal party which had appointed him and the Conservative party which had kept him in his position.

I wish to say just one word in fairness to the Civil Service Commission, because that is really what I rose to do. I have had no occasion, since I have been a mem-

ber, to make appointments or to suggest appointments to them. In a few cases where returned soldiers have asked me to recommend them, I have given them a general letter of recommendation; but I have yet to think of any such man that was appointed by the Civil Service Commission. I have, however, no complaint to make of any appointment made in my constituency by the Civil Service Commission.

Mr. MARTELL: The hon. member got his own friends.

Mr. MANION: I did not get my friends. I have stated that, as regards any man whom I have recommended in a general way, I have not had one appointed; but I have never had a complaint from my constituency as regards appointments made by the Civil Service Commission. In other words, as regards appointments made in my constituency and also, I believe, in the neighbouring constituency of Port Arthur, there have been no complaints by the people of those constituencies. I believe it is only fair that that should be said about the Civil Service Commission. I admit there are faults in the present law and no doubt they should be remedied. Perhaps there are cases where the Civil Service Commission could favour the member of the constituency and do it in justice to all parties concerned. I have had this happen in my constituency—and this is irritating—that an inspector has come in to make inquiries regarding an appointment in the Civil Service and he has consulted many other people but has not come to me. I believe that he should have consulted me as well as other people, but I think the appointment was a good one when he made it.

Mr. PUTNAM: Was the hon. gentleman satisfied that the returned soldiers whom he recommended were turned down?

Mr. MANION: I had no particular complaint to make because the positions were given to returned soldiers. If they had been given to other than returned soldiers, I would have had a complaint.

Mr. PUTNAM: They were subject to examination?

Mr. MANION: Yes.

Mr. PUTNAM: And could not pass it?

Mr. MANION: Yes, but someone passed it higher than they.

Mr. PUTNAM: Does the hon. gentleman know whether they passed the examination or not?

[Mr. Manion.]

Mr. MANION: I do not know, but I am simply saying that I know of none of them that got an appointment. I have, however, no complaint to make of the appointments that were made.

Mr. PUTNAM: I have as regards returned soldiers being turned down on technical examinatioins.

Mr. MANION: As I understand the existing law, where a number of men try an examination, if one of them is a returned soldier and he passes the examination, he comes before any other man who passes. If the soldier fails on the examination, then, theoretically at least, he is supposed not to be able to fill the position.

Mr. PUTNAM: Does that imply that the hon. gentleman agrees with the examination questions.

Mr. MANION: I do not say that I agree with some of the questions that are put, but I agree with the principle of examination, or you could not have anything in the shape of a Civil Service Commission. I have not gone into the question in detail, but I have seen in the press some of the questions that have been put. Generally speaking, the principle of examination is correct.

Mr. PUTNAM: Would that not depend entirely upon the common sense of the questions in regard to the duties required of a man in a position?

Mr. MANION: The questions should certainly relate to the job; and what I say is that if the questions do not relate to the job I would not agree with them. I am trying to point out that the principle of examination is what I stand for, not for the questions that may be put.

Mr. MARCIL (Bonaventure): In all cases in the outside service?

Mr. MANION: No, they could not well be examined.

Mr. MARCIL (Bonaventure): Does the hon. member approve of the way appointments are made at the present time?

Mr. MANION: That is the case I cited. When an inspector comes into a constituency to make an appointment, I think it should be his duty to call upon the sitting member amongst other people and give his views consideration. That has not been done sufficiently, in my experience at least. I wish, however, to say that generally, by and large, I have found the Civil Service

Commission something which has not been complained about in my constituency. I wish to be fair to them in saying that, and I have never had an appointment made through them. I think it is only fair to them that those who have had that experience should say so. We have not had many instances, certainly none from the opposite side, and very few from this side, of rendering them the justice that, I believe, is due them. They occupy a very difficult position, and I believe, by and large, they occupy it pretty well.

Mr. MARTELL: If everything was so perfectly satisfactory, particularly as regards the outside service, why did you want the Spinney Bill last session?

Mr. MANION: I did not specially want it. I do not remember even what the Spinney Bill was. Everything is not satisfactory, improvements can be made, but I do not believe that the people as a whole are willing to go back to the old patronage system.

Mr. J. E. FONTAINE (Hull) (Translation): Mr. Chairman, I have no intention at this late hour to speak at length; moreover the ground has fairly well been covered by the hon. members who preceded me in this debate; nevertheless this question concerning the Civil Service is so important that I deem it my duty to give to this House my views on the subject. Let me first state that I have nothing against the commissioners of the Civil Service; they are eminent men in whom I have confidence; however, I believe that the late government overburdened them with work and perhaps even with excessive powers. Mr. Chairman, it has always been an element of surprise to me to hear the hon. ministers, in answering questions asked by members, state that they could not be held responsible for the present state of things, and that their authority was very limited over a great number of their employees; the same could be said with reference to their salary; finally that they were entirely in the hands of the Civil Service Commission. Perchance, would that Commission be more important than the Government? Again, I believe that the Borden government invested this commission with too much power. The thought which guided the government of Sir Wilfrid Laurier in establishing the Civil Service Commission was to give the commission, so far as positions were concerned, control of the inside service; that is to say that examinations would be held and the most successful candidate would be given the vacant post. So far as this went, it was quite correct. But a great blunder was made in 1917, when the late government handed over the control of the outside service to the Civil Service Commission. I cannot see how the members of that commission can, with efficiency, choose workmen, elevator men, carpenters or persons belonging to other trades. I believe that members are better judges of those who have such qualifications to fill these positions. I repeat, in my opinion, that it was a mistake to give the control of the outside service to the Civil Service Commission. Now, I wish to pass a few remarks in regard to the famous re-classification which was made, a few years ago, by Griffenhagen and Company.

I always thought it bad policy that the Borden government considered it wise to fetch foreigners from the United States to perform work that they should have done themselves. I contend that the heads of departments were sufficiently qualified to classify the employees. I fail to understand how these foreigners in the course of a few weeks could size up the qualities needed or the value of the work of such employees. Accordingly many complaints have reached us ever since this classification was made. No one was satisfied; all the employees complain and say they have been unjustly dealt with, and I believe they are perfectly right. To my personal knowledge, I am aware that employees having important duties to fulfil, receive, according to this famous re-classification, very inferior salaries. I was anxious to protest against the work done by these gentlemen who have upset everything in the Civil Service and created discontent everywhere they set foot. It seems to me that salaries amounting to six or seven hundred dollars per year are not equitable. I do not believe that an employee can live in a decent manner with a salary of fifty or sixty dollars a month. I cannot understand how these gentlemen who had charge of the reclassification could have discovered positions at such paltry remuneration. I am convinced that the grievances are well founded and ask the Government to start anew, at least for some parts of the service, this re-classification made with such lack of knowledge and very often unjustly. I am aware that the Government must protect the interests of the ratepayers, but on the other hand they must be just towards the employees of the Civil Service. They are an important

class of servants; they are for the most part able men, and once more, I repeat it, I believe they have cause to complain of the manner in which things were conducted.

A short while ago, I heard some hon. members on the Opposition side make the statement that in their counties there had been no dismissal of employees when the Conservative party assumed power, in 1911. I have no knowledge of what occurred in my neighbour's counties but I can state that in my constituency many employees and competent ones, who were irreproachably fulfilling their duties, were dismissed for the simple reason that they were Liberals. I know that in my constituency, as well as in the county of the hon. member for Bonaventure (Mr. Marcil) a great number of postmasters were removed without cause, simply owing to their connection with the Liberal party; I also know that a great number of employees, in the different departments were dismissed. I might cite the case of a lock watchman, belonging to my constituency, who was discharged because he was a Liberal. Moreover a great number of workingmen of Hull, who were employed by the Public Works Department, were dismissed for the same reason: they were Liberals. The Borden government, between the years 1911 and 1914, dismissed 11,000 employees, under the guise of economy, yet, it found it possible to replace these 11,000 by 23,000 employees who were taken into the service during the same period. It goes without saying that these gentlemen now in the Opposition have made a frightful abuse of patronage. After dismissing our friends, they overcrowded the departments with their own friends, and some time later they passed this famous legislation abolishing patronage, knowing fully well that they would be defeated in the election as it so happened, however making sure beforehand of the permanency of their friends.

I want to protest against this way of doing things, and I feel fully confident that the present Government, which is prompted by a desire to render justice to all groups, will find means to ameliorate the present situation and will amend the Civil Service Act in a way that all political parties will be put on the same footing. I do not believe that it is in the country's interest that the party in power alone should have the right to distribute favours, as it was practised by the Conservative party.

Once more, in the name of my electors and those of the whole country, I ask the Government to amend the Civil Service Act in such a way as to pay equitable salaries to employees, so that like all other citizens of this country, they may be placed in such circumstances as to enable them to bring up their families decently.

Mr. HERMAS DESLAURIERS (St. Mary) (Translation): Mr. Chairman, we are at present considering a credit for the maintenance of the Civil Service Commission. What I am most desirous of knowing at present, is if the employees of this Commission have honourably administered the country's business or if they have acquitted themselves of their task honourably.

An employee who has performed his duties honourably, has a right to a reward, to a salary; but an employee who has endeavoured to invent lies when information was sought and thereby oblige the minister to come officially before this House and make false statements must be dealt with differently and I say that his case must certainly be investigated before money is voted to him. This is the case of Mr. Putman, chief of the Organization Branch of the Civil Service Commission. On May 12, 1920, the hon. member for Westmoreland, at present Secretary of State (Mr. Copp) asked for certain information in reference to this Mr. Putman, as follows:

Mr. PUTMAN

Mr. Copp:

1. Is there an official connected with the Civil Service Commission named Putman?
2. If so, does be hold a responsible position of an advisory or directory character?
3. What is said position?
4. Beyond an academic examination has he any qualifications in the nature of practical experience in handling or supervising large bodies of officials?
5. If so, what special qualification?
6. What is his age?
7. What is his salary?

On May 17, 1920, the Right Hon. Mr. Sifton answered as follows to these questions:

Rt. Hon. Mr. Sifton:

1. Yes.
2. Appointed Assistant Chief, Organization Branch in March, 1920.
3. Answered by No. 2.
4. Yes.
5. Graduate civil engineer, eight years' banking experience, six years of engineering experience, during such period had direction of as many as three hundred men, one year and a half with the Civil Service Commission on classification work, one year as acting chief. Obtained highest standing on Civil Service open competitive examination held in October, 1919, for the position of Chief, Organization Branch, with a percentage of 86.3 per cent.
6. 32 years.
7. $255 a month.

Now, in 1922, the hon. member for Bellechasse (Mr. Fournier) asked exactly the same questions and, this time, here is the answer given not by the Right Hon. Mr. Sifton, but by the Hon. Secretary of State (Mr. Copp), it contains statements entirely different from those made in 1920. Here are these questions and answers:

Civil Service Commission—Chief of Organization Branch

Mr. Fournier:

1. What is the name and age of the chief of the Organization Branch of the Civil Service Commission?

2. When was he first appointed to the commission, in what capacity and at what salary?

3. Was he appointed after competitive examination?

4. What experience had he fitting him for this position?

5. On what date, month and year, was he appointed as chief of the said Organization Branch, and at what salary?

6. Was his appointment retroactive?

7. If so, to what date, month and year, and on whose recommendation?

8. Did he receive any back pay?

9. If so, what amount?

10. What increase has he received each year since 1918?

Hon. Mr. Copp:

1. C. V. Putman, 33 years.

2. Temporary, to assist in classification work November 15, 1918, at $1,500.

3. Yes, when permanently appointed.

4. Six and a half years' banking experience, eight years of engineering experience; nearly two years of experience in classification work.

5. January 11, 1922, at $3,840.

6. Yes.

7. April 1, 1921. The Civil Service Commission.

8. Yes.

9. $450.

10. 1918—Answered by No. 2.

1919—Appointed Acting Chief, Organization Branch, March 1919. Temporary $2,700.

1920—Appointed Assistant Chief, Organization Branch, and Acting Chief, March 1920. Permanent $3,060.

1921—Promoted to Chief, Organization Branch, permanent, at $3,840.

In 1920, it was stated that he was 32 years old; in 1922, it was asserted that he had grown old by one year only during this two years interval, his age was therefore given as 33. His salary was as follows: in November 1918, $1,500; in March 1919, $2,700; in March 1920, $3,060, and in March 1921, $3,840. In the space of 3 years he seems therefore to have received an increase of $2,340.

The present Government, on January 11, 1922, finally appointed him head of the organization branch.

On May 17, 1920, and April, 1922, we find in Hansard untruthful answers: In Hansard of May 17, 1920, it is given out that this same Mr. Putman had had eight years experience in banking. In Hansard of April 19, 1922, it is asserted that he has only had six and a half years of banking experience. In Hansard of May 17, 1920, it is given out that he has had six years of experience as civil engineer, and in Hansard of April 19 1922, we find that eight years of experience as civil engineer is given. In Hansard of May 17, 1920, it is stated that he has been employed during one year and a half on classification work besides one year as assistant chief, and in Hansard of April 19, 1922, it is simply stated that he has had nearly two years of experience on classification work. Although the answers are different in both cases, the same number of 16½ years is given in each respective case. In one statement he would have graduated at the age of 15½ years, which is not the truth; in the other, he would have graduated at the age of 16½ years, which is again a false statement.

In Hansard of May 17, 1920, it is given out that he obtained the greatest number of points in the competitive examination, that is 86.3 per cent—take note not 86.4 per cent. Now, on that date, this Mr. Putman was on the board of examiners; he had knowledge of the questions which would be asked. Is it so astonishing that this gentleman obtained 86.3 per cent of the points, when he himself prepared the questions which he had to undergo. Now, I should like the Government to give special attention to these fabulous increases which I have referred to. We must not lose sight that this Mr. Putman is no more no less than the chief organizer of the Civil Service Commission. These people, each year, add scandalously to their salaries by recommending themselves for an increase to the commission.

An employee who has taken advantage of his position in the Civil Service Commission to outrage decency and commit injustice towards his fellow-men, has not the right to suppose that the country owes him his full salary and he must not expect that Parliament will take into serious consideration his suggestions.

Recently, I took part in a meeting of the Parliamentary Library Committee. It was brought to the attention of the members of this committee that a messenger, employed for a few years on the staff of the Library, recommended by the higher officials of the Library, Mr. Burrell and Mr. Taché, had just been appointed to a position of $2,100, I believe; while old employees with 20 years service, possessing high academic diplomas,

whose efficiency was not to be gainsaid, were deliberately cast aside. When we came to enquire about the qualifications of this young man who, on the recommendation of the higher Library officials, climbed from the position of messenger to that of assistant secretary or book-keeper, I do not know exactly, the one who had recommended him was not aware whether he had passed any examinations. To the truth of this statement, the Speaker of the House of Commons might bear testimony as he was chairman of this committee. You cannot imagine the answer we were given! Mr. Taché in his answer put down a date which allows me to state, that at that time, the person whom he recommended could hardly have been born. Well, Mr. Chairman, do you think that Parliament can ratify the acts of this Civil Service Commission, which acts on such information as I have just stated? I contend that under the present circumstances, when we must ever be practising economy, we have no right to waste the money of the Public Treasury.

In the money order branch of the Post Office Department, there is a young clerk with twelve or fifteen years' experience, who has trained three of his companions to the work that is done in that branch. Now, of late, high officials of this Department—as in the case I was mentioning a moment ago—recommended to the Civil Service Commission those three pupils, the first of which is deserving, the second being so, so, and the third utterly worthless; however, their "coach" was deliberately kept in the background although his record is most satisfactory.

There is in the Naturalization branch of the Department of the Secretary of State—we must look into every corner—a licentiate of laws—a qualification which is essential for that kind of work—who took a full course of classical studies; and next to him is a man who has had only a very elementary education, with no legal knowledge, whose salary nevertheless, is higher than his own.

Some hon. MEMBERS: Shame!

Mr. DESLAURIERS (Translation): A public servant taking advantage of his position to secure for himself back pay and an increase in salary should be called upon to clear himself before his remuneration is confirmed. For instance, we have the example of the secretary of the Civil Service Commission, Mr. W. Foran. When a question is put or information is asked for by an hon. member whom the people have elected, so that he might uphold the public interests, that member is entitled to be acquainted with the whole truth, even by the Secretary of the Civil Service Commission. Thus, when the hon. member from Bellechasse (Mr. Fournier) was asking questions concerning the commission, its secretary was bound to state the facts. The hon. member asked:

1. Has the Secretary of the Civil Service Commission been classified?
2. If so, by whom?
3. What was his salary on April 1, 1918, 1919, 1920, 1921 and 1922?
4. Did he receive any back pay?
5. If so, what amount?
6. At what date, month and year?

On April 10, 1922, the hon. Secretary of State gave the following answers:

1. Yes.
2. The Parliament of Canada, on the recommendation of the Civil Service Commission. (See classification volume adopted 10th November, 1919).
3. April 1918, $4,000; 1919, $4.260; 1920, $4,400; 1921, $4,620; 1922, $5,100.
4. Yes.
5. $960.
6. 31st December, 1921.

As you may see, we are referred for our evidence to the classification volume adopted on November 10, 1919.

On May 5, 1922, I put the following question to the Government:

How many copies of the edition of the 10th of November were distributed.

This is the answer I got: "No edition on that date."

On the 10th of April, he answers in a certain way, and on May 5, he answers in a different way. However, he applies for a full salary and above all for numerous and substantial increases!

As to his salary, this is what it was on the several dates I am going to give: March 31, 1918, according to the report from the Auditor General, a salary of $3,700 was granted to the secretary of the Civil Service Commission, while in Hansard of April 10, 1922, it is seen that during the year 1918, his salary was $4,000. In the Auditor General's report dated May 31, 1919, the salary of that official is given as $3,800, while according to Hansard of April 10, 1922, that salary in 1919 was $4,260. The report states that on March 31, 1920, Mr. Foran was receiving $4,440 a year and Hansard shows that to be correct. According to the report, the salary of the secretary of the Civil Service Commission was $4,400 on March 31, 1921, but then from the answer

given by the Secretary of State and printed in Hansard on the 10th of April, 1922, that gentleman's salary during 1921 amounted to $4,620; and also from Hansard of the same date Mr. Foran's salary for the year 1922, is $5,100. On December 31, 1921, the secretary of the Civil Service Commission received an amount of $1,220 as back-pay.

I must add that following the official volume upon the classification of the civil service in September, 1919, the sum of $4,620 was agreed on as the maximum salary of the secretary of the commission. Now, that gentleman succeeded in having it raised to $5,100 What should be done under these circumstances? He ought to be compelled to obey the law or, better still, be asked to retire.

Now, a few moments ago, I told you how the organization board of the Civil Service Commission held examinations. We are anxious about getting posted so as to prevent the grafting of nepotism on our administration and the forming of a "family compact" wherein secrecy is too well observed for the good of the country. We find in the report of the Auditor General for 1918, vol. 3, page Y-9, the name of a lady, M. G. Goode; in the same report for 1919, vol. I, we find the name of M. Goode, that of L. Daley and W. J. Paynter; again in the same report for 1920, vol. I, chapter 8, we find the name of E. F. Bland, and in the report for 1921, we find the names of E. F. Bland, M. Daley and Paynter. Who are these persons? Mrs. M. G. Goode or M. Goode is the eldest daughter of Mr. Wm. Foran, secretary of the commission; Mrs. L. Daley is the wife of the chief English examiner of the commission; Mrs. E. F. Bland is the wife of the assistant secretary of the commission, and W. J. Paynter or G. Paynter, is the wife of the chief accountant of the commission. Can any better family compact be found administering the affairs of the country, specially when it is a question of having salary increases granted? On May 9, 1922, I asked a number of questions in regard to certain persons of the commission, among other questions I asked if a person by the name of R. B. Veit was related to the secretary of the Civil Service Commission. I received the following answer:

No official information.

The secretary of the Civil Service Commission did not seem to recognize his brother-in-law.

I also asked if a Mr Bland was related to Mr. Farrow, of the Custom Department. The answer was: "No official information." It is his son-in-law, he was unknown to him.

Now, let me tell you what these gentlemen have received: On April 1, 1918, Mr. Veit's salary was $1,550; on April 1, 1919, it was increased to $1,680; on April 1, 1920, increased to $1,800; on April 1, 1921, increased to $2,400 and on April 1, 1922, it reached $2,520. Moreover he received, I believe, as back pay $363.35. In regard to Mr. Bland, here is his salary: in 1918, he only drew his military salary; in 1919, $3,060; in 1920, $3,240; in 1921, $3,660 and in 1922, $3,840. In 1919-20, he drew as back pay $960; in 1920-21, $355, which makes a total of $1,315 as back pay. All this, as a result of the family compact of the secretary of the Civil Service Commission. I shall draw the attention of the Government, who at this moment, are requesting us to approve the estimates in regard to the Civil Service Commission, to the fact that these votes have been prepared by the men whose names appear in my statements, by the people who, without any scruple, recommended one another for back pay of salary and who agreed between themselves on scandalous increases. I might say that no where else is the old English saying better put into practice: "Scratch my back and I'll scratch yours." For the honour of this House and that of the ministry, which were insulted by the false information given by the said employees,—independent, if you wish, of Parliament, but who nevertheless must come to the representatives of the people when it is a case of being paid,—I believe that before passing the present estimates of the Civil Service Commission we should use the power we have, and I suggest that Parliament should object, and, that we make these people wait a little. I mean those who perpetrated injustice in all the departments, who have everywhere violated equity and who laugh at the present Ministers of the Crown and representatives of the people. For my part, conscious of the mandate which my electors have given me, I demand once more the re-establishment of the principle of ministerial responsibility, a principle which is consigned to the back-ground by the acts of this commission. Before passing these estimates, I would ask the Government and the House to institute a parliamentary enquiry so as to discover the vultures that prey on the people's money, the parasites

that devour our public treasury and to furnish us the means to destroy them. At a time when economy is preached over the whole world, we have no right to vote these items and I for one set my foot squarely against it. It is a duty incumbent on us to start this parliamentary enquiry and to stop the salaries and especially curtail the powers of this organization committee of the Civil Service Commission.

Mr. DUFF: I am sure I shall be pardoned, Mr. Chairman, if for a few moments I take up the time of the committee, although the hour is late, in answering a few of the arguments made by certain hon. gentlemen sitting diagonally opposite to me.

An hon. MEMBER: Angularly opposite.

Mr. DUFF: Angularly opposite, yes. It is remarkable, Sir, for one of my political experience to listen to-night to the innocent young member from Fort William and Rainy River (Mr. Manion) in his effort to impress upon us the fact that he had never recommended, during his brief political career, any one for appointment in the government service. Of course, that may be quite true, but you will remember, Sir, that in the next breath he told us that every Liberal member who had represented the constituency before him had been deluged with applications for positions and that his Liberal friends had always been appointed. It might be interesting if the hon. gentleman had told us why this change came over the constituency of Fort William and Rainy River immediately after he was elected; because the hon. member said that from that day henceforth there was no political appointments in that county, nor was he bothered by either his political friends or his political enemies. We had a sort of experience meeting on the part of my hon. friends who comprise the National Liberal and Conservative party; every minute or two they were jumping up here and there and denying assertions made by hon. gentlemen on this side. When the hon. member for Gloucester (Mr. Turgeon) stated that after the election of 1911 wholesale dismissals were made in this country, these hon. members, one after the other, got up and denied that there had been any dismissals in their constituencies. It will go down in history, Sir, that when the Tory government came into power there were in this country, in the rural districts, in the urban districts, even in the city of Ottawa—scattered all over the Dominion, there was a total number of some 14,000 officials. It is well known that practically the whole of these 14,000 were dismissed within a year after the Tories came into power, and in their place were put, not 14,000 Conservatives, though personally I would have no objection to their replacing the Liberals who had been dismissed with their political friends. But what did they do? They dismissed 14,000, and they appointed 26,000 to do the same work. Of course, everybody knows that the men who were dismissed must have been so superior to the ones appointed in their place that it took two of the new men to do one man's work. It is a well known fact that these dismissals were wholesale in character. In the county of Guysborough, in the province of Nova Scotia, a letter came one day to the postmaster in one of the country districts telling him he had been dismissed from his office and that another person had been appointed in his stead. He read the letter and said to himself, "I do not know anybody of that name around here." So he consulted his wife, and they held a council of war and called in the neighbours. The postmaster, of course, from his position, knew everybody in the district, but neither he nor his wife nor any of the neighbours could remember any person by that name. At last the lady of the house had a very bright idea. "I do remember a man of that name," she said "who died about nine years ago." The postmaster, who was a bit of a wag, said, "Well then, the best thing we can do is to gather up the stamps and the rest of the paraphernalia, bundle it up and take it out to the graveyard and leave the bundle on his grave," and they did that. That is the way the Tories dismissed officials in 1912. The hon. member for Fort William and Rainy River said that there were no dismissals in his section of the country by the Tory government, and the hon. member for South Simcoe also said the same thing with respect to his riding. Why Mr. Chairman, I hold in my hand Hansard of session of 1912-1913, and if you will turn to page XIV of the index you will find five columns referring to questions put on the Order Paper that session by members of Parliament with regard to dismissals by the Tory government. Yet they say they did not dismiss anybody. Here are five whole columns, I presume about three or four hundred ques-

tions relating to dismissals by the Tory government, and that would be only a very small proportion of the total number of dismissals.

Mr. GRAHAM: That is only one volume.

Mr. DUFF: Yes, they kept on dismissing officials in 1913, 1914, 1915 and other years. To show the variety of dismissals, I see they dismissed light keepers, the Aldershot camp caretaker, and the man in charge of the experimental farm at Nappan, Nova Scotia. Yet the hon. ex-Minister of Agriculture stood up in his place just now and said that nobody in the Department of Agriculture had been dismissed. Why, it is a well known fact that fruit inspectors all over the country were dismissed. My hon. friend the member for Mississquoi told me a few moments ago that every official, fruit inspectors, postmasters, and everybody else in his county were dismissed in 1912. Yet the ex-Minister of Agriculture says there were no dismissals. Fisheries inspectors, immigration inspectors, land agents, engineers, superintendent of Dominion parks—I could go right down five whole columns of the index and show that officials were dismissed from every kind of position. They even went as far as the Yukon to fire officials, and yet they get up here and try and tell us they did not dismiss anybody.

Mr. IRVINE: Do I understand the hon. member to be opposed to that kind of dismissal?

Mr. DUFF: Wholesale dismissals, yes, but if there is good reason why certain officials should be dismissed, it is a different matter. In the last election for instance some civil servants acted as Tory agents in the polling booths, or took the stump against the Liberal and Progressive candidates and did several other things of a partisan nature that I could mention. A shipping-master in my county has talked nothing else but politics for the last ten years, and his wife was worse than he was in the last election and yet I am in the humiliating position to-day of having to see that man kept in office against my wishes and the wishes of the whole community. I say that man should be fired.

Mr. RYCKMAN: Would you punish the man for his wife?

Mr. DUFF: I think the husband gets punished enough as it is without my punishing him. I have shown conclusively that wholesale dismissals took place under the Tory government.

The question of making appointments to the Civil Service is a very serious one. It is a matter which should not be treated lightly by this Parliament, by the Government or by the Civil Service Com-

12 m. mission. I agree with the hon. member for Marquette that if we are ever to have good government in this country, we must have an efficient Civil Service, and the question is how are we going to bring that about. The hon. member for Marquette did not think it was right for members of Parliament to have anything to say as to appointments. He instanced postmasters in country districts, and he thought that these appointments could better be made by someone else than the member for the county. If I remember correctly, he said that the Post Office inspector would be the best one to make the selection of a country postmaster, but I noticed, before he finished his excellent speech, that he told us of his own business experience and said that he selected his own employees. He did not get the Civil Service Commission to employ men for him in his own business. Oh, no, he selected them himself, and that is the proper way for any business man to select his officials. He also said, and I agree with him, that in order to get an efficient Civil Service we have to have high-priced officials.

Let me give the hon. member for Marquette a few illustrations of how degraded the Civil Service has become, I have no fault to find with the personnel of the Civil Service Commission. I think they are just as good from a personal standpoint as anybody else who might be appointed, but I say that it is absolutely impossible for the commission, no matter how good they may be, to appoint officials outside of the city of Ottawa, and my opinion in that respect is exactly what it was last year and has been for three or four years, ever since I have been a member of this Parliament. I have always taken the ground that the work of the Civil Service Commission should be confined to the inside service, where they would be in a position to decide on the merits of candidates through a system of competitive examination, but I contend as I have always contended, and last year I was backed up by hon. gentlemen opposite when they were sitting on this side of the House supporting the government, men who were known either as Unionists or good straight Conservatives, that the Civil Service Commission cannot make appoint-

ments satisfactorily to the outside service. If we are ever going to have an efficient outside Civil Service, these appointments cannot be made by the commission. For instance, look at the delay which occurs when they have to make an appointment.

An hon. MEMBER: A month.

Mr. DUFF: Not a month, but six months, or a year, and the commission is not to blame. It is absolutely impossible for them to do better.

Mr. MARTELL: They appoint tailors as apple inspectors.

Mr. DUFF: They have done worse than that.

Mr. MARTELL: They did that in my constituency.

Mr. DUFF: We have had an incident mentioned in Nova Scotia of somebody living six hundred miles away from where the appointment was to be made being recommended for the position. Now let us see what happens in the case of these appointments. Let me take the appointment of a rural postmaster first. A postmaster dies, or resigns, and he, or one of his relatives, writes to the Postmaster General and notifies him of the resignation or death. That will take them three or four days. Or, in a country district, it will probably be a week or ten days before the letter reaches Ottawa. The Postmaster General sends a letter to the Civil Service Commission, and I notice that in Ottawa it takes about two or three days for a letter to get from the House of Commons to the Hunter block, or one of the other departments. Consequently it would require the same length of time for the Postmaster General to notify the Civil Service Commission of the vacancy. Now what do the Civil Service Commission do? They have to communicate with, say, the Post Office Inspector in Halifax, and he has to find out, in the best way he can, who will be the most suitable person to fill this office. What does he do? He writes to somebody in the county, which of course is outside the city of Halifax and asks for information. Now in Nova Scotia, Mr. Chairman, the people, are either Grits or Tories—mostly Grits I should say. So the Post Office Inspector when he writes to somebody or goes and visits somebody and asks whom he is to appoint, has to consult either a Grit or a Tory.

Of course that Grit or Tory whom he consults suggests the name of one of his own friends, and the person suggested to the Post Office Inspector is also a Grit or a Tory. How are you going to eliminate the political element in the matter? It cannot be done. Then the Post Office Inspector's report has to come back to Ottawa and the Civil Service Commission being very busy, having thousands of applications to deal with, after a certain time decide to make the appointment. For instance I had a case in my own county—

Mr. CRERAR: Will my hon. friend permit me a moment? I did not state, nor did I argue, that the Civil Service Commission should have anything to do with such appointments. I do not think it should have. I do not think the recommendation should go to the Civil Service Commission at all, it is not necessary to have such appointments rest in their hands. What I was pointing out was that there should be some official in the Post Office Department —taking the case that my hon. friend cites —who should carry the responsibility of recommending an appointment to that position rather than have the member of Parliament carry it.

Mr. DUFF: That is exactly what I am coming to. What I was trying to prove was that the Post Office Inspector living in Halifax would have to make an appointment to a post office—say down in Neill's Harbour which is at the extreme end of Cape Breton or in some small section outside of Yarmouth near Cape Sable at the other end of the province—and I say that is impracticable; it is not right either to the community concerned or to anybody else. And it must be borne in mind that the Post Office Inspector has two thousand offices in the province to look after. What I say should be done is this: There is a good deal of trouble about the appointment of officials. No member really wants to be bothered with it and perhaps would be glad to be clear of it, but this is my opinion. With all respect to my fellow members—of course they can choose themselves whether they will do this work or not—but I never had the reputation of being a coward and I think that I am the right and proper person—although this involves a lot of trouble and I would rather be without it; goodness knows I have enough to do when I am home—if a death or resignation occurs in a post office in my own constituency they usually notify me anyway. I say that I am the right and proper person to make the recom-

mendation. I know the people in the district, I know who is best qualified for the position, and I am the right and proper person to telegraph to Ottawa within twenty-four hours after the vacancy occurs and have the appointment made, if it is to be made by the Postmaster General, within forty-eight hours. In my opinion that is the businesslike way in which to do it. If I make a mistake in an appointment I have to take the full responsibility and should the people in the district have any fault to find with me, they know what to do and how to punish me for my action when an election comes on.

Mr. BOYS: May I ask a question.

Mr. CRERAR: I would like to ask my hon. friend a question.

Mr. BOYS: "After you, Alphonse".

Mr. CRERAR: If my hon. friend is arguing that that should apply to the rural postmasters I do not know that I would take issue to any great extent with him; but would he have that system apply to the appointment of postmasters, say, in a town of more than five thousand people?

Mr. DUFF: Does my hon. friend refer to a post office in my own constituency serving, say, five thousand people?

Mr. CRERAR: Yes.

Mr. DUFF: I certainly think that I am the right and proper man to recommend that appointment. I have a better knowledge than any other man outside of my own constituents. I will make that reservation as to my own constituents. I say that I am in a better position to make a better recommendation than the Post Office Inspector, the Civil Service Commission or the Postmaster General and my recommendation should be taken.

Mr. WOODSWORTH: May I ask my hon. friend—

Mr. CRERAR: May I say this—

Mr. DUFF: One at a time please.

Mr. CRERAR: Might it not be possible that in such a case the second in charge of the staff of such a post office would be suitable for promotion, and that the Post Office Inspector, having the supervision of that person's work, would know better whether he was or was not qualified for promotion than even the member for the constituency?

Mr. DUFF: That might apply in the case of large cities where perhaps a member for a district is not, and could not be, in close touch with the officials; but in a small constituency like mine I think that I know whether the postmaster, or his deputy, or any other official, is qualified or not. I would have no objection to promoting his deputy, if he were efficient, but I say that responsibility should be left to me. I am the right and proper person to decide whether the deputy should be promoted or whether a new man should be appointed.

Mr. RYCKMAN: Would you promote a deputy if he was a Tory?

Mr. DUFF: If he was a good man and a Presbyterian I might.

Mr. WOODSWORTH: If my hon. friend contends that the election of a man to Parliament is the qualification for him to decide as to who will be best for any public position of that kind, may I ask whether the hon. member would extend that privilege to all on this side of the House?

Mr. DUFF: I would have no objection so long as I was satisfied that my hon. friend was a fit and proper person to make such a recommendation.

Mr. MANION: How about hon. members on this side?

Mr. DUFF: As long as I felt hon. gentlemen were fit and proper persons to make an appointment, and I had confidence in them, I certainly would be glad to have them do so.

Now I want to speak of the appointment of other public employees. This difficulty arises not only in regard to rural postmasters, but also in regard to our fishery overseers. Last year—or perhaps it is two years ago—the fishery overseer in my county resigned and a new one had to be appointed. The Civil Service Commission proceeded to make appointment on the request, I presume, of the Fisheries Department. Posters were put up in conspicuous places and applications were received. The posters stated that applications would be received by a certain gentleman, a very respectable gentleman, who happened to be a good Conservative. The applications were to go to him and he was to hold a competitive examination. Mark that, a competitive examination for a fishery overseer! Now although I profess to remember a little of what I learned at school and also pretend to have a little information with

regard to the fisheries, the examination paper was such that I could not have answered one of the questions myself. They were the most foolish questions ever asked any individual since the world began —absolutely ridiculous. In appointing a fishery overseer, you require a practical man. As long as he can read and write, you need not care whether he has an education or not. For a position of that kind, probably the man with the least education has the most brains, and can do the best work. But this examination was held before this good Tory, and I had no objection to it at all. After the examination was over, I found that three candidates retired from the room where the examination was being held, simply because, after looking at the papers, they found they could not answer the questions. The other two made answers, hit or miss, and the highest man received 28 points out of a possible 100. That shows how foolish the whole thing is. The three best men retired from the contest, and left the other two to take the examination. The report of the examination came to Ottawa, and, I think, it was about four months before a decision was reached by the Civil Service Commission, because they were loaded up with applications, had not time to look after it, and they gave the job to the man who made the 28 points. He was not a bad sort of fellow, but, I say, the proper way to appoint a fishery overseer is to have some practical men go out and pick a man. I know a lot of Tories in my county who could pick out decent, respectable men, who know something about the business, but the man they asked to hold the examination was a schoolmaster. He decided who was to fill the very important position of fishery overseer in my constituency. Take the case of a lighthouse keeper. Imagine appointing a lighthouse keeper by competitive examination, and having the commission in Ottawa bother with the appointment of lighthouse keepers ten miles from land in the Atlantic ocean.

Mr. BOYS: Who, do you suggest, should make the appointment—the Civil Service Commission or the minister?

Mr. DUFF: The Minister, of course. I certainly say that appointments such as those of lighthouse keepers, rural postmasters, official overseers, and charwomen —in fact, all the outside service—should not be made by the Civil Service Commission. I think the Civil Service Commission can do a good work in appointing to the inside service, but that is all they can do.

Mr. BOYS: The hon. member suggests these appointments should be made by the minister of the department affected?

Mr. DUFF: Yes.

Mr. BOYS: Would you be satisfied, in that event, that the appointment should be made upon the recommendation of the sitting member.

Mr. DUFF: Yes, I think I would. It would not make a great deal of difference on which side of politics the sitting member was; he would be responsible, and I think it would be right and proper. In the past, appointments were made on the recommendation of the defeated candidate. That is a mistake, because the defeated candidate has no interest in the matter. He is usually full of spite and spleen, as I have known in my experience, and does not care whether a good appointment is made or not, but if the member had to make the appointment, he would be responsible to Parliament and would have to answer questions with regard to the appointment on the floor of the House. I think the act should be amended, so that the outside civil servants would be appointed by the minister on the recommendation of the member for the constituency. It would work out all right in the long run, because the Liberals will be in power for the next fifty years, and then the Tories would have a chance after that.

Mr. BOYS: That would not be the sitting member.

Mr. DUFF: An hon. member has stated that, since the Civil Service Commission was appointed, everything was done through that commission, that no appointments were made outside of it, that it did not make any difference whether applicants were Liberal or Conservative, the appointments were always made by the commission. Now, I say that hundreds of appointments, which, under the law, should be made by the Civil Service Commission, were made without recourse to that body. For instance, we have an inspector of fisheries in my province, a very desirable gentleman. Before he went into politics he was a clergyman.

Mr. BOYS: Presbyterian?

Mr. DUFF: Why no, he was a Baptist. That is the reason they made him fishery inspector. This gentleman was appointed

for the service, at a good salary, without asking the Civil Service Commission to make the appointment, and now, although he is a clergyman, with very little experience in fishery matters, he is chief inspector for the three maritime provinces, and has his office in the city of Halifax. Yet, my hon. friends will rise to their feet with a straight and long face, and tell us they had nothing to do with patronage at all, did not make appointments, and that it was all done by the Civil Service Commission. I would not blame the commission for something I do myself. I would be proud to say I made certain appointments, if such were the case. In my county, a customs officer resigned about two years ago, and I recommended the name of a retired sea captain, who had two sons overseas, and who had fallen down and hurt himself very badly, and had to retire from the seas. He was a good man, had been going to sea for thirty years and had a family. I recommended him. Shortly afterwards I heard a good Conservative had been appointed, a man who had always worked for his party, and deserved anything his party could give him, but he was not appointed by the Civil Service Commission. He was appointed temporarily, to get over the objection which I would raise, and was kept on temporarily, until six months after, when they thought I would forget all about it. But when I came to Ottawa I found his appointment had been made permanent, without any reference to the Civil Service Commission. Yet these gentlemen sitting angularly opposite say they never made any dismissals or appointments. In Nova Scotia, out of 1,000 appointments made, even by the commission, within the last five years, I doubt very much if two Liberals have been appointed, and there is reason for it. I can understand it, and if I were on the commission, perhaps, I would do the same thing, but the fact is that, although I have nothing against the commission, there is no question that, in Nova Scotia, influences were brought to bear on the commission, or on one of the members of the commission, with the result that the Tories all got jobs.

In conclusion, my candid opinion is that, in order to get an efficient Civil Service, there must be a housecleaning. I am told there are some 52,000 civil servants all over Canada. In 1911 there were 14,000 and these 52,000 are doing the same work now which the 14,000 did formerly, or very little more work. Everybody knows, whether it is here in Ottawa or out in the country districts, there are too many officials altogether. We must have rural postmasters, and certain officials, but everybody knows that, in most of the offices, instead of having one man to do the work they have two, and sometimes three or four. We know they may get small salaries, and, as the hon. member from Marquette (Mr. Crerar) said, it would be far better to arrange to give one man a good salary to do the work, and let the other two or three go on a farm, or on a fishing boat, or wherever they could get employment.

We must have a house-cleaning. After looking over the Estimates and seeing the very large amount of money—I think it is some $120,000,000—paid to officials, I think it is about time this Government did better than the late government did. They have a great work to do if they will properly rearrange matters as regards the Civil Service and public employees. Millions of dollars can be saved by this Government if the ministers and their deputies have a housecleaning. They should do that, and they should pay men properly for their services. I also say that the Civil Service Commission should be allowed to fill appointments in the inside service, because they are qualified to do that. They are here on the spot; they can hold examinations; they can find out about a person's character and all his qualifications, and I am quite sure that that should be done. With regard to the outside service, as the hon. member for Gloucester (Mr. Turgeon) says, it is both expensive and not the right and proper way to fill such vacancies, because there is a delay, a great delay in some cases, the public interest suffers in the meantime, and after somebody recommends a candidate to the Civil Service Commission, neither the Civil Service Commission nor the Government know whether that person is suitable for the position or not. Therefore, I say that putting politics aside—and as I said before, I do not want to have the appointment of these officials—I feel, as a member of Parliament, it is my duty to help the Government to get an efficient service, and that I should not shirk my duty, but should endeavour to give my knowledge of matters in my constituency and any information which I may have to the minister or his deputy. Therefore, in the best interest of the country, from a business standpoint, the right and proper thing to do is for the Civil Service Commission or the Government to divorce themselves from the outside service and to give to

members of Parliament the right to appointments in the outside service in all the constituencies. As a result members will feel that they have some responsibility, and whether appointments be Liberal or Conservative, I feel quite sure that, realizing their responsibility, the members, in every case, or in nearly every case, will appoint good men who will give good service to the country, and who will be satisfactory to the department.

Mr. NEILL: The hon. member for Lunenburg (Mr. Duff) remarked that in 1911, I think he said, 14,000 civil servants had been dismissed and 25,000 or 26,000 had taken their places. The percentage in my district was greater than that. I have in recollection a man who was a civil servant and he resigned in 1912. The gentleman who took his place is getting 65 per cent more salary than he got; he has two assistants; there is less work, and it is being worse done. Whether it was in gratitude for that beneficence or on account of the idle time that he had, that gentleman was able to devote a great deal of time and misspent energy to boosting the candidature of the gentleman who was the candidate for the late government in the last election. I have no doubt that, under existing conditions, he will make it his business to do so in the next election.

I think the rest of my contribution to this debate might be put in the form of a little parable. Sometimes a homely truth can be brought home in that way better than by hours of argument and debate. The debate that has gone on this evening on this question reminds me very much of the story of Tom Smith's wagon. Tom Smith went to town with a team and a wagon. This was in British Columbia, and he visited the government "booze-joint" as we call it. It has some particular name, but I forget it.

Mr. DUFF: They call it "speak-easy."

Mr. NEILL: Dispensary. He got a few shots and he was going home, his head nodding and his team travelling along at an easy pace. The king pin that holds the trees on to the tongue of the wagon came out—the farmers will understand this—and consequently the horses went on ahead and they pulled the reins through his hands. Tom was left sitting in the wagon; the team went home, and, of course, they stopped when they reached home. Tom sat there the whole night still, he thought, hanging on to the reins and thinking that it was taking the team a long time to get home. Next morning the neighbours turned out to see what was the matter when they saw the team standing at the barn. They found Tom along the road still hanging on, as he thought, to the reins; they stirred him up and said: "What's the matter?" Tom looked around and scratched his head, and said: "If I am Tom Smith, I have lost a team and if I am somebody else, I have found a wagon. That is the situation here to-day. If we are Tom Smith, we have lost a team, and if we are not Tom Smith, we have found a wagon.

Mr. MARTELL: In the course of his remarks the hon. member for New Westminster (Mr. McQuarrie), paid some attention to something I had said concerning the Marine Department. The hour is late and I am rather in the position of an Irishman who was called in to clean out a parson's cellar. It was a bright morning and the parson was walking in his garden when the Irishman held up some bottles which he was taking from the cellar to the light in the hope that he might extract from them a sufficient quantity for an eye opener. The parson observed this and yelled to him: "Pat, they are all dead soldiers." To which the son of Erin's isle replied: "Begorrah, your riverence, I'm glad they had the parson with them in their dying hours." I am glad to be in this House in the dying hours of this debate.

It is not my purpose to make any observations concerning the personnel of the Civil Service Commission. I had some experience in the department, and just to show you how there is a tendency for a department to become overmanned, I am going to give an illustration of something that I know something about. I am not blaming any particular political party for this; I am blaming simply the system. Applications were called for a particular position; it was stated that the person should have a knowledge of law and a practical knowledge of the fisheries. The person whom the department had sent them by the Civil Service Commission happened to be a lawyer. He was found not to be fit for the particular work which he was called upon to discharge, and you would naturally think that when he was found unfit, he would be discharged or told to go. Instead of doing that, they placed him in the department stamping lobster labels—a lawyer, at $2,600 a year! That was work that should have been

done by a boy for about $500 a year. Then they went down to the constituency of Queen's and Shelburne; they took a clergyman minister who had no practical knowledge of the fisheries, and they placed him in the department at a salary of about $3,000 a year, so that where the work was being done for $1,800 they were paying about $5,600 for the same work.

The think that I object to as regards the present Civil Service Act is the fact that it does not afford any scope for recommendation for promotion on account of efficiency. There is in every business concern in the country power, at least impliedly, in the manager, to pick out his good men and to recognize their efficiency by promotion. That is not the case in the Civil Service at the present time. It is absolutely impossible for the deputy minister or the minister to recognize ability or efficiency in the department. There is a certain position; a certain person is placed in that position, and no matter how great his ability may be there is no chance for him to get an increase of salary or to be promoted to a better position. Naturally he loses all ambition, becomes stagnant, so to speak, and incapable of evolving new ideas, and there is a tendency for him to "loaf on the job". Consequently he gets behind with his work, the department has to make application to the Civil Service Commission for further help, and another person is appointed to assist the loafer; thus two men are paid to do one man's work.

Mr. BAXTER: When was my friend fired from the department?

Mr. MARTELL: I was not fired, I resigned of my own volition to drive out some scalawags of the Tory party who were bungling the affairs of the country. But the point I am trying to make is that there will be no efficiency in the service so long as the deputy ministers and ministers are not in a position to recognize ability in their staff. My hon, friend from St. John has interpolated a political and personal note. I submit, Mr. Chairman, that my remarks do not afford him the slightest justification. I was simply blaming the system which has obtained for some considerable length of time. But politics—mean, low, personal politics, is so much akin to the nature of my hon. friend from St. John that he cannot give one credit for a sincere desire to advance the best interests of the country. I would like also to inform the hon. gentleman that if he wishes to discuss political issues I am prepared to meet him, for I am ashamed neither of my own political record nor of my party's. As he is so curious, I may inform him that I was in the department, but I defy him to get any minister who presided over the department during the time I was an official in it to state that I did not perform my duty diligently and efficiently.

Mr. BAXTER: I asked my hon. friend how long he was in the service. The House has heard a great many times about his having been in the department. He might now give us some details of his service there, for it is early in the morning yet.

Mr. MARTELL: If my hon. friend would possess his soul in patience I might recite to him a tale which he will not like to hear. However, I am not going to pay any more attention to my hon. friend's interruptions. So long, Mr. Chairman, as you keep from the heads of departments the right to recognize efficiency and ability in their staff, just so long are you putting a damper upon ambition, which must inevitably be followed by indifference and lack of efficiency, which in turn will necessitate the appointment of more officials to carry on the work.

What about the Civil Service Commission's method of ascertaining the qualifications of a person for a particular position? Some few years ago the late Union Government, so called, required in the Department of Agriculture—I do not know whether the ex-minister (Mr. Tolmie) was then presiding over it—an apple inspector for the county of Hants, and advertised for applicants. Several returned soldiers applied, but the commission appointed a custom tailor in the town of Windsor, although he did not know a Gravenstein from a Russet. When that man found what were the duties of an apple inspector he wrote to the department that he was not qualified to discharge the duties—and that after the Civil Service Commission had deemed him qualified! I am not advocating a return to political patronage, because I know that where a member recommends someone for a particular job he disappoints probably ten or twelve others who are also seeking it. But I claim the system is wrong. We must evolve a system which will give to the people better qualified officials who will render efficient service, and to this end the deputy ministers and ministers of de-

partments should have some measure of control at least over their staff.

Mr. COPP: The present administration is not claiming any credit for the Civil Service Commission; at the same time it is not assuming any blame. I am standing as a sort of godfather to the estimates now before the committee, we having had nothing whatever to do with their preparation. We are asking for quite a large sum of money to carry on the work of the Civil Service Commission during the ensuing year, for which work this Administration is prepared to assume responsibility. I feel sure that both the members of the Government and of the Civil Service Commission will co-operate to secure the fullest efficiency of the public service. I do not think that the commissioners themselves feel they have realized the ideal efficiency which we all desire to see in the departments. I do not suppose it was really the intention when the first Civil Service Act was passed that the control of the Outside Service should be so suddenly forced upon the Commission, but naturally during the war period a great deal of extra responsibility had to be assumed by it. This has been a very valuable discussion and I am sure the commission will be very glad to receive the suggestions made by hon. members to-night. I sincerely trust that with the appropriation we are asking for the coming year a great deal of splendid work will be accomplished towards increasing the efficiency of the public service throughout the Dominion.

Item agreed to.

Progress reported.

ADJOURNMENT—BUSINESS OF THE HOUSE

BIRTHDAY CONGRATULATIONS TO RIGHT HON. MR. MEIGHEN

On motion of Mr. Mackenzie King for the adjournment of the House:

Mr. MEIGHEN: Will the hon. gentlemen please tell us, with some definiteness, what the business to-morrow is to be?

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: To-morrow the Finance Minister proposes to go on with some of his budget resolutions. I think it is probable that we shall also take up one or two of the bills and resolutions that still stand under Government Orders. There are not many of them, but such as there are will be taken up. I am glad to be able to inform hon. members that we have completed the passing of the main estimates. Of course, there will still be some supplementary estimates, but I think it will be a source of satisfaction to hon. members to know that we have got that far. May I take advantage of this moment to congratulate my right hon. friend the leader of the Opposition on having attained his forty-eighth birthday, and to wish him many happy returns?

Some hon. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

Mr. MEIGHEN: I have to thank my hon. friend—even though I do feel this is driving it home a little—as well as the rest of the House; I appreciate their congratulations very much. Will the right hon. gentleman be good enough to say what budget resolutions it is proposed to take up? A very wide field is covered in the term "budget resolutions." The Finance Minister said yesterday there were certain items he did not propose to take up to-day; I do not know myself what they were. It would be of great value if we knew just what ones it was proposed to take up first. As far as the motions on the Order Paper are concerned, I am not particular, but I would like to know whether it is proposed to go on with the wheat board resolution?

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: No, we will not take the wheat board resolution to-morrow. As to the particular budget resolutions, I am sorry I cannot give my right hon. friend the information, but I am sure the Finance Minister will endeavour to meet the wishes of the House if there are any particular resolutions that the House should not wish to debate to-morrow.

Mr. MEIGHEN: Could the Prime Minister say whether it is proposed to go on with the specific tariff resolutions, with the resolutions as regards depreciated currency, the dumping clause, the marking act, and those in that category—outside of the customs resolutions?

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: The three that my right hon. friend has just mentioned are the three which the Minister of Finance said would not be taken up to-day.

Mr. MEIGHEN: And therefore not to-morrow?

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: If it is the wish of my right hon. friend that they should not be taken up to-morrow, I am sure that they will not be proceeded with.

Mr. MEIGHEN: I have no wish in the matter; I just want to know whether they will be or not.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: I could not say what the intention of the Minister of Finance was on that point but if there is any expression of a desire not to take up these particular resolutions, I am sure—

Mr. MANION: With regard to the resolution respecting depreciated currency, I believe the Minister of Finance had promised the member for Vancouver not to take it up to-day.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: I asked the Minister of Finance whether that applied to to-morrow—speaking of Saturday as to-morrow—and he said that his intention had been as regards Friday. I have no doubt, however, that he will so treat it as regards Saturday as well.

Motion agreed to, and the House adjourned at 12.48 a.m., Saturday.

Saturday, June 17. 1922

The House met at three o'clock.

PRIVATE BILL

FIRST AND SECOND READINGS

Bill No. 151 (from the Senate), respecting The Edmonton, Dunvegan and British Columbia Railway Company.

COLD STORAGE

On motion of Mr. Martell, Bill No. 152 (from the Senate), to amend The Cold Storage Warehouse Act, was read the first time.

BUSINESS OF THE HOUSE

CRIMINAL CODE AMENDMENT

On the Orders of the Day:

Right Hon. ARTHUR MEIGHEN (Leader of the Opposition): Mr. Speaker, there appears in the list of public bills and orders, under No. 30, an order which reads as follows:

April 24—Second Reading of Bill No. 54, An Act to amend the Criminal Code.—Mr. Kennedy (Edmonton).

A reference to page 1446 unrevised Hansard discloses the fact that this bill has already been read the second time and that a motion was made by its sponsor that the House go into committee upon it. Apparently I was out of the House at the time, and the hon. member for South Wellington (Mr. Guthrie), who was leading the Opposition, asked that in my absence, as I wished to speak on the bill, the consideration of it in committee be postponed. It therefore appears to have been postponed without any fault whatever on the part of the sponsor of the bill. It should, though, appear now on the Order Paper as in committee rather than for second reading. What I wish to mention particularly is that, in view of a great deal of public interest attaching to the amendment now sought to be repealed and of an almost unbelievable degree of misconception surrounding it, the Government should see that this bill is reached, even if, for the purpose, it is required to be called among the Government Orders. It would be very regrettable indeed if the session were to go through without the bill being reached. I would like to have it brought up on Monday.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: There will be no objection to meeting the wishes of my hon. friend in this matter.

LEGISLATION PENDING

On the Orders of the Day:

Right Hon. W. L. MACKENZIE KING (Prime Minister): I desire to implement a promise I made yesterday to inform the House as to any additional legislation which the Government is likely to propose at the present session. In addition to what appears on the Order Paper and in Votes and Proceedings of yesterday, the Government proposes to introduce the following: Further supplementary estimates; amendments to the Income Tax Act; amendments to the Oleomargarine Act; amendments to the Three Rivers Harbour Commissioners Act; amendments to the Naturalization Act. Such legislation will also be introduced as may necessarily arise out of reports of the committees of the House, particularly the committee dealing with transportation rates and the committee dealing with soldiers' civil re-establishment. I do not wish to say that this is the final word; some small measure may come up which the Government has not in mind at the moment. But I think I can say that this will include practically all the legislation to be introduced.

INCOME TAX—NATURALIZATION

Mr. MEIGHEN: May I ask what is the proposed extent of the amendments to the Naturalization Act and the Income Tax

Act, and also if the Government will be able by Monday to introduce these bills and explain briefly their purpose? That certainly should be done; it is very late now for these measures to be forecasted for the first time.

Mr. FIELDING: With regard to the income tax, it is not likely that the amendments will be extensive. There will be a provision regarding exemptions. A difficulty has also arisen in regard to commercial travellers, who have claimed that they were rather unfairly treated. Our endeavour is to meet the point that is raised. There is also something with regard to dependents. The bill is not a large one, but it touches on these three points. I hope to be able to introduce it on Monday.

Hon. A. B. COPP (Secretary of State): Regarding the Naturalization Act, I am not in a position to give definite information at the moment as my deputy only brought it to my notice to-day. The amendment is not of very great importance, and I hope to be in a position to make a statement to the House with regard to it on Monday.

SUPPLEMENTARY ESTIMATES

Hon. T. A. CRERAR (Marquette): When will the Supplementary Estimates be forthcoming?

Mr. FIELDING: I am exercising my best efforts to get them ready for the House. I do not like to say definitely, but I hope I shall be able to present them on Monday, and if not, on Tuesday. My hon. friend knows that it is not always easy to collect these estimates from the various departments, but we are doing the best we can.

IMMIGRATION—CRIMINAL CODE

Mr. J. S. WOODSWORTH (Centre Winnipeg): When may we expect a report from the special committee appointed to deal with amendments to the Immigration Act and the Criminal Code? These bills were introduced at the very beginning of the session, and we have not yet had any report.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: I do not see the chairman of the committee in the House, but I am informed there is a notice in the Votes and Proceedings that a motion will be made on Monday.

ORIENTAL IMMIGRATION

Mr. W. G. McQUARRIE (New Westminster): May I be permittted to ask the Prime Minister if he will make an announcement before the House prorogues as to the Government's policy regarding the effective restriction of oriental immigration, and also as to the result of his negotiations with the Chinese Ambassador, who was lately in Ottawa, and with the Japanese Consul General?

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: I may answer my hon. friend at once that the policy of the Government is to bring about effective restriction. As these negotiations have not yet been concluded, I doubt whether it will be possible to make an announcement to the House before the session is over.

CANADIAN GOVERNMENT MERCHANT MARINE

On the Orders of the Day:

Mr. S. W. JACOBS (George Etienne Cartier): A newspaper despatch announced last night that there is a well founded rumour in London that the vessels of the merchant marine have been offered for sale on the London market to British interests. I hope the good news is true. Can the Government give us any information?

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: I imagine it is a newspaper report.

Mr. JACOBS: Sometimes newspaper reports are correct.

Mr. MEIGHEN: I have no doubt it would be good news to many private interests.

WAYS AND MEANS

CUSTOMS TARIFF

The House in Committee of Ways and Means.—Mr. Gordon in the Chair.

1. Resolved, That The Customs Tariff, 1907, be amended by repealing Section 12A, added thereto by Section 5 of The Customs Tariff Amendment Act, 1921, and by inserting in place thereof the following Section:—

12A. The Governor in Council may from time to time as he deems it expedient, order that goods of any description or class specified in such order, imported into Canada, shall be marked, stamped, branded or labelled in legible English or French words, in a conspicuous place that shall not be covered or obscured by any subsequent attachments or arrangements, so as to indicate the country of origin. Said marking, stamping, branding or labelling shall be as nearly indelible and permanent as the nature of the goods will permit.

All orders made by the Governor in Council under this Section shall have effect from and after the day on which the same are published in The Canada Gazette, or from and after such later day as is appointed for the purpose in such

orders, and during such time as is therein expressed, or if no time is expressed for that purpose, then until the same are revoked or altered.

Provided that all such goods imported into Canada after the date of the coming into force of any such order of the Governor in Council which do not comply with the requirements of such order, shall be subject to an additional duty of ten per centum ad valorem to be levied on the value for duty purposes, and in addition such goods shall not be released from Customs possession until they have been so marked, stamped, branded or labelled under Customs supervision at the expense of the importer.

Provided further that if any person shall violate any of the provisions so established relating to the marking, stamping, branding or labelling of any such imported goods, or shall deface, destroy, remove, alter, or obliterate any such marks, stamps, brands or labels, with intent to conceal the information given by or contained in such marks, stamps, brands or labels, he shall be liable on summary conviction to a penalty not exceeding one thousand dollars, or to imprisonment not exceeding one year, or to both fine and imprisonment.

The Minister of Customs and Excise may make such regulations as are deemed necessary for carrying out the provisions of this Section and for the enforcement thereof.

Mr. FIELDING: This is the resolution which repeals the Marking Act as a general law, and authorizes the Governor in Council to deal with the matter under exceptional conditions.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: I wonder if the minister has taken cognizance of the fact that the United States have a Marking Act practically the same as our old Marking Act, and that Canadian products have from time to time been held up under that act? If the hon. gentleman has taken cognizance of that, I should like to know on what principle he proposes to administer the power given to the Government to put into force what is really the old act, because, after all, the new law recognizes the advisability and desirability, nay, the necessity, of marking at the present time, but leaves it to the discretion of the Government to say what shall be marked, instead of leaving it to the Government to make special exceptions where marking is not convenient. I rise for the purpose of ascertaining, first, the view of the Government as to the American legislation, and, second, the underlying principle upon which these new regulations will be administered.

Mr. FIELDING: There is, I understand, an act of that character in operation in the United States, and I have no doubt it could readily be made very embarrassing. This resolution simply repeals the Marking Act as it was passed last year, and restricts it to particular cases which may be determined by the Governor in Council. It has been found by experience that the Marking Act is an exceedingly difficult thing to administer. My hon. friend found it so, because the act was passed and a date fixed for its coming into operation, and he had to postpone its coming into operation until a further time, and did not apply the act. That must have shown him that there were great difficulties in the way. Difficulties might readily exist in enforcing a law which was to be applied generally which would not exist in the case of a law which was to be applied to particular cases that might arise, so instead of having a general Marking Act applied to products generally, which undoubtedly was difficult, embarrassing, and inconvenient, we are taking power to deal with certain exceptional cases that may arise. That is the principle upon which we are working.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: That hardly answers my question. I freely admit that there are difficulties in looking after any new regulations. No matter how beneficial a regulation may be, one has to recognize special conditions and make modifications. I think that last year we had covered a very large number of special conditions and were practically in a position to enforce the law without hardship. What I want to find out now is, the principle on which the Government is going to apply these regulations. The hon. minister says, "in special cases." What is a "special" case? Is the underlying principle the idea that the Canadian public ought to have knowledge of whose goods they are buying? Is the underlying principle to give effect to the spirit of the act in all cases where it can be shown that no damage to the goods will result from the marking? Or is it the idea that there are to be special cases, with special pressure, and some special considerations each time? What is the principle?

Mr. FIELDING: There is no principle, implied or suggested, extending any special favours. The principle is that if you have a disagreeable thing to do you had better not do too much of it. That in itself is a good, sound principle. In the application of this act what my hon. friend proposed was found to be practically impossible; he worked out regulations and found that it could not be done. What we propose is

this: Instead of applying the general law and disturbing trade generally, we will deal with any particular case that is brought before us. I really do not think I can make my explanation any clearer. There is no doubt that the principle of this act involved a threat; at all events the fact that the act was to come into operation was a cause of annoyance and irritation to the business men of the community. My hon. friend must have been aware of that, I am sure he had representations along that line, and it is an undoubted fact that the Marking Act was intended to make importation more difficult. Someone has said—perhaps unkindly—in the recent debate that the act was intended to make importation difficult, and practically was a measure to increase the protection, and I am not sure but that such was the tenor, or at all events, the purpose of the act. If our manufacturers in Canada wish to be protected as respects their own brand the thought just came to me "Why do they not mark their goods 'Made in Canada'?" That is simple, they can do that easily enough. If we cannot exercise control in the marking of foreign goods, we can control the marking of our own goods made in Canada. If the mark made in Canada is a good mark, and I hope it is, and one that we ought to be proud of, I would suggest that our Canadian manufacturers mark their goods "Made in Canada." Then we will know that any article not so branded is imported, and in that way we will be able to protect the home manufacturer when his brand is a good one. I think there is merit in the suggestion. However, so far as the principal aim of the act is concerned I regret that I do not think I can make it clearer to my hon. friend.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: What my hon. friend says with regard to the marking of goods in other countries may be quite true, but he could very well look after the importations from other countries that are not earmarked. The whole thing revolves around the question as to whether the government, in enforcing these regulations, have any regard to the interests of the Canadian purchaser bearing in mind what we look upon as his right to know whether or not he is buying German goods or English goods. Of course, if the Government are against that idea, these regulations will very largely be either a matter of special privilege or a dead letter; it must be either one thing or the other. We merely want to know where we are in connection with this matter. The Finance Minister says it is impossible to work out the law. But the Americans have had that law and have worked it very successfully in the protection of American industry and of the American public:

Mr. FIELDING: My hon. friend had the matter in his hands for months and found the law unworkable, and that is a better illustration than the American law.

Resolution agreed to.

2. Resolved, That schedule A to The Customs Tariff, 1907, as amended by Chapter twenty-six of the Statutes of 1914, by Chapter five of the Statutes of 1914 (second session), by Chapter seventeen of the Statutes of 1918, by Chapter forty-seven of the Statutes of 1919, by Chapter twenty-seven of the Statutes of 1921, and by Orders in Council, be further amended by striking thereout tariff items:—20, 21, 22, 23, 134, 143, 208, 219a, 220, 326, 398, 399, 427, 445, 446, 446b, 447, 448, 517, 520, 521, 522, 523, 565, 566, 567, 568, 575, 591, 611, 611a, 612, 619, 621, 631, 638a, 657a, 660, 682, 705a, the several enumerations of goods respectively, and the several rates of duties of Customs, if any, set opposite each of said items, and to repeal section (b) of the Orders in Council, P.C. 2654, dated twenty-seventh day of November, 1907 designated as item 715 of The Customs Tariff, section 2 (b) of Orders in Council, P.C. 16/1556, dated fifth day of June, 1912, designated as item 762 of The Customs Tariff, P.C. 224 and P.C. 2/233, dated thirtieth day of January, 1919, and P.C. 383, dated twentieth day of February, 1919, and to provide that the following items, enumerations and rates of duty be inserted in schedule A:—

Mr. FIELDING: We will take up the ensuing changes item by item if the committee so desires.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: Yes, item by item.

Mr. FIELDING: There is one item, gasoline, in regard to which I desire to propose a change when it is reached, otherwise the items stand as they appear in the resolution.

Customs tariff—Cocoa paste or "liquor" and chocolate paste or "liquor", not sweetened, in blocks or cakes, per pound: British Preferential tariff, 3 cents; Intermediate tariff, 4 cents; General tariff, 5 cents.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: We had better have some understanding as to just what is being done. My hon. friend will correct me if I am wrong, but I think the old rates were 3½, 4 and 4.

Mr. FIELDING: No, 4, 5 and 5 were the old rates.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: The old rates, as I have them, were 3½, 4 and 4, so that

there is an increase of 5 cents in the general tariff and a decrease of one-half a cent in the preferential rate.

Mr. FIELDING: The figures that I have are 4, 4 and 5. The new figures are 3, 4 and 5, so that there is a slight reduction.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: The item is founded on tariff item No. 20. I find on looking at the official tariff that the figures are 3½, 4 and 4. I wanted to know whether it was intended to raise the general tariff.

Mr. FIELDING: My hon. friend has omitted a later change. He will find the figures as I gave them—4, 5 and 5—so that there is a reduction.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: The result is a reduction of one-half a cent on the preferential tariff?

Mr. FIELDING: No, a reduction of one cent. The rate of four cents is reduced to three.

Item agreed to.

Customs tariff—Cocoa paste or "liquor" and chocolate paste or "liquor", sweetened, in blocks or cakes, not less than two pounds in weight, per pound: British Preferential tariff, 4 cents; Intermediate tariff, 4½ cents; General tariff, 5½ cents.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: Is there not a reduction of one cent here?

Mr. FIELDING: A reduction of half a cent in each case.

Item agreed to.

Customs tariff—Preparation of cocoa or chocolate powder form: British Preferential tariff, 22½ p.c.; Intermediate tariff, 27½ p.c.; General tariff, 35 p.c.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: There is a reduction there in the general rate, I think.

Mr. FIELDING: The general rate is 35; it remains unchanged. The preferential rate is changed; it was 27½, it is now 22½.

Mr. GOOD: I would ask the Minister of Finance if this rate covers cans of cocoa that are sold in the grocery stores?

Mr. FIELDING: Yes, that is the intention.

Customs tariff—Preparation of cocoa or chocolate, n.o.p., and confectionery, coated with or containing chocolate, the weight of the wrappings and cartons to be included in the weight for duty, per pound: British Preferential tariff, 1½ p.c.; Intermediate tariff, 1½ p.c.; General tariff, 1½ p.c.

Item agreed to.

Customs tariff—All sugar above number sixteen Dutch standard in colour, and all refined sugars of whatever kinds, grades or standards, not covered by tariff item: British Preferential tariff, 20 p.c.; Intermediate tariff, 27½ p.c.; General tariff, 35 p.c.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: I should think perhaps this item might be taken as read after the assurance given by the minister as to what is being proposed here.

Mr. FIELDING: There is a slight reduction in the British preference.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: And the other items are rated in proportion?

Mr. FIELDING: Are rated in proportion.

Customs Tariff—Cigars, the weight of the bands and ribbons to be included in the weight for duty, per pound: British Preferential Tariff $3.90 and 25 per cent, Intermediate tariff $3.90 and 25 per cent, General tariff $3.90 and 25 per cent.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: I do not know whether we should discuss that particular item now, or discuss it under the excise items. They really are interwoven one with the other.

Mr. FIELDING: Yes. I can tell the hon. member exactly what we propose. There is an excise duty on cigars of $6 per thousand, irrespective of weight. We are making it $3 per thousand, and we are adjusting the import duties to correspond. We are not gaining in the cigar tax any material increase of revenue. The effect would be, taking the customs, and the excise and special war revenue together, that the higher class would pay a little more, the medium priced cigar will pay taxes as now, and the tax on the lower priced cigar will be reduced. It is a readjustment without increase, in the somewhat famous way my hon. friend may have heard of in bygone years.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: I am inclined to believe that my hon. friend will get no more revenue. I will go a little bit further, and say that he will be getting no more revenue in connection with these tobaccos I am glad he has made the adjustments he has in connection with the other commodities he has referred to.

Item agreed to.

Customs Tariff—Cigarettes, the weight of the paper covering to be included in the weight for duty per pound: British Preferential tariff $4.70 and 25 per cent, Intermediate tariff $4.70 and 25 per cent, General tariff $4.70 and 25 per cent.

Mr. FIELDING: That is a readjustment to correspond, for the purpose stated.

Item agreed to.

Customs tariff—super-calendared or machine finish grades of book paper, not coated, when used exclusively in the production of magazines, newspapers and periodicals, printed, published or issued regularly under regulations prescribed by the Minister of Customs and Excise: British Preferential tariff 12½ per cent, Intermediate tariff 22½ per cent, General tariff 25 per cent.

Mr. FIELDING: The object of that is to make a slight decrease in the British preference on the class of paper used in magazines.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: The result of the change is that there is 2½ per cent decrease in the British preference, the other items standing exactly the same.

Item agreed to.

Customs tariff—coated papers, when used exclusively in the production of magazines, newspapers and periodicals printed published and issued regularly under regulations prescribed by the Minister of Customs and Excise: British Preferential tariff 17½ per cent, Intermediate tariff 32½ per cent, General Tariff 35 per cent.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: The old tariff, as I have it, would give 22½ as against the 17½, the other charges remaining the same. Is that correct?

Mr. FIELDING: There is a reduction of 5 per cent, in that case, in the British Preference.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: And the others are just the same?

Mr. FIELDING: Yes.

Mr. GOOD: I should like to know about the extent of the production in Canada,—how much of this line of goods is manufactured in Canada, compared with what is imported.

Mr. FIELDING: There is no classification, I am afraid, which enables us to distinguish as the hon. member desires. This paper is used exclusively in the magazine business.

Mr. GOOD: The reason I asked the question is that I had an opportunity of visiting some coating mills in Ontario and had a conversation with some of the men connected with them. One gentleman, in particular, an Englishman, who was very familiar with the manufacture of paper in the Old Country, stated that the Canadian manufacturers were very much behind the times in their methods. We are giving a very high protection on this particular line of commodity—35 per cent—and I think, before we pass the item, we ought to be reasonably sure that we are not encouraging the maintenance of these old-fashioned and obsolete methods of manufacture. It seems a very high protection.

Mr. FIELDING: I think, in the case of the items of the general tariff, hon. members should bear in mind that I stated that it was not our intention to reduce the general tariff on goods expected to come from the United States. We made exceptions in a few cases, but, speaking generally, we did not desire, at the present time and for reasons given, to reduce the duties on American goods, and that is the reason that the present item remains at 35 per cent. The magazine publishers made a plea for some further consideration in various forms. They think they are suffering an injustice, and to this extent, giving them a reduction on that class of goods in the British preference, we are meeting their wishes. This class of paper is not imported to any extent from Great Britain, but I am advised that very likely it will be.

Mr. GOOD: If the effect will be to encourage the importation from Great Britain, as compared with the United States, I see some justification for the position the minister takes; otherwise, it seems to me, it will be working a hardship to the Canadian consumers of paper. Some little time ago I had a communication—and probably other members received the same communication—from the Canadian publishers of magazines dealing with the cost of their coated paper, and I appreciate the disabilities under which they are labouring. I would like to know whether or not this change is going to meet the situation as presented to us.

Mr. FIELDING: Very few changes we make will fully meet the desires of those who make the representations. As far as it goes, it is in the right direction. I think they will get a considerable quantity of British paper under this item. That remains to be seen, but, as respects the duty on the American paper, my hon. friend will appreciate the reason I gave for the course that has been followed.

Mr. HOCKEN: I have not very much objection to the duty, but I wish some method could be found by which the Canadian publisher could be protected against the American magazines which come in. Two

or three years ago, I had occasion to investigate this, and I discovered that paper could be bought in Buffalo at such low prices that the goods could be landed in Toronto with the duty paid, at exactly the same price as paid in Canada.

Mr. McMASTER: Is not that usually the case?

Mr. HOCKEN: It looked to me as though the duty had been added. I am in favour, Mr. Chairman, of giving adequate protection to our paper mills, but I would like to find some method by which the hon. minister could prevent the finished article coming in. It is not only in the interests of the publishers, but in the interests of the sentiment of this country, that this should be done. The way Canada is flooded with American magazines to-day is not in the best interests of this country, if we are going to build up a Canadian nation.

Mr. JACOBS: Why?

Mr. HOCKEN: Because these magazines teach everything they have in the United States, and are simply a boost for the United States. It is impossible, with the competition we have, for any man, I do not care what amount of money he may have to invest, to establish a magazine in Canada that can hold its place. He cannot get the circulation that will warrant the advertising rates, and if a man spent two or three million dollars trying to establish a Canadian magazine, he could not succeed in competition with the magazines from the United States. If it were necessary, I could recite to this House a score of magazines that have been started in this country, and a large amount of money spent in trying to establish them, but without success. The Canadian Courier was one paper that was started. Something like a quarter of a million dollars was expended upon it. There was a really patriotic motive behind the publisher in that case; he did his best to establish a Canadian magazine to express Canadian sentiment, to be a market for Canadian writers and Canadian illustrators. After spending a large amount of money, he was compelled to suspend publication. The same thing applies to many other Canadian magazines. The Local Council of Women started the Canadian Century; but they were unable to carry on their magazine, although that is a very large organization. I do not suggest that a change should be made now; but at the next session, I should like to see the Minister of Finance (Mr. Fielding) go into this question very fully, in order to find out if there is not some way of affording to Canadian publishers a measure of protection that would make it possible for real Canadian magazines to be established in this country. The best success that has been obtained in the way of a general magazine is, I think, by Maclean's, and yet I venture to say that it is not a money-making proposition by any means. No Canadian magazine will be a money-making proposition unless some impost is put on the finished article coming in from the United States.

Mr. KYTE: I never was in thorough accord with the protectionist sentiments of my hon. friend from West Toronto (Mr. Hocken); but we have here a new feature of protection which the hon. member is endeavouring to fasten upon this country, that is, to "protect" the people against selecting their literature. Surely, if there is in the world anything which ought to be free, and as regards which a person ought to make his individual choice, it is the sort of literature that he desires to read. It is regrettable that money invested in Canadian magazines has not given returns to those whose desire was to establish such magazines; nevertheless, I do not think the reading public of Canada ought to be penalized on account of their failure. I am not aware that many magazines are published in Canada. From time to time some attempts have been made to publish in Canada magazines, some of which were fairly good, others mediocre, and another class that did not deserve very much encouragement. If United States publishers will produce a class of magazine literature that aims to satisfy the reading instinct and impulse of the people of Canada, it would be protection run mad to prevent the Canadian people from enjoying such literature.

Mr. FORKE: I do not think any one in this House will accuse me of being a protectionist. At the same time, I have a great deal of sympathy with the hon. member for West Toronto (Mr. Hocken) in regard to magazine literature. Perhaps, Sir, you would not so imagine, but I have had some connection with the Sunday schools, and I find that in all those Sunday school papers, every illustration you get as to great national figures, men whose lives and characters are worth copying, is drawn from United States statesmen or leaders in public life in the United States.

I do not think that is a very good thing as regards creating a national spirit and sentiment. When we come to the matter of magazines, one of the great difficulties which we have to overcome in this country is the fact that men with great literary ability in a very short time go to New York, Chicago or some other place where they can be paid more money than they can get from Canadian magazines. I do not say I should like protection; but I should like to see every encouragement possible given to the Canadian literature and Canadian magazines. We talk about trading with the Americans as regards buying implements—if you will allow me to use that illustration—and other goods; but more insidious than anything else as regards creating a national feeling is the literature that the people read. American firms, in our picture shows, and in magazines to be read in our households, will do more to frustrate the creation of a national spirit in Canada than any other means that I know of. I do not know just what steps I should like to see taken, but I should like to see Canadian literature and magazines of every kind encouraged in every possible way.

Mr. MacLAREN: I should like to point out that the difficulty Canadian magazines face in obtaining the success and wide circulation that one so often sees in the case of American magazines, does not depend upon an inferiority in the articles contained in Canadian magazines. I do not think Canadian magazines need fear the competition of American magazines from the standpoint of literary value, ability and interest. What, then, is the difference? The difference is, I think, due to the advertisements that are contained in American magazines. The circulation of many of them is very much greater than the circulation a Canadian magazine can have, certainly at the outset; and when advertisements are placed in magazines which obtain a very wide circulation, as is the case in newspapers, a very large revenue is obtained from such advertisements. This enables Americans to compete only too successfully with our magazines. The advantage which they have over us is not from a literary standpoint so much as from the revenue obtained from their advertisements. If, without imposing any special tax on American magazines per se as periodicals or literary papers, it could be that such magazines so far as they contain advertisements should be taxed, then this country would certainly lose nothing from an educational standpoint, but it would give our people an advantage in producing magazines; for the American magazines would not obtain the enormous circulation they now obtain in Canada, and which they are largely enabled to obtain by the revenue derived from those advertisements.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: In common, no doubt, with many other hon. members, I am quite sure, in common with the Minister of Finance (Mr. Fielding), I have received the following telegram:

> The Canadian magazine and periodical publishers have appealed for relief from their present impossible and intolerable position and have suggested three methods: 1. Application of present duty on printed and advertising matter to the advertising appearing in foreign magazines and periodicals; 2. Application of the present duty and import tax to paper coming into Canada in the form of finished magazines and periodicals; 3. Removal of all duty on paper, ink, engravings, art work and other materials used in or for the manufacture of magazines and periodicals. Unless some measure of relief is granted some of our members must either cease publication of their magazines or make arrangements to have them printed in the United States and shipped into Canada by freight, as United States magazines now are, thus avoiding all duties and import tax and depriving Canadian employees in paper mills, ink manufacturers, engravers, electrotypers and printers, of employment. We earnestly request that something be done at this session of Parliament to alleviate our ruinous position.

I assume that these representations have been made to my hon. friend. I do not know whether he agrees with them or not, or whether he thinks it is possible for the Canadian magazines to carry on under present conditions. But I do know that there is a very great deal of truth in what has been here set forth. I know, for example, that the American magazines come over in carload lots to different points in the country, whence they are distributed, and that we get no revenue out of them in connection with our postal service, except the small postage they pay. I also know, and I think every hon. gentleman knows, that very serious representations have been made from time to time by numerous patriotic and religious societies against the importation of American magazines. And the objection to these magazines is not confined to these bodies. The Great War Veterans have taken no uncertain stand against the circulation of Hearst's magazines in Canada, and the point has been taken that these magazines, in a large number of cases, cannot in any way be said

to be either instructive or properly amusing, but merely salacious. From the list of magazines submitted to me I should think that there is some ground at least for that view. Now, we are really considering a serious question, in this connection, having regard to our Canadian national life. After all, the spirit of a country as well as its character depends in no small degree upon its literature. Do we want that literature to be Canadian, or do we not? That really is the bald question that we have to consider. It is idle to talk about Canadian magazines being in a position to compete with the American magazines. Why, the magazine published in the United States has advertisers who pay rates on advertisements intended for a market of 114,000,000, and as hon. gentlemen undoubtedly know, the advertising revenues are the great stand-by of these publications, their very lifeblood; and that revenue depends upon the circulation which the magazine enjoys. The American advertiser has not only the home field, but he has the Canadian market thrown in besides. American publications are scattered broadcast throughout Canada. They contain—and properly so—purely American advertisements and American ideas; certainly they do not propagate any Canadian thoughts. It would be quite impossible for any Canadian manufacturer or producer to pay the advertising rates paid by the American producer and manufacturer. He cannot get into the American market, for their Marking Act, among other things, sees to that. They, on the other hand, can, and do get in here. Here, then, you have a mixed question. You have the question, on the one hand, as to whether a Canadian national spirit is worth while or not; and you have also the question as to whether or not you want to make it all the easier for American goods to flood this country. My opinion is that the complaint of the magazine publishers is well founded. I do not think that any of them is in a proper position to compete with the American publishers. The Canadian publishers are, I believe, all in a more or less difficult situation. Looking at the matter from every standpoint,—the creation of a distinctive Canadian literature being not the least important consideration by any means—we might at least do as much for our Canadian publishers as we
4 p.m. do for Canadian hardware or anything else. We have a tariff of 15 cents per pound on advertising materials, and as hon. gentlemen know, who read these magazines, a very large part of them consists almost entirely of advertisements. Some of these magazines, indeed, are printed largely for, and maintained by, advertisers, but simply because they are called magazines and publish a few articles they come into Canada free. Why should not the law calling for an impost of 15 cents a pound on advertising matter be applied to the advertisements contained in these magazines? At least, why could not something be done, by way of a tariff regulation, to look after and help Canadian literature?

Mr. FIELDING: There is much that can be said from the publisher's point of view. My hon. friend (Sir Henry Drayton) puts the question broadly: do we, or do we not, want American magazines? Well, some people may reply, that is a question for the individual buyer to decide for himself. If he buys American magazines it must be because he wants to read them; and there is no restriction to-day of the liberty of the Canadian people to buy American magazines in preference to Canadian publications if they desire to do so. I must confess that I have every sympathy with the point of view of the Canadian publishers, and have been impressed during the interviews I have had with them on the question. But the question is not a new one. It does not come before me to-day for the first time, and I am sure it was brought before my hon. friend (Sir Henry Drayton) in more than one year. It is, comparatively speaking, an old question. Every government that has had to deal with it has come to the same conclusion, that very much can be said in regard to the hardship which the Canadian magazine suffers; but no government, so far, has been prepared to impose a tax on American magazines. If we are sinning in this matter to-day, therefore, we are sinning in the company of my hon. friend who has had to deal with the same problem and has reached the same conclusion. My hon. friend referred to various resolutions passed by the Great War Veterans and others regarding Hearst's publications. That, of course, is a different question; it has reference altogether to a particular magazine which is anti-British in spirit; and although I do not advocate the repression of the right of the people to buy even these magazines if they desire to do so, I grant that this question is open to consideration. The representations that have been made in regard to these particular

magazines, however, do not urge any tariff proposal or anything of that kind, but suggest that the magazines should be prohibited the use of the mails. If a collection of advertising matter printed in the United States is brought into Canada as such, it is subject to a tax of 15 cents per pound; but advertisements incorporated in magazines may come in free. I frankly admit that the matter presents a problem, and I wish that I knew of some legitimate way by which we could help Canadian magazines, which I have no doubt are suffering a hardship. We are doing little now, but what we are doing is in the direction of some assistance.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: My hon. friend would like to know what remedy can be applied. Why not tax the advertising matter?

Mr. FIELDING: For the same reason that the hon. member did not do that a year ago.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: That is a poor reason. Surely my hon. friend will not take that stand. I admit that he is adopting a whole lot of our ways of a year ago, and is indeed going a hundred per cent further.

Mr. FIELDING: A hundred per cent better.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: Not better. But I should like to point out that as a matter of fact I never declined that relief. I thought that it ought to be granted, and if the accident of December 6th last had not occurred, I can assure my hon. friend, the interests of the Canadian magazines would have been protected. The minister would like to protect those interests. Well, there are two ways in which he can help the Canadian magazines. First, he might charge that 15 cents per pound on advertising matter contained in these magazines; or, if that is too complicated a system, he could put a tax of so much per pound—5 or 10 cents, or whatever rate is deemed advisable—on all magazines imported. So that under the British preferential tariff there would be no duty at all on magazines; under the general tariff it would be five or ten cents a pound, as the case might be.

Mr. HOCKEN: There is another aspect of this question that ought to be mentioned. I think these magazines that come in from the United States ought to come under the dumping clause. They are certainly sold in Canada in some cases at twenty-five per cent of the cost of production. There are magazines coming in from the United States, consisting of from 100 to 150 pages, printed on photo paper and selling at ten cents or thereabouts, which could not be produced in this country at less than 25 cents a copy. I do not object to any man buying the kind of literature that he desires, but I do object to discrimination against our publications, because that is exactly what it amounts to—discrimination against our own manufacturers, as the ex-Minister of Finance (Sir Henry Drayton) has said. There is one publication coming into this country and circulating to the extent of 100,000 copies a month, and a Canadian manufacturer who wants to get into that paper has to pay a rate of $7,000 a page. He has to pay that for the 100,000 circulation in Canada, but he has to pay, of course, also for a further circulation of 1,500,000, although only the 100,000 is of any value to him. That is the most extreme case I have to offer, but other publications come close to that amount. So that if you take only two of these publications, you have one with a weekly circulation of 100,000 copies, carrying not a single advertisement of a Canadian dealer, and another with a monthly circulation of 100,000, from which also the Canadian dealer is excluded. Our newspapers are full of the "Made in Canada" campaign, yet we are facilitating the advertising of purely American-made articles in publications to which the Canadian manufacturer cannot get access. It is worth while considering, Mr. Chairman, whether these publications, which come in by the carload, as the hon. member for West York (Sir Henry Drayton) says, should not come under the dumping clause or be taxed in some other way so as to make possible the creation in Canada of a Canadian national magazine. If I were to choose between American magazines and others coming from outside of our own country, I would prefer the British magazines; but perhaps they are not made up just to the liking of the Canadian people, owing to the fact that modern taste in this respect has been developed by education carried on by the United States publications. But the condition of the publishing interests in Canada is very critical. And it is an important interest; the men employed in it are among the most highly skilled and highly paid workmen we have in the country. But these men are being driven out of the country—the same applies

to literary and artistic ability manifested in other directions—by reason of the fact that there is no market in Canada for the services of a man who can do high-class work either in literature or in art. The best way to remedy that is to put it within the financial reach of some group of men to establish a real Canadian publication that can get a circulation of 100,000 or 200,000. Under present conditions that is impossible.

Mr. EVANS: It has been my observation for the last thirty years that the advocates of protection have always protested against the importation of United States magazines. I do not believe they take this attitude because of the resulting competition with Canadian periodicals. I will point you back to certain revisions of the tariff, particularly in 1905 and 1906, when they protested most vigorously against the importation of United States magazines, not because of the reading matter which they contained, but because of the advertisements contained in them. I am not so sure that my hon. friends to my right have not the same idea in mind now that the protectionists had at that time. As a Canadian I dislike having to hear the suggestion which is brought up so frequently, that Canada is utterly helpless to do anything in competition with other nations. It is the competition with these advertisements that some of our people fear, more than the competition of the periodical itself. Now, there are many Canadian magazines and periodicals which are doing very well. We certainly want to cultivate the Canadian national spirit as much as we can, and I do not think it will tend to promote that spirit if we shut out United States magazines, and thus prevent the people of this country from being as well read as possible.

Mr. CRERAR: So far as the exclusion of American magazines is concerned, I do not wish at the moment to discuss that point; I understand it is not relevant to the item we are considering. But representations have been made to me by magazine publishers in Canada, particularly by publishers of weekly newspapers, in the matter of securing a reduction of the duty on paper coming from the United States into Canada. I think they have a substantial argument to support their contention in that respect. Advertising houses which run advertisements in United States and Canadian publications place the Canadian publisher at a disadvantage: while there is no duty on the advertising coming into Canada, there is a duty, and a pretty stiff one, on the paper coming into Canada that is necessary for these Canadian publications. Our Canadian paper mills did very well during the years of the war and are to-day in a prosperous condition; the fact that practically 85 per cent of their product is exported is, I think, a pretty fair evidence of their prosperity. I would urge upon the minister the making of some reduction in the duties on this particular class of paper and thus affording much needed relief to Canadian publishers. I see no reason why that should not be done, and I trust that the Minister of Finance will give the matter consideration.

Mr. GOOD: I have a friend in the printing business who tells me that he buys a great deal of paper from the other side, on which he pays a duty of 30 per cent, or whatever it may be. It may not be just the class of paper under consideration, but it seems to me that the suggestion made by the hon. member for Marquette (Mr. Crear) is certainly worth considering—that we should cut down the duty on American paper. A very large protection is undoubtedly given to the Canadian manufacturer at present, and it would make it very much easier for all our publishers if that duty were reduced. I would submit to the minister that the duty were cut down from 35 to 25 per cent, we might get just as much revenue, possibly more than we are getting now under the very high duty of 35 per cent. I hope the Government will consider a reduction in the duty on this particular item.

Mr. NEILL: I hope that in that connection the Minister of Finance will remember that four of the six paper manufacturing mills in my district are idle today for lack of business.

Mr. FIELDING: I have no doubt a fair argument could be made for reduction of duty on several particular items, but I have to fall back on our attitude towards the United States. I think it is sound policy for the present, except in urgent cases, in the slang of the day, to "stand pat" on the tariff question until we see what our American friends are going to do. At all events, that is the ground we have taken with regard to the American tariff generally.

Item agreed to.

Paper milk bottle caps, printed or not: British Preferential tariff, 15 p.c.; Intermediate tariff, 25 p.c.; General tariff, 27½ p.c.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: What was the former tariff?

Mr. FIELDING: It was 22½, 32 and 35. We have made a considerable reduction.

Mr. WALLACE: To what extent are these milk bottle caps imported? What is the percentage as compared with the home manufactured article?

Mr. FIELDING: The figures are not classified in such a way that I can answer that question. The imports have not been very large because the rates have been very high. There will probably be some imports now. The effect of all these reductions will be to encourage some imports, I hope not at the expense of the home industry. With the general improvement of trade, I hope both will benefit.

Mr. MEIGHEN: Does the minister really think that a reduction in the duty on milk bottle caps is going to increase the dairy business so that whatever reduction may be made in local purchases of the same article will be more than made up for by the increase in the dairy business? Surely he does not think, even though this reduction does result in a lower price for milk bottle caps, that that is going to be reflected in any increase in the dairying industry of Canada. The suggestion is ludicrous.

Mr. FIELDING: Anything that will lighten the burdens on the dairying industry will encourage and help that industry. That is a fair proposition generally. My observation and experience are that a moderate tariff very often gives you as much revenue, or more, than a higher rate of duty. My experience under the Liberal administration was that such reductions did not diminish the general business of the country, but rather helped it.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: That opens up a pretty large field. What are these milk bottle caps worth to the dairyman? What is the percentage of cost?

Mr. FIELDING: I am afraid I could not give that.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: It is infinitesimal.

Mr. FIELDING: I hope my hon. friend will tell the manufacturer it is infinitesimal.

[Mr. Fielding.]

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: It is infinitesimal so far as any reduction to the public is concerned.

Mr. FIELDING: It works only one way, does it?

Item agreed to.

Boracic acid and borax in packages of not less than twenty-five pounds weight; hydrofluosilicic acid; oxalic acid; tannic acid; ammonia, sulphate of; sal ammoniac and nitrate of ammonia; cyanide of potassium; cyanide of sodium and cyanogen bromide; antimony salts, viz.:—tartar emetic, chlorine and lactate (antimonine); arsenous oxide; oxide of cobalt; oxide of tin; bichloride of tin; tin crystals; oxide of copper; precipitate of copper, crude; sulphate of copper (blue vitriol); verdigris or subacetate of copper, dry; sulphate of iron (copperas); sulphate of zinc; chloride of zinc; sulphur and brimstone, crude or in roll or flour; cream of tartar, in crystals or argols; tartaric acid crystals, iodine, crude; bromine; phosphorus; sulphide of arsenic; carbon bisulphide: British Preferential tariff, free; Intermediate tariff, free; General tariff, free.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: The whole of this item is unnecessary except that it adds three articles to the former free list, cyanide of sodium, cyanogen bromide—

Mr. FIELDING: These things were limited to certain purposes, and the limiting words are stricken out.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: That was not my understanding. I only want to get at the facts. If my hon. friend will look at the former tariff item No. 208, he will find that the only change being made is that formerly cyanide of sodium and cyanogen bromide were admitted free only for use in reducing metals in mining operations, and that these two articles were the only ones that were limited. I think that is the only change.

Mr. FIELDING: That is correct.

Item agreed to.

Caustic soda in solution: British Preferential tariff, 15 p.c.; Intermediate tariff, 17½ p.c.; General tariff, 17½ p.c.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: What was the former tariff?

Mr. FIELDING: One-fifth of a cent, three-tenths of a cent, and three-tenths of a cent. This is a very material reduction.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: What is the value?

Mr. FIELDING: The old duty works out at about 29 per cent. It is reduced now to 17½ per cent.

Item agreed to.

Paper refills for sputum cups; paper pocket sputum cups: British Preferential tariff, 12½ p.c.; Intermediate tariff, 17½ p.c.; General tariff, 20 p.c.

Mr. LEWIS: If there is one item in this whole list that ought to be placed on the free list, it is this one. I do not wish to speak of the disease, and of the patients who use these articles, but it is a well known fact that the health of the nation and the well-being of our people depend upon these patients being very careful in expectorating. The federal and provincial governments are conducting educational campaigns to teach those afflicted with this disease how to look after themselves, and to use these cups, but the moment these people endeavour to carry out their instructions, we penalize them by imposing a tariff on these cups. It should also be remembered that we are paying out sums of money every year for the destruction of herds of cattle that react to a certain test. In view of all that is being done to try to clean up this disease, and to get people to look after themselves in a sanitary way, it does seem to me a most illogical proposition that we should put this impediment in the way. The one disease that is carrying off more white people than any other to-day is tuberculosis, and it is those who are afflicted with this disease that use these cups. The large institutions, federal and provincial, that are looking after these patients have to buy large quantities of these cups, and to impose a tariff seems to me only taking money out of one pocket and putting it in another. I would urge the minister to place these cups, and I think the cups should be al- people have been educated to use these cups, and I think the cups should be allowed to come in free, so that we can help to eradicate this disease. Although I do not wish to propose an amendment I think it would be advisable for the minister to put this article on the free list.

Mr. FIELDING: It is difficult to resist my hon. friend's suggestion, but I would point out to him that we are making a very substantial reduction with which, I think, we might very well be content for the moment. There is a 15 per cent reduction under the general tariff and a 10 per cent reduction under the British preference. I think my hon. friend ought to accept that as an assurance that we are trying to deal with the case to which he alludes in a generous spirit.

Mr. MANION: What I wish to say does not come under this particular item but applies to another, nevertheless I would like to mention a matter at this stage which I think will appeal to the minister. I had a case some months ago of a little boy, the son of a poor carpenter, who is a cripple; he has paralysis of the legs. The father was very anxious to take the best possible care of him and wished to get him one of these wheel chairs suitable for cripples, but found he had to import it from the United States because he could not get it in Canada. I took the matter up with the Customs Department and found there was a fairly heavy duty payable on such a chair. I believe that in cases like this it is only in the interests of common humanity that we should eliminate the duties on any such appliances. If the Finance Minister would take this matter up he will be doing a favour to those who are sadly in need of attention and it will be greatly to his credit. I would like the minister to look into the matter and see whether he cannot make a recommendation in the desired direction.

Mr. FIELDING: I do not recall the circumstance to which my hon. friend alludes although it is quite possible that it may have been brought to my attention.

Mr. MANION: It was not brought to my hon. friend's attention. The case occurred under the late government.

Mr. FIELDING: There is much in what my hon. friend has said which commends itself, I am sure, to the consideration of the committee. I will take the matter into consideration and see whether there may be some opportunity of dealing with it.

Item agreed to.

Customs tariff—Gasoline .725 specific gravity and heavier but not heavier than .750 specific gravity at 60 degrees temperature, per gallon: British Preferential tariff, ½ cent; Intermediate tariff, ¾ cent; General tariff, 1 cent.

Mr. FIELDING: We have made a slight change in this item with a view of reducing the duty on a class of gasoline used by the fishermen. The duty on this is now 2½ cents but by the proposed amendment it will be reduced to 1 cent. I think it is all right as far as it goes, but my attention has been called by hon. members, chiefly from British Columbia,—and I refer particularly to my hon. friend from Comox-Alberni (Mr. Neill)—to the fact that the gasoline used by the fishermen on the Pacific coast is not exactly of the same

character as that which is used on the Atlantic coast. An effort has therefore been made, by changing the description of the item, to make it apply to the fishermen on both coasts which I hope the hon. members from British Columbia will find satisfactory. I therefore propose that the item shall read:

Gasoline .725 specific gravity and heavier, but not heavier than .770 specific gravity at 60 degrees temperature; oils, coal and kerosene, distilled, known as engine distillate" .725 specific gravity and heavier, but not heavier than .770 specific gravity at 60 degrees temperature, per gallon: British Preferential tariff $\frac{1}{2}$ cent; Intermediate tariff, $\frac{3}{4}$ cent; General tariff, 1 cent.

The object is to meet the wishes of my hon. friend from Comox-Alberni and make the relief apply to the fishermen of British Columbia as well as the Atlantic fishermen.

Mr. MARCIL (Bonaventure): Will the minister explain what the reduction amounts to as regards fishermen on the Atlantic coast?

Mr. FIELDING: A certain class of gasoline on which they would have had to pay 2½ cents they now get at 1 cent.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: Has the minister found out, in connection with his investigation, that the Canadian consumer is very much better off in connection with this free gasoline—because gasoline, speaking generally, is free; motor gasoline is free, there is no tax on it at all. Therefore the Canadian consumer is very much better off by reason of it. But has there not been a greater spread in cost between this free gasoline in Canada and in the United States, than there is between the gasoline the hon. member has referred to?

Mr. FIELDING: I may say that we have to act on a general principle. Reductions of duties, whether large or small, ought to reach the consumer. They may be slow in reaching him. I confess that if you put an additional tax on anything to-day it reaches the consumer to-morrow morning, when the shop keeper discovers the increase of taxation he adds the duty to his price; but when you reduce the duty on anything I believe it is slow in reaching the consumer, although I think it does reach him in the end.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: Is my hon. friend quite fair in that comment?

Mr. FIELDING: I think so.

[Mr. Fielding.]

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: I think if my hon. friend consults his experts he will find that we have had free gasoline for motor purposes for years, and that the spread in price to-day between the Canadian price and the American price is greater than it was years ago.

Mr. NEILL: I wish to express gratitude on the part of the fishermen of the Pacific coast for this change made by the Minister of Finance on representations made to him by the member for Skeena (Mr. Stork) and myself. It is a very substantial and a very important one; it means a 60 per cent reduction in the duties. As the minister outlined in his budget the reduction was intended to apply to the fishermen of both coasts, but owing to the fact that distillate is largely used—I suppose to the extent of 90 per cent—on fishing boats on the Pacific coast while it does not appear to be used on the Atlantic coast at all, we did not get the benefit that was intended. However, the amendment which he has brought in to-day now applies to us in the West, and I think I can assure the Finance Minister that this reduction will immediately benefit the consuming fishermen on the Pacific coast, and this distillate can be brought over from the American side in competition with the local product. The reduction is one very much to our benefit, and I compliment the Finance Minister for having given this matter consideration in the midst of his numerous and onerous duties. It shows his capacity for hard work and his devotion to duty when he can turn aside and, at the suggestion of the hon. member for Skeena and myself, listen to our representations and adjust a matter of this kind. It is certainly a high tribute to his sense of fairness and his mastery of detail that he will pay attention to matters of this kind advanced by two members—perhaps I may be allowed to say two insignificant members—coming from remote districts.

Mr. MEIGHEN: Unless there are any more compliments to be paid in respect of this fraction of a cent duty on gasoline, I may ask the minister if he would explain why it is that a duty is maintained on this gasoline at all when gasoline for motor purposes has been free for so many years? I ask him if he believes that the removal of the duty on gasoline, as it has been removed for many years, has resulted, as he says, in a lowering of the cost, in face of the fact that the spread between the

price of the Canadian free gasoline and the American free gasoline is greater than the spread between the American dutiable gasoline and the Canadian dutiable gasoline? In view of that fact, if the Finance Minister still thinks that this means a reduction in the cost, why does he maintain this duty at all, while the great body of the gasoline imported and used on the prairies, used in motors, has been free for many years?

Mr. FIELDING: Gasoline of a certain quality and consistency has been free, but all is not free. The fishermen use a quality of gasoline which will be reached by this concession—which, while it may not be much of a concession is, at all events, in the right direction. I am afraid I shall have to lay down the general principle that a reduction of duty, whether large or small, is desirable and will reach the consumer in the end. I think my hon. friend will admit that is a sound proposition.

Mr. MEIGHEN: Experience rather teaches the contrary. I would like to have some explanation from the minister—if not from the minister, perhaps from the hon. gentlemen to my left who have been finding fault with the difference between Canadian gasoline prices and American gasoline prices as an argument against protection, oblivious to the fact that there was no protection on gasoline—why the Canadian gasoline price under free trade conditions is so much higher than the American price.

Mr. NEILL: I wish to point out that the ordinary motor car gasoline is liable to a duty. It is free when not heavier than .725 but that is a very high class of gasoline used almost entirely by aeroplanes, and the ordinary person does not travel by aeroplane as a rule; he travels in a Ford car when he can afford it, and the gas he uses in that car is ordinary commercial gasoline of .745 specific gravity, which, under section 271 of the tariff is liable to a duty. It has been paying 2½ cents per gallon, and now it is reduced to 1 cent. The gasoline, nominally sold by the gallon is for practical purposes, on account of its expansion or contraction at different temperatures, really sold or measured by the weight, and the weight for commercial gasoline,—I may say I am in the business—is ·745. That is at a temperature of 60 degrees. If a man wants 40 gallons of gasoline, he gets forty times ·745. The distilate is ·765, coal oil ·800, while free gasoline is under ·725, and that is entirely used for aeroplanes or some very high class of machine. I suppose it would also be used in lamps. But the ordinary gasoline is ·745.

Mr. MEIGHEN: If the hon. member would look up the imports of free gasoline, and explain how that comes to be all used in aeroplanes in Canada, he might make good his case.

Item as amended agreed to.

Customs tariff—Glass demijohns or carboys, bottles n.o.p., decanters, flasks, phials, glass jars and glass balls, lamp chimneys, glass shades or globes; cut, pressed, moulded or crystal glass tableware, decorated or not: blown glass tableware and other cut glassware: British Preferential tariff 20 per cent; Intermediate tariff 30 per cent; General tariff 32½ per cent.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: They are the same as formerly.

Mr. FIELDING: They are the same, excepting the words "n.o.p."

Mr. GOOD: Has there been any reduction in the duty on these items?

Mr. FIELDING: No reduction.

Item agreed to.

Customs tariff—Glass milk bottles; British Preferential tariff, 15 per cent, Intermediate tariff, 25 per cent; General tariff, 27½ per cent.

Mr. LEWIS: What is the quantity of glass bottles manufactured in Canada? Have we any manufacturers of glass milk bottles in Canada?

Mr. FIELDING: I could not get the quantities. They are very largely manufactured in Canada. It is quite a large industry. I know that from the reports made on the subject.

Mr. GOOD: What reduction has been made in this particular item?

Mr. FIELDING: The figures before were 20, 30 and 32½; they are now 15, 25 and 27½.

Mr. MEIGHEN: Could the hon. minister tell us where the importations come from?

Mr. FIELDING: Chiefly from the United States.

Mr. MEIGHEN: They would pay 27½ still.

Mr. FIELDING: Yes. In that case there was a 5 per cent reduction, from 32½ per cent to 27½ per cent.

Item agreed to.

Customs tariff—Dairy tin hollow-ware, including cans for fresh milk or fresh cream; kitchen tin hollow-ware not painted, decorated or japanned: British Preferential tariff, 12½ per cent; Intermediate tariff, 17½ per cent; General tariff, 20 per cent.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: What reduction is there here?

Mr. FIELDING: The present rates are 15, 22½ and 25½. The proposed rates are 12½, 17½ and 20.

Item agreed to.

Customs tariff—Wrought or seamless iron or steel tubing, plain or galvanized, threaded and coupled or not, ten inches or less in diameter, n.o.p.: British Preferential tariff 15 per cent; Intermediate tariff 27½ per cent; General tariff, 30 per cent.

Mr. FIELDING: The present rates are 20, 30 and 35 per cent.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: Does that enter largely into the cost of agricultural implements?

Mr. FIELDING: Largely, I am informed.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: And it is the same class of material to which the drawback is extended, is it not?

Mr. FIELDING: It is used largely by plumbers.

Item agreed to.

Customs tariff—Agate, granite, or enamelled iron or steel ware: British Preferential tariff, 20 per cent; Intermediate tariff 27½ per cent; General tariff, 35 per cent.

Mr. FIELDING: The present rates are 22½, 32½ and 35 per cent.

Mr. GOOD: These are articles that are in very common use, and it seems to me that we have done nothing but make Canadian millionaires in this line in recent years. We ought to have very much more sweeping reductions in the duty, particularly on American goods.

Item agreed to.

Customs tariff—Mowing machines, harvesters, self-binding or without binders, binding attachments, reapers, and complete parts thereof, not including shafting or malleable iron castings: British Preferential tariff, 7½ per cent; Intermediate tariff, 10 per cent; General tariff 10 per cent.

Mr. FIELDING: The present rates are 12½, 12½ and 12½ per cent.

Mr. MEIGHEN: You would be quite safe in making the British Preferential nothing at all.

[Mr. Fielding.]

Mr. FIELDING: Yes, they will not come from Great Britain; they come from the United States.

Mr. EVANS: This relates to some of the chief implements used in agricultural production. The duty here, in the highest column is only 10 per cent, which does not look high, but if any one thinks he can import agricultural machinery on a 10 per cent duty, I would like him to try it. We do not object as much to this tariff schedule as to the fringes with which it is enclosed. It is our experience that we cannot import machinery on the invoice price at all. The anti-dumping duty is added to this, even, when bought from the foreign manufacturer in the usual way. The appraisers of the Customs Department seem to put whatever price they see fit on implements brought in, and it is our experience that, on some implements which have been imported during the last year by one of our co-operative companies, we have had to pay as high as 51 per cent, and, in one case, indeed, as high as 78 per cent. I do not see why this discrimination should exist, or why we cannot go to the United States, if we want to, find an independent manufacturer there, buy implements and import them at the schedule price, without coming under the anti-dumping duty. I should like to know from the minister if we cannot have this altered?

Mr. FIELDING: My hon. friend's remark would not apply to this particular item, but to things generally. The anti-dumping duty is, possibly, not as generally understood as it should be. Some people get the notion that, if goods are sold cheaply, it must be because of dumping, but that is not so. The dumping duty is a duty levied when there is a difference between the home price and the price at which goods are invoiced to Canada. If the price of these goods to Canada is lower than the price at which they are sold in the home market, that is dumping, and the duty of the customs is to value them according to the home market price. On the other hand, if the goods are sold to Canada at the exact price at which they are sold in the United States, that is not dumping, and there should be no additional duty.

Mr. EVANS: One hon. member from British Columbia said the anti-dumping duty had its teeth pulled. It is our experience that the teeth that are left in it

can take a pretty good hold. It was our experience here, only three years ago, that we bought implements in the usual way, and had the manufacturers' invoice price presented for customs appraisal, and we failed to bring them in on that, simply because, under the combine regulations in this country, we were not allowed to be registered as wholesalers or jobbers. I think it is an imposition, and puts the users of this machinery practically in bondage to the home manufacturer.

Mr. MEIGHEN: I have been quite impressed by what the hon. member has said, but I should like him to adduce the facts. I think he must be under a misapprehension, and I am sure the minister thinks the same. It would be very unlikely that the old dumping clause or any dumping clause could apply to such an article as this, and very unlikely that the American manufacturer would invoice such articles at a price lower than he was selling them at.

Mr. EVANS: He did not.

Mr. MEIGHEN: If he did not, then the old dumping clause could not possibly be applied, and I should like to have the facts adduced to show that what has been reported to the hon. gentleman is necessarily and, in fact, correct. Without for a moment questioning the bona fides of the hon. gentleman—and he is one of the last whose bona fides I would question—he must be misinformed as regards the incorporation. The department at Ottawa could not apply the dumping clause or any extra duty in respect of an invoice by denying the right of incorporation or the right to regard the institution to which he refers as a wholesale house or a jobber. Without going into the facts or knowing anything about the case at all, I venture to say that an investigation will show that the hon. member is wrong.

Mr. EVANS: The importation was made by the United Grain Growers, Limited, and recently we imported at Regina a carload of ploughs, the total selling price of which to us was $1,692.38 plus $9.24 value of repair parts, making a grand total of $1,701.62. On this we were required to pay duty on a value of $2,025, which duty amounted to $556.88, and, in addition, a dumping duty of $303.75, or a total duty of $860.63, which works out at over 51 per cent ad valorem on the purchase price, whereas the regular tariff rate is 27½ per cent. The customs entry of this car at Regina was dated August, 19, 1916, and is numbered 4658.

Mr. MEIGHEN: What is the hon. gentleman reading from?

Mr. EVANS: The annual report of the Grain Growers' Grain Company.

Mr. MEIGHEN: What year?

Mr. EVANS: 1917.

Mr. MEIGHEN: I do not like to reflect on the hon. member for Marquette (Mr. Crerar); but the duty on ploughs in 1917 was either 20 per cent or 17½ per cent I am not sure which. It certainly was not 27½ per cent. It is now or was prior to this tariff, 17½ per cent, and it has been 17½ per cent for some years. In 1917, it might have been 20 per cent; it certainly was not any higher.

Mr. EVANS: This says 27½ per cent.

Mr. MEIGHEN: I venture to say that the rest of the facts are about on a par with that.

Mr. EVANS: That does not alter the fact that we were brought under the anti-dumping clause, because we were not registered as wholesalers or jobbers. So, in that case, we could not import on the invoice price as every dealer in this country can.

Mr. MEIGHEN: Registered where as wholesalers or jobbers? Where is the registration?

Mr. EVANS: According to the customs regulations.

Mr. MEIGHEN: There is no such regulation.

Mr. CRERAR: I cannot at the moment recall the particular instances to which my hon. friend from Saskatoon (Mr. Evans) has alluded. I know we did have, for practically a whole year, very serious trouble with the customs officials as regards the importation of those implements from the United States. The dumping clause was applied in many cases where it should not have been applied. After a good deal of effort and trouble we prepared a case; we came down to Ottawa, and we submitted it to the customs officials. They admitted that they were wrong and we got the rebate in the duty.

Mr. MEIGHEN: That might easily occur. That shows that everything was made all right.

Mr. EVANS: I should like to tell the hon. member for Marquette (Mr. Crerar) that that was another item altogether, prior to this.

Mr. ROBB: May I point out to my hon. friend that, after the injustices which he now complains of had taken place, western Canada voted confidence in the government that was administering that act, and elected, as one of the members of that government, the hon. member for Marquette?

Mr. COOTE: Does the hon. member think the result of the election in 1917 was due to the tariff policy that government had in force?

Mr. JOHNSTON (Last Mountain): I should like to ask the minister why shafting and malleable castings are not included. They are exempted under item 445.

Mr. FIELDING: The item is the same. There is no change in that respect except in the rate.

Mr. JOHNSTON (Last Mountain): I submit that the minister should not make a part greater than the whole, and shafting and malleable iron castings for all these machines should come in under the same rate of duty as the machine.

Item agreed to.

Customs tariff—Cultivators, harrows, horse-rakes, seed-drills, manure spreaders and weeders and complete parts thereof: British Preferential tariff, 10 per cent; Intermediate tariff, 12½ per cent; General tariff, 12½ per cent.

Mr. FIELDING: The former rates were 10, 15 and 15.

Mr. JOHNSTON (Last Mountain): I found it necessary to vote against my hon. friend's budget, and I had certain reasons for doing so. This is one of them. I am convinced that there is no good reason why the duty on cultivators, harrows and so on should be higher than on mowing machines, binders, etc., under item 445. These machines are constructed of practically the same kind of material. Why there should be a difference in the import duty, I cannot understand. I am reminded of the words of the Minister of Trade and Commerce (Mr. Robb), when he spoke on the budget debate. He said that when we came to deal with this matter in committee the Government would listen to advice—I do not think he said it would be taken, but at least it would be listened to.

Mr. ROBB: Listened to.

Mr. FIELDING: Certainly.

Mr. JOHNSTON (Last Mountain): My advice to the minister is to reduce the rate of duty on item 446 to the same as prevails under item 445.

Mr. FIELDING: Will not my hon. friend accept the homely doctrine that a half loaf is better than no bread?

Mr. JOHNSTON (Last Mountain): I have been brought up on that principle, but I do not think we have quite the half loaf here. I am just looking for that.

Mr. MEIGHEN: As respects the matter referred to by the hon. member for Saskatoon, which refers just as much to this item as to any other, although the facts as disclosed by him in reading from the annual report of the Grain Growers' Grain Company have been shown in one very important particular to be manifestly wrong, nevertheless those facts have gone out to the country, have been spread broadcast through the West and are, in part, accountable, no doubt, for many misapprehensions that exist in that part of the country on this question. We are going through these items now. The publication made by the hon. member will simply add to the advertising that this matter has received. I think the minister, before these items are carried, should, at a convenient time, get the facts from his department or from the Department of Customs with regard to the case of the hon. member for Saskatoon (Mr. Evans), a full explanation of what actually happened and how it happened, and let this committee know what the facts really are. I do not think it is at all fair that what has been reported should go out; it has gone out already in the report of the company and, in one instance, at least, it is clearly wrong, contrary to the fact. I venture to say that the rest is also contrary to the fact in the main, and the minister owes it to the committee and the country to see that the true facts are adduced to the committee and spread upon the pages of Hansard.

Mr. FIELDING: At some stage of the proceedings, before we have finished with these items, I will, as suggested by the right hon. member, get a memorandum from the department on the subject.

Mr. JELLIFF: I should like to refer to one article that affects us very seriously in southern Alberta, and that is rotary rod weeders which, I imagine, would come under this item. The type of weeder we are using is not manufactured in this country at all. It is a very valuable tool, because with it we can clean up the land by going once or twice over the surface, whereas by the use of the ordinary cultivators we are sometimes obliged to keep going over the land all through the summer season. The price of one of these rotary rod weeders, as quoted to us at Spring Coulee station near my own farm, is $125, and any practical machinist or agricultural implement man in Canada will agree, I think, that the cost of producing that machine should not exceed $30 or $35. Inasmuch as this particular type of weeder is not manufactured here and is so essential to the maintenance of a clean and decent condition of the land in that part of the country, it seems to me that the duty should be taken off. This machine is absolutely needed in that part of Canada; and if I may call the attention of the minister to the fact, I would point out that one of the provisions of the Liberal platform of 1919 was the abolition of the duty in just such a case as this. That is also in accord with our own platform, and is absolutely necessary in the interests of the farming community in whose behalf I speak. I trust that the matter will receive the favourable consideration of the minister.

Mr. FIELDING: I should not care to agree at once to act on my hon. friend's suggestion and put this article on the free list. However, the suggestion may be useful at some other date, and I hope the hon. member will not press it now.

Item agreed to.

Customs tariff—Ploughs and complete parts thereof: British preferential tariff 10 per cent; Intermediate tariff, 15 per cent; General tariff, 15 per cent.

Mr. FIELDING: The present rates are 12½ per cent, 17½ per cent, 17½ per cent.

Mr. JOHNSTON (Last Mountain): The minister did not take my suggestion on the other item.

Mr. FIELDING: Oh, yes, I took it.

Mr. JOHNSTON (Last Mountain): You took it, but you did not act on it. Well, I am going to give the minister an opportunity to act on another suggestion, and I hope he will do so without a formal motion. If he does not see his way clear to reducing the duties on ploughs and parts thereof I shall have to move that those duties be reduced to a parity with the duties under item 445. The plough is the first tool that any one undertaking the cultivation of the land must have, and we should not place these obstacles in the way of people who have backbone enough to tackle this work under existing conditions. Why the duties should be as high as they are, on these implements, is a mystery to me, and I hope the minister will himself move to have the import duties thereon reduced.

Mr. FIELDING: My hon. friend ought not to expect too much all at once. He had better leave something for the future.

Mr. JOHNSTON (Last Mountain): I acted on that principle in connection with previous items, but in this case I shall move, seconded by the member for Prince Albert (Mr. Knox), that under item 446b the British preferential tariff be reduced to 7½ per cent, the intermediate tariff to 10 per cent, and the general tariff to 10 per cent.

Mr. FIELDING: I am not prepared to accept the amendment. The matter might stand until another sitting, and be considered in the meantime. I do not think the hon. member should press his amendment, but if he does the item can stand for the present.

Mr. JOHNSTON (Last Mountain): Let it stand.

Mr. CRERAR: That is quite satisfactory, but before we leave this item I might give the committee a little information I have gathered from the trade figures in regard to this particular article. I find that the total exports from Canada of ploughs manufactured in this country, to all countries, for the year ending March 31st, 1922, was $1,465,000. In the preceding year, when trade throughout the world was much better than it is at present, it amounted to $3,628,000. These duties are levied mainly against ploughs coming in from the United States. Now, we exported to the United Kingdom in 1922 ploughs to the value of $74,000, and in the previous year $441,000;

5 p.m.

while to the United States in the same year we exported $250,000 worth and in 1921 almost $1,200,000. I give these facts to show, in the first place, that our Canadian plough manufacturers are shipping ploughs to the United States

and selling them there in competition with American manufacturers. If that is true —and the figures are taken from the trade statistics—is it unreasonable to ask that the duties on ploughs be reduced to the same level as those on mowers and binders? There is another aspect of the question that should not be overlooked by the committee. The raw materials, such as iron and steel, entering Canada for the manufacture of ploughs, as indeed for all agricultural implements, come in under a duty; but when the manufactured article is exported the Canadian manufacturer gets a drawback on the duty. So that what we are really doing is this: The Canadian plough manufacturer imports a certain amount of raw material, iron and steel, for the manufacture of ploughs in Canada. He manufactures two carloads of ploughs, one of which he ships to the farmer in western Canada and the other to the United States. The cost to the western farmer is increased by the duty that the manufacturer has paid on the raw material. But on the carload of ploughs shipped to Dakota or Minnesota the manufacturer, receiving a rebate on the duty which he paid on the raw material that entered into the manufacture of them, is actually able, if the freight rates are equal, to sell those ploughs cheaper to the American farmer than he does to the Canadian agriculturist. No arguments of the most ardent protectionists can be advanced to justify that condition of affairs. This implement is very necessary in the development of agriculture, and if it is true that the Canadian manufacturers have been protected to the point where they are selling ploughs in the United States in competition with American manufacturers, is the request of my hon. friend from Last Mountain (Mr. Johnston) an unreasonable one, that the duties be further reduced on ploughs to the same level as the duties on mowers and binders?

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: Can my hon. friend tell the House the amount of duties represented in the raw materials he has referred to?

Mr. CRERAR: I do not know.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: I am quite sure you do not.

Mr. CRERAR: They do not come in free, I know that.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: I am asking as to the amount represented in each instance. I gave some illustrations to the committee.

Mr. CRERAR: My hon. friend, the ex-Minister of Finance (Sir Henry Drayton), will admit that, whatever the amount of duty, the Canadian manufacturer gets a drawback when he ships his implements to the United States, and consequently can sell them there so much cheaper than he can to the western farmer in Canada.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: The hon. member is showing that he has not familiarized himself with the state of the tariff in so far as his own business is concerned, or else he has been reading too many issues of his paper similar to the article he has referred to this afternoon. Does my hon. friend know that in connection with certain agricultural implements that are important to the western farmer there is a drawback of 99 per cent in respect to those articles of steel and iron entering into their manufacture? Does he know that in the case of articles manufactured for the home market there are drawbacks of 30 to 40 per cent?

Mr. CRERAR: Does that apply to raw material entering into the manufacture of ploughs?

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: I will turn up the details.

Mr. CRERAR: If my hon. friend turns up the details he will find that 99 per cent does not apply in that case.

Mr. STEWART (Argenteuil) Has my hon. friend the comparative figures of exports and sales in the home market?

Mr. CRERAR: No, I have not that information. Of course, the sales in Canada would be much greater than foreign sales, particularly in the last few years. But the plough manufacturers of Canada have been doing a pretty fair export business for a number of years. I gave the figures for 1922 and 1921. The total exports in 1920 were almost $2,500,000; the year before they amounted to more than $2,400,000.

Mr. STEWART (Argenteuil): I just wanted to get the proportion.

Mr. GUTHRIE: How much went to the United States?

Mr. CRERAR: Last year ploughs were exported to the United States to the value of $253,000. The year before the amount was $1,199,000, and the year before, $670,000.

Mr. HALBERT: Can the minister tell us whether plough-points, soil-plates, land-sides—the different parts of the plough—come in free if not punched or polished?

Mr. FIELDING: I understand they do.

Mr. HALBERT: Then the manufacturer of ploughs can get his plough-points, soil-plates and land-sides, can polish and put holes in them, set the plough up, and pay no duty on the finished article.

Mr. MEIGHEN: If there is one item in the whole tariff schedule to which the doctrine of the Minister of Finance would apply, it is this one—as you lower the duty the greater will be the importation. Does the minister admit that?

Mr. FIELDING: Not necessarily.

Mr. MEIGHEN: If there is one item in the whole schedule to which it should apply, it is this one. We manufacture a large number of the ploughs that we use; we import a considerable number. If the minister is proposing this as revenue tariff—and he has disallowed protection with disdain; he has even made a left-hand slap at his Minister of Justice (Sir Lomer Gouin) to do it—but if he is a revenue tariff man, let him come forward and apply the principle here, because beyond all question the reduction of duty would mean more importations and probably more revenue.

Mr. CRERAR: And lower prices to consumers.

Mr. MEIGHEN: I would not say that; I never did argue that. The minister may argue that.

The CHAIRMAN: Shall item 446b and the proposed amendment thereto stand?

Mr. MEIGHEN: Am I to get no answer from the minister, and no help from hon. gentlemen to my left?

Mr. HALBERT: Would my right hon. friend himself support that?

Mr. MEIGHEN: I certainly would not. I never preached this revenue tariff in any sense, but my hon. friends to my left did,—free trade nonsense and all the rest of it. But the minister comes forward and says he is against protection; that he does not believe in it; he is for a revenue tariff. Now, he knows that reduction of duty here means more importations and therefore more revenue. Will he tell the committee why he does not consent to follow that course?

Mr. LAPOINTE: Well, that is a fine admission, anyway.

Mr. CALDWELL: Consistency, thou art a jewel.

Mr. COOTE: We have been preaching increased production in order to get rid of our railway deficits, but at the same time we are keeping up the duty on ploughs. You cannot increase production if you decrease the number of ploughs. I think it would be quite in order to cut down the duty on ploughs; it might increase production, furnish more traffic for our railways, reduce the railway deficits and lessen our expenditure under the budget.

Mr. LUCAS: Will the minister explain why the rate of duty on ploughs is different from the rate applied to cultivators? I am new in this House, and I have not been able to understand that.

Mr. FIELDING: There has been a difference in the past. Our object was to make a reduction in each case where we thought it might fairly be done. We started from the point of view of the present duty, and asked ourselves to what extent we might make reductions.

Item stands.

Customs tariff—Gas or gasoline traction engines for farm purposes, valued at not more than fourteen hundred dollars each, and parts thereof for repairs; traction attachments designed and imported to be combined with automobiles in Canada for use as traction engines for farm purposes and parts thereof for repairs: British Preferential tariff, free; Intermediate tariff, free; General tariff, free.

Mr. FIELDING: There is no change in this item. The provision has already been sanctioned by Order in Council; this is simply to confirm it in the statute.

Mr. CALDWELL: I suggest that gasoline tractors ought to be included in this item as well. They are cheaper and more efficient. They have practically the same engine, but the combustion chamber is a little differently constructed. It is the poor man's engine tractor.

Mr. FIELDING: It may be that the tractors to which my hon. friend refers are now recognized as coming under this item. If at a later stage I find that is not the case, I will have the matter reconsidered.

Mr. LEWIS: If a tractor costs $1,400, it comes in free; if it exceeds that amount, the tariff is applied. In the case of automobiles the duty is 5 per cent up to a value of $1,200, and 10 per cent on any amount

in excess of $1,200. It seems to me that in the case of a tractor costing, say, $2,000, the tax should be applied only upon a valuation in excess of the $1,400.

Mr. FIELDING: That is a new thought, which we may take into consideration. I would not like to assent to it at once.

Mr. CRERAR: I commend the Minister of Finance for making this change in the tariff permanent. Hitherto it has been done by Order in Council. My hon. friend has changed that. At any rate these particular engines now come in free of duty. I could wish that I might have the support of my hon. friend the leader of the Opposition in furthering steps in this direction. We were in agreement before when this change was made at a very critical time in this country's history, and I trust that on reflection during the recess he will see the advisability of permitting free importation of other agricultural implements, and give us his support when he comes back next year.

Mr. MEIGHEN: If the hon. gentleman sees any great glory in maintaining the present state of facts by changing the basis from a perfectly valid Order in Council to a perfectly valid statute, I am content that he utilize that for the advantage of the Government with which he is so friendly. I have no objection at all. I cannot help, indeed, but be amused at the contrast between the determined campaign and the very violent threats against the tariff on the part of my hon. friends to my left through the election, and the devotion that their language displayed to their own programme—and the gentle pillow fights we now see between hon. gentlemen to my left and the Government. I am sure the West and indeed the whole country, will be impressed by that contrast. If the hon. gentleman was not satisfied with the security of these exemptions on the basis of what I call a perfectly valid Order in Council, I wonder why he did not suggest a better basis himself? He was in the government at that time, and we might just as well have done this then if he thought it would have been an improvement, but he thought it was quite right then, and I do not see why he sees such a very great advantage in the change now.

Mr. CRERAR: I really think there is a very considerable advantage in the change. I admit that my hon. friend may be suffering from a sort of political melancholy at the moment, but I trust that on reflection he will see the wisdom of the suggestion I offered a little while ago and will come to our assistance in attacking whatever forces of protection there may be among hon. gentlemen opposite.

Mr. MEIGHEN: Assistance presupposes an initiative, and I have not yet seen an initiative for me to assist.

Mr. CRERAR: We will give it to you.

Mr. LAPOINTE: It is very fortunate that my hon. friend has at last found out that his opponents are not all nation-wreckers, as he described them during the election.

Mr. MEIGHEN: Very often people are much more wreckers when they are on the stump than when they are in Parliament and enjoy the sweets of a seat in the House and of office in the Government.

Mr. STEEDSMAN: While we appreciate to the full the purpose of the minister in making this change permanent, I would like to point out that four-fifths of the work that is done by these engines coming in free is hauling ploughs and cultivators. I want again to draw the attention of the House to the inconsistency of charging a duty of 15 per cent on ploughs, when they are pulled by tractors that come in free, and I would like the minister to bear that in mind when he further considers Item No. 446b.

Item agreed to.

Customs Tariff—Wind stackers, and threshing machine separators, including baggers, weighers and self-feeders therefor, and complete parts thereof: British Preferential tariff, 10 per cent; Intermediate tariff, 15 per cent; General tariff, 15 per cent.

Mr. JOHNSON (Moosejaw): This is an item on which I wish to register a protest. Much has been said regarding ploughs and other implements. I do not think there is an implement entering into farming operations on which a reduction of duty would be more justifiable than on this. It is very true that a plough is the first implement that enters into farming operations, but after a man has grown his crop and seen it ripen, he has to harvest it, and if he cannot get threshing facilities a great percentage of his crop is lost. That is an actual fact, and hon. members sitting around me will be able to cite cases of that sort. A threshing machine runs into a considerable amount of money, and the duty on the machine is very often the deciding

factor whether a man will purchase or not. The manufacturers do not need this protection, as is evidenced by the export figures to the United States and other countries. In 1921 our manufacturers exported threshing machines to the United States to the value of $904,648, and in 1922, $131,701. They exported to all other countries, in 1921, threshing machines to the value of $818,052, and in 1922, $688,609. That is quite a substantial business, and it proves that they do not require this protection. On the other hand, the elimination of this duty might mean, and frequently would mean, the salvation of a man's entire crop. Last year hundreds of acres of crop were destroyed through the delay in threshing operations. I would like the Minister of Finance to reconsider this item and see if he cannot reduce it to the duty provided in Item No. 445. Perhaps the item could stand over in the meantime.

Mr. FIELDING: Let it stand with the plough item, if my hon. friend wishes it.

Mr. COOTE: The Minister of Finance is going to think over the question of making some change in the tariff on threshing machines. We heard a lot yesterday about the labour problem of the farmer. Most of the threshing machines we have in the West now are large outfits requiring a large number of men to run them. The solution of the farmer's problem so far as threshing is concerned, is in a small threshing outfit. A lot of the farmers have small tractors, and they would like to be able to get these small threshing machines to operate in connection with the small tractor. Then they would be able to do their own threshing without very much hired help. It would make it very much easier for them to get these threshing machines if this duty were reduced. At one time I had some little experience in keeping books for a jobber who handled threshing outfits, and I know that the freight and duty must always be paid in cash by the purchaser of the machine. He can get credit for the balance, but the freight and duty must be paid, and it is this initial payment that very often prevents a man from getting a threshing outfit. It would help very materially if this duty were reduced to the same level as the duty on mowing machines and binders. I am making this plea because I believe it would be a very material help to many of our farmers and help them to solve their threshing problems, which is one of the biggest problems on their hands to-day.

Mr. MacLEAN (Prince, P. E. I.): Regarding the question of threshing machines, I am not a high protectionist by any means, but speaking from an actual knowledge of the manufacturing concern in my own county I wish to make certain representations. The concern in question is the only one in the county shipping out of the province, and the only one in my town, and it manufactures threshing machines and ships them to western Canada. Now I know of my own knowledge that this concern is just carrying on and simply marking time; it is not able to pay a reasonable dividend to its shareholders. However, it is putting out an excellent machine which has been shipped to western Canada and, I believe, is well received by the people of that country. It is a small machine that farmers can buy and operate, but the great difficulty lies in the present freight rates which make the cost of the machine excessive, it is claimed, to the people of the West. While I have every sympathy with the westerners in their desire for a reduction in the duty on this item, I know from actual experience that this firm has not been able to pay large dividends to its stock holders, although it is putting out an excellent machine and trying to establish a connection with western Canada.

Mr. SPENCER: What make of machine is it?

Mr. MacLEAN (Prince, P. E. I.): It is put out by the Hall Manufacturing Company, of Summerside, P.E.I., and I would advise my hon. friends to get in touch with them.

Mr. MEIGHEN: My hon. friend has considerable sympathy with the principle of protection as applied to that industry.

Mr. MacLEAN (Prince, P.E.I.): I certainly have—a reasonable protection.

Mr. MEIGHEN: While I am on my feet let me say that I owe a correction to the hon. member for Saskatoon (Mr. Evans). I was under the impression that the duty on ploughs was as I stated—20 per cent. The duty was 20 per cent, but was subsequently reduced to 17½ per cent. But the war tax of 7½ per cent was on in 1917, so the total amounted to 27½ per cent. The war tax and 2½ per cent duty was taken off in June, 1919, leaving the rate 17½ per cent.

Item agreed to.

Customs tariff—Fruit or vegetable grading machines, incubators for hatching eggs, brooders for rearing young fowl, pruning hooks, pruning shears, hay loaders, potato-diggers, fodder or feed cutters, grain crushers, fanning mills, hay tedders, farm or field rollers, post hole diggers, snaths, and other agricultural implements, n.o.p., and complete parts of articles specified in this tariff item: British Preferential tariff, 10 per cent; Intermediate tariff, 15 per cent; General tariff, 15 per cent.

Mr. CALDWELL: I see here three articles that are used in haying, that is hay-tedders, hay-loaders and snaths—which latter is a part of the scythe that we operate by hand. I can hardly understand why these should carry a higher duty than the mower which cuts the hay. We have the hay-tedder and the hay-loader, but we do not use as many snaths as we formerly did. There is one article in the item that I want particularly to call the attention of the minister to. We on this side helped the Minister of Agriculture yesterday morning to get through the Committee on Agriculture a bill for the grading of vegetables. Now the new Grading Act will make it compulsory that farmers shall buy grading machinery. I think I am correct when I say that these grading machines are not made in Canada, but we have a number of them in New Brunswick at the present time; down there we are just a little ahead of the Minister of Agriculture's bill. We have been grading potatoes for some years in New Brunswick and we are very pleased to see this legislation providing for grading, and pleased to have it made compulsory. I would sincerely invite the assistance of the Minister of Agriculture in order that we may get those graders in free because when the new law passes it will be compulsory to have them. Under the new law, introduced by the Minister of Agriculture, we must grade our potatoes and we must have these machines in order to do so. They are not manufactured in Canada—I think I am correct in saying that—and therefore no hardship to any manufacturing firm in this country would be involved. I would ask that grading machines especially be put on the free list owing to the fact that by legislation this Parliament will compel us to use such machines.

Mr. FIELDING: There is a reduction of 5 per cent provided for here which is a substantial reduction; and I may mention incidentally, that while it is well to talk about the manufacturer, it is not a bad thing to think a little about the revenue.

[Mr. Meighen.]

Mr. CALDWELL: The minister will surely reduce this duty to the same amount as that on mowing machines and reapers?

Mr. FIELDING: There is a reduction of 5 per cent here, which is substantial. Mowing machines pay 12½ per cent.

Mr. CALDWELL: The duty was put too high in the first place, that was the trouble.

Mr. MEIGHEN: Are these machines made in Prince Edward Island, may I ask my hon. friend from Prince county?

Mr. MACLEAN (Prince, P.E.I.): Yes, I think we can supply some of these machines.

Item agreed to.

Customs tariff—Milking machines, milking machine attachments, centrifugal machines for testing butter fat, milk or cream, and complete parts of articles specified in this item: British Preferential tariff, 10 per cent; Intermediate tariff, 15 per cent; General tariff, 15 per cent.

Mr. HALBERT: Why is there a tax on milking machines when cream separators have no protection?

Mr. FIELDING: My hon. friend must not expect perfection in this tariff.

Item agreed to.

Customs tariff—Street or road rollers and complete parts thereof: British Preferential tariff, 12½ per cent; Intermediate tariff, 20 per cent; General tariff, 20 per cent.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: Is there any change there at all?

Mr. FIELDING: No change in the rate. It is for convenience in classification.

Item agreed to.

Customs tariff—Machinery for sawing lumber, up to but not including the point of planing, and complete parts thereof, not to include motive power: British Preferential tariff, 15 per cent; Intermediate tariff, 22½ per cent; General tariff, 25 per cent.

Mr. CALDWELL: Is there any reduction here?

Mr. FIELDING: The rates at present are 15, 25 and 27½ per cent. We are making them 15, 22½ and 25 per cent. There is a small reduction.

Mr. CALDWELL: Was not this one of the items that should be put on the free list according to the Liberal platform?

Mr. FIELDING: I do not remember.

Mr. CALDWELL: It is a long way from being free. I have the Liberal platform here if the minister would like to look at it?

Mr. FIELDING: I am not interested in that.

Mr. CALDWELL: I am sorry, Mr. Chairman, that the minister says he is not interested in the Liberal platform, I was in hopes that he was. I think the duty on sawmill machinery should be reduced. Surely 15 per cent, 22½ per cent, and 25 per cent are high duties. Such rates are a long way from being free. I am still not a very old man but I am afraid that at the rate at which we are going, I shall not live to see this machinery put on the free list, where the Liberal platform proposes to put it.

Mr. GRAHAM: This lumber is not lumber for the platform.

Mr. CALDWELL: A political platform should not be made out of lumber but out of good principles.

Mr. MEIGHEN: This one appears to be made out of blotting paper.

Item agreed to.

Customs tariff—Adzes, cleavers, hatchets, metal wedges, sledges, hammers, crowbars, cant-dogs and track tools, picks, mattocks, and eyes or poles for the same; tools of all kinds, n.o.p.; British Preferential tariff, 15 per cent; Intermediate tariff, 27½ per cent; General tariff, 30 per cent.

Mr. GOOD: What are the present rates?

Mr. FIELDING: The present rates are 20, 27 and 30 per cent. We are proposing 15, 27½ and 30 per cent. There is no change in the general rate but 5 per cent off the British preference.

Mr. GOOD: Will the minister not consider a further reduction in these duties? These are tools in general use and I think it would be highly advisable to cut at least 2½ per cent from the intermediate and general tariffs.

Mr. FIELDING: My American argument is the answer to that.

Item agreed to.

Customs tariff—Plungers or valves made of porcelain for pumps to be used exclusively in mining operations: British Preferential tariff, free; Intermediate tariff, free; General tariff, free.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: The minister, perhaps, can give figures as to the amount of the importations of these articles.

Mr. FIELDING: There is no separate classification. It is a class of pump used for certain mines which hitherto has not been classified.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: Has the minister no idea of the extent to which they are used?

Mr. FIELDING: They are not extensively used. They are used in certain mines where the water contains certain acids and where the ordinary pump would not stand the work. It is an advance, I believe, in mining machinery which has not been classified in the past.

Mr. CALDWELL: As a matter of fact, most of the plungers in these pumps are brass plungers; I think the large majority of them. Would the minister, therefore, not consider a reduction also in the brass plungers for these pumps?

Mr. FIELDING: This is an article not made in Canada and therefore the question of any home industry being affected does not enter at all.

Item agreed to.

Customs tariff—Window shade or blind rollers: British Preferential tariff, 20 per cent; Intermediate tariff, 30 per cent; General tariff, 35 per cent.

Mr. FIELDING: The present rates are, 22½, 20 and 35.

Item agreed to.

Customs tariff—Batts, batting and sheet wadding of wool, cotton or other fibre cotton warps and cotton yarns, dyed or not, n.o.p.: British Preferential tariff, 15 per cent; Intermediate tariff, 22½ per cent; General tariff 25 per cent.

Mr. FIELDING: The present rates are, 17½, 22½ and 25 per cent.

Customs tariff—Gray cotton fabrics and fabrics of flax, unbleached, n.o.p.: British Preferential tariff, 12½ per cent; Intermediate tariff, 22½ per cent; General tariff 25 per cent.

Mr. FIELDING: The present rates are, 15, 22½ and 25.

Mr. GOOD: I would like to ask the minister if these commodities are used in the manufacture of garments?

Mr. FIELDING: I would think so, probably.

Mr. CALDWELL: I think the minister has not forgotten the evidence given be-

fore the Cost of Living Committee a year or two ago, when, I believe, the firm which made these articles gave evidence that they had made a profit of 310 per cent on their capital invested. I think, in view of that, they might well stand a further reduction. Cottons in Canada are selling higher than they should; there is no question about that. If a firm manufacturing cotton could make 310 per cent profit, I think they could stand a further reduction.

Mr. FIELDING: But 12½ per cent is not a high rate on any class of cotton.

Mr. CALDWELL: But it runs to 25.

Mr. FIELDING: These are goods that come from Great Britain.

Item agreed to.

Customs tariff—White cotton fabrics, and fabrics of flax, bleached, n.o.p.; tailors' hollands of linen and towelling of linen or cotton in the web, coloured or not: British Preferential tariff, 15 per cent; Intermediate tariff, 22½ per cent; General tariff, 25 per cent.

Mr. FIELDING: 2½ off the British preference.

Item agreed to.

Customs tariff—Fabrics of cotton or flax, printed dyed or coloured n.o.p.: British preferential tariff, 22½ per cent; Intermediate tariff, 30 per cent; General tariff, 32½ per cent.

Mr. CALDWELL: Why should the duty on this be higher than on the other commodities?

Mr. FIELDING: The one is in the first stage of manufacture; the unbleached cotton would be used in further process of manufacture.

Mr. CALDWELL: I do not think that holds good, because the unbleached bears the same duty as the bleached which is a further process of manufacture. They are all too high. I think this one should be brought down to the level of the others.

Mr. FIELDING: There is a difference between the two classes.

Mr. GOOD: In regard to this item, it seems to me that the difference between the Preferential tariff of 22½ per cent and the Preferential tariff in the preceding item of 15, is a direct discrimination in favour of our Canadian manufacturers, at the expense of the Canadian consumer. I would like to see this item stand.

Mr. FIELDING: Yes, if the hon. member desires it, but the other item, which bears a lower duty, is the first process of manufacture, and this article is in a more advanced stage of manufacture, and, by the general practice, bears the higher rate of duty.

Mr. GOOD: I think that is the reason it should be reduced, because our Canadian manufacturers have been making unholy profits, and should not be protected, at the expense of the Canadian consumer.

Mr. FIELDING: There have been very large importations, and that is a consideration to be taken into account.

Item stands.

Customs tariff—Linen yarn, when imported by manufacturers of tailors' hollands of linen, for use exclusively in the manufacture of tailors' hollands of linen in their own factories: British Preferential tariff, free; Intermediate tariff, free; General tariff, free.

Mr. WALLACE: Is there a bounty paid on linen yarn manufactured in Canada?

Mr. ROBB: Yes, there is a small bounty paid under an act passed three years ago appropriating a sum for bounties. This is the last year of the bounty. The amount paid last year was very small. The amount appropriated was not earned.

Item agreed to.

Customs tariff—Blankets of any material: British Preferential tariff 22½ per cent, Intermediate tariff, 30 per cent; General tariff, 35 per cent.

Mr. SPENCER: I wish to protest against the high duty on blankets. In no place are blankets more extensively used than in western Canada. We have hardly a household out west that does not use them in quantities. Linen is very little used. Blankets are particularly used by workmen who go into the woods and other places. The poorest of our people need blankets, and I feel that blankets should be allowed to come in with the very lowest possible protection. Furthermore, the wool grown in Canada is being sold below cost by the producer. In view of that fact, why should the manufacturer have so much protection? Everybody is wondering why the sheep industry in this country is going down. Is it to be wondered at, when so little is paid the producer, and the article is so dear when it is manufactured into blankets?

Mr. FIELDING: We have brought these into one class, 22½ British preference, and these are articles which will come from Great Britain. The old rates were 22½, 25 and 30. There is a substantial reduction. Notwithstanding the high duties,

there are very large imports. The imports under the preference last year were $154,000 and under the general tariff $199,000; so that there is evidently competition and it is not a monopoly in the hands of any manufacturer.

Mr. GOOD: What is the reduction in the British preference in this item?

Mr. FIELDING: There were three items before. We have put them into one. The rate before was 22½, 25 and 30. We made it 22½.

Mr. GOOD: There is no reduction in the British preference in blankets?

Mr. FIELDING: Yes, some paid 30 and some paid 25; they are now 22½. There is a material reduction in that item.

Mr. GOULD: I must say I am very pleased with the manner in which the minister is accepting the suggestions from this corner. I wish to make another suggestion in that, supporting the sentiments of my hon. friend who spoke concerning the blankets which are absolutely necessary in our western country. In so far as the economic question is concerned, in the West at the present time, funds are not available in many instances. I know cases where people are unable to secure the necessary blankets to provide for comfort. I could give a concrete instance right close to my home, where a collector went to collect money for agricultural implements, and he was met at the door by a woman wearing only cotton, with a child in her arms wrapped up in old clothes. That is not necessarily an isolated case. But when we read that 22½ and 30 per cent protection is given to these industries to manufacture or sell blankets, it seems to me things are not based on equity, and I would plead for those people who really require blankets, and are unable to secure them on account of the prohibitive tariff, because it is really prohibitive to them. I would be glad if the minister would voluntarily submit to a substantial reduction. If not, will he allow the item to stand for further discussion.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: One remark made by an hon. member to my left has reference to a matter of great interest. He points out the extremely low price of wool, and the position of the wool producer in this country. It is to be expected, in so far as the lower processes of wool manufacture are concerned, because the policies of my hon. friends opposite have been absolutely put into effect. We are dependent entirely, in connection with the whole of our wool production, on the good graces of our friends to the south. We did not erect, as we should have, such plants as would enable us in Canada to take our raw wool, spin it, turn it into tops, and produce woollen goods for our own people. It is very good wool, although lots of people think it is not. However, I point out to members from the West, the reason why the price of wool is what it is to-day. There is no mystery about it. We had no home market, the manufacturer could not use the wool in its raw state. We had not the necessary plants for looking after the primary stages; we sold all our wool in the outside market, and, as a matter of fact, 95 per cent of our Canadian wool was sold in the Boston market. It cannot get there to-day.

Mr. CALDWELL: This is very interesting to me, because we have been told by our high protectionist friends that a high tariff would build up home industries. Yet, after having a duty as high as 35½ per cent on woollen goods for forty years, they admit that they have no factories in Canada that will manufacture wool into cloth. This is the most frank admission I have ever heard by my hon. friend to my right. If he is as candid as that in regard to all these items, he will admit that protection has not built up home industries in Canada as it was claimed it would, nor has it furnished the market. Some day when there is more time, I should like to analyze that home market.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: I am candid at all times.

Mr. CALDWELL: But misguided.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: I should like my hon. friend also to be candid. What is the duty on raw wool? What protection is there on your raw wool, on your wool tops or spun wool? There is none. If you had had it, the Canadian farmer to-day would have had a market for his wool; we could have said that there was some relation between the price of the raw material and that of the finished article, and if there was not a proper relation, we would have been in some position to enforce it.

Mr. WARNER: I should like to ask the hon. gentleman (Sir Henry Drayton) why our Canadian manufacturers do not buy our wool instead of letting it go to the other side of the line?

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: I think I have explained that; but if I may, I should like to explain it again. There is no protection for wool in the rough, for wool in the lower forms of manufacture. We have in this country no plant which takes that raw wool and puts it into such a condition that manufacturers of woollen goods can use it. There are different activities in wool. You have your cleaning, spinning and topping processes, all of which necessarily have to be gone through before the wool gets to your woollen manufacturer. That is not peculiar to Canada. You have all these different activities with regard to wool. In other words, the man who makes the cloth as we do in Canada, or the man who makes the blankets, is not the man who turns the wool from its original rough state into such an article as it is possible to manufacture blankets or cloth from.

Mr. EVANS: I should like to inform the hon. gentleman that last winter I saw a suit of clothes made of Canadian wool, and the whole thing was done in a small factory in Nova Scotia. While I am on my feet, I should like to urge the minister to reconsider this item, as I think there is an imposition in regard to this item if there ever was in any item of the tariff as it stands to-day. Blankets are articles used by the very poorest as well as by the rich. In fact, the poor need them more than the rich, and I would certainly put this item on the free list or, at least, cut it in half.

Mr. GOOD: I am sure the ex-Minister of Finance (Sir Henry Drayton) did not desire to misrepresent things; but I feel satisfied that there is now and has been in the recent past a very large manufacture in Canada of woollen goods from Canadian wool. I was in the warehouse of the Co-operative Wool Growers of Canada not very long ago, and I was shown many articles, yarns and woven articles of various kinds, which were stated to be made entirely out of Canadian wool in Canadian factories. If that is true, the statement just made by the ex-Minister of Finance is surely astray.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: It is perfectly true that, in some small instances and to a very small extent, you will find this, more so down in Nova Scotia than anywhere else. You have, in Nova Scotia, homespuns, while in Ontario the co-operative association has been trying to find a solution for the problem. It has not been a manufacturers' evil or a manufacturers' blight in Ontario; it has been the efforts of the farmers themselves, through their co-operative society, to try to do something with Canadian wool. In Nova Scotia, as I say, we have a cerain amount of business in which the wool is carried from its primary to its finished condition. We know it chiefly as homespun—Halifax homespun—a first class cloth, and that is made out of Canadian wool. But this is the old-fashioned way of making the cloth. This does not in any way compete with our regular manufacturers of woollens. As I say, we have been trying to find a way of utilizing our wool in Ontario, and we are getting some yarns out.

Mr. GOOD: Good cloth.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: Canadian wool is of first rate quality. Is that co-operative society going on now? What is it doing now? How much wool can it handle to-day and how much is it handling? This was tried, not only in Ontario, but in British Columbia, where a very excellent wool is grown from which you can get a warp 2½ inches long, which is as fine a bit of wool as you can get in Australia. Is this going on? It is not going on; and my hon. friends will find, if they look at the tariff, that there is no protection on these wools in their primary form. If you look at your tariff, you will see that all these wool tops come in free. The top wool that is imported free is wool in such a condition that it can be further manufactured into cloth. You will search in vain for any tariff upon the real wool which is used here; so the result is that our farmers' market was really an American market for Canadian wools. Our co-operative friends in Ontario put up a plant at Weston, and they managed to keep a little more money in Canada.

Mr. GOOD: That is only a warehouse, not a factory.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: No, it is not a factory. What they did was to collect wool, clean it and sort it with a view of getting better prices. I am speaking roughly from a recollection, which, I think, is correct, of a year and a half old, but 95 per cent of that wool was, as I say, sold on the Boston market. We require wool in Canada. There is no reason why we should be bringing wool in free and giving it to our manufacturers and having our output sent out of the country in that way.

As regards that particular item, I do not know why, but really the policies of my hon. friends to my left have been in effect. The farmer has no protection on his product, and the farmers' market to-day has entirely disappeared. While we are importing, as we should not be, large quantities of material from other countries, our wool is practically unsaleable, with the further result, as I have pointed out, that we have not what we ought to have, namely, something like a fair relation between the cost of the raw wool on the one side and that of the finished article on the other. Generally speaking, that wool cannot be sold in its native state; there is no market for it. On the other hand, the manufacturer here who could make use of these spinning, cleaning and topping mills, if they were installed and were running to capacity in this country, has to pay for the imported wool prices entirely out of proportion to the prices at which Canadian wool is sold.

Mr. CALDWELL: The remarks of my hon. friend (Sir Henry Drayton) in regard to wool and woollen goods are in keeping with what he has said in connection with manufactured goods. The condition to which he now draws attention existed last year and the year before, when he was in power. He apparently knew that this evil condition existed, yet he did not raise a finger to remedy it. However, that is not what I rose to speak about. I think that the duty on blankets should be reduced. I find in item 581a that silk cloth pays a duty of 10 per cent, under the British preferential tariff, while blankets must pay a duty of 22½ per cent. I can hardly see the justice of imposing a duty of 22½ per cent on blankets, which are an absolute necessity for poor people, while the duty on silk cloth is reduced to 10 per cent. If it were the other way about you would not find me making one kick, because those who can buy silk can afford to pay a duty on it. I agree with some hon. members who have already spoken, that blankets are not a luxury but an absolute necessity, and in comparison with the duty on silk, this duty on blankets is most unjust. I hope that the minister will reduce it. I am inclined to think that when he goes to church to-morrow and listens to a sermon on the brotherhood of man, and justice, and so forth, he will feel like amending this item.

Mr. FIELDING: On a large class of blankets there is a reduction of 7½ per cent, so that the reduction in the present item is very considerable indeed. The silk to which my hon. friend has referred in another item is raw material that is used in the manufacture of finished articles, and wherever you find any finished article you will see that the duties are quite high. But the duty on materials that go into the manufacture of finished goods is lower in most lines.

Mr. CALDWELL: Do I understand that this silk is raw material? Let me read a part of the item to which I have referred:

Silk cloth, woven in the gum, not boiled or bleached, measuring not less than 20 inches in width.

I should like to know what cocoon spun that web.

Mr. FIELDING: Are there not some more words in that item?

Mr. CALDWELL: Yes.

—when imported for the purpose of being dyed and finished in Canada, under regulations, etc.

Mr. FIELDING: It is in a sense raw material.

Mr. CALDWELL: I do not regard it as such. It is as far manufactured as blankets are. The blankets are manufactured out of plain wool, and this silk is woven out of the raw stuff. The blanket pays a duty of 22½ per cent, while the silk cloth, which, I contend, has gone through a process of manufacture just as complete as the blanket, is dutiable only at 10 per cent.

Mr. FIELDING: The blanket is a finished article.

Mr. GOULD: I do not think the argument of the ex-Minister of Finance (Sir Henry Drayton) will apply in this case. He says that we have not the initial industries in Canada and must therefore import the materials in a more or less finished state. How would the hon. gentleman apply that argument to hides? There are tanneries all over this country, and yet we find that whenever it is pointed out that the initial industries are already established, it is stated that we have not the particular kind of hide necessary for shoe manufacturing. Whatever arguments may be advanced, I know that as a matter of fact the consumer pays in the end.

At six o'clock the Speaker resumed the Chair, and the House took recess.

After Recess

The House resumed at eight o'clock.

PRIVATE BILL

SECOND READING

Bill No. 143 (from the Senate), for the relief of Frederick McClelland Aiken.—Mr. Macdonald (Pictou).

WAYS AND MEANS

THE TARIFF

The House again in Committee of Ways and Means, Mr. Gordon in the Chair.

Customs tariff—Blankets of any material: British Preferential tariff, 22½ per cent; Intermediate tariff, 30 per cent; General tariff, 35 per cent.

Mr. WARNER: It seems to me that after forty years of protection the manufacturer should be in a position to use our home-grown wool. As the ex-Minister of Finance (Sir Henry Drayton) has pointed out, very little of our wool is prepared here to be used by the manufacturer in Canada, though our wool is of good quality. It strikes me that if we reduced the tariff on blankets the situation would be very materially changed. I suggest that in view of past experiences the minister consider the advisability of letting blankets, manufactured in the United States out of wool produced in this country, come into Canada without the payment of the amount of duty now imposed. The manufacturer now is given a double advantage. As he can import wool free of duty, he is not obliged to prepare our wool for manufacture. And, as he has a high protection on blankets, he can be sure of this market for his goods. If the duty on blankets were reduced, he would be more likely to prepare and use Canadian wool, and, with reasonable duties on blankets, he could carry on his manufacture without danger of being undersold by his foreign competitor. The grower of wool is not fairly treated when he produces the raw material for the manufacture of a commodity so necessary in this country and then is obliged to pay for the finished article, blankets, a price which is largely enhanced by the tariff.

Mr. SPENCER: The blanket is the poor man's necessity; it is not an article used only by the rich. Next to food, the blanket is an article of prime necessity, in the country as well as in the city. We shall be bringing into this country quite a number of immigrants within the next few years, and the least we can do for them is to enable them to get their blankets at as reasonable a price as possible. I have seen the conditions under which thousands of immigrants live, and there is no question that blankets are to them a matter of pure necessity. When winter comes in the western country, the question of securing a sufficient supply of warm blankets to keep the children warm is second in importance only to the obtaining of enough nourishing food. I suggest, therefore, that the minister reduce the British preferential tariff on blankets to 15 per cent.

Mr. CAMPBELL: If any further evidence were necessary to prove that this budget is based on the principle of protection, not on the principle of revenue, a comparison of this item with No. 447a, which refers to tractors, would supply it. Tractors are put on the free list. A few days ago, speaking on the budget, I suggested that if it were necessary to produce revenue on these items the minister should impose a small duty on the tractor and reduce by a corresponding amount the duty on cotton and woollen clothing, something which is more necessary than the tractor. After all, the tractor is used only by farmers who are, perhaps, a little better off than others, whereas cotton and woollen clothing is needed by people of all occupations, regardless of their station in life. I hope the minister can see his way clear to take some action along that line.

Mr. WOODSWORTH: It is not my purpose to argue this point; I do not wish to speak on each of these items as they come up. But I should like to say that I have come here instructed to urge that taxes should be taken off the necessities of life. That is about all I can say in the matter. I urge upon the minister that point of view.

Mr. SUTHERLAND: I endeavour to appreciate the difficulties that confront the Minister of Finance in devising a tariff to meet the requirements of the country under present conditions. The tariff is a very complex piece of machinery, and the minister and the Government must of necessity be guided by the conditions that confront them.

With respect to this particular item, the raw material, wool, is mostly brought into Canada duty free. We have an immense area in this country, a large part of which is rough and not under a very high state of cultivation, and I would think that the

wool-growing industry would be one that could be carried on without very much difficulty. The duty on the manufactured article should allow the home manufacturer to turn the raw material into the finished product and be able to compete, but at the present time we are confronted with very disturbed conditions. A few years ago, and particularly during the war, sheep raising was a very profitable industry. Immediately after the war, as was pointed out by the hon. member for West York (Sir Henry Drayton), the market for our wool was largely found in the United States. Boston was the chief wool market for the North American continent. We have now been practically excluded from that market, and consequently during the past two or three years the price of wool has fallen very low indeed. In fact, at one time last year I do not believe that more than six cents per pound could be realized for coarse wool. These wools are well adapted for blankets and many articles of clothing. We hear a great deal about developing home industries, but it is significant that the people who are inclined to favour the development of home industries on all occasions are not so keen to support them themselves. I could not help wondering as I left the Chamber at six o'clock, how many of the members I encountered in the corridors, and who advocated the development of home industries, really patronized those home industries, and were wearing Canadian-made woollens, for instance. A few years ago the coarse long wools were the fashion. Scotch tweeds were regarded as the most expensive and most desirable garments, but fashions have changed, and people have developed more extravagant habits, and now instead of patronizing home industries, and wearing Canadian tweeds, they turn up their nose at it, and will wear nothing but the finest worsteds. Consequently, I believe we ourselves are to a great extent to blame for the conditions that confront the woollen industry in this country to-day. One would naturally think that with the tariff we have on blankets, which is fairly substantial, and with wool selling at the low price it has been for the past two years, there would be many people engaged in the manufacture of woollens, but that is not the case, and it is to some extent because of the uncertainty that prevails, not knowing what may develop at any time.

As I have already pointed out, our market was largely in the United States. We found ourselves suddenly shut out of that market, and consequently the farmers in this country to-day are going out of the raising of sheep. Rather than suffer a loss in raising mutton and wool, they are simply quitting the business and turning to something else. They often get going at a fairly good stride in some line that they take up when disturbing conditions arise. All this goes to show the need of having a substantial national policy with due regard for the conditions with which we are surrounded. You cannot afford to jeopardize our industries just for the sake of gratifying the desires of a small section of the community. The older I get the more firmly convinced I am that we must broaden out in our views and get rid of the selfish idea of gratifying our own personal ambitions or desires, regardless of the general effect it is going to have on the country as a whole. I have before me the United States tariff, and it is practically prohibitive to-day against wool imports. I also notice that the new bill now before the United States Senate proposed a tariff of 35 cents a pound on wool entering that country. These are conditions we have to deal with, and which the minister must take into consideration in framing the tariff.

Our tariff is not a scientific one and I am thoroughly convinced that we should have a commission in the Finance Department which would keep in touch with the conditions that prevail and draft a tariff which would meet our present requirements and develop home industries as much as possible. It is not much use to spend a little time now and again revising the tariff. It is impossible for any one looking at the tariff only from his own standpoint to realize the bearing it may have on other industries and the country as a whole. This particular industry that we are considering should be safeguarded. Some one will say, Oh, look at the poor people. What is going to happen if you have a tariff of so much on blankets? I ask, Mr. Chairman, what is the matter with our people in Canada if they cannot manufacture blankets? Surely it is a simple process, and surely there is enough enterprise in this country to devlop such an industry. I think myself we ought to be fairly generous in our views, not only with regard to manufacturers, but with regard to the producers and the workers of this country. Our interests are so interwoven that one cannot suffer without the other suffering as well. I am not one of

those who believe that if we have a reasonable tariff in this country, the manufacturers will exact the last cent of protection in profits from the people. Is there no competition among the manufacturers in our own country? It is this disturbing element of trying to adapt ourselves to changed conditions in other countries that is the worst feature of our present tariff system, as I see it. It does not matter how much we might approve of and advocate free trade in this country; it is an absolute impossibility. You cannot have free trade unless people will trade with you. If they are going to exclude us from their markets, are we going to allow them to dispose of their surplus products in our market and jeopardize our home industries? We ought to look at this question in a more sane manner than we have been inclined to do in the past. I have been surprised to find in this House representatives who claim to be farmers advocating the abolition of the tariff on all articles so that we can get them cheap. It may be that a cheap country is a good country to live in, but the standard of living in this country is undoubtedly as high as anywhere else in the world. It is therefore very important that every class in the community should be safeguarded from outside competition as thoroughly as it is possible to do. We cannot afford to have class antagonism.

Some hon. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

Mr. SUTHERLAND: I am glad hon. gentlemen appreciate that fact. It would be one of the most unfortunate things that could happen in this country for one class of the community to lose sight of the interest of the other classes. If you will study thoroughly the statistics of the trade and commerce of Canada you will find that many products natural to our country are being imported from foreign countries where labour is cheap. These products are being imported into Canada to-day, and that is largely responsible for the condition which now prevails on the farms of this country. Canadian farmers require protection just as much as any other class of the community, and when we reach that stage—

Mr. WARNER: Does the hon. member consider that the condition now existing in this country would have been worse than it is if we had had less protection or free trade?

[Mr. Sutherland.]

Mr. SUTHERLAND: I have been working over the records and I notice that the duty on agricultural implements is very much less than it would have been had the Reciprocity pact of 1911 gone into effect.

Mr. WARNER: Mr. Chairman, I claim that my question has not been answered.

The CHAIRMAN: Order. The hon. member is not required to answer questions unless he feels so inclined.

Mr. CALDWELL: Is it not a fact that the Reciprocity agreement did not apply to agricultural implements at all?

Mr. SUTHERLAND: That is where my hon. friend is wrong. It certainly did apply to agricultural implements, and in every instance the duty under it would have been much higher than it is to-day—very much higher; also the duty on cement, in which my hon. friend from (Victoria and Carleton, N.B.) is very much interested would have been higher under the reciprocity pact than it is to-day, and the same with the duties on many other articles. However I am getting away from the item before the committee. I want to give the Minister of Finance a little encouragement if I possibly can, and to assure him that he need not be stampeded by the criticisms that are directed at him. I consider that he has a very difficult course to pursue under present conditions.

An hon. MEMBER: You did not support his budget though.

Mr. SUTHERLAND: If the Finance Minister had carried out the views I am expressing to-day more fully I am inclined to think I would have supported his budget. The trouble with that budget is that it does not protect something which, in my opinion, should be protected. I am perfectly convinced that a much better condition of affairs will prevail in this country when we have a little more confidence in each other and adopt a less suspicious attitude one toward the other If we are going to overcome our difficulties—because we have difficulties to surmount and they are very difficult indeed—we will have to work as a united people towards a common goal.

Some hon. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

Mr. SUTHERLAND: This is not a light matter by any means, and those who have anything at stake in Canada must regard the present situation as very seri-

ous. We should do everything that lies in our power to encourage manufacturing in our own country. We should produce everything that this country is capable of producing and we should encourage, as much as we possibly can the development of the wonderful resources which we possess. I hope that that will be the view which the government will take in regard to this matter. I want to see a broad, stable, national policy adopted in Canada, one that will permit of the utilization of the raw materials that we have in such abundance, and will enable us to turn out the finished article. When we reach that stage we do not need to fear for the future. This idea that we must change our whole fiscal policy because some country adjacent to us changes its policy is an erroneous one. I think it will be found ere long that changes will take place in the tariff policy of the adjoining republic and if we are to follow every change which they may resolve upon it will mean interruptions to our trade in other directions which we may have been promoting. The industry which is affected by the present duty is one which has been placed in such jeopardy that the Canadian flocks have been slaughtered and disposed of by the tens of thousands, whereas under ordinary conditions those flocks ought to contribute much to a very profitable branch of the agricultural industry. As it is the prospects are brightening and the price of wool is more than double what it was this time last year. The chief trouble in the matter of wool was the tremendous quantities which were purchased by the British government during the war. This resulted in the accumulation of great quantities, which were subsequently placed on the market. That surplus has now been pretty well absorbed but it is, to my mind, a most unfortunate thing that there is practically no duty at the present time on wool entering Canada. I have studied this situation and I know that in the woollen mills to which I have had access it was practically all Australian wool which has been used. Now I know that our coarse Canadian wools are not adapted for underclothing and similar garments, but for blankets, tweeds, and other articles our long Canadian wools are of just as good quality, as much that is being imported to clothe our people. We ought to encourage our home industries, and I think the Minister of Finance is wise in leaving a reasonable tariff on these articles in order to permit of their being manufactured in Canada. I am satisfied that when it is realized that the tariff on these goods is not going to be abolished they will be manufactured to a much greater extent in this country than is the case at present.

Mr. McBRIDE: I would like to say a few words in connection with this item. I have already stated in this House that I was not a free trader—I never have been and never will be—but I must say that I would like it if the Finance Minister could see his way to cut the duty on these articles by at least one-half. In the tariff platforms to which I have given my adhesion I have been associated with some good Liberals, and some good Conservatives too, and I think without exception we all agreed that the Canadian duties on clothing ought to come down. Clothing is something that is of paramount importance in this country. There are few countries in the world where the people need more clothing than do the people of Canada by reason of the cold climate. I would not suggest that we should remove the duty entirely. For example I would not abolish the tariff on high class clothing, but tweeds, blankets and other articles used by the working people should be allowed to come into this country at a very low rate of duty. These articles are vitally necessary and the people must have them. I repeat that I do not wish to see the duty removed entirely, but I do think that in the present instance it should at least be cut in half.

Mr. BRETHEN: I would like to offer my protest against the adoption of this item as it stands at present. Blankets, flannels, wearing apparel and underclothing contribute not only to the comfort but to the actual welfare of practically every man, woman and child in Canada, and in taking the stand that I do I am actuated by a belief in the motto "The greatest good to the greatest number." I believe there are some members on this side of the House who raised no objection to the budget when it was brought down because they believed that full opportunity would be afforded for discussion and criticism when we came to consider the tariff items in committee. I think the time has now arrived when we should subject some of those items to attack.

I think, possibly, many items have been passed, and we have allowed them to go through rather smoothly, accepting the argument of the Minister of Finance (Mr. Fielding), but I think we are perfectly justified in opposing these two items, and I would like to move, as to this particular item, that the British preferential tariff be

reduced to 15 per cent, the intermediate tariff to 20 per cent, and the general tariff to 25 per cent.

Mr. FIELDING: May I ask my hon. friend not to press the amendment. I have already intimated, both generally, and with reference to this particular item, before recess, that if any hon. member desires an item to be held over till the next sitting, I am quite agreeable. I would not like the hon. member to press his amendment, because I desire an opportunity of considering it. However, I would be glad to have the debate proceed, and, at the conclusion of the debate, the matter may stand for further consideration. I have no desire to press the items through.

Mr. BRETHEN: I will withdraw the amendment, and allow the item to stand, for the consideration of the Prime Minister and the House.

Mr. FIELDING: If the hon. member wishes to continue the discussion, I have no desire to stop it.

Mr. SHAW: I wanted to ask one question, because I think, perhaps, it might assist some of us in coming to a conclusion. What class of blankets are contained in the three separate classifications the hon. minister referred to, and what is the amount of the tariff on each particular classification?

Mr. FIELDING: There were three classes of blankets before. One is called pure wool. Practically speaking, there is very little now imported. There is hardly such a thing to be found in merchandise as pure wool. The blanket most commonly used in Canada is a mixture. It comes in under "Blankets not otherwise provided for." The duty on the pure wool is 22½, 30 and 35 per cent, practically the same rate we now propose, but those are used by a limited number of people. On blankets "not otherwise provided for," the duty is 30, 30 and 35 per cent. That is the largest class of blankets used by the Canadian people. Then we have Canadian blankets at 25, 30 and 35 per cent. The main item is 566 in the old tariff. "Blankets not otherwise provided for." The rate was 30 per cent, and it is being reduced to 22½ per cent.

Mr. MILLAR: As the hon. minister has been kind enough to agree that the item should stand over, I will say only a few words. I was pleased to hear the remarks of the hon. member for South Oxford (Mr. Sutherland). It seems to me that, after forty years of protection, the light is beginning to dawn on some of our friends to the right. They begin to talk about each industry giving reasonable consideration to other industries. I am afraid that, in the past, there has not been enough of that. The trouble at the present time seems to be that various industries have been striving to get all they could, without thought of the other. I am afraid too much of that is going on at the present time, and I will cite one case. A couple of days ago I received a letter from a friend in the constituency which I have the honour to represent, and though I have not the letter to hand, I remember the effect of it. It read like this:

> The banks, in order to get around the Bank Act, are discounting notes.

Further on he said:

> I know of a case in the town of — where the bank is charging a farmer 9 per cent interest, and compelling him to pay interest in advance on the first of every month.

I just cite that case to show that the burden we are carrying, because various industries have been taking too much, has not disappeared. I was talking to the head of one of the loan companies about a year ago, and he said, "Some of the loan companies are now charging 9 per cent interest. Can agriculture possibly stand that rate?" I said, "It certainly cannot." Yet, they are charging that rate now. Now, in our present condition, if the fact that manufacturers and other industries are losing money—as I believe they are—has brought us to a state of affairs where we can stop, have a heart to heart talk amongst ourselves, gain sympathy and consideration for other industries and try to reach an adjustment, so that no industry will continue to suffer, I think we will have made some headway. I realize the difficult position in which the Finance Minister is placed; if we decide to cut down the rate on any item as a result of which he is going to lose money, we must be ready to offer some substitute, or else our national debt will increase. When we are faced with that proposition and asked "Where are you going to get an equal amount of money from some other source?" it is difficult to answer. Therefore, I am quite considerate of the Finance Minister's attitude. I agree practically with all that has been said about the great need of the poorer classes, and I would, with as much courtesy as I can, urge the Finance Minister, if he could see

his way clear, to reduce the duty on woollen goods, especially considering that it would hurt no industry, because, I understand, from remarks that were made before six o'clock, wool is not being manufactured here. Therefore, it cannot be urged that industry is being injured to any extent. I hope, now the matter has been allowed to stand over, that he will be able to reduce the duty on woollen goods. I do not think it is wise that we should attack item after item, but there are some items—and this is one of them—in regard to which we should ask the Finance Minister to do his very utmost to reduce the duty.

Item stands.

Customs tariff—Flannels, plain, not fancy: fabrics of wool or of cotton and wool, commonly described and sold as lustres, mohair, alpaca, and Italian linings: British Preferential tariff, 20 per cent; Intermediate tariff, 30 per cent; General tariff, 35 per cent.

Mr. GOULD: It seems to me that the next three items, 566, 567 and 568, would precipitate a debate similar to the one that has just taken place on item 565, and as the minister has consented to allow 565 to stand, I suggest that the three following items be allowed to stand.

Mr. FIELDING: They are very much of the same class, and the same objections might be raised to them. Therefore, I will allow them to stand.

Items stand.

Customs tariff—Silk cloth woven in the gum, not boiled or bleached, measuring not less than twenty inches in width, when imported for the purpose of being dyed and finished in Canada, under regulations prescribed by the Minister of Customs and Excise: British Preferential tariff, 10 per cent; Intermediate tariff 17½ per cent; General tariff 30 per cent.

Mr. CALDWELL: When one of the other items was under consideration before recess, I referred to the fact that on silk cloth woven the duty was only 10 per cent. The Minister of Finance (Mr. Fielding) called attention to the fact that the item which we were considering then, blankets, was a finished article. On looking over some of the others that we have passed, I find white cotton fabrics, woven the same as the silk fabrics are, with a duty of 15 per cent. This includes towelling of linen or cotton in the web, coloured or not. I cannot help thinking there has been a discrimination in favour of the very poor people who wear all silk clothing! I would like to see if the thing could not be balanced by something more being put on the silk and something taken off the cotton.

Mr. FIELDING: Wherever there is a lower duty on silk, it is silk in an initial process of manufacture, which silk is the raw material for the next stage. Wherever you get the finished article of silk, I am sure you will find the duty is a high one.

Item agreed to.

Customs tariff—Boots and shoes, pegged or wire fastened, with unstitched soles, close edged: British Preferential tariff, 15 per cent; Intermediate tariff, 22½ per cent; General tariff, 25 per cent.

Boots, shoes, slippers and insoles of any material, n.o.p.: British Preferential tariff, 17½ per cent; Intermediate tariff, 27½ per cent; General tariff, 30 per cent.

Mr. SHAW: I would suggest that items 611 and 611a be left over for further consideration.

Mr. FIELDING: All right.

Item stands.

Customs tariff—Harness and saddlery, including horseboots: British Preferential tariff, 17½ per cent; Intermediate tariff, 27½ per cent; General tariff, 30 per cent.

Mr. CALDWELL: If there is in this tariff list one item that should be reduced, it is this one. Last summer I was in a harness shop and a farmer brought in a cowhide to sell it. The cowhide was weighed and the farmer said: "I want a hame-strap now, and I will take the balance in change." The harness maker said: "You will owe me 25 cents in change." The farmer got one cent a pound for a cowhide that weighed fifty pounds, and he had to pay that harness maker 25 cents in money besides the cowhide, to get the hame-strap. In that case, I do not understand why a duty of this kind should be on harness. I am very much interested in what the hon. member for South Oxford (Mr. Sutherland) said about one industry considering another. There is no comparison between the price of hides and the present price of harness, and I know, when the minister looks into this matter and especially if he gets the information that he can get with regard to these things, he will certainly reduce the duty on harness.

Mr. FIELDING: The duty is 17½ per cent under the British preferential tariff, and surely, as things go now, that is not an extravagant rate of duty on anything.

Mr. CALDWELL: Yes, but it must be taken into consideration that it will take

about twenty cowhides to pay the duty on one set of harness.

Mr. FIELDING: The hon. member must have more cows.

Mr. CALDWELL: The minister realizes that we must increase our stock. This item ought to stand over with the items respecting boots and shoes.

Mr. EVANS: The ex-Minister of Finance (Sir Henry Drayton) said that raw wool cannot be prepared in Canada for manufacture. I am just wondering what is the matter with our hides.

Some hon. MEMBERS: Oh, oh.

Mr. EVANS: I was speaking of beef hides. This is a raw product that we cannot get off our hands at the present time. Last year during the months of June and July, some 8,000,000 pounds of hides were imported into this country at a time when farmers from one end of the Dominion to the other could not sell a hide at any price. I am asking what is the matter, and I am going to make a straight charge that there is discrimination in trade. There is no other explanation possible for me than direct discrimination in trade on the part of the manufacturers of this country. Everyone who had a beef hide or everyone who happened to kill a steer out West could not get rid of his hide, and at the same time, last June and July, I find that some 8,000,000 pounds of hides came in at prices that would have been very profitable to us. The price was ten cents per pound for cattle hides, 15½ cents for calfskins, and 15½ cents for sheepskins. Some hundreds of thousands of pounds of other skins were imported. What is the matter? I was very much interested a few days ago in listening to the Minister of Finance (Mr. Fielding) reading from one of his old speeches in which he recognized that, as far back as 1911, there was great unrest amongst the agriculturist classes in this country, particularly in western Canada. I can assure the minister to-day that the unrest then was nothing compared with what it is now, and some means will have to be found whereby our raw products can be worked up into the finished article. For forty years now we have paid many millions of dollars in protection, drawbacks and so on for the sake of building up industries in this country; yet, we find that one of the primary industries to work up one of the most common raw materials that we have is not available. This is a most preposterous state of affairs. If any evidence was ever needed more than what we have at present to show that protection is a fallacy, we find it right here. The hon. member for South Oxford spoke about the question of class privilege. We as a class have had no protection. We as a class are asking for no protection. Some hon. members seem to smile at that; but to let them know the difference, I will just point out that, did we have a protective tariff on our products, say the chief one that we are raising, namely wheat, which tariff would give us the privilege of charging the home consumer a price that would give us something that could be called a profit and of exporting at a cheaper rate, then the hon. member would know that there was some class privilege. We are the class which, along with other producers of the new wealth of the country each year, has had to bear the whole burden of protection.

Mr. STEVENS: My hon. friend said a large quantity of hides were imported last year. I have just turned up the tariff, and hides are free. Surely protection is not, therefore, responsible for the low price of hides in Canada. Does my hon. friend not consider that if we had, for instance, a duty on hides, that might have assisted the farmer in the sale of his stock during the past year in competition with this foreign importation? My second question is this: Surely, he does not mean to say that buyers of hides in Canada brought hides in from some place else and paid more for them than hides were selling at in Canada?

Mr. EVANS: They did. My hon. friend's question only emphasizes what I have said. It is a fact that cattle hides were brought into this country at a price of ten cents a pound, while farmers in the West would have been glad to have got that price and would have paid freight on the hides to their destination. It can be accounted for in no other way than a direct discrimination in trade. The hon. member for South Oxford (Mr. Sutherland) says that a cheap living country may be good to live in. He does not quite know that, but he thinks it may. The fact is—and I want hon. gentlemen to take notice of this—that the cost of production of articles which bring in the income of this country year after year, is out of proportion altogether to world prices, to the great detriment of Canada to-day. I repeat that if further evidence is needed that protection is one of the greatest fallacies that have ever been

foisted on the people, that evidence is to be found in connection with the importation of raw material.

Mr. SUTHERLAND: I hope the hon. member did not misunderstand me. I certainly did not say that a country where living conditions were of a low standard was a desirable place to live in. I pointed out that the standard of living in this country was very high, and that only when the standard of living was high could you expect high wages to be paid; while, on the other hand, where living was very cheap everything else was cheap in proportion and the people did not attain the position which we have reached. The hon. member evidently misunderstood what I said.

Mr. GOULD: I was wondering whether all the tariff for revenue Liberals had gone home to-night, because we have not been getting many expressions of opinion from that section of the House. In connection with the saddlery business considerable quantities of leather are procured from horse hides. Some hon. gentlemen have deprecated the fact that we have been able to receive hardly anything for our cow hides, or at least not sufficient to pay the freight; and it is well known that horse hides are cheaper still. Yet from horse hides is made the leather that enters largely into the manufacture of saddles and other articles of a similar kind. These hides are worth less than nothing, because it takes labour to produce them, and yet if you go into the stores you have to pay for the leather made from those hides, when manufactured into laces, $3 a pound, or 35 cents a string. This only emphasizes what the member for Qu'Appelle (Mr. Millar) says, that there is something wrong. There certainly is a discrimination, and whether it is attributable to the tariff entirely, or to other things in part, we want to find out. The whole thing will bear a real investigation. I might say incidentally that those of us who undertake every spring to renew our harness supplies on the farm find it cheaper to buy these supplies at sales from farmers who have failed in their business. That is how the greater part of harness supplies is bought to-day.

Mr. CALDWELL: Would the minister consider holding this item along with the item on boots and shoes?

Mr. FIELDING: If you press the request I will, but all we have done is to reduce the British rate 2½ per cent, making the net result 17½ per cent. Even from the point of view of my hon. friend opposite that is not a high duty, and I do not think there should be any objection to it.

Mr. SUTHERLAND: With reference to the question just brought up by my hon. friend (Mr. Gould), we all know that the price of hides has been very low during the past few years. But there is a difference in the quality of hides as in everything else, and the fact that there was no duty on hides coming into Canada has enabled the manufacturers of leathers to purchase hides at a cheap rate in other countries. And the hides they get abroad are on the whole of a much better quality than the great bulk of hides that are offered for sales in Canada. Animals that are not in a highly finished condition when they go on the market do not make as good leather as do highly finished animals. Immense quantities of hides have been shipped from South America and the United States, and these imports have tended to demoralise our home market. This is another evidence of the need of protection for the farmers of this country as well as for every other class.

Mr. McBRIDE: How does my hon. friend make out that we have not as good cattle here as anywhere else?

Mr. SUTHERLAND: The hon. gentleman has asked a very pertinent question. If the embargo on our cattle in England keeps up we shall probably have as good cattle as can be found in any other country. Unfortunately the majority of our cattle go on the market before they are ready to be slaughtered. There is no doubt about that.

Item agreed to.

Customs tariff—Hatters' bands (not cords) and hat sweats; hatters' tips and sides when cut to shape; and cashmere when cut to shape for under-brims and hat covers.

All articles in this item when imported by hat and cap manufacturers for use exclusively in the manufacture of hats and caps in their own factories: British Preferential tariff, free; Intermediate tariff, free; General tariff, free.

Mr. GOOD: What are the rates of duty on hats?

Mr. CALDWELL: And caps?

Mr. FIELDING: The rates are 22½ per cent preference and 35 per cent general. This particular item is already free in the tariff schedules, but the wording of the item has been changed because it

has been found that the language of the item as at present framed allows of some abuse. The item is really free. In another section, instead of declaring it to be free we let it come in under the ordin-
9 p.m. ary duty and provide for a drawback. Where an article is allowed to come in for a particular purpose at a lower rate it needs to be carefully watched so that there may be no abuses, and in some cases we levy the duty and give the drawback, because we can control it better that way.

Mr. CALDWELL: We have at last located the free traders in this country; they are evidently the manufacturers. These men decry the demand of the consumers for lower duties, but they get their raw material free just the same. I am glad to be able to locate these free traders. We have been chasing them all over the globe during the recent election and at last we have run them down.

Mr. FIELDING: Where do you find them?

Mr. CALDWELL: They are the manufacturers. They get their raw material free and then soak us 35 per cent on the finished product. And then they howl about free trade.

Item agreed to.

Customs tariff—Clothes wringers for domestic use, and parts thereof: British Preferential tariff, 20 per cent; Intermediate tariff, 30 per cent; General tariff, 32½ per cent.

Mr. GOULD: This is an item that might well be considered, particularly in the interests of people in the rural districts who are not in a position to send their clothes to laundries. This article enters into the everyday work of women, and while the duty upon clothes wringers will no doubt bring in considerable revenue, at the same time I think we should make them as cheap as possible.

Mr. FIELDING: There is a reduction both under the general and under the preferential tariff of 2½ per cent.

Item agreed to.

Customs tariff:

Customs tariff—Fish hooks, for deep sea or lake fishing, not smaller in size than number 2.0; bank, cod, pollock and mackerel fish lines; and mackerel, herring, salmon, seal, seine, mullet, net and trawl twine in hanks or coil, barked or not,—in variety of sizes and threads, —including gilling thread in balls, and head ropes for fishing nets; barked marline, and net

norsels of cotton, hemp, or flax; and fishing nets or seines, and manila rope, not exceeding one and one-half inches in circumference, when used exclusively for the fisheries, not to include hooks, lines, nets or rope commonly used for sportsmen's purposes: British Preferential tariff, free; Intermediate tariff, free; General tariff, free.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: Most of the articles in this item are already free, are they not?

Mr. FIELDING: Yes, nearly all.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: Except manila rope, which before was limited to use in connection with lobster fishing.

Mr. FIELDING: Yes; the item is not changed.

Mr. GARDINER: The various articles under this item are free, while other things in the tariff that are just as essential to the production of wealth from natural resources are dutiable. Why the distinction?

Mr. FIELDING: There always have been such distinctions in the tariff. It is a matter of proceeding on the principle of "tempering the wind to the shorn lamb."

Item agreed to.

Customs tariff—Settlers' effects viz:—machines, vehicles and implements for agricultural purposes, moved by mechanical power, and motor vehicles, valued at not more than one thousand dollars, and boats for fishing purposes if actually owned abroad by the settler for at least six months before his removal to Canada, and subject to regulations prescribed by the Minister of Customs and Excise. Provided that the said machines, vehicles, implements and boats may not be so entered unless brought by the settler on his first arrival, and shall not be sold or otherwise disposed of without payment of duty until after twelve months' actual use in Canada: British Preferential tariff, free; Intermediate tariff, free; General tariff, free.

Mr. CALDWELL: I have carefully gone over these items with a view to seeing whether there was included in them as placed on the free list an item mentioned in the Liberal tariff platform, which I have studied very closely in recent years, owing to the fact that it was so frequently compared with our own. Under that platform fertilizers were to be placed on the free list; they are not mentioned at all in these tariff reductions. Speaking on the budget, I pointed out that during the last six years we had collected only a little over $50,000 from the duty on fertilizers, while the manufacturers in this country had charged to the consumer some $3,800,000 extra on account of the duty. There would, therefore, be very little loss of revenue if we

put fertilizer on the free list. At any rate, I urge on the minister that he cut the present duty in two, because very little mixed fertilizer comes into Canada to-day. With the exception of acid phosphate the materials entering into the manufacture of fertilizers are free. I would like to see acid phosphate put on the free list, and the duty on mixed fertilizers reduced from 10 to 5 per cent. There would be little loss of revenue on this account either; we collected less than $90,000 a year during the last six years, but we have paid to the manufacturers or mixers over half a million dollars per year on the material they brought in free. They are able to charge us this year $9 more than is paid by the farmers in Maine for the same product. Last year the difference was $15.

The CHAIRMAN: I would point out that the hon. member is not discussing the item which is before the committeee. He may put a question to the minister, but he may not enter into a discussion of the matter.

Mr. FIELDING: If we put fertilizer on the free list, that commodity would come entirely from the United States. We do not think it wise, for the present, to make numerous reductions in the tariff as against the United States. That is my answer to my hon. friend. We have already exempted fertilizers from the sales tax. There are many items on which the duties are rather higher as against the United States than I personally would like to have them, but I do not think this is the right time to reduce them.

Item agreed to.

Resolved, That schedule B to The Customs Tariff, 1907, as amended by chapter forty-seven of the statutes of 1919, be amended by striking thereout tariff item 1026, the enumeration of goods and the rate of drawback of customs duties set opposite to the said item, and to provide that the following items, enumerations and rates of drawback of customs duties be inserted in said schedule B:

The CHAIRMAN: I take it that the committee desires to consider this resolution item by item.

Customs tariff—Resolution No. 3—materials, including all parts not finished, subject to drawback when used in the manufacture of goods enumerated in tariff items 446, 446b, 447b, 448 and 448a—portion of duty (not including special duty or dumping duty) payable as drawback, 40 per cent.

Mr. FIELDING: In this case there was a drawback before of 30 per cent. In view of the reduction on agricultural implements, we have increased the drawback to 40 per cent.

Item agreed to.

Hatters' plush of silk or cotton and hatters' bindings, subject to drawback when imported by hat and cap manufacturers and used in the manufacture of hats and caps in their own factories—portion of duty (not including special duty or dumping duty) payable as drawback, 99 per cent.

Mr. HALBERT: Under another item which has been passed, supplies for hatters are free of duty. I understand from this item that the hat manufacturers pay duty on some of the articles that go into the hats; they get a drawback of 99 per cent, and we pay a tax to the extent of 35 per cent on hats. I do not think there is anything fair about that.

Mr. FIELDING: They do not get it on all material; it is on certain specified articles. They were free before, but we find that there is danger of abuse when the article is free for a specific purpose; it is better that they should pay duty and get a drawback, when they have proved their claim, of 99 per cent.

Mr. HALBERT: Does the one per cent represent the cost of collecting the duty and paying the drawback?

Mr. FIELDING: That is the general rule applied in such cases.

Item agreed to.

Mr. FIELDING: I do not want to deal to-night with the general items of Inland Revenue, but at the bottom of page 9 there is an item by which it was intended to repeal the provisions which authorize what is called home brewing. Abuses have arisen in that respect, and the customs officials were at first strongly of opinion that the provision should be repealed. However, it is a case in which, perhaps, the remedy would be more troublesome than the disease, and for the present we intend to drop that item and let the matter stand as it is. I move, therefore, to strike out resolution 10 under the head of Inland Revenue, page 9.

Mr. CALDWELL: I am sorry that the minister has moved to strike this item out. I know for a fact that the home brewing business is the ruination of the country—our section of it at least. I notice that the Minister of Marine and Fisheries (Mr. Lapointe) deprecates that statement. Well, a short time ago a man in one of the Do-

minion fish hatcheries was arrested and fined for operating an illicit still.

Mr. LAPOINTE: That was for beer, not for brew.

Mr. CALDWELL: I do not know what he was brewing; it was something he should not have been brewing, anyway. In eastern Canada this home brewing is getting to be a great menace to the public.

Mr. BELAND: A still is not used in brewing.

Mr. CALDWELL: I do not know how they make it; I never tried to make it and never drank it.

Mr. LAPOINTE: That is the trouble with my hon. friend.

Motion agreed to and resolution No. 10 (Inland Revenue) struck out.

Resolutions reported.

SALE AND INSPECTION OF ROOT VEGETABLES

House in committee on Bill No. 133, to regulate the sale and inspection of root vegetables, Mr. Gordon in the Chair.

On section 3—potato grades:

Mr. HUGHES: Has the diameter been increased?

Mr. MOTHERWELL: This is an entirely new bill. There was a bill up last year that got through certain stages but remained on the Order Paper without being passed. This is the same as the old bill.

Mr. SPENCE: I should like to say a word or two in regard to the striking out of certain words at the bottom of subsection 1 (a). We discussed this matter in the Committee on Agriculture the other day and I urged then that it was not in the interests of the trade to be forced to accept potatoes of the dimensions of one and seven-eighths inches and call them grade A-1. There is no use passing an act for the grading of potatoes unless those grades are practicable. I spoke to the minister about it this morning and he assured me that this bill might not come up until next Tuesday. I have wired to a firm in New Brunswick to confirm what I stated the other day in committee, that every province was satisfied with the grades provided. I am sorry to say that the hon. member for Victoria and Carleton was the strongest objector in the committee the other day to this bill, and the men who handle the goods had no say whatever. I would ask the minister to be good enough to leave this bill in committee until next week.

Mr. MOTHERWELL: Very well.

Progress reported.

LOAN COMPANIES' ACT, 1914, AMENDMENT

House in committee on Bill No. 59, to amend the Loan Companies' Act, 1914, Mr. Gordon in the Chair.

On section 1—application to companies incorporated by act of Parliament:

Mr. FIELDING: There are three bills on the Order Paper in my name, one relating to loan companies, now before us, one relating to the Insurance Act, and one relating to trust companies. Owing to great pressure of work in connection with the budget, I was not able to attend the meetings of the committee on Banking and Commerce which had these bills in charge. My hon. friend from Halifax (Mr. Maclean), the chairman of that committee is more familiar with the details and has kindly offered his assistance to see that the bills go through.

Mr. MACLEAN (Halifax): Before we proceed to consider the bill section by section I may say that this bill has been amended very considerably, but only after consultation with all persons in the country who are interested in this legislation. The bill as reprinted represents the conclusions of the loan company representatives, the officials of the department, and the best judgment of the committee.

Section agreed to.

On the motion for the adoption of the title:

Mr. MILLAR: I would like to ask the minister, before we pass this bill, what the legal rate of interest is that loan companies are permitted to charge, or the maximum beyond which they cannot go?

Mr. MACLEAN (Halifax): Whatever rate of interest they can obtain from borrowers subject, of course, to the laws against usury.

Bill reported, read the third time and passed.

TRUST COMPANIES ACT, 1914, AMENDMENT

On motion of Hon. Mr. Fielding Bill No. 60 to amend the Trust Companies Act, 1914, was considered in committee, reported, read the third time and passed.

INSURANCE ACT, 1917, AMENDMENT

On motion of Hon. Mr. Fielding the House went into committee on Bill No. 58, to Amend the Insurance Act, 1917, Mr. Gordon in the Chair.

On Section 1—Definition:

Mr. MARCIL (Bonaventure): Is there any very radical change in this section?

Mr. MACLEAN (Halifax): There is no radical change. The section contains new definitions as to agent, chief agency, etc., and then there is a provision for automobile insurance which was not in the old act.

Section agreed to.

On section 7—Valuation of securities in statements deposited by companies.

Mr. MACLEAN (Halifax): I beg to move that the following words in line 37, section 7, 34a. be struck out, namely:

—by reason of serious disorganization of security markets.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: What is the object of the change?

The CHAIRMAN: It was struck out in the committee.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: In other words it is merely carrying into effect the committee's recommendations?

Mr. MACLEAN (Halifax): Yes.

Section as amended agreed to.

On the motion to report the bill—

Mr. GOULD: Not necessarily in connection with Bill No. 58, but in connection with chapter 57 of the statutes of 1919 relating to fraternal benefit insurance, I would like to place a concrete case before the committee for its consideration. On April 10th I placed on the Order Paper a resolution dealing with fraternal benefit insurance companies.

The CHAIRMAN: Is the hon. member dealing with Bill No. 58?

Mr. GOULD: No, not necessarily with Bill No. 58.

The CHAIRMAN: Bill No. 58 is before the committee.

Mr. CALDWELL: There is a fraternal clause in this bill.

Mr. GOULD: Yes, clause 16. I desired to bring before the House the conditions which obtain in the western country, particularly as they affect fraternal societies, and, in a measure, reciprocal insurance. I placed this resolution on the Order Paper on April 10th, but, owing to the fact that I was unable to secure all the necessary information at that time to bring the matter before the House—and I only had one opportunity—it lapsed. However, I approached the chairman of the committee on Banking and Commerce, and asked for permission to present my case before the committee. He courteously allowed me to appear before the committee, and bring my witnesses, and upon three occasions this clause was under discussion in the committee. I have an amendment to the Insurance Act that I propose to offer to the committee, but before doing so, I wish to lay the case before the House. As I stated, it is more particularly a western question, and it has to do with one of the largest foreign fraternal benefit insurance societies on this continent, in fact, I believe it is the largest, having a membership of 1,500,000. In chapter 57 of the statutes passed in 1919, provisions were enacted which practically forbid the membership who belong to the parent organization doing any business in Canada. It caused the people in western Canada to close their books and write no more business. The real question hinged on the solvency of the institution. I want to give a little of the record of that organization, and, perhaps present to the House the true state of affairs, from their point of view. For the past two years, I have received very many requests, not alone from the central organization, but from many of the members who belong to that organization, who felt that they had been deprived of the fraternal benefit that accrued to them, and had a right to accrue to them, by years of membership in the organization. Further, this organization has an existence in the West, and has been doing business there for about 18 years, and, at the present time, it has a membership of approximately 7,000. The particular organization I refer to alone has 7,000 members, but there are other organizations which, alike, are affected by this legislation of 1919. As I stated before, it is a question of actuarial solvency. I want to explain the attitude of this association in this regard, and I would go back to the year 1912, when the parent organization, or, at least, the head camp, as it is called, decided that they would require an increase in rates in this

parent organization, and they, immediately, upon recognition of the fact that it was necessary to increase their rates, did increase them, without having given as careful consideration to the effect that this would have upon the membership as they should have. The result was they lost 350,000 members at that time, because of the sudden increase in rates. There was litigation, and, in fact, I believe, a very strong branch broke off in the United States. However, the vast majority of the members stood loyal and have built their institution up again. One of the new provisions is that every three years they shall have a readjustment of rates. The experience acquired by both parties to the readjustment of rates in 1912 has been a great factor in connection with their triennial arrangement, in educating the members to see the necessity of this readjustment under the changed conditions. Therefore, during the triennial readjustments which have taken place since that 1912 period, they have retained all their membership, and, in fact, they have a well-satisfied membership. As I stated before, they now number 1,500,000 souls. Moreover, the head camp is the supreme legislative body of the organization and, consequently, seeing that they have these triennial meetings, they find it very difficult to conform to any given or stated thing as is laid down in section 57 of the Insurance Act. For instance, the act states that in 1925 they must be actuarially solvent. Owing to the war and the Spanish influenza which came over this country, this company's assets got very low. In fact, even with their large membership, their assets went down until they had only slightly over $1,000,000 in assets in excess of their liabilities. The members however, are proud to be able to say that on no occasion has there been a default in the payment of any just claim. They are very desirous to carry on their business in western Canada and that they should be allowed to retain the interest which, they believe, still exists in their camps and membership.

As I stated, 1925 is the time fixed by chapter 57, of the statutes of 1919, when they must stand actuarially solvent. They point out that it is impossible to have readjustment periods enough in rates to show that they are actuarially solvent at that time. Consequently, three years ago they stopped writing business in western Canada, and it is because of non-writing of this business that these members have shown the dissatisfaction with the act of 1919 that exists over the West at the present time. The association has always recognized that a campaign of education is absolutely necessary to persuade such a large body of public opinion that, owing to change of economic and financial conditions, a readjustment of rates must be made. Since this hard and fast rule has been laid down that 1925 is the date when a large institution such as this must stand actuarially solvent, they recognizing the hopelessness of reaching that standard at that particular time, have not continued to write business any further. As I mentioned before, in 1912 this particular organization of which I speak lost a large membership; and when I say that ever since then they have succeeded in retaining their membership, it is only fair to compare this with other organizations which do not take the same educative attitude as this one does. The whole result has been that other organizations have lost their membership on account of rapid or quick readjustments, while this organization has been able to retain a contented membership, and that is one of the strong reasons why this provision should not be enforced upon them. While they had little more than $1,000,000 of assets over liabilities at the close of the period of the Spanish influenza following the war, they did not fail to pay any just or legitimate claim, and they are at present raising the basis of solvency. At one time it was estimated that the solvency basis was down to about 10 per cent, and in conversation with their actuary, I was advised and shown figures by him to prove that they were now standing upon a 56 per cent basis of actuarial solvency. That is making wonderful progress; they have another readjustment period coming, and they state most positively that, if given time, they will become fully actuarially solvent. I know that the Superintendent of Insurance in his computations differs a little from the actuary of this company who, I may say, is also actuary for other organizations. This gentleman, who is a very able and capable private actuary, and recognized as such, is not recognized in Canada as an actuary. In fact there are in the United States a number of actuaries with nation-wide reputations, who are not recognized as actuaries under our law in Canada. Consequently, as this gentleman explained to me, he could submit figures and send them to Ottawa, but his figures would not be accepted by our Insurance Department. Yet, if some individual re-

sident in Canada, who might have the name of an actuary or who might join this particular firm of actuaries, even though he was not very competent, should submit figures or should endorse this gentleman's figures, they would be accepted. This gentleman felt, that, as a responsible actuary, his figures should be accepted when they are accepted by such large organizations and bodies of men as those for whom he works.

A New York conference bill was passed some years ago in which 45 states of the Union agreed, and they permit the formation of foreign fraternal benefit societies with the same privileges as those accorded to their own societies. As regards the question of solvency, one of the provisions laid down in the New York conference bill is that those companies in the United States must not retrograde in any respect; that they must make progress to maintain solvency. The provision is different in Canada. While people are not to be blamed in that they demand that a certain standard as regards solvency be maintained, this is an organization with 1,500,000 satisfied members who are well able to take care of an apparent deficit, especially when they know that in a short period of time, according to figures that have been submitted to them by their actuary, they will stand on a sound actuarial basis. In fact, they pointed out that the fraternal idea is really an asset in insurance, and this is being lost sight of in the demands made in chapter 57 of the statutes of 1919. I am sure the chairman of the committee will explain the whys and wherefores and the reasons why this was not altogether accepted in committee, and yet I must state that it was not rejected in committee. The matter was discussed two or three times, and with the kind permission of the committee I was asked to present a resolution to the House to-night on the presentation of this bill. The intention of the Superintendent of Insurance eventually to centralize the business of insurance in this country is possibly right. As a matter of fact, if I might digress a little, I might state that there are many departments of government, federal or provincial, which overlap. Perhaps the Department of Insurance is one where there is overlapping; but nevertheless, I might state that I have sent wires to western Canada because of sentiments that have been expressed to me that certain individuals in the West were opposed to having the provinces made supreme in the matter of this insurance. I have not received answers to all the telegrams that I have sent out; but I have received replies from responsible members of provincial government and responsible people in western Canada, and all the telegrams that I have so far received state that they are perfectly satisfied with the amendment that I am presenting to the House at this time. They are quite satisfied to allow this association to carry on business in western Canada. In view of the expressions of opinion coming from the various insurance companies in western Canada, or at least those that I have heard from, I think it is only right that the Dominion government should grant a license to this organization. It is with that end in view that I move my amendment. Section 105, of Chapter 57 as it stands reads:

> 105. This Part applies only to fraternal benefit societies, but does not apply to any society incorporated under the laws of any province of Canada and not licensed under this Part.

I would have it amended to read:

> This Part applies only to fraternal benefit societies, but does not apply to any such society incorporated, or any such foreign society licensed under the laws of any province of Canada and not licensed under this Part.

It was some considerable time before I could find a solution that would be satisfactory to myself and to the organization, simply because it appeared to me that nearly every section of chapter 57 contained some provision which it was difficult for the insurance companies to comply with. The committee understand that I am pleading for a large section of the people who live in my district as well as for people who are scattered throughout the three western provinces. I am safe in saying, I believe, that in my electoral district there is the largest percentage of units or camps to be found in any part of the West. These people have repeatedly asked me to take up this question, and it is only fair to them that the matter should be adjusted. I do not see any reason why the amendment I have offered should be opposed.

Mr. MACLEAN (Halifax): The matter which the hon. gentleman (Mr. Gould) has been discussing is not without difficulties. It has been frequently before the House for consideration. I believe that in 1919 similar proposals were considered by the committee on Banking and Commerce in connection with a bill then before it to amend the Insurance Act. At that time the bill after consideration by the committee was submitted to the House and the

amendment was again proposed but failed to secure support. In 1919 our insurance legislation required that thereafter all fraternal societies in Canada were required to be solvent; that is, that they must put themselves in a position to meet all liabilities to their policy holders. All Canadian fraternal societies incorporated by federal legislation are to-day believed to be solvent; and it is the desire and indeed the policy of the Department of Insurance to make sure that all federally incorporated fraternal societies are solvent. There are foreign fraternal societies in Canada doing business, some of which are solvent and have submitted themselves to the law. They are imposing insurance premiums upon their new members sufficiently high to secure the policyholders against any loss, and furthermore they are willing to make, and as a matter of fact do make deposits with the Insurance Department here, as additional security for Canadian policyholders and as required by the Insurance Act amendments of 1919. In 1919, the Insurance Act was amended, and it was provided that foreign fraternal societies even though insolvent might continue to do business until 1925 provided that in the meantime they imposed a new rate upon new members sufficiently high to make the company strong and to protect the new policyholders; and in addition they were required to make a deposit with the insurance department as additional security for the Canadian membership. Some foreign companies have complied with that act, and there is no question about the fact that the whole purpose of the legislation passed in 1919 is to make fraternal societies solvent and able to meet liabilities that may mature from time to time. That policy is sound. It was the judgment of the parliamentary committee that considered the matter in 1919. That view was sustained by Parliament and was endorsed by the Canadian Fraternal Association. It has brought great improvement in the strength of many of the foreign fraternal societies doing business in Canada. Canadian societies federally incorporated to-day are solvent and do not wish any fraternal body that is not solvent, to be permitted to do business in Canada except under the conditions I have stated. Besides, they say it is unfair to allow foreign fraternal societies to carry on business in Canada if they are not to be subject to the same regulations respecting solvency as are Canadian companies. I am not going to discuss the question of actuarial solvency.

[Mr. A. K. Maclean.]

I am not sufficiently acquainted with the subject to do that intelligently, and even if I could, I am not sure that many hon. members of the House would understand me. I do not know whether my hon. friend (Mr. Gould) understands really what actuarial solvency is, but if he does I congratulate him, because it is a most abstruse and difficult thing to understand.

10 p.m.

Mr. GOULD: Chapter 57 does not understand it either.

Mr. MACLEAN (Halifax): The society to which my hon. friend refers, is in this position financially. At the end of 1920 the amount of assets required to be maintained in order that the society might be actuarially solvent was $302,000,000, but the amount of assets that were actually maintained less provision for current liabilities was $17,000,000, in round figures. In other words, they were short of assets to the extent of $285,000,000. My hon. friend says that they should be given a period of years in which to become solvent, but he cannot tell how many years that will require. As a matter of fact, I do not suppose that the officers of that fraternal society themselves would know. It is true that they are doing business in several of the states of America, but at any rate their position as to actuarial solvency, is as I have stated. The idea of the legislation is to put foreign fraternal societies in the same position as Canadian fraternal societies. The law merely requires them to become solvent. There was an opportunity afforded this society of carrying on business under license until 1925, provided they made a certain deposit with the Insurance Department here, and also increased their insurance rates applicable to new membership. They failed to do that.

As I stated before, the matter has been carefully considered in the past, particularly in the year 1919 when it was thoroughly considered by Parliament. I do not think a single member of the Banking and Commerce Committee supported my hon. friend's amendment which we are now considering. The member for Lanark (Mr. Stewart) who is absent to-night, and who is associated with a very large provincial fraternal society operating in the province of Ontario, thought that the existing law was rather severe in respect of foreign societies. He admitted the difficulties of the situation, but did not undertake the responsibility of supporting the amendment of my

hon. friend. In the circumstances I think it is the duty of the committee to reject the amendment.

Mr. GRAHAM: I would like to say to hon. gentlemen who are endeavouring to make fraternal insurance easy that ten years from now they will regret having taken that attitude. There is a solid actuarial basis on which lives can be insured, and if we depart from that we get into trouble. Every fraternal society in Canada has had that experience. I speak knowingly, because for many years I was head of one of the largest fraternal societies in Ontario. Year after year some of us would introduce a recommendation that the rates be raised at least to approximate a safe basis, but that motion would be voted down on the ground that undue cost to the insured persons would be entailed. Ultimately, however, the rates have had to be raised, and many old members of these organizations have dropped out altogether, losing all that they invested in the way of life insurance. They are too old to go into any other organization now, and their families are therefore left without insurance. Those who have remained have had their insurance cut down immensely or are paying four or five times the rates they paid before their organization became financially sound. In my own case I was insured for $2,000; my policy was cut in two and the rate trebled. I stayed in, however, on account of the sentiment I have for the organization, in connection with which I have formed a great many friendly associations. The only result of giving protection in the form of life insurance without charging for it and without proceeding on an actuarial basis is failure to prosper, and although those who support that system may obtain cheap insurance for a few years, in the end they will regret it. The only real way to protect an organization of this kind is to insist that it be placed on a sound financial basis so that widows and orphans may reasonably expect to obtain the benefit of money invested. Otherwise these widows and orphans will be left without any return when their breadwinner is gone.

Mr. GOULD: I quite understand the remarks of my hon. friend (Mr. Graham) spoken in a spirit of prophecy—

Mr. GRAHAM: Experience.

Mr. GOULD: Well, experience. The members of the organization of which I speak recognize that principle; since 1912 they have willingly paid the increased rates assessed upon them in each triennial period as considered necessary in order that operations might be carried on on an actuarial basis. But this organization suffered very much as the result of the Spanish influenza and of the war. It is not a fact that they have failed to pay all legal claims up to the present time. They recognize that they must come to a basis of actuarial solvency, but so far as western Canada is concerned it is almost impossible for them to do that in the length of time stipulated, owing to the huge deficits they have sustained. The membership has been willing to meet the assessments made necessary by the actuarial regulations, but the fact remains that they cannot reach a condition of 100 per cent efficiency in the time stated, and the result will be, if we pass this present legislation, that 7,000 men will be deprived of insurance which we all believe they should retain. It is unfortunate that older members should be obliged to leave these organizations, but the presence in them of the younger members who remain will serve to place the association on a better footing, and that is an important consideration in the levying of rates. I appeal to the committee to give favourable consideration to the case of these people out in the west as I have presented it.

Amendment (Mr. Gould) negatived.

Section agreed to.

On section 18—profits from participating policies:

Mr. GOULD: I have another amendment to submit, the reasons for which are much the same as those which I have given. This company cannot by 1925 reach actuarial solvency.

The CHAIRMAN: Is the amendment in writing?

Mr. GOULD: No, it is just the changing of two words.

The CHAIRMAN: What section of the present bill?

Mr. GOULD: Section 113 of chapter 57, clause 6.

Mr. MACLEAN (Halifax): I am sorry, but my hon. friend cannot amend a section of the Insurance Act which is not dealt with in this bill.

The CHAIRMAN: I must rule the proposed amendment out of order; it does not deal with this particular bill.

Mr. GOULD: If I might offer a word of explanation, I have been in consultation with the Superintendent of Insurance and he has expressed the view that as an alternative my suggestion is well worth discussing. It is provided by clause 6 of section 113 of chapter 57 that in 1925 all fraternal benefit insurance societies shall stand upon a 100 per cent actuarial basis. These people find it impossible to retain their membership and do that. The amendment I wished to offer was that the period be extended until 1930.

The CHAIRMAN: I draw the hon. member's attention to the fact that the matter with which he is dealing was supposed to have been covered by an amendment which he proposed and which has been dealt with by the committee. He is not in order in dealing with the same subject matter again.

Mr. MACLEAN (Halifax): I hardly think the committee would be justified in extending that period now. It might be considered in 1925, though that is unlikely, because all Canadian fraternal societies federally incorporated are now solvent, and a great number of the foreign fraternal societies doing business in Canada are solvent or making themselves solvent actuarially. They have until 1925 to do it. The society to which my hon. friend refers can do business in Canada merely by providing for a higher premium rate for new membership and making a deposit. In the meantime the present members of the society are within the society, they pay the premium, and are covered by the risk. I think if my hon. friend has any other amendment to suggest, he had better appear before the Senate committee.

Section agreed to.

Mr. GOULD: I did not finish my explanation. I am sure Mr. Chairman—

The CHAIRMAN: The hon. member has already dealt with the subject in a previous amendment which has been voted down, and it is not competent for him to move a similar amendment on a subsequent section.

Bill reported, read the third time, and passed.

PENNY BANK ACT AMENDMENT

On the motion of Hon. W. S. Fielding (Minister of Finance) Bill No. 148, to amend the Penny Bank Act, was read the second time, and the House went into committee thereon, Mr. Marcil in the Chair.

[The Deputy Speaker.]

On section 1—proportion of certain deposits may be made in chartered bank, etc., designated by Minister of Finance.

Mr. FIELDING: When the resolution was under consideration, my hon. friend the ex-Minister of Finance asked that the bill be held over for further inquiry, and he has called to my attention the fact that in drafting the bill it would be desirable to provide that when the bank exercises this privilege of depositing funds elsewhere they should be deposited in a chartered bank. I concur in his suggestion, and I move accordingly that the words "in a chartered bank" be inserted in both cases.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: My whole idea was to save my hon. friend trouble.

Amendment agreed to.

Section as amended agreed to.

Bill reported, read the third time and passed.

PUBLIC SERVICE RETIREMENT ACT AMENDMENT

House again in committee on Bill No. 146, to amend the Public Service Retirement Act, Chapter 67 of the Statutes of 1920, as amended by Chapter 49 of the Statutes of 1921, Mr. Marcil in the Chair.

On section 1—"Officer" extended to include employee paid by the hour.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: What is the effect of that change?

Mr. COPP: The object of the amendment is to extend the operation of the act for one year. Since the resolution appeared on the Order Paper the Civil Service Commission has pointed out to me that under two subsections of the act an anomaly is created in the retirement of civil servants. The matter was referred to the Minister of Justice and the deputy minister, and they have advised that it is necessary to insert the words "an hourly", to make this section correspond with the other sections.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: Is it confined to "hourly"? Salaries are paid on many different bases, hourly, daily, weekly and yearly.

Mr. COPP: This is just extending the section to include the words "an hourly", to make all the sections correspond.

Section agreed to.

On section 2—retirement extended to officers over as well as under 65 and made retroactive to July 1, 1920:

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: What is the object of this section? What is the trouble which it is sought to cure?

Mr. COPP: For the information of my hon. friend I will read a memorandum explaining the amendment which has been placed in my hands:

As subsection 1 (b) of the act now stands, provision has been made to retire employees receiving daily, weekly or monthly rates of wages, but no provision has been made for an employee receiving an hourly rate. This is obviously an oversight and has resulted in anomalies.

As the act now stands it is possible for the Civil Service Commission to recommend for retirement under its terms, hourly rate employees by invoking subsection 2 of section 1 of the act as amended, i.e. in each case making a special case to be reported before council. This class of employee covers those men now drawing prevailing rates, but who, up to May of 1920, for many years service were paid on a salary scale.

On the other hand, hourly employees who are employed seasonally may be reported for retirement under sub-section 1 (b) of the act, thereby creating an anomaly, in that, without any special report, an hourly rate seasonal employee may be retired, whereas, an hourly rate yearly employee may be retired only by invoking subsection 2 of section 1 and thereby making a special case of it. To correct this anomaly it is recommended that the word "hourly" be inserted in subsection (b) of section 1, between "receives" and "daily".

It would appear that only those officers of sixty-five years of age and over who were first reported upon immediately after the passing of the act in July, 1920, could be retired. But there are a number of officers that were not so reported on and the Department of Justice has ruled that it was necessary to have this section in order that the law might be made applicable to them.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: As I understand, under this act the Government could not now retire men under sixty-five years of age?

Mr. COPP: The act is not changed a particle. The desire is merely to carry out the provisions of the law.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: You are not now rearranging matters so that you can, compulsorily or otherwise, retire a man with a pension even though he were under sixty-five years of age?

Mr. COPP: No.

Section agreed to.

Bill reported, read the third time, and passed.

MEAT AND CANNED FOODS ACT AMENDMENT

House again in committee on Bill No. 150, to amend the Meat and Canned Foods Act, Mr. Marcil (Bonaventure) in the Chair.

On Section 1—"Establishment"; "Inspector" or "Inspecting officer"; "Dry lobster meat" or "dry meat."

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: I would like to ask the Minister of Marine and Fisheries whether this bill has been before any committee and thoroughly studied?

Mr. LAPOINTE: All the explanations were given yesterday when the resolution upon which the bill is founded was considered in committee. Each of these sections has been explained and discussed, and my hon. friend will find the discussion reported in Hansard of yesterday.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: I was just wondering whether the term "meat" was the proper one to use. The bill seems to deal entirely with fish?

Mr. LAPOINTE: This expression has always been used in all the acts governing this matter. The only change in this particular section is that the word "shellfish" is added to fish.

Mr. TOLMIE: In connection with the enforcement of a similar act in regard to abattoirs, where meat is slaughtered for interprovincial trade or for export, the inspectors are carefully trained men who have to pass a special examination so as to ensure their being very thoroughly qualified for the work. What steps are proposed to be taken to ensure that these fishery inspectors shall be similarly qualified?

Mr. LAPOINTE: I may say to my hon. friend that the department of Marine and Fisheries has nothing to do with abattoirs. The Meat and Canned Foods Act applies to the department of Marine and Fisheries only in so far as fish and shellfish are concerned.

Mr. TOLMIE: The minister did not quite understand my question. I stated that in the case of a similar act applying to abattoirs, where animals are slaughtered for export or interprovincial trade, fully qualified inspectors are employed. What I want to know is, what steps the minister proposes taking to ensure that the inspectors to be placed in charge of this important work will be fully qualified?

Mr. LAPOINTE: We have no special rule as to that. I am afraid, though, that

the Civil Service Commission will have to appoint those men.

Mr. TOLMIE: I presume they will have to pass a certain examination?

Mr. LAPOINTE: I suppose so, in geography and arithmetic.

Section agreed to.

On section 2—Governor in Council may exempt export goods from labelling:

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: It seems to me that the minister in this case is showing a very great interest in the Marking Act, and is extending its provisions considerably.

Mr. LAPOINTE: No, not at all. This provision exists in the act.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: I apologize to the minister. He is merely endorsing the policy of the Marking Act.

Section agreed to.

On section 5—Regulations fixing varieties and grades of British Columbia salmon.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: Is there any change at all in paragraph 12e? Is that covered by the statute and Order in Council?

Mr. LAPOINTE: It is giving the names of the various kinds of salmon—

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: But it was statutory before?

Mr. LAPOINTE: Yes.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: Is the minister not feeling nervous about departing from the very proper thing called the statute, and leaving the whole business to Order in Council?

Mr. LAPOINTE: Oh, no, it is a question of regulation. It may certainly come under the power of the Governor in Council, but we are not intending to legislate, as was done, formerly, by Order in Council. It is a mere question of administration and regulation. Surely my hon. friend sees that.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: Previously the statute said that such and such salmon were in such a class. That all goes by the board, and, in future, these poor salmon will be designated as the Government sees fit to designate them, by Order in Council.

Section agreed to.

[Mr. Lapointe.]

On section 6—Canned fish imported for export only:

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: Does the minister think it is right for him to impose a greater degree of particularity on the home manufacturer than he does on the foreign exporter, his competitor in the Canadian market?

Mr. LAPOINTE: The provision now proposed is exactly as it was before, with the exception that three lines have been added, which read:

—and no false or misleading mark or designation of the kind or variety of the contents shall be shown on any can of fish or shellfish imported for sale in Canada.

I am adopting the section as enacted by the former government, adding this clause which is intended to stop the practice of Alaska packers sending Alaska red eye into Canada labelled as sockeye, which enables them to compete with British Columbia sockeye, a much superior fish. This provision protects the home industry.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: There is still room for hope, in the case of my hon. friend.

Mr. LAPOINTE: For all sinners.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: My hon. friend is the chief one. Does he not think that as much care should be taken in connection with the marketing of these goods, having regard to the foreigner, as is taken in connection with the home manufacturer.

Mr. LAPOINTE: This was the law before. We are making it more severe against the foreign canner than it was formerly, and, moreover, the Canadian canners accept this change. All the provisions of this bill have been submitted to them, both in British Columbia and the maritime provinces, and they have suggested changes which we have adopted. This bill meets their views. Surely, it should meet the views of my hon. friend.

Mr. MANION: Has the minister the permission of the hon. member for Lunenburg (Mr. Duff) to put this bill through?

Mr. LAPOINTE: No, but I think he approved of the bill yesterday.

Mr. DUFF: In no uncertain language.

Section agreed to.

Bill reported, read the third time and passed.

On motion of Mr. Mackenzie King, the House adjourned at 10.45 p.m.

Monday, June 19, 1922

The House met at three o'clock.

BUSINESS OF THE HOUSE

SPECIAL LOAN BILL

On Motions being called:

Hon. W. S. FIELDING (Minister of Finance): May I be permitted to supplement the statement made by the right hon. the Prime Minister on Saturday regarding legislation yet to be submitted. It has been customary to take a borrowing power by a clause in the Appropriation Act which comes in at the last stage of the session. In view, however, of the large amount of maturing loans, I think it is better we should have a special loan bill, and a bill for that purpose confined entirely to the meeting of the obligations maturing will be introduced.

CANADIAN RED CROSS SOCIETY

Hon. H. S. BELAND (Minister of Health) moved for leave to introduce Bill No. 175 respecting The Canadian Red Cross Society.

He said: This bill merely provides for the consolidation of two or three former acts passed by Parliament to establish a peace-time agency of the Red Cross Society in Canada, together with some amendments to those acts with a view to conforming with the provisions of the Covenant of the League of Nations.

Motion agreed to, and bill read the first time.

LEASES OF DOMINION LANDS

Hon. CHARLES STEWART (Minister of the Interior) moved for leave to introduce Bill No. 153 (from the Senate), respecting Notices of Cancellation of Leases of Dominion Lands.

Motion agreed to and bill read the first time.

PRIVATE BILLS

FIRST READINGS

Bill No. 155 (from the Senate), for the relief of Eva Florence Heavens.—Mr. Rankin.

Bill No. 156 (from the Senate), for the relief of Dorothy Lillian Jewitt.—Mr. Ross (Kingston).

Bill No. 157 (from the Senate), for the relief of Gladys Mae Larivey.—Mr. Ryckman.

Bill No. 158 (from the Senate), for the relief of Gladys Caroline Hilton.—Mr. German.

Bill No. 159 (from the Senate), for the relief of Eva McRae.—Mr. Ross (Kingston).

Bill No. 160 (from the Senate), for the relief of Warren Garfield Young.—Mr. Stewart (Hamilton).

Bill No. 161 (from the Senate), for the relief of Benjamin Charles Bowman.—Mr. Hocken.

Bill No. 162 (from the Senate), for the relief of Ivy Elsie Myron-Smith.—Mr. Ryckman.

Bill No. 163 (from the Senate), for the relief of Lillian May Maybee.—Mr. Rankin.

Bill No. 164 (from the Senate), for the relief of Phœbe Levina Simpson.—Mr. Ryckman.

Bill No. 165 (from the Senate), for the relief of Thomas Preece.—Mr. Stewart (Hamilton).

Bill No. 166 (from the Senate), for the relief of Frederick Greenhill.—Mr. Ryckman.

Bill No. 167 (from the Senate), for the relief of Hazel May Dillon.—Mr. McQuarrie.

Bill No. 168 (from the Senate), for the relief of William Arthur Parish.—Mr. White.

Bill No. 169 (from the Senate), for the relief of James Hayden.—Mr. Clark.

Bill No. 170 (from the Senate), for the relief of Bertha Plant.—Mr. Church.

Bill No. 171 (from the Senate), for the relief of James Murray Johnston.—Mr. Rankin.

Bill No. 173 (from the Senate), for the relief of Thomas Leonard Armstrong.—Mr. Macdonald (Pictou).

Bill No. 174 (from the Senate), for the relief of Henry Hardy Leigh.—Mr. McMurray.

FIRST AND SECOND READINGS

Bill No. 154 (from the Senate), to incorporate National Casualty Company.—Mr. McKay.

Bill No. 172 (from the Senate), for the relief of Arthur Percival Allen.—Mr. Porter.

QUESTIONS

(Questions answered orally are indicated by an asterisk).

SUBMARINE CABLES

Mr. MacLAREN:

1. Has the Canadian Government contributed towards the purchase of the submarine cable running from Ireland to Halifax, which is

stated was acquired by the British Government about a year ago?

2. If not, has the Canadian Government under consideration the subject of supplying in conjunction with the British Government, a British owned cable between Great Britain and Canada?

3. Of the seventeen trans-atlantic cables has the Canadian Government a financial interest in any?

4. Does the Government propose to extend the Canadian National Telegraph system from Moncton to Halifax, and so connect with the British Atlantic cable?

5. When official cablegrams are sent from Ottawa to the British Government in London, are they transmitted for a part of the distance through United States territory?

6. Does the Canadian Government Telegraph system directly connect with the British owned Pacific cable?

7. If not, is it proposed that this connection be made?

Hon. Mr. MACKENZIE KING: Stand.

Mr. MacLAREN: The question has been standing since May 29. May I ask if it will be possible to have an answer at an early date?

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: Yes. I will give my hon. friend an answer to this question to-morrow.

EX-SERVICE MEN

Mr. IRVINE:

1. How many ex-service men emigrated from Britain to Canada last year?

2. How many were deported?

3. How many received relief through the D.S.C.R.?

4. How many received relief through Government on 50 per cent basis with provincial and municipal governments?

Hon. Mr. COPP:

1. This information is not available as all immigrants are not examined as to whether they have performed military service.

2. Information not available. The total number of deports can be given, but the records of the Department are not tabulated in such a way as to show how many of the deports have performed military service with the Imperial Forces.

3. 10,452 ex-members of the forces were granted unemployment relief by the Department of Soldiers' Civil Re-establishment during the fiscal year April 1st, 1921, to March 31st, 1922.

4. No information.

NICKEL COIN BLANKS

Mr. HANSON:

1. To whom have contracts been awarded for supply of nickel coin blanks to Ottawa Mint?

2. What quantities have been purchased, and at what price.

[Mr. MacLaren.]

Hon. Mr. FIELDING:

1. The Mond Nickel Company, Limited, Coniston, Ontario.

2. 50,000 pounds at 82 cents per pound, free delivery at the Mint, duty and sales tax paid.

BRITISH COLUMBIA COASTAL SERVICE

Mr. NEILL:

1. What annual subsidy is paid by the Post Office Department and the Department of Trade and Commerce to the British Columbia Coastal Service of the Canadian Pacific Railway Company for the service between (a) Victoria and Vancouver, (b) Victoria and the Gulf Islands, and (c) Victoria and the West Coast of Vancouver Island?

2. What services are rendered in each case for such subsidies?

Hon. Mr. ROBB:

1. Subsidy paid to Canadian Pacific Railway Company for mail service between: (a) Victoria-Vancouver, $20,000 per annum; (b) Victoria-Gulf Islands, $10,000 per annum; (c) Victoria-West Coast of Vancouver Island, $15,000 per annum.

2. (a) Victoria-Vancouver, twice daily each way; (b) Victoria-Gulf Islands, four times per week in summer and three times per week in winter, (c) Victoria-West Coast of Vancouver Islands, three times per month each way.

RURAL MAIL ROUTES

Mr. ARTHURS:

1. How many new rural mail routes have been established since December 1st, last?

2. How many rural mail routes have been extended during the above period?

Hon. Mr. MURPHY:

1. (a) Number of new routes established under instructions of late government—9. (b) Number of new routes established under instructions of present Government—none.

2. 38.

GOVERNMENT TERMINAL ELEVATORS

Mr. CHURCH:

1. How many Government Terminal Elevators are there in Canada and where are they located?

2. What was the cost of each of said elevators?

3. Are the erection of any more being considered by the Government?

4. Have there been any requests for a terminal elevator for the central and western part of Ontario?

5. If so, (a) who requested same, and (b) will the Government give the matter consideration.

6. What report has the Grain Commission made on the matter of this proposed elevator?

Hon. Mr. ROBB:

1. Five, at Port Arthur, Saskatoon, Moosejaw, Calgary, and Vancouver, respectively.
2. Capital cost to January 31, 1922: Port Arthur, $1,411,545.47; Saskatoon ,$1,-134,745.73; Moosejaw, $1,322,720.71; Calgary, $834,564.35; Vancouver, 783,264.39.
3. Not in the immediate future.
4. Yes.
5. (a) Representatives of the Toronto Harbour Commission, the Grain Section of the Toronto Board of Trade, United Farmers' Co-operative Co. Ltd., United Farmers of Ontario, the Minister of Agriculture for Ontario, and many Ontario farmers. (b) The Government has given the matter careful consideration.
6. Unfavourable.

CONNAUGHT RIFLE RANGE

Mr. GARLAND (Carleton):

1. Has the Connaught Rifle Range been leased for pasturage or grazing purposes?
2. If so, to what party or parties has the said rifle range been leased?
3. What are the terms of said leases and for how long do they run?
4. Who is in charge of the said rifle range at the present time?

Hon. Mr. GRAHAM:

1. Grazing privileges only have been granted.
2. The Department of Agriculture for Dominion Central Experimental Farm.
3. The privilege is for the term of 5 years from May 1, 1920, and the terms are as follows:

(a) The ranges to be cleared of stock for as long as required for shooting purposes, upon 24 hours' notice in writing from the Department of Militia and Defence.

(b) Any damages due to their occupation will be chargeable to the Department of Agriculture.

(c) The rights of existing shore leases to be respected.

(d) The present caretaker will exercise general supervision over the range, subject to the officers of this department.

4. Caretaker—Mr. J. A. Holbrook.

RETURNED SOLDIER HIKERS

Mr. ARTHURS:

1. Were the returned soldiers who hiked to Ottawa given return transportation to Toronto by the Government?
2. If so, (a) at what cost to the public, and (b) by what authority?
3. By what railway?
4. (a) Were they transported by the Canadian National, (b) if not, why?

Hon. Mr. MURDOCK:

1. Yes.
2. (a) 247 men at $5.76 each, $1,422.72; (b) by the authority of the Minister of Labour.
3. Canadian Pacific Railway.
4. (a) No; (b) the hikers arrived in Union Station, Ottawa, about 3 a.m., June 6, and requested a special train to take them back to Toronto at once. They were told a special train could not be supplied, but that extra coaches would be placed on the Canadian National train leaving Ottawa at 1 p.m. same date. They claimed that leaving at 1 p.m. would land them in Toronto at night and insisted that they would not go; that the city of Ottawa would have to keep them, etc., unless they were sent forward earlier than 1 p.m. About 5 a.m. it was decided as inadvisable to ask or expect these returned soldiers to lie around on the floors or the benches of the station until 1 p.m., and that it was consistent and advisable to send them forward to Toronto at 9.40 a.m., and arrangements were made accordingly.

DOMINION NOTES

Mr. COOTE:

1. During each of the last ten fiscal years, what rate of interest has been charged, and what amount of interest has been collected from banks on excess circulation of notes issued under S/S 16. Section 61, Chapter 9, of the Bank Act?
2. During each fiscal year since August, 1914, what rate of interest has been charged, and what amount of interest has been collected from banks on excess circulation of notes issued under S/S 16, Section 61, Chapter 9, of the Bank Act?
3. What amount of Dominion notes was advanced to banks during each fiscal year since August, 1914, and what rate of interest was charged thereon, and what amount of interest was collected under S/S A, Section 4, Chapter 3, of the Finance Act, 1914?

Hon. Mr. FIELDING:

1. Rate of interest, 5 per cent per annum.

Amount of interest

Year	Amount
1912-13	$45,479.21
1913-14	16,485.69
1914-15	27,023.19
1915-16	27,846.25
1916-17	26,633.78
1917-18	64,823.19
1918-19	46,392.97
1919-20	37,705.89
1920-21	48,726.88
1921-22	34,958.87

2. Rate of interest, 5 per cent per annum.

Amount of interest

Year	Amount
1914-15	$ 4,109.04
1915-16	12,439.40
1916-17	31,467.25
1917-18	50,397.76
1918-19	35,319.35
1919-20	28,189.96
1920-21	88,986.29
1921-22	Nil

3.

Fiscal year ended Mar. 31	Amount advanced	Amount repaid	Interest
1915	$ 14,439,767 55	$ 9,047,267 55	$ 211,551 97
1916	3,585,000 00	7,906,265 00	62,722 49
1917	18,356,000 00	9,227,235 00	105,458 12
1918	90,565,000 00	74,100,000 00	754,792 01
1919	121,650,000 00	69,887,000 00	2,395,643 02
1920	211,990,000 00	182,851,275 00	3,322,952 78
1921	253,115,535 75	276,349,085 75	3,568,106 74
1922	313,080,248 00	350,470,360 01	2,401,290 64

Rate of interest: 5 per cent per annum, with the exception of advances secured by the deposit of Imperial Treasury bills issued to banks as security for loans utilized to purchase Canadian wheat and munitions, upon which the rate of interest was 3½ per cent per annum.

Mr. GARLAND (Bow River):

According to a statement on Hansard of last year, the amount of Dominion government notes issued for circulation was, at February 28, 1921, $290,194,519.92.

1. For what reason was this amount of Dominion notes issued for circulation?

2. For what purpose?

3. What security was taken?

4. Does the Government receive interest?

Hon. Mr. FIELDING:

1, 2 and 3. On Dominion notes outstanding at February 28, 1921, $127,079,444.92 were issued against gold under the provisions of the Dominion Notes Act, 1914. Of the balance, namely, $163,115,075, $26,000,000 were issued under chapter 4-5, Geo. V, with security as provided therein; $50,000,000 were issued as advances to the Imperial government for the purpose of assisting in financing its war purchases of Canadian produce, munitions, etc., and were secured by the deposit of Dominion of Canada, New Zealand, and South Africa sterling bonds, and Canadian Pacific Railway debenture stock; and $87,115,075 were issued to banks as advances under the Finance Act, 1914, and secured by the deposit of securities approved by the Treasury Board, including Dominion of Canada bonds and treasury bills, bonds of the provinces of Canada and Canadian municipalities, British Government treasury bills, Canadian Northern Railway Company notes, certain industrial bonds and stocks, assignments of grain and produce and demand notes of commercial houses endorsed by the banks to the order of the Minister of Finance.

4. Yes.

Mr. GARLAND (Bow River):

On the amount of $290,194,519.92 Dominion Government notes issued for circulation under Orders in Council (confirmed by chapters 4 and 5, George V), ten millions of this amount was put in circulation.

1. Is this amount still in circulation?

2. If not, how and when was it withdrawn, and why?

Hon. Mr. FIELDING:

1. Yes.

2. Answered by No. 1.

Mr. GARLAND (Bow River):

1. What amount of Dominion Government notes has been accepted from the chartered banks in lieu of gold for deposit in the central gold reserve during period 1911-1921 inclusive?

2. How do the banks become owners of this sum of Dominion notes?

Hon. Mr. FIELDING:

1. Dominion notes in central gold reserves as at December 31:

1911	nil
1912	nil
1913	$ 6,400,000
1914	5,200,000
1915	11,150,000
1916	31,740,000
1917	77,590,000
1918	122,400,000
1919	115,300,000
1920	101,850,000
1921	57,950,000

2. By the deposit of gold with the Receiver-General or the deposit of securities approved by the Treasury Board, under the provisions of the Dominion Notes and Finance Acts.

CANADIAN NATIONAL RAILWAYS—SECURITIES

Mr. GARLAND (Bow River):

What security was taken for the $10,000,000 loaned or advanced to the Canadian National Railway Company and for the payment advanced to the Grand Trunk Railway (loans confirmed by chapters 4 and 5, George V)?

1. Does the Government receive interest on both of these loans?

2. If so, on what dates was such interest paid, and in what amounts?

Hon. Mr. FIELDING:

$12,500,000 Canadian Northern Railway Company 4 per cent debenture stock, due September 1, 1934; £1,543,200 Grand Trunk Pacific Railway Company 4 per cent sterling bonds due January 1, 1962.

1. No.

2. In 1915-16 Canadian Northern Railway Company paid $516,301.39, being interest to November 1, 1915.

In 1915-16 Grand Trunk Pacific Railway Company paid $311,643.84, being interest to November 1, 1915.

GOLD RESERVE

Mr. GARLAND (Bow River):

1. What is the actual amount of gold now in the central gold reserve?
2. What was the actual amount of gold in the central gold reserve in each year from 1911-1921 inclusive?
3. What is the amount of gold held by the Dominion Government, and for what purpose?
4. What amount of Dominion Government notes are in circulation?
5. What amount of Dominion Government notes were in circulation each year from 1911 to 1921 inclusive?
6. What is the amount of gold held in reserve by the Dominion Government as security for the Dominion Government notes in circulation?
7. What was the amount of gold held in reserve by the Dominion Government during each year from 1911-1921 inclusive?
8. What amount of subsidiary coin, not gold, ish held by the banks, trust componies, etc?
9. What part of this gold and subsidiary coin is now in Canada and what part elsewhere?

Hon. Mr. FIELDING:

1. $9,502,533 as at May 31, 1922.

2. As at December 31;

1911	Nil
1912	Nil
1913	$ 1,197,066
1914	4,500,000
1915	6,210,000
1916	11,960,000
1917	19,680,000
1918	8,500,000
1919	10,500,000
1920	11,502,533
1921	10,502,533

3. $86,685,441.23 as at May 31, 1922; $3,396,356.83 on account of savings bank deposits and $83,289,084.40 for redemption of Dominion notes.

4. $221,894,062.67 as at May 31, 1922.

5. As at April 1,

1911	$ 89,994,270.25
1912	113,443,633.40
1913	112,101,885.65
1914	117,795,638.53
1915	157,056,118.91
1916	177,943,131.54
1917	183,248,986.79
1918	250,798,860.92
1919	298,058,697.67
1920	311,932,791.92
1921	277,882,884.92

6. Answered by No. 3.

7. As at April 1,

1911	$ 74,159,771.40
1912	98,892,395.14
1913	98,507,112.81
1914	101,161,366.18
1915	94,644,423.44
1916	120,931,622.98
1917	118,561,338.50
1918	119,941,748.92
1919	121,141,122.07
1920	104,399,455.48
1921	83,381,036.53

8 and 9. No information.

BANK NOTES

Mr. GARLAND: (Bow River):

1. What was the greatest or aggregate amount of bank notes in circulation during the first, second, third and fourth quarters of 1921?
2. What is the amount on deposit in savings banks, chartered banks, trust companies?
3. What part of this amount is money?

Hon. Mr. FIELDING:

1. Greatest amount of bank notes in circulation:

1st quarter, 1921	$229,608,213
2nd " "	216,262,907
3rd " "	203,134,777
4th " "	202,697,486

2. Amount of deposits in chartered banks, Dominion Government and Post Office savings banks as at April 30, 1922; $2,091,129,494. No current record of deposits in trust companies. (Vide Canada Year Book).

3. Deposits made by cheques, notes or coin are deemed to be money.

ADDITIONAL CURRENCY ISSUE

Mr. GARLAND: (Bow River):

1. What part, if any, of the additional issue of currency provided for under subsection 14, section 61, of the Bank Act was put in circulation and when?
2. Is this amount still in circulation?
3. For what purpose was it issued and what was the issue of this amount passed upon?

Hon. Mr. FIELDING:

1. The extent to which the various banks have availed themselves of the provision of subsection 14, section 61 of the Bank Act, is indicated by the returns of chartered banks, published monthly as a supplementary to the Canada Gazette.

2. At this date the provision is not effective.

3. Presumably to meet demands arising from increased business in the crop-moving season. The second part of the question is not understood.

ROYAL CANADIAN NAVY—TRAVELLING EXPENSES

Mr. CHURCH:

1. Will the Government pay the travelling expenses home of those members of the Royal Canadian Navy at Halifax and other places, such as the members of the crew of H.M.C.S. Aurora, and also of the cadets of the Naval College in view of their discharge?
2. If not, why?

Hon. Mr. GRAHAM: The question of demobilization is being fully considered by the Government.

CANADIAN PATRIOTIC FUND

Hon. W. S. FIELDING (Minister of Finance) moved that the House do tomorrow go into Committee of the Whole to consider the following proposed resolution:

That it is expedient to provide that whenever the Governor in Council is satisfied that the resources of the Canadian Patriotic Fund are inadequate to the continued performing of the relief work that has been carried on by that organization and that the result of the cessation of any part of such work would throw upon the public authorities additional burdens for the relief of distress, the Governor in Council may by Order in Council authorize the payment from the Consolidated Revenue Fund to the Canadian Patriotic Fund of such sums as may be required from time to time to enable the said Canadian Patriotic Fund to continue its works, such sums not to exceed $900,000.

He said: His Excellency the Governor General, having been made acquainted with the subject matter of this resolution, recommends it to the consideration of the House.

Motion agreed to.

IMMIGRATION—CRIMINAL CODE

On the Orders of the Day.

Mr. JOSEPH ARCHAMBAULT (Chambly and Vercheres): Mr. Speaker, my attention has been called to the following statement made by the hon. member for Centre Winnipeg (Mr. Woodsworth) on Saturday, as reported on page 3211 of unrevised Hansard of the 17th:

M. J. S. WOODSWORTH (Centre Winnipeg): When may we expect a report from the special committee appointed to deal with amendments to the Immigration Act and the Criminal Code? These bills were introduced at the very beginning of the session, and we have not yet had any report.

[Mr. E. J. Garland.]

The query was made on Saturday, and although I was in the House that day I was not in the Chamber when these remarks were made at the opening of the sitting. The hon. member was undoubtedly within his right in asking the question, but as chairman of that special committee I feel, on behalf of the members of the committee, that it is my duty to correct certain misleading remarks made by the hon. gentleman. While it is true that these bills were introduced at the beginning of the session, it is also true that the committee was finally appopinted only on the eleventh of May. The next day, the twelfth, we had our first sitting. So many members of that special committee were also members of other important standing special committees, especially the Transportation Committee and the Agricultural Committee, that in order to secure attendance we had first to make a motion to reduce the quorum, and then we had to make a motion to provide that the committee should sit while the House was in session. We had numerous sittings at which practically the whole immigration law and sections of the Criminal Code regarding sedition were thoroughly studied, and when my hon. friend says that no report has yet been made, he makes a misleading statement. If my hon. friend had been in the House last Friday, or if he had taken the trouble to read the Votes and Proceedings of that day, he would have seen that we had made a final report on Bill No. 16. We have already made three reports on both bills and on that day I myself made the final report on the Immigration Bill. The Assistant Clerk read it, and the report was tabled. I only wanted to make this correction in the hope that in the fuure my hon. friend will refrain from making such premature and uncalled for statements, and will possess his soul in patience in the meanwhile.

SOLDIERS' CIVIL RE-ESTABLISHMENT

On the Orders of the Day:

Mr. DONALD SUTHERLAND (South Oxford): Mr. Speaker, I desire to direct the attention of the Minister of Soldiers' Civil Re-establishment (Mr. Béland) and of the House to an article which appears in the morning papers of Ottawa and Montreal. I quote from the Ottawa Morning Journal:

G.W.V.A. appeal for an inquiry is recommended.

This is the heading of the article. The part to which I wish particularly to direct the attention of the minister is as follows:

The decision to recommend the appointment of a commission followed two executive meetings of the committee, and a public session at which Colonel J. T. C. Thompson, chairman of the pension board, and Mr. MacNeil stated their cases.

This, I contend, is an incorrect report of what took place. It is true that two meetings of the executive were held on that occasion, but the decision to recommend the appointment of a Royal Commission was arrived at before and not after Mr. MacNeil, and Colonel Thompson on behalf of the Pensions Board, were heard. Furthermore, the statement that the "Great War Veterans' Association appeal for an inquiry is recommended" is misleading, as my interpretation of Mr. MacNeil's desire, indicated in the telegram which was sent broadcast throughout the country, shows. That telegram reads, in part, as follows:

Chairman of the Committee has consented to reopen the question. Impressed by general expressed indignation.

In fact, an inquiry such as this article indicates has not been asked for by the Great War Veterans' Association.

Mr. BELAND: Does my hon. friend ask a question?

Mr. SUTHERLAND: I was merely directing the attention of the minister and of the House to an incorrect and misleading article contained in the morning press.

Mr. BELAND: I shall confer with the chairman of the committee on the subject at the next opportunity.

LIMITATION OF ARMAMENTS

APPROVAL OF TREATIES, SIGNED AT WASHINGTON

Right Hon. W. L. MACKENZIE KING (Prime Minister) moved that the House go into committee to consider the following proposed resolution:

That it is expedient that Parliament do approve of the following treaties, of which copies have been laid before Parliament:—

The treaty between the United States of America, the British Empire, France, Italy, and Japan, for the limitation of naval armament which was signed at Washington on the sixth day of February, nineteen hundred and twenty-two;

The treaty between the United States of America, the British Empire, France, Italy and Japan, to protect neutrals and non-combatants at sea in time of war and to prevent the use in war of noxious gases and chemicals, which was signed at Washington on the sixth day of February, nineteen hundred and twenty-two;

The treaty between the United States of America, Belgium, the British Empire, China, France, Italy, Japan, The Netherlands, and Portugal, to stabilize conditions in the Far East, which was signed at Washington on the sixth day of February, nineteen hundred and twenty-two;

The treaty between the United States of America, Belgium, the British Empire, China, France, Italy, Japan, The Netherlands, and Portugal, relating to the Chinese customs tariff, which was signed at Washington on the sixth day of February, nineteen hundred and twenty-two;

The treaty between the United States of America, the British Empire, France, and Japan, for the preservation of the general peace and the maintenance of their rights in relation to their insular possessions and insular dominions in the region of the Pacific Ocean (and the accompanying Declaration), and the Agreement between the same Powers supplementary thereto, which treaty and agreement were signed at Washington on the thirteenth day af December, nineteen hundred and twenty-one, and the sixth day of February, nineteen hundred and twenty-two, respectively; and that this House do approve of the same.

He said: Mr. Speaker, by this resolution the House is asked to express its approval of treaties which were signed at the Conference on the Limitation of Armaments which opened at Washington on Armistice Day of last year and which completed its proceedings on the 6th of February of the present year. The genesis, procedure, proceedings and results of the conference have been so fully, adequately and ably dealt with by Sir Robert Borden, who was Canadian delegate at the conference, in the report of the Conference on the Limitation of Armaments which was presented to this House some weeks ago that it would be superfluous, if not presumptuous, to attempt to add anything to what this report contains. As respects Canadian representation at the conference, I might say, however, that the procedure followed in relation to the other Dominions, and Great Britain was similar in the final arrangements to that which was followed at the Peace Conference at Paris.

It is, perhaps, appropriate that at this moment there should be an expression from this Parliament of appreciation of the great service rendered Canada in common with the other countries of the world by the President of the United States in calling this conference and by the United States government in co-operating throughout the conference with the several powers in the hearty manner it did, which co-operation helped so effectively to bring the proceedings to the successful issue to which

they were brought. I should also like to say a word of appreciation of the services rendered our country and the other countries associated at the conference by Sir Robert Borden, the Canadian delegate. I am sure the document which Sir Robert Borden has presented, embodying the proceedings of the conference, will remain one of historic interest and of the utmost value to the different countries assembled at that gathering, which has already come to be regarded as one of the most important in the history of the world.

As intimated, it is unnecessary to attempt to review these treaties in view of the careful, concise and precise manner in which they have been set forth in Sir Robert Borden's report; but it might be of assistance to hon. members of the House, for purposes of future reference, as well possibly to the House in expressing its approval, were I to give a brief statement of the essential features of the different treaties which the House is now called upon to approve. Let me state that the treaties have already been signed by the Canadian delegate; but they will not be ratified by His Majesty on behalf of Canada until after both Houses of Parliament have approved them. It is that approval as respects this House which is being sought at the present moment. There are five treaties in all, two of which are of special interest to Canada, the Treaty on the Limitation of Armaments and what has been described as the Quadruple Pacific Treaty, which relates to matters pertaining to the insular possessions of countries whose territories border upon the Pacific. I shall run briefly over the main features of these treaties and give the House also a short statement as to the others.

The Treaty for the Limitation of Naval Armaments

First of all, as to the treaty for the limitation of naval armaments, it will be seen that the parties to the treaty are the five great naval powers, the United States, the British Empire, France, Italy and Japan. Its chief effect has to do with capital ships, which are for aggressive purposes the main naval weapon. In respect of capital ships an agreed ratio of naval strength is established. As between the United States, the British Empire and Japan, the ratio is 5: 5: 3. The ratio assigned to both France and Italy is 1.75. The ratio was worked out by the naval experts as representing approximately the existing naval strength of the powers.

With some variations in the meanwhile, due to the differing ages and efficiency of existing capital ships, the eventual figures in actual capital ship tonnage are to be as follows:

	Tons
United States	525,000
British Empire	525,000
Japan	315,000
France	175,000
Italy	175,000

In order to achieve this result there is also involved in respect of capital ships the renunciation of present building programmes, the actual scrapping of many existing ships and the declaration of a naval construction holiday which will extend over a period of nearly ten years. How extensive and impressive the figures involved in these engagements are, hon. members will have seen from the detailed report.

In respect of aircraft carriers also a limitation upon total tonnage is self imposed on the five powers corresponding to the ratio of strength already stated.

So far as other auxiliary craft, such as cruisers, flotilla leaders, destroyers, and submarines, are concerned, the proposal to establish a limitation upon numbers and total tonnage in the same ratio failed to command unanimous agreement; and hence the powers remain free to build war vessels of these types. Individual cruisers however are to be limited in size to 10,000 tons.

Careful rules are laid down to govern the method of scrapping capital ships and to prevent evasions of the intent of the treaty.

What the treaty comes to, so far as building is concerned, is:

(1) With the exception of the two capital ships that may be laid down immediately, as shown in paragraph 29 (page 18) of Sir Robert Borden's report, the British Empire, or any part of it, cannot lay down new capital ship construction until 1931, and thereafter the new construction must be in accordance with the table in chapter II, part 3, section II of the treaty (page 177 of the report).

(2) In respect of cruisers, destroyers, submarines and other auxiliary craft the Empire, or any part of it, is free, as the other powers are, to build without restriction upon numbers or total tonnage.

Another point that may be mentioned here concerns the question of imperial co-operation. As the report indicates, the treaty has no effect upon that question (see paragraph 46, page 24).

A further matter of some direct interest to Canada is Article XIX of the treaty which preserves the status quo in respect of the naval bases and fortifications on certain islands of the Pacific. This arrangement represents an exceedingly valuable feature of the whole agreement, as must be apparent.

The islands adjacent to Canada, however, such as Vancouver island, are not included in the restriction, and we therefore remain free to fortify these as before.

In Articles XXI, XXII, and XXIII provision is made for future conferences to meet new contingencies that may arise in the future.

The treaty is to remain in force in any case until December 31, 1936—i.e. about 15 years—and thereafter unless one of the powers has denounced it.

Finally it may be mentioned that it will probably be necessary at a later date to introduce legislation to render effective certain of the provisions laid down for preventing evasions of the intent of the treaty. This has reference to Articles XV and XVI, which relate to the construction of war vessels for non-contracting powers within the jurisdiction of the contracting powers. It is understood that, in order to place themselves in a position to carry out these undertakings, the British government will shortly introduce legislation giving the Admiralty control over the construction and delivery of war vessels in private shipyards. The matter is under the consideration of the Government and a bill will probably be presented at the next session after an opportunity has been had to examine the British legislation in relation to the existing powers of the Government.

The Treaty to Protect Neutrals and Non-Combatants at Sea in time of War and to prevent the use in War of Noxious Gases and Chemicals.

As already seen the Naval Treaty places no restriction whatever upon the construction of submarines. It will be recalled that a proposal made by the British Empire delegation to the effect that, by international agreement, the submarine should be abolished outright was not accepted by the conference. Similarly it was impossible to secure unanimous agreement among the five naval powers upon any proposal to limit either the size of individual submarines or the numbers and total tonnage of submarine fleets. In view however of the improper uses to which this weapon was put in the late war the conference did take action with regard to the laws of war governing the operation of submarines. The result was the treaty signed between the United States, the British Empire, France, Italy, and Japan on February 6, 1922, to protect neutrals and non-combatants at sea in time of war and to prevent the use in war of noxious gases and chemicals. The purpose of the Treaty is in the first place simply to declare briefly the existing international law concerning the protection of such persons at sea in time of war, and to secure thereto the formal adhesion of all the other civilized Powers, so that there may be a clear public understanding throughout the world of the standards of conduct by which the public opinion of the world is to pass judgment upon future belligerents. In declaring the existing rules for seizure or attack of merchant vessels it is explicitly laid down that submarines are not in any circumstances exempt from the universal laws so stated. So far, therefore, the Treaty involves no change in international law. In order, however, to provide a sanction for these rules it is proposed to introduce a new feature into international law. The five powers agree that any person in the service of any power who shall violate any of the existing rules as declared, whether or not such person if under orders of a governmental superior, shall be deemed to have violated the laws of war and be liable, as for an act of piracy, to trial and punishment by the civil or military authorities of any power within whose jurisdiction he may be found. When this new feature has been accepted by the nations it will avoid the difficulty that confronted the Allied powers when they came to deal with the officers of submarines who had been guilty of inhuman acts uring the late war. It may be mentioned here that it will probably become necessary at a later session to introduce legislation giving power to our Courts to enforce this new provision.

The treaty then proposes to engraft a further amendment and improvement upon the existing laws of war. Recognizing, from the experience of the late war, the practical impossibility of using submarines as commerce destroyers without violating the rules of international law, the treaty proposes to prohibit such use altogether. Steps are being taken to secure the adhesion to the treaty of all the other powers, so that this new prohibition may be universally adopted into the law of nations. Without waiting however for the

assent of other nations, the five Powers who concluded the treaty have agreed to accept this prohibition as henceforth binding as between themselves.

The treaty finally deals with the use in war of poisonous gases and other analogous liquids, materials, or devices. Recognizing that such practices have been justly condemned by the civilized world and that their prohibition has been declared in various treaties, the signatory powers declare their assent to such prohibition, agree to be bound thereby as between themselves, and invite all other civilized nations to adhere thereto, to the end that the prohibition shall be universally accepted as a part of the law of nations. While it would seem that in this respect the Treaty does no more than to reaffirm existing international law, it may be hoped that this emphatic declaration by the five Powers will not be without effect in strengthening the moral aversion with which the civilized nations should regard such methods of warfare.

The Quadruple Pacific Treaty

It will be convenient at this point to deal briefly with the agreement covered by the last paragraph of the Resolution before the House. This is the treaty between the United States, the British Empire, France, and Japan, for the preservation of the general peace and the maintenance of their rights in relation to their insular possessions and insular dominions in the region of the Pacific ocean. It may be referred to briefly as the Quadruple Pacific Treaty. The Supplementary Treaty and Declaration mentioned in the Resolution are wholly dependent upon the main treaty, and the three documents should be read together as constituting one agreement.

While the treaty is brief and simple in structure, its relation to the underlying aims and conclusions of the conference is of great significance. The parties, it will be observed, are those Pacific Naval Powers that have island possessions in the Pacific ocean. Each power agrees to respect the rights of the others in relation to these possessions. If there should develop in the future between any of the parties a controversy, arising from a Pacific question and involving these rights, that is not settled by diplomacy and seems likely to affect their existing harmonious accord, there shall be a joint conference of all the parties to consider and adjust the whole question. Again, if the rights so described are threatened by the aggressive action of any other power, not a party to the treaty, the parties agree to consult together fully and frankly in order to reach an understanding respecting the situation. The treaty in any case is to exist for ten years and thereafter it is to continue in force unless any of the parties shall have denounced it. Upon its ratification the Anglo-Japanese Alliance comes to an end.

The Supplementary Declaration, signed on the same day, provides first of all that the treaty shall apply to the mandated islands in the Pacific ocean. The declaration also provides that the controversies referred to in Article I of the Quadruple Treaty are not to be taken to embrace questions which, under international law, lie exclusively within the domestic jurisdiction of the respective powers; in other words the intention is to exclude from the jurisdiction of future conferences between the parties such questions as those relating to immigration and tariff matters, which are regarded as of a domestic character so far as they are not affected by existing treaties.

The Supplementary Agreement, signed on February 6, 1922, has the effect of excluding the main islands of Japan from the scope of the treaty. This action was taken to meet the desires of both Japan and the United States.

It may be seen from the terms of the document that the Quadruple Pacific treaty does not constitute what is known as an Alliance. It imposes no military or warlike obligations. The obligation to respect each other's rights seems one which in any event is implicit in membership of the family of civilized nations. Beyond this there is simply the obligation to confer when international relations in these regions become strained or threatening. In other words, the powers will not resort to war without first endeavouring to settle their differences by peaceably meeting together. The principle involved is that which has been embodied in many conciliation and arbitration treaties of recent years. The effect is to employ the conference method of diplomacy as a means of settling international disputes; to give public opinion in the countries concerned and throughout the world time within which to face the issues and consequences and so to make known its reasoned attitude; to promote international co-operation rather than to risk international rivalry in this portion of the world.

The Far Eastern Treaty

The remaining treaties covered by the resolution relate especially to China and the

Far East. Conditions in China have in recent years been abnormal and difficult. The inherent weakness of her internal political position has produced a condition and an atmosphere peculiarly conducive to discord and conflict of interest among the powers both in their relations directly with China and in their relations as between themselves in Chinese matters. One of the main objects of the Washington Conference was to endeavour to secure an improvement in this situation. Considerable progress in this direction was made, but it must be borne in mind that it was not within the power of the nations represented at Washington to provide the whole remedy. The problem is essentially one for the Chinese people themselves.

The parties to each of the two treaties relating directly to China were the whole nine powers represented in the conference under the treaty signed on February 6th to stabilize conditions in the Far East, to safeguard the rights and interests of China and to promote intercourse between China and the other powers upon the basis of equality of opportunity. The powers agree to respect the sovereignty, the independence and the territorial and administrative integrity of China; to provide for China the opportunity to develop for herself a stable government; to promote the principle of equal opportunity in China for the commerce and industry of all nations; to refrain from taking advantage of conditions in China to seek special privileges that would abridge the rights of others, and from countenancing action inimical to the security of other states. By way of carrying out the principle of equality of opportunity in China for the trade and industry of all nations—this is the principle commonly known by the name of the "Open Door"—certain specific practices are prohibited. It is also agreed that whenever a situation arises involving in the opinion of any one of the powers the application of the treaty and rendering discussion desirable, there shall be full and frank communication between the powers concerned. Steps are to be taken to secure the adhesion to the treaty of all the other powers that have treaty relations with China, in order that these various rules of conduct shall be of universal effect. Many of the principles and policies thus adopted by the nine powers have appeared in various treaties and other international documents drawn up from time to time in the past. This is, however, the first occasion on which they have been adopted jointly by so large a group of powers, who henceforth will be collectively responsible for preventing their violation.

The Chinese Customs Tariff Treaty

The other treaty affecting China directly is the treaty signed on February 6th between the nine powers relating to the revision of the Chinese customs tariff and cognate matters with a view to increasing the revenues of the Chinese government. In order to secure stable conditions in any country adequate revenues are obviously an important desideratum. In China, however, the problem is rendered difficult by many conflicting factors, some of them grown up as the result of the relations of three-quarters of a century between China and other powers, and others arising from the peculiarities of Chinese civilization and commerce itself. The difficulties and the conditions of the problem are clearly described in Sir Robert Borden's report and it seems unnecessary to go into them at length here. The effect of the Chinese Customs Tariff Treaty is also fully set out in the report. Its main purpose and effect is, first of all, to provide for an immediate revision of the Chinese customs tariff in order to bring the rate of duty up to an effective 5 per cent. The treaty further provides for the creation of a special conference which is to meet in China in the near future with the object of settling the conditions upon which China may be enabled to increase the rate of her customs duties above 5 per cent, in order to secure adequate revenues for the administration and development of the country.

Conclusion

As already indicated, the agreements should in a broad sense be read together. Sir Robert Borden, in concluding his report, has pointed out that the results of the Washington conference "must be estimated as a whole and in their relation to one of the chief purposes for which it was summoned"—namely, the removal of the tension that existed in international relations touching the Far Eastern and Pacific regions. To the same effect is the eloquent speech made by Mr. Balfour at the close of the conference, whose text members will find set out in an Appendix at page 149 of the Report of the Canadian Dele gate. The agreements reached, varied as they are in subject matter and remote as they may appear some of them one from another, cannot profitably be estimated

piecemeal. Their unity flows from a common aim to preserve the peace in a vast region of the earth; they were interdependent in inception and they should be estimated as they were in fact negotiated, as a whole and together. Through the Naval Treaty the Great Powers for the first time in history have willingly by common consent renounced their freedom of action in a sphere where by tradition nations have been peculiarly sensitive and insistent on complete liberty. So far, that is, as the Pacific region is concerned they have agreed to discard aggressive force as an element in the adjustment of their relationships one with another. Here we may recall that for a century on our own continent there has existed, in the Great Lakes Naval Disarmament Agreement and in the understanding in fact observed along the whole Canadian-American boundary, a similar self-denying ordinance and repudiation of force; and it is impossible to doubt the influence of this condition upon the relations between the two countries and upon their unquestioned habit of solving their conflicts of interest by civilized means. In ordinary affairs men commonly avoid force in their relationships and rely upon other impulses; civil communities are conceived and exist on the assumption that on the whole men prefer so to live and can so best pursue even their own individual interests. With this assumption made at the outset the powers were enabled to approach in free consultation many outstanding questions between them and, through the treaties and resolutions on the Far East, to adjust their various conflicting interests. They did not completely adjust them nor did they legislate for all time; they were not essentially different from other public bodies; but under the Quadruple Pacific Treaty and other provisions, future meetings are ensured should the unsettled problems fail of adjustment by ordinary means or should fresh matters of difference arise. It would be idle to say that the powers were not actuated by self-interest, but insofar as each profited it may fairly be said that it meant no subtraction from the others, that on the contrary the interest of each part was served because the best interest of the whole was served. Certainly the highest interest of all demanded the allaying of the sinister discord that has been threatening this area of the world. Such an appeasement seems now fairly promised as the result of the agreement reached, while the perpetuation of the conference method, so successful in this instance, affords the basis of a stable policy to preserve the future peace. It remains for a vigilant and informed public opinion to give reality to the promise.

[Mr. Mackenzie King.]

It is, Mr. Speaker, a great privilege to have the opportunity of moving a resolution, which I am sure will meet with the unanimous support of all parties and of all groups in this House.

Right Hon. ARTHUR MEIGHEN (Leader of the Opposition): Before offering any remarks, I wish to ask the Prime Minister one question. His explanation covered, as I followed it, four treaties, that is to say, the limitation of naval armaments; the protection of neutrals and non-combatants; the stabilization of the Far Eastern rights; the Chinese customs tariff. As for the treaty relating to the insular possessions of the various powers in the North Pacific, I do not think his explanation made reference to it.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: I referred to it as the Quadruple Pacific Treaty. Possibly I touched rather on the insular possessions aspect of it, but I think my right hon. friend will find that I made considerable reference to it.

Mr. MEIGHEN: It was treated with the third?

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: Yes, I spoke of it before I dealt with the third and fourth.

Mr. MEIGHEN: Mr. Speaker, I need not say that I fully approve the motion of my right hon. friend for the approval of these five treaties, to all of which the British Empire is a party, to all of which Canada due to her place in the British Empire and as between the Empire and the world is a party as well.

4 p.m.

It goes without saying as well that these treaties are of such importance as to warrant their being brought before this House in order that the signatures thereto on behalf of this country may be confirmed by Parliament. As all hon. members know, the treaty-making power is inherent in government and may become effective even without confirmation by Parliament; but though such is the case the practice has always been, virtually without exception in the case of any treaty of consequence so far as Canada is concerned, and increas-

ingly so so far as Britain is concerned, to bring such treaties to Parliament for approval.

The late government pursued this course in the way I have described, and, indeed, in the case of treaties of much less consequence than those enumerated in the present motion the approval of Parliament was sought. Complaint has been made even this session as to the expense incurred by Canada in summoning a special session in 1919 in order that the most consequential treaties resulting from the war might be confirmed. I cannot see how the complaint can be made save on the part of those who do not regard the ratification by this country of a treaty made in the name of the Empire as a fundamental importance. With the development of our constitutional powers as a portion of the Empire it does become of great consequence that Canada's adhesion be obtained.

The Peace treaties were arrived at in the late spring of 1919. They were not reached as early as the people of the world had hoped. Following the armistice on the 11th November very prolonged negotiations took place, and unlooked for difficulties were encountered resulting in weeks and months of delay before the treaties from which Europe and the world were to take a new start could be consummated.

That delay has been one of the greatest misfortunes in the history of mankind. The delay that intervened between the armistice of November and the treaties of the following year was responsible for much of the disruption, for a great share of the chaos, for a tremendous portion of the difficulties that Europe and the world have had to surmount from that day until this. Had it been possible to arrive at these treaties earlier, to get the nations toed to a new line, resting on the new foundation upon which they were to build from that day forward, much of all that has been deplorable in the history of the world since then would have been avoided.

The adhesion of Canada to the treaties arrived at was an essential factor. The adhesion of Great Britain alone, without that of her Dominions, would have been relatively ineffective, and delay on the part of the British Empire, would have been only adding difficulties, only adding to the chaos that existed, only adding to the suffering that had already occurred. Therefore, it was essential that Canada's will should be known, that Canada's position with relation thereto should at the earliest possible date be disclosed. Consequently, action was immediately taken that we should say where we stood, in order that we might do our part to close the books so far as the British Empire was concerned. For that purpose a special session was called. Had it not been called there would have been five, six or seven months more delay, with all the havoc that such delay involved.

I join heartily, indeed I join gratefully, in the tribute paid to the representative of Canada at the Disarmament conference. Sir Robert Borden was chosen by the late government. It became impossible for me as Prime Minister of the day to attend because of an event transpiring in Canada, namely, the general election. That Sir Robert Borden was able to attend is a matter for congratulation to us all. Indeed, I may suggest with no mock modesty whatever that it was fortunate for Canada that Sir Robert Borden was chosen in place of the Prime Minister at that time. There could not be any Canadian, nor could there be any one anywhere, who in my judgment was so well fitted to represent us, and as well British interests generally, as was Sir Robert Borden. His experiences, commencing in public life twenty-five years before, commencing in their especial importance as relating to Empire and world affairs ten years before, and especially his intimate acquaintance through all the years of the war, and subsequently, with international relations and with inter-Imperial relations, particularly with British Empire and American relations, was so marked and profound that no one could have been chosen so well equipped, so well armed to represent this country at this momentous conference as was he.

And indeed the conference was momentous. The Treaty of Versailles was the outcome of the Peace conference, but the Peace conference itself did not mean more for humanity than did what is known as the Disarmament conference that took place last winter.

I join as well in the tribute to the President and government of the United States for the wisdom they displayed, as well as for the courage they manifested in selecting the opportune moment and in boldly taking the responsibility of calling together the great powers of the world in order to seek to achieve at last that which for centuries the nations had sought in vain to reach, namely, some formulation of principle, some concrete declaration of

policy, some consortium around which all could gather to reduce the burden of armaments upon the world. The success of the conference is the vindication of the United States government in choosing that period for its meeting. It is the vindication as well of the broad practical proposals that government made. The courage of the United States was equalled, if not excelled, by that of the government of Great Britain in immediately acquiescing in the suggestions of the United States, and in subsequently advancing proposals that in the direction pointed by the United States government went further than the United States itself. We are proud as citizens of the British Empire, as a component part of that Empire, that the palm of credit for seeking to go farther along the path of disarmament, much farther along that path than any other nation present, was taken by the British Empire. Indeed, had the proposals of Britain's representatives been accepted much more would have been achieved than has been achieved, and the weight of responsibility for defence resting upon the Empire now would have been much lighter than it is. That we should have taken the lead in that regard, and that Canada's representative in particular should have taken so prominent, so effective, indeed, so conspicuous a part, in that noble work is a matter for congratulation to every Canadian.

Coming to the treaties themselves, I have little to add to the explanation of each that has been given by the Prime Minister. They, of course, are not of equal importance. The treaty of chief importance to this country—indeed all are of importance save one—is the first, that providing a basis for naval disarmament, or rather, providing a basis along which the naval armament of the principal powers shall proceed, and within the limits of which they shall be confined. That treaty, I say, is undoubtedly of first and greatest moment to us. I do not for a moment think that any hon. member of this House will complain of the provisions of that treaty, in so far as it lays out a measure of defence naval forces which the British Empire may sustain. The relationship between the Empire, on the one hand, and the United States on the other, is fixed as one of equality; as between those two and Japan the relationship is five to three; as between these three and the other signatory powers, Italy and France, the relationship as between Britain or the United States and France is five to 1.75; and as between Japan and France, three to 1.75.

These figures appear to have been, roughly speaking, representative of the relative naval strength of those five powers at the time the conference opened. The relationship that should continue to subsist was fixed there, but that was only part of the accomplishment. Relationship as among powers is one thing: the aggregate of naval forces belonging to any single power is another thing, and the treaty went on to provide that while this relationship was maintained, the aggregate tonnage strength in capital ships of even those allowed the highest forces, should not be more than 525,000 tons. Provision is made by which this shall be arrived at; provision is made by which replacements may take place, to continue until the maximum is reached; and provision is made by which any nation signatory to the treaty may be kept within the limits so defined. That imposes, of course, upon the other powers, similar restrictions corresponding to the ratio that I set out a moment ago. Nothing like this had previously been in force in the world's history. This is the first milestone in the record of our race where the great powers have come together and have joined hands in an agreement that limits the building of destructive forces by themselves. I join with the Prime Minister wholeheartedly in regret that the conference was not able to go further, that a proposal advanced by Great Britain for the complete elimination of the submarine was not accepted by the other powers. So far as the report discloses—and of course we are bound to keep ourselves within the confines of the report—that idea was not acceptable to any other power. I do not know where the chief opposition came from but apparently acquiescence failed to come at all, and Britain stood alone in her championing of the total elimination of the submarine. It is true that relatively the submarine is not of major importance for the purposes of defence; its great importance is for the purposes of aggression in fields where its exercise shocks every dictate of conscience and violates all the laws of war. All that is true, and consequently a tremendous step would have been taken if agreement could have been reached on the proposal to abandon the submarine entirely. But we are all confronted with the fact that it was not reached, that progress in that direction must await some future day; and in the meantime Britain will doubtless find it

imposed upon her by sheer necessity—while other nations are building and preparing to use if perchance war should come, this detestable weapon—Britain will undoubtedly find herself bound to do the same because emergencies might come involving her very life.

The treaty that follows, to which I adverted a moment ago, has to do with the preservation, or rather with the dedication, in language that hereafter never can be disputed, of the principles of international law as regards the use of noxious gases, submarines and other newer weapons of war. As the Prime Minister points out, it is not pretended, on behalf of the delegates to the conference, that any new principles have been herein established, that any particular, specific legislative advance has been made in the humanizing of war—that only those principles are embedded in this treaty which Britain had advocated before the war and by which she stood during the war and to which she called upon the world to enforce as the war progressed. She has succeeded with the assistance—no doubt with the equal co-operation of the United States and other powers—in obtaining the adhesion of all these other powers to those principles binding themselves to abide by them should war come between themselves, binding themselves as well in facilitating the adhesion of other powers thereto, thereby establishing those principles as a moral guide among nations thus taking all the steps that could be taken to make sure that, those principles will be respected should the day of war arrive.

The third treaty has to do with the stabilization of far eastern conditions. One might think, at first sight, we were not particularly interested in such a matter, but, as has often been remarked in the course of many debates in this House, the world grows smaller year by year, and an area of peril in one part of the universe, though it may be at the very antipodes to ourselves, may in reality threaten our peace as acutely as though it were at the very borders of Canada. The far eastern situation has been fraught with great danger for years. Inchoate disputed rights have been the order of the day in the far Pacific—inchoate as between China and Japan, consequently as between Britain and China, consequently, as well, between the United States and China; disputed as between those eastern powers and western powers; and disputed as between western powers among themselves, and eastern powers among themselves. There has not only been dispute as to rights, but there has been also a too evident tendency toward the invasion of undisputed rights carrying just the dangers that such invasions, always carried—and as well dragging in its train controversy between parties who were not in the original quarrel at all but who could not avoid its consequences. That situation has been pretty largely cleared up.

At the conference last summer it was felt that the settlement of far eastern questions was itself not only vital to the success of the general disarmament conference, but it was the better opinion, indeed the almost unanimous opinion, that the settlement of far eastern questions was a necessary preliminary to any possible success in the disarmament question itself. However, difficulties which intervened prevented such preliminary discussion of far eastern questions; they were left over till the disarmament conference itself: but by the organization of the conference, along the lines fully explained in the report of Canada's representative, and by the discussion of far eastern questions and the settlement, as will be observed, early in the conference, the same results, or at least nearly the same results, were obtained as could have been hoped for by a preliminary discussion of these subjects. This treaty embodies the results arrived at. One reading it, not familiar with international disputes, might think that very little in the way of a concrete agreement was reached; that very little at least in the way of disputed rights, was settled. That is all true, but the advance made was this: A basis was found upon which, if an acute dispute should in the future arise, there might be a settlement of such dispute by peaceful means rather than by a report to arms. There is the basis that has been found; it is in a word the basis of conference. It is the same basis which has resulted in much of the advance in the international world of recent years—the basis of conference has been successfully substituted for the basis of diplomatic correspondence. That is to say, representatives not of two powers directly affected but of all powers directly and indirectly affected to any important extent get together round a conference table there submitting their various claims to what is virtually an arbitration, resulting in that exposure to the whole world of the relative rights of all that gives the peoples of those countries the opportunity to estimate not

only the strength of their own arguments but the strength of the arguments of the other side, and consequently puts the people of those countries into a state of mind where they are less disposed to fly at each others throat.

A basis of conference has been established here, and direct, useful, efficient provisions have been formulated whereby a conference as certain of success as humanly possible will take place should anything in the nature of a crisis occur. That is indeed a great advance; it brings other nations into the settlement besides the British Empire, China and Japan. And may I add that the more nations you bring in to any settlement of that sort, the more minds you bring into one, the more certainty there is of a permanent settlement and the less responsibility attaches to those individually who are parties to it. It is far better that the United States, that France, that Britain, China and Japan should come to settlement in the matter of the Far East than that only Great Britain, Japan and China should be parties to that settlement. It is better for us, because no matter what the results may be, we shall have the co-operation of other powers whose ideals are similar to if not identical with our own; whose world mission is the same as ours—we shall have their co-operation in securing in the future adhesion to such treaties and co-operation in their enforcement.

Mr. CANNON: Will my right hon. friend allow me a question? With regard to the settlement of the far eastern questions, would my right hon. friend state to the House which Chinese government was represented at Washington—the South or the North Government, the Loyalist or the Republican Government?

Mr. LAPOINTE: A Chinese puzzle.

Mr. MEIGHEN: The hon. member could scarcely ask me a more difficult question. As the report very ably and succinctly discloses, the measure of truth in the assertion that China had a government that could represent her in an international conference is a matter of degree. China, of course, had a federal government. Whether it was a government or not may be a question; whether it was federal or not may be a question, but that it was thought by China to be a federal government there can be no question, and it was that government that was represented.

Mr. CANNON: Is it possible, in my right hon. friend's judgment, to settle any eastern questions without a proper Chinese government being fully represented?

Mr. MEIGHEN: It is possible to help settle them. The only alternative is to leave them with all their frightful possibilities unsettled, to act as brands ready to set the world on fire at any moment. It is not as satisfactory, of course, as if China were federated and had a central authoritative government, carrying not only among her own people but throughout the world the moral authority that governments should carry—not so satisfactory as if that were the case, but it is the most gratifying result that can be obtained at the present time. Indeed, were it not for the inchoate state of China, many of these questions that are to-day a source of anxiety in the Far East would never have been allowed to arise at all.

The fifth treaty mentioned here I shall not deal with, because it is really closely related to the third, and what I have said with regard to the third, may be taken as applying as well to the fifth. The fourth is of the least significance of all so far as we are concerned, but still of more significance than a mere reading of the title would lead one to understand. One would say at first glance that we are not particularly concerned whether or not the Chinese tariff is on an effective five per cent basis, but as a matter of fact, owing to the very situation that exists in China, we and all the world are concerned in the principles that govern the Chinese tariff. I do not think I need go into this rather complex question here; suffice it to say that once it becomes the concern of the various nations of the world to maintain the principle of the open door in China; and equal rights for all nations there, then you become interested in the Chinese tariff. On account of the very conditions I have described, namely the absence of a central uniform government in China and the consequent necessity of the maintenance of the open door principle by the direct action of other powers—for those very reasons, the other powers become interested in the Chinese tariff. On account of there being various dominions there, not in the nature of provinces of a confederation, as are our provinces here, but in the nature of powers often hostile to each other, they have an utterly indescribable tariff condition under which the utmost discrimination can be exercised, discrimination amounting virtually to exclusion. The utmost discrimination, I say,

can be embodied in the very tariff itself, and the system so built up has had the effect of virtually giving their trade to certain powers and altogether excluding others. Consequently, we who are trying to build up some Chinese trade had an interest in this matter, and a very considerable part was played by Canada's representatives in arriving at a solution of this vexed question—such solution is in itself not final but it lays down rules and provides machinery that will lead to finality at an early day. Consequently it is of importance that we adhere to this treaty with the others. I whole-heartedly support the motion and commend these treaties to the House, and I commend also to the House approbation on the part of all hon. members and of the people of Canada of the conference itself, concurrence in the results achieved and in the part Canada has taken in it; loyalty to the results achieved, loyalty to the provisions of the treaties, and a determination that Canada shall take her part not only in bringing about this agreement for the betterment of world affairs, but in living up to all the responsibility that that agreement involves.

Hon. T. A. CRERAR (Marquette): Mr. Speaker, it is somewhat unfortunate that these treaties, which are of very considerable interest to Canada, are being considered in the atmosphere of listlessness that always attends the late sittings of the closing days of the session. I am not offering any criticism of the Government for not having placed them before the House sooner, but these treaties are of considerable consequence to Canada—indeed, to the whole world— and I am very glad to associate myself fully with the motion of the Prime Minister (Mr. Mackenzie King) that they be ratified by this House.

The Washington conference marked a new stage in the development of international affairs and in the settlement of international disputes. I very cordially agree with everything that has been said by the Prime Minister and by the right hon. leader of the Opposition (Mr. Meighen) as respects the credit due to the president of the United States for the initiative displayed by him in calling together the interested powers, that they might sit around a common table, and, like common sense people, discuss these differences with a view to agreeing on some method of settlement. I associate myself fully also, with all that has been said as to the worthy manner in which Sir Robert Borden represented this Dominion.

This conference marks a great step forward in the settlement of international disputes, and the result achieved at Washington has fully justified expectations that were held concerning it, when the first news was flashed throughout the world that such a conference was to be held. These treaties have been very fully dealt with by the Prime Minister and the leader of the Opposition. There are, however, a few thoughts connected with them that I should like to draw to the attention of the House, points that, perhaps, were not touched upon by my right hon. friends who preceded me.

The first treaty, dealing with the limitation of armaments, as the leader of the Opposition has pointed out, fixes the ratio of vessels of war that each of the countries interested shall maintain. That has a very direct bearing even upon Canada; but it has a very direct bearing upon the countries that are more particularly involved. If, by common agreement of the nations, these limitations of armaments can be brought into effect, is it too much to hope that, with the development of this method of settling international disputes, the time will come in the very near future when common agreement can be reached amongst the great nations of the world that they will rid themselves of the burden of maintaining these armaments, excepting what may be necessary for police purposes internationally? I think that time will soon come, and for this reason this is one of the most hopeful things that has been achieved. The conference, while it was called outside of the League of Nations altogether, nevertheless, I think, emphasizes, in a very direct way the great value that attaches to the central idea associated with the League of Nations, the idea of settlement of international disputes by friendly means, by the same means that are adopted in the settlement of disputes between individuals. Why can that not be done? Why can disputes between nations not be settled in the same way as disputes between individuals are settled? The moral conscience of the world can be aroused and brought to bear, to function in this way, and I for one hope,—I am sure we all hope—to live to see the day when these international disputes will be settled in the International Court of Justice which has recently been set up as a result of the formation of the League of Nations.

The treaty relating to the prevention of the use of poison gases and chemicals in future warfare is one that every person of humanitarian instinct throughout the world will heartily applaud. Unfortunately, these conventions are often not recognized in the spirit and in the letter as fully as they should be recognized when the horrors of war come upon us. We know that in the great war which ceased a few years ago, conventions formerly agreed to between the nations, seeking to ameliorate and soften the horrors of war, were broken,—broken, it is true, at the instance of Germany. When Germany broke those conventions, they were pretty generally disregarded, and we had all the horrors attendant upon poison gases and all the ingenuities the brain of man could conceive to hurt and destroy his enemy. The success of a treaty of this kind depends not so much on the mere signatures of the nations that are parties to it; it depends in the main on the arousing of the conscience of the world, by this means, making this sort of thing impossible, putting a nation that will resort to this thing beyond the pale of human association, if such were possible.

The next treaty, having to do with the stabilising of conditions in the Far East, is also one that has a very direct interest to Canada. Canada has taken her place, somewhat slowly, but nevertheless in a way that no one can deny, in international affairs. The same ocean that washes the coasts of China and Japan washes the western coast of Canada. The rapid means of transit that we have in the modern world bring these countries very closely together, and we are interested therefore in anything that will stabilize conditions in the Far East. It is well known that the fear has existed that difficulties leading to war might arise in the East owing to the peculiar position that China occupies. This treaty, therefore, has to do mainly with that great country of China, and it lays down several very important conditions, of which the first two in article I, I should like to bring to the attention of the House. This provides that the nations who are parties to this treaty agree:

(1) To respect the sovereignty, the independence and the territorial and administrative integrity of China.

(2) To provide the fullest and most unembarrassed opportunity to China to develop and maintain for herself an effective and stable government.

[Mr. Crerar.]

That is one of the essential things to the maintenance of peace and conditions of peace in the Far East. The signing of this treaty, the recognition of this fact by all these great nations who are interested in these eastern questions, means the taking of a very long step in advance in preventing, in that part of the world, the development of conditions which might eventually lead to war.

The fourth treaty relates to the Chinese customs tariff. It is interesting to know why Canada should be interested in the Chinese customs tariff; but apparently all the countries of the world, realizing the beneficent influences that flow from trading with their neighbours, desire access to the Chinese market, and in order that no discrimination may be perpetuated, as the leader of the Opposition has well stated, they have come into common agreement that the Chinese customs tariff shall be 5 per cent. I would almost wish that we could have an international conference that would set a customs tariff for Canada on the same basis.

Mr. MEIGHEN: The hon. gentleman, I hope, realizes what the agreement does. It raises the Chinese customs tariff from 2½ per cent to 5 per cent. I hope that fact will not keep my hon. friend from approving the agreement.

Mr. CRERAR: True it provides for raising the Chinese customs tariff from 2½ per cent to 5 per cent. In fact, they decided to increase their tariff by the same amount that the Canadian Minister of Finance (Mr. Fielding) has since decided to reduce the Canadian customs tariff. Nevertheless, this treaty is a recognition by the great powers of the world of the fact that trade is a useful, a beneficent thing. I have no doubt the Chinese would like to have had their tariff higher; in fact, I think their representatives at the conference asked that it be made higher in order that they might get more revenue out of it. They seemed to have the idea of settling their tariff on a moderate revenue basis. That, I think, is a very excellent idea for China at the present time, and it would be a very excellent idea for Canada also at the present time.

Of all these treaties, however, the last one mentioned is, in my judgment, the most important. The one affecting the limitation of armaments is of undoubted importance, as are the others; but this one seems to have a significance, for Canada at any rate, that is greater than that

attaching to any of the others. It is important to Canada because Canada is a Pacific power, a Pacific power, I mean in the sense that our shores are washed by the Pacific ocean. There are those who predicted after the Great War was concluded, that the next great international struggle would be fought in the Pacific ocean. Anything, then, that leads to a friendly method of settling disputes between the countries interested in that area of the world is of the first importance to Canada. The treaty specifically sets out the means by which disputes between the countries in that particular region of the earth may be settled; and it is not too too much to expect that the conditions laid down in the treaty shall be observed by the nations affected. If they are observed, then it is not too much to hope for, that the way has been found for effectually preventing the outbreak of any great war in the Pacific ocean.

This treaty has another particular significance to Canada, and it is this, that when it is ratified the agreement reached between Great Britain and Japan in 1911 shall cease to be further operative. Now, the British-Japanese treaty was made prior to the great war. It was perhaps a necessary treaty; at any rate, it was considered necessary by these two powers when it was negotiated. But every one in this country, who follows with any degree of interest at all the development of international matters, is aware of the fact that a considerable feeling had grown between the United States, our great neighbour to the south, and the Japanese empire; and that feeling was so acute prior to the Washington conference that there were many who predicted that it would eventually lead to a clash of arms between the United States and Japan. The fact that Great Britain had this treaty with Japan was, I think, an irritating factor in the minds of many of our neighbours to the south, and in that way the Anglo-Japanese Treaty had a direct bearing on Canada; because there is nothing of greater consequence to this country, there is nothing more necessary to Canada, than the maintenance of the most friendly relations between ourselves and the United States. Because the adoption of this treaty abrogates the British-Japanese treaty, there is therefore removed a possible source of irritation, while there is promoted a more friendly feeling between the United States and Great Britain, and for that reason the interest of peace in the world at large is promoted. These are the chief considerations, in my opinion, in addition to the reasons very ably set out by the Prime Minister and my right hon. friend (Mr. Meighen), why this House should unanimously ratify these treaties. I am sure that will be the sense of the House, and I trust that when the treaties are ratified it not only will be an evidence of the larger place Canada is taking in international affairs, but will be a long step in advance towards the preservation of the peace of the world in the years to come, the maintenance of which is of vital interest to every citizen of the Dominion.

Hon. ERNEST LAPOINTE (Minister of Marine): I desire to add a few words to what has been already stated in support of the resolution. I am pleased indeed that Canada should have been represented, and very ably represented, at the Washington Conference. I am glad that, although the Dominions were not invited in the first instance, Britain saw to it that they should be represented at that conference. I am pleased also that we, as a Parliament, have been given an opportunity to ratify the treaties which were there negotiated and signed. By so doing we are pledging Canadian influence and good-will in the promotion of the interests of peace and good understanding between the nations of the world. As my hon. friend from Marquette (Mr. Crerar) has said, this conference marks a new stage. It is a step in the direction of settling, or at least of trying to settle, international controversies by way of conference and negotiation instead of by means of war. The Four-Power treaty is to my mind a milestone in the history of the world. Four great powers, having various and sometimes divergent interests in the Pacific, have agreed to respect one another's rights and to try to negotiate any difficulty which may arise among them instead of resorting to war. Heretofore the treaties entered into between nations have been for the purpose of forming alliances, either offensive or defensive, or both. Their aim has been the prosecution of war. In this treaty there is no such object. This treaty has for its object not the prosecution of war but, on the contrary, the preservation of peace; it is a treaty in which the contracting parties have bound themselves to adopt other means than war in settling international disputes. The only obligation on any nation's part is to respect the possessions of the other contracting parties

in the Pacific, and, in case any difficulty arises, to join in conference to try to adjust that difficulty by way of negotiation or arbitration. And if other nations, not parties to the treaty, threaten any aggressive action against any of the signatories, the other parties also join in conference for the purpose of meeting the situation and of endeavouring to avert war. There is no legal or moral obligation on the part of any of the signatories to take part in a war. There cannot be any doubt as to that, as there was in connection with the Covenant of the League of Nations. When the Treaty of Versailles was discussed in this Parliament I, with others, took a strong stand against Article X. I seconded a motion offered by the member for Shelburne and Queens, now Minister of Finance (Mr. Fielding), to the effect that our ratification of that treaty should be subject to reservation, that we should not be bound to any military action except after the previous consent of the Canadian Parliament had been obtained. The government of that day said that our fears were not well founded, and our amendment was defeated. Yet we received the information later on that our delegates at the Versailles Peace Conference had opposed Article X of the Covenant; and at the last meeting of the Assembly of the League of Nations at Geneva the representatives of Canada moved that Article X be stricken from the Covenant of the League. I am pleased that they did so. No action was taken on that motion, which was postponed; but I hope that whoever represents Canada at the next meeting of the assembly will see that the motion presented last year by our representative is proceeded with and that Article X shall be eliminated from the covenant. There is in these treaties no such obligation as was imposed in Article X of the Covenant of the League of Nations. All that is called for now is a combination of the moral forces of the world to promote peace, international good-will and love of justice. The mere fact that such treaties have been signed is an indication that the world is moving forward. It is sometimes said that the peaceful adjustment of difficulties through negotiation or arbitration does not always give full justice to one of the parties concerned. Undoubtedly that is so. But who will contend that war, in other words, force, always promotes the ends of justice? A few days after signing the treaty which recognized the independence of his country, a great American statesman wrote to a friend:

[Mr. Lapointe.]

> May there be no other war, because there never was a war which was a good war, and there never was a peace which was a bad peace.

One of the great merits of this Four-Power treaty, as my hon. friend from Marquette stated, is that it makes possible the termination of the Anglo-Japanese alliance, which was a menace to this country. Article 2 of that treaty between the United Kingdom and Japan reads as follows:

> If, by reason of unprovoked attack or aggressive action, wherever arising, on the part of any power or powers, either high contracting party should be involved in war in defence of its territorial rights or special interests mentioned in the preamble of this agreement, the other high contracting party will at once go to the assistance of its ally, and will conduct the war in common and make peace in mutual agreement with it.

By that treaty Canada was bound. It is fortunate that it is replaced by this Quadruple Power Treaty.

With regard to the treaty for the limitation of armaments, I am in complete accord with my hon. friend from Marquette and my right hon. friend the leader of the Opposition in believing that this is the most important of all the treaties. The limitation of armaments was made possible by the signing in December of the first treaty, the Four-Power treaty. The limitation of armaments is also a deviation from the old order of things. Five great nations have met together and agreed to reduce their naval armaments, and thereby decrease the burdens of their respective peoples. They have also agreed on a naval holiday for a period of twelve years during which no new ships are to be built except those which may be necessary for replacement purposes.

I hope that world conditions will so adjust themselves as to permit of the reduction of land armaments as well. It is not true that war preparations ensure peace; the contrary is the case. Nations have been precipitated in devastating conflicts on account of having made military preparations. The last great war was the penalty paid by the world for that terrible mistake. I was reading the other day in a publication which is certainly not suspected of socialism or similar opinions—The Round Table, a good imperialist organ, which is described as "a quarterly review of the politics of the British commonwealth"—an article on the curse of militarism in which the origin of the late war is so well described that I take the liberty of reading a few sentences to the House.

It may be well, however, to examine a little more closely the manner of the outbreak, for it has great lessons for the future.

As every Continental Power under the pre-war system of the balance of power became more highly organized for war, as the whole of every nation was conscribed and put in training down to the last button and the last man, time became an increasingly important factor. Military numbers ceased to be the most important thing. The army which could mobilize quickest and strike an effective blow first would win the war, because it would destroy its opponent's capacity to fight before it was ready for action.

Thus it was, as was pointed out in this review in 1915, that the terrible time-table of the European General Staffs had far more to do with the actual outbreak of the world war than the deliberate decision of any man or government. Europe had become an armed camp under the impulse of German ambition. The crisis was precipitated by the decision of the Cabinets of Vienna and Berlin to take the opportunity afforded by the assassination of Franz Ferdinand to attempt by means of a 48-hour ultimatum to win a diplomatic victory which would mean the establishment of an Austro-German hegemony over Serbia and the Balkans. But it is almost certain that no one, political or general, deliberately decided to start the world war. It was the military time-table itself which swept them, like everybody else, headlong into the struggle once the first button had been pressed.

This was the march of events.

At the same time that the ultimatum was presented in Belgrade the Austro-Hungarian government ordered the mobilization of the southern part of the Austrian army in order to prove that they meant business in their ultimatum, and would, if necessary, enforce it by occupying Belgrade. No sooner did the Austro-Hungarian army mobilize than the Russian General Staff went to the Tsar and pointed out that if Austria-Hungary were allowed a start and a general war grew out of the crisis Russia would start at an immense disadvantage. They insisted, therefore, that there must be a preliminary mobilization of the southern section of the Russian army as a parallel move. Immediately there was the utmost excitement in Berlin. If the Russian army were allowed to mobilize what would happen to the German plan for victory in the event of war? That plan depended entirely upon the capacity of the German army to mobilize a few days faster than the French, and upon its being able to crush the French army before the Russians could take the field in strength.

Hence the frantic telegrams of the Kaiser to the Tsar imploring, almost commanding, him to give orders cancelling the mobilization. For he knew, and his advisers knew, that if that mobilization continued they would be faced with the alternative between immediate war according to plan and allowing a situation to develop which in their judgment meant certain failure for Germany in a general war. But the Tsar would not countermand unless Austria-Hungary countermanded. And for Vienna to countermand mobilization meant an abject humiliation for the Central Powers far worse than that of Agadir. And so while telegrams flashed and Sir Edward Grey's proposal for conference was on the wires, the fateful minutes passed, one after another the nations mobilized, the situation drifted steadily out of control, until finally the German General Staff insisted on marching through Belgium as the alternative to defeat, and Europe stumbled blindly into a war which killed 10,000,000 men, wounded 30,000,000, and ruined in one way or another as many more, without anybody deliberately setting fire to the train.

And this is the situation which always must arise where national security is based upon competitive armaments. A time will inevitably come when the deliberations of diplomats and statesmen will be rudely broken into by considerations of military necessity and nations will be rushed headlong into war, whether they want it or not.

I think this is a vivid description of what happened in 1914. I am pleased that in this country public opinion asserts itself in no uncertain tone against heavy armaments. Canadian public men must on every occasion which presents itself use their influence on the side of peace, on the side of negotiation and arbitration rather than on the side of force and armaments. That is why I congratulate the men who have negotiated these treaties at Washington. They may well use the language of M. Hymans, one of the presidents of the Assembly of the League of Nations, "Nous avons donné au monde un grand espoir"—"We have given to the world a great hope." And, as a Canadian representative in this Parliament, I offer them my thanks and the assurance of my support.

Motion (Mr. Mackenzie King) agreed to.

LEAGUE OF NATIONS

APPROVAL OF PROTOCOLS OF AMENDMENT TO THE COVENANT

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

Resolved, That it is expedient that Parliament do approve of the Protocols of Amendment signed on behalf of Canada at Geneva on May 20, 1922, of which copies have been laid before Parliament, embodying certain proposed amendments to Articles 4, 6, 12, 13, 15, and 26 of the covenant of the League of Nations, which were adopted by the second assembly of the Leauge at Geneva on October 3rd, 4th and 5th, 1921; and that this House do approve of the same.

Right Hon. ARTHUR MEIGHEN (Leader of the Opposition): Before the Prime Minister rises, may I suggest that as it has been impossible for many of us to see the documents laid on the Table, perhaps he would agree to postponing consideration of this resolution until a later hour to-day or until to-morrow.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: I think I can possibly save the time of the House if I give

a brief explanation of the several protocols which the House is being asked to approve.

As hon. members may have observed from copies of the protocols which have been distributed, they embody resolutions which were passed at the Assembly of the League of Nations in October of last year. For certain reasons it was thought advisable that the various resolutions should take the form of protocols to be submitted to the governments of the different nations represented in the League. For the most part, I may say, the protocols are either consequential or procedural in their nature, and do not in any way vary the spirit of the covenant. For this reason the Government might very well have approved the several protocols and authorized their ratification by His Majesty without coming to Parliament for approval before ratification. It was perhaps unnecessary to bring the protocols to Parliament for approval. Inasmuch, however, as Parliament was in session at the time the protocols were referred to the Government, we thought it was fitting and proper that hon. members of this House particularly should have the opportunity of approving of them. A step of this kind helps to enforce the principle of publicity in matters of international agreement, and the assertion of the supremacy of Parliament in these all important questions of international relations, particularly the supremacy of the elective Chamber.

As hon. members know, the constitution of the League of Nations provides that there shall be a council and an assembly. The council is a permanent body and convenes four times a year; the assembly meets only once a year. The different nations send their representatives to the assembly for its meeting on the 1st of September.

The effect of the proposed amendments in relation to the articles of the covenant may be set out as follows:

Article IV. The original Article in its first paragraph provides that the assembly may select from time to time in its discretion four members of the league to be represented on the council in addition to the four great Powers. There were, however, no rules fixed for the method of selection, etc. The amendment proposes that the assembly shall fix such rules by a two-thirds majority, particularly such regulations as relate to the term of office and the conditions of re-eligibility of the non-permanent members of the council. This amendment seems well designed to supply an omission that has caused much difficulty, and there seems every reason why Canada should assent.

Article VI. The original Article in its last paragraph provides that the expenses of the league should be borne by the members in accordance with the apportionment of the expenses of the Universal Postal Union. This has worked inequitably and has been especially hard on Canada, since it has obliged her to contribute on an equal basis with Great Britain, France, Italy, etc. The amendments to this Article propose a scheme that will materially reduce Canada's contribution. The new allocation is possibly still open to objection on our part, but it is the best we can get for the present. There seems every reason for the signature and ratification of the protocol in this case.

Article XII. Under the original Article the members of the league agree that if there should arise between them a dispute likely to lead to a rupture they will submit the matter either to arbitration or to inquiry by the council, and they agree in no case to resort to war until three months after the award by arbitrators or the report by the council. The amendment proposes to add submission to "judicial settlement" as a further alternative to submission to arbitration or to inquiry by the council. This is a purely consequential amendment and is necessary in view of the creation by the first and second assemblies of the Permanent Court of International Justice. Canada, having ratified the scheme of the Permanent Court, should also ratify this amendment.

Article XIII. The amendments here are precisely similar to those in the case of Article XII, and are also consequential on the setting up of the Permanent Court. Here too it would seem the Protocol should be signed and ratified.

Article XV. The amendment here is similar to those in the cases of Articles XII and Article XIII; they are consequential on the setting up of the Permanent Court and are subject to the same considerations.

Article XXVI. The original Article provided for amendments to the Covenant but was indefinite as to the precise procedure to be followed. Confusion and doubt have resulted. The amendment proposes the following procedure for enacting amendments to the Covenant. First of all, amendments must be voted by the assembly on a three-fourths majority, which ma-

jority must include the votes of all the members of the council represented at the meeting. Before amendments so voted can take effect, they must be ratified by all the members whose representatives composed the council when the vote was taken, and by a majority of those whose representatives form the assembly. If sufficient ratifications are not obtained within twenty-two months after the vote the proposed amendments remain without effect. All members are to be notified of the taking effect of an amendment, and any member which has not at that time ratified the amendment is free to signify its refusal to accept it, but in that case it shall cease to be a member of the league. This proposal seems well calculated to overcome the original defect, and there seems no reason why Canada should not sign and ratify it.

In all these cases therefore it would seem advisable to authorize ratification. There are four other Protocols relating to Article XVI. It appears from the Colonial Secretary's despatch of December 31, 1921 (No. 47), that the governments of Great Britain and France have agreed not to ratify these proposed amendments before the meeting of the assembly in 1922. As they are both represented on the council their ratifications are absolutely essential to the taking effect of any amendment. Consequently there would seem to be no point in signing the Protocols relating to Article XVI. Further the correspondence seems to indicate that these amendments were perhaps hastily considered. It would seem therefore just as well to wait until we can see what action the third assembly takes this year.

Mr. MEIGHEN: With reference to Canada's contribution, would the Prime Minister state what is the basis of the new allocation?

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: The last paragraph of the original Article 6 reads as follows:

> The expenses of the secretariat shall be borne by the members of the league in accordance with the apportionment of the expenses of the International Bureau of the Universal Postal Union.

Under the proposed amendment the above paragraph is to be struck out and the following two paragraphs are to be inserted:

> The expenses of the league shall be borne by the members of the league in the proportion decided by the Assembly.
>
> The allocation of the expenses of the league set out on Annex 3 shall be applied as from January 1st 1922, until a revised allocation has come in to force after adoption by the Assembly.

Also a third Annex is to be added to the two original annexes to the Covenant; the third Annex being the new provisional allocation of expenses referred to in the last paragraph just quoted. It will be found in the first of the Protocols relating to Article 6.

The purpose of the amendment is to bring about the new allocation of the expenses of the league as between the various members. As already stated the original Article 6 of the Covenant provided that the expenses of the Secretariat should be borne by the members of the league in accordance with the apportionment of the expenses of the international bureau of the Universal Postal Union. When the Covenant was adopted at the Paris Peace Conference the Universal Postal Union was the only international organization affording a precedent for this purpose, and as it would have been impracticable to work out an elaborate new scheme the scheme of the Postal Union was adopted. In practice, however, the scheme has been subject to much criticism especially on the part of smaller states. For Canada the matter has a direct interest. Under the Universal Postal Union scheme Canada is on the same footing as Great Britain, France, Italy and the other great Powers, and accordingly she has paid the same amount toward the expenses of the League as have these Powers. At both the first and second assemblies the Canadian representatives joined with other representatives in the endeavour to secure a re-allocation. The first assembly appointed a committee to inquire into the matter, and the report of this committee was considered by the second assembly with the result that three amendments to Article 6 are now proposed. In the first place it is proposed to strike out the last paragraph of Article 6 of the covenant and to provide instead that the assembly shall be authorized to fix the allocation of the expenses of the league. The second assembly, in anticipation, attempted to arrive at a new allocation. It was unable to agree upon what should be regarded as a final allocation; but it did arrive at a provisional new allocation to come into force January 1, 1922. This allocation is set out in the table embodied in the proposed third annex of the covenant. Under this table Canada appears

in the third class. For example, France is responsible for 90 units, China for 65 units and Canada for 35 units. Under the third protocol relating to Article 6 it is provided that the allocation of expenses set out in this table shall be applied as from January 1, 1922 until a revised allocation has come into force after adoption by the assembly. The Canadian representatives at the second assembly reported to the government that they were doubtful as to the ultimate fairness of the new allocation so far as Canada was concerned, but that it was impossible at the moment to secure anything better, and that it would still be possible to make representations in the future.

Hon. members will find the various amounts allocated to the different countries set out in the blue book which has been brought down. As regards Canada, I think our contribution for the first two years was $200,000 a year. Under the present allocation the amount has been reduced to $150,000, that amount is regarded as still too high and it is hoped that, perhaps, at the meeting of the assembly this year Canada's share may be somewhat further reduced.

Mr. MEIGHEN: The Prime Minister observed that the ratio between Canada and Australia is as 35 to 15. I see no explanation of that; I do not know how that ratio could have been arrived at.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: I am sorry I cannot give my right hon. friend that information at the moment.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: I think that Australia, under the old regulation, was classified as we were, as a first class postal power.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: I could not say at the moment. I think the leader of the Opposition wishes this resolution to stand.

Mr. MEIGHEN: I am not asking that it should stand.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: I think the resolution is mostly a formal matter.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: I would suggest that before the resolution is passed we make it quite clear that this is not the last word on this feature.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: On the feature of Canada's proportionate contribution, certainly not.

Motion agreed to.

[Mr. Mackenzie King.]

CANADIAN WHEAT BOARD

On motion of Hon. J. A. Robb (Minister of Trade and Commerce) the House went into committee on the following proposed resolution, Mr. Gordon in the Chair:

Resolved, That it is expedient to bring in a measure to provide,—

1. That the Governor in Council may appoint a board to be known as the Canadian Wheat Board, hereinafter called "the Board," which shall consist of not more than ten members, one of whom shall be nominated by the Governor in Council as Chairman of the Board, who shall be the chief executive officer,, and another member shall be nominated by the Governor in Council as Assistant Chairman, who shall have and exercise the powers and duties of the Chairman in his absence.

2. That the Chairman and Assistant Chairman shall be paid such salaries as the Governor in Council may direct, and the other members of the Board shall be paid such allowances for days actually engaged in the duties of the Board as the Governor in Council may direct; also travelling and living expenses while travelling on the business of the Board, but otherwise shall receive no remuneration: Provided that such salaries, allowances or expenses shall be payable only out of proceeds of sales hereinafter authorized.

3. That the members of the Board shall be a corporation under the corporate name aforesaid.

4. That the Board may from time to time appoint an executive committee of not less than three of its members of whom the Chairman shall be one, and may assign to such executive committee any duties or powers competent to the Board.

5. That the Board shall have power throughout Canada to receive and take delivery of wheat for marketing as offered by the producer or other person having possession of or being entitled to deliver the same; to sell wheat; to store, transport and market wheat; and moreover the Board may sell any quantity of wheat which it may possess in excess of domestic requirements to purchasers overseas or in foreign countries at such prices as may be obtainable, when advised by the consignor of such wheat or his representative to do so.

6. That the Board shall have power to receive advances of money for the general purposes of the Board from any province, or from any bank, corporation or individual upon such terms as may be stipulated with the approval of the Governor in Council.

7. That the Board shall have capacity to receive, have, enjoy and exercise such further powers or rights as may be conferred upon it by the legislature of any Province with relation to any matter connected with the purchase, acquisition, sale or marketing of wheat and within the legislative authority of the Province.

8. That the Board may at the time of delivery or at any time thereafter, make advances to the purchasers or other persons delivering wheat to the Board at such rate per bushel according to grade or quality and place of delivery as shall be set out in a schedule or schedules to be prepared by the Board and approved by the Governor in Council or by such other authority as the Governor in Council may prescribe, and may issue to such persons certificates of participation in the proceeds.

9. That deliveries of wheat may be taken from, through or by the use of such agents or grain companies or organizations as the Board may see fit, and may be at such points in Canada, at the seaboard or otherwise, as the Board may direct, and the Board may pay to such agents or grain companies or organizations handling wheat, or delivering wheat to the Board, such commissions, storage and other charges as the Board, with the approval of the Governor in Council or other such authority as he may prescribe, may deem proper.

10. That as soon as the Board shall have received payment in full for all wheat delivered to the Board during the operations of any season there shall be deducted from the proceeds all moneys disbursed by or on behalf of the Board for expenses or otherwise as payments connected with or incident to the operations of the Board for or during that season, including the remuneration, allowances, travelling and living expenses of the Chairman, Assistant Chairman or other members of the Board as hereinbefore provided; also the salaries, pay or allowances of the clerks, employees or assistants engaged by the Board, and the balance shall be distributed *pro rata* among all producers and others holding participation certificates.

11. That the Board, with the approval of the Governor in Council, may make such regulations as it deems necessary for the purpose of fully and effectively carrying out the objects and provisions of these resolutions, and, but not so as to restrict in any way the generality of the foregoing terms of this resolution, may make regulations,—

(a) for appointing representatives in different parts of Canada or overseas, or in any foreign country, for assisting the work of the Board, and for reporting to the Board such information as the regulations may require;

(b) to authorize the engaging of clerks, employees and assistants and paying their salaries;

(c) providing for the forms and contents of participation certificates, vouchers or documents of title to be held by producers and others delivering wheat to the Board, for the conditions of negotiability of the same, for the substitution of the same for other vouchers, and generally establishing such system as may in the judgment of the Board be necessary for the security and equitable treatment of all persons concerned in the delivery and sale of wheat and in the carrying out of the Act to be based upon these resolutions;

(d) fixing dates up to which, and not beyond which the Board will take deliveries at different places in Canada;

(e) determining the requisites of delivery to the Board.

12. That it shall be the duty of the Board to use its best endeavours to sell and dispose of the wheat which it may acquire or which may come into its possession for the best price that may be obtainable therefor, and to realize the proceeds; accurately to keep proper books of account showing quantities and grades of wheat received, the prices realized therefor, and such other particulars as may be requisite for a full and just accounting and for the equitable distribution of the net proceeds.

13. That the Government of Canada shall not be responsible for any of the contracts, obligations or liabilities of the Board, or for the payment of any remuneration, salary, allowances or expenses incurred by the Board, or to which any member of the Board or any other person is or may become entitled.

14. That the Government of Canada shall not be responsible for any deficits that may occur in the operation of such Board and should a surplus occur it shall be divided among the Provinces or patrons on a *pro rata* basis.

15. That operations of the Board under the powers conferred by the Act to be based upon these resolutions shall not extend beyond the .....day of ..... 1922, except for the purposes of sale, realization of assets, collections, payments, distribution of proceeds, and generally for the winding-up of the affairs and business of the Board unless on or before the .....day of .....the operation of the said Act for all purposes be extended by order of the Governor in Council for one year from the date first mentioned in this Resolution.

16. That the said Act shall come into operation upon a day to be named by the Governor in Council after two or more of the Provinces shall have enacted such legislation as the Governor in Council may consider necessary or adequate to enable the Board to have or enjoy such of the powers, rights and privileges which were possessed by the Canadian Wheat Board as constituted by the Orders in Council of 31st July, 1919, and 18th August, 1919, as the Governor in Council considers the Board should possess in order to make its operations comprehensive and effective for the purposes intended.

Mr. MEIGHEN: Does not the minister think this resolution should be in the name of the Minister of Agriculture?

Mr. ROBB: No. All the previous legislation was put through by the Department of Trade and Commerce. We are following the procedure adopted when my right hon. friend was in office. I may inform the committee that we are taking power under the bill to prevent any interference with the selling of seed wheat by one farmer to another, or with the Seed Purchasing Commission of the Department of Agriculture.

Mr. MEIGHEN: May I ask the minister if all in this resolution is really going to be in the bill?

Mr. ROBB: Not exactly. Perhaps we would make more progress by adopting the resolution and taking up the bill. We could discuss the matter more intelligently then.

Mr. MACLEAN (Halifax): When the Wheat Board of 1919 came into existence, some legislation became necessary to protect those who had previously been engaged in the selling and buying of wheat. As hon. gentlemen know, wheat importing countries buy their supplies of wheat months ahead. Grain dealers of Winnipeg are I suppose, selling wheat at the present time for delivery later in the year. These transactions are necessary; they are important; they are lawful. The section

which covered this point in the Act of 1920 was the following:

> Should a board be appointed under this act after trading in the wheat crop of 1920 has commenced, the board shall have power to adjust and make payments from the funds of the board in respect to actual losses incurred by reason of the bringing into effect of this act; provided that before payments are made such adjustments and payments are approved by the Governor in Council.

There will be uncertainty for some time whether the provinces will supplement this legislation and thereby create a wheat board with certain powers, and the conditions will be more or less chaotic until the decision of the legislature is actually made. As a result, western interests are bound to suffer. But if it is made clear that those engaged in the buying and selling of wheat in the meantime shall be protected by the board, the injury may be minimized. Some such provision should be inserted in the bill, and I rise chiefly to give notice that when the bill is before the committee I will move a clause somewhat after the tenor of the one I read which was a section of the law passed in 1920 to cover similar cases.

I do not feel like letting this opportunity go by without entering my protest against this legislation. I do not believe in it. It is altogether too radical, and it should not be imposed on any people without their first expressing their opinion with regard to it in the form of a plebiscite or something of that nature. We are invoking a principle which I do not believe the people will approve of or support, if they have an opportunity of reflecting upon it. I read some of the evidence given before the committee. I have discussed the matter with many persons who are not in Parliament and with some who are, and I simply state the truth when I say I have not heard anyone express himself as enthusiastic in regard to this legislation. In fact, I do not see how there could be any enthusiasm for it. It is invoking a dangerous principle and it will hurt the very interests that its supporters are trying to serve. The only reason given in the committee in support of the legislation amounted to this: that the agricultural business, particularly in the West, was in a state of depression this season, and that this arrangement might assist in the future. Not a single witness, so far as I can recall—certainly none whose evidence I read—expressed the firm belief that the measure would bring any relief to the people of the West. Some evidence to that effect may have been given, but I have failed to find it, and I have failed to meet any man in this country who has a firm, strong faith in the wisdom of this legislation and in the possibility of its bringing any advantage to Canada. The remarks delivered by the hon. member for Brome (Mr. McMaster) should have been answered by somebody. They have not been answered yet, and I doubt very much if they can be answered. The chief reason urged by friends of this measure is that the flow of wheat out of the country can be controlled in the early months after the grain is threshed. No Parliament and no producer can ever settle that. That is a question which will be determined by the consumers and they are not in Parliament to speak for themselves; they are not even citizens of Canada. But they are the factor which will determine the speed with which wheat harvested in the coming autumn eventually reaches the European market and gets into the hands of the consumer. The consumer has everything to say in that connection and the producer has very little to say. Furthermore, it was not demonstrated by any evidence given before the committee that farmers' prices suffered or fell by reason of wheat flowing out rapidly in the fall months rather than at any other time during the marketing of any season's crop. That has been proven with mathematical accuracy by the hon. member for Brome in his remarks, and I do not think his contention in that regard can be answered.

The result of this legislation will be endless confusion. No person in Canada will suffer more than the very persons whom the friends of this measure intend to help. It will disrupt the marketing agencies that now exist in the West. The confusion will commence immediately this legislation has passed this Parliament, and it will not end until some time next year. I think, further, it will have a bad effect upon intending immigrants to this country.

An hon. MEMBER: Oh, oh.

Mr. MACLEAN (Halifax): My hon. friend laughs. I may be wrong and those who laugh may be right; but I should say that it would disastrously affect intending settlers coming into this country, because in all countries of the world you will find men who do not wish to have their business run by governments or by governmental agencies. It is a radical departure to take out of the long-established and traditional marketing agencies the power of disposing of the products of this country and compulsorily putting that into the hands of somebody else. The people of the western pro-

vinces will not long submit to this and I doubt very much if they favour it to-day, if they had an opportunity of speaking upon it. I did not intend to say as much as I did; but having arisen to give notice of my intended amendment, I thought I should give expression to my views upon the matter. I should like very much to see hon. gentlemen opposite me, who are more representative of agricultural interests than any others in this House, request the withdrawal of this legislation. If they did that, they would be suggesting something that would be in the interest of the people whom they represent.

Mr. JOHNSON (Moosejaw): I did not, nor do I now, intend to debate the general principle of this measure at this time. I rise merely to make a reference to a few remarks by the hon. member for Halifax (Mr. Maclean). He has drawn to the attention of the committee a certain proposal which he suggests he will move when the bill is in committee, and the purport of which is that those people dealing in futures on the grain markets of the Dominion, who have made contracts prior to the bringing into force of this proposed legislation, shall be recompensed if they incur any loss thereby. The hon. gentleman was just a little in error, I think—probably he corrected himself—in stating that this was in effect in 1919 when the first wheat board was established. It was not in the Order in Council of 1919, but in the enabling legislation of July 31, 1920, which never came into effect, never operated. There was in that act a clause to that effect, which always seemed to me as entirely unjust. Why people should be protected in their profits on speculative enterprises has always been a mystery to me. They were purely speculative enterprises and they could not have been anything else. I wish to point out, however, even admitting, for the sake of argument, that there might be something in the hon. gentleman's contention, that conditions under this measure are entirely different from what they were at that time. It is not proposed in the bill, which as I understand the matter will come before the House, that all the wheat of Canada shall be brought under the operation of this board, but merely the wheat in provinces which pass concurrent legislation. It is not anticipated, for instance, that eastern provinces would care to bother with this. Two or three of the provinces—not more than three of them—may pass concurrent legislation; but until that is done, there is a field for those people who make those contracts to go to in order to secure wheat to fill their contracts. But, provided that the three prairie provinces were shut to them, there is always the wheat board itself to go to in order to secure grain, and anyone who has sold wheat for future delivery, say for the month of October, which is the next option after July, has the wheat board to go to in order to secure his supply. He can get the wheat from the board at the market price, and surely he would expect to pay the market price anyway; he has nothing to lose.

Mr. MACLEAN (Halifax): The suggested amendment I have, just on that point, reads:

> Should a board be appointed under this act, after trading in the wheat crop of 1922 has commenced, the board shall have power to make provision for the carrying out of existing contracts for the sale of wheat in Canada and outstanding when such board has been created.

The amendment really has in mind bona fide sales.

Mr. JOHNSON (Moosejaw): That is practically what was in the enabling legislation of 1920 which never came into effect. If they are bona fide sales, the same answer applies—that the wheat is there in the hands of the wheat board for sale at market prices, and such people should expect to pay market prices for the wheat. Without going into a general discussion of the board, there is little else I wish to say at this time. As I understand proceedings, if a bill is introduced based upon this resolution, we shall have ample opportunity of discussing the details when the bill comes into committee, and I do not wish to touch on them just now.

The hon. member for Halifax (Mr. Maclean) also stated that this was imposing upon the people a system without their consent. That is not proposed as far as provinces can be interpreted as acting for the people. The last clause in this resolution says that this must come into effect when the provinces have consented to it. While that may not be the wording, it is the substance of it, and as I understand the matter, the legislation will not come into effect until two or more of the provinces, speaking for their people, consent. They will not ask for this unless consent is obtained. There were several other points mentioned to which I wished to refer, but I will let them go for the present. Let me

say, however, that after a careful study of the resolutions I think there is one point, most vital to the success of the operations of the board, no matter whether it is voluntary or compulsory, which has been omitted.

Mr. MACLEAN (Halifax): Suppose a Canadian miller made a contract for the delivery of, say, a million barrels of flour to-morrow; the Wheat Board is later established and prices are higher then than to-day's ruling prices. Would the person or the organization that bought the flour from the miller be obliged to pay the higher price? If so, where would the trouble end? There would be a cancellation of contract by the baker, or somebody.

Mr. JOHNSON (Moosejaw): If a miller made a contract to-morrow for the sale of certain flour the price must necessarily be based on wheat to be delivered during this fall. Assuming that the man buying the flour is making a bona fide contract, one that is not a mere speculative document, there will be a market price when the flour is delivered, which price will be based on the price of wheat.

Mr. MACLEAN (Halifax): But in the meanwhile he is paying for flour on the basis of market quotations to-day.

Mr. JOHNSON (Moosejaw): If a man orders flour to be delivered in the future no one knows what the price will be; it will be based on the price of wheat at that time.

Mr. MACLEAN (Halifax): But the usefulness lies in having a fixed price.

Mr. JOHNSON (Moosejaw): When the bill comes before the committee I will move as an amendment that a new section be added. I shall read it so that hon. gentlemen may be apprised of its purport beforehand. The proposed amendment, which has been carefully prepared by the law officers of the Crown, at the request of myself and others associated with me, is as follows:

18. The Board shall have power by regulation, approved by the Lieutenant Governor in Council of any province which has enacted such legislation as in the last preceding section described, to prohibit, or to impose such conditions or restrictions as may be deemed advisable upon the export of wheat from that province, except by or under the authority and direction of the Board.

This is incorporated in order that the province, when they wish to take advantage of the bill, shall have all the powers which the bill proposes to confer upon them.

[Mr. R. M. Johnson.]

Mr. MACDONALD (Pictou): I do not assent to the proposition that the legislation that is now being submitted to the House is within the purview of Parliament to adopt, or is constitutional. In an earlir discussion on the question, when the matter first came before the House, I pointed out to hon. gentlemen who were discussing it that the decision given by the Privy Council in the Board of Commerce case was of such a nature that the argument that they were making at that time was one which could not be carried into legislative effect by this Parliament. And we had an opinion from the law officers of the Crown that the legislation as originally suggested could not be passed by this House. I do not propose to discuss the details of this measure, but I merely wish to put on record my belief that this legislation when passed will not be sustained by the courts of the country, if their interference is invoked.

Mr. MEIGHEN: I do not want to do more than to go on record on this question. I have already stated my opinion that the best method was for the Government to put into effect something practicable, something in accord with conditions, something that would actually work and, in my judgment, not do any injustice; that was to establish a board upon a purely voluntary basis, and not to give it any such powers as the province alone could confer upon it, unless with the approval of the Governor in Council. That is a method of procedure that would have actually worked out in practice, and would have given time for the consideration of compulsory powers, such consideration as Parliament must give in order to act wisely, but such as we at this end of the session cannot possibly bestow. If the bill which it is proposed to introduce becomes law I will not attempt to describe what will happen. I cannot, except by the exhaustion of considerable time, undertake to attack the bill at all its vulnerable points. It is vulnerable everywhere; it does not make common sense. With all deference to the minister (Mr. Robb), I think he would have been much wiser if he had left its paternity to the Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Motherwell); he would then have stood better in this House in the future. As the bill is, it resembles more a jumble of jargon than a piece of legislation.

Resolution reported, read the second time and concurred in. Mr. Robb thereupon moved for leave to introduce Bill No. 176 to provide for the constitution and powers of The Canadian Wheat Board.

Motion agreed to, and bill read the first and second times, and the House went into Committee thereon, Mr. Gordon in the chair.

On section 2—Canadian Wheat Board to be appointed:

Mr. JOHNSON (Moosejaw): How will this board be selected or appointed?

Mr. ROBB: As the provinces will be responsible for any deficits, it would seem reasonable that the members should be appointed subject to the approval of the concurring provinces.

Mr. JOHNSON (Moosejaw): As I understand it, this board will be created before the provinces pass their concurrent legislation. How can you thus appoint its members with the approval of the provinces?

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: I assume the act will have special reference to the provinces of Alberta and Saskatchewan, and I undertake to say that before the Government makes any appointments it will communicate with the premiers of these two provinces and obtain their approval of the personnel of the board.

Section agreed to.

On section 3—Salaries, allowances and expenses:

Mr. GOOD: Could we not leave this over until eight o'clock so that we may have time to read the bill? It has just been distributed.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: Yes.

Mr. MEIGHEN: I would point out at this stage that some gems in the resolution are omitted from this bill.

Section agreed to.

At six o'clock the committee took recess.

After Recess

The committee resumed at eight o'clock.

On section 6—general powers of board:

Mr. MEIGHEN: The minister should explain to the committee why he left out the provision in the resolution that the board could sell only on the order of the consignor.

Mr. ROBB: I am not able to say, unless it is that we are not giving any compulsory powers.

Mr. MEIGHEN: Oh no, that would not be the explanation. It is far nearer compulsory power when they can sell without the order of the consignor than when they can sell with it. It is nearer compulsory power now than it was in the resolution. Really, if the minister cannot explain it, I think anyone who understands the wheat trade can. It was perfect nonsense to have it in in the first place, most manifest nonsense that a board should be there engaged in a pool business to distribute among its patrons pro rata all the proceeds received, but should only be able to sell on the authority of the owner of the wheat. I never could understand what in the world it was in for, but it was in the resolution. The resolution, I do wish to impress on the House, should really embody what the bill is intended to bring forth. This resolution did not. There is no use having a rule that a resolution respecting trade and commerce shall precede a bill, if the bill is not to be the resolution. We may amend the bill it is true, but in very important respects this bill is not the resolution at all. It is merely playing with the rules to bring in the bill in this form with the resolution the way it was. For example, the Government went to His Excellency the Governor General and presented a resolution which made that board nothing but an agent to take the delivery of grain and sell it as a commission agent. It got the approval of His Excellency to such a resolution for commendation to the House, and now it comes forward with a bill that makes the board something else altogether.

Mr. ROBB: Does my hon. friend recommend that that provision should have remained in?

Mr. MEIGHEN: Oh no, but I would recommend after this that when the Government brings in a resolution, they give it a few minutes thought before submitting it to the House.

Mr. CAHILL: Then it is only a lecture.

Mr. MEIGHEN: That is all, but a very necessary one.

Mr. DUFF: Just scolding.

Section agreed to.

On section 7—Power to receive advances:

Mr. MILLAR: This provides that the board shall have power to receive advances. I suppose it is implied that they have the power to borrow money.

Mr. ROBB: Yes.

Section agreed to.

On Section 10—Deliveries of wheat, through agents, grain companies or organizations:

Mr. MACLEAN (Halifax): I wish to move an amendment. It is to add a subsection, to be known as subsection 2, of section 10. I propose that it shall read as follows:—

Should a board be appointed under this act, after trading in the wheat crop of 1922 has commenced, the board shall have power to make provision for the carrying out of existing contracts for the sale of wheat in Canada and outstanding when such board has been created, and to adjust and make payments from the funds of the board in respect to actual losses incurred by reason of the bringing into effect of this act; provided that before payments are made such adjustments and payments are approved by the Governor in Council.

As I stated this afternoon enabling legislation of this character was passed in 1920, and the purpose of this amendment is to enact a clause of that same nature and for the same purpose. I may say that the suggestion comes to me from persons interested in the grain trade in Winnipeg.

Mr. SALES: That is what we thought.

Mr. MACLEAN (Halifax): One would not need much thinking to reach that conclusion.

Mr. SALES: I do not think so.

Mr. MACLEAN (Halifax): The question after all is whether the amendment is a fair one or not. The persons engaged in the grain trade have as much right to be heard in Parliament as anyone else. As I stated this afternoon, if this bill becomes law in its present form the question will arise with those engaged in the grain business, say at Winnipeg, whether or not they shall continue making future sales They must consider that question; they will be obliged to. They have, up to the present moment been making future sales in this country but, after this bill passes Parliament, they will be obliged to consider whether they must not withdraw from that class of business. If there is no way of their implementing any sales or contracts which they enter into, they must withdraw from trading and dealing with wheat on the exchange. I fancy they will have to do that unless there is something in this bill enabling the Wheat Board to carry out these contracts. Now the Wheat Board should be given the power to do that. It will be in the interest of the grain growers of the West that this be done. The selling of grain to-day is a lawful business. It is a class of business over which this Parliament has some jurisdiction.

Mr. JOHNSON (Moosejaw): If the Wheat Board undertakes to deliver wheat to those people who have made contracts at the time their wheat is called for, is that not enabling them to fulfill those contracts?

Mr. MACLEAN (Halifax): But the Wheat Board must be given power to take over these contracts and complete them instead of the original parties to the contract.

Mr. BROWN: Would my hon. friend suggest that the Wheat Board should be given power to supply wheat at any price that those selling it now should see fit to fix; is that the suggestion?

Mr. MACLEAN (Halifax): How is my hon. friend going to meet the situation? By the laws of this country to-day people are permitted to enter into contracts for the future delivery of wheat.

Mr. BROWN: But my hon. friend must remember that when these men undertake to make such contracts they do it absolutely at their own risk, at the risk of not being able to fill those contracts.

Mr. MACLEAN (Halifax): That does not, however, meet the situation. Here are people to-day, lawfully engaged in the business, entering into contracts with people in Europe to deliver wheat at a future date. The legislatures of Alberta and Saskatchewan may enact legislation which, taken with the bill we are now considering, may prevent those people from fulfilling their contracts.

Mr. CAHILL: Have those people now got the wheat to deliver that they are contracting to deliver at that time?

Mr. MACLEAN (Halifax): I do not think that is important—

Mr. CAHILL: It is all important.

Mr. MACLEAN (Halifax): —because everybody knows futures are being dealt in, in handling the wheat crop. This afternoon I put a case to the committee of this kind: Supposing a Canadian miller to-day is asked to quote for the future delivery of a million barrels of flour in London, say in next September. He cannot decide what offer he shall make to those seeking a bid unless he knows what is going to be the price of his wheat. Whenever millers undertake to make large deliveries of flour they buy their wheat first and they enter

into a contract with a grain broker in Winnipeg. The grain broker may make a contract for delivery with some man owning wheat in a country elevator; he is assured of the delivery sometime of that wheat at a fixed price from somebody, and upon that basis he is enabled to make a contract for future delivery of flour, say, in a European market. Well, if he cannot do that, if he cannot make a bid for that flour that is all there is to it. Unless you have that method of trading the grain and flour business of this country cannot be carried on; and unless you put a clause such as I suggest in the bill I fear that trading on the exchange will cease between now and the time the measure is put into effect. That is why I am proposing this amendment.

Mr. MILLAR: I would like to ask the hon. member a question. Under the conditions of which he speaks is it not a fact that someone must take that risk? Even though the miller may buy futures, the man from whom he buys has not yet purchased the wheat, nor has the farmer raised it. There may be a failure between now and then, and somebody has to take that risk even under conditions which are considered normal.

Mr. MACLEAN (Halifax): Yes, that is quite true, somebody takes the risk, but my hon. friend will see that it is impossible for millers to undertake the future delivery of flour unless they know with certainty that they can buy the wheat with which to fill that contract at a definite and fixed price. In this supposititious case which I present to the committee there are two contracts—there is a contract for the purchase of grain, and their is a contract for the purchase of flour. In each case the delivery is far in the future, but it is necessary to have these two contracts. You must have some certain factors in the case settled before a contract can be quoted, and if these factors are not ascertainable and are not fixed there will be no contract, and there will be the loss of a sale of Canadian flour somewhere.

Mr. CARMICHAEL: The hon. gentleman is presuming that there will be a loss on this supposed contract. Supposing there should be a huge gain would he include in this amendment a provision that such gain should go to the Canada Wheat Board?

Mr. MACLEAN (Halifax): I do not know. I do not know what the dealers who were carrying these contracts would say; I daresay they would be very glad to let them take over the whole thing. In fact, they probably would have to do that. If my hon. friend wants that put in the amendment, and thinks it would be satisfactory—

Mr. CARMICHAEL: I think it is very important. There is just as likely to be a gain as a loss.

Mr. SALES: One of the witnesses who appeared before the committee—a witness who was not in favour of the wheat board—was asked a question as to the volume of wheat sold on these exchanges. This was his answer:

> There was evidence given before the United States Committee on Agriculture by officials of the Chicago Board of Trade in reference to certain very large figures which had been circulated in the United States. My memory, I am afraid, does not quite serve me, but I think the returns given showed that the total volume of wheat, that is the future sales in Chicago, had been over nine or eleven times the volume of grain marketed through Chicago.

Does the hon. member propose to settle for all the contracts made on the exchange, which constitute nine or eleven times the amount of wheat sold direct?

Mr. MACLEAN (Halifax): We have heard for years and years the figures which my hon. friend has given, though, of course they vary a little. He has reference to speculative sales on the exchange. The carrying on of these speculative transactions on the grain exchange may be unfortunate for the country and for all interests involved, but they cannot be avoided. A great many people engage in them, sometimes to their profit, very frequently to their loss; nevertheless, many of the transactions are bona fide transactions. Practically all the marketing of grain in Canada is done through operations of the grain exchange. That has been the system of buying and selling the world over, and you cannot very well get away from it; it is the only thing that makes a market for the producer of grain. If there was no grain exchange, how could a farmer market his grain? I suppose it would be sold, but somebody would be taking tremendous risks and the price would fall 25 or 30 cents a bushel. At any rate, no grain dealer would make very heavy advances on the purchase of grain in the first instance. Further, if there was no grain exchange there could be very few grain brokers; few men could succeed in getting sufficient capital to carry on the business. So there is no use in my hon. friend attacking the grain exchange. It is a factor in business; it serves a useful purpose, though some fea-

tures of that business—through the fault not of the grain exchange itself, but of others—leads to speculative trading which is not, perhaps, desirable. But again I say that here is the difficulty; it will probably be a month before the legislatures of Manitoba and Saskatchewan can consider this matter; in the meanwhile are you going to have no grain transactions in western Canada? What about the Manitoba wheat? Whose wheat will be sold if the exchange is closed? It will be American wheat that will go across; probably the price of wheat will rise, and then when the Manitoba product goes on the market, depression will follow. How are we going to meet that situation? I do not pretend to be very well informed upon grain exchange operations, and perhaps I cannot satisfactorily answer every question that is put to me, but I think I understand the general principle which applies. Some of the grain dealers of Winnipeg addressed a letter to the Minister of Trade and Commerce (Mr. Robb) on this subject. I have been given a copy of it, and perhaps it will make my point clearer if I read part of it. It says:

> We beg to ask your consideration of a matter of considerable importance to the grain trade at Winnipeg that may arise if the Wheat Board is established for the marketing of the crops.
>
> The matter is the fulfilling of the contracts that are now being made for the sale of the wheat and that would be in existence when the wheat board becomes operative.
>
> As you are doubtless aware, overseas buyers and Canadian millers make contracts in the open market for supplies of wheat for future delivery and at the present time Canadian grain dealers are making such contracts in October wheat and in wheat of other months.

Mr. COOTE: My hon. friend a while ago said something about trading in futures being bona fide transactions. Is he satisfied in his own mind that it is really a bona fide transaction to sell something that is not in existence? I assure him that the wheat that is being sold for delivery next October is not in existence and a good deal of it never will exist.

Mr. MARTELL: Is it not possible to enter into a present contract for future goods?

Mr. COOTE: That would be quite legitimate in respect to anything that is manufactured.

Mr. MARTELL: I assure my hon. friend that there are in the law reports hundreds of cases of the selling of grain that did not at the time exist—at present contract for future goods.

[Mr. A. K. Maclean.]

Mr. COOTE: I do not doubt it at all; I am simply asking the hon. member for Halifax if he is prepared to say it is a bona fide transaction to sell something that is not in existence.

Mr. MACLEAN (Halifax): There is nothing peculiar about dealing in futures in wheat. Down in my province fish is sold long before it is taken from the water; lumber is frequently sold before the trees are cut. Trade and commerce could not flow unless products were sold before production for future delivery. Does my hon. friend mean to say that the European importing countries should have to wait until the wheat is actually harvested and threshed and in elevators before they buy wheat? He seems to talk as though it were something strange or peculiar or irregular—unlawful, perhaps—to deal in futures in wheat.

Mr. SPENCER: Can my hon. friend say whether eight or nine times as many fish are brought and sold as are caught?

Mr. DUFF: There might be.

Mr. MACLEAN (Halifax): I really do not know. I have already stated that there are speculative transactions in grain and many other agricultural productions. My hon. friend is not responsible for it; neither am I. At any rate, practically all the wheat exported from Canada is, I fancy, sold through the grain exchange, which fixes or regulates the prices in co-operation with the foreign wheat exchange.

Mr. SHAW: If the contract contemplates an actual delivery of goods, it is a perfectly valid contract. That, as I understand it, is the distinction between a mere wagering contract and a valid contract.

Mr. MACLEAN (Halifax): Take the supposed case I mentioned a few moments ago: if a Montreal mill contracts to deliver a million barrels of flour in London in December next, it must buy three or four million bushels of wheat. In all probability that wheat will be bought from a grain dealer in Winnipeg, who protects himself by purchasing from some country elevator. Eventually, that quantity of wheat gets into the Montreal mill, at a price fixed. The price may rise, of course, and somebody may lose on the transaction, but the miller himself is secured; he is able to carry out his contract—a contract which he could never have entered into unless he then knew what the price of the wheat

to him was to be. Now, let me proceed with this letter.

Mr. CRERAR: What would happen in that case if the wheat crop were a total failure?

Mr. MACLEAN (Halifax): Well, there would be a great deal of damage to settle, I suppose, and a great many actions at law, which would be useful for the legal profession.

Let me proceed with this letter:

> We do not think it is necessary to give here anything like a detailed defence of such contracts. Countries that import wheat must provide for supplies months ahead of actual import and consumption, and exporting countries like Canada trade in the same way. Canadian millers, for example, cannot make contracts for the delivery of flour at future dates unless they are able to purchase wheat for future delivery.
>
> And we do not think that under open market conditions Canadian wheat could be successfully marketed without this method of trading as other countries, for example, the United States, trade in the same way and American grain dealers are now and have been for some time selling to overseas buyers and to American millers their coming wheat crop.
>
> And these contracts not only contemplate the actual delivery of the wheat to the buyer, but they actually result in such deliveries as the buyers require the wheat and have no other means of securing it.
>
> We submit to you that in the event of a Wheat Board being established all such contracts as have actually been made should be fulfilled; such contracts are made under the open market as recognised by law. They have been made in good faith, they have been made in the interests of the successful marketing of the crop, and in asking that they be fulfilled, we are asking not only for fair treatment for those that have made them, but also for recognition of the principle which we think is universally recognised, namely, the protection of contracts.

Mr. JOHNSON (Moosejaw): If we take it for granted that these contracts are bona fide and that somebody must deliver the wheat, is the wheat not there to be bought at the market price? Can they not go to the Wheat Board and get the wheat? The Wheat Board is going to sell it to those people to fulfil their contracts.

Mr. MACLEAN (Halifax): In the first place there certainly can be nothing wrong in giving the Wheat Board power to take over these contracts. The Wheat Board ought to have that power; that power ought to be enumerated amongst the other powers given to the board, and they should have that power in very specific terms.

Mr. McCONICA: It occurs to me that if this amendment means that the Wheat Board is compelled to protect all contracts that have been made, or that may be made from now on, it will certainly put the Wheat Board out of business. Any man then could contract to sell wheat at any price he saw fit, and when the day of delivery came, he could say to the board: "You settle my business for me; I will unload my obligations upon you." There will be just as much wheat after this board is formed as there will be before, to fill the contracts that have been made or that may be made by those who contract to deliver wheat in the future; that board will have the wheat to sell, and it will be anxious to sell it at the market price. Why do we need to insert in this bill an authority to fill contracts or to sell wheat to men who have contracted for wheat beforehand? That power is inherent in the board; but is it proposed that the board shall assume a loss if there is any? If so, I certainly object to such a provision. The men who are making these contracts or who have made them are bound now to fulfil them and to shoulder any loss if there is any. The appointment of this board does not change their responsibility or their liability in any way; it merely changes the party to whom they must look for the wheat to fulfil their contracts, and that wheat will be in existence if a generous Providence favours us with the crop. If it does not, where are those fellows who are selling wheat going to be? They are taking that chance; they have taken it; they propose to continue to take it; and when settlement day comes, let them walk up to the men who have the wheat to sell and get it, just as they will be compelled to do if we do not appoint this board. I do not see why the board should be responsible. If so, then every Tom, Dick and Harry in western Canada will be selling wheat for future delivery, and holding this board responsible for it. The thing will be a snap; and if we make good to the fellow who sells wheat at too low a price, we shall also have to make good if somebody buys wheat at too high a price, so that the board will catch it both ways. There is no reason why this amendment should be enacted. It does not protect anybody who needs protection. If contracts have been made, they have been made by parties who knew that this legislation was pending. Those parties have taken their chances and they are accustomed to taking those chances. Last year at this time, they were selling our wheat, and this year they have been selling it before it was sown at $1.80 for

October delivery. What was their bet? Their bet was that they could buy it from the farmer at less than that figure. They bought it at about 80 cents. Where did the profit go? Not to any wheat board to be distributed amongst any farmers who raised the wheat, but into the pockets of those gentlemen who are now calling upon the hon. member for Halifax (Mr. Maclean) to take care of them. I hope this amendment will be defeated.

Mr. ROBB: The amendment moved by the hon. member for Halifax (Mr. Maclean) is apparently based upon the assumption that we are creating a compulsory board. In framing this legislation, the Government have very carefully avoided giving any compulsory rights as regards this Parliament. If, under the powers of the bill, the legislatures of the provinces where the wheat is grown, later on undertake to give compulsory powers to this Wheat Board, I submit that is the proper place for my hon. friend to present his amendment.

Mr. MACLEAN (Halifax): I shall have to go west then.

Mr. ROBB: We cannot accept this amendment because it seeks to introduce into the bill a power that we, as a Government, have very carefully avoided giving; that is, as regards this Parliament, we have avoided giving compulsory powers. We have framed a bill that we hope will go a long way towards satisfying the demands of our western friends who grow wheat. May I say to the committee that we are not—and I frankly admit this—giving the powers that were asked for by the Council of Agriculture when they came to Ottawa. They sought a board with compulsory powers, although at the time they made the request from the Government, they had themselves been advised by the Attorney General of Alberta that this Parliament had no right to give such legislation, and although that statement had again been confirmed by Mr. Gregory, a lawyer of their own selection, legal advisor of the Council of Agriculture, when they met in Regina. It was quite clear that we had not that right; but we have the right to pass such legislation as we are proposing to-night. If the representatives of the Council of Agriculture desire compulsory powers, they will go before their legislatures and under this bill they may obtain such powers. When that is under consideration in the legislatures, I submit that will be the time and place for the grain dealers and millers of Canada, who consider themselves affected, to seek the rights which they are asking now through the amendment moved by the hon. member for Halifax, an amendment which, I regret, we cannot accept.

Mr. MEIGHEN: Does the minister say that the Government has definitely avoided giving any compulsory powers in this bill?

Mr. ROBB: In so far as powers are given directly from this Parliament.

Mr. MEIGHEN: The minister has the Minister of Justice (Sir Lomer Gouin) sitting beside him or, perhaps, it would not be fair to put this question. Does he not admit that the old board had compulsory powers given by this Parliament, which powers this Parliament still has a right to give, aside from the compulsory powers which the provincial legislatures alone have the right to give? Does my hon. friend catch what I mean?

Mr. ROBB: I am not a lawyer, but my recollection is that these powers were subsequently declared illegal; they were ultra vires.

Mr. MEIGHEN: The minister has not got my point. It is true that certain compulsory powers given to the old Wheat Board have been declared to be powers that only the provincial parliaments could give, but that does not apply by any means to all the compulsory powers given to the old Wheat Board. There were compulsory powers vested in the old board which only this Parliament could give either at that time or to-day; for example, directory powers as to transportation, powers of priority as to lake vessels, and compulsory powers in relation to our own system of elevators. All these the late Wheat Board had. Do I understand from the minister that they are exempt from this bill and are carefully avoided by the Government?

Mr. ROBB: Does my right hon. friend contend that those powers are now conferred?

Mr. MEIGHEN: I cannot find them in the bill, but what I say is that the Government undertook to put them in.

Mr. ROBB: No.

Mr. MEIGHEN: Yes. In the report to which I took exception, but which the Government accepted, an acceptance that was marked by very considerable eulogies from hon. gentlemen to my left, it is pro-

vided that all the powers of the old board which this Parliament has the right to give should be conferred upon the new board. The Government accepted that report, but now the minister says they have carefully avoided acting upon it in that respect.

Mr. McMASTER: Mr. Chairman—

Mr. CALDWELL: There is one point I might refer to.

The CHAIRMAN: The member for Brome has the floor.

Mr. McMASTER: Hon. members are quite aware of the view I take of this legislation. It is unfortunate in its inception and will be more unfortunate in its carrying out. The right hon. member who last addressed the House on the other side (Mr. Meighen) is no doubt quite familiar with the phrase of a celebrated American statesman, that the United States could not live half slave and half free; and I believe that the trade in grain in this country cannot live if half of its existence this trading season is to be passed under free conditions, and the other half under coercive or limiting conditions. The grievous unfairness which the refusal to grant this amendment will work upon the grain trade is obvious. Up to the time that compulsory powers are given to the Wheat Board by the prairie provinces, if such be given, the grain traders will have been trading in a free market; and certainly up to the present they have been under the impression that when they came to close out their contracts they would be able to do so under a free market. But that is not going to happen. You are going to create by this legislation a situation in which 85 per cent of the wheat crop will be put into the hands of a few men, instead of there being an open competition between buyers and sellers.

Mr. SPENCER: The hon. member says there is a difference between selling in a market such as it is proposed to create, and selling in a free market. If this board is put into operation, he contends, buyers will not have a free market. What is the difference between the board holding the wheat and the farmers holding it, as they have a right to do?

Mr. McMASTER: If the farmers of this country desire to hold their wheat and take the chance of having it depreciate in value rather than increase, they have a perfect right to do so, and I am not complaining about that. I am, however, complaining of the state assisting in bringing about what I believe will be a very undesirable consequence not only to the people of Canada as a whole, but to the very grain-growers themselves. Under present conditions contracts are made day by day on the Winnipeg Grain Exchange. When people are dealing in futures they are not dealing in grain, but in contracts for the delivery of grain, and it is quite true that the same grain which is the subject matter of a contract may change hands half a dozen times, sometimes at a higher and sometimes at a lower price. I know that a number of hon. gentlemen regard that as speculation, something akin to gambling. But from my study of the question, to which I have given some care and attention in the last few weeks, my impression is that that very mode of dealing in grain tends to eliminate speculative variations in prices; and I believe that you will get a more constant price by means of this free dealing in grain contracts than if you operate in a market that does not deal in futures. For proof of this proposition I would refer hon. gentlemen to a little book I read, the facts of which are correct, written by an American professor in a western university. He compared dealing in wheat with dealing in barley. The wheat was dealt in a future market, while the barley was not; and the spread was much less in respect of wheat than in respect of barley. The creation of this Wheat Board will mean that 85 per cent of the wheat will be in the hands of two or three men, who will deal with it. Is that fair to people who have been calculating on the assumption that they would have a free market? I do not think it is, and I strongly support the amendment of the hon. member for Halifax (Mr. Maclean). It merely gives the right to the board, where any injustice would occur, to remedy that injustice by taking over existing contracts. This bill proposes to take away people's business from them and force them to deal in a manner different from that on which their calculations have been based. Is it not a matter of primary justice that if the state does that, the state will see to it that no harm is done to the public interest?

Mr. JOHNSON (Moosejaw): If the object of the hon. member is merely that people shall have the right to buy and sell

voluntarily, is not that embodied in section 6?

Mr. CRERAR: I should like to say a word on the amendment offered by the hon. member for Halifax (Mr. Maclean). In respect of the whole question of speculative trading in wheat, it is very difficult to draw the line and say that here legitimate trading ceases and illegitimate trading begins. It is extremely difficult, in fact it is impossible to draw that distinguishing line. It is a fact that the October future has been traded in to some degree in the only grain exchange we have in Canada, namely, in Winnipeg. What volume of trading has taken place in that exchange relating to the new crop that will be harvested next September and which is at present growing, no one can say. But we are very certain of this fact, that if any person has sold October wheat he has sold it on pure speculation. I do not think that fact can be gainsaid. My hon. friend from Halifax says that the elevator owners are selling this wheat now. I beg to say that he is mistaken, because the elevator owner or operator who attempted to do his business that way could not get his line of credit established at any bank in Canada, for one thing that our banking institutions insist upon, and rightly, is that such speculation be avoided, and any person who to-day will sell wheat for October delivery, not knowing what price he will have to pay for the actual wheat when October comes, is engaging in a pure speculation.

Mr. McMASTER: But it is a legitimate speculation.

Mr. CRERAR: I am not discussing whether it is legitimate or illegitimate; but it is a speculation. I am quite aware of the fact that exporters, for instance, under the methods that have obtained in the business make contract sales of wheat for delivery one, two or even three months ahead,—although to make contracts for delivery three months ahead is rather unusual—and they protect their contracts, if they themselves do not wish to take the speculative risk, by the purchase of grain for delivery in a future month.

Mr. McMASTER: That is the usual way.

Mr. CRERAR: That is the usual way when the grain is in actual existence and has started to move. But if you take grain not in actual existence, it is a pure speculation and nothing else on the part of the person who sells it, and my own judgment is that the volume of trading that so far has been engaged in in that way is very limited.

Reference has been made to-night by one of my friends on this side of the House to the volume of wheat dealt with in the exchanges in relation to the actual amount grown, that it is eight and ten and twelve times as great. I think such a statement would be difficult to verify. Undoubtedly years ago—and the same condition may recur—a very large volume of purely speculative trading was indulged in. My opinion is that now the volume of speculative trading is very much restricted, because all legitimate business interests—the bankers, bona fide people in the trade and others frown it down and do not want to see it engaged in. That is an additional reason for my conclusion, based only on my opinion, that up to the present time the volume of trading in our October wheat has been relatively small.

There is one other objection to the amendment suggested by my hon. friend from Halifax. If this amendment were passed it would be an encouragement to any person to go out and sell October or December wheat for future delivery. They would have no responsibility in the matter at all.

Mr. McMASTER: Might I interrupt my hon. friend for a moment?

Mr. CRERAR: I am always glad to have my hon. friend from Brome interrupt me.

Mr. McMASTER: Does not my hon. friend from Marquette see that this amendment merely gives the board power to honour a contract when of course the board would be satisfied that some injustice had been perpetrated?

Mr. CRERAR: Very true; reading the amendment that is all it appears to do. But pass this amendment, and the impression in the public mind will be that the board will honour those contracts when claims are presented to it, and you do not discourage this trading, which, I submit, at the present time is purely of a speculative character. For that reason I do not think it is wise to accept this amendment.

But there is another and to my mind even a stronger reason, and that is that under the bill the responsibility for mak-

ing good any losses that may arise rests upon the provinces that pass the concurrent legislation. This Parliament takes the ground in passing this bill, and I think perhaps very fairly when you bear in mind that the demand for this legislation comes from a particular section of Canada, that the federal treasury should not be responsible for any losses that may arise from the operations of the board. That being so, what right has this Parliament to insert in the bill a condition that might throw an additional financial loss on the provinces passing the concurrent legislation? That to my mind is the very strongest reason why the amendment is not advisable. The provinces passing the concurrent legislation must assume the financial responsibility, and if in the operations of this board a loss should result instead of a gain, they have to make good that loss. I think when that concurrent legislation is being passed the provinces might properly be asked to give the board permission to make good losses that might arise under bona fide contracts that may be entered into. I think those contracts at the present time are very few, and in any case with this legislation passing, such contracts will or should cease, because it is fair notice to those making them that they are doing so on their own responsibility.

My hon. friend from Halifax has argued, and I think with a good deal of correctness, that in the past this has been the accepted method of doing business. It is the method that governs after the grain is actually in hand, but up to the time the crop is harvested and assured, those who are selling it for October delivery are simply taking a chance on the market that they will be able to buy at a slightly cheaper price than that at which they are selling and make some money thereby.

Now, I want to make this point clear. There is a widespread impression abroad that these sales are made by grain men and elevator companies, as my hon. friend from Halifax suggested this evening, and by brokers and others. I do not think that is the case. You find far more of the pure grain speculators outside the ranks of the grain business than inside, and I am speaking of brokers and dealers generally. Reference was made on one occasion in the discussions in committee that it was preachers, lawyers, doctors and business men—

Mr. McMASTER: And stenographers.

Mr. CRERAR: —and possibly stenographers, who having the speculative bug that each of us, Mr. Chairman, 9 p.m. has more or less inherent in our system, took this means of satisfying their curiosity of what the game of chance in the grain market might bring them, and from my experience in the grain trade running over quite a number of years I think there is considerable truth in that statement. The widespread impression that elevator companies and others engaged in the business are responsible for this volume of speculuation is very largely all wrong. The elevator interests that buy grain will not be permitted by their banks if they know it to engage in speculation, and the volume of speculation in the market comes in very largely from outside. It is to-day perhaps the people outside the trade who are selling October wheat in the expectation that they may buy at a cheaper price and make a profit on the transaction, and they are the persons for whom my hon. friend from Halifax is asking protection.

Mr. MACLEAN (Halifax): Are there not a great many English importers buying futures at this season of the year?

Mr. CRERAR: There will be after our grain crop is assured.

Mr. MACLEAN (Halifax): Before?

Mr. CRERAR: I do not think so, at any rate to any large degree. From whom are they buying? From the speculator. I think, however, the financial reason I have given is the strongest reason against the amendment. If any loss arises on the whole transactions of this board, the provinces affected should make it good, and not the federal treasury. Surely you cannot impose the conditions in the amendment without the consent of the provinces that are affected.

Mr. GOOD: I think it would be desirable if we could get a little more unanimity, and I venture to repeat the question which the hon. member for Brome asked, and which has not yet been answered definitely. As I understood him, he suggested that when the miller came to the Wheat Board for his wheat, as the board had a monopoly of wheat, they would hold him up for a tremendous price, probably exact twice the price that he should pay. I think if that question could be answered satisfactorily, the hon. member would be quite willing to vote with the rest of us.

Amendment negatived.

Section agreed to.

On section 15—Limitation on time for operations of board:

Mr. ROBB: I move that there be inserted in the blank for the date the words "the first day of July, 1923".

Motion agreed to.

Section as amended agreed to.

On section 17—Act to come into operation after two or more provinces enact necessary legislation:

Mr. GOOD: Suppose the Governor in Council considered that the legislation enacted by the provinces was not adequate; what would happen?

Mr. ROBB: That will have to be determined when we take the legislation into consideration.

Section agreed to.

Mr. JOHNSON (Moosejaw): I wish to move that a section be added to the bill to be known as Section 18. I explained very fully the purpose of this amendment when we were discussing the matter before six o'clock. It is merely for the purpose of rounding out the powers which provinces concurring in this legislation may take, and making them more complete. I now beg to move to add to the bill as section 18 the following:

The board shall have power by regulation approved by the Lieutenant Governor in Council of any province which has enacted such legislation as in the last preceding section described, to prohibit, or to impose such conditions or restrictions as may be deemed advisable upon the export of wheat from that province except by or under the authority and direction of the board.

Mr. ROBB: For the same reason that the Government could not accept the amendment of my hon. friend from Halifax (Mr. Maclean), we cannot concur in this amendment. The idea of the Government all through, in creating this legislation and bringing it before Parliament, was to avoid compulsory legislation in every way. This proposal, in my judgment interferes with provincial rights. This Government is not disposed to take away from a man in Alberta, or Saskatchewan, or Manitoba, or Ontario any civil rights, which he may enjoy in such province. I submit to my hon. friend that his amendment is contrary to the spirit of the legislation that we have brought down and are considering to-night, and we will not be able to accept it.

Mr. SPENCER: If the provincial governments wished to have such a clause included in the bill would the minister be in favour of accepting it.

Mr. ROBB: Well, that would be a matter for consideration after we had before us the legislation adopted by the different provincial governments. We cannot anticipate what we will do in advance of the provincial measures coming before us.

Mr, STEWART (Argenteuil): Will the hon. member for Moosejaw (Mr. Johnson) explain what he is trying to do by this amendment.

Mr. JOHNSON (Moosejaw): The purpose of this amendment is not that this Government or this Parliament shall take away any of the rights enjoyed by any citizen in any province unless those citizens, speaking through their provincial government, express that wish. As I understand, from the opinion given by the law officers of the Crown, the provincial governments have not the power to prohibit the export of grain from any province, nor has this Parliament, nor this Government, authority to delegate its powers to a provincial government. It may, however, delegate them to the Wheat Board if the provincial authorities want that done. That is exactly what the resolution declares. I submit, Mr. Chairman, that two or three days ago we passed legislation here of an exactly parallel nature. In that case the province of Saskatchewan not having the power to prohibit the export of liquor from the liquor houses in question, we passed legislation declaring that when the province asked that such exportation be prohibited this Government would give effect to its wishes. That is exactly what we are asking for here; not that this Government shall interfere at all in any degree whatever, but that when a province asks that the export of wheat from that province, except through the wheat board, be prohibited, that then this Government shall give the board power to carry out the wishes of the provincial executive. I would add, that without this clause the whole bill is practically unworkable; it is absolutely useless to carry out its purpose. Unless this amendment is incorporated in the bill, what is to prevent any man, any speculator from any part of the world, if you like, or from the grain exchanges, advertising all over creating disruption and disorganizing the operations of the Wheat Board itself? Such men might say, for example: "We cannot go into Alberta and buy your wheat because your provincial law prohibits it;

but you send us your wheat to Winnipeg, to Fort William, to Montreal, or wherever you like, and we will buy it when it gets there," the result would be to disorganize the whole trade. We would have this state of affairs: Any irresponsible set of people could go into a province and ask the grain growers in outside districts to ship their grain from a station platform. As I have done scores of times, not finding a loading platform, the wheat could be dumped from the waggon into a car at the siding. What is the result? Nobody knows whether that is wheat, oats, sand, gravel or anything else. It is a carload of something, and until the car is billed out the transportation companies have no responsibility for it. This provision is, I claim, a necessary protection to the shipper himself and should be embodied in the bill, for as the measure now stands it is worse than useless.

Mr. McMASTER: When once people start on wrong economic lines there is no saying where they will end up. What the hon. member for Moosejaw is asking is to restore the condition which prevailed in France before the French Revolution, when grain could not pass freely from one province in France to another. The same sort of thing was done in Spain. It is reverting back not exactly to the Middle Ages but to the time before the French Revolution. It is to that extreme that these gentlemen, these protagonists of free trade, have gone for the purpose of throttling the grain trade of this country. I stand on the floor of this House to protest against it and I make this prediction—that no one will be sorrier in the future than the men who are asking for this restriction to-night.

Mr. McCONICA: May I ask the hon. member a question?

Mr. McMASTER: Oh, certainly.

Mr. McCONICA: Did any of the direful consequences which my hon. friend is picturing occur when we had the Wheat Board two or three years ago?

Mr. McMASTER: No. You were moving from a condition of government control to another condition of government control. You were meeting collective buying in Europe by collective selling on this continent; and you had control of prices in the United States. Here you are comparing things absolutely different. I suppose there is no necessity for an easterner, whose only desire is to advance the welfare of this country, getting warmed up about this thing, but I would implore my hon. friends opposite not to urge such an amendment as this. To my mind you are going to destroy every demand you have made for economic freedom in the past; you are hauling down the flag you have been carrying so bravely heretofore for years past; and if you persist no one will be sorrier than yourselves. I trust that this amendment will not be accepted by the Government, and that in the calm light of sober reason my hon. friends will not press it.

Mr. COOTE: May I point out that in the second clause of the report of the select Standing Committee on Agriculture it was recommended that there be given to this board all the powers possessed by the Wheat Board of 1919, "as are within the jurisdiction of Parliament to grant excepting as they include the direct marketing of flour and other mill products." Now we understood that we had the promise of the Prime Minister that if that report was adopted by the House, the bill to be brought in would give the board all the powers that are set forth in that report. I think it is the duty of the Government to see that all such powers given to the old Wheat Board included in this bill.

Mr. STEWART (Argenteuil): The amendment is new to me. I thought we were giving the board all the powers it was possible to confer upon it for federal authority. The federal Government is proposing a voluntary board that can be made compulsory by the action of the provincial governments. The provincial governments, if they take the necessary action, will add the compulsory feature, and I cannot understand why this amendment is necessary. It seems to me simply to add the power to withhold the exportation of wheat, and if I understand the desire of my hon. friends it is that the wheat shall move freely; that a pool shall be formed and that every one within its boundaries shall be forced to sell his grain in it. I do not think it would affect the grain trade as stated by the hon. member for Halifax (Mr. Maclean) to-night.

Mr. JOHNSON (Moosejaw): Does the minister object to the provinces exercising that compulsory power, provided they pass the necessary legislation?

Mr. STEWART (Argenteuil): Not at all.

Mr. JOHNSON (Moosejaw): But if you do not accept this amendment you curtail their power to enforce compulsion.

Mr. STEWART (Argenteuil): I do not want to be certain about this, because the matter is entirely new to me; but I understood the law officers of the Crown to intimate that all the necessary powers were contained in the act itself. But this proposed amendment seems to me to permit the province to store grain and hold it—that is, to order the board to store grain and hold it, and I do not think that is a power they require at all.

Mr. MEIGHEN: The matter is not nearly so simple as the Minister of the Interior (Mr. Stewart) seems to think. The members of the Government have merely scratched the surface of this question. They have brought in an undigested bill, a bill that I described in the first place as unworthy the name of legislation. They seem to have proceeded on the idea that all the powers this Parliament had could be described in one word, "voluntary", and that all powers that were compulsory were provincial. There is not a lawyer in this House who does not know that such is not the case. Certain compulsory powers are ours; certain are not. It would not be suggested that the province has power to forbid export from that province without accessory legislation from this Parliament—and this is the accessory legislation. The Government accepted a report, against warning which I expressed and which I sought to impress upon them in a fair way—a report that I knew they could not live up to. And they are not living up to it; they cannot live up to it. This legislation is not a reflection of the report; hon. gentlemen to my left now see that. But this is only one respect in which the legislation is by no means the outgrowth or fulfilment of the report. It is only one of many; we will come to others later. That report bound the Government to embody in the powers they vested in the Wheat Board all the powers that the old board had that this Parliament could bestow. The power dealt with in the amendment is one they have withheld; there are many others. I named a few of them a little while ago—not embodied here at all—and the Minister of Trade and Commerce (Mr. Robb) stood up and said: "We carefully avoided putting those in." Carefully avoided it, though they had given their word to Parliament that everything asked for in the report of the committee on agriculture would find its way into this legislation. Furthermore, the report of the committee on agriculture said this—indeed, this was the very essence to which I took exception: "Two legislatures must vest this board with all the powers they can give to it that the old board had. They must do that, and all that, then and only then the Governor in Council was to have power to call this new act into effect." Have they followed that? No, they have not. I am glad to see they took my warning, but they would have been more frank with Parliament—and it would have been a little fairer to this House—if they had said: "Yes, that is correct; we cannot follow the report in that regard." Instead of that the Prime Minister rose and said: "We are ready to bring legislation into the House to fulfil this report." He has not done it. This legislation does not provide that the legislatures shall give all the compulsory powers they can give before the act goes into effect; it says that when they do confer compulsory powers the Government will pass on those powers, and if they suit them the act will go into effect. That is along the line I suggested in that respect, but it is precisely the opposite of what the Prime Minister bound himself to do, and for which he received the overflowing gratitude of the hon. gentleman from Moosejaw (Mr. Johnson), who described the Prime Minister as having, in this respect anyway, lived up to his policy as enunciated to the electors. Well, he had a great advantage in living up to his policy on this subject, because he had none; he never pronounced any to the electorate. It was very easy to live up to nothing. I must admit that he was in a better position when he had no policy than he is now when he has this bill. The amendment of the hon. member for Moosejaw is necessary he says to give teeth to this legislation. That is correct; the legislation is next to worthless without it. But after you give teeth to the legislation in the shape it is in, you have put teeth in the mouth of a deformed, famished monstrosity, and it is doubtful whether to do so is not more dangerous than disuseful.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: If the present bill falls short in any respect of the statement I made in the House the other day, I should certainly be the first to ask that the Government have opportunity to implement any pledge I have made here or elsewhere. I am unable at the moment to say just how far the amendment would go,

but I would like to have opportunity to have it looked into from a legal point of view and in other respects. I suggest, therefore, that the amendment be allowed to stand and that the committee at this stage rise and report progress, so that the Government may have an opportunity to consider the effect that the proposed amendment would have. My right hon. friend need not be alarmed in the least that the Government will not carry out in the fullest measure possible the report made to this House by the committee, and which I said would be carried out in accordance with the terms of that report.

Mr. MEIGHEN: May I ask the Prime Minister what is the significance of the word "possible" in that promise?

Mr. LAPOINTE: Go to school.

Mr. GRAHAM: In Webster's unabridged you will find it.

Mr. CRERAR: Before the committee rises, I should like to say a word. I have not had an opportunity to study carefully the full significance of the amendment moved by the hon. member for Moosejaw (Mr. Johnson). As I understand it now, it simply seeks to clothe the provinces concurring with the necessary power to control the export of wheat to the places in which the board may seek to sell it. In that respect I do not know that the power could do any harm. It is a matter concerning the provinces themselves; they have the financial liability if there is any loss, and they share in the gain if there is any. It seems to me to be a matter very largely of local consequence. It may be a good thing or it may be a bad thing, but if the people of those provinces want to make the experiment of handling their grain in this way, I do not know that it is a matter of very great concern to the rest of the Dominion. I appreciate the arguments advanced by the hon. member for Brome (Mr. McMaster). I do not know—

Mr. McMASTER: I wish you had the saving faith in them.

Mr. CRERAR: I do not know that the case is quite analogous; but we need not discuss that now. As to the doleful pessimism of my right hon. friend who leads the Opposition (Mr. Meighen) it has really surpassed the pessimism of his views on some other legislation that has come before this House. I think this proposition can work out in the manner in which the people interested wish it to work out. Let them have the experiment; let them try it, and experience will determine whether the thing is good or bad.

Mr. MEIGHEN: That will depend upon the changes that are made.

Mr. CRERAR: My right hon. friend is altogether wrong in that.

Mr. MEIGHEN: Quite a few have already been made.

Mr. CRERAR: That is, perhaps, a testimony to the foresight and wisdom of my right hon. friend who suggested them; but I think the bill, as proposed in this House with the concurrent legislation of the provinces, gives a fair opportunity to try out this experiment. There is no doubt that the people of western Canada, particularly Saskatchewan and Alberta desire to have this experiment in marketing their grain. At first hand, I see no reason why the amendment suggested by the hon. member for Moosejaw (Mr. Johnson) should not receive favourable consideration. I say that subject to this reservation, that I have not had an opportunity of studying it thoroughly. The matter is one that concerns these provinces and if they wish to control absolutely the export of grain from those provinces as they wish to control absolutely the export of liquor, I do not know that it will greatly injure any other part of the Dominion should they have this power.

Amendment stands.

Progress reported.

INDIAN ACT AMENDMENT

On motion of Hon. Charles Stewart (Minister of the Interior), Bill No. 142, to amend the Indian Act, was read the second time, and the House went into committee thereon. Mr. Gordon in the Chair:

On clause 2—Title for common lands of band may be granted on land acquired for Indian settler. Such lands may be security for advances as under Soldier Settlement Act, 1919, but only individual Indian interest is acquired.

Mr. LADNER: Is it the intention of the Government to give certain concessions to the Indians with respect to the Potlach institution, an ancient right or custom of the Indians, where they gather together, in dealing with their personal and real property, in celebrating marriages and in carrying on certain dances and matters of

that kind of a social nature? The law has been on the statute book since 1884, but it is only since about 1918 that it has been enforced. Amendments have been made, and the law is now being enforced to the extent that thousands and thousands of dollars of Indian property are being forcibly taken from them and some twenty-three have been sent to jail, of whom a number have been liberated, for infractions of the act in respect to carrying on a Potlach. I have reliable information that an aged woman, a grandmother, in fact, was sent to jail. The only reason why the Indians carry on this practice is because they thoroughly believe in their ancient customs and they think the honour of their family is not maintained unless certain celebrations take place according to the Potlach institution. I have had some communications with the department, and I should like the minister to give the committee some information whether any remedy will be applied as regards this matter, and whether the Indians will be released from jail and the restrictions lessened.

Mr. STEWART (Argenteuil): I think this ceremony is confined very largely, if not practically altogether, to the province of British Columbia. It is true, from what I can gather, that no action was taken until very recent times with respect to the ceremonies incidental to the Potlach. Perhaps there is not very much to be complained about so long as it is confined to the ceremony; but unfortunately—I am speaking not from actual knowledge, but from information gleaned from the department itself—they are in the habit of giving away their entire belongings and impoverishing themselves at these feasts. It is the desire of the department to stop this practice and not particularly celebrations or other matters incidental to the ceremony. The fact is that they do, under excitement, give away practically their entire belongings. It must be remembered that I am speaking only from information; I do not know about this at first hand. Inasmuch, however, as I intend to visit British Columbia, either next month or in August, and shall meet the Indians in British Columbia, I shall be very glad to make a personal inquiry into this matter. I can hardly conceive that a magistrate would be so severe as to convict and send to jail those Indians who no doubt have a certain amount of reverence for institutions and customs that have been handed down to them by their forefathers. Some action, however, should be taken to prevent them from impoverishing themselves sometimes with winter approaching and without any provision being made for them.

Mr. LADNER: As regards giving away articles, people in authority, of course, know that these articles are not given away. The custom is in the nature of making christmas gifts, where one man will take a turn at giving away a number of articles of value, and on the next occasion another man will take his turn and give them back and so the thing goes around in a circle. Has the matter not been investigated, at the instance of the department, by the Anthropological Society which has made a report favourable to the lessening of these restrictions and giving back to the Indians some of their rights? I believe this whole matter has been gone into, carefully studied and a report made to the department. Has a report been filed and what is the nature of its contents?

Mr. STEWART (Argenteuil): If a report is in the department, it has not been brought to my attention; but in connection with the Indians of British Columbia particularly, there are many matters awaiting my attention. I would not say that the report is not in the department; but if it is, I have not seen it.

Mr. LADNER: Will the report be available for the members?

Mr. STEWART (Argenteuil): There is no objection, if it is in the department.

Mr. MEIGHEN: As regards the question of compulsory enfranchisement, I really fear the minister has not given the matter full enough consideration. The principle of compulsory enfranchisement was accepted by the last Parliament, the idea being the same as has underlain our whole Indian law and administration, namely, that we should seek to bring the Indians gradually, by slow but sure degrees, out of the state of wardship and into the status of citizenship. Now, there are certain advantages that accrue to the condition of wardship; there are certain advantages that even those Indians quite capable of citizenship are loth to give up. And now, if the minister takes this step and gives the ground that he is giving, under, I fear, a certain measure of coercion from certain bands of Indians themselves, then we may just as well abandon all hope of the day when we shall ever have any substantial enfranchisement of the

Indians of this country. The old law provided, not for compulsory enfranchisement in its naked and forbidding sense at all; but, after the most careful examination, under all sorts of restrictions and under proper supervision, it provided that the Indians who were felt to be wholly capable of looking after themselves should take their share of the property that belonged to them and administer it themselves. Those who had shown themselves capable of this, after years of supervision, and who had passed the probationary stage, it was provided, should be declared to be citizens. This, on the one hand, released the state from the obligation of supervision and, on the other hand, released the Indian from that state of subserviency that keeps down the development of his manhood and his sense of independence. Once the department takes the position now proposed and goes back at the behest of these tribes, I do not believe we are ever going to get the Indians in this country into the rank of citizenship. They will not get into that rank of their own accord; it is not in human nature for them to do so. This country does its duty by the Indian when it takes care of him, while he is yet undeveloped, is not equal to the rest of the people, and cannot take care of himself. When he passes that stage and attains an equality with others in ability to care for himself, then we have no more obligation to him, further than to give him his civil rights, the rights of citizenship, and the property that belongs to him. We have discharged our whole obligation and should not be asked to go further. But the minister does not take that view. He says that though the Indian be thoroughly capable, though, indeed, the heads of his own tribe consider him so, though years have shown him to be so, nevertheless, unless he elects himself to come out of the rank of wardship into the rank of citizenship we will not place him there. Experience showed the department and I know that the deputy minister was firmly convinced of it in my time—that we ourselves had positively to take the step, or it was not going to be taken. I know that the minister will meet with difficulties; I have no doubt he will receive threats. Agitators among the Indians centered on this point with particular force, and these obstacles were bound to confront the minister. But he should have sternly faced them and surmounted them; because, once you yield, these same forces will come back later with redoubled strength, with a courage born of past success, and no minister in the future will be likely to get to the point we reached in the last Parliament.

Mr. STEWART (Argenteuil): I agree with some part of what my right hon. friend (Mr. Meighen) has said, but not with all of it. So far as I can ascertain, no Indian has been enfranchised under the Compulsory Enfranchisement Act passed last session. Why? Because the Indians were up in arms about it; they resented being made to give up their property under compulsion. They argued that the deputy superintendent or the superintendent general could name any Indian and enfranchise him willy nilly, have him take his share of the band money and his share of land and place him in a position where he might sell the land subsequently to a white man if he so desired, thereby breaking up the reserve. The Indians had very serious objection to this. I agree thoroughly as to the character of the Indians who should be enfranchised. We are trying to educate the Indians, and my right hon. friend will agree that this has been the object of the department. Once the Indian is able to assume the status of citizenship and is desirous of being enfranchised, then I think he should be enfranchised and be given his share of the band money; and so far as I have been able to ascertain, whenever this is done he invariably leaves the area in which he has lived. It seems to me that you will make far greater progress with these wards of the Government if you try to instil in them the real essence of their manhood, allowing them to take upon themselves the responsibility that is theirs, rather than forcing it upon them. The same thing prevailed with respect to the soldiers' settlement. Up to date no Indian has been enfranchised who has not expressed the desire for citizenship. The attempt to enfranchise the Indian whether he wanted to be enfranchised or not if in the opinion of the superintendent general he was a fit and proper subject to be enfranchised, has been strenuously opposed by the Indians, who are fighting the question very vigorously upon the reserves. I think that if we are to succeed with the Indians we shall do so by educating them and inculcating in them a desire for the franchise, rather than by forcing it upon them. I may be mistaken, but that is the opinion I have formed in the short time I have had to deal with the matter. The one outstanding difficulty is that the franchise

carries with it, in their minds,—as it does in fact—a certain share of the land that constitutes the reserve, and in many cases the reserves are accordingly becoming restricted; and unless these men are taught to cultivate their lands in these areas a greater burden will have to be assumed by the people with respect to them. My belief is that we shall succeed better with the Indians by going to them and getting a candid agreement with them to do certain things rather than by attempting by force to make them do things that they feel to be repulsive. I might refer to one experience. I know an area of land held by Indians in this country, of which the portion I saw was farmed, in my opinion, as well as any land I have seen in Ontario. I think these Indians are to be congratulated on the way they are carrying on. But they are the most dissatisfied lot of people I ever went amongst, and I cannot understand why that should be. It does seem to me, however, that we can do more with them by encouragement, by endeavouring to get them to do what is in their own best interests, instead of by legislative action that has a spirit of compulsion about it. That is my firm belief.

Mr. MEIGHEN: The difficulty mentioned by the minister, that the Indian on being enfranchised would own land in the reserve of his own right which he could sell to any white man, is just as present in the case of voluntary as in the case of compulsory enfranchisement. It could be overcome by some provision for exchange which I would think could easily be made fair; that is to say, if it is a difficulty of such magnitude as to warrant such a step.

As to the fact that no Indians have been enfranchised, the act has only been in force a few months, and naturally until the Indian had it instilled in his mind that it was for his own benefit, the department would be loth to proceed with the enfranchisement; but I do think that during that period it would have been better to have pursued an educational policy designed to bring the Indian to agree with the act, rather than submit to the defiance of these agitators and thereby postpone forever the possibility of this reform.

Section agreed to.

Bill reported, read the third time and passed.

SALE AND INSPECTION OF ROOT VEGETABLES

House again in committee on Bill No. 133 to regulate the sale and inspection of root vegetables (as amended), Mr. Gordon in the Chair.

[Mr. Charles Stewart.]

On section 3—Potato grades.

Mr. MOTHERWELL: When this bill was in committee last Saturday the hon. member for Parkdale (Mr. Spence) requested that it stand over until to-morrow because of certain features of this section. I think therefore we should pass over this section to-night and take up the other sections.

Section stands.

On section 4—Onion grades; definitions.

The CHAIRMAN: This section was amended in the special committee by striking out the words, "grown in Canada" and substituting therefor the word "offered".

Mr. SPENCE: I understood the whole bill was to stand over until Tuesday.

Mr. MOTHERWELL: I thought the hon. member was interested only in clause 3, which has been allowed to stand.

Mr. SPENCE: I am interested in the whole bill, and I wish you would be good enough to let it stand until to-morrow. That is what you assured me you would do.

Mr. MOTHERWELL: I thought I was complying with the hon. gentleman's request in asking the committee to let section 3 stand. However, I shall be happy to comply with his request. I therefore propose that the committee rise and report progress.

Progress reported.

SALE OF AGRICULTURAL FERTILIZERS

House in committee on Bill No. 149 to regulate the sale of agricultural fertilizers (as amended), Mr. Gordon in the Chair.

On section 7—Application of act.

The CHAIRMAN: Clause 7 is amended by striking out the whole of sub-clause (a). The clause reads now:

> This act shall not apply to the selling or offering for sale of fertilizers for manufacturing purposes.

Mr. CALDWELL: That is right. That is what was agreed to by the committee.

Mr. MOTHERWELL: In my copy the whole of section 7 is struck out and another section is substituted.

Mr. CALDWELL: The section substituted would be the first line and the last line and a half of that section.

Mr. MOTHERWELL: Whatever change is in your copy, Mr. Chairman, is intended to carry.

Section agreed to.

Bill reported, read the third time and passed.

QUEBEC HARBOUR COMMISSIONERS

On motion of Hon. Ernest Lapointe (Minister of Marine and Fisheries) Bill No. 78, to provide for further advances to the Quebec Harbour Commissioners, was read the second time and the House went into committee thereon, Mr. Gordon in the Chair.

On section 2—$1,500,000 may be advanced to Harbour Commissioners for terminal facilities:

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: Is the minister still of the view that this legislation should be proceeded with? Is he still of the view that we should issue debentures to pay for painting, for instance, and the replacement of ropes? Is he still of the view that this bill should be pressed irrespective of the fact that, as already disclosed, the facilities at Quebec are greater than the business of to-day requires? Is he still of the view that this legislation should be pressed in view of the attitude taken by him and his Government in connection with other public expenditures urgently necessary? I think that before the bill is proceeded with, the minister should take us into his confidence.

Mr. LAPOINTE: I think this bill was explained pretty fully when the resolution was under consideration. I am still of the view that its provisions are necessary, and there is no other way in which the money can be advanced for the necessary work to be done. My hon. friend cannot suggest any other way, because there is no other way. This is the way it was done in his time.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: It is perfectly true that advances running up into millions have been made and exhausted. It is perfectly true that when business was still being carried on, not only was there no return to the government of the advances, but the business was done at a loss. We were approached for further sums of money, and we came to the conclusion that there was an end to everything, and that the end in this case had been reached, and we did not give way to the importunities of the commission. I do not know what the minister's ultimate idea with regard to these properties may be, but surely something ought to be done. Surely he should give us some idea of what he is going to do. Does he think we should go on indefinitely making advances to harbour properties that do not give us any returns but, on the other hand, show substantial losses? Surely he must have some idea as to what is to be done in the future.

Mr. LAPOINTE: My hon. friend knows that we are getting some return from these advances, even if they have not paid interest so far. I gave the committee all the figures when the resolution was under consideration. I think that the sums expended on the port of Quebec compare favourably with those expended on all the other ports of the country. It is true that no interest is being paid, but may I point out that on the port of Halifax the sum of $16,738,965 has been spent and that no interest of any kind whatever is paid. On the harbour of St. John, a total of $14,746,220 has been expended and no interest is being paid there either. Those are national expenditures, they are necessary expenditure. In Montreal the harbour is paying its own way. The revenues are so large that the commissioners are able to pay interest on all sums that have been lent to them by the federal government. In Toronto, $8,806,345 has been spent by this government without any interest whatever being paid, and surely the port of Toronto cannot be compared with the port of Quebec as far as traffic is concerned. On the harbour of Vancouver the sum of $7,056,256.70 has been expended. There the revenues exceed the expenditure, and the Government hopes that the interest will be paid on the various loans made. As I stated before, these expenditures are necessary for the purpose of keeping up work that has already been done. They are necessary in order that the harbour works may be used to advantage, and they are necessary for the navigation of the St. Lawrence river. I hope that in the future the expansion of trade at Quebec will permit the harbour commissioners there to pay interest on these advances.

Mr. McBRIDE: Will this money be expended on new work or in repairing work that has already been constructed?

Mr. LAPOINTE: It is to complete work which has been started and to repair works which need repair.

Mr. McBRIDE: Well, has the money which has been spent in Halifax, St. John and Vancouver been for the construction of new work or for the repair of old work?

Mr. LAPOINTE: New work.

Mr. McBRIDE: Does the minister think it is a good policy for this Parliament to vote money for repairing old work? Ought not that expenditure be charged up to general account and not to capital account?

Mr. LAPOINTE: I do not think my hon. friend can suggest any other way of doing it. If he can I am quite willing to accept it. This is the only way in which it can be done. The work needed in Quebec is done by the harbour commission just as the work in other ports is done by their harbour commission. Otherwise the Department of Public Works would have to do the work.

Mr. McBRIDE: I quite understand this work is done by the harbour commission, but does the minister think it is sound policy to borrow capital to repair work that already exists?

Mr. LAPOINTE: When it is necessary. If the Government was doing the work itself the expenditure would certainly be charged to capital account.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: I think the hon. member to my left has put his finger on the whole trouble. There is not a bit of good referring to what has been done other places because the minister will not find —I know he will correct me if I am wrong—that as regards other places debentures are being issued to pay for current repairs. I do not think he will find that debentures are being issued anywhere else for repaving approaches or repainting woodwork such as we have here.

Mr. LAPOINTE: Certainly.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: It will not be found anywhere else. Nor does it help very much to refer to other ports unless we refer to ports that are administered in the same way. It does not help the case at all to refer for example, to Toronto. It is quite true that the sum of $8,000,000 has been spent in the port of Toronto but it is also true that the commissioners there have spent a great deal more than $8,000,000 and they administer the port themselves and pay—

Mr. LAPOINTE: Will my hon. friend permit me.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: Certainly.

[Mr. Lapointe.]

Mr. LAPOINTE: The only reason I referred to the other ports is because it is charged against the port of Quebec that it is not paying interest on the sums spent there. I only want to show my hon. friend that the same thing exists in all the ports of Canada except the port of Montreal.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: I had not quite finished following up my line of thought but the minister's argument makes my point very apparent. I say there is not much use talking about the port of Toronto, because the Toronto people finance the greater part of the capital themselves and pay their own deficits when they have them. Can my hon. friend point to one other port—if he will just mention one I will be satisfied—where we are issuing debentures to pay for current repairs? I do not know of any; I may be wrong and I will be very glad to be corrected if I am wrong. We have these separate Boards of Commissioners working under guarantee at different places; we have them working at Montreal, Quebec and Vancouver. I do not remember another port—if I am wrong my hon. friend will correct me, because it is in his department and he knows all about it—but I only remember those three places. Montreal pays its interest, and the minister says the receipts in Vancouver are greater than the expenses so that it will also pay. So that, so far as this particular class of port is concerned, Quebec is the only one that is not paying interest?

Mr. LAPOINTE: What about St. John and Halifax?

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: But my hon. friend knows very well that there is no Harbour Commission there?

Mr. LAPOINTE: What is the difference?

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: My hon. friend knows very well that these ports are not so administered. He knows that in the cases mentioned the port is a city port. On the other hand this is Dominion property, this is something for the administration of which we are responsible, and we have two other ports where we have the same condition. Now I want to find out from my hon. friend, as the minister in charge, what he thinks of a Dominion government property being so administered that, as I have already pointed out, we have to issue debentures to pay for current upkeep. The idea of this advance is two-fold; it is further to enlarge the facilities not

now used to anything like the capacity, and it is also to make repairs. Well if we have to issue debentures can they not be kept down to at least repairs so that we would not be enlarging the basis of our loans. This bill is drawn in a very misleading manner because our investment in this port is infinitely greater than appears.

Mr. LAPOINTE: Why say that? This bill has been drawn in exactly the same manner as the bills presented by my predecessors, Mr. Hazen and Mr. Ballantyne. Why say this is a misleading draught?

Mr. CALDWELL: May I ask a question? A supplementary estimate was brought down to the House on June 4 last year for $60,000 to pay for the expropriation of land in connection with the Quebec Harbour. Can the minister tell me whether any part of this vote is to go to pay that $60,000?

Mr. LAPOINTE: I hope not.

Mr. CALDWELL: Has the $60,000 been paid since last June?

Mr. LAPOINTE: I do not think it has. If so it has been paid by the Commission, but I do not think so.

Mr. CALDWELL: It has not been paid by the Government.

Mr. LAPOINTE: No.

Mr. BELAND: It could not have been paid because the money was not voted.

Mr. CALDWELL: Just there, I dislike to differ with my hon. friend for I very often find myself in perfect accord with him, but there is this thing which has disturbed me somewhat during the present session. We spend day after day here trying to pare down estimates and be economical. Yet we came to the House this year and we find, I think, in the neighbourhood, of $10,000,000 in supplementary estimates for money that had not been voted by parliament but had been expended under Governor General's warrant. I will therefore have to differ with my hon. friend opposite when he says that in this particular case the money could not have been paid because it was not voted, because we had nearly $10,000,000 paid that was not voted by Parliament last year. But what I would like to ask is this: Has any claim been put into the Government for the $60,000 since last June?

Mr. LAPOINTE: Not to the Government, but there is a judgment against the harbour commissioners for that amount, on which they are paying interest. I do not know what they will really do, but there is nothing to be gained by perpetuating the thing.

Mr. CALDWELL: I ask the question because a very serious charge was made when the supplementary estimates were brought down last year. It was alleged that this $60,000 was not to pay for the expropriation of land by the Quebec Harbour Commission, but to cover election expenses on the occasion of the by-election in the county of Yamaska. The supplementary estimate was introduced by the then Minister of Justice and was strongly supported by the then Prime Minister, but the charge that was made seemed to scare them as a coon is scared out of a tree; they withdrew the item without even letting it come to a vote. That would make it appear as though there was something in the charge, and I think the minister should investigate the matter and find out if it has been the practice of governments, either past or present, to pass supplementary estimates with which to pay election expenses. I think he should also inquire how the Yamaska election expenses were paid last year if not by the Department of Marine. I know that if I had been in charge of that estimate and knew the allegation to be false, I certainly should have demanded a vote of the House on it and would have gone into the matter to the bottom. I would not have let it stand for a year and then come into the House and be a dummy about it; I would have investigated it thoroughly.

Mr. LAPOINTE: My hon. friend may be sure that if there is a way of abstaining from payment of the amount, the commissioners will take that way.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: I agree entirely with the conclusion arrived at by the hon. member for Carleton (Mr. Caldwell), though my reasoning differs from his and I do not start from the same premises. In the first place, his premises were incorrect, and it is not necessary to say anything about the reasoning, because if you start on wrong premises your reasoning is apt to be wrong. The item was held up under such circumstances that I think the hon. member is quite right in saying that this Government ought to investigate the matter and find out just how it stands. That is what we wanted to have done. The item was

brought down, as the hon. member says, in the supplementary estimates last year and was objected to by the then member for Gaspé. He charged among other things, as I recollect it, that there had been collusion in connection with the arbitration. It was the first the government had heard of it, and the stand they took—and I think it was a proper one—was that if these commissioners had been guilty of fraud, if there had been collusion, the amount ought not to be paid; it was something that ought to be considered. The government, therefore, with a view to ascertaining the facts, shortly after Parliament prorogued passed an Order in Council providing for an investigation under the Inquiries Act so that evidence could be taken under oath. But the inquiry did not go on. The challenger did not like to appear before the judge, saying that he had intended that the investigation should be carried on by this Parliament. Well, this is the first Parliament that has since met. We are not in charge of it; we could not go on with the investigation here as suggested by the hon. member for Carleton. It seems to me that the matter is entirely one for the minister. There is a judgment, as the minister says, against the commissioners. If that judgment was obtained as the result of fraud, as charged at the last session, this House and the country have a right to know it; the matter should not be allowed to stand. We could not get an unwilling prosecutor to come forward and prosecute, and we cannot now act, so that it is a matter which, I submit, ought to receive the attention of the present minister.

Mr. McBRIDE: What amount of this money is to be used in the construction of new works and what amount on old work?

Mr. LAPOINTE: The details are already on Hansard; I gave them when the resolution was discussed. The largest part of the amount is for new work.

Mr. McBRIDE: I understood the minister to say it would take five years to carry this work out.

Mr. LAPOINTE: I see by the notes I have that it will take three years for some of the items—the dredging and two others.

Mr. McBRIDE: Why should we vote money here for three years ahead? Is it not sufficient to vote money for each year's work?

[Sir Henry Drayton.]

Mr. LAPOINTE: This is not an appropriation as appropriations are made for public works generally. The moneys are advanced in the form of loans; it has always been done in that way in the case of harbour commissions. It obviates the necessity of their coming here from year to year and asking for advances.

Mr. McBRIDE: I want to be quite clear on this thing. It has been my impression that this Government have never received anything in the way of interest on these advances, neither has the capital been repaid. If I am wrong, I shall be glad to be corrected.

Mr. LAPOINTE: I admit that the interest has not been paid, except to the extent of a small amount—about a million and half.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: I have not the figures, but I understand that the arrears are very great; both principal and interest are uncollectable, as my hon. friend (Mr. McBride) points out. What information can the minister give as to the necessity of spending the money on dredging just now? As I understand it, you now have a standard depth for the grain berth of 30 feet which it is desired to increase to 35 feet, though the ocean vessels that have been loading grain at that port have not, as a rule, exceeded a draft of 27 to 29 feet. Is that correct?

Mr. LAPOINTE: We have to maintain a standard depth of 35 feet at low tide at Quebec. My hon. friend must remember that Quebec is the port of call for the big vessels. Big ships, such as the liners of the Canadian Pacific, cannot go further than Quebec; they have to stop at that port, and it is necessary that the depth shall be maintained there. This is for the purpose of maintaining a depth of thirty-five feet. Otherwise, those ships would go to Boston or New York, and we would have trade and truck with the Yankees.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: Do any of the Canadian Pacific boats go to the grain berth?

Mr. LAPOINTE: No, not usually, though officials of the steamship service of the Canadian Pacific want to load grain in Quebec on their liners. They have approached me on that point.

Section agreed to.

Bill reported, read the third time and passed.

APPROPRIATION FOR MONTREAL HARBOUR COMMISSION

On motion of Hon. Ernest Lapointe (Minister of Marine and Fisheries), Bill No. 80, to provide for further advances to the Harbour Commissioners of Montreal, was read the second time and the House went into committee thereon, Mr. Gordon in the Chair.

On section 1—short title:

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: I take it that, in this case also, this is for new capital expenditure?

Mr. LAPOINTE: Yes.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: I know they have made arrangements, so that this is further capital on which we shall receive interest in the future.

Mr. LAPOINTE: Yes.

Section agreed to.

Bill reported, read the third time and passed.

LAKE OF THE WOODS REGULATION

On motion of Hon. D. D. McKenzie (Solicitor General), Bill No. 141, to repeal the Lake of the Woods Regulation Act, 1921, was read the second time and the House went into committee thereon, Mr. Gordon in the Chair.

On section 1—Act repealed, and property rights and authority over work mentioned in act.

Mr. HUDSON: This bill is one which affects the people of the city of Winnipeg and the province of Manitoba in a very material way. The position of the matter is that the city of Winnipeg and the eastern portion of the province of Manitoba is supplied with its hydro-electric power from the Winnipeg river. The waters of the Winnipeg river flow from the Lake of the Woods at Kenora and also from the English river at Lac Seul from the northeast. The waters of the Lake of the Woods are regulated under an arrangement with the United States the arrangement being made through the International Joint Commission. Under a regulation of that commission the waters must be maintained between certain levels. They can be maintained between those levels only by a dam at the point where the waters of the lake run into the Winnipeg river at Norman. That dam is owned by a private company. It is the duty of the Government of Canada to control that dam in order to fulfil its international obligations. Moreover, that dam is necessary to regulate the waters which flow into the river and which are utilised lower down the river for power purposes. The regulation of the flow for those power purposes is recognised by everybody, by Ontario as well as by Manitoba, as being necessary and proper. The result of the recognition of this condition was an arrangement made between the province of Ontario and the Dominion of Canada some years ago and implemented by an Order in Council, by which a board was created to control the flow of those waters. It soon became apparent that it was necessary to have some body with effective powers. A body created by Order in Council had only directory powers; it had no controlling powers whatever. In the autumn of 1920, the Ontario government disposed of a number of water powers on the English river and a large area of timber lands to be used for pulp purposes. They were disposed of to an American citizen, who also controlled the dam at Norman. By means of his control of this dam and his control of the powers of the English river he had absolute command of the flow of the waters and the powers within the province of Manitoba. These circumstances came to the knowledge of the people of Manitoba, and as the people of the province, the city of Winnipeg particularly, were dependent on the proper control of these powers they made a request of the government at Ottawa and the government of Ontario to appoint a body with legal powers to exercise the proper control of these dams and the proposed power works. The result of that request was that the government of Ontario, represented by its premier, the government of Canada, represented by the then Prime Minister (Mr. Meighen) and other members of the government, and representatives of the Manitoba government got together in Ottawa and agreed upon a bill for the creation of a board with the necessary powers. The premier of Ontario undertook to have that bill passed in the Ontario legislature, the Dominion government undertaking to have the same bill carried through this House. It was passed in this House and duly carried through the Senate, thereafter coming into force. But the bill was not passed in the Ontario legislature. It was introduced there, but was allowed to drag on until the dying days of the session when it was withdrawn by the premier. Immediately on that situation being brought to the attention of the authorities in

Manitoba they requested the Dominion government to take the necessary steps to protect their interests, by doing two things: first, by expropriating the dam at Norman, which was really the controlling factor of the waters coming from the south; and secondly, by declaring the works created or to be created in the future to be works for the general advantage of Canada, under section 92, subsection 10 (c) of the British North America Act. In response to their request the act which it is now proposed to repeal was passed. Now, the only purpose to be served by the passing of the bill now before this House is to repeal the section declaring these works to be works for the general advantage of Canada, and to the repeal of that section the people of the city of Winnipeg and the province of Manitoba object. The act which was originally passed and agreed to between Ontario and the Dominion was not a wholly satisfactory act, but it was agreed to as the best that could be got. It was Hobson's choice; we took the only thing we could get. It was defective in one important respect, and that is the fact that there was no finality; no one was given the final voice in case of dispute among the members of the board. We endeavoured to have such a clause inserted in the bill but we were not able to achieve that end.

Mr. MEIGHEN: I did not hear what it was the hon. member said they were not able to get.

Mr. HUDSON: We wanted a clause put in giving some one a casting vote. A balanced board was created; there were two representatives from Ontario and two from the Dominion, but there was no provision in the bill giving any one the last word. Nor was there any provision as to what should constitute a quorum. That was left to be subsequently agreed upon. The whole purpose of the control was to vest in somebody, having ample authority, the ability to act quickly and definitely; because the damage, if any were done in connection with the control of the waters, might be irreparable if it were not remedied almost instantaneously. The original bill was very defective in that respect, and for that reason it seemed to us that the bill which was subsequently passed provided a more ample and proper safeguard. Now, the objection which has been and which may be raised to this bill is that it is an infringement of provincial rights. That was considered at the time the request was made by the province of Manitoba, and the view was then taken that it was not an unreasonable infringement of such rights. In the first place, the waters in question are interprovincial streams; in the second place, the waters of the Winnipeg river coming from the Lake of the Woods are international waters, and the Dominion itself is under international obligations; in the third place, the Dominion itself has a direct interest in the lower water powers of the river within the province of Manitoba, because that province does not own or control its natural resources. In addition to that, the Dominion had spent large sums of money in making surveys and improving the water powers of this river. The Dominion had a direct interest; it had, incidentally, interests in connection with navigation. These things, all taken together, took the case outside of what might be ordinarily regarded as an infringement of provincial rights. The Dominion has acted in the same way in regard to another river, the Ottawa river. As far back as 1870 an act was passed, not unlike the present act, declaring the works of the Ottawa river to be works for the general advantage of Canada. For that reason we felt that we were not asking the Dominion to do anything that was either unreasonable or unprecedented, and besides it was necessary in the interests not merely of Manitoba but of the Dominion as a whole. There is one respect in which the bill which it is sought to repeal perhaps infringed somewhat on what might be claimed to be a purely provincial situation, and that is in regard to the water powers on the English rivers within the province of Ontario itself. It seems to me that in that respect there might very well be negotiations and consultation between the province of Ontario and the Dominion. But in the meantime I submit that this bill should not be proceeded with in regard to the section repealing the clause as to the works for the general advantage of Canada.

Mr. MEIGHEN: Mr. Chairman, had I been in the House at the moment I would have opposed the second reading of this bill, and I take the opportunity now to state my position in regard thereto. My position coincides with that taken by the hon. member for South Winnipeg (Mr. Hudson) in so far as opposition to the bill is concerned. I would not like to identify myself exactly with his words as expressed in the last two sentences relative to

negotiations as to the waters of English river. That, however, is a mere detail.

The effect of the bill is as the hon. member describes it. It repeals chapter 38 of the statutes of last session. By repealing that act it revokes a declaration by this House—if Parliament has power to do so—that certain works are for the general advantage of Canada. Personally, I am by no means convinced that once Parliament acts under the provisions of the British North America Act and declares works to be for the general advantage of Canada, it can afterwards degrade those works and make them purely provincial. However, assuming that it can—which this bill assumes—I think we are taking a retrograde step in passing the legislation. It is true that by the proposed concurrent acts, of which ours is chapter 10 of the statutes of last year, we did agree, providing the province of Ontario carried out its part of the agreement, to place the control of these waters, subject to the directions contained in that act, in a joint board; and we even surrendered that finality of control that we before had exercised on the part of the chairman of that board; we provided that the control should be in a joint board and that each section should act in conformity with the final decision of the Lieutenant-Governor in Council of Ontario in the one case or the Governor in Council of Canada in the other. The province of Ontario failed to live up to its agreement. The Premier of that province withdrew the legislation because certain criticism was offered and did not even put his legislation to the test of a vote, indeed, never carried it to second reading at all. The distinct understanding was that he should do so and conduct it as a government measure through the provincial legislature. Because he so undertook we yielded what we did yield and came to agreement with him.

Upon his failure something had to be done by this House. The whole matter was reviewed again and this Parliament then passed chapter 38 of the statutes of last year. By that act we provided a board to control these waters in relation to the whole level of the lake of the Woods, which is purely a federal matter, being international in character and having to do with navigation—federal therefore for both these reasons; and to control them with regard to the supervision of construction of water-powers and the management of those water-powers thereafter. From a certain phase that is provincial in that the power is within the province; but from another angle it is federal, because the waters that themselves make the power are interprovincial streams, and only by some control that has as much concern for the rights of the one province as the other can the best results be obtained. Therefore we provided a board appointed federally. But I ask Parliament to note this, that in making the appointments we chose the men who had acted before on our part, and we also chose the two men who previously had acted for the Ontario government, and we asked the Ontario government to consent to those men still acting on the board. That consent, if I remember rightly, they declined to give.

However, having regard to the fact that these waters are interprovincial, we declared the works constructed in them to be works for the general advantage of Canada. The British North America Act provides that this Parliament may so declare wherever it is felt in the public interest to make such a declaration, and it contains no restriction whatever on this Parliament in determining what is proper in this regard. Nevertheless we should be guided by certain principles.

Now, what is a principle that may govern us? I submit that if the works are such that control over them by one province may be operated to the disadvantage of another, then it would be fair and right that they should be declared federal. It must not be presumed that any federal authority is going to control works in any province inimically to the interests of the people generally. We are here as trustees, not for one province but for all; we are equally concerned with Ontario rights and Manitoba rights. Here is a structure, say the Norman dam, because that is the chief one as emphasized by the hon. member for south Winnipeg, the proper control of which affects very large interests in the province of Manitoba, indeed, affects as well interests in the province of Ontario. Consequently this structure is eminently what this Parliament may declare to be for the general advantage of Canada, thereby vesting in this Parliament federal control in relation thereto, that control, as regards civil rights, circling around a structure that otherwise would be provincial. The act of last session asserted that and other works to be for the genreal advantage of Canada. If we repeal chapter 38, then we have done everything in our power to take those works out of the category of

federal works and make them provincial again, and to place in the power of a board, half of whose members only we appoint, and over which there is no veto power whatever on the part of this Parliament, the ability to use those structures disadvantageously and unfairly as respects one of the provinces of Canada.

There is another reason why this statute should not be repealed. On the faith of this statute—which, by the way, contained a provision that the rest of it might be repealed when Ontario lived up to its agreement, but not this section—large investments have been made in the province of Manitoba. The great power development on the Winnipeg river—I forget the name of the falls—now financed by the Winnipeg Street Railway in which the whole of Manitoba is interested and deeply concerned has been financed on the faith in some substantial measure of the statute of this Parliament, because the investors in the bonds of that company believed that a statute passed by this Parliament placing those structures in the category of works for the general advantage of Canada was a statute upon which they could rely, and they knew that while they were works for the general advantage of Canada they would be administered for that general advantage and not specially for the advantage of any province. For the reason, first of all that they are eminently works that ought to be declared for the general advantage of Canada, for the reason, secondly, that having been so declared, investments have been made on the faith thereof, and developments have taken place on the faith thereof; for these two reasons I submit that that declaration ought not to be revoked. Let the Government act, if it chooses, upon the provision of Chapter 38, which enables them to revoke my Order in Council the rest of the act, but let them leave intact this, the corner stone of the structure, which is relied on to-day by the province of Manitoba generally, and by those who invested money in the enterprise particularly. No harm can be done by leaving it intact; no injustice can be done to any province. There can be no desire on the part of the province of Ontario to have that wiped away, save the desire to utilize those works unfairly to the other provinces, and to the undue and improper advantage of the province of Ontario, or possibly, to the advantage of private interests, but not to the advantage of either province at all. I submit to the Solicitor General that he had better withdraw this bill. It is not a bill in the public interest. There is going to be no harm done to those works by leaving the ultimate, final control where it ought to be, and at the same time placing the immediate administrative power in the hands of a joint body, where it will rest if this legislation does not pass.

[Mr. Meighen.]

Mr. McKENZIE: The facts of the case as stated by the right hon. leader of the Opposition and by the hon. member for South Winnipeg (Mr. Hudson) do not seem to differ very much from the facts of the case as related by myself. I think hon. gentlemen will all agree that we should live up to a bargain as closely as possible, whether it be national, international or interprovincial. This particular bargain was made in the latter part of 1921 between the province of Ontario and the Dominion of Canada. The province of Ontario was represented by the Premier, the Hon. Mr. Drury, and by its officials, and the Dominion government by the Prime Minister, now the right hon. leader of the Opposition. Although the province of Manitoba does not seem to appear very conspicuously in the bargain, I think they had something to do with it too, but they do not appear in the agreement. All that we want so far as the province of Ontario is concerned, is to put them back exactly where they were when they made that agreement.

On the 28th of April, 1921, the Premier of Ontario sent a telegram to the Prime Minister of Canada, reading as follows:

> In view of the fact that the Lake of the Woods Control Bill was opposed last night in the House by the Liberal Opposition and the Conservative Opposition as well as from the Government side, it was found inadvisable to press second reading under circumstances that pointed to the probable defeat of the measure, and in withdrawing the bill I made the announcement that if then desired it would be reintroduced next session. I respectfully urge that in the meantime the present control arrangements be continued and assure you of the thorough co-operation of this Government to ensure the best results for all the interests involved.

That was the telegram sent by Premier Drury when he found the bill so strenuously opposed in the Ontario House that there was no prospect of getting it through. That bill was the twin brother of the bill which my right hon. friend undertook to put through the House here, and did put through, namely, Chapter 10 of the Acts of 1921. The two bills were prepared by the same officers; at all events, the officers

were agreed upon them, and the bills were identically the same. The right hon. leader of the Opposition, then Prime Minister, put his bill through this Parliament, and the Premier of Ontario undertook to put his bill through the Ontario House. One succeeded, and the other failed, and when Premier Drury found he was not able on the spur of the moment to carry out the agreement, he sent the telegram I have read asking for a stay of proceedings until he could go on with the agreement which they had arrived at.

In reply to that telegram the following communication—it does not show exactly whether it was a telegram or a letter, but I think it was a letter—was sent to Premier Drury, dated from the Prime Minister's office on the 29th of April, that is, the next day:

> I have your telegram of yesterday. I regret very much indeed that the Lake of the Woods Control bill is not to be passed by the Ontario legislature this session. It has already passed both Houses of the federal Parliament. I will take up the matter of continuing the present Control Board with the Minister of the Interior and can assure you that we will endeavour to do so if same can be effectively done.
>
> Faithfully yours,
>
> (Sgd) ARTHUR MEIGHEN.

So at that stage my right hon. friend appeared to be quite willing to fall in line with the idea of continuing matters as they were, and it must not be forgotten that they had continued in that way for years and years under orders in council; but at some time in 1921 both parties got together, and they must have reasoned somewhat like this. The Ontario government says: The province of Ontario has a vast and valuable property around this Norman dam, in this lake and in this stream. The Dominion government says: We have navigable control. We have such control as comes to us by reason of this being an interprovincial stream, and being also, as I understand, to some extent international waters. The Prime Minister might very well have said: Representing the Dominion, I have these powers under the British North America Act. So he says to Mr. Drury: We certainly do not question your rights, and the proper thing is for us to keep together and make this agreement. The act itself that was passed by this Parliament, Chapter 10 of the Acts of 1921, recites the agreement in the preamble:

> Whereas it has been agreed by and between the Government of the Dominion of Canada and the government of the province of Ontario that the powers hereinafter mentioned shall be vested in a Board consisting of four members, two to be appointed by the Governor General in Council and two by the Lieutenant-Governor in Council and that the necessary legislation to authorize the same shall be enacted by the Parliament of Canada and the legislature of Ontario respectively; Therefore, His Majesty, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate and House of Commons of Canada, enacts as follows:

So you will see, Mr. Chairman, that in order that there should be no mistake as to the purpose of the act, the agreement was cited in the preamble. That act passed this Parliament, and was intituled The Lake of the Woods Control Board Act of 1921. Now for some reason or another the Prime Minister of that day had occasion to write a letter, dated March 17, 1921, to the Premier of Ontario in which he recapitulated all the letters and telegrams that had passed between them in connection with this matter up to date and in the same communication makes this statement:

> The Lake of the Woods Control Bill has been introduced into the Dominion Parliament pursuant to agreement between the government of the province of Ontario and this government, such agreement being arrived after a conference between the two governments at which you as well as I were present, and at which officers of each government having special knowledge of the surrounding facts and various public interests were also present. The agreement provided for the concurrent introduction of exactly similar legislation by your government in the Ontario legislature. It seems to me to follow from this state of facts that each government should proceed with its legislation unless subsequent facts were adduced or reasons advanced so affecting the public interests as to carry the judgment of both governments.

That is as nearly as possible the same idea that we find in the preamble of the bill so that there can be no question as to what the agreement was. Some time before the introduction of the act known as Chapter 10 into this Parliament in 1921 the Ontario government and the Dominion government had come together, absolutely and clearly, as to what had to be done. The Ontario government then finds there is opposition to the scheme in the provincial legislature, whereupon the Prime Minister of that province writes to the Prime Minister of Canada, as I have already quoted, saying in effect: "You had better stay your hand, I am not able to keep up my end of the bargain just now." Nothing was said to warn the Premier of Ontario that the proposition he made would not be carried out. The next thing the government of

Ontario found out was that a new act—of which they had never heard, in respect to which there was no negotiation, and in respect to which there was no assemblage of officials or representatives such as occurred before—was put through. That would appear to me to be a most arbitrary proceeding. That act, Chapter 38, contained a proviso that property of the province of Ontario, amounting to perhaps up in the millions, should be taken out of its control and put under the control of this government and this Parliament. That was done without any notice whatever to the province of Ontario.

Mr. MEIGHEN: The hon. gentleman is entirely wrong, but I would just ask him one question: What was this property worth millions that the province of Ontario owned that was taken out of its control?

Mr. McKENZIE: It consists of waterpowers, and the beds of rivers and lakes. That is what I am told it consists of.

Mr. MEIGHEN: What is the waterpower that the province owned that has been alienated?

Mr McKENZIE: There must have been some waterpower because my right hon. friend, who is a keen bargainer had a statute passed saying that the federal government on one side and the government of Ontario on the other would always have the control of it. It must have been something worth while or this Parliament would not be put into motion to pass legislation appointing a board to deal with it as joint property. I am taking for granted that it was a valuable property; and furthermore there is the fact that the leader of the Opposition has told us to-night that millions of money—large amounts of money at all events—are being invested in the province of Manitoba on account of some turn of management in connection with this property. So if all this is true this property must be very valuable and it must be property the province of Ontario regards seriously and thinks should be under its control. All I say is this: It is not for hon. gentlemen here to trouble their minds about going behind the agreement that is cited in the statutes of 1921. I am satisfied for one, and I expect hon. gentlemen to be satisfied that a proper agreement was made in that year, and we find that agreement crystallized in the shape of a statute. I am not asking anybody to go behind that agreement, because I am satisfied that the several parties concerned came together with respect to it. All that I am saying is that we should put them back where they were, start anew, and carry out the arrangement upon which they all absolutely agreed, an agreement in which the property rights of the respective governments were absolutely safeguarded and as to which nobody was finding fault. In Chapter 38, which the right hon. gentleman (Mr. Meighen) caused to be passed in 1921 there is a proviso in which he recommends that this act itself should be repealed. Now if Chapter 10 and the agreement upon which it is based, were not proper, why did the right hon. gentleman provide that Chapter 38 should be repealed and Chapter 10 come into force? That is all that we are now asking with this exception: We want the parties to be put where they were before, and if there is any new bargaining to be made let it be made between the province of Ontario and the Dominion government and, if you like, the province of Manitoba. I say it was not fair to Premier Drury and the province of Ontario that this property should be taken out of their hands without telling them a word about it. It seems to me that when it was found that Premier Drury could not get his legislation through, the least that could have been done was to have asked him to come down to Ottawa and point out to him "Matters are urgent, we cannot wait for your legislation; we are going to put through another bill. Let us sit down together and try to agree upon the terms of that bill so that if your province has a right to be safeguarded you will have an opportunity of presenting your views to this Parliament." No such course was taken. Premier Drury was never asked to come down and submit a basis for chapter 38, and this vast property —I think it must be valuable property or there would not have been such trouble taken about it—was placed beyond the control of the province of Ontario and vested entirely in another body in which it had no say.

Let me point out that any provincial government we have dealt with has always been jealous in the matter of provincial rights, and there could not have been a more violent intrusion upon provincial rights than has taken place here in the case of the province of Ontario. It is acknowledged that the lake of the Woods is part of the Winnipeg river and of the English river and of the other waters in that vicinity; some of these are within the jurisdiction of Ontario and should not be

swept from the control of that province by an act of this Parliament without their having an opportunity of presenting their case along the line of the agreement which they had made some time before. As I understand my right hon. friend's argument, he says that this property belonging to Ontario was by chapter 38 of the statutes of 1921 taken out of the control of that province and placed under the jurisdiction of this Parliament and that since that has been done, the matter cannot be put right. I do not accept that proposition as sound. If this property had been owned or controlled by the Dominion government, will anybody say they could not hand over that ownership or control to the local government? Could that right be not transferred to the province? Surely it cannot be said, then, that in this case we are functus officio as a parliament simply because we once declared that a certain right is in the Dominion. If there is any doubt about that, it is a matter of law—possibly of constitutional law—which can be settled by the courts, if there is anything to settle. My own belief is—and I have other authority to support me—that there is no doubt about the matter; we have the right to put this property back where it was before so that the Dominion, Manitoba and everybody else concerned may start afresh. I am sure that nothing is moving any of us in this matter but absolute honesty and the desire to protect the respective rights of the province and of the Dominion, and if it is later found that anyone suffers by reason of any control exercised by Ontario, there will be plenty of time to put it right. I am informed and believe that the Premier and the government of Ontario take the view that the province was imposed upon by the passing of chapter 38 of the acts of 1921 and that that measure was passed in the face of the strongest protest that they could put up. At this session of the Ontario legislature the legislation which Mr. Drury feared to press to a vote in 1921 has been introduced and passed, and the old agreement is now ready to be carried out. I am simply asking, therefore, that Parliament assist Premier Drury in carrying out the old agreement, without the slightest change. Now, this is the provision, which, on account of some conscientious scruples, I believe, the right hon. gentleman felt called upon to insert in his act of 1921. It is the last section:

> If the necessary legislation of Ontario referred to in the preamble of the Lake of the Woods Control Board Act, 1921, be enacted by the legislature—

It is enacted now.

> —the Governor in Council may, by proclamation published in the Canada Gazette, repeal or suspend this act and the regulations made thereunder at any time when or after the Lake of the Woods Control Board Act, 1921, shall come into force.

That is all right as far as it goes, but this is the part which we think is wrong:

> Provided that notwithstanding any repeal or suspension of this act in the matter provided by this section the works and each of them hereby declared to be for the general advantage of Canada shall remain and continue to be works for the general advantage of Canada.

That means that everything should go back except the property, the only thing that Ontario was really interested in. In other words, my right hon. friend provides that all that is no good shall go back, but that the property, the thing really worth while, shall remain in the Dominion government. We say that the property and everything else must go back, and that everything must be as it was before any act at all was passed. This bill is the only means whereby the parties concerned can be restored to their original respective positions, and start afresh without interfering in the slightest degree with any interest. The purpose, then is, first, to carry out the original pact between the parties, and, second, to restore to Ontario rights which were taken away from that province without their consent.

Mr. McMURRAY: Mr. Chairman, I find myself reluctantly compelled to take a stand in opposition to that of the hon. Solicitor General (Mr. McKenzie). The question at issue here involves the interests of Manitoba. It involves a large investment of money in the development of power on the Winnipeg river lying within the area of that province. It involves the interests of a large and populous city that is making use of this power now and will make a great deal more use of it in the future. It involves the interest of the entire population of Manitoba, where this power is being gradually sent out to the rural districts and through the surrounding towns and cities. The people of Manitoba are apprehensive of the rights that have been obtained by one Backus on the Winnipeg and English rivers. Rightly or wrongly—altogether rightly, I submit—they are afraid of this man Backus. They feel that in Backus they have a man

who will not hesitate to take advantage to the full in an absolutely selfish manner of any possible opportunity that he may have by reason of the interest that he may have secured upon these streams. We already have an instance of this in the proposition that he made to the city of Winnipeg, so I am advised, in connection with the Norman dam. He secured this dam for some $147,000 and he submitted an offer of it to the city of Winnipeg for $1,500,000. The danger is this. These are both large streams carrying vast volumes of water. By the use of dams on either the English river or the Winnipeg river, it is possible for the person in possession of those dams, Backus in this instance, to interfere with the flow and in such a way control the supply and creation of electricity in the water-powers where the city of Winnipeg and other interests have placed their works. We have at the present time on the statute books, placed there by the late government, an act which I must commend fully, which protects the province of Manitoba and the city of Winnipeg. In the interest of the people of Manitoba, it is my duty to protest against anything that will remove their protection and the interest that they have obtained in that way. This is an interprovincial stream; it is more; it is in many ways an international stream. It is, therefore, right and proper that the Dominion Government should have power there. I believe it may be a debatable question, and I submit it is a debatable question whether the Dominion Government, as a matter of pure legality is not entitled in the eyes of the law to have some interest, some advantage, as the word was used in the Act, in those works. If there is any debate about the question at all, it is the duty of this Parliament to preserve the interest by the act which the late government passed, and for that reason, because the question is debatable, because the interests of the people of Manitoba are left at the mercy of an individual, I am obliged to oppose this bill.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: There are two points of view from which the committee might well consider the legislation that is before it, the one, as to whether or not the works in question are or are not to be considered works for the general advantage of Canada; the other, as to the value that is to be attached to agreements made between governments. As to the first, whether the particular works are or are not to be considered works for the general advantage of Canada, that, I think, is a subject that might well be argued at any time in this House; but I do not think it comes appropriately at this moment in connection with the repeal being sought of a particular measure. I say that for a reason which I shall give in a moment. To the remarks of my hon. friends from Winnipeg, I wish to make it perfectly clear that I take no exception whatever. There may be a great deal to be said for the point of view which they have presented. I do not wish to enter into that to-night, because I think that subject may well at some more appropriate time be discussed upon its merits. The point of view which I wish to place before the committee to-night, is, as I have intimated, the value to be attached to agreements between governments in matters of legislation.

Last session we had introduced into this House a bill known as the Lake of the Woods Control Bill. When that bill was introduced, it was stated by the then Prime Minister, the present leader of the Opposition (Mr. Meighen), that, if the Ontario Government passed a similar act, the two acts would stand on the statute books and their provisions would govern the control of the waters in question. Nothing was said at the time the first bill was introduced about the works being declared works for the general advantage of Canada. There never was any discussion of that question between the then Prime Minister and the premier of Ontario. If there was, we were told nothing of it. Indeed, we have been told by the premier of Ontario that the subject was never discussed. For reasons which need not be a matter of consideration here, Mr. Drury found it impossible to pass, at the last session, legislation along lines similar to that which was introduced into this House. As a consequence, the then Prime Minister introduced a second bill which was known as the Lake of the Woods Regulation Bill. When my right hon. friend introduced that bill into the House, I drew his attention to the previous enactment and asked him what was the necessity of introducing that particular measure. This is the reply made by my right hon. friend. It will be found in Hansard of May 26, 1921, at page 3903:

> Mr. Meighen: The previous bill, already passed, was intended to be concurrent with legislation by the province of Ontario which did not go through, so our former bill is valueless. The present measure is designed to hold the situation in the meantime, until, if it should come to pass, the Ontario legislature enacts the concurrent legislation contemplated.

Now the Ontario Legislature has enacted the concurrent legislation contemplated, and what we say is that this Government is in duty and honour bound to repeal that second piece of legislation which was made to hold the situation in the interval, to use the words of my right hon. friend. My right hon. friend went further than that. On the 2nd reading of the bill, he made this further statement which will be found on Hansard of May 31, 1921:

> That is to say this legislation is intended to take care of responsibilities pending the concurrence of Ontario in the principle of joint control.

The province of Ontario has now concurred in the principle of joint control. It has passed at the session just concluded an act literatim et verbatim of the act known as the Lake of the Woods Control Act which is on our statutes. We say, therefore, that the second act which, according to the statement of my right hon. friend, was put on the statutes to take care of responsibilities pending the concurrence of Ontario in the principle of joint control, should now be wiped off the slate completely, as at the time it was introduced it was understood it would be. My right hon. friend made this further statement in the course of his remarks:

> It is only because, through no fault of ours, but entirely through the fault of the government or the legislature of Ontario—I do not care where the blame is placed—but I think it is chiefly on the shoulders of the Premier of Ontario by reason of his failure to carry through the joint legislation—we are compelled to take the position which we are taking now to ask that Parliament vest us with authority to serve the interests of both provinces and the whole country until we are able to effect the joint legislation for which we strove in the first place.

We are now in a position to effect that joint legislation. It has been effected. The Ontario government has passed its act in words, as I have said, identical with those in the statute, known as the Lake of the Woods Control Act. For that reason, we think the second bill should be repealed in its entirety.

I may say to hon. members of the House who were not present when the second bill was introduced, that those of us who sat in opposition at that time were amazed at my right hon. friend adding to the second bill this clause:

> Provided that notwitstanding any repeal or suspension of this act in the manner provided by this section the works and each of them hereby declared to be for the general advantage of Canada shall remain and continue to be works for the general advantage of Canada

That clause was put in by my right hon. friend or his friends without any consultation with the province of Ontario, in direct violation of the understanding and agreement made between his government and the government of Ontario. I suggest that it was a piece of sharp practice on his part, and that it stands on the statutes to-day as a record of deception and as such is a blot upon the statutes, which blot we desire to remove.

Mr. MEIGHEN: The debate up to this time had been conducted in language worthy of this House.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: I suppose we shall get something now that is not.

Mr. MEIGHEN: We have got something that is not and of all the outbursts of the Prime Minister, I think this is the one that least becomes the position that he now holds.

Mr. DUFF: That is too bad.

Mr. MEIGHEN: It will not be difficult, however, for me to discuss the matter with some regard for reason and decency notwithstanding the remarks which the right hon. gentleman has just uttered. Certainly the statute of last session was a statute to hold the situation and to hold the situation until the government of Ontario should carry out its end of the agreement reached. That agreement covered certain matters and provided a joint method of supervision and control of these works. By that agreement we were prepared then to abide; and so far as I am concerned I am prepared now to stand by it to the extent it went and within its purview. The Prime Minister of Ontario failed to carry out his agreement with the government of Canada, and no one is better aware of that than the member for South Winnipeg (Mr. Hudson) who, representing the province of Manitoba, was a party to the arrangement. Premier Drury gave as his reason that circumstances had developed that pointed to the defeat of the bill. I submit that under the arrangement made it was the duty of Premier Drury to have laid his bill before the House and taken the judgment of the legislature upon it as a government measure. He did not merely agree to introduce the bill and then guess at what might happen, and after that do what he liked. That was not his agreement. He undertook to do what the government of Canada agreed to

do, namely, to take the bill to Parliament as government legislation, have the opinion of Parliament upon it and, if that opinion were favourable, have it passed. Of course, had he failed after doing everything in his power then no more could be asked of him or of any man; but he did not do everything in his power. He brought the bill to Parliament and withdrew it from Parliament; he became himself the judge of what would happen, never taking the judgment of the legislature upon the question at all. However, that is one matter. If Premier Drury had taken the judgment of the legislature and the bill had passed, then the agreement would have carried. But that does not say that this Parliament would have been robbed of any of its powers as to the future in regard to any matter not covered by the agreement. This Parliament would have been perfectly at liberty after that, at any time it felt it to be in the public interest, to declare the works for the general advantage of Canada. We would have been entirely free to do that, unhampered by any terms of the agreement.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: Certainly.

Mr. MEIGHEN: Certainly, my hon. friend says. Well, just consider where that remark brings him. Now, certain occurrences took place in the province of Ontario in the meantime. I am not sure just when the Norman dam was alienated, but it was about that time. But there were other occurrences that seriously alarmed the province of Manitoba, besides the fact that the Prime Minister of Ontario had not gone on with his legislation. I should have liked to have held the situation without legislation in the meantime if it had been possible. I consulted with the Department of the Interior, particularly with Mr. Challies, the head of the Water Power branch of that department, and I am pretty sure, although I speak only from memory, that he conferred with the Prime Minister of Ontario and the officers of that government as respects what ought to be done by this Parliament in the meantime. I ascertained that there were large developments pending in the province of Ontario, developments that could not be ascertained, and that fact was urged upon me strongly from that province, and by none more urgently than the government of Manitoba. This very legislation that we passed was urged by that government upon the government of which I was Prime Minister—legislation described, in the flippant language of the Prime Minister (Mr. Mackenzie King), as sharp practice.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: Did my right hon. friend, in his discussions with the government of Ontario, take up the question whether or not these works were to be declared for the general advantage of Canada?

Mr. MEIGHEN: No, he did not—

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: And that is just where the sharp practice came in.

Mr. MEIGHEN:—because the government of Ontario had nothing to say on the question as to what we should declare to be works for the general advantage of Canada. The Prime Minister knows that bills come before this Parliament session after session declaring works to be for the general advantage of Canada. Does he suggest that this Government always takes up the question with the province in which such works are to be carried out? I never knew that to be done myself.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: This whole matter is one of agreement betwen two governments, and anything done outside of the knowledge of either party was sharp practice.

Some hon. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

Mr. MEIGHEN: Hon. gentlemen are welcome to any gratification they may obtain in the circumstances.

An hon. MEMBER: Thank you, very much.

Mr. MEIGHEN: There was no agreement whatsoever between the province of Ontario and the Dominion of Canada as to the question of the works being declared for the general advantage of the country. There was no agreement whatsoever. The Prime Minister confirmed my word only a few moments ago that notwithstanding anything agreed to we were at perfect liberty to declare them for the general advantage of Canada.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: Certainly my right hon. friend was free at that time and he is free to-day to have any works declared for the general advantage of Canada. But when he was negotiating with another government on that subject he was in honour bound to discuss that phase of the question if he intended to incorporate it into a bill relating to the subject.

Mr. MEIGHEN: So far as I can recall that question was not discussed between Premier Drury, the member for South Winnipeg (Mr. Hudson) and myself at the time the original bill was under consideration. That was not the subject in our minds at all. But it was quite consistent with the agreement; it was wholly consistent. If it were not consistent with the agreement would it be possible for us afterwards to declare the works to be for the general advantage of Canada? How could we be free to do so? We were by no means restrained by the agreement in any respect whatsoever in that regard. That is something which this Parliament decides altogether in the light of the view that Parliament itself takes of the public interest of Canada.

Now, as I said, there were circumstances that developed in the meantime, after that arrangement was made, that made it clear that it was in the public interest of Canada to have those works so declared; and in the full face of the facts this Parliament so declared them, which declaration was supported by the hon. member for Marquette (Mr. Crerar) and by many hon. members on the side of my right hon. friend who knew the facts just as I did and just as hon. gentlemen on our side of the House did. Now, I ask hon. members of this House to be good enough to suppress any feelings of partisan favour they may have in this regard as to what view they take of the language of the Prime Minister. I have stated that that act was intended to hold the situation in the meantime; otherwise there could be no board. This was the only way there could be supervision exercised over the actual works. We provided a method in the meantime which did not violate the original agreement but was in the general interest of the country. If ever there were works that should be declared to be for the general advantage of Canada, these are the works; and for the reasons advanced by the two hon. members for Winnipeg who have spoken, these are works as respects which the will and final disposition of any one province is not in the general interest or likely to be fair to all the provinces of the Dominion. I am quite content that a board shall sit in actual exercise of jurisdiction and authority over them; but I am not prepared that there shall rest in the hands of any board, no matter how appointed, aside from the control of this Parliament, the final jurisdiction and say in respect of the disposition of works in which two provinces are vitally concerned, one just as much as the other. The province of Manitoba is concerned to-day in these works to a degree equal at least to the province of Ontario, if not indeed to a greater extent; because the province of Manitoba has within its boundaries, in the Winnipeg river, horse power many times the value of that within the confines of Ontario. It would not, in my judgment, be right or proper for this Parliament to recede from the position it has taken, a position which, I repeat, does not in the least come in discord with any arrangement arrived at in 1921, even had that arrangement been lived up to, as it was not; and when that arrangement was broken it restored all rights to this Parliament and to the government of Canada. That arrangement, once broken, put us in the same position as if it had never been made. But we did not take that position, although we could have taken it without incurring the just displeasure of any reasonable man. On the contrary, we gave the legislature of Ontario still time to carry out its end of the agreement, and we did not impair the effectiveness of that agreement for all fair and reasonable purposes in contemplation when it was made.

Mr. HALBERT: Were not the works in Manitoba which the right hon. gentleman speaks of as so important already there a year ago when the waters were under the control which we are seeking now to repeal?

Mr. MEIGHEN: I do not know how far they had progressed—the hon. member for South Winnipeg knows; but they had not progressed to the point they are at today. I know that the Manitoba Power Company's bonds have been sold within the last few months on the faith, doubtless, in part, of the legislaton we passed. Let not hon. members be under any misapprehension: the declaring of works to be for the general advantage of Canada does not change the ownership of those works. One would think to listen to the hon. Solicitor General that we jumped into the treasure house of the province of Ontario and grabbed millions of dollars' worth of property. That is not the effect of the declaration. A railway, we will say, is built by provincial subsidy or under provincial guarantee, and therefore the province has a financial interest in it. Well, this Parliament is frequently approached to declare such a railway for the general advantage

of Canada; in fact is very often urged to do so by the province, although I could not give a specific case at the moment where the province has made such a request. Declaring a work to be for the general advantage of Canada merely makes that work of the character that certain provisions of the British North America Act apply to it that otherwise would not apply. I have not looked up the provisions of the act lately to be able to say just what their effect is, but the hon. member for the city of Winnipeg has given more close study to the subject than I have, and no doubt could enlighten the House.

But let me again impress on hon. members that by such a declaration there is no removal of provincial ownership whatsoever, there is no filching of rights by the Dominion, there is merely the making of the works come within certain provisions of the British North America Act. This declaration has in the past been applied to cases where the works were such that other provinces were interested therein. Here is a work in which other provinces are not only interested, but where the interest of the province beyond the immediate structure is more vital than, or at least as vital as, the interest of the province within which it rests.

Let me add further, that it is not the flow of the water that is made a work for the general advantage of Canada. The statute reads:

> All dams, structures and other works of whatsoever description which appear to have been or may hereafter be constructed.

The dams and structures if they affect or impede or interfere with the natural flow of the stream are declared to be works for the general advantage of Canada. Is it, or is it not, right and proper that they should be so declared? I need not ask the other question: Is it not wholly and absolutely aside from the terms of any agreement as to concurrent legislation? The concurrent legislation goes into effect just the same whether the declaration is maintained or not.

Mr. HUDSON: Mr. Chairman, the Prime Minister stated that there were two points for consideration in this matter: first whether the clause as to the works being for the general advantage of Canada was, or was not, a good thing; secondly, had, or bad there not, been a breach of contract. There was a contract made between Ontario and the Dominion, and that contract was broken by Ontario. The contract was to have been carried out at the then session of the Ontario legislature. By a failure to do so, the contract was discharged. Hon. members who are lawyers all know that when one party fails to carry out his contract the other party is discharged; and that is true between governments as between individuals.

Mr. McKENZIE: As a good lawyer, my hon. friend will observe that when contracts are broken, reasons are given by the other side to show that they are regarded as broken. There were not the grounds taken by the then Prime Minister. He never said the contract was no good.

Mr. MEIGHEN: Oh, yes. What does the hon. Solicitor General mean by saying that?

Mr. McKENZIE: He continued the contract in existence by saying: whenever you put through your end we are at your disposal as before. Those are the terms of his act.

Mr. HUDSON: It would seem to me, Mr. Chairman that the position is this: they accepted the contract as having been broken, and they made a new offer. They said: we will carry out what we did before, but if we do, and you do, too, it is going to be subject to the condition that these works are for the general advantage of Canada.

Mr. MEIGHEN: Precisely.

Mr. HUDSON: That is the situation. I am not concerned with what was said in this House when the other act was passed, and I do not think any member should now be concerned with that. The only thing we are concerned with is whether or not it is a good thing that these works should be declared to be works for the general advantage of Canada or not, and that, I submit, is the only question which should be decided by this House. Tnere has not been anything offered by way of argument in the opposite direction, nothing has been said to show that these should not be declared works for the general advantage of Canada. That being so, there is no reason why this act should be repealed.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: In regard to what my hon. friend has said about considerations of contract, I should mention that the right hon. leader of the Opposition received a wire dated April 28th, in which Mr Drury intimated that in with-

drawing his bill then before the legislature he had made the announcement that it would likely be re-introduced at the next session, which was the session of the Ontario legislature just ended. It was on the 26th May that my right hon. friend said: "the present measure is designed to hold the situation in the meantime until it should come to pass that the Ontario legislature enact the concurrent legislation contemplated." It was made apparent in half a dozen different statements by my right hon. friend that he fully expected the Ontario legislature at this session to enact concurrent legislation, and he stated emphatically to this House that when that concurrent legislation was enacted the bill which he was then introducing would be repealed. That is all we are asking, that the act shall be repealed.

Mr. MEIGHEN: I stated nothing of the sort about the repeal of the bill. The bill itself contains a clause for its revocation save for section 2.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: I leave it to the House to reach its own conclusion from the remarks of my right hon. hon. friend. He states now that he said nothing about the repeal of the bill, and yet he says that the statute contains a clause for its repeal. It would, I think, have been very difficult for my hon. friend to have put through that legislation without referring to the possibility of its repeal.

Mr. MEIGHEN: Save section 2.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: This proviso was slipped in at the end and nothing was said about it to anyone except to those in the secret councils of my right hon. friend. That is the clause to which we took such strong exception at the last session, as being in direct violation of the agreement reached with Mr. Drury. Mr. Drury at the time also stated most emphatically that he had no knowledge whatever that the then leader of the government intended putting any such clause into the legislation dealing with the lake of the Woods control bill. If this matter is of sufficient importance, and if at some subsequent time any member wishes to introduce a bill declaring these works to be for the general advantage of Canada, we can then properly discuss such a measure, and I shall be prepared to argue and accept the proposition on its merits. But at this time we are trying to implement a pledge made between governments in order to maintain faith in governments in their dealings with each other.

Mr. MEIGHEN: My words speak for themselves. It was to hold the situation until Mr. Drury would pass the bill which he had agreed to pass—not at the succeeding session but at that particular session; but it was to hold the situation subject to the condition embodied in the bill and emphasized by myself over and over again that the repeal now would be a repeal of the bill, the revocation by proclamation of all except section 2. That is contained in the minutes.

Mr. HALBERT: Is section 2 not part of that bill?

Mr. MEIGHEN: Certainly.

Mr. HALBERT: It does not exclude it.

Mr. MEIGHEN: Certainly it does. If my hon. friend will read the last clause of the act he will see that it provides that it may be revoked by proclamation by the Governor in Council, all except clause 2. That was reserved in case of a term of the agreement being left over.

Section agreed to.

Bill reported.

CRIMINAL CODE AMENDMENT

Mr. D. M. KENNEDY (West Edmonton) moved the second reading of Bill No. 54 to amend the Criminal Code.

Right Hon. ARTHUR MEIGHEN (leader of the Opposition): I think it would be better that what I have to say on this bill be said on the second reading. I am not rising to discuss the merits of the bill. I am not very much concerned as to whether the bill passes or not, but I do wish to say something as to the amendment to the code which it seeks to repeal, the circumstances of its introduction, of its passing, and something of its political history since.

I may say for my own part I never heard of the amendment, because even as Prime Minister one finds it impossible to follow all legislation, particularly the details of legislation applying to departments over which he does not preside, and consequently this amendment being one of several embodied in a bill amending the Code, particularly as it was a bill introduced in the Senate, and finally assented to in the House of Commons, the matter never came to my personal attention. I do not say that with any idea of evading in the slightest degree responsibility for it. I wish to assume that just the same as if the bill had been introduced in Parliament by myself, and had passed this House and the Senate pursuant thereto. The first I became aware

of it was some time after my return from Great Britain last summer, when I found it had become the subject of considerable political agitation, particularly in the province of Alberta. My attention was drawn to newspapers articles dealing therewith.

At this point it is necessary to describe what the legislation was. While a bill of the Minister of Justice amending several sections of the Criminal Code was before the Senate, this amendment among others was introduced and passed. This amendment provided for the addition to the proscription section of the statute of a proscription of, I think it was, three years to apply to the offense of fraud in connection with the procuring of scrip, that is, of half-breed land scrip. The section made it law that there should be no prosecution for any such fraud unless brought within three years after the offense. The law of proscription has been part of the law of Canada and of England, as every hon. member knows, well, for generations, and I have no doubt for centuries. The law of proscription is not founded upon any desire to protect guilty individuals. It is founded upon the belief that after a certain period of time from the commission of the offense there is more danger to be apprehended from the commission of prosecution than from the failure to punish. That danger consists in this, that after a number of years from the commission of the offense there is very great likelihood that the evidence on one side or the other may have disappeared, very great likelihood that one side would be able to come to trial with his evidence practically intact while the other side through the progress of time has lost its evidence. Therefore, there would be great danger of injustice and of wrong. As a consequence, there has been proscription in our law for generations. For some reason or other it had not been attempted to apply it to this particular offense, and when the suggestion was made to Sir James Lougheed, who was leading the Senate, that it should be made apply to this offense he inserted the amendment, and stated on inserting it, as I find by reference to Hansard, that one or two cases had developed that had brought the matter to the attention of the Government where the offense had been committed many years before, and in one case he mentioned, prosecution had been entered where the offense had been committed twenty years before. Therefore, this amendment was introduced and passed the Senate. It came back to the Commons and passed the Commons. Now it developed that there had been a prosecution entered in the city of Edmonton, or at least in the province of Alberta—and I am glad the former prime minister of that province is here, now Minister of the Interior (Mr. Stewart)—against a man in that city, reputed to be very wealthy, a Mr. Secord. He had been committed for trial, and this legislation went through after the commitment, I am informed, and before the final trial, and because it did, the report went broadcast through Alberta and all through the West that the government of the day had introduced legislation exculpating this wealthy man and relieving him of punishment for his offense.

I want to say, first of all, that the government of the day had not the slightest intention of exculpating anybody. Most of the members of the government, no doubt, like myself had no knowledge of the case at all. I had not, and there were others who did not even know about the amendment. But they had no knowledge of the case, and even the minister who had mentioned that one or two cases had arisen, had not the slightest intention of the amendment applying to that particular case. If he had had, the amendment would have had to be made retroactive. That case had merely brought the condition of the law to his attention. That was all the fact, and that was all he said. It is a fact of law which I do not need to suggest to hon. members who are lawyers, for I am sure every lawyer will agree at once, that any amendment to legislation to be a proscription of an offence has no application whatever to offenses in respect of which prosecutions have been entered unless the legislation has been made retroactive. This legislation was not made retroactive, consequently there was no proscription upon Mr. Secord's alleged offence at all; it had no application to it in the world. Now I am informed—I may be wrong—that the government of Alberta, after the passing of this legislation, withdrew the prosecution—entered a nolle prosequi, or took some step to terminate the prosecution of Mr. Secord. Well, if the province of Alberta did so, it took the responsibility for that action. I cannot really think that the government of Alberta of that day was advised by its Attorney General that this legislation exculpated Mr. Secord, or relieved him of punishment if he were guilty. I do not think any Attorney General would so advise; I know the Justice Department of Canada would not so ad-

vise, I know that when I was Prime Minister correspondence took place with the Justice Department and the Justice Department immediately replied that this legislation had no operation whatever in respect of that case, and that if they wanted to go on with the prosecution they were perfectly free so far as the legislation was concerned; and that is not only the opinion of the Justice Department but of every lawyer worthy of the name. Consequently the legislation now before Parliament is not at all necessary in so far as the Secord case is concerned. The Secord case exists to-day just as it existed when the legislation passed, unless its position has been altered by the government of that province. Now if the government of that province saw fit to withdraw the prosecution that was their responsibility; I am not criticizing it, I am not approving it, I have nothing to say about it—that was the responsibility of that government but it could never base its action upon any legislation passed by this House, and never could seek shelter behind it.

Now I thought it worth while to make this statement. Probably it will be an illustration to hon. members of what injustice can be done any administration by the circulation of unfounded information based on a wrong apprehension of law, seeking to implant in the public mind the idea that all the government intends to do is to stand and help the rich and oppress the poor, seeking to appeal to base, low prejudice when no ground for that feeling exists at all. I do not know whether this Parliament considers it wise that there should be a proscription in respect of this offence or not. If it does, let the legislation pass. For myself, I know of no reason why there should be proscription in respect of many offences—even treason, even rape, even far more vicious offences than this and no proscription as respects this. It may be that three years is considered too short. Three years applies to graver offences than this, but if three years is considered too short all right—make it more; but we should never favour the enactment of legislation designed for the benefit of any individual, or retroactive legislation. As to criminal law, such legislation was not passed, therefore such legislation does not need to be repealed. Therefore, all that is before this House is the question as to what is best in the public interest—whether proscription should apply to subornation of perjury for the purpose of getting scrip or whether in general it should apply. The question as to any particular case is not, and was not, before Parliament at all.

Mr. KENNEDY (West Edmonton): The right hon. gentleman has given this House certain information in connection with this matter and the reasons why this bill has been introduced. However, there are some things which he has omitted from his reviey. I do not see how the right hon. gentleman can forget an interview which he had in Edmonton with two half breeds from the north country—about seven hundred miles north of Edmonton—when he was Prime Minister of Canada. At that time he was making a tour of the West. The interview in question took place on November 11, 1920. On that day he met, in the Macdonald hotel in Edmonton, two halfbreeds, Philip Atkinson and Alexis Lafferty. They were introduced to him by Mr. J. C. Calhoun, of Edmonton, and they presented to him the following petition:

To the Right Honourable
ARTHUR MEIGHEN,
Prime Minister of Canada.

The Petition of Philip Atkinson and Alexis Lafferty humbly sheweth:—

1. That your petitioners are persons of mixed white and Indian blood, residing at or near Fort Resolution, in the North-west Territories, and that your petitioners have been delegated by a number of persons of mixed white and Indian blood residing in the environments of Fort Resolution, Fort Smith and Fort Chippewyan, seeking redress for what they believe to be a real grievance and to ask that justice be done.

2. That during the years 1900 to 1903 His Majesty as represented by the Minister of the Interior for Canada caused to be allotted and issued to persons of mixed white and Indian blood, certificates entitling the person named in such certificate to select, fyle upon and become the registered owner of two hundred and forty acres of land, the property of the Dominion of Canada, and situated in the North-West Territory and open for homestead entry, which said certificates are known as half-breed script.

3. That unscripulous spectulators followed in the wake of the commission entrusted by the Honourable the Minister of the Interior with delivery of such certificates of half-breed script, and taking shameful if not even criminal advantage of the illiteracy and ignorance of the half-breed, purchased such script from the holders, paying therefor a proportion of the agreed purchase price, and agreeing to pay the balance, together with the expenses of the vendor in traveling to and from the Land Office at such time as the vendor might be called upon by the purchaser to come to a Dominion Land Office and fyle upon the parcel of land located and selected by the purchaser.

4. Many of the unscruptulous purchasers instead of bringing the vendor to the Land Office and paying him or her the expenses of such a trip together with the balance of the agreed purchase price, by fraud, perjury, subornation

of perjury and forgery procured other persons to appear at the Land Office and represent themselves to be the persons named in the script, and to fyle upon the lands selected or located by the purchaser, and to forge the name of the real vendor to transfers and other documents in connection therewith, thereby committing a fraud on His Majesty's government, and a fraud upon the vendor.

5. That in the North Country in the neighbourhood of Forts Resolution, Smith and Chippewyan there are several hundred half-breeds who have been defrauded and with respect to whose scripts His Majesty's government has been defrauded.

6. And your Petitioners pray that a commission be appointed to enquire into and report upon all fylings upon government lands by means of half-breed script, and to cause to be punished all persons who may be found to be guilty of fraud or criminal conspiracy, or any other offence, with respect to such fyling and to procure compensation and redress for those of His Majesty's subjects of mixed white and Indian blood who may have been the victims of such frauds and conspiracies

And your petitioners will every pray.

This petition was promised consideration by the Premier of Canada and upon returning to Ottawa he apparently referred the matter to the Minister of Interior. A letter was sent to these parties—in care of Mr. Calhoun, King Edward hotel, Edmonton—by Mr. Coté, of the Department of the Interior, with reference to this matter. The letter, which is dated December 17, 1920, reads in part as follows:

In further reference to the minister's letter to you of the 30th, ultimo, respecting your petition, referred to him by the Prime Minister, in which you state that you have been delegated by a number of persons of white and Indian blood residing in the environment of Fort Resolution, Fort Smith and Fort Chippewyan to seek redress in connection with the location of half-breed land scrip, I beg to state as you have been advised, that this matter has already received the attention of the department and it has been decided, after very careful consideration, that applications to have half-breed land scrip locations, claimed to have been made fraudulently, investigated by the department, could not be entertained.

This question has been before the department on several occasions in the past, and in view of your petition has again been considered. No reason, however, has been found which, in the opinion of the department would justify altering a decision already arrived at and it is not possible, therefore, to grant your petition.

Since the beginning of 1900 about 4,800 claims have been satisfied by the issue of land scrip calling for some 1,153,092 acres nearly all of which have been located and patents therefor issued either to the grantees of the scrip themselves or to their assignees. Many of these patents covering thousands of acres were issued nearly 20 years ago, the titles passing through many hands, and to question such titles now would, in the opinion of the department, be very injudicious and could result in no benefit.

Moreover many of the original grantees and witnesses are dead and it would be impossible, at this date, to locate many of the others or obtain satisfaction or reliable evidence relating to these transactions which took place so many years ago.

The scrip certificates issued in satisfaction of half-breed claims and the scrip notes issued by the department were delivered to the grantees personally and it is not considered that the department can be held responsible for subsequent action taken in connection with the location of the scrip, and if there were any fraud perpetrated in connection therewith it was open to them to take the ordinary proceedings before the proper court.

Now, in connection with what the right hon. gentleman has said, that the Secord case in Edmonton was the one that directed the attention of the department to this matter, I would like the House to take note of the fact that, as appears from this letter, the question had been before the department on several occasions in the past. It says: "And in view of your petition has again been considered." But the advice of the department was to take proceedings before the proper court in the ordinary way. A certain half-breed a returned soldier, John Graham, on the fifth of April, 1921, laid information before Lieut.-Colonel George B. McLeod, police magistrate in the city of Edmonton charging a certain Edmonton millionaire, the same Richard Secord, with the uttering of a forged document and the procuring of a certain portion of land under land scrip. The department had taken the position that all the evidence in connection with most of these matters would long ago have disappeared, but in this very first case in which a definite information was laid, the Edmonton millionaire to whom I have referred was committed for trial at the first court of competent jurisdiction. So I cannot see how the contention of the department or of the minister, or whoever is responsible for that opinion can be upheld, namely, that evidence could not be obtained and that it was not the duty of the department in any way to interfere with or to investigate the claims made by these northern half-breeds. That is the reason why we want this amendment repealed. I had a resolution on the Order Paper asking for an investigation into this matter, but it has not been reached. I still believe that is the duty of the Government to appoint a commission—I do not care whether it is a royal commission or what you call it, so long as it will investigate the claims of these northern half-breeds. The information that was laid by Mr. Graham before Lieut.-Colonel George B. McLeod of Edmonton was that the accused had bribed a half-breed woman with $10 and a grey

shawl to go with him to the Dominion land office and there represent herself to be the holder of the paticular scrip certificate in question and to make her mark on behalf of the person named in the scrip, who was then living at Fort Rae. The owner of the scrip was living 600 miles northeast of Edmonton at the time. This bears out the contention of the petition that at least one scrip had been filed by the method complained of.

With the political purposes served by this particular case I have no concern. I referred to it during my campaign; I cannot say whether it got me any votes or not. But I certainly am opposed to this kind of legislation. Fifty-eight days after Richard Secord was committed for trial in the city of Edmonton this bill was introduced in the Senate, piloted through, evidently by the Minister of the Interior and was then introduced and passed in the House of Commons as a "constructive amendment" to the Criminal Code.

Mr. MEIGHEN: Does not the hon. gentleman see that this bill does not affect the Secord case at all? That is what I sought to impress upon him.

Mr. KENNEDY (Edmonton): The Secord case is only an incident.

Mr. MEIGHEN: Very good; but there was nothing to hinder the Secord case from being continued—nothing in the world.

Mr. KENNEDY (Edmonton): The point is that the Secord case was started in order to uphold the contention of those half-breeds that appeared before the Prime Minister in Edmonton, and they showed that there was real reason why the Department of the Interior—

Mr. MEIGHEN: Maybe; that is another question.

Mr. KENNEDY (Edmonton): —should hold an investigation. As long as this amendment stands on the statute book, what is the use of starting an investigation? We want the law repealed and we want an investigation held with a view to seeing whether the contention of these half-breeds is justified. It would seem from the records in connection with this case that they were justified and that they had a real reason for appearing and presenting their objection on that occasion.

It is also maintained by the department that most of the scrips issued to half-breeds north of Edmonton were money scrips; that only a few were land scrips. Well, I do not see that that has much to do with it, for the simple reason that there are half-breeds from all over the Northwest Territories north of Edmonton. As settlement has pushed on westward over the prairies the tendency has been for the half-breeds to move back into those sections of the country where they can carry on hunting and can make their living by the work to which they are accustomed. You can find half-breeds north of Edmonton from all over Manitoba and Saskatchewan. I think it is the duty of this House to repeal this legislation, and it is the duty of the Government to grant an investigation into these claims. We have taken this country away from the Indians and the half-breeds and it is our duty as a people to try to teach them something of our civilization. If we say that we cannot grant this investigation because of an amendment to a certain section of the Criminal Code which says that such an investigation cannot be started after three years—well, they cannot understand it. That has no more meaning to the half-breed than if you told him that the investigation could not be started because of the presence in Ottawa in 1921 of Barnum and Bailey's circus.

Mr. MEIGHEN: The statute does not say that at all. You can start all the investigation you like. You cannot prosecute if the statute stays, but you can investigate.

Mr. KENNEDY (Edmonton): What is the use of investigating if you cannot prosecute?

Mr. McMASTER: An investigation leading to action is an investigation.

Mr. MEIGHEN: I am not objecting to the repeal, anyway, if it is for the purpose of investigating. What I wanted to make clear to the hon. member was that this legislation did not affect the Secord case in the least. That is all, and I think he ought to be fair enough now to acknowledge it, unless he disputes the law.

Mr. KENNEDY (Edmonton): There was a good deal of dispute among legal men whether it did or not.

Mr. HANSON: There should not be.

Mr. BAXTER: Would my hon. friend tell the House what was the result of the Secord case?

Mr. KENNEDY (Edmonton): Are we to have all the members of the Opposition on their feet at once? I know there is a good deal of dispute in the matter. The then Minister of Justice, Mr. R. B. Bennett,

took the position that it did not affect the Secord case. But we are not so much interested in the Secord case; we are interested in the petition that was presented to the Prime Minister by the half-breeds asking for an investigation.

Mr. BAXTER: Will my hon. friend permit me a question? What was the outcome of the Secord case?

Mr. KENNEDY (Edmonton): I could not tell my hon. friend.

Mr. KELLNER: I would ask the right hon. gentleman where the demand came from for this amendment to the Criminal Code. It must have come from somewhere or it would not have been made. Where did that demand come from?

Mr. MEIGHEN: If my hon. friend is asking that question of me, I am sorry I cannot answer of my own knowledge because what I stated before is perfectly correct. I did not know about it until after; I am responsible all the same. I have asked Sir James Lougheed about it; judging from what he stated to the Senate and what he told me himself, the case was doubtless brought to his attention in the department as Minister of the Interior; the fact that there was no proscription in connection with this was also brought to his attention, and he felt that there ought to be. But it was never intended to be retroactive; he never said so and he never intended that it should be. The law, moreover, does not make it retroactive. I have no doubt at all that the case itself had come—in fact he so informed me—to his attention, and the departmental officials, doubtless with his concurrence, felt that it would be unfair to keep open the possibility of prosecutions generally. But no one had the slightest intention that it should apply to any prosecution already entered, and it never did so apply.

Mr. KELLNER: I think the right hon. gentleman is a little wrong there. The attorney general in the province of Alberta claimed that it did apply in the Secord case.

Mr. MEIGHEN: I am sorry for the attorney general. I will leave the matter to the Minister of Justice of to-day (Sir Lomer Gouin).

Mr. KENNEDY (Edmonton): I think I need not say anything more with regard to this matter. Possibly we understand one another and I believe the House will be willing to pass this bill.

[Mr. D. M. Kennedy.]

Mr. GARLAND (Bow River): Mr. Speaker, I propose to support the bill introduced by the hon. member for West Edmonton (Mr. Kennedy), and I wish to remove a misunderstanding from the mind of the leader of the Opposition (Mr. Meighen). He has said that there is no reason for this bill at all.

Mr. MEIGHEN: In so far as the Secord case is concerned.

Mr. GARLAND (Bow River): Exactly, that we were free to go ahead with it; that the legislation was not retroactive, and that he did not believe in bills being retroactive that affected the Criminal Code.

Mr. MEIGHEN: Yes.

Mr. GARLAND (Bow River): Immediately upon the passing of the amendment, counsel for Mr. Secord, the defendant in the case, at once advised the attorney general that, in his opinion, the case could not be continued, the first reason being the staleness of the charge, and the second that the amendment was retroactive in effect and applied to this case. Following that a conference took place between Mr. McDonald, K.C., acting for the private prosecutor; Mr. Cogswell, K.C., crown prosecutor, and Mr. Browning, Deputy Attorney General, with the result that a letter appears on the file from the crown prosecutor, the last paragraph of which letter reads:

> I have had a talk with Mr. McDonald, solicitor for the complainant, and he is now of our opinion that the amendment is retrospective in character and cuts out the right to proceed further.

Mr. MEIGHEN: That was the opinion of the solicitor for the plaintiff?

Mr. GARLAND (Bow River): That was the opinion of the conference that was held. Subsequently, a letter was written by the deputy attorney general on July 11 instructing the crown prosecutor not to prefer a formal charge. Since that time, no action was taken. I had the privilege of taking this matter up with the present attorney general of the province, and he has given it that, in his opinion, he or the department cannot proceed with this case at this time as that amendment is retroactive in effect. Therefore, I beg to support the bill introduced by the hon. member for west Edmonton. I think the amendment should be repealed and an opportunity given to the attorney general or the crown prosecutor in Alberta to proceed with this case. Justice demands that.

Hon. J. B. M. BAXTER (St. John city and counties of St. John and Albert): Mr. Speaker, I do not want to add anything unnecessarily to this debate. I do not care whether there are any limitations to prosecutions of this character or not. It is true, if you want to prosecute a man for treason, you have to do so within three years. To prosecute for a fraud of this kind, some people apparently think you should have all the rest of a man's life and possibly a little longer. I do not care; there are no frauds that I want to cover up or to see covered up. But the extraordinary thing, to my mind, is: What possible good will the defrauded Indians or whoever have been defrauded get out of a prosecution? Somebody will be punished ultimately, possibly; but as regards restoring any rights to the defrauded people, the prosecution will not accomplish that.

I want to make one observation on the very excellent order of legal acumen that has been displayed in this province. It would have required some extraordinary research, I admit; it would simply have required opening Crankshaw's Criminal law at the right page to have found a long collection, a bead-roll of English cases, showing that what is put forward here as being the opinion of the law officers and what must surely be an error is not an opinion worthy of the name, and showing, by Canadian decisions themselves, that the statute is not retroactive; that an information having once been laid, this act would not stop its going to its final conclusion. I can well understand that, after the extraordinary performance which has been described, the prosecution having dropped, it cannot now be recommenced because of this statutory barrier; but there was nothing in the world ever to prevent the Secord case from being prosecuted to a conclusion, except something that I suspect, that when the gentlemen got together, they found, the thing being so remote, they did not have the evidence. That is the most likely feature in the case. We can get no assurance as to what the facts are; but I am not here to protect any Secord or any fraud. I am quite willing that this shall be repealed. I only want to point out that it is scarcely fair to have laid this blame at the door of the former government or any member of it when the blame ought to have been laid at the doors of those ignorant professional gentlemen who were either too ignorant or too lazy to resort to a simple well-known book which would have given them all the authority that it was necessary to give the prosecution.

Mr. GARLAND (Bow River): Has the hon. gentleman any objection to justice being done? I ask the question because the hon. member would lead me to believe that, because no benefit could accrue to the murdered man, the murderer should not be punished.

Mr. BAXTER: I did not catch the last observation about the murdered man. Would the hon. member kindly repeat it? I have been informed since what it was. I will inform my hon. friend that I have not now, I never have had and I hope I never shall have any objection to justice being done. My objection, on the contrary, is very strong to injustice being done, and I realize that my hon. friend who has interrogated me and a number of others in concert with him, have been doing either very ignorantly or very wilfully injustice to my right hon. friend (Mr. Meighen), who sits on this side of the House. That is my sole reason for intervening in this debate.

Motion agreed to, bill read the second time, and the House went into committee thereon, Mr. Gordon in the Chair.

On section 1—section repealed, providing that prosecution not to be taken after three years for any offence respecting the location of land paid for by scrip issued to half breeds.

Mr. McKENZIE: I admit I am somewhat surprised that the leader of the Opposition (Mr. Meighen) and the hon. member for St. John city (Mr. Baxter) are so very pronounced on this question of law. There is a question as to whether this amendment is a matter of procedure or of substantive law. I rather think it is one of procedure; and while I do not vouch for the correctness of the theory, there is a well known theory that a matter of procedure is retroactive. There is a well founded English theory that legislation that is merely in the nature of procedure is retroactive. I do not think my hon. friend should be very severe in his criticism. Section 20 of Chap. 25 of the Acts of 1911 reads:

> Any offence relating to or arising out of the location of land which was paid for in whole or in part by scrip, or was granted upon certificates issued to half-breeds in connection with the extinguishment of Indian title.

Now, it seems to me most extraordinary that the criminal code having been in force since the year 1892, and containing

as it does a long list of exceptions, it should have been thought necessary in 1921 to hunt up a peculiar subject like this and give it the benefit of the statute of limitations. I do not know who was responsible for it, but it strikes me as strange. I have no axe to grind, but I am merely pointing out that the amendment is quite peculiar.

Mr. BAXTER: I speak subject to correction, but I think the amendment is couched in the words which the Code uses in constituting the offence, and therefore they would seem to be very apt words. I can hardly agree with the Solicitor-General (Mr. McKenzie) in the doubt he throws on the law I have expounded. I am afraid I shall not be able to differentiate betwee my legal brethren of the West and one of my legal brethren from the East. I almost think that for the sake of his reputation, a good reputation, my hon. friend the Solicitor-General had better not have tried to add to the wealth of legal erudition upon this subject to-night. It might almost have been better for him to have opened Crankshaw at least, or referred to some legal authority, before taking up the subject.

Mr. McKENZIE: I have opened Crankshaw a great many times.

Mr. BAXTER: I wonder whether my hon. friend has held it upside down or read it in the normal way. I confess I am somewhat in doubt because of his peculiar references. He seems to have delved into Maxwell on Statutes; he has read much that is applicable to civil procedure, but he has got far away from criminal procedure. I want to shed more light this evening for the benefit of my hon. friend. If he had only taken the precaution to look, not before he leaped, but before he spoke, he would have consulted—

Mr. McKENZIE: My hon. friend will understand I offered no positive opinion. I simply stated that there was a well-known theory that when it was a matter of procedure it was retroactive. I did not draw any sharp line between criminal and civil procedure.

Mr. BAXTER: I pity my hon. friend still more. I want to inform him that it is not yet too late for him to receive instruction.

Mr. McKENZIE: I care little for my hon. friend's instruction.

Mr. BAXTER: My hon. friend is sensitive and is apt to resent even the mildest and most gentle criticism, but I want to tell him that at any age, in any of the provinces that compose this Dominion, a man may be admitted to study law. And when he begins that study it is well for him to understand definitely that law is a science. It is not a political platform; it is not something that varies with the atmosphere or with the latitude or longitude of the vicinity in which one studies. There are certain fixed principles inherent in the science, which a man cannot throw overboard as he would his political convictions. I know that my hon. friend has refrained from any positive opinion, other than the mere tenuity of an idea; but he did imply that there was enough uncertainty about the subject to justify my western brethren in doubting. Now apparently he shares the possibility of doubt, coming about as near, I suppose, to a scintilla juris as he is likely to get. Now, I would like to ask him to follow me. He can look up the fourth edition of Crankshaw, printed in 1915, at page 1191. And this is no extraordinary authority delivered in a Nova Scotia court by a celebrated judge on an election petition. This is real law. He will find in the notes to section 1140, which deals with the prescription of offences, the following notes which I have extracted. He will find in a case upon the repealed statutes relating to coin that it was held that the information and proceedings before the magistrate upon the defendant being taken was to be deemed the "Commencement of the Prosecution within the meaning of those Acts". He will find sound English authority cited in support of that. He will find in a case based upon the repealed statutes relating to coin that it was held that the information and proceedings before the magistrate upon the defendant being taken was to be deemed the "commencement of the prosecution within the meaning of those acts." He will find sound English authority cited in support of that. He will find also another case where a warrant of commitment for the offences issued within the time limited was held sufficient, although the indictment was not drawn until a later date. And that would be exactly parallel with the Secord case referred to to-night. My hon. friend will also find, if he can by any chance run across the Nova Scotia authorities, in the 23rd Nova Scotian decisions, at pages 21 and 22 of that interesting volume, that bringing the prosecution is not the hearing or trial, but it is the initiation of the proceedings by

the prosecutor. It refers entirely to the preliminary act. Now, he will also find in Maxwell on statutes at page 308, 3rd tdition, the following:

> In general, where the law is altered pending an action, the rights of the parties are decided according to the law as it existed when the action was begun unless the new statute shows a clear intention to vary such rights. Thus the Medical Act which enacts that no person shall, after the 1st January, 1859, recover any charge for medical treatment "unless he shall prove at the trial" that he was on the Medical Register, was held not to apply to an action for medical services begun before that date but tried after it.

He will find two very excellent English cases upon that subject. I fortified myself with these citations because I thought somebody would get up here—I did not expect the Solicitor General—and deny the most axiomatic principles of law relevant to this point. I am sorry it had to come from the Solicitor General, because when we are sometimes bombarded in the committees with the weight of the opinion of the law officers of the Crown I should like sometimes to be able to accept the opinion, even if contrary to that which I have formed myself; but if an opinion is cited, the example of the Solicitor General rushing blindly in and disregarding precedents and stating absolutely bad law to this committee will I fear, force me to decline to follow afterwards such opinion unless I have ascertained which law officer is responsible for it.

Mr. McKENZIE: I am not surprised at my hon. friend being familiar with when an action can be and cannot be brought, and why it should be and should not be brought, because there is no form of political shortcoming that he has not been called upon to defend in some shape or another Consequently there is no trick or form in criminal law which he has not traversed from Dan to Beersheba. If a man robs a hen coop he is particularly anxious to know when the statute of limitations begins to run, and I have no doubt my hon. friend has been often called upon to advise hen stealers down in his country. Now, this voluminous, delightful, Gladstonian law that my hon. friend has been able to give us—

Mr. BAXTER: Gladstonian law!

Mr. McKENZIE: Of course, what I meant was Blackstonian law. But I am now addressing the hon. member for St. John, and it is no use dealing with him in ordinary language. For the most of us Blackstone would be good enough, but I had to come down a few generations and mention Gladstone for the benefit of my hon. friend. But he will probably recognize that name when possibly he never heard of Blackstone. I heard nothing from my hon. friend that throws any further light on the law. He tells us as to what is the commencement of an action. There is not a magistrate of the meanest intelligence in any part of the maritime provinces but knows that the laying of the action is the commencement of the action and not the hearing. But my hon. friend, with all the wisdom of a Solomon, comes before this House and tells us as it was decided years ago that the laying of the action is the commencement of the action. It is noble to seek truth; it is beautiful to find it. I leave my hon. friend to rejoice in his impressive knowledge of criminal law. He reminds me of the old man who had a cow with a record. He was trying to sell the cow, and in doing so continually pointed to her record. "I will na buy your coo," said a bystander. "But look at her record," exclaimed her owner. "Well," was the rejoinder, "she needs it." If my hon. friend has a profound knowledge of the criminal law, he needs it.

Mr. MEIGHEN: With the Minister of Justice in his seat I think it is only fair that he should state what is the fact about this matter. The Minister of Justice knows that his officers have passed on this question without the least hesitation, have no more doubt about their opinions than they have about the multiplication table, and the Minister of Justice I know has no doubt either. Although I do not usually ask across the House for the judgment of the Justice Department, I think in this case undoubtedly a grave injustice has been done, I know unmeaningly, by hon, members and citizens of this country; nevertheless it has been done, and I think the Minister of Justice owes it to the House to make a statement as to what the effect of that legislation was as regards the existing case in which the accused had already been committed for trial.

Sir LOMER GOUIN: I have looked over the record regarding this matter. The question was put to the officers of my department, and over their signatures they have given it as their opinion that they believe the statute of 1921 had no retroactive effect. That is also my opinion. As to the Secord case which was mentioned, it was commenced before the bill was introduced, passed and sanctioned. I would con-

sider that this amendment would not affect that case. As to the merits of this bill, if the House is of opinion that it should pass for my part I have no objection to it.

Mr. MEIGHEN: I desire to thank the Minister of Justice for his frank and clear statement, and I have no objection to the bill now. The bill is not necessary by reason of any action of this Parliament last session or any other session, it may be necessary by reason of the blunder of the Attorney General of Alberta.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: While the bill may not apply to the Secord case, there are a number of other cases to which it may very aptly apply, and therefore there is reason why it should pass.

Mr. KENNEDY (Edmonton): We are not particularly interested in the Secord case. It was started to show that there was something in the charges contained in the petition of the half-breeds. It is only an incident in the whole question.

Mr. MEIGHEN: Very good. That is the incident which swept the West like a prairie fire and was thundered in the press day after day as the reason for the legislation—in order to absolve this rich man. Is the hon. member not fair enough to admit that that is a great injustice to the government responsible for the legislation? This bill is necessary for the Secord case in this respect and because of the error of the Alberta government: the prosecution having been discontinued then, it could only be revised by a new prosecution; the new prosecution now would of course be subject to the terms of the legislation; abolish the legislation and that impediment does not exist. It is necessary for that reason—a reason traceable wholly to the error of the Alberta government.

I want to refer to what the hon. member said about the petition of the half-breeds. I do not dispute that that petition was presented to me. The fact is, I must admit, that I have not the least recollection of it, but there will be many others in the same position. If the hon. member is ever a minister of the Crown, much more so if he is Prime Minister, he will find cases by the score in which incidents like that occur, but of which he cannot possibly keep the records in his mind. What I would do in a case of that kind would be this: I would transmit it through my secretary to the Minister of the Interior, in whose charge it was, and he would take it up with his officers, and I would know no more about it after I had transmitted the letter. This matter has been reviewed by the officers of the Interior Department, no doubt, over and over again. The gentleman who wrote that letter, Mr. Coté, have been an officer of that department for I would think thirty-five or forty years, or more. He is intimately acquainted with this whole controversy over the granting of scrip. He is an eminently fair and able officer, and would have the whole history of the matter at his finger-ends, and I would place great confidence in a judgment arrived at by him in a letter. I was no party to the refusal of the investigation. I feel that if I had gone into it the officers would likely have persuaded me that their view was right. I have not the slightest objection to an investigation. Let the hon. member press it on the Minister of the Interior on its merits, and if he makes out a case, I hope it is granted, but I venture to say that if he goes into it from the standpoint of the department as well as from the standpoint that has been urged upon him, he will come to grave doubts whether it is the part of wisdom or not. I only rose to explain that there was no failure on my part to carry out anything with respect to the two half-breeds who through Mr. Cahoon waited upon me, nothing at all in the whole incident to militate or reflect in the least upon the statement of the whole circumstances as well as of the law that I gave to the House a little while ago.

Mr. STEWART (Argenteuil): I do not intend to take any part in this discussion except to say this: I only knew incidentally of the Secord case. My hon. friend has made the statement that the Attorney General of Alberta was lacking in legal knowledge when he dropped the case against Mr. Secord. So far as I know, the Attorney General of Alberta had very little to do with the case. He may have been consulted, but it was in the hands of the Deputy Attorney General. I was not consulted about the matter at all. Mr. Cogswell bears, I think, a fair reputation as a criminal lawyer, and I can hardly think that all the criticism offered of the Alberta law officers is warranted. I do not know the exact circumstances under which this case happened to be dropped, but I may say to my hon. friend from New Brunswick (Mr. Baxter) that the Deputy Attorney General is a native of his pro-

vince, so surely his legal training must be fair.

Mr. BAXTER: If the minister took the trouble to get down to the facts, I think he would probably find that what really happened was that after the lapse of years they could not get the evidence, and that that is the real reason why they dropped the case, but it was stated boldly here in the House to-night by my hon. friends as the determined, settled opinion of the law officers of Alberta. Personally, without having any kowledge of the case, I very much doubt if that was the settled opinion of any law officer worthy of the name.

Section agreed to.

Bill reported, read the third time and passed.

On the motion of Mr. Mackenzie King, House adjourned at 1.08 a.m. Tuesday.

Tuesday, June 20, 1922

The House met at three o'clock.

HOUSE OF COMMONS STAFF

The SPEAKER laid on the Table the organization of the House of Commons staff.

Right Hon. W. L. MACKENZIE KING (Prime Minister): I beg to move that the organization of the staff of the House of Commons laid on the Table of the House this day, be approved. I may say, Mr. Speaker, that this does not involve any change in expenditure but is simply a re-designation.

Motion agreed to.

PRIVILEGE—MR. GAUVREAU

STATEMENT ATTRIBUTED TO MISS MACPHAIL DENIED

On the Orders of the Day:

Mr. C. A. GAUVREAU (Temiscouata): Mr. Speaker, I rise to a question of privilege, and at this stage of the session I shall be very brief. My attention was called, by a man of high position, to a certain part of a speech delivered by a member of this House at a public meeting on Saturday. I will quote from The Citizen of Monday last the following sentence from that speech:

> Miss Macphail again emphasized that her whole heart was with the people of the farm whose battle, she said, she was trying to fight in the House of Commons or rather the House of Anesthetics where principles and honour and justice were lulled to sleep, she averred.

Mr. Speaker, in my humble judgment these words are a direct attack on the honour of Parliament, on the honour of every member of this House, nay on the honour of the three parties in this House, and as I am one of the oldest members I think it is my duty to resent these words and to protest most strongly against them. I hope, Mr. Speaker, that the member for Southeast Grey will avail herself of the first opportunity to tell this House if she has been fairly or accurately reported by the newspapers. If not, so much the better for herself and those who are concerned. If it is true that she did make the statement attributed to her by this newspaper, the least she could do would be to apologize or explain.

Miss AGNES C. MACPHAIL (Southeast Grey): Mr. Speaker, there were two other members of this House present at the meeting at which I am alleged to have uttered the words complained of—the hon. member for West Edmonton (Mr. Kennedy) and the hon. member for Humboldt (Mr. Stewart). The only thing of the kind referred to that I can recall in connection with that speech was that I had been referring to the much-talked-of "House of Temptation", and I said I thought a mistake had been made in that; I said I did not think that was proper, but that possibly "The room in which they administered anesthetics" would have been a more correct interpretation. The words which the hon. member has quoted I did not use at all, as I am sure both the hon. members who were with me on the occasion referred to will confirm. I will be very glad if both these hon. gentlemen will corroborate what I have said. I repeat that I never used the words with which I am credited at all.

Mr. STEWART (Humboldt): At the request of the hon. member for Southeast Grey I can state that I heard her address on Saturday evening. I know that she referred to the quoted statement that has been attributed to her and did qualify it as she has stated; but I do not recall, and I do not think, that she used any such terms as are reported in the statement ascribed to her by the press.

WAYS AND MEANS

CUSTOMS ACT AMENDMENT

House again in committee of Ways and Means, Mr. Gordon in the Chair.

Hon. W. S. FIELDING (Minister of Finance): Before I proceed to take up the resolutions, may I make a word or two of introductory observation? I shall have several amendments to propose, not making any material change, but designed to facilitate the carrying out of the resolutions. Various suggestions have been offered by hon. members on both sides with regard to the rates of duties imposed on some of the items to which their attention has been drawn. I desire to say that, after giving full consideration to these suggestions, I am of the opinion that it would be wise to make no change in the rates we have proposed. I do not imagine that the resolutions, as I have presented them to the House, are perfect; I have no doubt, in the light of experience, we shall find room for some changes, and, perhaps, improvement. But in every case where the reductions have been made in the rates of duty, they have been made with due regard to the embarrassments that might be created if a more radical change were proposed. My hon. friends who proposed these amendments may consider it their duty to move at a later stage, but I thought it better to say at once that, to make any change in the various matters in the budget resolutions will be difficult, and, at this stage, very embarrassing. Of course, hon. members must act according to their own views, but I am going to ask members on all sides to accept the resolutions, as far as may be possible, as the settled policy for the present session; and if experience shows that there is room for improvement, no one will be more ready to accept suggestions in that direction than I. Hon. members who have been making these suggestions may feel it necessary, from their own viewpoint, to deal with them further, and, possibly, to move amendments. I regret that I cannot accept these suggestions, but I consider it reasonable, having considered the proposed changes, to say that we do not think it wise that they should be adopted.

Mr. MACLEAN (York): Does the statement the minister now gives apply to items like the stamp duty?

Mr. FIELDING: Yes.

Mr. MACLEAN (York): Because we are receiving telegrams about that duty.

Mr. FIELDING: My hon. friend will receive telegrams no matter what rates are affected—the most flourishing industry in the country, during the last two or three weeks, is the telegraph office. Of course, what I have said is a suggestion from my own viewpoint, and is only a request. I cannot prevent any hon. member commenting upon these resolutions, and, if he feels it his duty, moving against them.

[Mr. C. W. Stewart.]

Mr. MEIGHEN: I understood the hon. Minister of Finance in his statement of policy to refer to the resolutions which we have gone over, as to which some amendments have been suggested. I do not understand him to refer to those we have not yet touched in committee.

Mr. FIELDING: Even as respects those, what I said would apply, from my own viewpoint. I admit there is room for criticism on those points, and hon. members can make their own comments, and, if they find it necessary, can move against them, but I am expressing the hope that, with a view to facilitate the business, the committee may come to the conclusion that they might do worse than accept the resolutions as they stand, with a protest or with discussion if they desire; but I want to discourage change in so far as I have the power to do so.

Mr. MEIGHEN: I hope the statement is not regarded by the hon. minister as final, as relates to matters that have not yet been under discussion in committee.

Mr. FIELDING: We will see how matters develop. I am always ready to receive suggestions, but I think we have reached a stage in the session when we should be patient—to "rather bear those ills we have than fly to others that we know not of." I desire to move the first resolution of the Customs Act, which reads:

1. Resolved, That it is expedient to amend The Customs Act and Amending Acts, including The Department of Customs and Excise Act (chapter twenty-six of the Statutes of 1921), as follows:—

1. By repealing section six of The Department of Customs and Excise Act, being chapter twenty-six of the Statutes of 1921, and amending section thirty-one of the said Customs Act accordingly.

The clause referred to was enacted last year, and contemplated the appointment of a number of officers in various parts of the country—shall I say, of the world?—who would give certificates on every invoice of export for more than $100. The act was passed a year ago, and the Government provided that it should only go into operation by Order in Council. The Government, apparently for their own reasons, did not bring it into operation, and we thought it better to repeal it.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: That is the first resolution.

Mr. FIELDING: Yes, and the first subsection. It will be remembered that last year there was some discussion in the House, and it was enacted that officers representing the Government of Canada might be appointed with a view to giving certificates, and that every invoice of more than $100 would require a certificate by the Canadian officials. That provision has not yet been called into operation; we think it has been found inconvenient and we propose to repeal it.

Section 1, resolution 1, agreed to.

Mr. FIELDING: I move the adoption of section 2, which reads:

2. By repealing section seven of The Department of Customs and Excise Act aforesaid, and amending section forty of the said Customs Act accordingly.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: Carried on division.

The CHAIRMAN: Carried on division.

Resolution 1, section 3, subsection (1):

3. By amending section fifty-nine of the said Customs Act, as follows:—

(1) By striking out subsection three thereof, and substituting therefor the following:—

"(3) Whenever the value of a currency has not been proclaimed, or whenever there is no fixed standard value, or whenever from any cause the value of a currency has become depreciated or appreciated, there shall be attached to the invoice of the goods imported the certificate of some Consul or Canadian Trade Commissioner, resident in such place or country, or the certificate of a bank showing the extent of such depreciation or appreciation, or the true value at the time of the exportation of the goods of the currency in which such invoice is made out, as compared with the standard dollar of Canada: Provided that the Collector of Customs and Excise may compute the value for duty at the rate of exchange certified by the bank through which the same is drawn as current at the time and place when and whence the goods were exported to Canada."

Mr. FIELDING: This clause has reference to depreciated currency; but it is not the Depreciated Currency clause which we have been more than once discussing. The object of this is to enable the collector of customs to ascertain more easily the current rate of exchange, instead of going through the more difficult process which at present prevails. It is entirely to facilitate the work of the officers in the Customs Department in that regard. It introduces no new principle, but it makes it easy for the Customs Department to determine the value in this case.

Section 3, subsection (1), agreed to.

(2) By amending subsection 4 of the said section 59 by adding after the word "Consul's" in the second line thereof the words "or Canadian Trade Commissioner's".

Mr. FIELDING: This provides that where a certificate is required under the law from a consul, if there is a Canadian trade commissioner there, his certificate shall be accepted.

Mr. MARCIL (Bonaventure): We heard a great deal about treaties in this House yesterday, and this might be an opportune time to ask a question in regard to treaties. In what shape is the French treaty at the present time, and is any action being taken towards entering into a trade treaty with Belgium or any other country?

Mr. FIELDING: The situation as regards France is this. A year or two ago a treaty was adopted which seemed to contemplate further negotiations. I believe negotiations were begun, or the French authorities endeavoured to begin some negotiations, but it was deemed at that time inexpedient or inconvenient to the Government of the day and no action was taken. The French Consul General at Montreal has recently approached us on the subject, and we have intimated our willingness to enter into negotiations at a convenient time, but no further action has been taken. I anticipate that one of these days the French government will take some further action; that they will give us some information as to what they suggest, and our desire is to have again with France a comprehensive treaty, as we had a few years ago.

Mr. MARCIL (Bonaventure): As regards Belgium and other countries?

Mr. FIELDING: I do not think we have had any direct approach from Belgium on the subject.

Mr. LADNER: Does not the minister think it is expedient to have negotiations with Belgium along the same lines, seeing that France and Belgium have corresponding industries, in relationship to our country?

Mr. FIELDING: France has always been treated as a unit in any negotiations. I have not had before me the suggestion that we should at the same time deal with Belgium. Indeed, I do not think there has been any approach by the Belgian authorities. I believe there has been an

approach by the authorities of Greece with a view to some negotiations, but no progress has been made.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: I hope the minister wil not wait for the French government to aproach us. The matter is in such a shape now that it is entirely open to Canada to make her representations to France. If the minister will look over the files, I think he will agree with me that this ought to be done at the earliest possible moment.

Mr. FIELDING: We have indicated our willingness to undertake negotiations at a time which will be agreed upon. The matter is at present in such a condition that it would almost naturally call for some approach from the French government. The question, however, who makes the first approach, is not important. A comprehensive treaty such as we had a few years ago is very desirable if we can obtain it.

Section 3, subsection (2), agreed to.

(3) By repealing section 8 of the Department of Customs and Excise Act aforesaid and amending said section 59 accordingly.

Mr. STEVENS: This is the clause regarding depreciated currency. In this clause we are repealing clause 8 of the Customs and Excise Act of last year, 1921. We have in resolution 5, I think, what the minister proposes to substitute for this. Am I correct in that?

Mr. FIELDING: No, my hon. friend in that respect is hardly correct. The purport of this resolution was correctly stated by me in the earlier discussion; but the wording of the resolution is, I think, capable of improvement, and I will send to my hon. friend a copy of what is proposed by way of amendment and which reads:

That it is expedient to amend section 40 of the Customs Act by providing that in the case of importations of goods, the manufacture or produce of a foreign country, the currency of which is substantially depreciated, the value for duty shall not be less than the value that would be placed on similar goods manufactured or produced in the United Kingdom and imported from that country, if such similar goods are made or produced there. If similar goods are not made or produced in the United Kingdom, the value for duty shall not be less than the value of similar goods made or produced in any European country the currency of which is not substantially depreciated.

The minister may determine the value for duty of such goods, and the value so determined, shall, until otherwise provided, be the value upon which the duty on such goods shall be computed and levied under regulations prescribed by the minister.

[Mr. Fielding.]

That is substantially the same as the resolution on the Order Paper. It was not clear in the first draft of the resolution whether it would apply to goods of a foreign country coming, say, by way of Great Britain. It is so worded now that it distinctly applies to goods of a foreign country no matter where they may come from. That is the material change in the wording. In substance it is exactly as it stands to-day.

Mr. STEVENS: I should like to be perfectly clear as to the minister's intention. If I remember rightly, in his speech of last Monday, when he suggested that amendments would be made he intimated that the contention was to bring the value of goods of a country whose currency was substantially depreciated, up to the level of the price of the goods from Great Britain.

Mr. FIELDING: That is correct.

Mr. STEVENS: That is the impression that has gone abroad and is, I think, correct. While my former remarks, perhaps, went a little further than that, I would be quite willing to accept such a provision as I have stated. But I do not think my hon. friend's amendment will accomplish that end. In the absence of applying the full dump, I do not think it is possible for that end to be achieved by this resolution. I do not wish to presume too much upon the good nature of my hon. friend; but I have gone into the matter very carefully, and I have in my hand a wording which I should like to submit to him. I was not quite sure of his viewpoint, although I read Hansard carefully and it appealed to me as he stated it and as he has now confirmed it. If it is the intention to put the German exporter into the Canadian market on the same basis as the British exporter, allowing the British exporter, the legal preference, then I submit that this wording will not do. In order to accomplish the desired end, it will be necessary to apply the full dump. I appreciate very highly the value of the dump doctrine as introduced into our legislation in 1907 in section 40, I think it is, by the present Minister of Finance. I suggest to my hon. friend that this wording be used:

That in the case of importations produced in a foreign country whose currency is depreciated the value for duty shall not be less than the value that would be placed on similar goods produced in the United Kingdom and imported from that country if such similar goods are produced there. If similar goods are not produced

in the United Kingdom, the value for duty shall not be less than the value of similar goods produced in any European country in which the currency is not depreciated; if the purchase price, or the exporter's sales price, is less than such value for duty, there shall be levied, collected, and paid, in addition to the duties imposed thereon by law, a special dumping duty in an amount equal to such difference.

That, I think, will completely cover exactly what my hon. friend has in mind, which he has intimated to the House and country, and which has been accepted as satisfactory, namely, the placing of the German trader on the same level as the British trader. I submit it to my hon. friend for his acceptance.

Mr. FIELDING: My hon. friend is associating two things which to my mind are separate, one the value for duty and the other the dumping duty. The dumping duty remains exactly as it is now; it is not changed in any way. Whatever protection it gave to any manufacturer he still has. If the hon. member desires it, I will reflect on the question; but I am inclined to think that what he wants to accomplish will be attained by the resolution as it stands. If at the close of any discussion which it is thought proper to have on the subject my hon. friend still presses his point, I shall be glad to let the matter stand over until a later period of the day. In the meantime I can take it up with the customs authorities. The hon. member has correctly stated my purpose. The object is that the valuation of any goods—not German goods in particular but those of any country where the currency is substantially depreciated—shall be exactly on the same basis as the valuation of similar goods of British manufacture coming in at the same time; and if similar goods are not made in Great Britain we shall look for the standard of value to, say, Holland or Switzerland, where the currency has suffered little or no depreciation. I think that what my hon. friend is aiming at will be accomplished by the resolution as it stands. But if he urges the point he has raised I will let the matter stand for the present and take it up at a later stage. In the evening I shall have a consultation with the customs authorities.

Mr. MEIGHEN: I think it is well that the committee understand the very great difference between the law as it will be, if amended by the amendment submitted now, and the law as it will be if passed as the minister commended it to the committee just a moment ago. The valuation for duty purposes, under the minister's proposal, will be the British valuation; consequently the duty will be the same as the duty against Great Britain, save for any advantage, small though it might be, that Great Britain will have under the preference. But under the amendment submitted there will be a special dumping duty, as I understand it,—I have not seen the amendment before—on the difference between the German price and the British price. Let us take by way of illustration the case that has so often been before the House in connection with this subject; I refer to the question of the knives. The British valuation is about $3.75 per dozen, ours about $4, and the German valuation about 55 cents. On the goods imported from Great Britain there would be a duty at the preferential rate on $3.75, on the goods imported from Germany there would be a duty at the ordinary rate on $3.75; but under the amendment there would be in addition a special dumping duty on the difference between the German valuation of 55 cents and the British valuation of $3.75. The difference is very great and I submit it is essential if the British trader and the German trader are to be put on an equality, an equality barring, of course, the ordinary preference afforded to British goods.

Mr. FIELDING: I do not wish to stop the discussion. I have already suggested that I am willing to reserve the item for later consideration in order that I may discuss it with the customs authorities. The main difference between the resolution as worded to-day and as it has appeared on the Order Paper is in the matter of direct route. That is to say, the resolution as it stood on the Order Paper before was open to the interpretation that foreign goods might be imported by way of another country, from Great Britain, for example, and so escape the penalty, if it was a penalty, provided by the resolution. The amendment now provides that German goods, or for that matter the goods of any other country whose currency is considerably depreciated, whether they come direct or by way of some other port, shall be subject to the same regulation. That is the main purpose of the resolution. But I will consider later in the day whether the point raised by the hon. member for Vancouver Centre (Mr. Stevens) is well taken.

Mr. STEVENS: I do not wish to delay the committee, but before an adverse decision is arrived at by the minister I should like to have an opportunity to

argue the point, if I might use that term. I am accepting at full face value the minister's statement that we desire to put the German exporter on the same level and in the same position as the British exporter.

Mr. FIELDING: As to valuation.

Mr. STEVENS: I did not so understand my hon. friend the other day, and certainly the country does not so understand his position. The understanding has gone abroad throughout the country—and I have had considerable information from various sources on that point—that the minister by his amendment is placing the German exporter in the same position as the British exporter, only, of course, giving the British exporter the advantage he has legally by the preference. Perhaps I had better make a brief argument before the minister decides the question.

There was one point which I am sure escaped the minister's mind the other day, and considering the multitudinous questions that have been thrust upon him in the last few days it is not to be wondered at. That point is that the German principal price is not a fair competitive price. It is not fair for certain reasons. It is necessary that I should repeat something of what I said the other day, and I shall try to be as brief as possible. The artificial methods by which the German government is maintaining a low cost of production in Germany to the extent of three times the value of their mark on the exchange is, I contend, an absolutely unfair competition and justifies us in putting the dumping regulation upon their goods. We are not alone in taking that position. I have here the Congressional Record, and while I will not weary the House by reading extensively from them, I can assure the committee that many illustrations are given by Mr. Fordney and others in which they show, perhaps from a slightly different angle from that from which I argued the matter, that the Germans are entering goods for duty purposes at New York and other American points at figures that are not true value figures. Let me give my hon. friend one illustration to show that the German is really receiving in gold value to-day a very much greater value than would appear by the figures submitted in Canada at the point of entry. Take the same illustration I took the other day, which is applicable to any article, although there might be variations in prices—let us take knives. Fifty-five cents, at the exchange rate, is equal to 165 marks—now, this is the crux of my whole argument, and if the minister will get this point I think he will agree with me absolutely; 165 marks at gold value is $39.60, or approximately $40.

Mr. McMASTER: Is that old par value?

Mr. STEVENS: A hundred and sixty-five marks at par value is $39.60 gold value. So, the German is getting to-day, say, $40 for one dozen knives. The cost of living and production in Germany, according to their best experts, has increased sixteen-fold. Divide $40 by that increase and it gives $2.50, which the German receives in Germany to-day for that article—I am figuring it at pre-war rates. So that, in entering that knife in Canada to-day at 55 cents the German is subjecting us to an utterly unfair competition. It does not make much difference how one reasons out this low price that exists in Germany. I am quite confident that my processes are accurate, although I do not wish to be dogmatic about it. But this point I am making now cannot be gainsaid, that that value represents at pre-war rates, $2.50. Taking the advanced cost of production in Canada, we would be entitled to double that value in assessing duty. What I am asking by this resolution is to simply take the German price, add to that the British duty on that price, and then add to that again the difference betwen the German principal price and the British principal price.

Mr. FIELDING: Between what?

Mr. STEVENS: We add to that a dumping duty equivalent to the difference between the German principal price and the British principal price. My argument in defence of that is, that the German principal price is maintained at an exceedingly low level by artificial methods, not by ordinary methods that are fair to competitive trade. Let me put it in a slightly different way. Are we not going far enough if we ask the Canadian to compete against normal countries such as Great Britain and the United States? I think in putting it that way I am saying what everybody will admit to be fair. Therefore, if any other country with an abnormally depreciated currency cuts under, say, the British figures, which is the lowest usually in most classes of goods, then we will be doing what is fair and right to raise the abnormally low

prices of goods from the country with depreciated currency to a level with the prices of goods enjoying the British preference. That is exactly what will be done by my suggested wording of this amendment. If my hon. friend will simply acept the position that we are going to ask the Canadians to compete against the British price, then my wording will achieve that end; whereas his wording will put us in a position where the Canadian would have to compete against half that price.

Mr. McMASTER: Mr. Chairman, I trust that the Finance Minister will not be influenced by the arguments advanced by gentlemen sitting across the way from him to make trade more difficult in this country. It seems to me that a knife-blade is a very narrow basis on which to found an economic argument, and I think that most members will agree that there can be no permanent industrial prosperity based upon the fact that the currency of a country is depreciated. As a matter of fact, I have in my hand a letter which I received the other day from some clients of mine who import goods from Germany, saying that the German prices are such that they find it difficult with these goods to meet American competition. I have also in my hand a dispatch from Washington in which an American commercial attaché by the name of Herring states that:

> In Germany production costs are affected by rising coal prices and wage increases and by the 25 per cent freight rate increase of June 1st.

The dispatch goes on to say:

> As time progresses any advantage which they ever had by a rapidly depreciated currency has been offset by the inevitable result of a depreciated currency, which is an inflation in prices and wages.

I do not propose to quote the whole article, but it states that German prices, as we might know would inevitably happen, are gradually rising to the same level as world prices. As to the somewhat abstruse reasoning along lines of figures, I confess that I am somewhat like the Oxford undergraduate, who, when plucked in arithmetic, said that he had not the low cunning necessary to understand figures; I am afraid I have not that sort of cunning to understand the figures placed before the House by the hon. member from Vancouver Centre. But, let me say in conclusion, that a depreciated currency cannot for any substantial period of time give an advantage to the nation which has it. That nation has to go out into the world's markets to buy its raw materials to make up into goods and ship them out, and to have a depreciated currency in that regard is a direct detriment rather than a benefit.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: I do not desire to enter into a lengthy argument largely reiterating what has been said in the House not only this year but last year. I suppose the best answer to the observations of the hon. member for Brome is to point out that despite these things not happening they have happened—that Germany is about the only place to-day where there is very little, if any, unemployment; and to draw his attention to the further fact that, stating the case in his own way, it always takes some time for the depreciation in a nation's currency to be reflected in its domestic market. It would not be so bad if the depreciation of the German mark reached the point of saturation and stopped there long enough; for then there would be a great deal in what the hon. gentleman argued; but it has not stopped there, and the fact is that much more can be obtained for the mark in Germany than elsewhere. I do not think there is any doubt about that.

Further, we are in the position to-day that this opposition has not to debate the question. We took issue on the general argument that the effect of the hon. minister's resolution was to create free trade with Germany. And the hon. gentleman himself has realized the situation, for he has turned around and said: "No, something has got to be done about this; it is absolutely wrong to give the Germans that great advantage in the Canadian market which my original proposition gave them over the British." That, in effect, is what my hon. friend has done.

I want to point out just one other matter to him—the position he is in unless he accepts the amendment of the hon. member for Vancouver Centre (Mr. Stevens). The hon. minister will remember that he said there were two things wrong with the currency question. The first was, it was altogether unnecessary and should be swept aside. The hon. gentleman has reconsidered that view, I think very properly, and has reached the conclusion that it is something which cannot be swept aside. But there was something else wrong with it. I think he said that to a large extent it was unworkable because German goods were being sent to Great Britain and other countries and invoiced from there. For that reason again the

provision had to be set aside. Now, unless the declaration of my hon. friend meant just exactly what the hon. member for Vancouver Centre says, he is by law simply putting the position back to the case of the man who was evading the former regulations which he said were no good. Indeed, he is doing a little better. Because, where you have your exporter from Germany at the disability of having to ship from England, he is at some extra cost; has to export to this country on the British valuation, but he is at the inconvenience and the extra cost of the broken transit, broken billing, broken accounting, and the like. The effect of my hon. friend's amendment, unless it means what the hon. member for Vancouver Centre says, is simply to tell the German, who is in a position to undersell here: "I am going to relieve you of all the trouble you were put to in the past for the purpose of evading Canada's currency regulations; I am going to let you ship direct from your own place to Canada upon the same footing as if you had gone to all the trouble to ship by way of Great Britain." I am satisfied that the Minister of Finance had no such idea, but I fear that is the effect of his amendment unless it means what the hon. member for Vancouver Centre suggests it means.

Mr. GOOD: There seems to be a good deal of confusion in regard to this matter. The Finance Minister seems to have given up entirely the position he took when he delivered his main budget speech; he has gone much further in the direction of prohibiting German importations than the hon. member for Vancouver Centre asked him to go. As I understand the situation now, German exporters will have to invoice their goods into Canada at the British price. In the case of the knives referred to, no German manufacturer may invoice these goods into Canada at less than $3.75 a dozen, on which duty will be paid under the general tariff. If that is the situation, and British goods come in under the preferential tariff, does it not mean a prohibition against those German goods? I do not see how any German manufacturers, if they are compelled to invoice goods at the British price and pay a higher duty than the British have to pay, can do any trade here at all. Now, according to the hon. member for Vancouver Centre, the cost of production in Germany of these knives is about $2.50 a dozen, and it seems to me they ought to be allowed to come into this country at that rate, if we are to get any advantage of the cheaper production in Germany. If, of course, we determine on a policy of absolute exclusion of German goods, we might as well confess it and prohibit their entry. In regard to the suggestion which has been made by the hon. member for Vancouver Centre, it seems to me there will be two duties levied against these knives—one of 30 or 35 per cent on the $3.75, the British price, and in addition a dumping duty on the difference between 55 cents, the German valuation, and the $3.75. If it will be difficult for the German manufacturer of knives to export his product to Canada at the British price, it will be rendered impossible if, in addition to the duty on the basis of the English valuation, he has to pay another duty on the difference between the German valuation and the British valuation. I would like to see this matter cleared up before the item passes.

Mr. HUGHES: I just wish to present this thought to the hon. member for Vancouver Centre. The only advantage the German manufacturer and exporter can have is that which is involved in the difference between the domestic value of the mark and its foreign value. He has not all the advantage of that, but that is the greatest advantage he can have, because in what he imports he has to suffer the disadvantage of paying the foreign price. In other words, if the domestic and the foreign value of the mark were exactly the same, he would have no advantage no matter what the value of the mark was, because he would have to pay so much more for what he imported—so much more for transportation—so much more for overhead expenses—and so on. And his advantage in the case where there is a difference favourable to him between the domestic value and the foreign value of the mark is minimized to the extent that he has to import the material, or part of the material, that enters into the article he produces.

4 p.m.

The CHAIRMAN: Subsection 3 of section 3 has not yet been adopted.

Mr. GOOD: I understood the minister to say that he would leave this matter over until after 8 o'clock.

Mr. STEVENS: That has reference to a later clause. Subsection 3 is to repeal the original clause.

Mr. FIELDING: The new clause will stand as suggested. The hon. member for Brant (Mr. Good) has suggested that the German exporter must invoice his goods

at the British price. I do not think that is correct; he may invoice them any way he likes, but the customs authorities must deal with the valuation. I do not think it is important to determine how the German exporter shall invoice his goods; the great question will be, on what principle are they to be valued? In that respect the Customs Department will have to apply whatever the decision of the House is.

Mr. GOOD: Would the minister illustrate his point in reference to the case of the knives?

Mr. FIELDING: My point is that I do not think it is important how the exporter invoices them. The value to be ascertained by the Customs Department is the English value of a similar article. If the invoice is made out in marks, the customs officer at the proper port will deal with the value, not with the invoice at all; he can brush aside the invoice. Of course, if an invoice is fraudulent, that is another matter.

The CHAIRMAN: Does subsection 3 stand?

Mr. STEVENS: Carried on division. That is the subsection which repeals section 8 of the act.

The CHAIRMAN: Subsection 3 carried on division.

Resolution 5, with amendments, allowed to stand.

6. Resolved, That it is expedient to amend the said Act by adding at the end of section one hundred and one thereof the following proviso:—

"Provided, however, that upon the entry outwards of wines and spirituous liquors to be exported from a Customs warehouse either by sea or by land or inland navigation, as the case may be, the person entering the same for such purpose shall give security by bond of an incorporated Guarantee Company authorized to do business in Canada and whose bonds are acceptable to the Dominion Government, such bond to be in form approved by the Minister, in double the duties of importation on such goods, that the same shall, when the entry aforesaid is for exportation by sea, be actually exported to the place provided for in said entry, and when the entry aforesaid is for exportation by land or inland navigation, shall be landed and delivered at the place for which they are entered outwards, unless in either case the said goods were after leaving Canada lost and destroyed, and that such proof or certificate that such goods have been so exported, landed or delivered, or lost and destroyed, as the case may be, as shall be required by any regulation of the Minister, shall be produced to the Collector or other proper officer within a period to be appointed in such bond. This proviso, however, shall not apply to wines and spirituous liquors in a Canadian port, without entry thereat for warehouse and for no other purpose than their transportation *in transitu* on a through bill of lading, from a port outside of Canada to another port of destination outside of Canada via a Canadian port or ports."

Mr. FIELDING: The object is to ensure, when wines and spirits are sent from a port in Canada to another port, that they have actually gone to that port, and for that purpose bond is required. Sometimes it is suggested that they do not go to the intended port. This provision is to ensure that these wines and spirits really go to their actual destination.

Section 6 agreed to.

7. Resolved, That it is expedient to amend section one hundred and two of the said Act by inserting the words "or in such bond" between the word "exportation" and the word "there" in the second line thereof, and by adding at the end of the said section the words "and if security by bond is given, the said bond may be cancelled."

Mr. FIELDING: That deals with the same thing.

Section 7 agreed to.

CUSTOMS TARIFF ACT 1907 AMENDMENT

Mr. FIELDING: That brings us down to the schedule of duties, several items of which were reserved.

The CHAIRMAN: The first of these is:

Customs tariff 446b:—Ploughs and complete parts thereof: British Preferential tariff, 10 per cent; Intermediate tariff, 15 per cent; General tariff, 15 per cent.

Mr. FIELDING: The suggestion was offered by some hon. gentlemen oposite that the duty provided for here should be reduced. I may say, referring to that item, that the manufacturers—we are not bound to accept them, I suppose, as absolutely unbiassed witnesses — the manufacturers are very much alarmed at the proposal and have given me all sorts of assurances that if that reduction is made it will be disastrous to them. In framing all these changes our desire has been to move in the right direction, but not to make such changes as would disturb business. I think, on the whole, it would be wiser if we are content to accept the measure of reduction that has been given. If my hon. friends opposite think it is necessary to divide the House on that, I should regret the fact; but, of course, it is their right to do so.

The CHAIRMAN: Mr. Johnston of Last Mountain has moved an amendment to this item, 446b, that the duties be: 7½ per cent

under the British Preferential tariff; 10 per cent under the Intermediate tariff; and 10 per cent under the General tariff. The question is on the amendment.

Some Hon. MEMBERS: Lost.

Mr. KNOX: The member for Last Mountain (Mr. Johnston) was called to the committee on railway rates, and as the seconder of the amendment I desire to say that we wish the amendment to be considered. Those of us who were here in the last parliament will recall that this item created a good deal of discussion on a former occasion. We had reason to believe that certain special interests had made representations that the duty in this case should be higher than the duty on some of the other machinery, and on the occasion referred to we moved to have the duty reduced to the same level as that on harvesting machinery. I think it is only right that this matter should be re-considered. We feel that the duty should be on the same level as harvesting machinery—that is that the rates should be 7½, 10 and 10 respectively.

The CHAIRMAN: The question is on the amendment. Those in favour of the amendment please say "Aye".

Mr. MEIGHEN: Before the vote is taken, we should have some discussion on the real merits of the amendment. The Minister of Finance has stated his position. He believes that any further reduction would be disastrous to the industry. He states that it is the policy of the Government not to reduce the duty where to reduce would be disastrous to business. That is the Minister of Finance's method of declaring his fidelity to the protective principle; he prefers that method to the method that I adopt. I do not think it really makes much difference. I feel very much like the Minister of Justice (Sir Lomer Gouin), that the matter of expression means nothing at all; it is what is done, it is the principle voiced. The principle that the Minister of Finance has just expounded is the principle to which I adhere. He should have information that would guide him in this decision; he is simply giving his judgment in accordance with the best information that he has now. I really think that, unless hon. members of this House have different information, the tariff item is what they should accept. I do not know any hon. members who were in the last House who are in a position to dispute the principles that the Minister of Finance advances, because all in the last House—both of the party to my left and the party opposite—voted for a resolution which declared that any reductions made should be so made as not to injure busines. That is, the resolution declared for the principle of protection and also declared against it. In that, of course, it was quite consistent with the tactics adopted at that time and throughout the campaign—there was a plank for everybody Now the Minister of Finance advances the principle upon which he stands. If hon. gentlemen to my left can show that he is wrong in his premises, that would be ground for their motion; if they cannot show it they cannot have any ground unless they want to break from the resolution their own party accepted in the last House. In this connection I think we should hear from the hon. member for Brantford (Mr. Raymond). I do not know any place in Canada so much interested in this particular production as his constituency. He may have facts that the Minister of Finance has not; he may be able to help the committee on this subject. I know that he adheres to the principle the Minister of Finance has enunciated. I know that because he has expounded it in most eloquent, must persuasive, and most convincing terms. I really have been at a loss to know why he fought the principle and at the same time supported it; but now no doubt he will have to support the principle involved as he has done since he reached this House. I would like to hear what facts he can adduce in support of the position taken by the Minister of Finance. I assure him that if he can show that the producers of these goods will be in a position fairly to compete with their competitors across the line in the case of a further reduction, I will support a further reduction.

Mr. RAYMOND: With regard to the matter that is under discussion, I would like to say that I think it has been discussed in this House on a previous occasion—that is as to the difference in the duties upon mowers and binders and ploughs. It is hardly worth while now, when we are all endeavouring to save time, to enter into a lengthy discussion of the question as to the difference that appears in the tariff schedule, and has always existed in that schedule, between the duty on binders, for instance, and the duty on mowers and ploughs. Briefly stated, however, it is

this: That in the manufacture of ploughs more materials are used upon which a duty is placed in order that raw materials of Canadian production may be utilized That is the position stated in brief. As I stated on a former occasion one of the arguments used for the creation of a Wheat Board was the amount of Nova Scotia steel and iron that figured in the agricultural implements the farmers used. That would not be the case if there was not a duty on these goods, the object of the duty being to cause the manufacture of our own Canadian materials. Now, I think, with regard to the matter of ploughs, the gentlemen opposite who favour the amendment have not fairly considered the question. It was hoped that they would be pleased when the reduction of 2½ per cent was made. At that time those who felt interested in seeing the old duties maintained did not press their side of the case. But the reduction made does not seem to satisfy some hon. gentlemen opposite, and they are now pressing for a still further reduction of 5 per cent in the duty on ploughs. The point I would bring to the attention of the committee is this: Whether the position of my hon. friend is right or wrong, the present is exactly the wrong time to press for such a reduction, when we have a balance of trade against us from the United States, and when we have all the plough factories in our own country idle, with their warehouses filled; and when the same condition obtains in the United States; when all the plough factories are stocked up, and some of them have recently gone into liquidation, and are selling off their stock at a sacrifice. I say, unless it is the deliberate intention of this committee to sacrifice that industry, now is not the right time to take off the 5 per cent. Therefore, I would ask the committee with all the strength I possess, to oppose the amendment.

Mr. JOHNSON (Moosejaw): The hon. member says that now is not the proper time to reduce his duty—

Mr. RAYMOND: To propose the amendment.

Mr. JOHNSON (Moosejaw): Which means, to reduce the duty—now is not the proper time, in the estimation of my hon. friend. Does he think the proper time will ever come?

Mr. KNOX: I would like to say, in reply to what the leader of the official Opposition (Mr. Meighen) has said in regard to injuring business, that there are other businesses in the country besides manufacturing ploughs. The plough is one of the first implements to be used on the farm, and one of the first things to be considered in the effort to encourage farming, and I again state my position in support of the amendment.

Mr. HALBERT: Will the hon. member (Mr. Raymond) explain why, when the manufacturers of cream separators can get along without protection, the manufacturers of ploughs, who have the plough points, and all the different parts coming in free, and have only to bore the holes, cannot get along without protection?

Item agreed to on division.

Customs tariff—Portable engines with boilers, in combination, horsepowers and traction engines for farm purposes, n.o.p., and complete parts thereof: British Preferential tariff 12½ per cent; Intermediate tariff 17½ per cent; General tariff, 17½ per cent.

Mr. JOHNSON (Moosejaw): I am not going to offer an amendment yet. I said about all I have to say on the subject the other day. Considering the fact that the one suggestion has been turned down, it would be useless to waste time proposing an amendment on the other. I wish to place myself on record as opposed to a tariff on these goods as being vicious in principle, and I trust that when the Finance Minister another year brings forward his budget, he will have the advice of people on this side of the House, and we will look for some reduction.

Item agreed to.

Customs tariff—Blankets of any material: British Preferential tariff 22½ per cent; Intermediate tariff, 30 per cent; General tariff, 35 per cent.

Mr. BRETHEN: I listened to the statement of the Finance Minister at the opening of the House to-day, and I am quite willing to grant that his experience and wisdom are superior to my own in these matters. His argument is that we can gain more by barter in our trade relations with the United States than we can by concession. I must submit to his judgment in these matters. But I believe that under this item—and there are several others like it, for instance, the items in regard to boots and shoes and in regard to automobiles—the protection afforded the Canadian manufacturer is out of all proportion, and does not do justice to the average man in this country. If it is unwise to reduce the customs duty between this country and the

United States in these matters, I would suggest, as a source of revenue—and I consider it only just—that the Canadian manufacturer who is protected up to the hilt in these matters, should pay an excise tax to the Dominion treasury. I feel very strongly on this matter, just about strongly enough to move an amendment that an excise tax be imposed on these articles. I would like to hear this matter discussed, and to understand the justification for the Government not placing an excise duty on the Canadian manufacturer in order to increase our revenue and compel the manufacturer to pay into the Canadian treasury something of the protection that the Canadian people as a whole give him. I believe it is unfair to tax the residents in East Peterborough, and give the credit of that tax to a resident in Toronto. We do not increase the tax on the wealth of Canada thereby.

Mr. BROWN: We have some wonderful anomalies in our system. A few evenings ago we voted a subsidy to a line of steamers carrying on trade with New Zealand. If I understand the situation aright, a considerable portion of that trade is in carrying agricultural products between New Zealand and Canada, and one of these agricultural products is wool. The Finance Minister in the late administration the other night referred to the question of wool, and seemed to intimate that we would be in a much better position if we had a duty on wool. My recollection goes back as far as the election of 1878, when the national policy came into force, and one of the great arguments for protection at that time was that we would have a market for our wool. Forty years have gone by and we are still in the same position—we are paying high duties, and we have a high protective duty on manufactured woollen goods; we are still in that deplorable position, as regards the sale of our raw products.

There are some strange anomalies in the situation, as I have said. I would like to give some consideration, as the hon. Finance Minister has often advised us, to the question of revenue, and I believe the tariff may be reduced to the advantage of the revenue. The leader of the official Opposition used a very strange expression the other night, and I have been wondering what he meant. He said he did not believe in tariff for revenue nonsense, or free trade nonsense. I do not know what is in the minds of men when they say they do not believe in tariff for revenue nonsense, when we hear so much about the necessity of getting revenue from customs duties. I know the right hon. member's Finance Minister (Sir Henry Drayton) did not take that position, for I had the privilege of appearing before him when he was conducting that tariff commission in the fall of 1920, when he had a little advantage over us in the position he occupied—we were not on equal terms on that occasion, adn when we would make protests to him touching this question of reduction of duty, invariably he asked the question "And where do you get the revenue?" Yet his leader talks about tariff for revenue nonsense. We may very well admit that the tariff is not, perhaps, the ideal way of collecting revenue; but we are all agreed that for many years we must collect revenue through tariffs; so why talk about this "tariff-for-revenue nonsense?" I also noticed that, in regard to the former tariff commission when the Minister of Finance in the late Government was approached by representatives of the manufacturing interests, he would put to them such questions as these: "Yes, if we increase the duty as you desire, that will mean that it will be a little more difficult for outside competitors to compete?" Yes, that was conceded. But never once did he ask them: "Where will you get the revenue?" I would like to consider this question from the standpoint of revenue; we have been considering it long enough from the standpoint of protection, and I am one who believes very thoroughly in the idea that it is possible to reduce our tariffs and at the same time to increase our revenue. As regards this matter of woollens, I say avowedly, that we would like to encourage importation; and if our tariff is going to have the effect we would like it to have, that of producing a revenue that will help us to solve the financial problems of our country, I believe we could reduce not only this item but many other items to the advantage of the revenue. I am afraid, however, we are always going to be in this trouble so long as we insist on tangling up our taxation problems with our "encouragement-of-industry" problems.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: I am afraid I have to say one or two things in connection with this woollen matter. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Brown) made some reference to what I said the other night, and I have been looking up the figures in connection with the matter.

Some hon. MEMBERS: Louder.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: Hon. gentlemen can hear me very easily if they want to. It was pointed out that the price which the farmer got for his wool was entirely out of proportion to what he had to pay for blankets. I told hon. gentlemen the reason why that was so, and I am going to give them a little more information upon the same subject. An analysis of the wool industry of 1920 discloses that our local plants manufactured $41,000,000 worth of finished goods—I am merely giving the round numbers—and that the cost of materials to them was $22,000,000. I think the price the farmer is now getting for wool is 17 cents; of course that seems to be ridiculous, but if you turn to the last page of the analysis as made by the Bureau of Statistics, you will see the reason at once. We imported $15,667,000 worth of wool into this country. I think I told the House the other night that this anomaly had occurred to me in connection with the tariff investigation that my hon. friends are laughing about and imagining questions in connection with, and I took it up. As a result, one company has been incorporated which, I hope, will give the farmer a proper market for his wool. I just refer to that for the purpose of showing my friends, who apparently did not believe me the other night, how absolutely true my statement in regard to the situation is. I read from the prospectus:

> Dominion Combing Mills, Limited, will fill the missing link in the worsted end of the textile industry in Canada, that of combing the wool.

That is the one end the farmer is interested in.

> There is no mill combing for the trade in Canada. Dominion Combing Mills, Limited, has been organized to develop the rapidly increasing wool growing industry in Canada. Statistics published by the Department of Trade and Commerce show that all but a very small percentage of the wool grown in Canada is exported in order to be combed into tops for the spinners. At present there is not a wool combing plant in Canada combing for the trade.

And so on. There is a gentleman who lives in Bradford who has very much the same position in the newspaper world in connection with the great Bradford industry, which is combing wool and the manufacture of worsted tops and noils, that Miss Hind has, for example, in connection with the Winnipeg Free Press and the grain business. He is referring to the fact that Canada is now going into this business and is going to have a plant. He says:

> There should be a most useful field for top-making in Canada, and this is the beginning of an industry which should lead to a big development of the textile trade in the not distant future.

For the benefit of my hon. friends who cannot understand this tremendously wide spread in cost, I am going to read what he says about the advanced prices in the tops that our manufacturers have to buy and what has happened to costs in free-trade England. He says:

> Apart from the question of tariffs, the cost of combing in Canada will have to be taken into serious consideration, otherwise Bradford houses will still be able to export big weights of tops and undersell the Canadian combed article. The combing tariff in operation here in Bradford to-day is very high; in fact, some think it is a crying scandal, for whereas a tear of 5 top to 1 of noil—

The noil is the short; the top is the proper worsted top.

> —in pre-war days cost 4½ cents per lb., to-day's charges are 12½ cents per lb., and although the top-making section of the British Wool Federation have approached the master wool combers about reducing their charges, they frankly say that they have no need to do so because they have at least six months' work in hand with top-makers everywhere clamouring to get the wool through the combs. However, apart from financial considerations, we think that before long Bradford commission combers will have to face their moral obligations, and make a slight reduction.

That affords the reason why we have this spectacle which we have to-day in Canada, of cheap wool and expensive manufactured products.

Mr. LEWIS: I am not all interested in this item as regards revenue. There is a more important consideration in regard to blankets than getting a revenue, so far that reason I am not altogether in favour of what my hon. friend (Mr. Brethen) said, that it would be a good plan to put an excise tax upon blankets, because that will not make it any easier to the consumer, and I believe blankets in this country of extreme climates are an absolute necessity for the family. I might give the committee one or two vivid experiences in order to bring the matter home to them. This is a matter upon which I do not wish to speak; but when the case is one of the poor getting blankets, I think it is time somebody spoke about it. In 1918, I had the opportunity and privilege of looking after many families during the 'flu epidemic, and I want to tell the committee that I came across family

after family where there were two, three and four children in bed with no blankets at all upon them, simply a few old coats thrown over them, because the blankets which they needed were too high in price and too highly protected for those poor families to buy them. I could cite instance after instance in the hundred families that I visited during that time, where the poor people had no blankets at all to cover them. So, for that reason, I am not in favour of placing an excise tax upon this as well as a tariff, simply because it brings no benefit to the individual family, and since in Canada our extreme climate demands that we shall have blankets to cover the children, to guard them against cold and disease. I, therefore, want to second an amendment that will be moved by the hon. member for Battle River (Mr. Spencer) that as far as the British tariff is concerned, it shall be reduced to 15 per cent.

Mr. SPENCER: I spoke on this matter some nights ago and I do not intend to take up the time of the House to-day following up the remarks I made then. I said that blankets were an absolute necessity and should be made available to the people at the very lowest possible prices. In accordance with that statement I beg to move, seconded by the hon. member for Swift Current (Mr. Lewis), that the British preferential tariff on blankets be reduced to 15 per cent.

Mr. FORKE: I endorse the sentiments expressed by hon. gentlemen who have already spoken. The two commodities which should be made as cheap as possible in this country are coal and warm clothing. The coldness of our climate is one of the drawbacks in this splendid country, and no obstacle should be put in the way of the people in meeting the difficulties that are encountered by reason of climatic conditions. I might say a word in regard to what the hon. member for West York (Sir Henry Drayton) has stated. I cannot see why we should have high duties on blankets when we have no mills in this country that can take over our wool and weave it into cloth. That, I think, should be a forceful argument for lowering these duties. I know something about the woollen industry and the production of wool, and possibly it might interest the House for me to tell them that last year, getting my sheep shorn I did not receive enough money from the wool to pay the shearer and the freight on the wool, and if there were any method of taking the wool off the sheep without the expense that is now attached to that unprofitable process I should be glad to try it and let the wool go. That, at any rate, is the way the people who raise sheep feel about this matter. I appreciate what my hon. friend has said in connection with the combing of wool, and I hope we shall get some industry started here that will prepare our wool, since the duty has gone up under the Fordney tariff and we have nowhere to dispose of our product, if something is not done in the immediate future we shall have no market at all. But I cannot see how hon. gentlemen can find in this any argument in favour of a protective tariff on woollen goods. I honestly believe that if the minister took the matter into consideration and made due allowance for all the circumstances he would accept the amendment. As the hon. member for Swift Current (Mr. Lewis) has said, poor families in this country are unable to buy warm clothing, and we should be very careful how we put on protective tariffs.

Mr. FIELDING: There is already a very substantial reduction in the duty on blankets of the class most generally used. When hon. members talk about the severity of the climate, especially as it bears upon the poor people, it is only natural that they should want such commodities as blankets to be made as cheap as possible. But I would point out that we have already made a reduction of 7½ per cent as respects the largest class of blankets. There is a pure wool blanket that is not widely used, because pure wool goods are scarce. There is also a class of blankets, chiefly cotton. The third class is designated "not otherwise provided", or, in the language of the tariff, "n.o.p." That is the class that is most largely used. It is commonly spoken of as a woollen blanket, although it is not all wool; and that class has been reduced by 7½ per cent. That is a big reduction, and my hon. friends should realise that we are not unmindful of what has been said regarding the severity of the climate and the necessity for blankets at a fair price.

Mr. GOOD: Notwithstanding the fact that the duty on this particular line has been reduced 7½ per cent, the duty still remains at 22 per cent, and it strikes me that the Government is more solicitous for the manufacturers of blankets than they

are for the poor shivering people who want blankets. The amendment should carry.

Mr. FIELDING: I am very apt sometimes to see things from the point of view of my hon. friend, but I do not think the farmer would have a better market for his wool if the factories that we have got were closed down. In what has been done there has been a desire to be fair to the consumer without destroying the manufacturer.

Mr. SUTHERLAND: The remarks of the hon. member for Brandon (Mr. Forke) are important. You cannot leave the wool on your sheep in the hot weather, or the animal will die. You simply have to take it off. And if, as the hon. member states, the expense of shearing the sheep amounts to more than the value of the wool, and in view of the statement of the ex-Minister of Finance (Sir Henry Drayton) that we have not a combing factory in Canada to handle Canadian wools, there is certainly something wrong somewhere. I thought I heard the Minister of Finance make some reference to the closing of factories. My information is that there is not a factory in the Dominion for the combing of Canadian wool. The hon. member for West York (Sir Henry Drayton) pointed out that negotiations are on foot for the erection of a factory. Could the minister inform the House what duty there is at present on wools imported into Canada of a similar quality to our Canadian wools, and what quantities of such wools were imported during the past year? The member for West York quoted figures showing that worsted to the value of $15,000,000 was imported into Canada. That, I take it, would be wool such as is grown in Australia.

Mr. FIELDING: The importations of the class of wools to which my hon. friend refers are not very large.

Amendment (Mr. Spencer) negatived on division: Yeas 46, Nays 117.

Item agreed to.

Customs tariff—Fabrics, manufactures, wearing apparel and ready made clothing composed wholly or in part of wool, worsted, the hair of the goat, or other like animal, n.o.p.; cloths, doeskins, cassimeres, tweeds, coatings, overcoatings and felt cloth, n.o.p.: British Preferential tariff, 27½ per cent; Intermediate tariff, 35 per cent; General tariff, 17½ per cent.

Mr. JELLIFF: In this item, which relates to the clothing of the common people, I think a more substantial reduction should be made than is indicated. If there ever was a time in the history of Canada when the duty on the clothing of the common people should be reduced it is now. It is only about a month ago that our attention was called to a serious coal strike in Nova Scotia; in Alberta we have another serious coal strike on our hands; all over the western prairies there has been difficulty during the last winter in obtaining sufficient clothing to keep our people warm and their children comfortably clad to attend school. This Government itself has been called upon to disburse tens of thousands of dollars to assist in relief work on the western prairies during the past winter, and the provinces themselves have voted hundreds of thousands of dollars for the same purpose. In the face of these circumstances can we stand silent and fail in our duty to these people by not placing in their hands the ordinary clothing requirements of life at the cheapest possible price? I would not be doing my duty if I did not protest with the utmost vehemence against this schedule. I do not think that gentlemen opposite, for whom I have the utmost sympathy, are doing their duty under their own declarations in maintaining this schedule. I have in my hand the "Message from Liberalism" of August, 1919. I think I first read a similar treatise on the principles dealt with in this pamphlet in a book that was gotten out by the Canadian Council of Agriculture in 1916. After the Liberal convention of 1919 I read it again in this pamphlet. Cannot we do something for the poor people of this country in carrying out this "Message from Liberalism"? Let me quote one passage:

> That a revision downward of the tariff should be made whereby substantial reductions should be effected in the duties on wearing apparel and footwear, and on other articles of general consumption (other than luxuries), as well as on the raw material entering into the manufacture of the same.

Now, Sir, I am very deeply in earnest in this matter, because I know that all through the towns and cities of Alberta last winter relief clubs and societies were collecting cast-off clothing, renovating it and distributing it among the poor people so that they and their children could have some protection against the intense cold. I do not want to interfere with the collection of revenue by my hon. friend the Minister of Finance. I have known him for only a short time, but after the two or three occasions it has been my pleasure to meet him I have come to love him. When I first came into his presence I thought: Here is the kind of man to whom

I should like to say, "Well, I want to go home and spend a couple of weeks with you." I really think it is the duty of this Parliament, which duty I hope will be implemented by the Finance Minister himself, to make a further cut in the tariff on the articles covered by this item so that the clothing necessary to meet the absolute requirements of our people can be brought to them cheaper than at present. I am sure it will not hurt the manufacturing interests of this country if such a reduction is made.

I do not want a single member to leave this House with the impression that the farmers represented on this side of the Chamber have aught against our manufacturing interests. I want to see them succeed just as much as I want to see the men on the farms succeed. Farmer and manufacturer must go hand in hand together if this country is to be as prosperous as we want it to be. I do not think that our manufacturers are looking upon our farmers in the right light. They must look to us for a market. You talk to us farmers about the "home market". Well, we appreciate the home market, but the fact of the matter is that the farmers of the prairies have not a home market for their products. I wish they had. I wish we had that country filled up with manufacturing towns which would consume our agricultural produce. I have always wished that we had plenty of mills out there The hon. member for Marquette (Mr. Crerar) said a few nights ago that he did not think the West was adapted for manufacturing. I disagree with him on that point; I believe that the western country is the greatest place within the Dominion of Canada for the carrying on of manufacturing. Think of the millions of tons of coal that are stored up in the hills of Alberta, a source of wealth that has scarcely been touched. Think of the power available for all kinds of manufactures; think of our other natural resources. In the district which I represent we are shipping out 1,750,000 pounds of wool every year. Alberta's wool production has trebled and quadrupled. There should be woollen mills out there manufacturing that raw material; we should not have to bale it up and send it to Boston to be put in such shape that it can be used, with resulting extra cost. Every additional set of hands it passes through adds to the price, and the wool required for the manufacture of a suit of clothes is multiplied ten, fifteen or twenty times in value by the time we obtain the suit. I do think that the relationship between the manufacturer and the farmer is misunderstood: Think of the city of Chicago, for instance; there you get a very good example of the relationship between the manufacturer and the farmer. Chicago in 1830 was a little town of one hundred souls; since that time it has become a city of two and three-quarter millions. Why? Because it is located on the edge of the great American wheat and corn belt, where it has the advantage of all the great stock-raising industries of central United States. The result has been that in ministering to the wants of the farmers of western United States the manufacturers of Chicago have grown until their annual output is six billions of dollars—far more than we put out in this country altogether. We must not forget these things. We farmers owe a lot to the manufacturers; the manufacturers owe a lot to us for the market they enjoy in Canada to-day. I should like to see them show their appreciation of it in respect to this one itme at least, by allowing the people of the West, the women and children of the West, to get these manufactured wool products at prices which will enable them to provide for their needs.

[Mr. Jelliff.]

Item agreed to.

Customs tariff—Boots and shoes, pegged or wire fastened, with unstitched soles close edged, British Preferential tariff, 15 per cent; Intermediate tariff, 22½ per cent; General tariff, 25 per cent.

Mr. SHAW: I regret that the Finance Minister has not seen fit to grant a further reduction in the customs duty on this very important article, which is a necessity for every one, rich or poor. It seems to me that the conditions in respect to the boot and shoe industry should afford cause for reflection on the part of members of this Parliament, especially in view of evidence which was produced before the tariff commission of which the ex-Finance Minister (Sir Henry Drayton) was chairman. It is a rather interesting fact that, in the year 1900 for every dollar invested in the boot and shoe business there was produced or earned $1.68, whereas in 1918, the last year for which I have any figures, for every dollar of capital invested in the business, only $1.40 was produced. There are, perhaps, several explanations for that. It is due either to manufacturing efficiency having decreased, or to labour efficiency having decreased; or perhaps there is some other reason. I do not want to have to

deal with the first point, but as to the second—whether or not the efficiency of labour decreased in that period—I should like to point out that in 1900, according to figures given in the Year

5. p.m. Book, each workman produced goods worth $1,345, and in 1918 each workman produced goods of the value of $3,297. This is not entirely explained by the increase in the values of the articles, because according to the figures I think there has been an increase in values of something like 118 per cent. But, to my mind there is a very cogent reason, and it is the watering of stock which has taken place in connection with this particular industry. I want to quote one illustration to indicate the truth of what I say. I take it from Hansard of 1921, page 3484, in which the hon. member for Marquette (Mr. Crerar) directed the attention of the House to certain facts which, so far as the records show, were not disputed. He said:

> Take the boot and shoe business—an article of vital necessity to the whole Canadian people, because even if we were disposed to do so, the rigours of our climate would not permit us to go barefooted or lightly shod. We find that in 1911 there was a merger of shoe manufacturing concerns in Canada. In that year the Ames-Holden-McCready Company, Limited, was formed, absorbing Ames-Holden, Limited, and the James McCready Company, Limited. The capital issues of these two concerns—capital stock and bonds—amounted to $3,500,000. That was their actual worth as disclosed by their bonds and capital stock. What was that turned into? $3,500,000 of common stock, $2,500,000 of preferred stock, and $1,000,000 of bonds, or a total issue of $7,000,000. One cannot speak with definite knowledge because one has not access to the records of this company, but I believe that I am not beyond the mark when I make the statement that practically every dollar of that common stock was watered.

If this tremendous amount of watered stock must earn dividends, then of course we have some explanation.

Mr. CHAPLIN: Is the hon. gentleman aware that the company referred to has not earned any dividends? Does he know anything about the state of the company to-day?

Mr. SHAW: Oh, I thank the hon. gentleman for his gratuitous information; I am speaking of the period up to the year 1918. I have no doubt it will be urged by my questioner that protection is something that not only gives employment to men but also increases their wages. It is a peculiar fact that if you compare the figures for the period I have mentioned—or you may go further back if you like—you will find that there has been no increase in the number of establishments engaged in the boot and shoe industry. On the contrary, there has been an actual decrease, and there has been a substantial decrease also in the number of men employed. I want to draw the committee's attention to one further matter and it is this: If you examine the wages paid to working men in that industry you will find that although the product has increased in price on the average by something like 17 per cent per year during the last six years, during the same period there has only been an average yearly increase in wages paid of something like 7 per cent; and, as a matter of fact, if you consider the matter on the basis of the ability of the labouring man to buy the product which he has manufactured, you will find that it has decreased from 25.13 per cent in 1900 to something slightly over 20 per cent in 1918.

Mr. STEVENS: Is my hon. friend basing his figures upon the boot and shoe industry upon the speech of my hon. friend from Marquette (Mr. Crerar) in 1921?

Mr. SHAW: No, I am not. I am basing my argument on figures that were produced before the tariff commission of which the ex-Minister of Finance (Sir Henry Drayton) was the Chairman.

An hon. MEMBER: In 1918?

Mr. SHAW: No, 1920. There is also another very interesting fact in connection with this industry and that is, that in the year 1918 it was able to ship to the United Kingdom and compete with the boot and shoe industry there goods to the extent of over half a million of dollars—to be accurate $534,000, and to the United States—where they have, I believe, a free market—goods amounting to about $347,000. If the boot and shoe industry can compete in the foreign market why should this continuous protection be accorded them? For they are thereby enabled to exploit the Canadian consumer to substantially the amount of the tariff. Therefore, Mr. Chairman, with due deference—

Mr. WHITE: The hon. member gave the amount of exports from Canada to the United States and Great Britain. Can he state the volume of imports from Britain and the United States to Canada?

Mr. SHAW: I regret that I cannot give that information. I can only say, that, speaking from memory, the imports from the United States that year amounted to something like $2,000,000.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: That is about right.

Mr. SHAW: With due deference to the request of the Minister of Finance (Mr. Fielding), I think that, in view of the fact that these articles form a vital necessity for every person in Canada, there should be a further reduction beyond the amount indicated in the item before us. I would therefore move, Mr. Chairman:

That item 611 be amended by reducing the duty under the British Preferentia tariff to 10 per cent; the duty under the intermediate tariff, to 15 per cent; and the duty under the General tariff to 20 per cent.

Mr. FIELDING: If there had never been a duty—call it, if you like, a high duty—upon these articles I could find it easier to agree with my hon. friend from West Calgary (Mr. Shaw); but there have been duties on these goods for a long time, and under these duties business has been established, employment has been given—many things have happened which prevent our having absolute freedom of action in this case. We approached the consideration of all these questions from this viewpoint: Can we make reductions on these articles, giving some degree of relief to the consumer, without endangering the manufacturing interests? Whether or not we are pleased with the idea of having these large manufacturing industries in Canada, the fact remains that they are here and that they have an important relation to every community in which they are found. If, by any hasty action, we should make trouble in that industry and close up the fcatories—even though it may be only a question of scare, even though perhaps they do not really suffer; if the manufacturers get it into their heads that by these changes we are creating serious diculties for them—we would certainly be adding to the troubles of the community in a way that hon. members do not desire. Now, what we have done in this matter is to make a small reduction in the duty under the British Preferential tariff. We do not at present import any very great quantities of these goods from Great Britain, but I believe that under this change we will increase our imports from the United Kingdom. For reasons which have been given in connection with other matters, we have not deemed it desirable to reduce the duty on the goods coming from the United States. A few years ago American shoes were very much in evidence all over England, and "The American Shoe Store" was a common sign. The last time I had the privilege of being in London, which was not very recently, I did not meet the sign of "The American Shoe Store" very often, and I made inquiry as to the reason for that. I found that while John Bull is sometimes slow to grasp an idea, yet when he once gets a grip upon it he holds. I was advised that the British manufacturers had sent out their experts to the United States. They had studied American methods and had adopted American ideas in the matter of patterns and styles; and the result is that to-day the British manufacturer is holding and controlling his trade, and very few American shoes, as compared with former years, are imported into Great Britain. I believe that under this small reduction there will be a considerable increase in our imports from Great Britain. In that way a measure of relief will be given to the consumer, and I think that a larger measure of relief—while well intended, I am sure, by my hon. friend—would put in peril the manufacturing industries, and I am sure that on reflection none of us would wish to do that.

Mr. IRVINE: In figuring how large a tariff was necessary to protect the shoe industry of Canada, did the Minister of Finance consider the amount of watered stock as stated by the hon. member for West Calgary, or did he not allow for that?

Mr. FIELDING: It may not be possible to answer my hon. friend but if it has any bearing let me mention this fact,—it is not conclusive, but the fact is—that the shoe industry in Canada to-day is rather depressed, several of the largest shoe factories in Canada are financially embarrassed and some of them have suspended altogether. It may be that in times past much money was made—I hope it was—but the fact is to-day that the shoe manufacturing industry is not a prosperous industry, and I do not think there is much money being made in it.

Amendment (Mr. Shaw) negatived.

The CHAIRMAN: Shall item 611 and item 611a, which is related to it, carry?

Mr. GOOD: Before this item carries I want to ask the Minister of Finance if he said the other day in his budget speech that when these items came into committee the Government would be prepared to consider suggestions as to amendments in the direction which we desire? Now, many of us in this part of the Chamber are very

anxious, and very sincere, I think, in our anxiety, to have relief given in certain directions, and so far there has not been one single proposal in that line which has not been voted down. I would therefore like to ask the minister if the Government is prepared to make any concession in the direction of tariff relief along the lines of their platform and our own?

Mr. FIELDING: Of course, every item in the budget is subject to consideration. It is true that I stated that the Government would be prepared to consider the matter in committee, and we have been considering it. In each case when a motion has been made we have endeavoured to give good reasons why it was not expedient to adopt it. My hon. friend is not bound to accept these reasons, but I hope he does not think that any discourtesy is intended to any hon. gentleman here. We have considered these things and we have come to the conclusion that it was not wise to make reductions and whether they are good or bad, we have given reasons therefor.

Mr. COOTE: Has there been any reduction made under this item?

Mr. FIELDING: Yes, the present rate on the British Preference in Canada is 20 and it is reduced to 17½. The Intermediate and General tariffs remain the same.

Mr. COOTE: Do felt boots come under this item?

Mr. FIELDING: Yes, they come under the item now in question.

Mr. HALBERT: Does the minister think, when there is no protection on leather, that there should be a protection of 30 per cent on insoles required by the manufacturer?

Mr. FIELDING: I am afraid I cannot answer that.

Mr. COOTE: So far as the felt shoe industry in Canada is concerned, I simply wish to state that I think it needs a little protection. In December 1919 I was in a retail store when the salesman for a felt shoe manufacturing concern endeavoured to sell some shoes to the retailer. That was in the beginning of the winter, when the retailer's trade in felt shoes had only started—the salesman was soliciting orders for delivery a year later. The retailer protested that he could not intelligently order his felt shoes for the following winter at that time. He said his trade had only started. It might be a mild winter, and he might not need any felt shoes, and the traveller said if he did not order his felt shoes in December he could not get any felt shoes any time that year for trade the following winter. After the salesman had gone out, the retailer told me that was the third salesman who told him the very same thing that month—that he must order his felt shoes one year ahead, and before he had any idea of how many felt shoes he would sell that winter. When our felt shoe manufacturers can dictate to the retailer to that extent, I think it is time they were subjected to a little more competition and that some of the protective tariff should be removed.

Item agreed to.

INLAND REVENUE

1. Resolved, That it is expedient to amend The Inland Revenue Act, as amended by chapter six of the Statutes of 1914, and chapter twenty-eight of the Statutes of 1918 by repealing subsections (e), (f), (g) and (h) of section two hundred and seventy-nine thereof and substituting therefor the following:—

279 (e) On cigars of all descriptions, made from raw leaf tobacco, three dollars per thousand;

(f) On all cigars when put up in packages containing less than ten cigars each, four dollars per thousand;

(g) On cigarettes made from raw leaf tobacco or any substitute therefor, weighing not more than three pounds per thousand, seven dollars and fifty cents per thousand;

(h) On cigarettes made from raw leaf tobacco or any substitute therefor, weighing more than three pounds per thousand, twelve dollars and fifty cents per thousand;

Mr. FIELDING: This resolution was explained before in relation to the cigarette duty. I explained we had made a change in the excise duty on cigars, and this was changed to correspond with it. The net result is that the duty is increased on the more expensive cigar; the duty on the medium cigar remains about where it was; and the duty on the cheaper cigar is reduced. That, in short, is the whole story of the duty on cigars.

Mr. LEWIS: I brought this matter up on the debate on the budget, and I still think there is a great discrimination between the cigarette and the cigar. I can fully appreciate the value of taxing the cigarette, because it has been said in a great many ways, and in a great many places, that cigarette smoking is detrimental to the youth of Canada. That may be, but I do not believe that by putting the tax on cigarettes you can eliminate it altogether. There are ways and means of

getting around it, and if the boys cannot smoke a cigarette which is already made for them, they will simply roll them themselves and avoid paying the duty. If it is the intention of the hon. minister to eradicate the cigarette entirely by placing an almost prohibitive tax on it, I think the best method is to start in the public schools and teach the boys the danger of smoking. I am quite willing to allow the duty of $7.50 per thousand to remain, but I do think there is a great discrimination between the cigar and the cigarette. You have to pay a 1-cent tax on the cigar that cost 20 cents. That makes a total of 21 cents; whereas on the other hand you place 7½ cents on a 10-cent package of cigarettes, and in some cases 12½ cents. It seems to me that is hardly fair. We are talking of raising a revenue, and this is one place where the revenue should be raised. We place an almost prohibitive tax on woollen blankets, and also on boots and shoes, which are almost a necessity to our people, but when it comes down to cigars, which are an absolute luxury, we simply put on an inland revenue tax of 5 per cent. You put 22½ per cent on blankets and 15, 25, and 30 per cent on boots and shoes, but when it comes to a luxury in the shape of a 20-cent cigar you place a tax of 1 cent upon it, which, I say, is not adequate. If we want to raise a revenue, let us place the same tax upon the cigar as we are placing upon the cigarette, and I think I could support it.

Mr. JACOBS: There seems to be no relation at all between the excise on cigars and the excise on cigarettes, under the resolution. As I understand it, the excise on cigarettes now amounts to about 1 cent per cigarette. That seems to me to make it almost prohibitive to smoke cigarettes, when they are sold in packages, as is the practice now. I am quite in favour of putting on the traffic as much as it can bear, particularly as I am not a cigarette smoker myself, but it seems to me that we reach a point where we practically make the traffic prohibitive. Those who smoke cigarettes will tell you that, after two or three puffs, it is thrown away, whereas a person can smoke a cigar for half an hour and sometimes for an hour.

Mr. GRAHAM: It depends on the cigar.

Mr. JACOBS: Yes, that is quite true. I fear, if we impose this very heavy excise on cigarettes, it will drive people into what is known as "rolling their own." For 15 cents, I am advised, you can buy a little package of tobacco and rice paper out of which you can make forty cigarettes. That being the case, it seems to me that instead of increasing our revenue on cigarettes, we shall simply decrease it. I am intimating to the Minister of Finance (Mr. Fielding) what, I think, will happen; I am not here to propose any amendment by way of reduction or anything of that kind. I want to point out that we have passed the margin of safety and reached the danger zone when we tax this article practically out of existence.

Mr. FIELDING: Every country taxes tobacco in its various forms rather more heavily than other things, and particularly are cigarettes taxed. We proposed to get a considerable revenue by increasing the duty per thousand from $6 to $9, and then upon representations that we were likely to lose revenue, we compromised and made the tax $7.50. As regards rolling cigarettes, I think that will happen for the first week; but after a very short time, people will get tired of rolling cigarettes; they will go back to the merchant at the corner shop and buy the cigarettes, and we shall get the duty. I hope my hon. friend is wrong about the duty, because I am anxious about that. We shall, however, see how the year goes on; and if the revenue is reduced, my hon. friend will have a strong case next year.

Mr. JACOBS: At present, there is brought into the coffers of this country between $20,000,000 and $25,000,000 a year from cigarettes alone, and we cannot endanger the receipt of such an enormous sum by over taxation. If you compare the excise on cigarettes in Canada with that in the United States, I think you will find that cigarettes in the United States are about half the price they are in Canada. A situation may arise whereby we may be boot-legging cigarettes into Canada and exchanging our liquor for cigarettes. This tax would make such a business quite attractive. As I say, the amount which the Government receives from this excise duty is so large and lucrative that I would warn the Government to be careful and to go slow in this matter, because, after all, a person is as much entitled to smoke a cigarette as he is to smoke a cigar. Why tax the cigar an ordinary sum and make the cigarette pay practically four or five times what you have to pay for the cigar in the matter of excise?

Mr. RYCKMAN: I am not specially interested in the consumption of cigarettes; but some manufacturers and dealers in cigarettes have made representations to me. They have told me that when the resolution was in the form in which the Minister of Finance (Mr. Fielding) first brought it out, there was at least a two-third reduction in the sale, and they say that there will be as least a one-third reduction in the consumption of cigarettes during the coming year. I know how necessary it is to raise revenue, and I am not asking for the alleviation of any tax; but one year hence, judging from the information which I have received, I think we will find that, by reason of this heavy impost, we have collected less revenue in 1922-23 than we got last year. I really think the matter is of such importance that if the Minister of Finance has advisers, men whom he would care to consult on a matter of this kind, the opinion of these men should be sought. I hesitate to press the matter; but it is because, from information which I have received, so much hangs upon it, that I have had to say what I have said, and I wish to go on record in this regard.

Mr. FIELDING: We had representations from gentlemen interested in the matter; those representations impressed us to some degree, and we made a reduction accordingly. It is quite possible that my hon. friend is right, but I hope he is not. If, however, we live to see next year, and if we find that his judgment and prediction are right, we shall be obliged, for the sake of the revenue, to make the reduction. I am quite aware that this is a debatable question. I hope it is going to turn out more favourably to the revenue than the hon. member suggests.

Mr. FORKE: In all humility, I should like to ask the Minister of Finance: Would it be a calamity if the consumption of cigarettes were to fall off?

Mr. JACOBS: It would be a calamity to the revenue of the country.

Mr. FIELDING: Representations have been made to us that what we ought to do is to make the duty even higher. There may be a great moral issue in the matter, but we have not got down to that to-day.

Resolution agreed to.

2. Resolved, That it is expedient to amend The Inland Revenue Act by striking out of the said Act section three hundred and twenty-eight A, as enacted by chapter twenty-eight of the Statutes of 1918, and by striking out of said Act section three hundred and twenty-eight B, as enacted by chapter fifty-two of the Statutes of 1920.

Mr. FIELDING: This resolution abolishes the duty on Canadian raw leaf tobacco.

Resolution agreed to.

4. Resolved, That it is expedient to amend The Inland Revenue Act as amended by chapter six of the Statutes of 1914 and chapter thirty-four of the Statutes of 1921, and to provide:—

That when any druggist is licensed by the Minister of Customs and Excise to prepare prescriptions for medicines and pharmaceutical preparations in the manufacture or preparation of which spirits are used, where such spirits are purchased for such purposes by a druggist so licensed the following duties of excise shall be imposed, levied and collected, that is to say:—

On spirits testing not less than fifty per centum over proof in such limited quantities as may be prescribed by the Minister of Customs and Excise—

(a) When the material used in the manufacture thereof consists of not less than ninety per centum, by weight, of raw or unmalted grain, or when manufactured from sugar, syrup, molasses or other saccharine matter not otherwise provided for, on every gallon of the strength of proof by Sykes' hydromter, two dollars and forty cents and so in proportion for any greater strength than the strength of proof, and for any less quantity than a gallon;

(b) When manufactured exclusively from malted barley, taken to the distillery in bond and on which no duty of customs or excise has been paid, or when manufactured from raw or unmalted grain, used in combination, in such proportions as the Department prescribes, with malted barley, taken to the distillery in bond and on which no duty of customs or of excise has been paid, on every gallon of the strength of proof by Sykes' hydrometer, two dollars and forty-two cents, and so in proportion for any greater strength than the strength of proof and for any less quantity than a gallon;

(c) When manufactured exclusively from molasses, syrup, sugar or other saccharine matter, taken to the distillery in bond and on which no duty of customs has been paid, on every gallon of the strength of proof by Sykes' hydrometer, two dollars and forty-three cents, and so in proportion for any greater strength than the strength of proof and for any less quantity than a gallon.

(d) Where such spirits are purchased from a Government vendor or other person lawfully authorized to sell the same and where the duties imposed by law have been paid thereon, the said druggist may be entitled to a drawback of all such duty in excess of the rates of duties set forth in this resolution.

Mr. FIELDING: There are quite a number of paragraphs in this resolution which all relate to the one subject. This is an effort to extend the privileges of alcohol at a moderate rate of duty to the druggists of the country. This requires certain regulations, certain stipulations to be made and certain bonds to be given. This covers all the machinery which, our officials ad-

vise us, will protect the revenue while giving the druggists this privilege, and preventing abuse.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: When we had this question up before, there were other matters which were also to be covered and which we were desirous of covering. Is the country doctor not just as much interested in this question? He puts up his own prescriptions. There is also the question of pure alcohol for rubbing for home treatment. Pure alcohol is required just as much for home treatment as for hospital treatment. Why should the country doctor not get the same privileges as the druggists?

Mr. FIELDING: I must confess that it was the druggists who made application and who presented the matter to us in various forms. I do not want to be too positive, but I do not think the country doctors made any representations at all. That, of course, is not a conclusive reason why they should not be included. This question may be well worthy of consideration at the next session; but it was not pressed upon us in the same manner as the question in regard to the druggists was.

Mr. HANSON: Would there be any objection to the minister including duly qualified and regularly registered physicians with druggists in this resolution? The matter is an important one, and I know that in the constituency which I represent, there are many qualified physicians who live a long way from a drug store and who make up their own prescriptions. I suppose the charges are passed on to their clientelle, but I think they might very well be included. They are a very reputable class of the community, quite on a par with the druggists and quite as much to be trusted.

Mr. FIELDING: I think quite a number of country doctors are conducting drug stores at the same time, although this practice is not extensive; and if they receive a license from the minister, they could be supplied in that way. Any privilege, however, of that character must be surrounded by regulations to guard against abuse, and I would not like to make a change in the matter at the present time. While the matter is deserving of consideration, we would have to make regulations accordingly.

Resolution agreed to.

[Mr. Fielding.]

7. Resolved, That it is expedient to amend The Inland Revenue Act, chapter fifty-one of the Revised Statutes, 1906, as amended by chapter six of the Statutes of 1914, and chapter thirty-four of the Statutes of 1921, by adding the following:—

There shall be imposed, levied and collected on all sugar produced in Canada from sugar beets, the following duties of excise:—

Sugar, sugar drainings, melado, sugar concrete and molasses testing over fifty-six degrees and not exceeding seventy-five degrees of polarization, per one hundred pounds, 12 cents.

And for each additional degree over seventy-five degrees, per hundred pounds ½ cent.

Provided that fractions of five-tenths of a degree or less shall not be subject to the duty and that fractions of more than five-tenths shall be subject to the duty as a degree. Provided that such duty of excise shall not be payable when such sugar is exported.

Mr. FIELDING: I propose that this provision shall come into effect on the 1st of January, 1923.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: I would suggest if that course is taken, that instead of definitely fixing that date the minister should provide that the clause shall come into effect on the passing of an Order in Council after that date.

Mr. FIELDING: No.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: I make this proposal for certain urgent reasons. As things stand now the sugar beet industry is depressed to quite an alarming extent. We are growing to-day less than 50 per cent of the sugar beets we grew last year, and having worked the business up to a total of something over $5,000,000 we are falling off rapidly. The tax, even as reduced, if put on amounts to 52.8 cents on every ton of sugar beets grown, and I do not think the industry can stand it. Why is it that this industry, of all things, is picked out? I do not speak at all for my hon. friend's platform; I do not profess to be able to say anything about it. But there is no question that the Farmers' platform, if it stands for anything, stands for the production of the natural resources of the country. And surely sugar beet is a natural resource. I could take a long time in speaking on this question, but if my hon. friend would simply say that this clause is not to come into effect until the passing of an Order in Council I would not ask anything more.

Mr. FIELDING: That would only create an additional embarrassment. The situation must be viewed from the standpoint of the tariff. We must have regard to the degree of protection this industry

enjoys; and it so happens that it has had an exceptional degree of protection. When the sugar beet industry was established in the days when I first had the honour to hold the position of Minister of Finance, the highest duty there was on refined sugar was $1.24 per hundred pounds. That was all protection for the sugar beet industry, which has no duty to pay on raw material; and under that protection the industry was built up and flourished. From time to time additional duties have been imposed on refined sugar, by reason of the necessities of war and one thing and another, until the rate is to-day $2.39 per hundred pounds. Every cent of that beyond the original duty of $1.24 is so much additional protection to the sugar beet industry, because the industry does not pay a penny into the treasury on importations of raw material. In the case of refined sugar made from sugar cane it was thought years ago that a duty of half a cent per pound over the raw sugar was sufficient to cover the cost of manufacture and protection, if you like. From time to time substantial increases were made, and to-day the cane sugar industry injoys a large measure of protection—from fifty to eighty cents per hundred pounds, I believe—in the difference between what is paid on the raw material and the duty on the refined sugar. The earlier duty of $1.24 on refined sugar, which was protection for the beet industry, is now $2.39, and we thought it not unreasonable that out of that large increase of protection this small tax might be paid. There is no need for any alarm. Considering the favoured position of that industry the small duty we are asking is a very reasonable one.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: The situation is not quite what my hon. friend has stated it to be. There is a great difference between the sugar beet industry and the production of sugar from cane. In the first place, it takes 9.9 tons of sugar beets of good saccharine quality to produce a ton of beet sugar; and in the second place, the whole process of manufacture must be carried out in this country. There is absolutely no comparison between the cost of producing beet sugar in Canada and the cost of producing refined cane sugar here. In the production of beet sugar we have a twofold activity. There is the extraction of the saccharine matter, and in connection with the refined cane sugar industry in Canada that process is all done outside of this country. The raw cane sugar is imported. Whatever my hon. friend may think about the tremendous profits that have been made out of the beet sugar industry, from the investigation I made during the tariff inquiry I came to the conclusion that the profits in this industry were not very great. Such profits as were made were secured by reason of successful purchases of sugar raws on the market. My hon. friend's view was certainly not the view of the farmer. In the beet sugar industry the farmer goes hand in hand with the factory. They have practically to be partners. Beets are not a thing that can be shipped very far, because they are bulky, and there must therefore be a fairly close relationship between the farmer and the factory. The farmers are now getting themselves together to put up a co-operative sugar plant, but I do not think they will do so with this tax. One farmers' association appeared to ask for a bonus in connection with sugar beets. I will not say they were entitled to it; frankly, I do not think they were. But the position taken by the farmers, as represented by the district organizer of the United Farmers of Ontario, Mr. Gilroy, was that as the price of beets was falling the production of sugar beets was becoming unproductive in Canada. It was contended that there was no money to the farmer in producing sugar beets at a lower price than $9 per ton. The price to-day for the lower saccharine content of 14 per cent is $4.50; and I again point out to my hon. friend that this will work out as a tax on sugar beets to the extent of 52.8 cents per ton. I hope I am not right, but before the minister pledges himself to carry out something that may, and I think will, prove highly detrimental to western Ontario, I think he should satisfy himself by a thorough examination of the facts in connection with this industry and resolve not to bring the act into force until an Order in Council is passed.

Mr. LeSUEUR: I wish to support the suggestion of the ex-Minister of Finance (Sir Henry Drayton). The proposal of the Government to place an excise tax on the sugar beet industry has been a matter of great concern to the people of south-western Ontario, especially to the growers of sugar beets. The industry is of considerable importance there and practically every farmer in Lambton and parts of Kent is engaged in it. The industry was bonussed by the Ontario government for a while until 1906, and

later it was encouraged by various regulations of the federal House. The result is that to-day I am advised we have from 25,000 to 30,000 acres devoted to sugar beet cultivation in southwestern Ontario. The market for the product of that acreage has been largely the local factories, and to some extent Michigan factories; but the Michigan market is to-day completely cut off by reason of the increased duty on beets imposed by the Fordney tariff.

The placing of this excise tax on the industry would, I believe, be very detrimental and would possibly mean its complete elimination. The tax must be borne by the consumer or the refiner, or the producer. If the sugar beet product set the price it would of course mean that this duty could be spread out over the consumers and so thin and light that it would not be felt by the consumer; but I submit that under present conditions this tax must be borne by the producer. In Cuba the production of sugar has doubled, which, coupled with the fact that the sugar producing countries of Europe are also coming back into the market, means that there is a tremendous supply of raw sugar available. Then we have reduced the preferential tariff which, as I understand, lets in raw cane sugar from the British possessions in the West Indies, and last year they exported to this country about 130,000,000 pounds of raw cane sugar. Consequently the outside cane sugar is more than ample to supply our local demand, and it is being produced at a very low cost and sold very cheap. Now, as we produce only about ten per cent of the sugar consumed in Canada, and ninety per cent is imported raw cane sugar, it will be seen that the price must naturally be controlled by the source of big production, that is, by the cane sugar. In other words, the price of sugar in Canada is controlled by the sugar refined from cane. The result is that this tax on sugar derived from sugar beet would have to be borne either by the refiner or the grower.

The ex-Minister of Finance has explained the differences in the processes of manufacture of sugar from beets and from cane. I am advised that the refiner of sugar beets claims he will not make a dollar on this year's crop, and offers his books for inspection to prove his claim; and that he has not made a dollar on the sugar beet end of his refining business for several years. Now then, if, as he says, he is bound under this tax to lose about $150,000 this year, he is either going to shift as much as he can of that burden on to the grower, or to confine his energies to the refining of sugar from cane.

The grower, I am advised, this year is getting $4.50 per ton for his sugar beets. This is practically a deflation of price to the pre-war level. Sugar beet production requires a large amount of labour, and the growers advise me that they cannot produce beets commercially at a figure lower than $4.50 per ton, and if they are bound to absorb this excise tax they say the sugar beet industry must cease as far as they are concerned.

I am not a sugar beet grower, but the views and the facts I have submitted, I believe, are correct. They are given to me by sugar refiners and sugar beet growers, and by various chambers of commerce who have taken the trouble of looking into the question and gathering the facts. Therefore I submit that if the Minister of Finance thinks this tax should stand, it should at least not come into force until he has had an opportunity of examining the books of the refiners to see if their statements are right. Of course, if he finds they are right the tax should not be enforced. If he concludes—and we have absolute faith in his judgment—that their statements are not borne out by their books and they can stand the tax, all well and good. Otherwise, if the facts I have submitted are accurate, the imposition of this tax simply means defeating the very purpose for which it is designed, namely, the gaining of revenue.

Mr. FIELDING: It is possible that the results which my hon. friend fears may happen; we cannot see into the future. Much money is made at times and much is lost in the sugar business which has no relation to refining; it is made in trading, in legitimate speculation, and an examination of the books might disclose interesting transactions of that kind.

But I am going to ask my hon. friend to come back to the vital question—the measure of protection which is accorded to the industry. Let me repeat, this business was established and made successful when the duty was $1.24 per hundred pounds on refined sugar. That was all protection for the sugar beet refiner; it was not protection for the cane sugar refiner, for he had to pay on his raw material 60, 70, and 80 cents duty. But the whole duty was protection to the beet sugar refiner because

he had not to pay any duty on his raw material. The protection which any industry enjoys is the difference between what the duty on its raw material and on the finished article.

Now, in the earlier years this business was built up and made successful when the duty on refined sugar was at its highest, $1.24 per hundred pounds.

Mr. GOOD: Is it not true that at that time there was a provincial bounty on sugar which added to that protection?

Mr. FIELDING: In the earlier days; my hon. friend is right, the province of Ontario gave a bounty, not the federal authorities. But still the simple fact to which I want to draw the attention of the House is this, that the whole duty on refined sugar is protection to the beet sugar man, because he does not pay any duty on his raw material. Let us absorb that fact. He had a protection of $1.24 per hundred pounds before. From time to time the duty has been increased until it has reached the high figure of $2.39 per hundred pounds, and the refiners of beet and cane sugar, I am sure, take advantage of that, as they have a perfect right to do, because the price to the consumer is governed by the rate of duty. If I could do so, I would like to reduce the duty on sugar and take off a cent or a little more and bring the industry back to where it was in the period to which I have referred, but we cannot afford to do that. If we take off one cent from the duty on sugar we will lose a great deal of revenue. If we did that I do not think that even my friends who are interested in the beet trade could object very much; they would simply say: "We are back where we were before when the rate was $1.24 per 100 pounds, we prospered." But since they have this abnormal protection; since they have now the $2.39 where before they had only $1.24, I think they can pay the small fraction of 24 cents per 100 pounds. I think they are magnifying the trouble unduly.

Mr. LESUEUR: The preferential tariff to-day on raw sugar of 96 degrees is only $1.49, as I understand it.

Mr. FIELDING: I am taking the general tariff at its highest point. If you take it off the one you take it off the other.

Mr. KENNEDY (Glengarry): There is just one feature of this question that I think the Minister of Finance has not really taken into consideration. He is discussing it altogether from the standpoint of the protective tariff that is already afforded to the sugar industry in Canada. The excise duty will undoubtedly fall ultimately upon the grower of beets. Now, I am not interested in beet growing, but I think it has hitherto been a well established principle in this country that excise duties should be applied to articles which are in the nature of luxuries, such as tobacco, liquor and things of that kind. I feel that the minister is making a departure from that principle; he is establishing a precedent in placing excise duty on an article which is not a luxury, but which is a necessity. That may be just or may be unjust; I would simply like to present that feature of the case. He is selecting a necessary article of food and is placing upon it an excise duty which will afford a certain amount of revenue and which will not likely increase the price of sugar. But to a certain extent it may be unjust to the grower of beets, the man who will have to stand it in the end. If the minister had, as he said he would like to have done, taken the duty off sugar or lowered it in some degree, I should be inclined to support him, because the consumer of sugar in Canada would get the advantage. The consumer of sugar in Canada is not benefited at all by the arrangement proposed.

Mr. FIELDING: If the duty were reduced as my hon. friend suggests—or rather, as I suggested and he approves—might that not involve a reduction in price to the beet grower in the same way? It makes no difference whether you put it on one or take it off another.

Mr. KENNEDY (Glengarry): But the consumer would get the benefit.

Mr. LESUEUR: I do not want to be importunate, but I believe that the Minister of Finance misunderstood me on one point. He stated, if I understood him, that the duty on sugar to-day was $2.39.

Mr. FIELDING: Under the general tariff.

Mr. LESUEUR: And that that had been increased over a period of years from $1.43.

Mr. FIELDING: $1.24.

Mr. LESUEUR: What I wanted to point out was that the same duty under the preferential tariff to-day is $1.59, which is a very small increase over $1.24, and that that preferential tariff applies to the Bri-

tish possessions in the West Indies which are large producers of sugar cane and raw cane sugar. Therefore that sugar will come in in increasing quantities, without doubt, to supply the market and to meet the preference given under this tariff.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: There are just two figures I would like to give my hon. friend in order to show how prosperous this industry is. In 1920 the farmers produced 340,875 tons of beets, and with all this preference this year they are producing only 154,530 tons.

At six o'clock the Speaker resumed the Chair and the House took recess.

After Recess

The House resumed at eight o'clock.

PRIVATE BILLS

SECOND READINGS

Bill No. 155, (from the Senate) for the relief of Eva Florence Heavens.—Mr. Rankin.

Bill No. 156, (from the Senate) for the relief of Dorothy Lillian Jewitt.—Mr. Ross (Kingston).

Bill No. 157, (from the Senate) for the relief of Gladys Mae Larivey.—Mr. Ryckman.

Bill No. 158, (from the Senate) for the relief of Gladys Caroline Hilton.—Mr. German.

Bill No. 159, (from the Senate) for the relief of Eva McRae.—Mr. Ross (Kingston).

Bill No. 160, (from the Senate) for the relief of Warren Garfield Young.—Mr. Stewart (Hamilton).

Bill No. 161, (from the Senate) for the relief of Benjamin Charles Bowman.—Mr. Hocken.

Bill No. 162, (from the Senate) for the relief of Ivy Elsie Myron-Smith.—Mr. Ryckman.

Bill No. 163, (from the Senate) for the relief of Lillian May Maybee.—Mr. Rankin.

Bill No. 164, (from the Senate) for the relief of Phoebe Levina Simpson.—Mr. Ryckman.

Bill No. 165, (from the Senate) for the relief of Thomas Preece.—Mr. Stewart (Hamilton).

Bill No. 166, (from the Senate) for the relief of Frederick Greenhill.—Mr. Ryckman.

[Mr. LeSueur.]

Bill No. 167, (from the Senate) for the relief of Hazel May Dillon.—Mr. McQuarrie.

Bill No. 168, (from the Senate) for the relief of William Arthur Parish.—Mr. White.

Bill No. 169, (from the Senate) for the relief of James Hayden.—Mr. Clark.

Bill No. 170, (from the Senate) for the relief of Bertha Plant.—Mr. Church.

Bill No. 171, (from the Senate) for the relief of James Murray Johnston.—Mr. Rankin.

Bill No. 173, (from the Senate) for the relief of Thomas Leonard Armstrong.—Mr. Macdonald (Pictou).

Bill No. 174, (from the Senate) for the relief of Henry Hardy Leigh.—Mr. McMurray.

WAYS AND MEANS

INLAND REVENUE

The House in committee, resumed consideration of Resolution No. 7, respecting duties of excise on beet-root sugar.

Mr. FANSHER: Before the resolution carries, I would like to say a few words in regard to it. Up to the present time, an excise duty has been imposed only on articles which were considered to be luxuries, such as tobaccos and liquors, and this year automobiles were included in the luxuries, and an excise placed upon them. With this resolution we have a new departure, which proposes to put an excise on a food product. This is the first time, I believe, in the history of this country that we have had an excise tax imposed on a food product, and, if it were imposed on all the companies which have to deal with the manufacture of sugar, there might be some excuse for it, but we find that it is only imposed on one branch of that industry, which is the beet sugar industry, —that branch which produces the refined article from the sugar beet root. There are, in Canada, six companies which produce refined sugar, one in Halifax, one in St. John, two in Montreal, and one in Vancouver. One company in the province of Ontario produces sugar from sugar beets. The other five companies produce their sugar from the sugar cane, which is imported from outside this country. We have in this resolution a proposition to impose a tax upon the one company in Ontario which produces beet sugar from beets produced in this country, while the other companies which import their raw product and refine the raw sugar are let

go free. It is stated in that connection that the reason that this is done is because the sugar beet industry enjoys a larger protection than does the cane sugar refiner. I should, however, like to point out that only one process is performed in this country in connection with the production of sugar from sugar cane, and that is refining the raw sugar. On the other hand, with the beet sugar industry, growing the beets, extracting the saccharine content from the beets and also the refining process are done in this country. In other words, in making sugar from sugar beets, three distinct processes take place in Canada, while on the other hand, growing the cane and the first process of manufacture are both done outside of this country, only the refining process being done within the bounds of Canada. I claim, therefore, that in proportion to the amount of employment and work done in this country, the sugar beet industry is not at all in the same class with the cane sugar refining industry, and yet it is proposed to place an excise tax upon the only company which produces sugar from the sugar beets. I might say too that less than ten per cent of the sugar produced in Canada by the six companies, cane and beet combined, is produced from beets.

The tax that is proposed is equivalent to a little over 50 cents per ton on sugar beets. A ton of sugar beets will yield a little over 200 pounds of beet sugar, and the rate, as set forth in this resolution, will be about 24 cents per hundred pounds, so that this figures out at a little over 50 cents per ton of sugar beets. If we take the trade statistics for the last eleven years as furnished by the Right Hon. Sir George E. Foster, when he was Minister of Trade and Commerce, we find that the average yield of sugar beets per acre during that period was nine tons. Figured out, the excise would amount to a tax of practically $5 per acre to the grower. This is entirely unjust and unwarranted. If some measure of relief were given by reducing the duty on sugar so that consumers of sugar would have less to pay, there might be something in a proposition to reduce the duty; but in this case no decrease in the duty is provided at all; the consumer will have to pay for his sugar the same price as he did before, and the sugar beet industry will be taxed to the extent of $5 per acre. If this industry is to be discouraged and, perhaps, put out of business in this way, the consumer will not receive any benefit whatever, and on the other hand the revenue will not be increased. In fact, if this resolution carries, the revenue will be increased by only about $100,000. A tax of two cents on every hundred pounds of sugar produced in Canada would raise an amount practically equivalent to the amount expected to be raised by the tax provided in this resolution. Yet this figures out to the grower of sugar beets at $5 per acre.

I was somewhat surprised that as proposed by the Minister of Finance this afternoon, this resolution should not come into effect until the 1st day of January, 1923. I just wish to show why I think its coming into force has been suspended for about a year. The beet sugar industry is, in a large measure, a co-operative concern between farmers and manufacturers. The beets are grown under a contract with the company. The company guarantees to furnish the labour which does the spacing, thinning, hoeing and lifting of the beets, and this is done largely by Belgian labourers. On the other hand, the farmer undertakes to prepare the soil for planting, to do the planting, the cultivating, and lifting of the beets and the hauling of the beets to market. As regards signing the contracts, a straight price is given, and the contracts are generally made during the winter. Last winter this particular company made all their contracts with the growers at a fixed price, and I have no doubt they have made representations that they are obligated to pay that fixed price and that if this excise tax comes on, they have no way of shifting it to the grower this year. Hence, we see that this tax is not to be put into effect for one year until the company can get out, so to speak, this year on their contracts; before they make their new contracts, they will know that they can shift the tax to the farmer, and then this regulation will come into effect. That is an admission of the truth of our argument that this tax will ultimately be shifted to the farmer and that he will have to pay it.

I wish to submit a few facts in connection with the cost of production of sugar beets. As I said before, this is a crop that is produced under contract with the Dominion Sugar Company which produces beet sugar. The amount of contract labour supplied by this beet sugar company is $18 per acre. The cost of the seed per acre is $3.75. The ploughing of the ground, done by the farmer, costs $4

per acre. Preparing the land and planting the seed costs $2 per acre. Cultivating the crop, which, being planted in rows, has to be cultivated throughout the growing season, costs $3 per acre. Then the beets have to be lifted with a plough and this costs the farmer at the rate of $2 per acre. The average yield of beets is about nine tons to the acre. Hauling a little over two tons or about two and a half tons to a load and hauling four loads in a day, a farmer would haul an acre of beets to market in a day, and I put the cost of hauling at $5 per acre. That makes a total expense, not considering anything for the value, use, wear and tear, of machinery, or interest on investment, of $37.75 per acre. The average yield is nine tons, and the contract price this year was $4.50. That gives a return of $40.50 per acre, leaving for the farmer, besides paying him for the work, a profit of $2.75 per acre. This resolution simply imposes a tax of $5 per acre, and that would wipe out the profit of $2.75 and leave a deficit of $2.25.

Let me give some figures in connection with the amount of sugar beets produced in this country. During the past ten years more than 20,000 acres have been planted on an average; in one abnormal year, 1920, the number was 34,000. I give these figures to show that this is no inconsiderable industry in the province of Ontario. Now, of the six companies refining and selling sugar in Canada the only one that produces sugar made entirely from a product of this country is subject to an excise tax. The Minister of Finance stated in his budget speech that he favoured the encouragement of native industry in this country. Well, here we have an industry that gets its raw product right in the country, and employs labour in Canada in the preliminary stage of extraction, as well as in the refining. It has to pay an excise tax. On the other hand, the other five companies that do merely the refining in Canada have no excise tax to pay. When beet sugar was first produced in Canada the manufacturers had a hard time trying to induce the wholesalers to handle the product, largely because the cane sugar men did not want the wholesalers to have anything to do with beet sugar. As a result the beet sugar manufacturers were driven to establish a retail marketing system, and beet sugar to-day is not marketed through the wholesalers at all. The Dominion Sugar Company have had at one time over 30,000 different accounts of various retailers, to whom they market direct. I think this is an argument in their favour because it reduces the cost of getting the product to the consumer, which would be increased if it passed through the hands of the wholesalers. If we are to have a protective system surely some equality should be observed. It is not equitable that one company should be penalized by an excise tax while other companies engaged in the same industry are exempted from that impost. I am thoroughly convinced that if this resolution carries the revenue derived by means of it will not amount to a very great deal. In fact, I believe it would gradually diminish and probably the industry would be put out of business. If the beet sugar industry were put out of business the consumers, far from benefiting by any reduction in the price of sugar, would stand to suffer, because the cane sugar manufacturers would have the situation in their own hands and the price of sugar would go up to the full extent of the protection now afforded it. The cane sugar manufacturers have not always benefited to the full extent of that protection, and to my mind that is largely due to the existence of this native industry in the province of Ontario, which has offered competition. I hope that this resolution will not be put into effect until a thorough investigation is made of the beet sugar industry. If after a full and complete investigation it is decided that that industry shall be taxed in the way proposed while the others shall be allowed to go free, then I shall have nothing to say. But I believe that if the business is investigated it will be found that the beet sugar manufacturers have no more right to pay an excise tax than any of the other refineries located in Canada. In this connection I move that the resolution be amended by adding thereto the following:

Provided that this amendment shall not come into effect until a thorough investigation of the beet sugar industry shall have been made and proclamation has been issued by the Governor in Council and published in the Canada Gazette.

Mr. FIELDING: I am afraid my hon. friend from East Lambton (Mr. Fansher) has failed to see the point—and I thought there was a point—of my explanation this afternoon. He has made three points in his speech to which I take the liberty of replying. In the first place, he says that the excise tax should be imposed only on luxuries. Now, repeatedly in this House, and especially from the group in which my hon. friend sits, the argument has been

advanced, and it is advanced even to-day, that wherever there is a high protective duty on articles there ought to be a corresponding, or partly corresponding, excise duty. That view has been advanced over and over again by my hon. friends in the Progressive ranks, and to-day it was put forward very prominently by one hon. gentleman. We are doing that very thing in this case. Beet sugar happens to be fortunate enough to have a very large protection, and in consideration of that exceptional position we are going to impose a small tax on the industry, the very thing my hon. friends have been advocating. Hon. gentlemen, of course, may say that we should go further and extend that principle more widely. Well, perhaps that contention is right. But this is an exceptional case. The protection is larger than it was before; it is larger than seems to be necessary; and we are trying to get a small sum back in the way of this little excise tax. That is one point. There was another point my hon. friend raised in this question: Why not reduce the duty on sugar? If we were to reduce the general duty on sugar 50 cents a hundred, or a half a cent a pound—and I gather from my hon. friend's remarks that he would approve of that—it would strike the beet sugar business twice as hard as we are striking it here. It would take half a cent off the protection that is afforded the industry, whereas we are taking only a quarter of a cent or less under the present proposal. The suggestion, if carried out, that we should reduce the duty on sugar would, I repeat, strike the beet sugar industry much harder than we are doing here. True it would benefit the consumer, and that point might well be taken. But under all the circumstances we feel that we cannot afford to reduce the revenue, and thi is one way of making the industry pay a small amount. It is exactly what my hon. friends have been arguing.

Mr. KNOX: Why should the excise tax not be levied on cane sugar as well?

Mr. FIELDING: I am coming to that. My hon. friend from East Lambton asked the same question. The answer is, because the cane sugar refiners pay into the treasury of Canada on their raw material $9,000,000, while the beet sugar pays not one cent on its raw material. Is not that a satisfactory reply? In the year 1921, and about the same the year before, $9,000,000 was collected from the cane sugar refiners and they have a very modest protection as compared with the beet sugar industry. Surely my hon. friends will appreciate the difference. Of course, the beet sugar industry must pay the cost of production, management, and so forth. But so must all other industries; all industries have to bear that cost. The great difference is that the cane sugar industry, with a moderate protection in comparison with the other, pays $9,000,000 into the treasury, whereas the beet sugar industry pays not a single cent. Surely my hon. friend from East Lambton (Mr. Fansher) will see that his argument in that respect is altogether inadequate to the occasion. It is mistaken.

Mr. MACLEAN (York): I firmly believe in Canada's ability to grow enough beets to supply the whole sugar market in competition with the other class of sugar. I know some of the men identified with the development of the sugar industry in this country, both beet and cane, and I also have an idea as to the state of public opinion on this subject. There is a feeling in the country that sugar, being one of the most essential foods, should if possible be made in Canada. Beet sugar is being made in the United States. It was the foundation of the national policy of Napoleon and it also made Germany great. Between France and Germany they largely captured the sugar market of Europe and the Americans followed and developed a great industry. I should like to see Canada do the same, and I am sure we have the land that can grow sugar beets. The farmers are well acquainted with that branch of agriculture and they should receive some encouragement. I am not unmindful of the Canadian consumer, who is entitled to some relief in the matter of sugar prices. We have a sugar industry here, but what does it cost the country? How many millions of our money have been lost in connection with the sugar refining business? Was there ever such an exploitation by Canadian capitalists, especially those of Montreal, as took place within the last twelve months in connection with the sugar refineries? I believe we can produce the highest class of sugar, and we ought to be able to supply our home market. I do not like the record of the beet sugar business so far, but I am convinced that with a little encouragement we can supply all our domestic requirements. Our banks are advancing millions of dollars to the

cane sugar producers of the West Indies. It may be a good place to invest our money, but no one knows yet how much capital we have invested there or how sound the investment is. We ought to be able to do what France and Germany have done, produce sugar at the lowest price for our own consumption. I do not think that either this Government or the past government has had the right solution of the sugar question. It is a question that comes home to every household, and especially to every woman. When our sugar refiners come to us to be taken care of we ought to know what they did with their shareholders' money in exploiting the sugar market, and when the facts become known I think the public will exact a strict accounting. I cannot suggest to the Minister of Finance to-night the correct solution of this question, but I want to tell him and the House that it has got to be solved, and solved satisfactorily for the people of this country. Next to wheat, sugar is one of the greatest foods that we use, indeed, it can be classed as one of the absolute necessities of life. In the States they have built up a great sugar industry, and I am convinced that with the help of our farmers we can do the same. I am not speaking from a party point of view for the moment when I say that the sugar question is with us, and the people will never be satisfied until we get the inside story of the exploitation of Canada by the cane sugar refiners.

Mr. GOOD: The condition of the beet sugar industry at the present time is a very good example of the mischief that comes from the adoption of the protective system. Twenty or twenty-five years ago, under the stimulus of tariff protection and provincial bounties, this industry was established in Ontario. I remember the time very well because I had something to do with the business then. The history of the industry has been very unfortunate. It has stagnated, and I question very much whether there is any possibility of maintaining it permanently without a state subsidy. We have not, and I do not know that I hope we ever shall have, the same amount of cheap labour that is available in Europe for the cultivation of sugar beets, and I submit that without a large supply of cheap labour it is impossible for the sugar beet industry to compete with the sugar cane industry.

[Mr. W. F. Maclean.]

Now, what are we going to do? A good many farmers in Ontario are more or less tied up to the sugar beet industry, and we find that we cannot maintain it without a permanent subsidy. For my part I think the country would be very much better off if the industry disappeared. It will be hard on those who have invested their money in the factories and on some of the farmers, but ultimately I think it will be better for Canada if the sugar beet industry disappears, and in this respect I must differ from the opinions expressed by the hon. member for South York (Mr. Maclean). I think if he will look into the comparative cost of production in the sugar cane and sugar beet industry he will find it is practically impossible to consider competition on a fair basis in this country.

I do not know that I would care to recommend any definite policy to the Minister of Finance in this connection, but I want to state the situation as I see it. We have got ourselves into a very awkward position by adopting a foolish policy in the past. Just how we are going to get out of that position I do not know, but I do think that although, as the Minister of Finance has stated, the sugar beet industry has a protection of $2.39, which is ostensibly the protection under which the industry is carried on, it has so very many natural handicaps that that is not going to be of very much assistance to it, and it may very well be that the imposition of this small excise tax will lead to the disappearance of the industry. Whether that is wise or not I cannot say, but personally I would very much prefer and urge upon the House that instead of putting this excise tax of 24 cents per 100 pounds on beet sugar we put it on all sugar, or reduce the duty by that amount, and in that way we will reduce the price of sugar to the Canadian consumer. The member for East Lambton has stated that only about one-tenth of the sugar consumed in Canada is made here. Then if we can reduce the price of sugar to the masses, surely that is worth while. I do not know offhand the difference in the duty between raw sugar and refined sugar, but I do not think it is less than 24 cents per 100 pounds. So if the duty could be cut to that extent on refined sugar, the same amount would come into the treasury on the raw sugar importations, and the Canadian public would get their refined sugar that much cheaper. Then we would let the beet sugar industry look after itself.

Mr. LeSUEUR: The hon. Minister of Finance in reply to the member for East Lambton laid considerable stress on one argument, that the sugar cane industry paid a tax of $9,000,000 while the sugar beet end of the industry paid nothing. Is it not true that under the economic conditions at present surrounding the sugar industry that $9,000,000, owing to those conditions would naturally be spread over a large area that is among all consumers; but in consequence of the same economic conditions surrounding the sugar industry today, the excise tax which would be imposed on beet sugar would rest largely on a comparatively small number of sugar beet growers situated in a few counties of south-western Ontario? That, I believe, is the danger in the excise tax, that it is going to fall heavily on a small proportion of the population, and therefore is dangerous to the existence of the industry itself.

Mr. DRUMMOND: The minister has emphasized the fact that these taxes are imposed for the purpose of raising revenue. Now, the method of applying this tax is such as to enable the beet sugar refiner to evade the tax for this year—from now until the first of January. The imposition of a tax of $5 per acre upon the grower of sugar beets—because the refiner will undoubtedly pass it on to him—will have the effect of preventing the grower from operating, and if that is the case, where is your revenue to come from next year? The minister is by this means defeating the very purpose for which the imposition of the duty is intended.

Mr. MILLAR: I am inclined to think that the minister misunderstood the hon. member for East Lambton (Mr. Fansher). That hon. gentleman said, as I understood him, that it had been the policy of the Government to levy excise taxes on luxuries, and that is the respect in which the minister, I think, misunderstood his remarks. Stress has been laid by the minister on the fact that the five cane sugar refineries have paid $9,000,000 into the public treasury. I think a moment's thought will teach all of us that every cent of that was passed on to the consumer. No industry can be given very much credit if they simply pay out a sum of money and then collect it—or collect, as in this case, a considerably greater amount—from the consumers. We know what is done when a sum of money is paid by way of customs duty; every time it is turned over—to the wholesaler, to the retailer or otherwise—a profit is added on the amount of duty paid. So that this $9,000,000, by the time it reaches the consumer, is nearer $12,000,000. This would seem to me to be a move in the wrong direction. If only one-tenth of the sugar output is produced from sugar beets, the revenue derived from this tax will be very small. It would seem, according to the hon. member for East Lambton, that this tax will greatly endanger the sugar beet industry, and if there is anything we need in this country it is a policy that will encourage work on the land. How much revenue does the minister expect from this tax?

Mr. FIELDING: I think we shall get something approaching $200,000 from it.

Mr. FANSHER: It is said that $9,000,000 has been paid into the treasury by the cane sugar refineries. I understand that a good portion of the amount paid by those refineries is refunded in the form of drawbacks. Has the minister deducted the amount so refunded by way of drawbacks? A total of over $10,000,000, I believe, has been paid in drawbacks, and a considerable amount of that has gone to cane sugar refineries.

Mr. FIELDING: A portion—I have not the exact figures, but I think it
9 p.m. is about a million and a half—has been paid by way of drawback. As to the suggestion that the $9,000,000, or whatever the amount is, has been passed on to the consumer, I would say that that is certainly the case; all these taxes in the end reach the consumer. I do not for a moment pretend that these cane sugar refiners have been actuated by benevolence in respect to the $9,000,000 they paid into the treasury; it is passed on to the consumer, and I would not be surprised if they added something more than the $9,000,000. That is the way taxes are passed on.

Mr. SUTHERLAND: This industry which may be considered as natural to this country, has suffered possibly more than any other as the result of the scarcity of labour during the past six or eight years. We hear a great deal about unemployment in this country and the necessity for providing work for the unemployed. Now the growing of beets and the manufacture of these beets into sugar requires a great deal of labour. Although sugar beets are not grown to any extent at the present time in the county from which I come, I appreciate

the difficulty which confronts those who are engaged in that industry in some of the adjoining counties. I think it would be a very unfortunate thing indeed to saddle a tax of this nature upon this industry when those engaged in it are just at the turn of the tide, as you may say, as a result of which they might naturally expect to get sufficient labour to carry on this work. I say that it would be a very unfortunate thing if this industry, which is struggling so hard to exist, should receive a blow of this kind when it is now so much in need of a little encouragement.

Mr. FANSHER: I would just like to say a word in connection with the amount of revenue derived from the Canadian cane sugar industry. According to a return presented to Parliament there was a million and a half paid in drawbacks to one company, and about half a million paid to another company. There are five companies in Canada which import raw cane sugar. I have no doubt that at least one-third of the $9,000,000 derived in duties from this industry, if it were figured out, was handed back in the form of drawbacks. Let me point out that the employment furnished by the Canadian cane sugar refineries is in no way to be compared to the amount of employment that the beet sugar refinery gives, and it must be remembered that the latter industry is in operation throughout the winter months when employment is scarce. At that time of the year in the towns and cities where the cane sugar refineries are located bread lines are known to exist. No such bread line is to be seen in the district where the beet sugar factory is located. What is observed, is a steady stream of employees on their way to work in the factory which is running throughout the winter when other kinds of employment are scarce. I fully appreciate the need of revenue but I believe that this tax will in a large degree defeat its own object and that the revenue derived from it will be very small. On the other hand the consummer will pay the same price for his refined sugar as heretofore and, in the event of the beet sugar industry being put out of business, will even pay a much higher sum than he does at present.

Amendment (Mr. Fansher) negatived.

Resolution agreed to.

8. Resolved, That it is expedient to provide that no person shall produce sugar in Canada from sugar beets without a license and that a fee of two dollars per annum be paid for such license and to further provide that all the provisions of Part II of The Inland Revenue Act

[Mr. Sutherland.]

respecting licenses and the obligations of persons holding them, the keeping of books or accounts, the payment of duties and making returns and the general regulations as to bonding and warehousing, so far as applied by departmental regulations, and all provisions respecting penalties, so far as applicable, shall have full force and effect with respect to the manufacture of sugar made from sugar beets.

Mr. FIELDING This is part of the same matter.

Section agreed to.

9. Resolved, That any enactment founded on the preceding resolutions numbered seven and eight shall be deemed to have come into force on the twenty-fourth day of May, one thousand nine hundred and twenty-two.

The CHAIRMAN: It is moved by Mr. Fielding in amendment to Resolution No 9:

Resolved that any enactment founded on the preceding resolutions numbered seven and eight shall be deemed to have come into force on the first day of January, one thousand nine hundred and twenty-three.

Section as amended agreed to.

10. Resolved, That it is expedient to amend The Inland Revenue Act, chapter fifty-one of the Revised Statutes of Canada, 1906, by repealing section one hundred and ninety-nine of the said Act, which provides that beer brewed for private use shall not be liable to any duty under the said Act; and to provide that section two hundred and four of the said Act be amended by striking out the words "except for use of himself or his family, as by this Act provided" in the third and fourth lines thereof.

Resolution No. 10 dropped.

Resolutions reported.

SPECIAL WAR REVENUE

Mr. FIELDING: I move that we take up the resolutions to amend the Special War Revenue Act.

Motion agreed to.

1. Resolved, That it is expedient to amend The Special War Revenue Act, 1915, as amended by chapter forty-six of the Statutes of 1918, chapter seventy-one of the Statutes of 1920, and chapter fifty of the Statutes of 1921, and to provide:—

1. That subsection two of section five of the said Act be amended by removing purely mutual companies from the class of companies exempt from the tax imposed by said subsection, and by adding to said section five the following subsections:—

(11) Every person resident in Canada, who insures his property situate in Canada, or any property situate in Canada in which he has an insurable interest, with any British or foreign company or British or foreign underwriter or underwriters, not licensed under the provisions of the Insurance Act, 1917, to transact business in Canada, or with any association of persons formed for the purpose of exchanging reciprocal contracts of indemnity upon the plan known as inter-insurance and not

licensed under the provisions of the Insurance Act, 1917, the chief place of business of which association or of its principal attorney-in-fact is situate outside of Canada, shall on or before the thirty-first day of December in each year pay to the Minister for the Consolidated Revenue Fund, in addition to any other tax payable under any existing law or statute, a tax of five per centum of the total net cost to such person of all such insurance for the preceding calendar year, and for the purposes of this section every corporation carrying on business in Canada shall be deemed to be a person resident in Canada.

"(12) Every person to whom this section applies shall on or before the thirty-first day of December in each year make a return in writing to the Superintendent of Insurance stating the names of the companies, societies of underwriters or associations with whom the insurance was effected by him or on his behalf, the amount of such insurance and the net cost thereof in each case.

"(13) Every person who fails or neglects to make such return or pay to the Minister within the time limited by subsection (11) hereof the tax hereby imposed, shall incur a penalty of fifty dollars for each and every day during which such default continues."

Mr. BAXTER: In common with a great many other members I presume, I have received telegrams and letters with reference to this particular section. No doubt the Minister of Finance has also had representations made to him on behalf of those interested. I would like to ask the minister if any consideration has been given to the matter, and if it has been found possible to make any alterations in the proposal?

Mr. FIELDING: I have received, as my hon. friend suggests, many telegrams on the matter but I really think there must be a misapprehension as to the purpose of this resolution. I think the idea must be abroad that we are trying to prevent these reciprocal and other companies from doing business in Canada. This is simply to levy a small tax upon the premiums that are paid. These companies do a considerable business in Canada, although they are located in the States, and they pay no tax here in any shape or form. This is not a proposal to levy any tax upon the insurable property; it is simply a small tax upon the premium. For example: I saw a letter written by one of these policy holders who was complaining of the high rates of the old line companies and he said: "I am now getting for ten cents per $100 what I had at one time to pay a dollar and a half for." Perhaps the dollar and a half was an exaggeration, but he is getting a low rate of insurance, and where he paid 10 cents before he will now have to pay 10½ cents. Of course all taxation is unpopular; nobody wants to be taxed. Every one of these resolutions is taxing somebody and naturally they all want to avoid it if they can. This tax is an exceedingly small one. All our Canadian companies are taxed in one form or other; and if these people are able to do business in Canada, although their headquarters are in the United States, surely it is not excessive for us to impose this little tax of half a cent which is added to the ten cents to which I referred. I think there must be some misapprehension of the purpose of this resolution. It does not seek to drive these companies away, it imposes no burden upon them; but the individual policy holder, who boasts that he is getting very cheap insurance is asked in these days of hard times to contribute the modest tax of five per cent on his premium. I do not think that is an alarming thing at all.

Mr. PARENT: I do not know exactly what the effect of this legislation will be upon the insurance business, but I have had a little experience of my own with American insurance companies doing business in Canada. Under the law of the United States the estate of a person resident in Canada and insured in an American company is required to pay a succession tax upon the amount of the insurance policy which had been held by him. So that if the Minister of Finance to-day finds a means by which he can tax an American company in return for the taxation the Canadian pays to the United States Government it would seem to be a very proper thing. I have a case in mind. Suppose an estate has to transfer stock held in an American company by a deceased person, you are called upon by two or three states of the United States, and also by the Treasury Department at Washington, to make a full report of your estate. If you happen to have an interest in an American company, the trust company will refuse to transfer your shares, unless you notify the two or three states of the United States, and also the Treasury Department at Washington, what your estate is valued at, with the result that you cannot have your shares transferred, unless you divulge the amount of insurance you may possess in an American company. And when you have given them the details, and have told them that you are insured in one of their companies, they will impose a succession tax upon you, and tell you that you will have to pay so

much on the amount of insurance you possess in the United States, and this on the ground that the insurance companies have their head offices in the United States. It seems to me it is time for Canada to take some action in the matter, when our country gives the American companies the right to do business here. The American companies have practically the same right as a Canadian insurance company doing business in this country, in the way of securing premiums and getting money out of Canadians. It seems to me those companies should be compelled to conduct business independently, and some provision should be made to relieve from taxation Canadians who are insured in these American companies. I have called the attention of the Department of Insurance to this matter on a good many occasions, without any result whatever. It is a very important matter, and I am sorry that this question has come up so suddenly, for I am not prepared at this moment to discuss it fully. I called the attention of the department to this matter, and I am sure, that if the minister looks into it, he will find it is unfair to our Canadian citizens to be put in such situation by the government of the United States. Canadians insuring in American companies have to pay succession taxes over there, whereas, if they were insured in Canada, they would pay succession taxes in their own country only.

Mr. CALDWELL: Looking into this matter, I find each individual who carries an insurance policy must make a return on or before a certain date in December of each year. He is liable for a penalty of $50 a day for every day he is in default, if he fails to make the report by the time specified. I think it is imposing a hardship on the policyholders. How many people in Canada will know the law is in effect?

Mr. FIELDING: That remark applies to all the laws we pass.

Mr. CALDWELL: I think this is going a little beyond the realm of reason, almost, when we impose such a tax. If you are able to impose a tax on the company which effected the insurance, you would be able, from one central point, to get a report of the insurance carried by the company, but I understand we cannot impose a tax on an American company doing business outside of Canada. The tax is imposed personally on the policy holder. I think our people have had quite a scorching in making income tax returns, but when they are compelled to make a sworn insurance return, and are liable to a fine of $50 a day for every day after a certain period, if the return is not made, when they possibly do not know the law is in effect, it is going rather far and it is much worse than I thought it was when I first read the act. I would like to urge upon the minister the advisability of reconsidering this, and to consider the wave of indignation which would sweep over the country among the insurance policy holders when it became known that this was the law. I think it would be a good thing for the Government if the people did not become aware of it. It would be a bad thing if the policy holders woke up, and found they were liable to a fine of $50 a day for the time they were in default.

Mr. FIELDING: When a duty is imposed it is our habit to impose a penalty, so that it is not a peculiar thing. The whole purpose of the provision is simply to tax the individual who is getting, as he believes, and, as I think, very cheap insurance. If I buy cotton in the United States, the law penalizes me by imposing a tax of 35 per cent. In this matter we are exceedingly moderate. If a man wants to pass over our Canadian companies, and insure in the United States, we do not tax him 35 per cent, but simply 5 per cent. He is getting cheap insurance, and is being asked to contribute, in a very small degree, to the business of Canada. There is nothing serious about it. I am sure there is nothing in this resolution to prevent these companies from doing business in Canada. The hon. member from West Quebec (Mr. Parent) suggests there are difficulties in insuring in American companies. There may be. We are not dealing with that at all. We are not dealing with the right to do business. We simply say that, as these individual policy holders are doing business, and getting cheap insurance—and we have no objection to that in these hard times—it is not a very severe thing to ask them to pay 5 per cent on the amount of their premiums.

Mr. JACOBS: This is an entirely novel scheme, whereby it is sought to tax your expenditure. You might as well tax your rent roll, or your pay roll, as to tax insurance. This whole matter has been very clearly, and distinctly put in a letter addressed to me by a well known Montreal firm, who asked me to read it to the committee. There are only a few paragraphs

and perhaps the committee will bear with me while I read it. The letter reads:

First. Insurance premiums are not and ought not be taxed any more than any other expense that a company may have in the conduct of its business. It would be just as reasonable to tax the pay-roll of a company or its rent bill or any other expense item.

Second. The straight Line Companies do not and will not write the kind of policies that are necessary in many businesses. The result is, that the Canadian firms are driven to apply to outside concerns, such as Lloyds, New England Mutuals, Reciprocals and others.

Third. These companies do not seek risks in Canada. If we wish to insure with them, we must make application to them for protection and for this reason, they do not oven offices nor do they maintain staffs here.

Fourth. It is highly important that we should be able to secure insurance with these companies as otherwise, there would be no competition, and we would have no protection against excessive rates.

Fifth. The fact that these companies invariably write risks at reasonable rates, enables the average concern to carry an adequate amount of fire protection, and thereby aid and assist in stabliizing business and protecting business. It is estimated that the average concern in Canada is under-insured to the extent of anywhere from 25 to 40 per cent. This practice of under-insuring is a serious one, and leaves business houses without adequate protection for their accounts in case a customer has a fire loss. The effect of this tax would be to further increase this practice of under-insuring, and which will lead to serious financial loss and embarrassments.

Sixth. The companies mentioned above have a very rigorous and close inspection organization. The result of their attention to this detail has resulted in the improving of factory and ware houses' fire risks by 50 to 60 per cent, owing to improved class of buildings, improved fire protection equipment, etc.

Seventh. The amount of revenue secured by the minister by the imposition of this tax, will be so small as to be almost negligible and it is conceivable that one serious fire loss due to failure to properly insure, may wipe out all the revenue thus secured.

Eighth. At the present, business in Canada is labouring under many handicaps and this is an additional burden which helps to make more difficult, the successful conduct of affairs.

Mr. McMASTER: That letter was written by a Nova Scotian.

Mr. JACOBS: An intelligent gentleman, nevertheless.

Mr. McBRIDE: Was it an insurance agent who wrote that letter?

Mr. JACOBS: The letter was written by Mr. A. Kirk Cameron, vice-president and managing director of the Metal Shingle and Siding Company Limited of Montreal, which is associated with the A. B. Ormsby Company, Limited, of Toronto.

Mr. CHAPLIN: I would like to inquire from the minister in respect to what is known as mutual insurance. The first premium paid on mutual insurance is much larger than the net cost. Is it intended to collect this percentage based up the first premium cost, or is it the net cost of the insurance when the losses are ascertained?

Mr. FIELDING: On the net cost.

Mr. STEWART (Humboldt): I want to point out to the Minister of Finance (Mr. Fielding) the entire inequality of the bearing of this tax upon those who come under it. As he has already shown us, there are certain industries that cannot obtain adequate fire insurance protection in Canadian companies, unless they come under what they deem exorbitant rates, and which he has, by comparison, shown us are exorbitant rates. I think those rates are known in the trade as board rates and bear some such relation as $1.25 to ten or twenty-five cent rates which they can obtain in American companies for the same class of insurance. Two of our industries are particularly affected by this. Those two are the small flour mills up to a certain size, say about 75 barrels of flour a day, and the ordinary lumber mills which are poor risks and which under any policy would have to pay a heavy rate of insurance. They cannot obtain adequate insurance in Canadian companies, unless they come under those board rates which make insurance prohibitive to them. Therefore, they are forced to go to American companies. Those companies are complaining, not that the tax should be imposed, but that it bears unfairly upon them in that their premiums are very large and, therefore, they have to pay a very large tax on the same amount of capital investment as that of companies, for example, a textile company, which has a good factory equipped with a sprinkler system, can obtain a rate very much lower than that which flour or lumber mills can obtain under any circumstances. That is the point that I want to bring out, that this tax bears unfairly upon those two industries particularly. There may be other industries which come in the same class; but those are known as bad fire risks; the rate is higher, therefore, the premium is higher, and the tax is going to make the whole cost to them unfairly high in proportion to the cost to those other companies with similar capital investment.

Mr. FIELDING: I think from what has been said by the hon. member for George Etienne Cartier (Mr. Jacobs) that there

is a misapprehension as to the effect of this resolution. My hon. friend said that the revenue to be derived was quite negligible. If the whole thing is so small and unimportant as that, why make a fuss about it?

Mr. JACOBS: It is the principle of the thing.

Mr. FIELDING: The principle of the thing is sometimes of importance in insurance in this country as well. Canadian insurance companies in one form or another have to pay taxes. My hon. friend (Mr. Stewart, Humboldt) refers to textile companies as being penalized in connection with this. They are amongst those companies which insure with outside concerns.

Mr. STEWART (Humboldt): I said that textile companies pay this tax, but that it would not be a heavy matter with them because most of them are equipped with sprinkler systems, and, therefore, their rates are low. But the flour mill and the saw mill cannot be equipped with sprinkler systems; therefore, their rates are higher; their premiums will be higher, and the tax will accordingly be higher.

Mr. FIELDING: Therefore, they are driven to insure with these outside companies—is not that the argument? The rates are too high at home. If we were doing anything to interfere with business at home or their rights, I could see some force in the objection. We are not dealing here with regard to their right to do business in Canada. We simply say that out of the cheap insurance which they are getting, they shall pay the small tax of 5 per cent. I believe this tax is almost negligible; I do not think there is any ground for the agitation that has been raised against it. I know telegrams have been sent throughout the country asking policyholders to send telegrams to members. I am pretty familiar with that method of agitation now; but I am sure, from the communications that have been received, that there is a misapprehension. Let me give the illustration which I gave a moment ago. A man who is getting cheap insurance, who is paying only ten cents where, in former times, he paid $1.50, is now going to pay 10½ cents. Nobody is going to make a fuss over that. The thing has been magnified. It is only a small thing; but despise not the day of small things.

Mr. HANSON: This resolution on the face of it purports to be a revenue measure.

[Mr. Fielding.]

Mr. FIELDING: Yes.

Mr. HANSON: But it will be observed that this tax is restricted to companies not licensed under the Insurance Act of 1917. I am opposed to the resolution for many reasons given in the letter read by the hon. member for George Etienne Cartier (Mr. Jacobs). I should like to point out to the committee that the policyholders of any company may escape this tax if the company comes and becomes licensed in Canada. It seems to me that this is a left-handed method of attempting to compel these companies to become licensed under the Dominion Insurance Act. Most of these companies—and I am familiar with the New England mutuals—have no desire to do business in Canada; but our people have sought business with them on account of the service which they give to them for a proper premium, and the people have not been sought after by New England mutuals. I believe this is a clear instance of a method adopted by the Insurance Department to attempt to drive these companies into becoming licensed in Canada, and that it is not in any sense a revenue measure.

Mr. GRAHAM: As a matter of fact, these companies do solicit business in this country.

Mr. HANSON: I do not think so.

Mr. GRAHAM: There is no question about that. I know; I have been solicited. They have their agents in Canada who go down regularly to the cities of the United States and get their instructions.

Mr. JACOBS: Why not tax the companies?

Mr. GRAHAM: How can you tax a company in the United States and go over and collect the tax?

Mr. JACOBS: That is the point.

Mr. GRAHAM: The company will have to be reached through the policyholder. If these companies were licensed or would become licensed in Canada, we control them in some way, because they would have some interests in Canada. On the other hand, does any person contend for a moment that this small tax of 5 per cent is going to hurt anybody? Is it going to stop the issuing of one policy in Canada? I cannot see that it will. Is it not time that we in this country ask people on the outside who do business in Canada and who have the benefit of all our machinery, to help a little in paying the expenses?

Mr. HANSON: May I ask a question? If the companies were to pay this tax, I would say: "All right;" but the companies are not paying this tax; it is a tax on a resident policyholder, a man who, in many cases, is obliged to go to the United States to get insurance.

The CHAIRMAN: The hon. member has a right to ask a question, not to make a statement.

Mr. FIELDING: If the tax could be imposed on the company, we all know they would pass it right on to the policyholder. But we cannot reach the company in the United States; we reach the policyholder in Canada.

Mr. GRAHAM: I was going to remark that this small tax will not stop the issuing of one policy in the Dominion of Canada. We forget, perhaps, in discussing these matters, that every person who is taxed objects, of course, on general principles. One thing we all hate to do is to pay taxes. It is like going to prayer-meeting—a lot of us are willing to go on our wife's side. We are willing to pay taxes through our neighbours, but when the tax comes to us, we say: Take it away. Does it not strike hon. members that the companies who object to this little 5 per cent tax are companies who are doing business under a 35 per cent protection themselves? Some high protectionists are protectionists when they are selling; but when they want to buy anything, they are absolute free traders. We find many of them are free traders at night when they are protectionists in the day time. This is such a small matter that no objection should be raised to it. If a policyholder in the Dominion of Canada says to the company that comes to him soliciting insurance. "This will cost me 5 per cent more," if the company wants business very badly, it will give the policyholder the 5 per cent. To my mind, this tax can be carried on to the company through the policyholder in this instance. It is time that we asked these people to pay a little into the treasury of Canada. We must not forget that we have a debt of two billions and a half, the interest on which somebody must pay, besides our pensions, besides all our extraordinary expenditures on account of the war, taking care of widows, orphans and maimed men. If every one gets out of paying taxes where could we get the money? And you get a little money from these Americans that do business here.

Mr. McMASTER: You are not going to get this money from Americans doing business here; you are going to get it from men who are carrying on business in this country, who have sought and obtained the best form of insurance that they can find anywhere.

Mr. PARENT: And get nothing in return.

Mr. McMASTER: You are going to tax them on their wisdom, their forethought and their capacity by taxing them on the premiums they pay. It is only a small tax, I admit but when I heard the Minister of Militia (Mr. Graham) appealing to patriotism, I confess I did not think of Johnson's statement that patriotism is the last refuge of the scoundrel; I thought of the theory that patriotism is the last refuge of those who wish to promote or advocate something economically unsound. It is economically unsound to tax people upon their expenses incurred in doing business. I grant you that these manufacturers, who are protected to the extent of 25, 30 and 35 per cent, are the last people in the world who should complain. But, let me say, that does not apply to the member for Brome when he speaks on taxation principles. I respectfully urge up on the Minister of Finance that this is a mistaken way of raising a very small amount of money. It is opening the door to an unsound system of taxation. I do not think a man should be taxed on the expenditure incurred in carrying on his business.

Mr. GRAHAM: The statement has been made that no taxes have ever been imposed on expenditures incurred in connection with business. If you build a store in a municipality are you not taxed on that? You are immediately taxed on the amount of money expended in carrying on that business.

An hon. MEMBER: And there is the business tax.

Mr. GRAHAM: Yes, but I am trying to answer the statement that no taxes are imposed on expenditures.

Mr. McMASTER: I never said that. I simply said that this is not a sound economic system of taxation. And one of the greatest objections to municipal taxes is that at present all improvements are taxed, whereas under a proper system you would tax the land values and not the improvements.

Mr. HARRIS: Under the present system the tariff companies just sit down in their offices in the large centres and strike a rate which the man seeking insurance must pay. Practically all tariff companies, it is well known, are licensed companies. On the other hand, a very large number of unlicensed companies are non-tariff companies. One hon. member just now had a good deal to say in regard to the manufacturers who wanted insurance. Well, they are not the only people that want insurance; there are other people looking for insurance, and they invariably go to non-tariff or unlicensed companies. In my humble opinion, if the Minister of Finance deems it necessary to levy a tax on the premiums from these non-tariff or unlicensed companies, the tax should apply to all companies. The unhappy experience of practically all manufacturers in the Dominion is that the underwriters association send out a deputy to look over the risk, who comes back and reports to his seniors that the rate for the institution shall be such-and-such. What redress have the manufacturers? They have none at all, unless they go to the unlicensed companies; and by instituting this small tax against these companies you are establishing, in my opinion, a wrong principle which will tend to put another big club into the hands of such organizations as the Canadian Fire Underwriters' Association and similar institutions.

Mr. COOTE: I protest against the resolution as a matter of partiality to the Fire Underwriters Association of Canada, which is without doubt the worst trust that exists in the country. I wish to utter a protest on behalf of a man who does not enjoy any protective tariff. The constituency in which I live has very few men who get any benefit from the tariff, and this man says that he carries insurance in unlicensed insurance companies, and considers the proposed tax unjust in view of the high rates charged and the excessive profits made by the licensed companies. I suggest to the Minister of Finance that if he is going to impose a tax on insurance premiums it should be on all premiums and not only on those in unlicensed companies.

Mr. FIELDING: All the other companies, in one form or another, pay taxes. These people pay none, and we are trying to get something from them.

Resolution agreed to

[Mr. McMaster.]

3. Resolved, That it is expedient to amend section 12 of the said Act by striking thereout subsections two and four and substituting the following:—

(2) No person shall issue a cheque payable at or by a bank unless there is affixed thereto an adhesive stamp or unless there is impressed thereon by means of a die a stamp of the value of, if the amount of money for which the cheque is issued

(i) does not exceed $50.. .. .. .. two cents
(ii) exceeds $50, for every $50 or fraction thereof.. .. .. .. two cents

but not to exceed in any case two dollars and every adhesive stamp affixed to a cheque be cancelled by the bank at which the cheque is payable at or before the time of payment.

Mr. FIELDING: I move that Resolution No. 3 be amended by adding after the paragraph respecting stamp tax on cheques a provision that:

The minister may make regulations under which there may be impressed on a cheque words indicating that stamps to the requisite value in respect thereof have been duly paid together with such further regulations as may be necessary, and to provide that only persons licensed by the minister shall be entitled to the benefit of such regulations.

It has been suggested that we take power to the Governor in Council to make regulation, not varying the amount of taxation but facilitating the method of collecting. I have no doubt something can be done along these lines to make the matter less objectionable than heretofore.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: On what basis will that be worked out? Will it be on the basis of the amount of money checked out of each man's bank account?

Mr. FIELDING: I do not care to commit myself on the question. Any suggestions that may be offered will be fairly considered. We want the money; that is the foundation principle. But whatever can be done by way of regulations tc facilitate the collection of the money with the least possible inconvenience to business we shall be glad to do.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: Has the minister thought over the question of having a flat rate again for cheques under a given amount, and a flat rate for larger sums?

Mr. FIELDING: I have thought of it.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: It does seems to me that unless that course is adopted ;there is no reasonable way of collecting the tax. Obviously if a $500 cheque is to pay 20 cents, and a $5,000 cheque $2, a $50,-000 cheque ought to pay $20. The reasons which have no doubt actuated my hon. friend in making the changes only go to

show how unworkable these things are. In certain lines, such as the grain trade and the bond business, trading is done on such a small margin that this tax will seriously eat into the profits. But, after all, does not that merely show it is an illogical kind of tax? Would it not be better to make the tax five cents for cheques over $100? I think the treasury would get just as much money. But again we have the stamp tax brought in on receipts.

Mr. FIELDING: The next clause.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: The receipt tax seems to be put on because my hon. friend has abandoned a graduated scale of duty on cheques above $5,000; because it is an inconvenient tax he substitutes a two cent tax on every receipt over $10. I would venture to suggest to my hon. friend that after all they do some things very well in Great Britain, that they have been years in the banking business where we have been days, that they thoroughly understand the necessities of revenue, and that they have found in connection with cheques—things which have to be written out so frequently—that it is impossible to make all these calculations, and therefore they have simply a flat tax of two cents. If there is to be a graduation, why not have it on the receipt rather than on the cheque? Should not the man who gives the receipt be much readier to pay on a higher scale than he who makes out the cheque? I know my hon. friend needs the money, but it seems to me he might adopt a very much better principle than this.

Mr. FIELDING: If we are dealing with principles, I am afraid the first principle to be considered is that we need the money, and I would like my hon. friend to read that principle into every one of these resolutions. Even if some tax seems to be absolutely illogical, it must be remembered that we still need the money. With regard to a flat rate, undoubtedly there would be an advantage, except in regard to the amount of revenue that would result from it. If we could make a large flat rate, say 10 cents, on every cheque, we would get a lot of money, possibly as much as we will get this way; but my own information is, speaking not of the big offices in Montreal, Toronto, Quebec, St. John and Halifax, but of the ordinary businesses in the smaller communities, that 60 or 70 per cent of the cheques are under $50. The small cheque that we all issue for household expenses and so on is still to pay a small tax; we do not want to change that. But if you adopt the principle of a graduated scale without a limitation you get into trouble, as I found in actual communication with parties interested. There are very large transactions handled on a very small margin indeed; then there are some classes of transactions where as a matter of fact each transaction passes through two or three stages, necessitating two or three and sometimes three or four cheques; that is notably so, I am told, in the bond business. If we had to have a graduated scale without limitation, that tax would be very oppressive on that class of business, indeed I think it would probably destroy it. I am frank to say that on a fuller investigation I came to the conclusion that a graduated tax without some limitation would be very disastrous to some lines of business. We cannot adopt a flat rate because it will not give us enough revenue unless we make it so high as to be oppressive on the small cheque givers. I do not want to interfere with cheques given by small householders for ordinary small transactions. So as respects a very large percentage of these cheques there is no change whatever in the tax. But if we go on without limitation I am afraid we would make the tax oppressive. We are prepared to admit the principle is illogical, but again I say: We need the money.

Mr. MACLEAN (York): The main grievance of our business men, as set out in the telegrams received to-day, is that they do want a flat tax if it can possibly be arranged, say a 5 cent tax on all cheques above $100. It might reduce the revenue, but it would give a certainty in the carrying on of business which a complicated proposition such as that now before the House does not give.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: I do not see that my hon. friend the Minister of Finance covers the question of cheques drawn on provincial banks. Has the hon. gentleman considered that question?

Mr. FIELDING: No doubt some details will have to be worked out more carefully in the bill, and I will bear in mind my hon. friend's suggestion. There is no such thing as a provincial bank, except the very excellent bank of that name in the province of Quebec, which has that title. But using the word broadly, there is no such thing as a provincial bank; there cannot be.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: There are two.

Mr. FIELDING: My hon. friend is wrong. He is a lawyer and I am not, and he knows that no province can do business under the name of a bank. Only a chartered bank authorized by the Parliament of Canada can use the word "bank", and if anybody in this country attempts to do business and put a sign over the door containing the word, "bank", he is liable to prosecution, even the Premier of a province would not be exempt.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: I would point out that offices are maintained by the Ontario government for the deposit of moneys which can be withdrawn by cheque. We do not call our postoffice a bank, but we carry on a savings bank business. I want to know whether the resolution applies to these provincial activities.

Mr. FIELDING: You cannot prevent a province receiving money from people who are willing to lend it. That is what the people are doing, they are lending money to the provinces, and we do not want to prevent that.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: Certainly not.

Mr. FIELDING: Whether or not it is a wise policy for those provinces to do that is a matter of controversy upon which I offer no opinion. But I do not think we can prevent them receiving public money from those who want to lend it.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: I agree absolutely that the provinces have that right. But when they cheque the money out will they have to put a stamp on the cheque? That is all I want to know.

Mr. FIELDING: They are not chartered banks.

Mr. GARDINER: When we consider that provincial and municipal bodies will have to pay this tax on their cheques I am afraid it is going to be quite a burden on public business, and I would ask the minister to please take that matter into consideration.

Mr. FIELDING: It is a hardship to have to pay taxes, but we have to have the money.

Mr. CHAPLIN: Whether they are banks or not we have institutions in the province of Ontario that are soliciting deposits from the people. Must stamps be placed upon cheques that are made out for withdrawing money from those banks?

[Mr. Fielding.]

Mr. FIELDING: You cannot tax the Crown. If these are to be regarded as ordinary banks, the cheques would be liable to the tax. I would not like to give too definite an opinion; we will have to look into that closely. You cannot tax the Crown, but you may tax an individual who has money in the possession of the Crown. In the preparation of the bill, which will come before the House later, I will promise to have this matter looked into.

Mr. GARDNER: I just want to enter a protest against the taxing of municipal and school board cheques, other than at the flat two-cent rate. The minister says we need the money; I admit we do need it. But he has exempted a lot of people who are in a position to pay and he is taking it out of these public institutions. If he would look over the whole field of available taxation I am sure he could find plenty of opportunity to impose taxes without taxing the cheques issued by these institutions.

Mr. FIELDING: They are taxed now; we are simply turning the screw a little more, that is all.

Mr. SPENCE: I have a number of telegrams here with respect to this matter.

Mr. CALDWELL: We all have them.

Mr. SPENCE: I suggest that there should be a specific tax on each cheque. If we employ the method proposed, a good deal of hardship will result. This looks to me like playing to the large interests; the man who issues cheques for very large sums will not pay any more than the man who issues cheques for $5,000. The man who issues 150 to 200 cheques a week will have to pay a very considerable sum as a result of this tax, and great loss and inconvenience will ensue. It will entail more work to keep track of the different denominations of stamps that will have to be used on the cheques, and from this point of view it would be much better to impose a straight tax of five or ten cents on cheques amounting to $5 and upward. It seems to me that the whole tendency is to get as much as possible out of the man of business, to take from him every dollar he makes. I know that is the case with me. I am interested in a business in connection with which 150 cheques a week are issued. We have no other way of paying the accounts to different growers all over the country. We have 200 accounts in connection with which we send men out to make

collections every week; these men will have to carry a bunch of two-cent stamps in their pockets and put a stamp on every receipt. This tax is certainly an injury to the man who is carrying on business. I hope the time will soon come when this thing will stop; it is getting worse all the time.

Mr. STEWART (Hamilton): I am very much opposed to this tax, and I know that a large number of citizens take the same view. I suggest that the minister should allow this item to stand in order that he may see whether some different method cannot be arrived at of getting the necessary revenue. Upon further consideration it may be found possible to devise some tax that will be more equitable in its effects. I certainly hope the minister will consider the matter.

Mr. FIELDING: If it is any comfort to my hon. friends, I can tell them that there is not one of these proposed taxes concerning which I have not had sheaves of telegrams.

Mr. THOMPSON: Take the case of the cheese and butter industry. When a man buys a shipment of butter, he pays stamp duty on the cheque he issues for it, which means a stamp for every $50. Then, the salesmen of the different companies in their transactions with their patrons, have to put a stamp on every cheque or draft amounting to $50 or a fraction thereof. So that on transactions in connection with cheese and butter this tax will be applied four or five times; in the end it comes out of the price of those products, and is therefore a hardship on the dairy farmer. For this reason I am opposed to the amendment.

Mr. GARDINER: The minister says he has received many telegrams in respect to this tax. Has he received any telegrams protesting against the imposition of this tax on cheques amounting to more than $5,000?

Mr. FIELDING: I have had telegrams protesting against the stamp tax in any shape or form.

Mr. GARDINER: Will the minister please answer the question more directly? Has he had telegrams protesting against the stamp tax on cheques exceeding $5,000?

Mr. FIELDING: Since that limitation was put on I have had representations along the line of what has been suggested to-night—that we had better have a flat tax.

Mr. BOIVIN: Will this tax apply to cheques upon trust companies?

Mr. FIELDING: Yes.

Mr. BOIVIN: I notice that in the resolution the word " bank " only is used. There are a great many corporations in Canada and a great many persons who receive deposits from the general public, and I suggest that some words be added to cover that. It might read:

—or any person or corporation receiving deposits from the general public.

Mr. FIELDING: I think it will be found that the bill will cover all these points.

Resolution agreed to.

7. Resolved, That it is expedient to amend section 13 of the said Act by striking thereout subsections 2 and 3 and substituting the following:—

"(2) Every express company carrying on business in Canada shall before the issue of a money order or traveller's cheque affix thereto an adhesive stamp of the value of, if the amount of money for which the money order or traveller's cheque is issued

(i) does not exceed $50.. .. .. two cents
(ii) exceeds $50, for every $50 or fraction thereof.. .. .. two cents

but not to exceed in any case two dollars and the company may charge the amount of the stamps so affixed to and collect the same from the purchaser of the order or cheque or from the payee thereof. The company shall before delivery of the order or cheque cancel the stamp by writing on or across the stamp initials or other identification of the company together with the date of the issue of the order or cheque."

"(3) No money order shall be issued under the provisions of the Post Office Act until there is affixed thereto or to the relative advice a postage stamp of the value of, if the amount of money for which the money order is issued

(i) does not exceed $50.. .. .. two cents
(ii) exceeds $50, for every $50 or fraction thereof.. .. .. two cents

but not to exceed in any case two dollars, to be paid for by the purchaser of the order. The postmaster or other officer of the Post Office Department issuing the order shall cancel the stamp by impressing thereon when affixed the date stamp of the post office at which the order is issued."

"Any enactment founded on paragraphs three, four, five, six and seven of these resolutions shall come into force on the first day of July, one thousand nine hundred and twenty-two."

Mr. FIELDING: I want to move an amendment to the last paragraph of this resolution, to provide that any enactment founded on paragraphs three, four, five, six and seven of these resolutions shall come into force on the first day of August instead of the first day of July, so as to give a longer time for the making of the necessary arrangements consequent upon the new taxation.

Resolution, as amended, agreed to.

8. Resolved, That it is expedient to amend the said Act by providing that no person shall give a receipt unless there is affixed thereto an adhesive stamp or unless there is impressed thereon by means of a die a stamp of the value of two cents, which is to be cancelled by the person by whom the receipt is given before he delivers it out of his hands; that the expression "receipt" shall mean any note, memorandum or writing whereby any money amounting to $10 or upwards, or any bill of exchange or promissory note for money amounting to $10 or upwards is acknowledged or expressed to have been received, deposited or repaid or whereby any debt or demand or any part of a debt or demand of the amount of $10 or upwards is acknowledged to have been settled, satisfied or discharged or which signifies or imports any such acknowledgement and whether the same is or is not signed with the name of any person; and to provide that any person who violates any of the provisions of any enactment founded on this resolution or who refuses to give a receipt duly stamped, shall be liable to a penalty not exceeding $100; and to provide for certain exemptions from the foregoing; and to provide that any enactment founded on this resolution shall come into force on the first day of January, one thousand nine hundred and twenty-three.

Mr. SIMPSON: I think the Minister of Finance should give some explanation before this resolution carries because it is one thing that is likely to have considerable ramifications. For instance, if a customer goes into a store and purchases goods exceeding $10 in value for which he pays cash, that cash is put into the cash register and a little ticket is given to him which is the receipt for that purchase. Will it be necessary to attach a stamp to that kind of a receipt where the purchase exceeds $10? Furthermore where a customer pays a bill exceeding $10, the bill is receipted and handed back to him; it is virtually a cash transaction. Will it be necessary in that case also to attach a stamp to the bill. Moreover, many orders are given to stores over the telephone. For example, a housewife will call up a grocery store and may leave an order, exceeding $10 in amount, asking that the goods be sent C.O.D. The delivery man comes round and delivers the goods, hands in the bill, and receives the money. Will it be necessary for that delivery man to carry stamps with him and attach a stamp to the bill in such a case when he receipts it?

Mr. FIELDING: I think, perhaps, that in the great majority of transactions in the retail business the amount is less than $10 and no receipt is given at all. We are applying the English act in this respect, but I confess that I have some hesitation in giving a definite answer to my hon. friend at the moment. However, we are not going to bring this act into operation until January 1, next, We will thus be able to investigate the English practice in the matter and to adapt the regulations we will make to conditions here so as to try them out, our chief object being to get money with the least possible embarrassment to business. The receipt stamp tax is a very old tax in England. We are adopting it in the words of the English act, and we will try to find cut what the English regulations are, and what the practice is, and conform to that as far as possible. I think there will be ample time in which these matters may be carefully considered and due consideration given to suggestions such as my hon. friend has offered.

Mr. MARCIL (Bonaventure): In Paris a stamp tax is put on every receipt or invoice for goods purchased in a store, as all who have visited that city know. The purchaser pays the stamp.

Mr. SIMPSON: I would suggest to the minister that instead of fixing the amount at $10 it be raised to $25, which will fully answer the purpose and cover the majority of transactions in a retail store.

Mr. FIELDING: I am afraid that would have a restrictive effect for revenue purposes.

Resolution agreed to.

9. Resolved, That subsection one of section sixteen A of the said Act as enacted by chapter forty-six of the Statutes of 1918, be amended by adding thereto the following:

Providing that when matches are put up in parckages containing not more than sixty and not less than thirty matches each, the tax shall be payable at the rate of one-half of one cent for each package, and when matches are put up in packages containing less than thirty matches each, the tax shall be payable at the rate of one-fourth of one cent per package.

Mr. HANSON: I would like to point out to the minister that under this resolution the matches used by the well-to-do will bear a lower rate rate of taxation than the matches used by the poor man. I do not think this is a proper method of distributing taxation. If there is to be any favour shown in this matter it ought to be to the poor man rather than to the rich.

Mr. FIELDING: This tax is certainly in favour of the small consumer because we provide a smaller rate in the case of a small package.

Mr. HANSON: At first blush that might appear to be so but I call the attention of the minister to the fact that in the ordinary country districts, and small communi-

ties these small packages of matches, as a rule, are not sold at all. There they buy a box of five hundred matches, and they do not use the safety matches, so-called, that the people in the cities use.

Mr. FIELDING: Owing to the tax being rather severe we are not now making, I am told, that class of matches in Canada, although they are used widely in the neighbouring States. No doubt under this resolution smaller packages of matches will be made.

Resolution agreed to.

10. Resolved, That section nineteen A of the said Act as enacted by chapter forty-six of the Statutes of 1918, be amended by adding thereto the following:

Provided that in computing the "duty paid value" of tea purchased in bond in the United Kingdom the amount of the customs duty payable on tea for consumption in the United Kingdom shall not be included in the value of such tea for purposes of this Act.

Resolution agreed to.

11. Resolved, That Order in Council 2031, dated the thirteenth day of June, 1921, shall cease to have force or effect and that subsection one of section nineteen BBB of the said Act as enacted by chapter fifty of the Statutes of 1921, be struck out and the following substituted therefor:

(1) In addition to any duty or tax that may be payable under this section, or any other statute or law, there shall be imposed, levied and collected an excise tax of two and one-quarter per cent on sales and deliveries by Canadian manufacturers or producers and wholesalers or jobbers, and a tax of three and three-quarters per cent on the duty paid value of goods imported, but in respect of sales by manufacturers or producers, to retailers or consumers the excise tax payable shall be four and one-half per cent and on goods imported by retailers or consumers the excise tax payable shall be six per cent on the duty paid value.

Provided that in respect of lumber an excise tax of three per cent shall be imposed, levied and collected on sales and deliveries by the Canadian manufacturer and of four and one-half per cent on importations, and that no further excise tax shall be payable on re-sale.

Provided also that the taxes specified in this section shall not apply to sales or importations of:—

Bread; flour, oatmeal, rolled oats and cornmeal; rolled wheat, buckwheat meal and pea meal; animals living; live poultry; meats and poultry, fresh; milk, including butter-milk; cream; butter; cheese; oleomargarine, margarine, butterine or other substitutes for butter; lard, lard compound and similar substances, made from animal or vegetable stearine or oils; eggs; vegetables, fruits, grains and seeds in their natural state; bran, shorts, middlings, alfalfa meal; oil cake, oil cake meal; grains mixed or crushed for cattle or poultry feed; hay; straw; hops; nursery stock; chicory, raw or green; bees; honey; sugar; molasses; salt; other farm produce sold by the individual farmer of his own production; ice; fish and products thereof not canned or medicated; ores of metals of all kinds; fuel of all kinds; gold and silver in ingots, blocks, bars, drops, sheets or plates unmanufactured; British and Canadian coin and foreign gold coin; logs and round unmanufactured timber; fence posts, railroad ties, pulpwood, tan bark, and other articles the product of the forest when produced and sold by the individual settler or farmer; newspapers and quarterly, monthly and semi-monthly magazines and weekly literary papers unbound; materials for use only in the construction, equipment and repair of ships; ships licensed to engage in the Canadian coasting trade; calcium carbide; radium; electricity; gas manufactured from coal, calcium carbide or oil for illuminating or heating purposes; materials for use solely in the manufacture of oleomargarine or any substitute for butter or lard; artificial limbs and parts thereof; artificial eyes; donations of clothing and books for charitable purposes; settlers' effects; War Veterans' badges; memorials or monuments erected in memory of soldiers who fell in the Great War; articles imported for the use of the Governor General; articles imported for the personal or official use of Consuls General who are natives or citizens of the country they represent and who are engaged in any other business or profession; bibles, missals, prayer-books, psalm and hymn-books, religious tracts, and Sunday school lesson pictures; articles admitted to free entry under Customs Tariff item 682; manila fibre for use only in the manufacture of rope not exceeding one and one-half inches in circumference for the fisheries; boats bona fide purchased by individual fisherman for their own personal use in the fisheries; articles and materials used in the manufacture of boats bona fide built for individual fishermen for their own personal use in the fisheries; fibre for use only in the manufacture of binder twine; job printed matter produced and sold by printers or firms, whose sales of job printing do not exceed three thousand dollars per annum; fertilizers; dried beet pulp, and the Governor in Council shall have power to add to the foregoing list of articles exempted from the excise tax on sales, as he may deem it expedient or necessary to exempt from the said excise taxes.

Provided further that the excise taxes specified in this section shall not be payable on goods exported, or on sales of goods made to the order of each individual customer by a business which sells exclusively by retail; and provided that the tax as specified in this section shall be payable on sales of goods manufactured for stock by merchants who sell exclusively by retail.

A drawback may be granted of ninety-nine per cent of the said taxes paid on materials used wrought into or attached to articles exported, provided that payment of a specific sum in lieu of such drawback may be authorized by the Governor in Council in cases where specific rates of drawback of Customs duties are granted under the provisions of section 288 of the Customs Act.

Mr. STEVENS: I rise to make two requests of the Minister of Finance. He will notice among the exemptions that there are a large number of articles, for instance, milk, including buttermilk, cream, etc. I was going to ask the minister if he would include there preserved milk, powdered milk, and condensed milk because it

seems to me there is no reason why, for instance, oleomargarine and butterine, which are substitutes for butter, lard, and so on, should be exempted and not condensed milk, an article of food of very great value. On the next page among the exemptions there is an exemption applying to "job printed matter produced and sold by printers or firms whose sales of job printing do not exceed three thousand dollars per annum." Let me point out to the minister what I think is the weakness of this particular provision. Here is a job printer doing, let us say, a business of $3,000. Across the street there is another job printer doing a business of four, five, or six thousand dollars; one is taxed and the other is not. Or if the job printer was only doing, say, a business of $3,500 he is taxed while the other man who is doing a business just under $3,000 is not taxed. I do not think there is—what shall I say?—any sound reason in logic in this method of exemption regarding the printing business. I submit that condensed milk should be added to the exemptions, and I would also suggest that the provision regarding job printers, which is a comparatively small matter, should be struck out all together.

Mr. WOODS: I would like to call attention to the latter part of clause 1, which reads:

> But in respect of sales by manufacturers or producers to retailers or consumers, the excise tax payable shall be 4½ per cent, and on goods imported by retailers or consumers, the excise tax payable shall be 6 per cent on the duty paid value.

It looks to me that there is an added 1½ per cent customs duty, in favour of the manufacturer. The retailer or the consumer, if he goes direct to the manufacturer in this country, and buys his goods, pays 4½ per cent of an excise tax on those goods. It all comes off the consumer. If that same retailer or consumer goes to a foreign country, buys goods and brings them to this country, he is taxed 6 per cent, he being a retailer or consumer. So that, in buying goods from a foreign country the consumer is taxed 6 per cent, whereas if he buys from the home manufacturer he is taxed 4½ per cent.

Mr. FIELDING: The manufacturer would have to buy his raw material. In this resolution we have not changed the machinery of the sales tax at all. I assume it was carefully worked out in due proportion by my predecessor. At all events, all we propose here is to get $1.50 instead of $1.00. We have not changed the machinery at all. These are the figures which we found in the act of a year ago, and, I think, they were worked out with a due sense of proportion. In regard to the resolution generally, I would be very glad to have the discussion proceed for a few minutes, so that we may have the opinion of the committee. I do not intend to ask judgment on this to-night. Representations have been made in regard to it, and I want to make a further study of it. We can all, from the point of view of our own community, suggest the exemption of something, but once you commence with exemption, and you open the door, you get into trouble in nearly every item. One gentleman says canned milk should be made free because fresh milk is free, and another member suggests something else should be made free, and so on. Each one of these things may have some relation to other things, and if you look at it from the point of view of one particular thing that interests your own community we will have all kinds of difficulty. I do not wish the clause to be finally passed to-night, but I will be glad to have the discussion, so that we may ascertain the minds of the committee.

Mr. STANSELL: In support of the statement made by the hon. member from Centre Vancouver (Mr. Stevens), I may say that milk and all products of milk, except condensed milk, are exempted from this tax. Most of you who know anything of the condensed or canned milk industry know that since the war they have been labouring under very severe difficulties. Their markets have been greatly restricted, so much so that two of the most important and best equipped factories in Canada, one in Tillsonburg, Ontario, and one in Huntingdon, Quebec, have closed up and, I believe dismantled. They were last year subject to a sales tax which, in the opinion of the manufacturers under existing conditions, was as heavy as could possibly be borne by the industry. I would like to suggest to the minister that, if possible, this matter should be taken into consideration, and, if it is not decided to relieve the industry from taxation, that they should, at lest, not be taxed further than they have been in the past. It has been explained to me by some gentlemen with whom I am acquainted, and who are engaged in this business, that they have been able to absorb most of that tax, but not all of it.

Under present market conditions, it would be practically impossible to pass it on to the consumer; therefore, the whole tax falls on the farmer producing the milk for the factory while the other farmer, who produces the milk for ordinary sale, goes free of tax. For this reason I suggest respectfully that this tax should be on the basis of last year if the Finance Minister is not able to remove it altogether.

Mr. McMASTER: I wish to place before the minister a question of general interest in connection with the sales tax. Looking at the matter from the point of view of revenue, I apprehend that the imposition of sales taxes, sometimes 3¾ per cent and sometimes 6 per cent, on top of very high import duties, may have a result upon the revenue the reverse of beneficial. It may mean that the aggregate duty imposed on the goods coming in may be raised so high that it will keep the goods out, if that is not a Hibernianism. There is another point I wish to bring before the Committee. These sales taxes are based upon the duty paid value of the article, not the invoice value of the article; therefore, the higher the duty the higher the sales tax. The sales tax of 6 per cent on produce coming in from a foreign manufacturer directly to a Canadian retailer, on goods which carry a customs duty of 35 per cent, is not a sales tax of 6 per cent, but a sales tax of over 8 per cent. I would like the minister, if he could, to provide that, after the duty borne by goods coming into the country reaches a certain level, the sales tax be not imposed at all. That, I think, would be sound legislation. If the minister does not feel that he can do that, I would urge upon him the advisability of having the sales tax estimated, not upon the duty paid value of the article, but upon the invoice value of the article, because, I think, it is something of a compound duty, the higher the duty the higher the sales tax, and if you run up the duties too high where, I think, the revenue will suffer. I quite realize the difficulties with which the minister is faced in his desire not to open the door.

I wish to refer now to the question of flour. That is one of the first articles mentioned in this list as being free from sales tax. There has been in Montreal, for two generations, what used to be called a small milling partnership, now a small milling company, who make and put upon the market a brand of self-raising flour. It is made of wheat. There is restored to the wheat a certain amount of chemical, which modern milling processes take from it, and this mixture is used by the poorer people. It is put on the market in small packages. It is not a fancy article. It competes with ordinary flour, and has certain baking powder or chemical ingredients in it. I hope that the minister will be able to regard that as a staple article, such as it is, and that he will have no objection to adding to the definition of flour, the words "including self-raising wheat flour". There has been a doubt in the Customs Board whether this flour fallls under the general terms of flour or not. I should be glad if this could be put beyond all question.

Mr. PUTNAM: If we may revert for a moment to the question of the proposed increased tax upon condensed milk, I am sorry that I have to find myself, even on one item of the budget of the Minister of Finance (Mr. Fielding) in disagreement therewith, when it falls upon the very day when I, in a humble manner, was helping with pride and great joy to celebrate the fortieth anniversary of the entry of the Minister of Finance into public life in this country. I am sure everybody in the House joins in the spirit of congratulation that we, of his own particular side, extend to him to-day.

As regards this item, I have listened to so many arguments and the answers to them, that I am going to make my remarks very brief because, while I could adduce a variety of arguments which, I think, are sound, in opposition to this proposed increase, I know, on the other hand, that they would be met by the other side of the question in the same manner as has fallen to the fate of many similar arguments adduced by hon. gentlemen all around me this evening. I have, I may say, submitted to the Minister of Finance a brief upon this, and I took the liberty of placing that same brief before a majority, at least, of his colleagues. Therefore it is that my remarks of to-night shall not be lengthy. I should like to emphasize the fact that when you come to tax condensed milk, you are taxing a staple food for children and a food which is becoming more and more of popular use amongst the children of the poor. It is wonderful how nearly those who manufacture condensed milk can approximate the real milk of the cow; they can come to within less than one per cent

of the actual natural milk. There is some little difference after all, I daresay, in the benefit of it. It is said that scientists can make a grain of wheat, to all intents, appearances and human analysis, an exact grain of wheat; but if you put it into the ground, of course it will not grow. While I admit that there is possibly some natural benefit in the natural cow's milk over condensed milk, it is a fact that condensed milk can be reduced and diluted until, in appearance and in substance, it is within less than one per cent of real milk. It comes a great deal cheaper than real milk, and it goes into a great many localities where it is not feasible to keep a cow. It is a fact that in the larger cities this is becoming more and more a means of promoting the philanthropic work of child welfare. Our larger cities in Canada are as yet few, and you may contend that the question is in an academic stage as yet; but even some of the Canadian cities and the larger cities of the United States are teaching us the possibilities of this very use of condensed milk as an indispensible factor in the life of the young child. When we come to that consideration we are on delicate ground. The Minister of Finance said a few moments ago that as good an argument could be made against the taxing of canned fish as against the taxing of condensed milk. But with due respect, I must urge that milk has a unique place in the sense that it is a food for children. Meat for strong men, says Scripture, and milk for the babes, and it is a food for which there is, I believe, scarcely any substitute when you come to the case of small children.

An hon. member on the other side mentioned that whilst trying to cope with the outbreak of a certain disease he found a scarcity of blankets amongst the poor; but even in that case you may get other woollen goods; you may get even old clothes, and if you get the proper degree of weight, and the proper heat, you may have a substitute for blankets, a clumsy and inconvenient one, I admit. But when you come to the question of milk for the children of the poor man, you cannot get that substitute. In addition to the considerations which I have already in documentary form addressed to the Minister of Finance, in addition to the propaganda which, I know, he has already received and which he is carefully digesting, from various sources on this very question, I would, as a final word, leave with him and his colleagues this question of the welfare of the children of the poor. I am in hope that the milk of human kindness will prompt them to see that they should not increase the present tax upon the human kindness of milk.

Mr. SUTHERLAND: We all appreciate the difficulties which the minister has in raising sufficient revenues to meet the demands on the country. At the same time, I think we should be very careful to see that no industry is injuriously affected that is essential to the future development of our country, and particularly the one which, according to all reports, is labouring under such hard circumstances at the present time. I refer to agriculture. The articles which are exempted in this schedule before the committee include many articles of a similar nature to condensed, evaporated and powdered milk. This may be a somewhat new process to many people, but it is one which has gained enormous proportions in this country. Some people can scarcely realize the extent of this business. I might say that, during the past year, 310,858,503 pounds of milk were condensed or powdered in this Dominion. During the past year a sales tax was levied upon this of 3 per cent in addition to the inland revenue tax of 1½ per cent. In 1920, these milk products were exempted from the tax. Unfortunately, in 1921, they were left out. I brought the matter before the House on that occasion and had the assurance of the then Minister of Finance (Sir Henry Drayton) that the matter would be taken into consideration. The customs authorities, however, have ruled that these commodities do not come under the exemptions which were provided in the act of 1921, which exemptions comprise milk, including buttermilk, cream, butter, cheese, oleomargarine, margarine, butterine or other substitutes for butter; lard, lard compound and similar substances, made from animal or vegetable stearine or oils; and in addition to that, materials for use solely in the manufacture of oleomargarine or any substitute for butter or lard. Any of these substitutes may be imported into this country and are exempted from this tax entirely. It is on these articles to which I have referred, namely, condensed milk, powdered milk and evaporated milk that this heavy tax has now been imposed, and it is well known that these industries have had a great deal of difficulty in carrying on business during the past year. During the war the product of these factories was in great demand in Europe. Since that time, this demand has ceased and they have been shut out of the United States

market, as well with the result that factories have had to close down. One in Quebec and one in the constituency which I represent have been closed during the past year, and in all probability, if this tax goes into effect, the condensed and powdered milk industry of this country will be destroyed. There is at present under construction in our county town a very large powdered milk factory which will be in operation in the course of a few weeks. The milk is simply subjected to a process of evaporation, all the moisture being drawn off, leaving the powder, and why this residium should not be regarded as milk by the customs authorities is something I fail to understand. The fact must not be lost sight of that this industry is paying a very heavy tax on the tinplate which is imported. An immense quantity of this material is used in the manufacture of cans to take care of this product, and upon it they pay a heavy tax of 12½ per cent. The minister should not make any comparison between milk and this milk product, on the one hand and, on the other hand, fish and canned fish. The comparison is not a fair one. This product is not exempt from taxation, but other substitutes for milk are. Two factories in Ontario during the past two years imported material amounting to some four million pounds for the manufacture of a butter substitute, oleomargarine, and it is a strange thing that while every other industry or business in Canada pays a tax of 7½ cents per hundred pounds on the salt it imports, this particular industry manufacturing a substitute for dairy products is allowed to bring in its salt free of duty. If a legitimate industry native to the country is going to be singled out in this way and be made subject to a tax of this kind while other industries that are trying to supplant it are to be fostered by the Government, then the sooner the people understand the truth of the matter the better.

I have already pointed out the difficulties that surround these dairy industries to-day. In the county I represent one factory alone took in upwards of 60,000,000 pounds of milk last year to be manufactured into this article. Of the total product of the condensories of the Dominion, 35 per cent is manufactured in Oxford county. Immense quantities of low grade wheat and mill feeds from western Canada are fed there and manufactured in this way into this product. We have heard a good deal in the past about the necessity for progress and development along agricultural lines, and here is a finished article that is being consumed by the working people of this country to-day to a greater extent than most people realize. Two weeks ago I was in a grocery in a town in the county I represent, and the grocer knowing that this question was coming up, called my attention to the fact that he was then wrapping up four cans of condensed milk, not for one of the wealthy people of the town but for a returned soldier who was working in a foundry. Families who have no refrigerators and cannot have ice to keep their milk in proper condition, cannot afford to use the bottled milk that is left on their doorsteps in the morning, especially if they have children, because it is a well known fact that milk that is not kept on ice in hot weather quickly goes bad. On the other hand, this milk product is absolutely pure, and will keep indefinitely. I am sure that representations must have been made to the minister from many quarters in regard to this matter, and I was disappointed, not to say surprised, to hear him make the comparison between the conditions attached to condensed and powdered milk and liquid milk, and fish and canned fish. There can be no comparison between the two.

I regret very much the attitude that the minister has taken. I am satisfied that the imposition of a tax of $200,000 on the sugar beet industry which we have in western Ontario will destroy the business. Here also we have had another advance in agriculture, in the manufacturing into a finished article of one of the products of the farm. This commodity can be shipped to every part of the world and can be kept for an indefinite period, and it is only within recent years that the industry has developed. I am sorry that the minister cannot see his way to encourage this industry. I shall move an amendment before I conclude and I hope that the matter will receive the careful consideration at the hands of the minister which its importance warrants. I might point out that the value of this milk product in Canada last year was $14,162,000. There are 27 factories engaged in the manufacture of powdered and condensed milk, and in some sections of the country the whole agricultural industry depends entirely upon this enterprise. As I pointed out, $4,574,878 was the value of this product in Oxford county last year, seven-eighths of which was paid in the riding I represent. The tax last year was a heavy one indeed, and it is proposed to increase that tax by 50 per

cent, as well as the Inland Revenue tax, while all substitutes for dairy products and for lard are being exempted. I can scarcely credit any government or any minister of finance advocating a policy of that kind. The minister may say that the present system was in effect last year. That is true, but it does not justify its continuance. And it was not in effect in 1920. I fully expected that these articles would have been exempted along with the others last year, and I was under the impression that the customs authorities would regard this commodity as milk. The conditions to which I have referred are so serious to-day that the doors of the factories are being closed, and the whole industry seems to me to be in jeopardy. I therefore move that the taxes proposed in this section shall not apply to sales or importations of condensed milk, milk powder or evaporated milk.

Mr. FIELDING: I regret that the hon. member has deemed it necessary to move this amendment. I had already intimated that while I invited discussion this evening it was not my intention to ask for a final vote on this question. I propose to hold it. I am not sure that my hon. friend has advanced the cause he has in mind by his speech. His zeal is great, but he did not display it when his friends imposed the tax. I regret that he did not bring his enthusiasm and energy to bear upon it at that time. We found the tax and we are adhering to it. I have intimated that I am prepared to let the matter stand, but since my hon. friend is pressing the question, I presume we shall have to deal with it.

Mr. SUTHERLAND: I have evidently misunderstood the minister, but in view of the statement the minister has made I will gladly withdraw the amendment for the present.

Mr. FIELDING: I do not want the resolution to finally pass; there are other phases of the matter which will be discussed.

Mr. SUTHERLAND: I pointed out, also, Mr. Chairman, that I did challenge this matter last year.

Mr. FIELDING: With the same energy that he has displayed to-night?

Mr. SUTHERLAND: I was assured that the matter was to be given consideration, just as we are assured to-night.

[Mr. Sutherland.]

Mr. FIELDING: Then if I can relieve my hon. friend by promising consideration with the same result, I suppose he will not complain.

Mr. NEILL: If, as I understand, the hon. Minister of Finance is open to accept a suggestion for another item to be added to the exemptions from the sales tax, I should like to refer to what I have already briefly mentioned to him in writing, that is, stumping powder, fuses and caps when used by farmers in clearing land, and more particularly soldier-farmer settlers. In British Columbia the need for cheap powder is so great that the provincial government make a special arrangement with the powder companies to let settlers get it at wholesale prices. This tax presses somewhat heavily on farmers who are clearing their land, because stumping powder has gone up in price almost 100 per cent beyond what it was before the war. The applications I have, come almost entirely from soldier settlers, men struggling to make homes on bush land. The cost of clearing this land is extremely high, running from $300 to $450 an acre, and when cleared it is only second-rate land. The timber is heavy Douglas fir, very different from the deciduous trees you have here in Ontario, where if you cut the bush down you can kick the stumps out ten years later. I have seen stumps blown out in British Columbia from which the trunks had been cut down sixty-five years ago, and the roots had not rotted more than a quarter of an inch, and it took as much powder practically as to blow up green stumps. This will not be a precedent because it will apply to only a very few people. And, further, the exemption will not be abused, because there is a system in vogue now, which the hon. Minister of Public Works will no doubt be familiar with, by which men who get powder under these conditions have to be affiliated with farmers' institutes, and have to produce a certificate that they are bona fide farmers and will not use the powder for any other purpose than clearing land.

Of course, we must raise money and make sacrifices, and in order to make up for the loss of revenue by inserting the exemptions I have suggested, for my part I would cheerfully agree, as I think would a number of other hon. members here, to the Minister of Finance striking out from these exemptions oleomargarine and its by-products. We in this quarter of the House would even be willing to see taxes imposed

on the vegetable oils which are now imported free in order to manufacture this article that I have already designated.

Another point I would like to refer to is this. I see that the sales tax varies from 2½ per cent to 3¾ per cent. Many of these taxes have to be collected by small retail stores where they do not keep actuaries to make out the sales slips, and I would suggest to the minister that a not too well educated clerk who in the rush of business is called upon to figure what 3¾ per cent on, say, $19.64 amounts to is likely to make a wrong calculation. If I might suggest, it seems to me that the returns would probably average up much the same if the minister made some of the duties 4 per cent and others 2 per cent, and it would be much easier for the general retailer to calculate and perhaps more convenient to the general public.

Mr. McQUARRIE: I wish to support hon. members who have asked that powdered, condensed, and evaporated milk be placed on the list of exemptions. We have had a number of reasons given to-night why these articles should be exempted, and with very many of those reasons I agree. I hope the minister after further consideration will decide to grant the exemption.

Mr. GOOD: I endorse very heartily the sentiments expressed by the hon. member for Colchester in respect to condensed and powdered milk. When the matter was first brought to my attention, I concluded that the omission was an oversight, and I was rather surprised when told that that might not be the case. Certainly the argument in favour of including condensed and powdered milk in the list of exemptions is overwhelming, and I hope the minister will adopt the suggestion which apparently is favourably entertained in all quarters of the House.

Mr. RYCKMAN: When the minister is giving further consideration to this resolution I would ask him to take into account what seems to be a novelty and will perhaps work out unfairly in a way that is not intended. Section 1 provides that wholesalers or jobbers may sell to retailers and consumers at a duty of 2½ per cent, but if manufacturers or producers sell to retailers and consumers the duty is 4½ per cent, or a difference of 2¼ per cent, which, as the minister well knows, would be a handsome profit for the manufacturer and wholesaler. But certain manufacturers and wholesalers sell direct to retailers and consumers, and I submit that the channel of business, so well known and so often followed, should not be disturbed to the extent of giving the jobber a lead of 2¼ per cent on the turnover. I do not think the manufacturer or wholesaler selling to the retailer should be penalized to that extent.

Mr. FIELDING: I can assure my hon. friend that it is not our purpose to disturb the arrangement at all. As I pointed out, these rates were in the act as it now stands, and I have no doubt they were considered carefully and balanced with due proportion one to the other. We have adopted the machinery, but we have tried to get more money. If the machinery is bad, I do not say that is a reason to continue it, but on the whole I think these rates were selected with due regard one item to the other, and we have simply increased the tax 50 per cent.

Mr. RYCKMAN: Before the tax was as high as it is now it was increased by 50 per cent, and the consumer absorbed it; but when it is increased by another 50 per cent the manufacturer cannot get the consumer to absorb the further increase.

Mr. SPEAKMAN: I should like to say a word on the resolution as a whole from a slightly different angle; that is, in regard to the sales tax. I am not going to attack it because I think the principle was settled when the budget was passed. I recognize the need for money, and therefore I do not wish to embarrass the Government. But there is one point of view which I think should be given attention. The sales tax or excise tax, whichever it may be called, when added to the duty paid on imported articles reaches a height which we consider at least is unnecessary from a protective standpoint. I would like to see the sales tax apply only, in those cases where the duty has reached the point at which it is as high as necessary for protection purposes, to the home produced article, thus becoming an excise tax pure and simple, a tax which would in the nature of things be absorbed by the manufacturer in all cases where he was utilizing to the full the protection afforded him by the tariff. If it is in order, I move that resolution No. 11 be amended by inserting after the second proviso the following words:

Provided also that the taxes specified in this section shall not apply to importations of any articles which are dutiable under the general tariff at a rate of 30 per cent or a rate exceeding 30 per cent.

I had thought of setting the rate lower than that but I have set it fairly high, for two reasons. One reason was that by fixing it at that amount it does not apply particularly to articles used by agriculturists. I want to take a broader view of it. The amendment would apply not to articles exclusively used by farmers, but to articles in common use in every household throughout the country—clothing, boots, shoes, and so on. I believe, rightly or wrongly, that when a manufacturing industry is protected to the extent of 30 per cent or over, it received sufficient protection to enable it to afford to absorb a small extra tax on these internal sales. The minister may not accept that principle; I am sure it will not be accepted by some hon. members of this House. But it is exactly in line with the ideas which I have been brought up to believe in—ideas which I think the minister would believe if he realized that it was possible to work them out. This matter has been thoroughly gone into during the budget debate; I leave it with the minister and ask him to give it consideration.

Mr. SUTHERLAND: May I ask why the hon. member (Mr. Speakman) confines these exemptions to articles on which a duty of 30 per cent and over is collected? I would like to direct his attention to some things that are exempted in the provision that is now before us. Last year we imported into this country butter to the extent of 6,078,882 pounds. These importations from the United States, New Zealand, and elsewhere are to be exempt under this resolution; they would be exempt also under the motion of my hon. friend. Last year we imported from the United States 1,332,000 pounds of butter, all of which is to be exempt from any tax except that provided under the customs tariff, which is 4 cents per pound. Now, the Finance Minister himself, when the motion of the hon. member for Comox-Alberni (Mr. Neill) regarding oleomargarine was before the House, recognized the fact that Canada is a great dairying country. He said:

> I have always understood that Canada was a dairying country. I have been down in the eastern townships of Quebec and have heard eloquent speakers declare that there was no finer agricultural, grazing, or dairying country in the wide world than those eastern townships of the province of Quebec.

I agree with the minister's statement in that regard. But we have been subjected to the competition of countries in which labour is cheap. We have been using milking machines in an effort to overcome this labour difficulty. Were they placed on the free list? They were not, though they are not manufactured in Canada. There is a substantial tariff duty on these machines. I believe in having a reasonable duty on all things we can manufacture here, but it is unfair to permit dairy products to come in untaxed from foreign countries under present conditions when thousands of people are out of employment in our country. We need the revenue; yet we are providing work for people in foreign countries by importing their dairy products. In fact, we are doing everything in our power not to assist but to retard those who are struggling under the handicaps which now exist.

11 p.m.

Mr. McBRIDE: I would like to correct one statement made by the hon. member. He says milking machines are not made in Canada. Perhaps he thinks British Columbia is not in Canada, but I may tell him they are made in that province.

Mr. SUTHERLAND: I was not aware of that. Last year we imported 4,630,000 pounds of oleomargarine. Why should this product not be subject to a tax of this kind? These are some of the inconsistencies we find in the tariff all the way through. It appears to me that our present customs tariff was made with a hatchet and a pitchfork; they struck out something here and something there wherever it suited them or wherever pressure was brought to bear. The Minister of Finance illustrated that this afternoon pointing out that the druggists were very insistent in the presentation of their claims, and that the doctors were not pressing theirs and did not receive consideration. If the tariff was ever suited to the conditions of this country, it is by these methods being made unsuitable. The exemptions included in the resolutions now before the committee are most injurious to this branch of agriculture and when I say agriculture I do not mean growing of grain but of agriculture in a real sense. The carrying on of agriculture as it should be carried on is the only way to maintain the fertility which has for centuries been stored up in the soil and which in some sections of the country was being rapidly depleted.

I wish to call the minister's attention also to the matter of tile for drainage purposes. For six or eight years little or no draining has been done, on account of

the scarcity of labour. I would ask the minister to consider the advisability of adding to this list of exemptions tile used for reclaiming wet lands. There is an abundance of labour to be had now, but the price of the material is very high and if you impose another tax you make the difficulty all the greater. It is possible that the minister's attention may not have been called to this matter, and I suggest that he consider it. But it is about the dairy products that I am particularly anxious, because if the tax goes into effect as proposed, millions of dollars will be lost to this country and you will defeat the object in view and not obtain the revenue you expect.

Mr. SPEAKMAN: May I ask the hon. member to repeat his question? I have lost the gist of it.

Mr. FIELDING: The hon. member for Red Deer (Mr. Speakman) was kind enough to send me a copy of his amendment in advance, and I have therefore had opportunity to consider it. From his viewpoint I can quite understand the arguments he advances, I think, however, I have to take exception to the amendment, for two reasons—certainly for one. The main objection is based on the question of the need for money. My hon. friend would exempt from the sales tax all articles imported on which the duty is 30 per cent or more. Now unfortunately, as many are probably aware, there is a very large part of our imports which bears a duty of 30 per cent or more—a very large part—and if you are going to exempt all these from the sales tax you are going to make a very big hole in the budget; you are going to exempt all spirits, wines, cigars and tobaccos of all shapes and forms. All these things are dutiable at a rate which works out at more than 30 per cent and therefore you are going to exempt from the sales tax a wide range of goods and, from a revenue point of view only, that is to my mind regrettable. Therefore I could not support my hon. friend's motion. There is another fact of which some hon. members may not have thought. My hon. friend from Red Deer has thought of it; he wants to exempt imported goods but not to exempt the corresponding articles made at home. His purpose is to deprive the home industry of that degree of protection which it may have. That opens up the pretty broad question of whether or not there is too much protection. However, I dwell with greater emphasis on the revenue side of the subject. I think if there is going to be this large exemption from the sales tax we will have to find some other scheme of getting additional revenues because it will be a very serious drawback to our programme.

Mr. STEWART (Leeds): I want to add a word to the volume of protest and argument that has been so well presented for the consideration of the Finance Minister in connection with the sales tax and excise tax on powdered milk, condensed milk and evaporated milk. I do that because there is an industry of that character in the constituency which I have the honour to represent, and I base my very brief argument on the very long list of articles which have been exempted by the present resolution. I submit that the principle underlying this long list of exemptions applies almost irresistably to the product which I have mentioned. In the imposition of a tax one has to consider who pays that tax, whether it is the consumer or the producer. In this particular case I think it makes little difference because if the producer of milk pays the tax then, I think, we all agree that under existing conditions it is a hardship. On the other hand, if it is the consumer who pays this tax, then when we recall the fact that this article is consumed by children, that it is consumed by the people in outlying districts where they cannot get fresh milk, that it is consumed largely by the poor in cities, I think the argument is equally strong against asking the consumer to pay this tax. I hope the Finance Minister will not find himself hampered or bound by the fact that this tax was imposed by the late government. Surely that should not be very embarrassing to him, but in any event the conditions then were altogether different. At that time this product was marketed very largely in a foreign country and perhaps there may have been a very good reason why, under those conditions, a sales tax should be imposed. Such is not the case to-day. The producers of these products are forced to seek a market in our own country and they have large stocks on hand which they experience great difficulty in finding a sale for. I submit, therefore, that the conditions under which the tax was first imposed do not apply at the present time. For these reasons, briefly stated, I hope the Finance Minister will be able to exempt this product from the sales tax and from the excise tax.

Mr. SIMPSON: I have one suggestion to make before this resolution is adopted. We have heard, particularly from hon. gentlemen to my left the argument that the increase in the sales tax is going to bear pretty heavily on the families of the working men in this country. With that I agree, but I cannot agree with the proposal my hon. friend from Red Deer (Mr. Speakman) has advanced to remedy that. I want to offer the suggestion to the Finance Minister that he exempt from the sales tax a few of the articles worn by working men. I would suggest that he exempt workmen's overalls, men's work shirts and smocks, and workmen's boots and shoes—that is, boots and shoes of the class designated in the customs tariff as "pegged or wire fastened with unstitched soles".

Mr. MARTELL: Is my hon. friend in favour of taking the tariff off these particular things?

Mr. SIMPSON: We are dealing with the sales tax just now. My hon. friend has not declared his own position on this question yet, and probably he had better do that before asking where I stand.

Mr. MARTELL: I am in favour of the resolutions.

Mr. SIMPSON: I do not care to elaborate the matter further. I make this suggestion in the hope the minister will give it careful consideration and see if he cannot add the articles I have mentioned to the exempted list.

Mr. JELLIFF: I am very much in sympathy with what was said by the last speaker. I hold in my hand a petition from a co-operative society of working men in my district. This co-operative association was formed by men who constitute the miners and other labour unions of the Lethbridge constituency, and they oppose this increase in the sales tax very strongly just as they strongly opposed the sales tax as it appeared in previous budgets. I have had the feeling ever since the sales tax was initiated in this country that it was an unjust tax, and that it laid a burden upon the shoulders of those who are least able to bear it. I am glad that my hon. friend from West Algoma (Mr. Simpson) made the suggestion to the minister that he place on the free list in this budget a number of the articles of clothing which the workingmen of this country must use in their everyday labour. I do not believe that I could present the case for this co-operative society of labouring men in any better way than reading the petition they have forwarded, and have it placed on Hansard.

Some hon. MEMBERS: Dispense.

Mr. JELLIFF: I would like to read a part of it anyway. The petition reads:

Whereas it is proposed by the federal government to increase the sale tax by one half the percentage now levied.

And whereas taxation based on the purchases of the consumers is oppressive and unjust because

(1) It has no regard to the adequacy of the income of the purchaser to bear the burden.

(2) It virtually involves discrimination against the citizen who is under the necessity of providing for the maintenance of a large family in favour of people with no families which are self-supporting, thereby increasing the burden of people who are not only least able to carry them but are contributing to the welfare of the state.

They make two or three other representations, the reading of which I will dispense with, at the request of hon. members, but I wish to refer to the correctness of the principles contained in this petition. I do not believe in the principle of this sales tax, nor do I believe it is going to secure for him the results he desires. I would not wish to see the minister embarrassed in his effort to raise the necessary revenue to meet the needs of the country, but at the same time I entertain the fear that the increase in this sales tax is going to result in a decrease, rather than an increase, of the revenue and, for that reason, I protest against it. I am going to send this resolution over to the minister, in the hope it will have his careful consideration.

Item stands.

12. Resolved, That there shall be imposed, levied and collected upon goods enumerated in schedule I to this Part, when such goods are imported into Canada or taken out of warehouse on and after the twenty-fourth day of May, one thousand nine hundred and twenty-two, on the duty paid value in addition to any duty or tax that may be payable under The Special War Revenue Act, 1915, or any other statute or law, the rate of excise tax set opposite to each item in said schedule I; and there shall also be imposed, levied and collected when any such goods are manufactured in Canada and sold on and after the twenty-fourth day of May, one thousand nine hundred and twenty-two, in addition to any duty or tax that may be payable under The Special War Revenue Act, 1915, or any other statute or law the rate of excise tax set opposite to each item in said schedule I on the price for which the same is sold.

There shall be imposed, levied and collected upon all goods enumerated in schedule II to this Part, when the goods are imported into Canada or taken out of warehouse or when any such goods are manufactured in Canada and sold on and after the twenty-fourth day of May,

one thousand nine hundred and twenty-two, in addition to any duty or tax that may be payable under The Special War Revenue Act, 1915, or any other statute or law the rate of excise tax set opposite to each item in said schedule II.

Where the goods are imported such excise tax shall be paid by the importer and where the goods are manufactured and sold in Canada such excise tax shall be paid by the manufacturer; provided that if an automobile is, on the twenty-fourth day of May, one thousand nine hundred and twenty-two, in the hands of a dealer and not sold to a bona fide user the tax shall be paid by such dealer when such automobile is sold.

The Minister may require every manufacturer to take out an annual license for the purposes aforesaid, and may prescribe a fee therefor, not exceeding two dollars, and the penalty for neglect or refusal shall be a sum not exceeding one thousand dollars.

Provided that such excise tax shall not be payable when such goods are manufactured for export, under regulations prescribed by the Minister of Customs and Excise.

Mr. GOOD: This is the resolution that deals with the tax on automobiles. That being so, I wish to speak to it.

Mr. FIELDING: That comes later.

Mr. GOOD: I understand there is a reference in this resolution, in schedule 1, to automobiles. If the schedule is to be taken up again, I will reserve my remarks, but if the schedule is part of this resolution, I wish to make my observations now.

Mr. FIELDING: There is no reason why the hon. member should not proceed now.

Mr. GOOD: The hon. Minister of Finance (Mr. Fielding) has stated to-night that we need money. He spoke of putting on the screws a little harder to get more money.

Now, there is, I understand, a duty on automobiles of 35 per cent, and I wish to deal with the situation as revealed in connection with the Canadian Ford Company. According to my best information, the difference between the Canadian and the United States prices of Ford cars last year was about $263, on the Sedan car, $175 on the touring car, and other smaller differences on some of the other kinds. I think it is admitted that the Canadian Ford touring car is a little better than the United States Ford. At all events, it costs $30 more in the city of Toronto, and we may assume that it is a little better car. If I am to be permitted to speak, I desire to take the opportunity, but if I am to be interrupted by calls of "Question," I will sit down. I do not wish to speak, if I am not within the rules of the House, but if I have the privilege of speaking, I wish to speak without interruption. I think it is a fair assumption, so far as I have information, that the difference between the United States price of a Ford car and the Canadian price is $125, and that is solely due to the protective duty which is imposed on United States cars. As for the Canadian Ford Company, in the years 1920 and 1921, their output was over 100,000 cars. I have here also a statement issued by the same company, to the effect that one-third of the Canadian production was export business and two-thirds home business. If we deduct the one-third export business, we find there were sold by the Canadian Ford Company in Canada in the years 1920 and 1921, about 70,000 cars, and 70,000 cars at $125 per car brings $8,750,000, which the Canadian purchasers of Ford cars put into the pockets of the Canadian Ford Company.

Mr. BELAND: How does the hon. member make that out?

Mr. GOOD: I shall repeat the argument. There were 70,000 cars sold to Canadian consumers by the Canadian Ford Company in these two years, at a difference in price due to the tariff of not less than $125 per car, which is a very conservative estimate—

Mr. CHAPLIN: How do you figure at $125 per car?

Mr. GOOD: I quoted the difference between the Canadian and the United States prices, and I stated that there was a difference of about $263 on the Ford Sedan car, and $175 on the touring car, and I think, after making all necessary allowance for some slight difference in the cars, that $125 per car is a very conservative estimate of the difference in price or the excess price which the Ford Company is able to charge the Canadian purchasers of cars, by reason of the tariff. That amounts, on the 70,000 cars, to about $8,750,000.

Mr. STEVENS: Does the hon. member suggest that that is a sort of illegal and unfair profit secured by this company?

Mr. GOOD: I do not suggest anything of the sort. They take advantage of a protective tariff which we have given them. I am not accusing them of doing anything illegal.

Mr. STEVENS: Is it an excess profit?

Mr. GOOD: It is certainly a larger profit than they would get if the tariff were not there. In that respect, it is an excess profit.

Mr. STEVENS: Has the hon. member made any allowances for the very large amount of taxes paid to the treasury by the company, whereas imported cars pay nothing except the duty?

Mr. GOOD: I think I have made all necessary allowances for the duty on raw material which enters into these cars. I think it is a very small matter, so far as that is concerned, and, in reducing the price from $175 to $125, I think I have made all necessary allowances. If not, there might be some further small allowance to be made, but it would not alter the nature of the argument one whit.

Mr. CHAPLIN: I am informed that, in the matter of upholstering and tops alone, the difference in the actual cost price between the American car and the Canadian car is more than double the amount that the hon. member has allowed for all the difference.

Mr. GOOD: I cannot accept the statement at all from the information that I have received. I have, in my hand, as supplementary to the statements that I have made, a table giving the output of the Canadian Ford Company from 1904 to last year, starting out with 117 cars in 1904-1905, and running up to 46,000 cars in 1920-1921. I shall not read the table; but in addition to the cars mentioned therein, in the year 1919-1920, 2,335 tractors were produced, and in the year 1920-1921, 3,063 tractors were turned out. I want to submit to the committee some other figures concerning the Canadian Ford Company. Here is a table showing how the original investment of $125,000 in 1904, grew in the years between 1904-1905 and 1921. Here are the dividends that were paid by the Canadian Ford Company in those years:

Year	Cash dividend	Bonus stock distribution
1905	$ 7,488	
1908	12,500	
1909	31,250	
1910	125,000	
1911	125,000	$ 625,000
1912	150,000	250,000
1914	100,000	
1915	1,100,000	
1916	.....	6,000,000
1917	350,000	
1918	350,000	
1919	350,000	
	700,000	
	700,000	
	700,000	
1920	1,050,000	
1921	1,050,000	
	1,050,000	

[Mr. Good.]

Making in that period total cash dividends realized of $7,951,238 and a distribution of bonus stock of $6,875,000. So the Ford Company has certainly done well. It is not one of those concerns spoken of today by the Minister of Finance (Mr. Fielding) so solicitously lest any decrease in the duty should thrust them into bankruptcy. This is one concern at all events as regards which we may have no fear that a slight reduction in the protection which they now enjoy would thrust them over the precipice into bankruptcy. In that connection, the net profits as stated by this concern for the years 1920 and 1921 are:

1920	$5,664,834
1921	2,368,407

Making a total net profit for those two years of $8,033,241. That confirms the calculation which I submitted to the committee a few minutes ago in regard to excess profits, if we might use that term, which this company are enabled to secure by reason of the tariff. It will be remembered that I stated that 70,000 cars at $125 per car mean $8,750,000. In these two years, according to the company's own statement, they made a net profit of $8,033,241. That shows pretty clearly where the extraordinary profits which this company have made came from, profits which are derived from the excess price which they are able to charge Canadian purchasers of Ford cars by reason of the duty which we impose. I have here a further statement showing the assets of this company and showing, as I have already stated, the amounts which have been paid in dividends and bonus stock distributions. This is the way in which the assets of this company have grown during this period. There has been issued, as has already been stated, $6,875,000 worth of bonus stock which, with the original $125,000 worth, makes $7,000,000 worth of stock. This stock has been sold in recent years, so my information goes, at from $300 to $380 per share. The company admit, in their balance sheet, total assets of $19,000,000; but if you figure up the cash dividends that they have received and the present value of the stock, you will find that the dividends amount to some $7,900,000, and this 70,000 shares of stock at a price of $326 amount to $22,820,000, making total assets, if you like, a total valuation of this company at the present time of over $30,000,000. That has grown in this very short period from an original investment of $125,000. I submit that it has grown

very largely because we have enabled them to overcharge Canadian purchasers of Ford cars.

Now, in this connection I want to submit to the Minister of Finance some suggestions: The effect of the proposed sales tax on automobiles will leave the protection which the Canadian Ford Company and other manufacturers of automobiles enjoy, exactly the same as it is at the present time, and it will enable this company, which has already piled up millions and millions of dollars out of the Canadian purchasers of cars, to continue this process. The proposition which the Minister of Finance has made will simply add to the cost of automobiles. But if the sales tax were replaced by an excise tax of 35 per cent, the price of cars would not rise, but the profits of the manufacturers would go into the public treasury. In this particular case, covering the two years, 1920 and 1921, if instead of the sales tax which is now proposed, we had had an excise tax of 35 per cent, it would have neutralized the 35 per cent protection in toto, and the $8,000,000 odd which this company have put into their own pockets out of the Canadian people would have come into the federal treasury.

The Minister of Finance has said repeatedly that he is after money. Here is money galore that we have enabled, and are enabling, an American concern to take out of the pockets of Canadian purchasers of cars. We have not got one cent of it into the federal treasury, nor are we going to get one cent if the present proposition of the minister is adopted. I would suggest that if he is not disposed to go the limit of the 35 per cent excise duty, which would work no hardship on this concern at all, he might at least go halfway. If he would consider the adoption of a 17½ per cent excise duty the result would be, based on the business of these two years, that of the $8,000,000 profits $4,000,000 would go into the public treasury and the Ford company would still be left with a handsome profit of $4,000,000. I do not know the situation with respect to other manufacturers of automobiles, but I understand that some, perhaps, a good many, of them are largely American in their origin. I want to ask the minister to justify, if possible, the continuance of the present conditions and the increase in the price of automobiles through imposing a sales tax of 5 or 10 per cent, as the case may be, on top of the protective tariff which we already have. What we ought to do from the standpoint of revenue is to make the excise duty as heavy as possible on cars made in Canada. In that way we should get very much more revenue, without increasing the price of cars at all to the Canadian consumers. The facts I have submitted show that this company has got fabulously rich at the expense of the Canadian consumers in a very short time, and has done so by reason of the protection which this country has given it. I think it is an outrage that this condition of things has been allowed to continue in this country. Now, if we impose the tax I suggest we shall greatly increase the revenue from this particular line of goods without increasing the price of automobiles to the Canadian public. And the Canadian manufacturers of cars, particularly the Ford company, are well able to stand all possible screws that the Minister of Finance can put on.

Som hon. MEMBERS: Carried.

Mr. GOOD: Surely my question is entitled to some reply.

Mr. FIELDING: The burden of my hon. friend's complaint is against the customs duty. If we were dealing with the question of duties on American products generally I think it highly probable that some reduction might be made in the duty on automobiles. But inasmuch as we have determined for the present that we are not going to reduce the duty on American products, it is not wise to make the change. What my hon. friend suggests in regard to the excise duty is very much in line with what was proposed in another form at an earlier stage. While his argument applies with some force against the customs duty, he has not made out a good case in regard to the excise duty.

Mr. MACLEAN (York): I want to answer the minister to this extent, that there has been excessive profiteering in this country as a result of conditions brought about by the war. That profiteering has not stopped and the public have a right to expect some remedy. The revenue can be increased by some such method as my hon. friend (Mr. Good) suggests, and representations to this effect should be heeded. This excessive profiteering cannot be allowed to continue.

Mr. MEWBURN: Question.

Mr. MACLEAN (York): My hon. friend had better allow me to speak. He has sat here for several hours doing nothing

but shouting "question," and I am not going to stand it. I want hon. gentlemen to listen to what I have to say. Henry Ford is a great manufacturer in the United States and has devoted his time and talents successfully to reducing the prices of automobiles in that country. The Canadian Ford company, however, I regret to say, are still profiteering to a great extent by reason of the tariff. Now, it is the duty of this Government to remedy this state of affairs. The present Government is in office to-day on the strength of promises, among others, to combat profiteering, and the people have the right to expect that they shall take vigorous means of curbing the profits of these concerns, at the same time increasing the revenues of the country. Let it be understood throughout the country that excessive profiteering shall cease. There is no reason why these concerns should make excessive profits simply because we happen to have had a war. The war is over and the conditions that it created have passed. I have always been a protectionist, but I do say that it is high time that there should be some change in this respect and that these profits should be curtailed.

Mr. FIELDING: We had an excess profits tax which was found to be restrictive in business operations, and it was repealed. I think my hon. friend helped to repeal it, but I do not know that it is worth while getting angry now because of that fact. I did not help to repeal it. Now, the income tax reaches the Ford Company as well as the others. We have no special legislation for the Ford concern. Evidently it has been a pretty good thing, but if that company makes a great deal of money it will be reached in one form or another by the present system of taxation. As to excess profits, I would remind my hon. friend that while in the case of a company like the Ford concern it might work all right, it was found to be embarrassing to business generally, and the late government, with my hon. friend's assistance, repealed it.

Mr. MACLEAN (York): That is no answer at all to my remarks. Excess profiteeering is continuing to-day, and the evidence has been submitted to the House tonight. Automobiles are becoming as useful as tractors, and every man in Canada who buys an automobile has to contend with this profiteering. If the manufacturer in the United States can sell an automobile at a certain price, why shouldn't the same car be sold in Canada at about the same price? You may call me protectionist or whatever you like by reason of what I have done in the past, but I again say on behalf of the Canadian people that they are being unjustly treated in this matter; and the Government that committed itself to a pledge to remove the unfairness should take proper steps to carry out that promise, and not justify the present condition of things as the Minister of Finance is attempting to do.

Mr. GOOD: The Minister of Finance has stated that my argument does not appeal to him. Well, it stands before the House and the country for what it is worth, and if the facts I have submitted and the argument I have based on those facts do not appeal to certain members of this House, it may be taken that those members are not going to be here very long.

Mr. FIELDING: My hon. friend may make out a good case with regard to the Ford Automobile Company, but there are a number of automobile companies and it is quite possible that they have not all been so fortunate as the Ford Company. We must frame legislation not for the Ford Motor Company alone, but for the industry generally.

Mr. BAXTER: There was a very clear declaration in the last campaign on the part of my right hon. friend the Prime Minister that if excess profits were being taken or monopolies were burdening the people it would be the business of his government to alter that condition of affairs. It was a perfectly proper and courageous declaration. Has the Government found that there are no monopolies increasing the cost of living, and no excess profits being taken, or has it discovered that these abuses exist but it does not dare deal with them?

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: The Government has not finished its work; it is only beginning it.

Mr. COOTE: In regard to the automobile tax, as the tariff stands now I certainly think we have an instance of protection gone mad.

Mr. BRETHEN: I beg to enter my protest against this item. In the case of a particular car, which I can name for the benefit of the minister, this protection does not work out to the extent of 35 per cent, but because of the system of valuation—unless it has been changed in the mean-

time—it works out at 48 per cent. So the manufacturers of the American car, which is identical with the car manufactured in this country, are taking advantage of a protective tariff up to 48 per cent because the valuation has been made on the Canadian instead of the American basis. I fail to see why, when the hon. minister was putting on this duty he did not allow the automobile manufacturers of Canada—who, it has been shown, are making such large profits—to shoulder some part of it, instead of allowing it in every case to be shifted back to the consumer. This so-called excise tax is nothing more than another sales tax, with the undesirable feature that it is always passed back to the consumer. Out of a total of 79,000 cars manufactured in this country in 1920, 23,000 were exported in competition with American and other foreign cars. So it shows that Canadian cars made by Canadian workmen under Canadian conditions can compete with foreign built cars. Then why should they be protected to this extent? The Canadian public are paying this protection to our manufacturers. We are not asking that our money be refunded, but we believe it is only fair that the manufacturers, in lieu of that protection which the Government is giving them, should pay the excise duty instead of shifting it back to the consumer.

Mr. GRAHAM: Out of justice to the memory of the late Gordon MacGregor, who was president of the Ford Company of Canada, and who knew every detail of the business, let me say that a few months ago I heard him make an explanation of practically every item brought forward by my hon. friend from Brant, and he put a far different face on the supposed excessive profits when he deducted the immense sums the company paid into the treasury in various ways. I do not hold a brief for the Ford Company, but I do not think we ought to rush to the conclusion that wholesale robbery has been going on.

In answer to the hon. member for East Peterborough, I may say, I heard the late Mr. MacGregor state that the Ford Company of Canada under the contract between it and the Ford Company of the United States had a certain foreign territory allotted to it that the Detroit company does not enter at all.

I want to ask my hon. friend from Brant this question. Of course it is difficult to handle this tax; we all admit that. It was thought that the automobile industry would be a fair field for getting some revenue. Now, suppose the Government had done as my hon. friend suggested, that is, left the tax off the cheaper cars and placed it on the dearer, that looks well at first glance, but what would be the charge immediately? We would be told that we were "standing in" with the Ford Motor Company, which already has been held up as a company making excessive profits. While the Ford Motor Company has made good profits—I go that far; perhaps it has made better than good profits—it is probably the best conducted concern in the Dominion from the point of thorough organization, and while that company has made good profits, the other motor companies in this country have lost money during the last two or three years. Is it not fairer to all classes that there should be a small tax imposed on the cheaper car so the manufacturer or purchaser will contribute something? In the figures given by my hon. friend to-night the Ford Company would be let off altogether on the 5 per cent tax. That is the question we have under consideration, whether they should be taxed or not.

Mr. GOOD: I am afraid my hon. friend has entirely misunderstood me. I never advocated the removal of the tax on the cheaper cars and the imposition of higher taxes on the dearer cars. I simply advocated a change in the incidence of this tax—an increase of the tax on cars made in Canada with the taking off of the sales tax or excise tax, or whatever you like to call it on imported cars.

Mr. GRAHAM: A great many cars that we call Canadian cars are largely assembled in the Dominion, and if my hon. friend were to carry out his view, while the Ford Company might be able to stand it the other companies would not be able to. As the Finance Minister has pointed out, we cannot in legislation, no matter what the conditions may be, select any one industry and say that simply because one firm enjoyed in it is making a lot of money, the output of that industry should be taxed. That would ruin other industries of a similar kind which have not been making money for the last four or five years—many of whom, in fact, have gone through the bankruptcy courts.

Mr. BRETHEN: I have here the preliminary report on the automobile industry in Canada for the year 1920, issued under the authority of the Minister of Trade and

Commerce (Mr. Robb), and, in respect to the point raised by the hon. Minister of Militia (Mr. Graham), I submit the following figures from it with regard to the automobile industry of Canada. Seventeen companies paid wages in 1920 amounting to $13,331,184. They paid out for fuel, $703,736; miscellaneous expenses, $11,539,-079; cost of material, $67,157,045, a total of $92,731,044. The total value of products was $101,465,846, leaving a profit of $8,734,-802 on a capital of $54,000,000, which would figure out at about 16 per cent.

12 m. This is in respect to the whole automobile industry of Canada and is based on their own figures. The hon. minister says that several of these companies are working at a loss; it appears that on the whole they were doing fairly well.

Resolution agreed to.

INCOME WAR TAX

Resolved, That it is expedient to amend subsection five (a) of section four of The Income War Tax Act, 1917, as enacted by chapter fifty-five of the Statutes of 1919, by providing that the provisions of the said subsection five (a) shall not apply to a bank as defined by section three of The Special War Revenue Act, 1915.

Mr. GOOD: Would it be in order to suggest any changes in the income tax rates? They are not dealt with in these resolutions.

Mr. FIELDING: I expect to have a bill before the House within a day or two, the purpose of which will be to make a few changes in the Income Tax Act. My hon. friend will then have an opportunity of discussing the matter.

Mr. STEWART (Hamilton): Mr. Chairman, do you say that schedule II. has been carried?

The CHAIRMAN: Schedule II has been carried.

Mr. STEWART (Hamilton): I do not think we are fairly treated in that regard; we have not had an opportunity of discussing it. I can not allow that schedule to be carried without raising my objection.

The CHAIRMAN: It is carried. The item now before the committee is the resolution with respect to the Income War Tax Act. Shall the resolution carry?

Mr. STEWART (Hamilton): I object to this procedure. I appeal to the Finance Minister and ask him if he thinks it is fair that the Chairman should declare that schedule carried.

[Mr. Brethen.]

The CHAIRMAN: Shall the resolution carry?

Mr. STEWART (Hamilton): If this is the way the business of Parliament is to be done, I prefer not to be here.

Mr. FIELDING: The hon. member will agree that I have not made any attempt to force these resolutions through the House. At every stage I have desired to afford the fullest opportunity of discussion, and I have no objection to doing so now.

Mr. STEWART (Hamilton): If I may be permitted, I desire to say something in reference to this tax on mineral waters. I am in the business myself, I am free to admit, and I know something about it. If the minister insists on that five cent tax being paid he is going to put half the people engaged in this industry out of business. Now, they pay 40 cents a dozen for their soft drinks, and they lose from 7 to 10 cents on every case that they send out to their customers from bottles broken and not returned. The proposed tax of 5 cents per gallon leaves the man who is handling the stuff a net profit of 9 cents. Now, you know as well as I do that no man can handle that stuff at 9 cents. I have before me the results of experienced men in the United States, where a tax of 10 per cent was imposed in 1921, with the result that nearly all the mineral water people were practically put out of business. The tax has since been reduced to 2 cents on the syrups used in the manufacture of these drinks. Last year I gave a cheque for over $500 sales taxes for one month; with the increased taxation proposed that amount will be increased to nearly $1,100. I may say that this affects about 800 people in this country, and I think the present proposal is unfair. I do feel that the result of this tax will be to put the small manufacturer out of business. Take the case of the man who paid $200 as against the $500 or $600 paid by others last year; his revenue is such that he cannot exist if this 5 cent tax is insisted upon.

Mr. FIELDING: This matter was well considered. I think there is needless alarm with regard to it. It was thoroughly gone into in an effort to meet the views of gentlemen who take the stand that my hon. friend now takes. I am hoping that his expectations of disaster will not be realized.

The CHAIRMAN: The resolution before the committee is the proposed amendment

to the Income War Tax Act, 1917. Shall the resolution carry?

Mr. BAXTER: May I ask the minister to explain precisely what the amendment is?

Mr. FIELDING: There was tax of one per cent on the circulation of the banks, but provision was made that any tax paid under that section should be deducted from the income tax; consequently it was of no effect. We are removing the exemption so that the one per cent on the circulation of banks shall remain as a tax.

Resolution agreed to.

Resolution reported.

ADJOURNMENT—BUSINESS OF THE HOUSE

On the motion of Mr. Mackenzie King for the adjournment of the House.

Mr. STEVENS: What business will be taken up to-morrow?

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: It is not intended to go on with the budget to-morrow—at least not until evening, and possibly not until the following day—but we will take up the resolutions and bills that appear under Government Orders, and I understand that it is the intention of the Chairman of the Committee on Pensions, Soldiers' Insurance, and Civil Re-establishment to move the adoption of the report which the committee have brought in. I had intimated that time would be set apart for the discussion of the Conference of Premiers of last year, but I have been told that the hon. member who had requested that opportunity should be afforded for this purpose is very much occupied with committee work and has requested that the subject should not be brought up at the present time. However I will leave that to his wish, and to the wish of other hon. members of the House.

HON. MR. FIELDING

CONGRATULATIONS UPON FORTIETH YEAR OF PUBLIC LIFE

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: Mr. Speaker, I am sure the House will permit me the privilege at this moment of congratulating our honoured Minister of Finance (Mr. Fielding) upon celebrating to-day the fortieth anniversary of his entry into public life. It is a source of happiness not less to us than to him that on this day we should see him in the midst of his labours, hale and hearty, piloting through this House of Commons his sixteenth budget. To us the day will be as memorable as it has been to him. Indeed it is an inspiration to every hon. member to have the privilege of witnessing what we have witnessed to-day—a gentleman of his distinguished name and years, standing here through continuous debate from three o'clock in the afternoon until the morning of the following day, meeting every question that has been asked, and setting an example in resourcefulness, in forbearance and tenacity, in courtesy and chivalry, and others of the arts of parliamentary discussion in a manner we would seek in vain to emulate. I but speak the mind of every honourable member of this House when I say that we hope he may be spared through years to come to give, with his wide experience and profound knowledge of public affairs, continued service to his country in these halls of parliament which his presence so greatly adorns.

Mr. STEVENS: Mr. Speaker, I am sure that the right hon. leader of the Opposition (Mr. Meighen), had he been here, would have discharged this duty very much more gracefully than I could hope to do, but let me, in all sincerity and earnestness, offer the congratulations of myself and the other hon. members on this side to the Minister of Finance on this, as I may call it, memorable occasion. It is a great inspiration to those of us who are so much younger in years to realize that one can go through a long period of stress and trial in public affairs and maintain a purity of character and display a devotion to the public service such as we find exhibited in the hon. gentleman who has so ably and—as the right hon. the Prime Minister has so well said—with almost youthful vigour, discharged such onerous duties to-day. We on this side most heartily tender our congratulations to the hon. gentleman on this most auspicious period in his life.

Mr. FIELDING: Mr. Speaker, I will not do more at this hour than express my very warmest thanks to the right hon. the Prime Minister, Mr. Mackenzie King, and to my hon. friend from Centre Vancouver (Mr. Stevens). I appreciate very sincerely and deeply the great kindness they have shown to me.

Motion agreed to and the House adjourned at 12.08 a.m., Wednesday.

Wednesday, June 21, 1922.

The House met at three o'clock.

IMMIGRATION—CRIMINAL CODE

REPORT OF SPECIAL COMMITTEE

Mr. JOSEPH ARCHAMBAULT (Chambly and Verchères) presented the third report of the Special Committee to which was referred Bill No. 16, to amend the Immigration Act and Bill No. 17, to amend the Criminal Code, and moved concurrence therein. He said:

In moving for concurrence in this report, I wish to make a brief statement. The report is to be found at page 353 of the Votes and Proceedings, of the 16th instant. It reads:

> Your Committee recommend that a general revision of the Immigration Act is desirable, and in making such revision the sections relating to deportation should be so amended as to provide:—
>
> 1. That the provisions of section forty-one (41) as enacted by section one (1) of chapter twenty-six (26) of the Statutes of 1919 (First session) should not apply to any person who is a Canadian citizen.
>
> 2. That subsection two (2) of section forty-one (41) of the foreging Act be repealed.
>
> 3. That the following words "or is suspected of belonging to" in the fourteenth (14th) line of subsection one (1) of section forty-one (41) of the said Act be deleted.
>
> 4. That pending such general revision Bill No. 16 should not now be proceeded with.

As hon. members will see, this is a final report on Bill No. 16, regarding the Immigration Act, and the final report on Bill No. 17 will probably be presented to the House to-morrow or Friday. Section 1 of Bill No. 16 reads as follows:

> 1. Subsection one of section two of chapter twenty-five of the statutes of 1919, being "An Act to amend The Immigration Act," is amended by repealing all such subsection from the proviso in subparagraph (i) to the end of the said subsection.

The purpose of the section was to repeal subsection 1, of section II, of chapter 25, of 1919 regarding immigration. The effect of the first section of the Bill would not only repeal the legislation which was passed in 1919 regarding undersirable classes of citizens coming to this country and their deportation, but would also have the effect of repealing sections of the original Act of 1910. Section 2 of the Bill reads:

> 2. The said Act is further amended by repealing paragraphs (n), (o) and (p) of subsection six of said section two.

The purpose of this section was to exempt from the operation of the act persons who are advocating acts of violence against organized government, members of societies opposed to organized government, and who advocate unlawful assault and killing, and also enemy aliens, or persons who have been alien enemies, or who were or who may be interned on or after the 11th November, 1918, in any part of His Majesty's Dominion, or by any of His Majesty's allies. Section 3 refers to the abrogation of the procedure for deportation.

The purpose of section 4 was to repeal the whole of chapter 26 of our Immigration Act, which gave the definition of undesirable citizens.

Your committee had numerous sittings at which all these sections and the original sections of the Immigration Act to which they referred were thoroughly examined and discussed, and your committee has come to the conclusion that the whole of the Immigration Act should be revised. We also heard the hon. member for Centre Winnipeg (Mr. Woodsworth) in reference to that Bill before the Committee, and, after having discussed it, we came to that conclusion. During discussion many important points arose which convinced your committee that a revision was necessary. First and foremost in importance, in my opinion and in the opinion of the committee, was the one regarding Canadian citizenship Section 41 of the act gives the definition of undesirable citizens who could be deported by an officer of the Immigration Department, with an appeal, of course, to the minister if the decision is not satisfactory, which applied to practically every citizen, except any person who is a British subject either by reason of birth in Canada, or by reason of naturalization in Canada. This proviso did not cover, for instance, the British subject who was not a British subject by reason of birth or naturalization in Canada. Hon. members will see that that, therefore it excluded many British subjects. Our suggestion is that this proviso hould be abrogated and replaced by the following:

> Provided that this section shall not apply to any Canadian citizen.

I may say that many discussions took place on this matter before. In 1920, Senator Robertson moved a similar amendment in the Senate; there was a very long discussion, and his bill was defeated. In 1921, the hon. member for Quebec East, the present Minister of Marine and Fisheries (Mr. Lapointe), introduced a similar bill. This bill went to its second reading; the Minister of Immigration of that day, Hon. Mr. Calder, asked the hon. member for Quebec East to withdraw his bill on

the promise that he would enact the same legislation in his own Immigration Bill that he was presenting to this House. This was done; the bill passed all the various stages of the procedure of this House, went to the Senate, and again in the Senate it was defeated. Although this provision has been defeated in the Senate twice, I believe it is most desirable that a Canadian citizen should not come under this legislation; that a Canadian citizen could not be brought before an officer of the Immigration Department and deported without trial before the courts. This is the first suggestion of your committee. The second suggestion is, as hon. members will see;

That subsection (2) of section 41 of the foregoing act be repealed.

Subsection (2) reads:

Proof that any person belonged to or was within the description of any of the prohibited or undesirable classes within the meaning of this section at any time since the 4th day of May, 1910, shall for all the purposes of this act be deemed to establish prima facia that he still belongs to such prohibited or undesirable class or classes.

Your committee is of opinion that this section should be abrogated. I believe it is contrary to the British principle of justice, which says that a man is not supposed to be guilty until it is proved that he is guilty; and proof prima facie that he is guilty seems to me to be against the principle of British and Canadian justice. I may add that I was a member on the Committee on Sedition when this first legislation was passed, and some other hon. members and myself protested vigorously against this legislation; but we were overruled.

The third suggestion made by your committee is that certain words contained in section 41, namely—

Or is suspected of belonging to.

—be deleted from this section. As I have said before, section 41 deals with the persons who are considered to be of the undesirable class, persons who could be brought before an officer and subjected to deportation. Although the section enumerates those persons, namely those who "seek to overthrow by force or violence the government of or constituted law and authority in the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Ireland or of Canada"—And so forth, we find the following words in this section:

Or is suspected of belonging to any secret society or organization.

Your committee is of opinion that the mere fact of a person being suspected of belonging to one of these societies or classes is not sufficient to permit the application of this legislation.

In conclusion, your committee is of opinion that, although this legislation, passed during a time of unrest which has now abated, should still be retained in part on our statutes for the safeguard of our institutions, some of the sections should be amended in the manner to which I have referred, and therefore, we submit that the whole Immigration Act should be revised, and that the present Bill, No. 16, should not be proceeded with at this session.

Mr. J. S. WOODSWORTH (Centre Winnipeg): Mr. Speaker, I take it that this report of the committee really has the effect of side-tracking the bill, and that no action will be taken along this line at this session. I am not sufficiently familiar with the procedure of this House to know whether a recommendation of this charactre would even bind the Government to introduce legislation along this line at the next session. I noticed that it was stated in committee, I think by the hon. member for North Winnipeg (Mr. McMurray) that even if this bill were passed in this House, it would be rejected by the Senate, because of the one who introduced it. It seems to me that is rather a serious reflection upon the Senate, for I take it that any bill ought to be discussed and decided upon on its merits, and not because of the particular individual who brings it before the House. Further than that, it would seem to be a very strange thing if this House should be dissuaded from presenting a piece of legislation for fear the Senate would reject it. I take it that it is our duty to bring before this House these measures which we consider in the general welfare and to treat them on their merits.

There are several things to which, it seems to me, attention ought to be called. After all the various meetings of the committee only three minor recommendations are brought in. I would call attention to the fact that the bill provided for certain revisions with regard to two different parts of the Immigration Act. The amendment to the act was passed in 1919. And an amendment to that amendment passed

a few days later. The report does not deal at all with the original amendment; but refers merely to the amendment to the amendment, leaving the original amendment, which is absolutely vicious in character, altogether untouched. We are told in the recommendation of the committee, that these words should be repealed.

Or is suspected of belonging to.

I agree with that; it is good as far as it goes. But that would still leave the amendment untouched. The committee recommends that we should take out the retroactive sections. That, too, is good as far as it goes. There is further recommendation that these clauses should not apply to Canadian citizens. They do not apply today, and that is the very point of the bill. It is barely possible that relief may be given to one particular class, the British citizen who has been naturalized in Canada, although, so far as my study of the bill goes, I think there is just a possibility that it might not apply to him. As the bill stands it means that any one born outside of Canada. whether alien or British-born, is liable to deportation. The essential part of this legislation lies in this. Section 41 in the amendment, which is not touched, and which as well as the amendment to the amendment, provides that certain classes shall be incapable of becoming Canadian citizens since they are not able to establish domicile. The section reads:

Provided that the time spent by a person while confined in or an inmate of any penitentiary, gaol, reformatory, prison or asylum for the insane in Canada shall not be counted in the period of residence in Canada which is necessary in order to acquire Canadian domicile, and provided further that no person who belongs to the prohbited or undesirable classes within the meaning of section forty-one of this act shall be capable of acquiring Canadian domicile.

Now turn to section 41—not the section 41 to which the Chairman of the committee made referecne, but section 41 of the original amendment—which reads:

Whenever any person. . . . shall by word or act create or attempt to create riot or public disorder in Canada, or shall by common repute belong to or be suspected of belonging to any secret society or organization which extorts money from, or in any way attempts to control any resident of Canada by force or threat of bodily harm, or by blackmail, or who is a member of or affiliated with any organization entertaining or teaching disbelief in or opposition to organized government; such person for the purposes of this act shall be considered as belonging to the prohibited or undesirable classes, and shall be liable to deportation.

That is to say, whether a man has been in this country one year or twenty years,

[Mr. Woodsworth.]

whether he has been naturalized or not, if he is deemed undesirable according to this classification he is incapable of obtaining Canadian domicile and in that case is liable to deportation. Let me say in passing that while the committee recommends that the section in Chap. 26 should be amended by striking out the word "suspected", that word still stands in this section of Chap. 25.

Any person suspected of an offence under this section may forthwith be arrested and detained without warrant by any officer for examination and deportation.

Now, the Minister of Immigration (Mr. Stewart) has been advocating a particular immigration policy during the past few weeks. Some members on this side have opposed that policy. The hon. member for Bow River (Mr. Garland) has been rigorously opposing that policy in so far as it relates to juvenile immigrants. Well, suppose his opposition becomes obnoxious to the Minister of Immigration. He thereby becomes undesirable; he may be classed as an agitator, and I presume there would be some presumptive evidence to substantiate that classification in the fact that he comes from Ireland. Under the circumstances there is nothing whatever in this act to prohibit the Minister of Immigration from declaring my hon. friend undesirable and deporting him to Ireland without trial. It is that sort of thing we want to put beyond the range of possibility. We want to see to it that the hon. member for Bow River—this is purely a supposititious case, of course,—if he is regarded by the minister as undesirable, shall be tried before a jury, and that the matter shall not be disposed of by a minister of the Crown. I shall move, seconded by the hon. member for East Calgary (Mr. Irvine):

That the second report of the Special Committee on Bill No. 16 be not concurred in but that the same be sent back to the Special Committee to amend the bill by providing that no one shall be deported for any political offence committed in Canada without being granted a trial by jury.

It may be that there were some clauses in my bill as introduced which did not exactly meet the situation. I quite conceded that at the time, and when the Prime Minister (Mr. Mackenzie King) suggested that the matter be referred to a special committee I very gladly accepted the suggestion, because it seemed to me only reasonable that in the committee the whole question could be better threshed out and what was faulty in the wording of the bill could be improved so that the result aimed

at might be achieved. I fully agree with the finding of the committee that it is highly desirable that the whole Immigration Act should be redrafted. It has been amended and reamended until it is exceedingly difficult to ascertain exactly what its purport is. But I should like to see the provision which I propose incorporated in the act at this session of Parliament. It has been admitted that this legislation was placed on the statute books during a time of hysteria, just after the war, and hon. members on both sides of the House are agreed that it is no longer necessary. Indeed, Sir, I can hardly conceive of a Liberal government, headed by a Prime Minister who is the grandson of William Lyon Mackenzie, refusing to grant us legislation of this character. My amendment provides that no one shall be deported for any political offence committed in Canada without being granted a trial by jury. This legislation which I seek to amend is not intended primarily to keep people out of the country; its purpose is to deal with people already in Canada. I am not referring to the question of political offences committed in the Old Country by prospective immigrants, my proposal has reference to any offences that may be alleged to have been committed by people in this country. Nor am I speaking of that class of immigrants who may be physically or mentally defective, who may become paupers, or who may have committed some crime other than political. I am speaking purely of political offences, because it is in this respect that our objection applies. I am not condoning political offences, but I do say that, when such an offence is alleged to have been committed, the whole question should not be decided in camera by a minister of the Crown but rather that the people of the country, through a jury, should give their decision as to whether or not the offence has been committed and hence that accused deserves deportation. When introducing this bill I made an appeal to French speaking Canadians to join with English speaking Canadians in giving this measure of relief to the British-born in this country. Personally, I have no particular concern in the matter as I happen to be Canadian born; yet as a Canadian it does materially affect me, for I feel ashamed that our statute books should contain legislation that deprives my British-born friends and comrades of their right to trial by jury. And I would speak not merely of the British-born but also of the foreign-born in this country. We are spending hundreds of thousands of dollars to attract immigrants, and certainly it ought to be the proud boast of Canadians that any man who comes here to make this country his home will at least get a fair chance. In North Winnipeg members of the Canadian Club have erected a flag pole from which they sometimes fly the Union Jack, hoping in this way to make good Canadian citizens of the foreigners who are living in that section of the city. I would suggest that you may fly the flag for a long time, but you are not going to make the foreign-born good Canadian citizens as long as there is gross injustice existing under that flag.

Some hon. MEMBERS: Question.

Mr. WOODSWORTH: Yes, it is "question." I am not going to detain hon. members much longer, but this is an important question I submit, Mr. Speaker, which I was asked to bring before this House by my constituents and by labour locals throughout the length and breadth of the Dominion. If we can take a long time, as we did last night, in deciding whether or not we should tax substitutes for milk at a time when many of our people have not the wherewithal to buy milk, it seems to me we can at least afford a few minutes to discuss whether or not we shall maintain rights that the British people have enjoyed since the time of Magna Charta and the Bill of Rights. Therefore I move my resolution to amend the bill by providing that:

—no one shall be deported for any political offence committed in Canada without being granted a trial by jury.

I trust that I shall have the support of members generally for what seems to be a reasonable request.

Mr. A. B. HUDSON (South Winnipeg): Mr. Speaker, I was a member of the special committee which considered the matter under discussion. The committee after considering the bill for a short time came to the conclusion that it was impossible to recommend its passage in the form presented, for it had the effect of doing many things which its promoters evidently did not intend, and of doing many other things with which the committee could not agree. As a result we asked the House for permission to make a special report, and the chairman of the committee has just presented it to the House.

That special report has been made in this form because we found that the deportation clauses of the Immigration Act were in such a confused condition that we

could not, within any reasonable time, propose to the House any amendments which would meet all the considerations the hon. member for Centre Winnipeg (Mr. Woodsworth) wished to have brought forward or that the members of the committee themselves thought should be dealt with. We have therefore made this report, bringing to the attention of the House three matters which we all agreed ought to be corrected. We did not intend in any way to limit the scope of the revision of the act; we left that open for the House, or for the body which the House might appoint, to deal with in the future. We had no desire to limit in any way any proposal which the hon member for Centre Winnipeg might wish to put forward when a new bill in a form which could reasonably be considered should be brought before the House.

Hon. CHARLES STEWART (Minister of the Interior): It seems to me that the House should accept the report of the committee. I have no particular objection to the amendment suggested by my friend from Centre Winnipeg, except that I have discovered that when you suddenly interject amendments into an act without due consideration you do not know how far they may extend. Clearly, it may be a good thing to say that a British subject should not be deported without trial by jury; but to say that any one who happens to get into Canada—and many people enter without the knowledge of the immigration officials—should not be deported without trial by jury for what might be construed to be a political offence does not seem to me reasonable, because the term "political offence" covers a very wide field, if my hon. friend will allow me to say so, and we would meet with innumerable difficulties in deporting undesirables who ought to be deported almost immediately. Therefore I ask the House to accept the report of the committee and await a revision of the act.

Right Hon. ARTHUR MEIGHEN (Leader of the Opposition): Mr. Speaker—

Mr. SPEAKER: Order. The hon. member for Centre Winnipeg has submitted an amendment which I must put to the House. The motion by Mr. Archambault, seconded by Mr. Hudson, is:

That the House concur in the report.

Mr. Woodsworth moves an amendment, seconded by Mr. Irvine:

That the third report of the special committee on Bill No. 16 be not concurred in, but that the same be sent back to the special committee to amend the bill by providing that no one shall be deported for any political offence committed in Canada without being granted a trial by jury.

Mr. MEIGHEN: I had not heard the amendment until you read it now, Mr. Speaker. If I caught its words aright, there would seem to me to be some question as to its being in order. A committee has not power to amend a bill; it has power only to amend its own report. The wording of the amendment would appear to ask the committee to amend the bill. If so, whether in order or not, it obviously demands a negative because of the impossibility of conceding what it requests.

I turn now to a discussion of the main motion. If I caught the report correctly as described by the chairman of the committee, it is to the effect that the criminal law be not now altered, but that the Immigration Act be altered; that is to say, that new legislation be introduced as soon as possible looking—

Mr. ARCHAMBAULT: We did not touch the criminal code; we dealt only with the Immigration Act.

Mr. MEIGHEN: That is what I was saying.

Mr. WOODSWORTH: Did not the committee receive special power from this House to amend the bill? If I understood aright, it was given power to make a special report on the bill.

Mr. MEIGHEN: I understood the chairman of the committee to say that it received power to make a special report beyond the specific purview of the two bills committed to it. But, of course, that committee never received any power to amend the bill. Anyway, its report recommends an amendment to the Immigration Act, and that alone, the amendment leaving the act in the shape in which it would have been left if the bill introduced in 1920 in the Senate by Senator Robertson, then Minister of Labour, had carried through both Houses, or if the bill introduced last session in this House had passed the Senate. In substance that is the report of the committee. I concur in the report.

The amendment to the Immigration Act to which Bill No. 16 specifically refers, and which it seeks to repeal, was passed in the spring of 1919. It had the effect of placing immigrants of a certain class, though they may have come from Great Britain

in the category as to power of deportation that immigrants of a similar class or other undesirable classes had already been in who came from another country. Much of what has been urged by the hon. member for Centre Winnipeg (Mr. Woodsworth), and, from his point of view, consistently, because he believes in changing the whole law—not only in wiping out the amendment of 1919, but in altering the whole basis of the deportation law; everything, indeed—

Mr. WOODSWORTH: I would like to ask the right hon. leader of the Opposition on what basis he founds that statement?

Mr. MEIGHEN: I found it on the basis of the amendment moved just now by the hon. member. If I understand his motion aright it instructs the committee to amend the bill—we will put it in order, and say to amend the report—and to make it read that all guilty of what he describes as political offences, no matter from what country they have come, shall be deportable only after conviction by a jury. Well, I say that virtually all he has urged in favour of the striking out of the original Immigration Act amendment of 1919 is an argument in favour of changing the whole basis of the deportation law in that regard and placing upon the authorities the burden of conviction as a necessary precedent to the deportation of a man even coming—say from Poland. From his own point of view that is consistent, but do we want to alter the whole immigration law in that regard? What I am trying to emphasize is this: it has been the law as long as I can remember that anyone but a British subject coming to this country is deportable without the necessity of an indictment and going through the whole procedure of a criminal prosecution—that is, deportable if in the judgment of immigration officials, concurred in by the minister, he is of a certain undesirable class. And among the undesirable classes is the class known as anarchists, whose professed principles are against government of every kind. We have not, as far as I can remember, ever had a law making it necessary to get a conviction through process of law and the decision of a jury before such a man could be deported if he came from an outside country.

Mr. IRVINE: Is the hon. leader of the Opposition correct when he states that this law places the British immigrant and the immigrant from other countries on the same basis? As I understand the present law, it means this: that if a man from, say, Russia who has been naturalized here commits a crime after he receives his citizenship, he cannot be deported, but if a British subject commits such a crime after living in this country as long, say, as the Russian, he can be deported. Is that so, or is it not so?

Mr. MEIGHEN: I see there might be a difference in a case of that sort. After the Russian is naturalized he does not, of course, come in under the regular law, and a British subject would consequently be in a different position under the amendment. But what has always been the law is this: a Russian, a Pole, or any one else coming from another country to Canada, was, if he belonged to that class, deportable under the regular machinery of the Immigration Act. Now, in the spring of 1919 it was felt desirable—and, I think, universally felt desirable; it was not a party measure in the least—that that be altered and that the same restraints and powers that had obtained in relation to immigrants from another country obtain in relation to immigrants from Great Britain. The reasons for that, of course, were to be found in the events, the temper and the very atmosphere of the time. There is nothing easier now, in the light of calmer and more peaceful years, when the psychology of the people is changing, and naturally so, as we recede from the war—nothing easier than to look back on those days and to be wise and say: "Oh, all this was just the same as now, though we did not know it; we were deceived by events; we were really ourselves the instigators of the riotous times through which we lived." Well, sometimes it is only an affected wisdom that comes with the years. At the time, the action taken was believed to be the part of wisdom. I am not one of those who feel that immigrants to Canada from the Mother Land should, under normal conditions, be treated the same as immigrants from other countries. I think we must have regard to the unity of this Empire; we must have some regard to citizenship within this Empire in the determination of all our laws. Of that I am convinced, and it has relation to immigration, perhaps, more than anything else. But this law was framed for the circumstances of the time, because we were then having very considerable difficulty with just that class of immigrants, and we felt we had to take some summary and effective method of dealing

with the difficulty if the Government was to do its duty and cope with the situation that confronted it. The amendment passed, and I am not sure that the law was ever acted upon, but I do believe it did good while it was there. I have recollection of one case, but I know it never was acted on arbitrarily. If the minister did concur in deportation under it, he took the precaution first to have an independent investigation held; in the case I have referred to I am pretty sure it was a judge of one of the courts of Winnipeg who was called in under the Immigration Act and made a party to the investigation, and his report was acted upon. Anyway, the next year the Government, through the then Minister of Labour, introduced a bill to repeal that amendment. It failed to pass the Senate. In the Senate there was no party division; I do not know what the proportions were, but a very considerable number from both parties in the Senate—a very large majority, I think—opposed the repeal. Last year the Government took the same attitude. It felt that the time for the operation of this provision had passed; that it was no longer necessary. Accordingly, the Government introduced into this House a bill—or, rather, took over a bill introduced by the hon. member for Quebec East (Mr. Lapointe) and passed it through this House; but again, under similar circumstances, it failed to pass the Senate. The committee recommends that the course pursued, but not carried to successful termination because of the negative action of the Senate in 1920 and 1921, be pursued again. I am of the same view that I was then; therefore I concur in the report of the committee.

Amendment (Mr. Woodsworth) negatived.

Motion (Mr. Archambault) agreed to and report concurred in.

SOLDIERS' RE-ESTABLISHMENT AND PENSIONS

CONSIDERATION OF SPECIAL COMMITTEE'S FINAL REPORT

Mr. HERBERT MARLER (St. Lawrence-St. George) moved:

That the second and final report of the Special Committee on Pensions, Soldiers' Insurance and Civil Re-Establishment be considered:, that the recommendations contained therein be commended to the consideration of the Government, and that the recommendation contained in the concluding paragraph in respect of printing be concurred in.

[Mr. Meighen.]

Mr. SPEAKER: The custom and the rule is that every member should speak from his seat, but I think in view of the accoustics of the Chamber and the importance of the question, the hon. member, who is chairman of the Pensions Committee, should be allowed to speak from one of the front seats.

Mr. HERBERT MARLER (St. Lawrence-St. George): It has been called to my attention in the last few moments that certain members of the committee have not received notice from me personally that this debate was about to proceed to-day. For the information of those members I beg to state that I gave instructions that every member of the committee should receive such notice. I, of course, must accept the responsibility for the notice not being received, and I beg to tender to those members who have not received notice, my apologies for the non-receipt.

It is unnecessary, Mr. Speaker, in discussing this report to go into all the matters which are therein contained; most of the matters, I think, are self-explanatory. But certain features of the report are of the utmost importance, and I think therefore that hon. members are entitled to a certain amount of explanation in order that they may realize how the committee have been actuated in bringing in their recommendations. I shall endeavour in this respect to be as brief as possible, and if my remarks appear to be of too great length, I trust hon. members will attribute the length to the importance of the matters involved, and not to any lack of desire on my part to curtail them.

I would like to thank the members of the committee for the honour they did me in appointing me their chairman, and to thank them also for the invariable courtesy I have received at their hands on all occasions. I am quite free to admit that without that assistance, without that courtesy and consideration, the work, arduous thought it was, would have been almost an intolerable burden, but with that courtesy and that assistance the work has not been unpleasant, and also I think that with their assistance the report brought in now is an equitable report.

I would like also to thank those responsible for having given me the opportunity of serving on the committee in question. That opportunity allowed me to understand far more clearly what this country had effected in the Great War. It also allowed me to study and to realize what should be done

for those who came back from the war, and for the dependents of those who did not return.

I think, Sir, it is not improper if I remind hon. members of certain facts, which, no doubt, most of them know. The number of men who enlisted in Canada was over 595,000. There proceeded overseas of this number over 418,000. Of these there were wounded nearly 150,000, and of these there died or were killed nearly 63,000. Nobody could deny, Mr. Speaker, that these figures in themselves show what a tremendous effort this country made in the late war, what a great achievement it accomplished, an achievement, it is true, surrounded with suffering and sorrow, but nevertheless, a great effort,—an effort, Sir, which I am bound to say from the floor of this House, is a far greater effort than many other countries of far greater size and population, and of far greater wealth than this country of ours, have made. I venture to say that this great effort of which I speak, preserving, as in
4 p.m. my opinion it has preserved, our independence and our traditions, will go down in our history as the greatest effort the Canadian nation ever made, nay more, it should be taken up in the histories of other people as a great effort for any nation to have made.

There are certain after-war results which one must reduce to figures. I hesitate in reducing anything in connection with the war to figures because my feeling is this; that the service of those who went forward and served and of those who were left behind, and the suffering of those who returned, cannot in any way be estimated in figures. That service and that suffering I believe to be beyond all measure in matters of dollars, and I do not think any hon. member would for a moment deny that. On the other hand, we are here in this House as legislators for this country, and we have to accept certain responsibilities. We have to say what should be done, not only for the present time, but also for the future. Therefore, I propose to give certain figures in connection with the after-war results in connection with the departments which the committee in question has had under review.

The cost to the 31st of December, 1921, of the Military Hospitals Commission—which was subsequently taken over by the Department of Soldiers' Civil Re-Establishment—plus the federal emergency appropriation for relief, amounts to $110,000,000. Included in this total are: medical treatment, amounting to over $42,000,000; training, amounting to nearly $42,000,000; employment and employment relief, amounting to nearly $15,000,000. The amount disbursed in pensions and the cost thereof to the 31st of March, 1922, was over $127,000,000. The estimated loss on returned soldiers' insurance to the 31st of March, 1922, is over $4,000,000. The amount outstanding under the Soldiers' Settlement Act to the 31st of March, 1922, is over $80,000,000. These figures total over $323,000,000, to which could be very properly added the war service gratuity of $164,000,000, making a total of over $487,000,000.

Hon. members will well realize from figures of this size, that the departments administering these various matters in connection with after-war results must be administered in a very proper and very efficient manner. The figures, also, as presented to hon. members at the present moment, will cause them to realize the enormous number of problems, and the diversity of the problems, which come before these departments from day to day. The departments in question—and in speaking my personal opinion at the present time—because they have been in contact with me now daily for three months past. And I must say—I would like to say, with the permission of the House, and from the floor of the House—that the officers and servants of those departments are such as, in my opinion, the state might well feel proud of. Not only are the officers faithful in the exercise of their various duties, but they have at heart one thing, and one thing only, and that is the welfare of the returned soldier.

When the present committee was appointed it naturally was composed of members from all sides of the House. The reference was made to it in general terms, instructing the committee to obtain all necessary information, to call all necessary witnesses, and to bring down a report which would be eminently fair in all respects to the returned soldier. Your committee have carried out these instructions, and I may say that, during the whole course of their deliberations, no question of political division arose on any occasion whatsoever. Two chairmen of sub-committees, Mr. Speaker, were chosen from the other side of the House. The report brought down, and in which concurrence is asked at the present time, has not been changed by the Government in one single particular. It therefore follows, it seems to me, that if the committee was representative of the whole

House, the report, as brought down by that committee, should also be representative of the opinion of the House itself. In the prosecution of the work of the committee, very many matters from very many bodies were placed before it. Some of these questions are discussed in the report. Others are brought in by way of recommendation. Others will be discussed in the course of my remarks. Some, I admit, are not discussed at all, because it was thought that no good object would be gained by discussing them. But I should like to make abundantly clear to every member in the House the fact that, whether these questions are discussed in the report or not, whether recommendations are brought down in the report or not, or whether they are discussed by me in the course of these remarks or not, the committee was actuated by one motive, imbued with one idea, and one only, and that was that the returned soldiers, and the dependents of those who died, and those who come back sick or disabled, should be given an absolutely square deal, in all respects, compatible with the resources of the country and the welfare of the nation. There was no other idea in the minds of the committee at any time. I admit, Sir, that it is quite true that some will say that something should have been done for certain who are not disabled, that pensions should have been given, perhaps, to some who are indirectly, or not at all, suffering from any war disability, and that treatment should be given to certain others when sick. Some of these matters are not brought down, in the report, I admit, but, I think, Sir, from the figures which I have given to the House so far, and the figures which I expect to give later on, we can fairly admit, at least, that the country has been reasonably generous. I do not say that generosity is not right. I say that generosity is correct, and that generosity is proper in every respect. We are not giving this generosity to our returned soldiers as a gift, but as our duty, and we are glad to give that generosity to the returned soldiers, as a duty, and to their dependents, the sick and the disabled. But let us look further than that. Should we extend so-called generosity further? It is right, I admit, and proper, I admit, in every way, that the state should take under its paternal care, to the fullest extent, all those who are suffering from war disabilities, all the dependents of those who have died, and all those who are injured, or are suffering from a war injury. But should that state paternalism extend further than that? I do not think it should. State paternalism, as I see it, when unavoidable, is necessary. Where it is avoidable, it should not take place. If extended where it should not be extended, the result can be, and can only be one thing, and that one thing will be this: that the nation will lose self reliance; instead of relying on ourselves, and remaining a strong nation, as we are to-day, it will take that self reliance away and turn us into a weak nation. Sir, let me qualify the statements that I have made regarding paternalism in all sincerity. Our soldiers have earned our gratitude. They have earned that gratitude, I venture to say—in fact do say—to an extent that we cannot repay to an extent even which we do not pretend to be able to repay. There is no pretence on our part of any attempt to estimate in dollars and cents what has been done. But, although these soldiers have served us, we ask the soldiers to go further. We ask them to remember, Sir, that they are also citizens of this country, and, although we are indebted to them in very many ways, we ask them to make us their debtors still further. We ask them to realize that they, also, although they have our gratitude, should carry on as citizens of this country the same an any other citizen, where it is possible to do so. I admit, Sir, that the great majority of soldiers who were overseas have taken up the duties of citizenship, without the slightest question. They have cheerfully taken up those duties, have gone back to their jobs, and have said nothing whatsoever about their being overseas. But, perhaps, there may be a few who do not realize the duties of citizenship and who ask the state to continue, as I say, its paternal care indefinitely. I think those few should realize the efforts which the state has made, realize the efforts which everybody interested in this great question has attempted to make, and is still attempting to make, and, also, realize that they, on their part, must take up their duties as citizens also. I quite admit, Sir, in reference to my last few words, that such utterance is far from popular. It does not breed popularity in any man who makes such an utterance, perhaps, anywhere in this broad Dominion. But, Sir, notwithstanding that, is it not much better to be sincere and not to deceive. Any influence I may have had, whatever that

small influence has been, since this committee met, in the prosecutions of this work, has had one object, and one object only, and that has been to tell returned soldiers, and those representing returned soldiers, what we thought the state should do, and what we thought the state could do, and not to make empty promises when we thought the state should not or could not carry out those promises. No other man on the floor of this House—and I speak from my personal viewpoint at the present time—realizes with greater gratitude than I do how much this country is indebted to the returned soldier. I think any man who had not the privilege of going overseas should realize that, perhaps, more than those who did go overseas; but personally I decline absolutely to attempt to deceive the returned soldier by making rash promises which, I know, cannot and will not be carried out. It is on that basis, in view of these preliminary remarks, that this report was prepared.

Coming directly to the report, let me say that the first chapter takes up the question of re-establishment. By re-establisment is meant the placing of the ex-soldier in a position to earn his livelihood, by means of remedying damages which have been caused by the war. For that purpose, the State comes forward and says: "First of all we will endeavour to cure you through hospital treatment." In the second place it says: "If you require artificial limbs or anything of that description, we will furnish you with such articles." In the third place it says: "We will give you training in order to fit you for a trade, and during this period of hospital treatment, during this period of training, we will pay you pay and allowances." This the state has done. The state has not stated, nor has the state ever attempted to say to any returned soldier that it will attempt to repair damages caused by a man's financial losses, or his losses in social standing. All it attempts to do, all that re-establishment tries to do—and I think re-establishment has made a very fair attempt—is to repair the damage done to the returned soldier on account of war service. That, I think, should be made perfectly clear.

Let me again detail to the House a few of the figures which the Department of Soldiers' Civil Re-establishment have taken up. Prior to the 31st of December last, admissions to hospitals numbered over 12,000; clinical treatments accorded numbered over 945,000; dental treatments numbered over 28,000; the number of those who commenced training was 51,000; orthopedic and surgical appliances supplied numbered over 127,000; positions found numbered over 175,000, and dependants returned from overseas numbered 49,000. All these are large figures.

The next item in the report which, I think, perhaps, I might call to the attention of the House is the knowledge which the returned soldier has of the various advantages which he may receive and the various acts and departments which attempt to assist him. Evidence came before the committee which led the committee to believe that, although a great deal of propaganda had been made, there might be a few returned soldiers in some parts of the country who had not the knowledge of what they could do and how they were to go about that. The recommendation, therefore, contained in the report that a booklet shall be prepared and issued to all returned soldiers, is for the purpose of giving all these returned soldiers ample notice of all that the state is ready and willing to do for them.

Hon. members will note the heading "Constitution of further Medical Advisory Board." Your committee considered that question with the utmost care. The facts were these. A soldier goes to the Department of Soldiers' Civil Re-establishment and is there examined by the unit medical director. The unit medical director says to the soldier: "We are very sorry that we cannot give you treatment." Under the law as it stands at present, that soldier has a right to go to his own medical adviser and to obtain from such medical adviser a certificate stating that the injury, for which he asks treatment, is the result of war disability, and that certificate is then sent in to the Department of Soldiers' Civil Re-establishment. Our suggestion to the House in that respect is this, that where a soldier goes to his medical adviser and obtains a certificate from a practitioner of standing showing that the initial decision of the Department of Soldiers' Civil Re-establishment is at fault, submitting therewith reasonable evidence substantiating the facts set out in such certificate, then and in that case he goes before the so-called Medical Advisory Board, which consists, as shown in this section of the report, of certain independent medical men. In that way, the soldier will have the benefit of two boards to sit on his case and

decide whether treatment shall or shall not be rendered and thus is set aside, in so far as it can be set aside, any question whatsoever whether the soldier is or is not capable of having treatment at the hands of that department.

I do not think I need take up in any great detail other matters contained under the heading "re-establishment", excepting possibly the question of the canteen funds. As hon. members possibly know, the Canteen Funds' Disposal Committee was appointed during or after the last session of Parliament. Ballots were sent out to a very great extent, but no conclusive results were obtained from the ballots sent out. As a matter of fact, the ideas sent in by those who received ballots were too numerous; in fact, it would be impossible in any way to act on the report of that particular committee. Your committee in taking up this subject have analysed the statement and the report of the Canteen Funds' Disposal Committee and have segregated those items which appear to be the actual items that most votes were cast for under that reference, and they are bringing in their reference in this report based on the report of the Canteen Funds' Disposal Committee and suggesting to the House that that they concur in the recommendation that a board of administration be appointed, as set out in the report, for the purpose of administering these funds, indicating to that board that the funds, which all members of the committee understand and believe are soldiers' funds shall, in the first place, be used for promoting sheltered employment, and in the second place, for the purpose of promoting education of soldier's children who could not get education otherwise.

On the subject of unemployment, your committee expended a great deal of thought and energy. I myself, I may say, thought over the subject day after day. It was recommended to the committee that a National Economic Congress be appointed, and that it sit in various parts of the Dominion. We did not think that the appointment of such a congress would have any active or immediate results. Other points came up as regards unemployment; all were dissected; all were considered; all were placed on one side. On several occasions we asked that concrete proposals as to what could be done for unemployment be placed before us. I, personally, as Chairman of the Committee, asked this question on many occasions; but after all this was done, none was offered. There is nothing we can suggest which will cure the prevailing unemployment condition. We realize the difficulties of the situation, with which we are most sympathetic, and we should gladly have seized on anything that would have tended to improve matters. We did think, however, that the winter should not be allowed to approach without some kind of help being available for the returned soldiers, and we felt that if it was possible for the Government to give them work in the meanwhile so that they might be paid for doing something instead of being given money by way of gifts, as has been done in the past, it would be infinitely preferable. I am free to admit to hon. gentlemen on the floor of this House that although every attempt has been made, both on my part and on the part of every member of the committee, to solve the great difficulty, it appears that the only hope for a satisfactory solution lies in a return to normal conditions.

The next part of the report deals with pensions. I do not intend to say a great deal on this subject, but I think there should be clearly placed before the House at least the elements that enter into the question of awarding pensions. There has been considerable criticism on the subject of pensions. Many hon. members wonder why certain people are not granted pensions, and they cannot fathom the reason. Now, the elements of the principle on which pensions are granted are simple, but the application of the principle itself is exceedingly difficult. Similarly, the principles of war are simple, but the application of those principles present considerable difficulty. However, I want to put before the House a few simple principles that are adopted in the awarding of pensions. In the first place, the Pensions Board is regulated by an act. That board is a judicial body, quite separate, and properly so, from any governmental agency. It is a judicial body and functions as such under the Pensions Act.

Mr. MACLEAN (York): Will the hon member define the distinction between applications for pension and the application that has been made for a bonus? Did such an application come up?

Mr. MARLER: That question did not come up; it is an entirely separate and distinct thing. My understanding is that the application for bonus is made to the Department of Militia and Defence, while

the application for pension is made to the Pensions Board. But I am giving that answer to my hon. friend, not having any great knowledge of the question in regard to bonus.

Mr. MACLEAN (York): Was a direct application made to the committee by the returned men for a bonus?

Mr. MARLER: I misunderstood the hon. member. As I understand his question now it is this: Was any application made for a bonus to be granted to returned men in addition to the ordinary pension? Is that the question?

Mr. MACLEAN (York): Was that matter brought to the attention of the committee? Was there a direct application of that nature before the committee?

Mr. MARLER: Yes, it was. That question was considered and is mentioned in the report. Now, as regards the question of pensions. Pensions are awarded on account of death or by reason of war disability. Before any pension can be awarded there must first of all be the prerequisite of a disability caused by the war. Pensions are not awarded because soldiers went overseas and underwent bodily sufferings, or because they have lost social status, or because their businesses did not prosper while they were away. Pensions are not awarded for any of these causes, but simply and solely for war disability or on account of death. This being the case, pensions had to be reduced to a common denominator. In other words, one man could not be awarded a pension because he held a certain status in life, and another man another pension because he held a lesser or a higher position. One common denominator was chosen, and that was unskilled labourer 100 per cent efficient. It follows therefore that if a man is 10 per cent deficient he gets a 10 per cent pension on that basis; if he is 100 per cent deficient he gets 100 per cent pension based on that deficiency.

Mr. IRVINE: Does this common rate apply to officers as well? Is there any distinction between one class and another?

Mr. MARLER: Pensions are given according to rank. Prior to the late war pensions were granted only on account of disability due to war service. On the outbreak of the war we granted for a time, until September, 1920, pensions to soldiers no matter what happened to them during the course of the war. But after the first of September, 1920, the old principle was reverted to, under which a soldier was pensioned only because of disability attributable to military service as such. It does not mean that a soldier has necessarily to apply for his pension on discharge. The soldiers were discharged either on the short form or on the long form. If they claimed to be fit they were discharged on the short form; if they were not well, or if they were suffering from any disability at the time, they were discharged on the long form. The long form gave a pen picture of every man in the condition in which he was at the time of his discharge. Hon. members will see from this that certain difficulties must arise in connection with the granting of pensions. When a man has been discharged on the long form the particulars of his case are taken at the time. But a man might say he was fit and would accordingly be discharged on the short form. And a man discharged on the short form is not thereby precluded from getting a pension if he discovers that any disability that has appeared afterwards is attributable to war services. In other words, the evidence in existence at the time of his discharge is not conclusive at all. The history of every man is gone into and every attempt is made to give the soldier the benefit of the doubt, no matter how long after his discharge it may be before he applies for his pension.

The question as to the rates of pension will no doubt be of interest to hon. members. We have heard that our Canadian pensions are higher than those in other countries. Here are the rates:

	Canada	United States	United Kingdom	New Zealand
	$	$	$ c.	$ c.
For a pensioner only..	900	1,200	506 13	506 13
For a pensioner and wife.....	1,200	1,200	632 66	759 20
For a pensioner and wife and three children.....	1,644	1,200	879 42	1,138 80

Mr. McMASTER: That is for total disability.

Mr. MARLER: I am speaking in total disability terms at the present time.

The next question taken up in the report is one which I have alluded to before —the question of an appeal board. When a man applies for a pension the necessary information is first of all given to the unit medical officer of the D.S.C.R., who sends it forward to the Pension Board for

examination by the physicians of that board. Naturally pensions are based on two particular points: first, on the point of law, that is, whether the pensioner comes under the Pension Act or not; second, on the facts. The facts are largely medical. It therefore follows that the medical officers may disagree. What your committee had to consider was this: The unit medical officer would say to the applicant, "I think you should receive a 50 per cent disability pension." When that application with the requisite papers reached the head office the physicians there would say, "No, we think the unit medical officer is wrong. We think you should receive only a 40 per cent disability pension." In other words, there is a difference between the medical unit officer and the medical directors of the head office. In another case where a disability pension was subject to revision, the unit medical officer might say, "Your pension should be reduced so much." But on the papers being transmitted to the head office the medical directors there would disagree with that opinion. Therefore your committee recommends that where such a disagreement arises the case shall be submitted to what we call a Medical Advisory Board. This would give the soldier affected two boards, consistently against or in his favour, to determine which decision is right.

Various other matters are dealt with in the report which, however, do not call for particular comment. The report, in so far as pensions are concerned, is very full, and each section has been drawn in such a way that I hope it is perfectly clear. There are only one or two other points in connection with pensions on which I need comment. One of these points—and I must say that I approach it with a geed deal of hesitation—deals with pensions to widowed mothers. I think all hon. members will recall the resolution which this House passed on the 1st May last:

> That, in the opinion of this House, it is expedient to amend the act to provide pensions to or in respect of members of the Canadian Naval and Military Air Forces, 1919, so as to provide that the pension of a widowed mother of a member of the forces who has died on active service shall not be reduced on account of her income; and further that pension shall be granted her of right whether or not there are other living children.

I have stated, Mr. Speaker, that I approach this question with a good deal of hestitation. I have a high opinion of the

mover of that resolution, and I am quite sure that by reason of his magnificent war record he realized the situation and acted in the best possible spirit. Hon. members will recall that during the course of the debate which took place on that resolution a question arose as to whether or not the resolution, if accepted by the House, would be submitted to the committee which was sitting at that time. The resolution carried. Your committee were authorized under the general reference to take up the question embodied in that resolution.

A pension of of $720 a year is awarded to a widowed mother when a soldier does not leave a widow and children or orphans. Of course when the soldier leaves the other dependents referred to the widowed mother does not receive as much. The particular section of the act dealing with this class of pensions states in effect that where a soldier leaves a widow and also a widowed mother that his widow shall be preferred as the recipient of the pension. In addition to the pension to the widow the widowed mother is also allowed a certain sum. It is also provided that the pension to the widowed mother shall not be reduced on account of her own earnings, but if she has a greater income than $240 per annum, anything over and above that sum shall be deducted from the pension.

Mr. MEIGHEN: That is, income which she does not earn herself.

Mr. MARLER: Yes; she can earn as much as she likes. The effort of the state, it seems to me, has been to place all widowed mothers in precisely the same position. In other words, the widowed mother in one case is told: If you need this pension it shall be granted you. But in another case she is told: If you have an income from other sources there is no reason why the state should support you. If you have children who can support you, then the money that they give you will be deducted from the pension. That, according to my reading of the law, was the intention of the state in framing the legislation as regards widowed mothers' pensions. Let us look at what the resolution asks for. The resolution that I am discussing at the present moment, that is to say, the resolution passed by this House on the first of May last, asks that the widowed mother of a soldier who died on active service shall receive a pension of $720 per annum, whether or not the soldier left a widow and whether or not he left depen-

dent children, and that a pension so granted to the widowed mother shall not be reduced for any cause, no matter how much income of her own she may have. If an amendment of this description were placed in the law it seems to me it would strike at the whole question of dependency, because pension for dependents other than the soldier's widow is always based on the extent to which the persons in question are actually dependent. In other words, the question to be determined is whether the dependents of the soldier need the money to live on, or do not. The effect of the law can be reduced into dollars—and I am not referring to the question from this point of view for the purpose of influencing the decision of any hon. member. If a thing is right, it should be done, but before asking that a thing be done we should certainly count the cost. If every widowed mother who at present is in receipt of pension is granted additional pension in accordance with this resolution, it will mean a known increase in our pension bill of $2,200,000 per annum. It is impossible to say, of course, what the ultimate effect of the adoption of the resolution would be, because it is a fact that many widowed mothers have applied for pension and many of these applications have been refused because the applicants were not considered dependent. But so far as can be ascertained, the change would result in an increased expenditure of $2,200,000.

Another question dealt with in the report has reference to certain charges made against the Pensions Board.

Mr. McQUARRIE: May I ask the hon. gentleman a question?

Mr. MARLER: Certainly.

Mr. McQUARRIE: Will he be good enough to explain what he means by "dependents"? Take the case where a mother has a number of sons, one of whom was killed in the war. She has certain sons with her now who should be expected to support her, but who do not do so, and she is really in destitute circumstances. In a case where these facts can be shown beyond question, will the widowed mother be entitled to pension?

Mr. MARLER: Did the soldier leave a widow also?

Mr. McQUARRIE: No.

Mr. MARLER: He left only a widowed mother; he did not leave any children?

Mr. McQUARRIE: No.

Mr. MARLER: The widowed mother under those conditions would be entitled to pension only if she was dependent. Now, the hon. member asks what is the meaning of "dependency."

Mr. McQUARRIE: That is the question, please.

Mr. MARLER: I will answer it, with pleasure. Dependency is a sufficiency for maintenance and is recognized by the statute to the extent of $60 a month in the case of one parent and $75 in the case of two. In the case mentioned by the hon. member, if the widow asking for the pension has $60 a month of her own, the law would not consider that she was dependent.

Mr. McQUARRIE: But if she has no income whatever and has other sons who might be expected to support her or to contribute to her support, but do not do so, what then?

Mr. MARLER: These sons would have to contribute to her support, and any pension she might be entitled to under the act would be subject to reduction to the extent that the Pension Board considered those sons should support her.

Mr. McQUARRIE: As the law stands now, and according to rulings of the Pension Commissioners, she is not entitled to anything because she has these other sons who should be expected to support her, but do not do it. That is the case I am referring to.

Mr. MARLER: If there are other sons who should support the widowed mother, she will not get a pension. The law in effect, is based on the principle that children should support their parents and that the country cannot be expected to support a widowed mother if there are children capable of supporting her to such and such an extent.

Mr. MARCIL (Bonaventure): Is any change being made in the practice of reducing the pension to widowed mothers? Several cases have come up in my constituency in which the amount originally awarded has been reduced.

Mr. MARLER: As far as I know, no change has been made.

Mr. MARCIL (Bonaventure): That is, these pensions may still be reduced? I received a letter only this morning in which it is stated that the pension awarded to a widowed mother has actually been reduced.

Mr. MARLER: There is probably some reason for that.

Mr. PUTNAM: Is that provision invariable, that a mother having capable but unfilial children shall be obliged to account for their lapses in the deduction of her pension?

Mr. MARLER: Yes, she would. I think I had better finish my remarks, Mr. Speaker, with regard to the pensions. I was about to deal with the question of certain accusations which had been made against the Pensions Board. Charges have recently been made in the press, and the matter has been brought up on the floor of the House. I do not desire to pose as a defender of the board, or anything of that kind; I would simply like to say that the question was carefully considered by the committee and that the committee has recommended that a commission be appointed to inquire into the facts. I hesitate, in view of that, to discuss the matter at any greater length; probably it will be just as well to leave it to the commission to consider the facts as they are brought before it.

The next question dealt with in the report is that of insurance. The only comment I desire to make in that respect is with regard to section 5, which has reference to the refusal of the minister to enter into an insurance contract. Under section 13 of the Insurance Act the minister has the right to frame regulations, and under section 15 he has the right to require medical examination where that is thought proper. The present regulations were placed before the committee and the committee found them to be eminently fair in all respects.

The next question which comes up under the report is that of land settlement. I shall be exceedingly brief on this question. I shall give only the outline of the general law on the subject and the general effect, and indicate the payments which the soldier settlers are now required to meet under the various acts, and the payments which it is proposed shall be made under amendments to the acts which this House will be asked to concur in.

There were two Land Settlement acts. The first was the Land Settlement Act of 1917. It provided in the first place for loans of $2,500, which amount was subsequently extended under Order in Council to $3,000. Then the act of 1919 was passed, and amendments were made to that act in 1920. The provisions of these acts are very largely the same. They all give the returned soldier, and in certain cases the widow of a soldier, the right to become settlers, but hon. members should realize that every returned soldier was not entitled to become a settler under the terms of these acts. Whether he was capable of being a successful soldier settler or not was first of all carefully inquired into by the board. Other inquiries had to be made as to whether the soldier was sufficiently fit, whether he had had practical farming experience, as to his sincerity of purpose and his ability to pay 10 per cent of the cost of the farm and to keep his family from want. The man on being declared eligible to become a soldier farmer selects his farm, subject to the approval of the board. In the selection of the farm the board takes all the necessary facts into consideration, and after it has been finally decided that the soldier settler is suitable to become a farmer, and that the farm is a suitable one on which to settle, he is granted a loan.

At present there are three classes of loans. There is the loan to the settler who purchases land; there is the loan to the settler who settles on Dominion free land; and there is the loan to the settler who owns his own land. All these loans have various qualifications: various questions arise as to repayment and whether the loan is made on improved or unimproved land. It follows from this that we have settlers at the present time under many conditions. We have settlers under the act of 1917, and settlers under the act of 1919, who have loans on land, loans for improvements, loans for stock and implements. We have also settlers under the act of 1920, with loans on unimproved land, loans for improvements on improved land, loans for improvements on unimproved land, and so on. In other words, in many cases the settler has several accounts which have to be kept, and the keeping of these accounts is cumbersome to a very great degree. In examining into the question of soldier settlers, there has been a certain amount of criticism of the acts. I do not see it in that light. I think the effect of soldier settlement so far has been remarkably good.

Mr. MACLEAN (York): Roughly, how many soldier settlers are there?

Mr. MARLER: There are 21,394.

Mr. MEIGHEN: That would be without taking into account the homesteading soldier settlers. With those included, the number would be between 27,000 and 28,000.

Mr. MARLER: Yes, the figure I gave was of settlers under the Soldier Settlement Acts. These soldier settlers have opened up 600,000 acres of new land, and they have under cultivation over 5,000,000 acres of land. Take, for example, the amounts they are worth to the railroads. If we take as a basis $740 of freight for each soldier settler, that means a very large amount in freight to the railroads. It does seem to me that the soldier settlers under the circumstances that have existed in agriculture in the past few years have done remarkably well. But I do think this, and the committee also thought, that the loans as made under the acts, were not sufficiently extended as regards repayments. In other words, they did not give the soldier first of all the opportunity of getting his farm in order before being called upon to make heavy payments. We must look at this question from two viewpoints. We should look at it from the viewpoint of the great advisability of keeping the soldiers on the land, because, as I have said, they have done remarkably well so far, and, in the second place, we must also look at it from the standpoint that the nation has a very large amount of money locked up in this undertaking. It is therefore advisable that we should encourage the soldier settlers to stay on the land and to cultivate it, assisting them in every way possible to repay the loans which have been made to them.

5 p.m.

As I have indicated previously, the payments under the present acts are far too heavy. The soldier settlers cannot meet these payments as they now exist. Consequently, what your committee suggests is this, that all amounts advanced to every soldier settler, the arrears, loans for improvements, loans for stock and implements, and loans on land, be all consolidated into one account, as of the 1st of April, 1922, and that interest be added to the consolidated account so arrived at, at the rate of 5 per cent per annum to the next interest date, which in Manitoba is the 1st of October, and that on the 1st of October next the soldier will pay one twenty-fifth of that amount less interest exemption, which I shall explain in a moment or two.

Mr. MEIGHEN: Did the committee take into account when making that recommendation the mortality of personal property security? Land is eternal, but implements very soon pass away, and twenty-five years seems a long time to expect them to remain as security; and it seems longer still in the case of stock. I am just asking if the committee took into account that there is a very great difference between the length of time you can afford to give in the case of land, and in the case of stock and implements.

Mr. MARLER: The question is an absolutely proper one in every way. I thought of the very same situation myself, and I agree that to give twenty-five years to pay for stock and implements and also for goods which can pass away is a very long time indeed, but under the present law, the payments on stock and implements are, unfortunately, very heavy, and the committee thought that although the country would be taking a certain risk in extending the period for the repayment of loans on stock and implements, the increment on the farm itself would more than offset the loss in security which they might suffer by depreciation of the implements. In other words, you get depreciation in one case, and appreciation in the other.

Mr. LOVETT: How many farms have been abandoned by the soldiers and have come back into the hands of the Government?

Mr. MARLER: I am sorry I cannot give that information at the moment, but I shall make a note of it and let my hon. friend know.

I mentioned certain interest exemptions. Your committee are suggesting interest exemptions as follows: For 1919 settlers, up until the 1st of October, 1926, or in other words, four years from next October; for 1920 settlers, up to the 1st of October, 1925, or three years from next October; for 1921 settlers, up to the 1st of October, 1924, or two years from next October. The question naturally arises, why this difference? Why are some settlers given a longer period within which to pay this interest than others? The reason is that the exemption in 1919 is made for four years because the committee thought that implements, stock, etc. at that time, had been bought at higher figures, and, possibly, the soldier settler at that particular period paid more for his land, and also very likely, almost certainly, paid more for his stock. He was given a preference in that respect; so the settlers in 1920 and 1921 were given lesser preferences for similar reasons. The situation does not affect a man who has paid up his debt, because interest is added up till the 1st of April

this year, and the whole amount is consolidated. The man owing less simply has to pay less interest in the future. These payments, I admit, are all exceedingly complicated and very very hard to follow. Consequently, I have reduced to the simplest possible calculation, for the benefit of hon. members, the method in which an average loan of $5,000 would be paid under the old plan, and how it will now be payable under the new plan. The average of loan of $5,000 divided into:

Land purchases	$3,000
Permanent improvements	500
Stock and equipment	1,500

This is a hypothetical case, to distinguish how payments have been made in the past, and how they will be made in the future. Under the old plan, as at present in existence, that loan of $5,000 would be payable in this way, leaving out the cents:—

1st October 1920	$254
1st October 1921	667
1st October 1922	667

Or, in other words, on the 1st October 1922 the settler of 1919 would have had to pay $1,589.53. But some have paid and some have not paid. The payments have been made fairly regularly, but I am simply quoting this example in order to show that, in the opinion of your committee, the initial payments were too heavy. What is suggested under the proposed amendment to the act is that, on this same loan of $5,000, on the 1st of next October the amount due will be $232.40, and that amount of $232.40 will continue for some years and then there will be nineteen payments of $372,97. In other words, the earlier payments are less and the later payments a little heavier. Take an example of a settler established Ist April, 1920. He would have had to pay, under the old plan, on the 1st October, 1922, $922.04. It is suggested, in the consolidated plan, that this be converted into a payment of $219,35 on the 1st October, and the later payments of $359.27, instead of the method under the old plan, when his later payments were $254.55. In the case of a settler established 1st April, 1921, the payment due 1st October, 1921, under the old plan, would be $557.47, and, under the new plan, it would be $210. This means that all these loans, which are now placed in very many accounts, will all be on exactly the same basis, and all payable in 25 years. I am informed that the saving in cost of administration alone will be very considerable—the amount which has been mentioned to me is around $250,000 per annum. The treasury, it goes without saying, will lose a certain amount of interest. That amount of interest which the treasury will lose under the exemption for interest, as it stands now, will be $11,700,000.

[Mr. Marler.]

Mr. MEIGHEN: In connection with the virtual rebate on non-payment of interest, has the committee considered the possibility, indeed the certainty, of discrimination? One man has paid a third or half his loan, and another has paid nothing, perhaps, not even his interest. If the debt of each was consolidated, and each was given freedom from interest for four or three or two years, as the case may be, the man who has been delinquent gets a far greater advantage than the man who has been industrious and prompt. In a word, is it not open to the objection that the plan really puts a premium upon procrastination?

Mr. MARLER: My right hon. friend is, in part, right in his criticism. It is true, the man who has paid up the greater part of his loan is not getting exactly the same as the man who has not paid up his loan, but none of the past interest is waived in any way. I trust I have made that quite clear. It is consolidated up to a certain date. But where a man has paid off his loan entirely, he is, to some extent, discriminated against.

Mr. MACLEAN (York): Does it not mean that the successful settler takes up the loss of the unsuccessful settler?

Mr. MARLER: In that regard, the question of interest exemption arose out of the desire for a revaluation, which was utterly impossible to arrive at. We could not have a revaluation. Then the committee had to consider the two main points: first the advisability of keeping the soldier settler on the land—that is what we had in mind the whole time—and, second, to save as much as we possibly could, and, in fact, increase our security by keeping him on the land, so that we would minimize, or eliminate entirely, our loss on acount of the large amount involved. But the criticisms of my right hon. friend (Mr. Meighen) and the hon member for South York (Mr. Maclean) are well founded, I must admit, in part. But I do not see how it could be gotten over, although I must admit, I tried to get over it. I took that question up,

and I may say there are very very few who will be discriminated against in that respect.

Mr. MEIGHEN: If that is the case, the objection is not strong, but is it really the case? The hon. member seems to think that only those who have paid in full will be discriminated against. There are not very many of these—I am told only about five hundred. But is there not discrimination as between all of them, the man who has paid two-thirds, the man who has paid a half, and the man who has paid one-third or the man who has paid one-tenth? All those are discriminated against, in favour of the man who has paid nothing at all, because, when the outstanding indebtedness is all consolidated, then the amount of interest due now is waived, just in proportion to the debt.

Mr. MARLER: Not precisely. I do not think that is quite right.

Mr. MEIGHEN: Perhaps I misunderstood it.

Mr. MARLER: The interest is not waived. If a man has paid one-third of his debt, he is saved that much interest. If a man is in arrears, his interest is added up to the 1st of April of this year. Nothing is waived up to the first of April.

Mr. MEIGHEN: I know that.

Mr. MARLER: Let us take this example. If a man has paid one-third of his debt, he will have so much less interest to pay. A man who has paid none of his debt will have the whole of his debt capitalized with interest. A man who has paid one-third of his debt, will have two-thirds of his debt capitalized with interest. It is as regards the future that the privilege exists. There is no waiving at all up to the date of consolidation.

Mr. MEIGHEN: I am aware of that. Supposing six men started out, each with a debt of $5,000. One has paid nothing; another has paid $1,000; another, $2,000; another, $3,000; another, $4,000, and another, the whole thing. As regards the man who has paid nothing at all, his remission is the interest for four years on $5,000, presuming that he has been paying interest; that is to say, it would be, at 5 per cent, $1,000. The man who has paid $1,000, gets out on $4,000, which would mean $800 remitted. And so on down; the man who has paid all except $1,000, gets only $200 remission, and the man who has paid everything gets nothing. There is discrimination everywhere, and I would fear that this would be the birth of a long, long series of claims for readjustment.

Mr. MARLER: I admit that there is something in what my right hon. friend states. That was gone into very carefully by the committee at the time, and it is difficult to see how we can get out of it.

That is the report of the committee. I do not think any further comment on my part is necessary, nor is it necessary, so far as I can see to detain the House further. I should like to say, however, that during the course of the prosecution of the work of the committee, the attitude which all hon. members of that committee have taken in an attempt to solve these difficulties which have been placed before us has been exceedingly pleasant. As I have stated previously in the opening remarks of this address, the one effort which we have had before us has been to alleviate, in every possible manner, the lot of the returned soldier, to make the returned soldier feel that we have taken into consideration everything which we reasonably could have been expected to take into consideration, and I believe the report, as now brought down, is an equitable report in every way.

Mr. ALFRED SPEAKMAN (Red Deer): Mr. Speaker, I second the motion for concurrence in this report. It has been a pleasure to me to have been associated to some slight extent in this work. I think all the members of that committee felt as I do; as a matter of fact, the committee itself was a rather unique one, in that every member of that committee was placed there at his express desire, because he was interested in the work the committee had in hand, and was anxious to assist as far as possible in bringing justice to the returned men in our country. The work has been very pleasant because, as our chairman has said, it has been a committee where men from all parts of this House met on an absolutely equal footing, where politics or party considerations were forgotten and where we each gave the best that was in us to bring about a successful consummation of our labours. That, perhaps, was the most important feature in the committee, and, further, it was absolutely right and just that such should have been the case. This is no party question; this is no question of

political gain or party advantage; this is absolutely a national question affecting every one on all sides of this House and the country as a whole. I would say further that, as regards any man who would inject politics into work of that kind, who would endeavour to use work of that kind for any political advantage, no matter where he resided or what part of the country he represented, the place of that man would be outside of the doors of the committee altogether; and I believe, further, the place of that man would be outside of Parliament. But, very fortunately, very happily, such considerations never arose. Unanimity of purpose was found on that committee, not always unanimity of ideas, because that was not to be expected, and I do not think it would be altogether desirable if there had been unanimity of ideas. We brought various ideas into the common melting-pot, and from that common melting-pot we have brought in a report which, we hope, will be of advantage to returned men and will improve the acts which we have attempted to amend. I may say further that I very much appreciate the assistance which we have had from our chairman and every member of the committee. I think the chairman of the sub-committees appreciate that particularly, because they have found the chairman of the committee to be most helpful, most assiduous in giving what assistance he could. As one of the sub-chairmen, I can speak of that from personal experience.

I shall now, however, confine my remarks to my particular subject, that is, the subject of land settlement, because, to a large extent that subject was left in the hands of the sub-committee. The greater part of the evidence was taken before the main committee. But the sub-committee took that evidence, sifted it out, took further evidence, considered and discussed it, and arrived at a decision, drew up its sub-committee report and presented it to the main committee where it was discussed, criticized and finally adopted. Therefore, to some extent, if in the report there are failings and weaknesses, as have been pointed out by some hon. members, I am, perhaps, more responsible for that than the chairman of the committee, and in that I think I can associate all the other members of the sub-committee, as our report was absolutely unanimous.

Before going into the work of that sub-committee, I want to say a few brief words on the motives that actuated us. There were two. One was this, to remedy any injustices which might unhappily have been done to returned men through no fault in the act. The second was to look at the matter as a business proposition, as a colonization scheme. In that way the work of this sub-committee stands apart, the work of this particular department stands apart from that of other departments of re-establishment. This is not even under the heading of re-establishment; it is a department of its own under the heading of the Department of the Interior, because, in its essence, it is not a measure of re-establishment; it is not a measure particularly of special assistance given to returned men; in its essence, it is a colonization method of assisted farming, which is applied only to those men who, by reason of their services abroad, were particularly entitled to that assistance.

I am not going to criticize in the least the law as it exists. I have studied that law fairly carefully during the last few months; I believe that law was sound in its inception; that it was just according to conditions which prevailed at the time it was passed. It is natural that when any law is passed, as time goes on and as the effects of the law become more apparent, weaknesses will be found. Those weaknesses we have sought to remedy. The main trouble which we encountered was this—and it is not any fault of the act or of any member of the Government in operating the act, but results from a complete change in the economic conditions of agriculture itself; that is what we sought to meet and, so far as possible, to alleviate. When the act first came into force and during the years when the bulk of the men came on the land, agriculture was, on the whole, in an exceedingly flourishing condition. Markets were good; the demand for products was good; prices were high, and the men who went on the land, those who knew something about farming, had every expectation, and rightfully so, of succeeding in their operations and becoming self-supporting citizens of this country. Unfortunately, by reason of the conditions prevailing at that time, these men had to purchase at high prices; because, naturally, if they could sell their produce at high prices they had to pay high prices for whatever they required themselves. If there was a good market for the man who

had stock to sell, it meant that the man who was commencing farming had to pay a good deal for the necessary stock to start with. That was inevitable. Land was affected to some extent also. Land that produced wheat worth $2 or $2.50 a bushel was obviously worth more than land producing wheat that fetched $1 a bushel.

Now, on the contrary, the condition that the committee was confronted with was one of general economic depression in agriculture as a whole, and that condition bore peculiarly upon the men who had been placed on the land under this scheme, not because of the fact that they were returned men but simply because they owed for everything they possessed. They were in debt to that extent, they had no reserve piled up during the good years, and in the majority of cases had no property of their own to fall back upon. They were in debt to the full extent of the property they held, and having these interest payments to meet they felt the economic depression to a greater degree than did those who owned their own property. For that reason, and because we recognized that this country owes a debt to these men, to see that as far as possible they shall be given a fair opportunity to re-establish themselves successfully and become self-supporting, self-respecting citizens, we decided to go to their assistance to that extent. Now, it has been suggested that any assistance given in that way is a form of special privilege extended to a small number of men and withheld from others. That is hardly just. These men were not given a great or any special consideration in the way of bonus when they were placed on the land. They paid the full price for everything they got, borrowing from the country the money with which to buy their properties, on which money they had to pay interest. It cannot therefore be argued that any special privilege was given them in that respect. The loan was made to these men at that time to enable them to go into agriculture because of the great cry that was being raised for increased production on the land. The attempt was made to put men on the land who would be an asset to the nation, just as the attempt is now being made, in any immigration policy that may be adopted, to secure immigrants for the same purpose. There is no question of discrimination; there was a necessity for people on the land because the country needed farmers. That was the object in giving this particular assistance to these men, and in any debate of interest, or any special consideration in regard to payment, that may be conceded, that fact must be taken into consideration. These men are not being given a bonus now; they are relieved as far as possible of conditions which have made it impossible for them to succeed personally, or to become that asset to the country which they should be.

Moreover, it is quite self-evident that if these men fail because of conditions over which they have no control, or because the payments they have to make are unduly burdensome, the country will be the loser. Those men who fail, it is true, will lose all that they had. They will lose the ten per cent which they were called upon to pay, and they will lose the result of one, two, or three years of work. But the country would also lose, and in two ways. It would lose the difference between the amount of the loan it made and the value of the property, if sold at a resale. And more than that, it would lose the men themselves, who undoubtedly are an asset to the country because they produce revenue for the railways. The country would lose these men and in their stead we should have men, women and children out of employment whom it would have to support. That is the reason we give special consideration to this class; and that is why, in my opinion, they cannot be justly considered as receiving any special privilege as compared with others. At all events, it is not our intention to give any special privilege and we do not look at the matter in that way.

Now, I am not going to go into the actual working of our recommendations; our chairman has touched on that question very ably. I have been farming in my part of the country for over thirty years, and there are more returned men on the land in that vicinity than in any other part of Canada. In my own constituency of Red Deer there are at least 1,200 returned men placed on the land by the board, and that is more than in any other constituency of Canada. I can therefore say that I know personally the conditions under which these men work. I have worked side by side with them during the last few years and under the same conditions, with this advantage over them that enabled me to pull through where they could not, namely, that I owned my property, free from debt, prior to the time of depression. So that I can speak with knowledge of the actual conditions of the men on the land at the present time. In bringing our recommendations forward, I at least have largely had

in view those conditions. I am not a lawyer. Sometimes I am glad of the fact, and sometimes I am sorry. I can see where a knowledge of law is a tremendous asset to a man; I can see also where a knowledge of law sometimes limits a man's outlook and usefulness, and there are subjects on which a man who is actually conversant with working conditions—I am not speaking in any spirit of egotism at all—is a better authority than any lawyer, however skilful he may be, whose actual knowledge is only theoretical. In bringing forward these recommendations, for which I, as a member of the committee, am jointly responsible, I may say that we looked at the matter from the point of view of practical farmers as to what was necessary, in our opinion, to enable men to succeed under these conditions as farmers. Now, in doing so we may have infringed some of the ethics of law. I do not know whether we have, and I do not particularly care. Our object was not to frame a law that would read well or sound well, or that was even particularly consistent, our object was to bring about conditions of re-payment on the land which would enable these men to succeed on a return to normal agricultural prosperity. And I want to emphasize that point. We found it impossible to make any recommendation based on abnormal conditions, because in considering the term of payments for twenty-five years we have had in view normal periods of average prosperity on these farms during that time. If we had considered only the present year we would simply have said: "Well, we might as well wipe out the whole thing because it is absolutely worthless; seeing that in the present year the farmers that own their properties cannot meet expenditures, it would be of course futile to expect that any assistance would enable these men to succeed." But we are optimistic enough—at least I am—to believe that better times are coming, that our greatest period of depression is passing, and that we can expect some return to normal conditions, especially if these men are assisted by the wisdom of a parliament such as this. Let me say that in considering the conditions of these returned men, most of whom are on the prairies, we had in mind that this Parliament would probably see to it that they should not be crushed out of existence by excessive freight rates and other unnecessary burdens. That was our point of view. We approached the consideration of the whole subject from the angle of the actual conditions.

[Mr. Speakman.]

The question as to the actual conditions of repayment now and what they will be henceforth has been touched on largely by the Chairman; but I might also refer to it, as I have made a particular study of it. As has been said, at the present time there are three or four different terms of years, and under present conditions the heavy payments come now and the lighter payments later. We believe that, under present circumstances, that system should be reversed; the light payments should come in the first years, when the men are struggling to obtain a footing, and the heavier payments—if heavier payments there must be—afterwards, when they are firmly established on the land and have had an opportunity of creating to some extent a reserve. What was the position under the old system? There was a land payment which ran twenty or twenty-five years, and a stock and equipment loan which was given on the basis of two years' exemption for interest, and for payment a term of four years. The exemption for interest was granted simply because Parliament recognized at that time that it was impossible for the men to make any payments until they were firmly established on the land. That time of exemption is over and those men are now called upon to meet those interest payments during the next four years, with the result that this year and the three years following the payments falling due are absolutely impossible for any of them to meet. When you consider in the cold light of reason what a man has to pay under these conditions everyone will admit that it is beyond his financial ability. Take the average payment of $667 that he has to meet. In addition he has to pay taxes—and I can assure hon. members that municipal and school taxes are not to be sneezed at these days, they amount to a small rent in themselves;—then he has to pay all the expenses of running his farm, and also to maintain his wife and family. Moreover,—and this is something which we have taken into consideration, although it has not been mentioned—in a great many cases during the last few years these men, being unable to provide money to carry on their operations, have received advances from the board for seed and feed, and in some cases for their own subsistence during the year. The advance is not a very large sum taken by itself—between $200 and $300 in some cases—but it is a mortgage on this year's crop and therefore has to be added to this already large total which must be met this fall under conditions

which make it absolutely impossible for the debt to be discharged. That has worked a further hardship. Those men, having what you might call that special indebtedness on this year's crop, are unable to go to any store and buy goods on credit because they have nothing on which to base credit; the crop which they will harvest belongs under the terms of the mortgage to the board, and the board's indebtedness must be met first.

By our method of re-amortization we shall take all indebtedness which has been piling up, including the accumulated back interest, and, commencing with the 1st October this year, and spread it over a term of twenty-five years in one straight loan, relieving him of the bad results of the last two years' depression—not enabling him to succeed if conditions never return to normal, but relieving him of the tremendous load which has been piled on his back in the last two or three years. Further, we are cancelling interest. The chairman admitted that the committee had not considered a re-valuation, but I can assure this House that we considered it very carefully in our sub-committee. As you are no doubt aware, Mr. Speaker, I was one of the first in this House to advocate that measure of relief, for I thought it was just, right, and essential, and I still believe so. But, finding it impossible to carry it out as a re-valuation, we reached the same end to some extent by cancelling interest. That is why we did it. We found that we could not arrive at a fair basis of estimating depreciation in land, when re-sales in some five hundred-odd cases showed a slight appreciation in value. We could not, in the face of that testimony, justly say that land had depreciated. Even after subtracting the 10 per cent paid by the soldier and lost, those re-sales still showed a very slight appreciation in value. The committee as a whole, however, felt that it could not take that as definite evidence. In the first place, only 25 per cent of the holdings had been re-sold, and it might be that those were the most desirable, and that others were not sold because the board could not realize the price which has been paid for them. We also took into account this broad, logical truth, that whatever the market value, the final value of land is the value of the stuff you can produce on it. And no one can tell me that as a business proposition, land which is producing commodities at fifty per cent of what they were worth two or three years ago is worth much to-day as it was when commodities prices were higher. On stock the depreciation was very heavy, about thirty-five per cent taking all the year into account; on equipment it was very slight, due, I may say, to the careful manner in which the board brought that equipment under the very beneficial arrangement which they were able to make with the machinery companies. They were able to buy equipment at wholesale prices, less five per cent, which meant that they did not pay the peak retail prices which civilian farmers had to pay. There was marked depreciation in the value of live stock. We could not go out and re-value the live stock because the same stock was not in existence. So, we took the broad ground and cut off enough interest to meet that depreciation in value. That is why we divided the cases into classes, 1919, 1920 and 1921, partly because depreciation was greater the longer the time you went back, as a whole, depreciation being greatest in the first year; and partly because the accumulated indebtedness of those soldiers working through those hard years was greater and therefore they required more relief. Consequently, we recommend a cut of interest which will amount to re-valuation on the articles which have depreciated in value.

I think the point raised by the right hon. leader of the Opposition (Mr. Meighen) that that recommendation constitutes a discrimination in favour of those men who have not paid anything at all should be dealt with. While I will admit it does constitute discrimination, we just looked at the matter from two points. Certain men had been able to pay. That would probably mean that they would be in less need of this assistance to get over these hard times. It meant they were better business men, in which case they were paying it themselves or they were under better conditions. Because you can readily understand that the value of a binder is the same all the country over, and a Ford car is essentially the same value wherever you find it, but the value of a piece of land varies according to locality, and even pieces of land in the same locality vary in value —I mean productive value—as do different districts. Some men may have been more fortunate in the land they secured or in the district they went into. Therefore we simply take the ground that we are not basing the recommendation on the desirability of granting a bonus to the men, but

on the absolute necessity of keeping them on the land. There is no doubt there is discrimination in the sense stated by the right hon. leader of the Opposition, that is, the more a man owes the greater amount of interest will be taken off for four years. But we could not work out any other solution, and while we admit that it is open to criticism, we consider the recommendation should be accepted, unless something better is brought forward.

The right hon. gentleman brought up another point, which is absolutely sound and should be touched upon to some extent; that is, the danger of spreading the loan on equipment over twenty-five years, because the security disappears by the end of that time. But the first essential thing about the scheme is that it shall be workable, that is, it must take into account such payments as the men can meet and remain on the land and succeed. We may transgress the rules of logic, but the main purpose is that those men shall succeed. It must not be forgotten that as the years go on every payment made increases the board's equity in the property, and in a very short time a few payments wipe out the value of the equipment, still leaving the whole of the land as security for the lesser amount that is owing to the board. By the time four or five years' payments have been made they will account for the disappearance of the equipment, but the board will still own the whole of the land as security for the loan. So the board's equity in the land will be, comparatively speaking, greater as time goes by. We are taking that into consideration also.

As I said when I rose, I did not intend to speak at any great length, and I hope I have not done so. I shall be very glad indeed to answer any questions on points that I have not covered. I simply wish to add that I concur in what our chairman has said. We have worked on this purely and simply from the point of view of helping the returned men to become self-supporting citizens standing on their own feet —an asset and credit to the country. It may be of interest, in speaking of the asset which has thus resulted to the country, to examine what has already been done in that respect. I shall not read the long list of details which I have here, but I will say this: in 1921 the soldier settlers produced about $13,000,000 worth of goods on the farms, which went into the ordinary channels of trade and were to that extent an asset to the country. In 1920, an accurate calculation was made of the amount of freight paid by these men on the stuff they sold—not on the stuff they bought, which should really be included—which was found to amount to $3,000,000 in one year. When you consider these things you can readily see that we can afford to lose interest to the extent of $11,000,000—even, if necessary, $15,000,000—in order to retain these men on the land. From that point of view alone it is a sound and a just policy. As the chairman of the committee has just said, it is estimated by the Canadian Pacific Railway Company, who are generally considered, in this House and out of it, to be about as efficient as any authority in computing the value of population as related to the railways, that every settler on the land is worth $740 a year to the railways. On that basis the settlers now on the land under the Soldier Settlement Act, are worth about $13,360,000 a year to the railways. That sounds like a large sum, does it not? If I were speaking on transportation now I would compare the amount they were worth in freight to the amount they received for their produce, but for the present I let that go; I may have occasion to refer to it later. But to keep the men on the land, with all that is involved, is no charity, is not doing something from which we get no return; it is a sound business proposition, and it is sound from the point of view of the Minister of Finance as well.

I want to make just one further remark. We expected our report to be criticized on two grounds; first, that we had gone too far, and second, that we had not gone far enough. We expect that criticism, but I assure the House that we have laboured most diligently; we have gone into these matters with the idea of giving the soldier everything we could give him, having regard to the money available to give to anyone. We have come unanimously to the conclusion that we have gone as far as we can soundly, honestly and justly go. If we went further, it would be practically impossible to meet the bill; if we did not go as far as this, we should hardly be doing justice. In this year of grace we believe this report is a good one. We ask hon. members of the House to adopt it, and first, if necessary, to criticize it—but in the same non-partisan, friendly spirit which characterized the meetings of the committee itself.

Hon. R. J. MANION (Fort William and Rainy River): Mr. Speaker, I should like

first to offer a word of congratulation to my hon. friend the chairman of the committee (Mr. Marler) for his very full explanation of the legislation which he is proposing to the House in the form of the report of the committee. I do not rise to criticise the report adversely; the hon. member who has just taken his seat (Mr. Speakman) is, perhaps, wrong in thinking that any hon. members will have severe criticism to offer of the work of a committee which has laboured as hard as this committee has laboured, on this occasion and such other committees in previous sessions. Some constructive criticism will probably be offered, and I believe that is the only type of criticism that any one should offer on a subject of this kind. I realize as well as any one does that no more difficult task confronts any committee of the House than that of dealing with the subjects coming within the scope of this committee.

I have noticed in glancing over the report that it contains some sixteen sections. There are three main points in it that appeal particularly to me. In the first place there is the recommendation for the appointment of a pension appeal board. That appeals to me, because as a member of this House and as a medical man I know there has been a great deal of dissatisfaction—rightly or wrongly; in many cases, I think, wrongly, but in some cases, rightly—with regard to the decisions that have been made respecting pensions to the returned men and their dependents. I therefore believe that those men who have served overseas and who feel that they have pensions which should not be taken away or that they are not getting pensions which they should get, will be much more satisfied to have some board to which they can appeal for a reconsideration of their case. I compliment the committee very strongly upon its suggestion that such an appeal board should be established.

The second point to which I desire to refer has to do with a matter which, I believe, required a great deal of consideration, but the committee has attempted to settle as fairly as it can, namely, the question of soldier land settlement. My right hon. leader (Mr. Meighen) has pointed out one or two flaws in the recommendations which the committee has made. At the same time, I know that the committee has attempted to bring forward something of value, and any suggestion which has for its object the assisting of the men who settle upon the land is, at any rate, a worthy attempt. I believe that is the spirit which has animated the committee, and it is the spirit, I know, in which the House will receive the suggestion. In working out the details, some of the suggestions of my right hon. friend may be submitted when the legislation is brought before the House.

The third suggestion which appealed to me was the recommendation that a year's pension be given to children who lost their father, who was receiving a pension and whose death was due to some cause other than injury or illness resulting from the war. I have great sympathy for little children who have lost parents under any circumstances. I have always felt that it is a blot on the civilization of any country that little children left without parents are thrown upon what is sometimes the rather cold charity of the world. But I particularly feel that sympathy for little children whose father endangered his life to serve his country and to fight for that liberty which we all love and which we all wish to retain. The method proposed may be of great benefit in helping such children, and I suggest that upon further consideration—not at present, but later—this suggestion may be extended and, perhaps, more done than the giving of a year's pension to the children of any man who endangered his life for the good of the country and who left those children without a protector.

These, to my mind are the three most important sections in the report. They do not involve the expenditure of very much money; in fact, none of the suggestions made involves, so far as I can see, any very large expenditure. It proves, as was stated by the chairman of the committee at the beginning of his remarks, that the past government—and I am not saying this in a political sense—the past government and the people of Canada have endeavoured to treat the returned soldiers and their dependents fairly since the war has passed. When one considers the vast amount of money that was spent on gratuities, pensions, re-establishment, land settlement and various other things, amounting in all to $445,000,000 up to about a year ago, one realizes that the country did endeavour to treat the returned soldiers fairly. And when one realizes also that that $445,000,000 is about one and one-half times the amount of the whole national debt of Canada before the war, one still further realizes the effort that was made by the government and the

people of Canada to be fair to the soldiers who served overseas, and their dependents. Canada, I submit—and I have said this from various platforms at various times—has treated her returned soldiers better than any other country in the world in this or any other war, and I am only quoting in saying that the statement made by Lady Astor very recently in the Russell theatre. I had made the statement myself long before, and I believe it is absolutely true. At the same time, I do not wish to be understood as suggesting that we have carried out complete re-establishment of the soldier. There are many changes which it will be necessary to make as time goes on, and the committee has recommended some of them, to meet the conditions of the returned soldiers and their dependents. Therefore, I do not wish to be understood as suggesting that everything has been done. I simply repeat that the country has endeavoured to do its duty fully by the returned men.

Two or three other suggestions and I shall have finished. In the first place, at various times I have made the suggestion in this House that some scheme of housing should be worked out for the returned men. In my remarks on the Address this year I even took that up, and I remember that various other members have done likewise. The committee has dealt with that subject and found no way of working it out, but it seems to me the method by which the late government helped to encourage the building of homes in this country by loaning money to the provinces, which handled it through the municipalities for the encouragement of home building, might be extended in some for or other to returned soldiers, so that they would get greater benefit from housing loans than they have obtained in the past. I believe that the Government might well consider a further extension of those provisions so as to help returned soldiers who desire to build homes for themselves. Up to recently those loans have not been taken advantage of to the extent they might have been for the reason that building costs were very high, but costs have now come down to a certain extent, and will come down still more, and I think that some plan should be worked out to give the soldiers greater assistance in that direction than they have received in the past.

There is one other matter that I think will require further consideration by the Government, and that is the question of extending the powers of the Royal Commission that has been recommended to inquire into charges made by Mr. MacNeil and Mr. Maxwell, or at all events, made in their names. I have worked in this House for some years now in rather close association with Mr. Maxwell and Mr. MacNeil, and have found them from the first two very high-minded gentlemen who have always had at the bottom of their hearts the desire to do good, and only good, for the returned soldiers; so I believe that when they make these charges they at least believe them to be true. I should like to suggest that this Royal Commission which has been recommended, and will probably be appointed, should be given wider powers than are suggested in the committee's report, for the purpose of looking more thoroughly into various complaints by soldiers throughout the country. A committee such as we have in this House has not time to go into all these cases as thoroughly as they should be gone into, and I think that this commission might well be organized and remain in force for a long time with the purpose in view of settling whatever dissatisfaction exists in the minds of the returned men of this country. Therefore, for that purpose, I would suggest that the Royal Commission should be given wider powers than are recommended in the committee's report.

There is one other suggestion in regard to the taking care of tubercular cases, those injured or maimed at the front, old age cases, and problem cases. I believe that every effort should be made by the Government to carry out the committee's recommendations in this respect to the fullest extent possible.

I have one other suggestion to make in regard to unemployment. I think we all agree that it is the duty of the Government, as far as possible, to assist the returned soldiers with work rather than with doles, so to speak. I do not believe that it is conducive to good citizenship to be handing out money to keep men from starvation. I think the Government might well consider doing more, particularly in the winter months, in the direction of supplying employment for returned soldiers, rather than be handing out charitable doles. I believe, indeed I know, it is the desire of all members of this House and of the people of this country to be fair and just to the men who have risked their lives and limbs in serving our country

at the front. I do not believe that any well man has a right to consider that he has a living coming to him from this country simply because he served overseas, but I do not consider that any ill man whose illness was due to the service he gave overseas should be dependent on charity in this country, and that is my closing submission to the Government.

At six o'clock the House took recess.

After Recess

The House resumed at eight o'clock.

Mr. J. T. SHAW (West Calgary): Mr. Speaker, I join in the congratulations which have been tendered to the chairman of this committee upon his being able, at last, to make a report to this House. I am sure that one and all agree with him and his associates that, regardless of what may be our attitude on other questions, this question is primarily one which is above politics, and partisanship, and I am sure, therefore, that I but voice the sentiments of every member of this honourable House when I say that we are one in the desire to discuss the after-war problems on a basis far above that which usually follows the discussion of political problems.

I regret, in connection with this most important matter, that the committee did not, from the outset, furnish to the members of the House the evidence taken from day to day, in order that we might be able to follow the evidence given and determine what weight, in our judgment, at least, might be given to the recommendations of the committee. But, in any event, I think that this is perfectly clear; regardless of whatever other obligations we may have, now that the tide of war has receded, it is our solemn duty and obligation to see that the human wreckage, the resultant of that war, should be given every possible consideration by the Parliament of Canada. I rather regret that the chairman of the committee and the seconder of the resolution did not see fit to express their appreciation of the services rendered by Mr. MacNeil, who represented the veteran organizations of this Dominion. I presume that that was entirely an oversight, but I am frank to say—and I join with the hon. member for Fort William and Rainy River (Mr. Manion) in that regard—that I am confident, although not a member of the committee, that much valuable and unprejudiced information came from Mr. MacNeil, which undoubtedly must have assisted the committee in coming to its conclusion.

May I say, too, that I rather deprecate the suggestion of paternalism, as applied to this particular question? The returned soldiers, I venture to say, are not asking for paternalistic legislation. We have much paternalistic legislation in this House, because every measure of protection is, after all, a paternalistic measure. But I say that the returned soldiers of Canada are not asking for anything other than they deem to be justice, and to be fair and right to every part of this country.

I do not propose to go into detail in connection with this report. I take it that the report is not a final one, that from time to time, to use the words of the ex-Prime Minister of this country (Mr. Meighen), the door must be kept continually open, in order that any injustice which may appear may be remedied, and in order that full and complete satisfaction, as far as possible, may be given to those who are entitled to it. There are one or two phases in connection with this report to which I would like to draw the attention of the House. The recommendations of the committee followed largely the recommendations of former parliamentary committees in this matter and, I think, I am not saying anything unfair when I say that they have not travelled very much further, perhaps, than former parliamentary committees.

Let me take up very shortly the question of pensions. There are new difficulties here which are continually pressing upon us, and I venture to say that many of the difficulties which arise are due to the unfortunate fact that at the time of the medical examination for discharge or demobilization purposes, complete steps were not taken to insure that the exact condition of every man in the service was ascertained. It is quite true that many men went before the medical officers in England and, in their desire and anxiety to get back to Canada, and to be demobilized, stated to the medical officers that there was absolutely nothing wrong with them; they were, consequently, certified as medically fit, and, therefore, not entitled to further consideration, except, perhaps, in the way of gratuity. I do not blame the ex-service men for that particularly, because when one knows the facts, one must realize that these men had been kept for a period of, approximately, six months in the war area, anxious to get home and back to their

farming operations, and anxious, amongst other things, to get out of the army. The result was that many of them did themselves very serious injustice by stating to the medical officers, on the occasion I have mentioned, that they were medically fit. It has been suggested that, despite that fact, these men may still come forward and claim pensionability, but the fact is that, when these men present themselves for consideration in the matter of pensions, they are confronted with a medical certificate, which says "You were fit at the time of your demobilization, and, therefore"—not always, but generally—"consideration cannot be given your claim."

In addition to that fact, there are, of course, many difficulties in the matter of securing pensions. The ordinary man is unfamiliar with the proper method to pursue, in order to secure his just rights. I am not blaming that at all on the departmental officials; I think, generally speaking, they conduct the affairs of the department efficiently and well; but it is a difficulty in the way of the man who is making application for a pension. I am glad to note that the chairman of the committee states that these regulations will be embodied in printed form in order that the soldier may read them for himself.

May I also say that I compliment the committee on granting an appeal? I am not so sure that I would have limited the appeal in the manner in which it is limited in the report, that is to the case in which a disagreement exists between the medical officer of the local board and the medical officials of the Pension Board. I think these claims should be thoroughly, fully and impartially investigated; and if possible, if any mistake is to be made, then by all means make the mistake in the interest of the returned soldier.

May I also mention the matter of the Insurance Act? I find at the time of the introduction of that particular act, Mr. Cronyn, in his report stated:

> This insurance will be granted without medical examination and will, therefore be available to all no matter what may be their condition of health.

I understand that, acting under a particular section, representatives of the Pension Board exercise a discretion in the matter, and that latterly many applications have been refused. If that be so—and I am not speaking of my own knowledge—that condition should be remedied, because I am sure that act was passed with the intention that the returned soldier, regardless of his physical condition from a medical point of view, was to be put in a position where he could secure insurance.

I have read with a great deal of interest the report of the committee found on page 369 of the Votes and Proceedings, dealing with cases of sheltered employment and the after care of tuberculous patients. I am sure that we are unanimous in our desire that these problem cases and tuberculous cases should receive the best possible consideration. In reading the report, I fail to see that the committee has added very much to reports of former years. May I say that just this evening I received this telegram from one R. H. Macdonald, London, Ontario:

> Your urgent support is solicited by 200 inmates of Byron Sanatorium in procuring more liberal consideration of proposals submitted by Tuberculous Veterans' Association, especially extension of time limit for veterans who served in theatre of war and now tuberculous.

Every possible consideration should be given to these men scattered throughout the length and breadth of Canada in various sanitoria; not only that, but the matter of the after care of these tuberculous patients should be thoroughly and completely investigated, in order that they may receive, during the few years remaining to them, the greatest possible consideration, and, perhaps, by that means the health of some of them will be renewed. The treatment of all these problem cases is, I am sure, a matter which must have engaged the serious attention of the committee for a considerable length of time; but I regret, in that matter too, no very definite recommendation is made.

In view of these circumstances, and the few illustrations I have given—and I could give more—I think the Royal Commission which is proposed, should have its powers enlarged, as suggested by the hon. member for Fort William and Rainy River in order that it may investigate these particular cases and, if possible, make recommendations in connection therewith.

There are one or two other matters to which I want to refer, and I shall do so very briefly. The housing problem is an important one which should be seriously considered by this Parliament at a very early date. Such consideration will, I think, do much to assist the returned soldier in securing housing accommodation. I make these criticisms in the most friendly way and in the desire to assist us all to get a proper viewpoint of this matter.

I regret very much that the committee has not been able to make any definite or

concrete proposal in connection with the unemployment problem. That problem is of special significance to the returned soldier, and hon. members will appreciate that fact when I state that from 60 to 75 per cent of the unemployed are returned soldiers. These men are in a most unfortunate position. They lost their positions by reason of their enlistment for service in the war. They came back and many of them secured temporary positions. In view of the depressed conditions which existed, they were the first to lose their positions, and, as a result, the figures that I have given represent to-day the proportion of returned soldiers in the unemployed class.

Mr. LADNER: As this is a matter of very considerable importance to many people, would the hon. gentleman inform the House as to the sources from which he secured these figures? I am not doubting them at all.

Mr. SHAW: During the last election campaign and for some time subsequently thereto, I made some little investigation myself—I do not suggest that it was accurate—in the city of Calgary. I have consulted some of the officials of the veterans' organizations, and they concur in the figures which I have given, that from 60 to 75 per cent of the unemployed are returned soldiers.

Mr. MACLEAN (York): Was the hon. gentleman at the front? I believe he was.

Mr. SHAW: Yes.

Mr. MACLEAN (York): Will he give his own experience as regards unemployment that has developed in the regiment with which he was associated?

Mr. SHAW: Of course, I need not tell the hon. member (Mr. Maclean) that there was not any unemployment at the front.

Mr. MACLEAN (York): I mean unemployment that my hon. friend has come into contact with in connection with the regiment with which he was identified.

Mr. SHAW: I regret very much that I am unable to give that information, because the battalion with which I was associated was not a battalion which centered at the city of Calgary. It did, as a matter of fact, have its centre at the city of Regina and consequently I regret I am not familiar with conditions in that city.

I realize the difficulties that the committee necessarily would have in dealing with the problem of unemployment. I do not know whether Mr. MacNeil, on behalf of the veterans' organizations, was able to give to the committee any concrete or definite plan; but in any event, I know the matter of unemployment was before this Parliament on another occasion. I know that perhaps next winter and during the next year or two, the greatest possible difficulties will again exist in connection with that problem, and returned soldiers in common with others will necessarily suffer by reason of that condition.

While therefore I do not blame the committee for not coming to a conclusion in the matter, I do think that the Parliament of Canada should if possible have some definite concrete proposal to put forward to solve this difficulty during the coming year.

I desire now to refer for a moment to the Soldier Settlement Board. The matter of the revaluation of loans made by the board is not a new one. I think it was voiced from practically every platform in the province of Alberta during the last political campaign. It did not become a political question for the reason, I think, that Liberals, Conservatives, Progressives and every one else agreed that if anything could be done in the way of revaluation it should be done in order to ensure that the soldier settlement scheme might be carried out for the benefit of those for whom it was intended. It is useless to continue this scheme if under its operations the beneficiaries find it impossible to carry on satisfactorily. I am not a farmer and I cannot say whether or not the measure of relief proposed by the committee, as indicated by the hon. member for Red Deer (Mr. Speakman), will achieve the end desired. However, if I were to venture an opinion, despite the fact that I am not a farmer, I rather doubt the full measure of success which some may attribute to this relief from interest. I am hopeful that it will be successful. Indeed, I am sure we all hope that the proposal will prove abundantly worth while and that it will enable this particular scheme to be continued to the benefit of the people for whom it was intended. Having stated these various criticisms, if such they might be termed, I shall now suggest what I hope will be satisfactory to the mover of the motion. I submit the following amendment for his consideration:

That the said report be not now commended, but that it be referred back to the Special Committee on Pensions, Insurance and Civil Re-establishment with instructions that it have power to add to the supplementary part thereof, relating to the appointment of a royal commission the following words:

And further, that such commission shall have power to consider and report upon the following matters, namely:

1. To consider and make suggestions in respect of the procedure by which disabled ex-members of the Canadian Expeditionary Force are enabled to make application for pensions and medical treatment, or submit an appeal in respect of decisions thereon.

2. To recommend means for ensuring that suitable provision is made for those ex-members of the forces and dependents who are under serious handicaps by reason of war services, in conformity with the recommendations now made, and for whom definite legislative provision has not yet been made.

For the above purposes the commission shall:

1. Survey existing re-establishment needs among Canadian ex-service men and dependents.

2. Investigate available data in respect of phases of the Parliamentary inquiry as yet incomplete.

3. Obtain information as regards suitable provision for those classes of ex-service men described in section 7, Chap. 2, of the foregoing report.

4. Investigate the question of exchange and canteen funds.

This amendment is offered in a friendly spirit, with the desire that the commission which is to be appointed for the investigation of some alleged charges may be enabled to investigate certain other fields of activity and make recommendations in connection therewith. With regard to the question of canteen funds, which I am asking to have investigated, the committee, in my humble judgment, seems to have been under a misapprehension. That canteen fund belongs to the ex-service men of Canada. It does not at all belong to the Parliament of Canada to dispose of as it sees fit. It is money that must be used for the benefit of the men, and is subject to their disposal. But I notice that the committee, disregarding that fact, suggests that certain things be done with the fund.

Mr. MACLEAN: What page?

Mr. SHAW: Page 375. The report provides for the appointment of a board and in that I heartily concur. Then there are the following provisions:

(a) In the allocation of such amount as may be necessary for the purpose of the promotion of workshops where sheltered employment under suitable conditions can be provided where not already in existence or, in the opinion of the board, are not sufficiently provided for; and

(b) To provide further educational facilities to children of ex-members of the forces, such education to be both primary and secondary, and to apply to such children of ex-members of the forces who would otherwise in the opinion of the board be unable to procure such educational facilities.

Now, I contend that these two objects represent an obligation either of the Parliament of Canada or of the provincial governments, and this special fund should not be used for such purposes. This obligation on the part of the Dominion of Canada or of the provinces—wherever the responsibility lies—should be carried out by the people who obligated themselves to perform them, and I say that you cannot properly without the consent of the veterans of Canada, who are entitled to the fund, allocate it for these particular purposes mentioned.

I know that some attempt was made to secure a vote of the veterans of Canada to indicate what they wanted done with the fund. But the report itself, at page 372 states:

It was considered by the Committee after the Report of the Canteen Disposal Funds Committee, appointed under the said Order in Council, had been reviewed, and also after having heard the evidence, that the plebiscite as so taken did not yield conclusive results.

I say, therefore, that it would be unfair to take this fund and allocate it to these purposes. By way of enforcing what I have said in connection with this matter, I might point out that shortly before coming here I received a telegram from the secretary of the Great War Veterans' Association in Calgary protesting against the proposed disposal of the canteen fund, believing as he does that the education of children, and that the furnishing of sheltered employment, are government responsibilities. He urges that the fund be placed at the disposal of the men who contributed to it. Under these circumstances I am sure that the committee would not desire to use the fund for purposes for which, in my judgment at any rate, it cannot properly be used. May I say in conclusion—

Mr. BELAND: Before my hon. friend leaves that point, can he suggest to the House any mode by which the wish of the veterans in Canada could be ascertained with regard to the disposal of the canteen fund?

Mr. MACLEAN (York): What is the amount?

Mr. BELAND: In round figures, $2,000,000.

Mr. SHAW: The request of the hon. minister is indeed a very large order. The veterans of course are scattered all over this country, but nevertheless the difficulty of securing their judgment on a particular matter does not justify this or any other government in allocating this fund, which are held in trust for them, to these specified purposes without their consent. I have no doubt that the allied veterans' organizations could probably suggest to the minister some satisfactory means for the disposition of the fund. I have no special views myself on the matter, except that I do not think it would be right or just to allocate the fund to these particular purposes in view of the results obtained by this most unsatisfactory and incomplete plebiscite, in which only about 22,000 men out of a total membership of 250,000 indicated their choice.

I trust that the hon. gentleman who has moved the adoption of this report will see his way clear to incorporate in it the amendment which I have proposed. I am sure we are at one in our desire to do what is right and fair and to ensure that the veterans receive from this Parliament the fullest possible justice.

Mr. T. L. CHURCH (North Toronto): Mr. Speaker, I would not have had anything to say upon this question but for the fact that about 60,000 men went to the front from Toronto, where many of the difficulties in the administration of the Pension Act have arisen, and where there is a great deal of suffering among the returned men through technical enforcement of acts of Parliament; therefore at their request I take part in this debate.

I take this opportunity of congratulating the hon. member for St. Lawrence-St. George (Mr. Marler) on the report he has presented, although it does not go as far as I had hoped it would. However, I think the hon. gentleman's heart is in the right place for the returned men, and I believe that he wishes to eliminate many of the technicalities which have hampered the administration of the present act and have worked to the disadvantage of the veterans.

This is about the only opportunity the House has had to consider the whole question of soldiers' civil re-establishment which up to date has involved an expenditure of $475,000,000 or about one and a half times the total debt of Canada before the war. The report deals with four important points: re-establishment; pensions; insurance; land settlement, and a very elaborate survey is made of these problems. Certain recommendations are made, but I am sorry these do not go as far as the circumstances necessitate.

The recommendations made by the committee of which the former member for London, Mr. Hume Cronyn, was chairman, added about $623,000 to the pensions granted for disability plus special cases. The report now before us has this to say about the inquiry—

Mr. MARLER: I think my hon. friend will find that figure is not correct. If he refers to section 1 of chapter 2 he will find the correct figures to which he refers.

Mr. CHURCH: Perhaps I had better read what the report says. I find the following in the first part of section 1, chapter 2 to which my hon. friend from St. Lawrence and St. George (Mr. Marler) refers, but my total is corect, $623,000:

> This committee is satisfied that every effort possible to be made has been made in effecting the recommendations and suggestions of the 1921 committee referred to in this section.
>
> It may be noted as regards the recommendations of the 1921 committee that they resulted in the following increased liability to the state, namely:

Increased liability to pay to pensioners resident outside of Canada the same bonus as that paid to pensioners resident in Canada	$400,000
Increase to widowed mothers by reason of lessened deduction of income from children	10,500
Increase to pensoners for deaths or disability prior to August 1914 not receiving C.E.F. rates	7,500
Additional death claims not provided for	10,000
Total Supplementary Estimates for pension	$428,000
Employers' liability compensation	100,000
G.T.R. employees	60,000
Calydor Sanatorium addition	35,000
Total Supplementary Estimates	$623,000

The report now before us at page 25 has this to say about the inquiry:

> "The committee has heard and considered much evidence with regard to increasing pensions or bonus, as the case may be, applicable to pensioners in general, or to pensioners suffering from particular disabilities and/or to dependents under certain circumstances. All these representations and the evidence adduced with regard thereto have been very carefully and separately considered by the committee."

This is what the committee recommends as to increases in pensions:

Except where otherwise indicated in this report, the committee is not disposed to recommend increases in pension and/or bonus as requested, but does recommend that the rates and extent of pension and bonus as now provided for under The Pension Act be continued—

That is, the present scale be continued except as specified.

—and remain in effect until the 1st September, 1924.

I contend very strongly that the time have not yet arrived when there should be any curtailment in the very limited scale of pensions granted. Rent and coal are the two main items in the cost of living, and they take about 65 per cent of all that a soldier gets, leaving him a very small balance to meet the other items which go to make up his total cost of living, and we all know that everything is still very, very expensive. Therefore I consider that the time has not yet come to mark down the scale of pensions.

Mr. CALDWELL: Is the hon. member arguing that we have recommended reducing the scale of pensions? The bonus provided last year expires this coming September, and the committee recommends that it be continued for another two years.

Mr. CHURCH: I understand that and have already read that the bonus is to go to 1924, but I have here a large number of telegrams from many organizations, urging increases. Organizations in the city of Toronto protest strongly against any curtailment in the present rate of pensions. Last year the House increased the amount paid out in pensions to the extent of $623,000. I contend that there should be a 10 to 12½ per cent further increase in pensions over the amount paid in 1921, particularly in special, urgent and important cases. The extra expenditure involved would only be about half a million dollars. I have an outline of the suggested increases for 1922 here, but I will not read it to-night.

I would like to refer to some points dealt with in the report, some of which have been referred to by others who have spoken in the debate and some have not. I wish to mention first the case of the blind, not yet referred to in this debate. A deputation representing the organizations of Canada which are working in the interests of the blind waited on the committee, and were more than kindly received by the chairman. Consider what it means to a man to be blind—what he suffers; what his family suffers; the attention he needs. It is difficult enough for persons who have their sight to move about the streets of our large cities under modern conditions of traffic without being knocked down. A blind man in a large city or town needs a guide or attendant. The blind men ask that their pensions be increased from $600 to $900—the present rate is $600 plus a special bonus of $300. They are asking for a straight pension of $900, to enable them to take care of their living expenses and engage the services of a guide, etc. It is true that the blind men have a home, Pearson Hall, but the money they can earn separately is a mere trifle, not sufficient to keep body and soul together. It has been said that a few of them earn their living in various ways, but few of them make enough, as I have said, to keep body and soul together, let alone save anything. We have an institution in our city which is looking after the interests of the blind, and they have continually to ask for money; once or twice a year they have to have a charitable tag day in order to help to maintain this magnificent institution. But many men who have lost their sight are men of great knowledge and ability who to-day would be earning salaries of $25,000 to $30,000 a year were they not blind. I myself know a young engineer, one of the most brilliant graduates of Queen's University, who was permanently blinded at the battle of St. Eloi, and who gets a pittance of a pension. Another has a family but he is quite unable to do anything, and all he receives is a pension of $600 plus a $300 bonus. I hope that the chairman of the committee, who has taken a great deal of interest in the blind, will consider the advisability of increasing the pension to the blind as I have suggested.

Mr. CALDWELL: Is the hon. gentleman not aware that the blind have been getting $900 and will be getting it for the next two years?

Mr. CHURCH: Yes, but not as a pension. They only get $600 pension plus $300 bonus as I said, and not $900 as the hon. gentleman says. I was not a member of the committee, and I may say here that I think the Toronto city and county district which sent 75,000 men overseas should have had a representative on that committee. A large number of the cases that came before the committee were from Toronto district, and though there are fourteen or fifteen members in this House representing that district—they constitute one-third of the members on the Opposition benches—we

had no representative on that committee, and, therefore, no voice in determining questions with regard to the blind, and other soldier matters. Now, the committee recommend that the blind should have free transportation on the steam railways occasionally; that is as far as they go. It is not necessary to make such a provision for the Toronto blind men, because the city is carrying them free in the street cars, and I believe that many patriotic companies in Canada are doing the same thing. I do urge on the committee the necessity of dealing with this question at once. Only a small number of men have lost their sight, and the best the country can do is none too good for them. If we doubled the pensions of these men we would not be discharging one-fifth of the debt the people of Canada owe to them. They have suffered for humanity and Canada as no other class of soldiers suffered, and deserve every consideration instead of the miserable pittance afforded after a lot of trouble.

The question of unemployment is also dealt with in the report. Unemployment, which is acute at the present time, will be worse next winter in the large centres. The tendency seems to be to give the returned man all the pick and shovel jobs, so to speak, but when it comes to the large appointments, such as appointments to the Bench, the antiquated Senate and so on, they go to others who are civilians. Take the case of secretaries and assistant secretaries to the present ministers. I venture to say that if a proper return was brought down it would be found that there are not two returned soldiers among the considerable number of private secretaries and assistant secretaries who have been appointed since this Government came into office. I doubt if more than from three to five among them would be found to be returned men. Some of the ministers are filling positions by appointing women when the work could be done by returned men. The returned men are entitled to something more than a pick and shovel job. They are entitled to senatorships, judgships, appointments to the Bench and other larger positions. Many of these men have been in the banking business and engaged in other enterprises, yet they are walking the streets to-day. I know two or three men who were in banking and financial business before they enlisted, but who cannot now get a position; some of them are working with a pick and shovel for the transportation commission in the city I come from—and no city in Canada does more for the returned soldier than Toronto does in every way possible. This is a deplorable state of affairs. The other day a question was asked in the House with respect to an appointment of a customs officer in the constituency represented by the hon. member for East Toronto (Mr. Ryckman). The salary was $960 a year, and although there were over 200 men on the list, many of them returned soldiers, the man who was appointed was a civilian, No. 241 on the Civil Service Commission's list—a Mr. Ritchie, who had left the Civil Service three months before. I suppose the Government have not yet had an opportunity to look over the service, but there is one isolated instance of the treatment accorded to returned soldiers. Has the policy of giving returned men the preference been rescinded? The House and the country should know.

I would like to see this Pension Act broadened out. I think there should be a proper court of inquiry to cover not only pension cases, but everything pertaining to the returned men—civil re-establishment, pensions and everything else that concerns their health, prosperity and comfort. We have an act which is construed literally by some men who have not shown any too much zeal on behalf of or sympathy for the soldiers. We should have a proper pension and civil re-establishment court established that would travel all over Canada. A civilian who institutes a civil action involving damages of $500 or $1,000 may take his case to one of three, four or five civil courts in the land and in most cases he can take an appeal, if he so desires, right across to the Privy Council, but a returned man who has done his duty by King and country, who has given up his business and lost everything, has no such facility afforded to him and no appeal from a technical decision by a pension board often wrong in both law and fact. I am glad that the committee has recommended an appeal board; if civilians have the right to appeal to the Privy Council, there should be an adequate, proper and up-to-date appeal board for the soldiers as well, especially when the matters in question relate to the health, condition, comfort, prosperity and welfare of the men who fought Canada's battles and of their dependents as well.

I am glad to see a step taken in that direction by the committee, and I hope the Government will bring down the necessary

legislation and see that an efficient and proper court of appeal is established. I would go even further than the report of the committee. I would have a proper court established, get good men and bigger men, and pay them good salaries. If a Royal Commission is appointed I think it should investigate the present board, its findings, administration and so forth, and travel all over Canada inquiring into the whole administration of the board as well as investigating the charges made by reputable returned men in the city of Ottawa, who are very conservative and moderate in what they say. We should sooner or later have a new board of pension commissioners, and the sooner the present lot are let out the better if these charges are substantiated.

I would like to see the Royal Commission given wider powers than is at present proposed by the committee. They should be able to investigate all charges brought by returned men. There are many phases of the problem of re-establishment that could very properly be investigated by this proposed Royal Commission, and they should have their report ready for presentation at the next session of Parliament. I think it is very desirable in the public interest that all vexatious technicalities—quibbles, failures and delays and the many problems that surround the re-establishment of ex-service men should be cleaned up now and for all time. I believe that this commission should not only investigate the present administration of the board, but go further and deal with the whole problem of the returned man from coast to coast, and not only with the problems of members of the military forces but members of Canada's naval and air forces as well. Members of the naval forces were treated in a very shabby way on demobilization this month in my opinion. This commission should have power to inquire into the problems affecting the naval and air forces because they are all returned men, after all is said and done, whether they served on land or sea or in the air. The commission should also have power to investigate the question of the pensions paid to those Canadians of all ranks who in their great desire to get to the front quickly, took a ship overseas on the outbreak of the war, and paid their own passage across the ocean, and enlisted with the British expeditionary forces. I know one such veteran, Colonel Young of Kingston a splendid soldier who served in the Northwest Rebellion, the Fenian Raid, the South African war, and the last Great War and who is now getting a pension of only $17 a month from the British government because he would not wait in Canada to get over. This commission should go over the list of all these special case men and deal with their cases. Many of them are receiving a mere pittance to-day from the British government. I believe that the government of Canada should make up the difference between what these men are receiving in pensions from the British government and what they would have received if they had served and suffered the same disability in the Canadian forces.

The parliamentary committee did very good work, and I want to congratulate the chairman especially. He worked night and day to get at the root of the trouble, and had his heart in the work, but it is impossible for any parliamentary committee to go into all these soldier problems equitably or thoroughly. I would therefore suggest that the powers of the proposed Royal Commission be broadened out and extended so that they can inquire into the entire soldier problem in all its phases and into any dissatisfaction that now exists, with a view to providing a permanent remedy.

Much dissatisfaction undoubtedly does exist at the present time owing to the technicalities which are raised by the Board of Pension Commissioners at Ottawa and their failure to carry out the intention of Parliament. They give judicial decisions which are not right, and from which there is no appeal. For several years parliamentary committees have been dealing with the returned soldiers' problems. Now let us have an adequate Royal Commission and not a lot of whitewash—a commission who will travel from one end of Canada to the other, and get at the root of the trouble once and for all.

One very emphatic claim being urged by ex-service men is for certain members of His Majesty's forces who do not get anything at all under any existing legislation. There are a number of these men throughout Canada who served in different branches of the Canadian Expeditionary Forces, but who do not get anything under existing legislation. These are more or less special cases, and they should be taken up and dealt with by this Royal Commission, because in my opinion they cannot be properly dealt with by a parliamentary committee. It is further contended that in these special cases I have mentioned, there are serious handicaps other than physical which are not given recognition. It is in the public interest, I think, that these claims

should be fully investigated by a judicial body in order that Parliament may be furnished with accurate information and that no opportunity may be given for exaggerated statements as to the distress among these men. There are many of these special cases throughout the countrdy, but owing to technicalities in the present law, the men and their dependents now get nothing at all and there is much suffering as a result and much real dissatisfaction.

Another special class of cases that I wish to refer to are the tubercular cases. We have many of these in the various institutions and hospitals throughout Canada, and it is a very pitiful sight to go through one of these hospitals. If you go to the top floor of the Christie street hospital (an institution with about 1,200 different cases) you will find there many of these men suffering from tubercular glands. There are several institutions in Ontario and throughout the country looking after these cases many of which are incurable, and these patients and their families are suffering from lack of proper pensions in a way I cannot describe here to-night because I have not the time. I am sorry the committee has not made recommendations for dealing more generously with these special cases and allowing more latitude. I advocate here and now that when this Royal Commission is appointed it shall have power to investigate these special cases and any others overlooked in this report.

9 p.m.

Mr. CARROLL: Does the hon. member say that some cases were not investigated by the committee that should have been?

Mr. CHURCH: Yes, many. I am referring to a great many special cases, those who were in the B.E.F., also disability cases, blind cases, tubercular cases, and some where the men and their dependents do not now get anything at all under existing legislation, and others I have mentioned, and I am advocating a policy that would broaden out the act and give the Pension Board power to deal with them as a matter of right and justice.

Mr. CARROLL: Were these cases not considered by the committee?

Mr. CHURCH: A great many cases were, and a great many were not. This Parliamentary committee holds its sittings in Ottawa, and there are hundreds of special cases all over Canada and the men cannot afford the time and the money to come here personally and present their cases. That is the reason why I advocate that the royal commission or the new Pension Board should have power to travel all over Canada, be a sort of roving commission like the Board of Railway Commissioners, to investigate these special and all other cases and phases.

Referring to the question of soldiers' insurance, there have been a great many complaints from returned men about the administration of the Returned Soldiers' Insurance Act. I just wish to read one short sentence from a memorandum prepared by the Secretary of the G.W.V.A., Toronto District. He says:

> It has been submitted that wholesale discrimination has been made against the ex-service men whom the act was intended to benefit, in the issuance of Insurance Policies under the Soldiers' Insurance Act in direct violation of the Act as now in force, and that you consider the proposed amendments clause by clause, as you will find that many amendments, innocent in appearance, when applied will effect great hardships on large numbers of the ex-service men in a manner not contemplated by even the majority of the members of the Parliamentary Committee.

Mr. Cronyn, the former member for London who was chairman of the Pensions Committee last year, when introducing the Returned Soldiers Insurance Bill stated as one of the chief features of the bill:

> This Insurance will be granted without medical examination and will, therefore, be available to all no matter what may be their condition of health.

Notwithstanding that that was the intention of Parliament, the Pension Board of their own volition and ignorance have changed all that on their own initiative, and have prepared secret regulations under which they have assumed power to reject applications for insurance policies for medical reasons. If this is so, and I believe it is, the present Pension Boards' usefulness is gone now and forever. In this proposed new statute based on this present committee's report, the law should make it clear that the Pension Board should have no power to vary the manifest intention of Parliament, to give relief in these insurance cases, without medical examination. This whole soldier question should not be approached from a party standpoint. I am glad to hear the moderate tone of this debate to-day, and to observe that all parties in the House, as the chairman stated, are eager, anxious and willing to do what they can for the returned men. I hope that this view of the problem on the

part of hon. members will always continue in Canada, which should do everything it can for its returned men and see that they are well provided for.

With reference to the housing proposition, which has been dealt with by my hon. friend from Fort William and Rainy River (Mr. Manion), I do not think the report of the committee goes far enough. No class of the community is suffering from lack of houses more than the returned men. Instead of giving doles of money, as has been done for the past three or four winters to help unemployment, by the Dominion, the provinces, and the municipalities combined in the larger centres of population, it would be far better to start a housing policy for the relief of the soldiers, and, if it proves a success, extend it to civilians as well. About $750,000 was doled out in the winter of 1920 for unemployment in Toronto. The city of Toronto contributed $250,000 and the province and the Dominion each contributed the same amount, bringing the total to $750,000. That is 5 per cent on $15,000,000. Instead of the waste of money in doles a housing policy would be a much better way to solve the problem, because the soldiers want work, not charity. They want to get permanent work. If the Dominion, the provinces and the municipalities inaugurated an up to date housing policy, and built probably three or four thousand houses in Toronto and Montreal, and a lesser number in other cities, of say, a cheaper class of construction, it would provide work for the soldiers as well as the civilians who are out of work and solve the unemployment situation, and the housing problem as well, very materially. Not many of these returned soldiers have 100 per cent efficiency after having gone through the horrors of war for four years. I admit the high cost of land, labour, money and materials, but a housing policy would be an economy over the dole policy and would create work, as well as help to solve the housing problem.

Looking over the report, I am surprised at some of the recommendations. In some districts in Canada, when a returned soldier dies, he cannot have a military funeral. It is a most difficult matter in Toronto to arrange a proper military funeral. There is no military band and no gun carriage in that city. Some of the officers there, of course, are doing their best. I think the committee have made a recommendation dealing with that problem, but it does not go far enough. The officer commanding of each military district should be in charge of these military funerals, and should see that each soldier gets a decent burial, because in some cases they cannot get a decent burial. I think the country should, at least, pay for the decent burial of a veteran of the war, and give him adequate and proper medical care and also take care of those who many months or years after discharge break down in health because of their war service. The time limit of his taking sick is immaterial.

With reference to the request for a more ejcient labour bureau, I may say that here have been many requests for such a bureau. The province has a labour bureau, and the Department of Soldiers' Civil Re-establishment has a bureau. If these two were co-ordinated, an economy would be effected. I believe that the Government should bring down some good building programme to include the improved plants of various post offices and secure a more modern plant in some places that pay, in order to give a better service, and this applies also to improved custom house plants. Some of these services in Canadian cities would take care of the fixed charges, contingent on the new proposed outlay. It would be better to improve these public offices, and spend a little money, which would mean employment for these men, instead of giving them doles, as was done last year. In the main cities in Canada, a new post office and the customs house plant would pay their way, if the buildings were enlarged and increased accommodation provided.

I think the powers of the board should be enlarged to hold all inquiries to help returned men. There should be a further investigation in such a case as the late Captain Hueston, who was murdered in the Rainy River district, and the civil authorities did nothing in the matter for weeks and months. It is a public scandal. I suggest to the chairman that the powers of the committee should be broadened, and I submit their powers should be made broad enough to deal with an isolated case like that, and any others, and they should be given power to ascertain how that soldier came to his death. There is a great deal of dissatisfaction, not only in Toronto and Rainy River, but in other districts in Ontario, in regard to the investigation into this soldier's death. Technicalities have been raised by the civil authorities and the authorities in Toronto will not find out how he came to his death, and they have whitewashed everybody. The Militia De-

partment and the Soldiers' Civil Re-establishment should hold an inquiry and give his family a pension.:

I should like to see the board given power to deal with many other features of the returned soldier problem. There should be added to the proposed legislation, which is to be based on this report, a residuary clause giving the new board, in addition to all other powers conferred, the power to go into all questions relating to the returned soldier problem in all its phases and forms, to deal with all the cases I have suggested, and many other problems affecting the health, comfort, peace, and prosperity of the returned soldier. I should like to see a survey made of the returned men who are in custody. The judges are too hard on them in many cases. I should like to see the board confer with the Justice Department, and a wider exercise of executive clemency in these trivial cases, in these days of stress and strain. War service should be considered and allowance made for it, as many are in only for trivial offences. A young man stole $1.20 from a postal letter and was sent to gaol for three year. I think he should be released in a much less time. Many of these men have good war records, and I believe that if the Soldiers' Civil Re-establishment Department looked into every case and made a national survey of them we would have, in many cases, a sympathetic consideration by the Government of executive clemency for many returned men ow in custody. Some judges are more severe on soldiers than they are on civilians. The House should deal with them. I should like to see the report make some references to the seventy-five or one hundred cases of old soldiers who are still alive, veterans of the Fenian Raid, the Crimean war, the Northwest Rebellion and the South African war, who bore the heat of the day and who are still suffering, and are getting no pension from Canada at all.

I know that the late Sergeant Michael Brophy, a Crimean war veteran, was for a long time selling shoe laces in front of Eaton's store in Toronto to try and make a living. The number of these cases is very small, and it would not cost very much, and it would be an act of mercy and gratitude to these good old veterans of the war in their evening of life to give them a pension.

In many cases the report is a good one, but does not go far enough, and does not give the powers which should be given. I desire to read one or two paragraphs from a statement by a widow of a soldier who was present when the army of "Generals" Macdonald and Riley left Toronto. I do not agree with what all these men said or did. I believe they did a lot of good in educating public opinion to do what is right with the soldiers and that all that they proposed to do was to start a campaign of education on these questions, and get better pension results in a more direct way. I know, however, that there were some very sad cases among them needing relief, and many cases of hardship. I will read one or two paragraphs from this statement to show that the act is not broad enough. This widow's pension was ruled out on a technicality, and I think the scope of the act should be widened so as to include such cases. The statement reads as follows:

> Mrs. Jeannie Bain, a war widow who is in service in Toronto, was a speaker at the unemployed soldiers' meeting held in Queen's Park last night.
>
> "My husband was wounded by shrapnel at Hill 70," she said. "He had a fractured skull. He was deaf and dumb for four days. He was in hospital in England and France for a long time, and eventually returned to Canada as a stretcher case.
>
> "When he died he had a pension of $27.50 so I applied for my widow's pension. I was told that I was not entitled to a full pension but only to 50 per cent because my husband only suffered from a deaf ear. The only deaf ears are the ones at the pension board. They are deaf because they do not want to hear, especially if it is a widow's case The autopsy showed "T.B." and heart trouble and they tried to make out that he suffered from these before he joined up. If he did have 'T.B.' it was the result of marching through mud and snow and if he had it before he enlisted they had no right to take him.
>
> Words of Warning
>
> "I would give you men a word of warning. If you are married and go on the march and anything happens to you the authorities will say that it is the result of the hike and your widow and children will be left in poverty.

These poor widows and orphans, where the report of the officers of the department show that they are penniless, should be given some relief. There is a Provincial Soldiers' Aid Commission home on Jarvis street, Toronto, for orphan soldier children, and it is too bad that more assistance is not given to these orphan children, although they are happy. It is recommended in the report that, in some of these cases, one year's allowance should be given after the death of the father. I do not believe that goes far enough, and I think the children should be dealt with more liberally. This would be in the public interest, because these soldiers'

children should not be a charge on charity, when their fathers served their country in the way they did. The other day there was mentioned by the hon. member for Fort William in this House the case of two Soldiers' Aid Commission children who went out to a farm as foster children in the country and were brutally treated. I hope something will be done by the new board in regard to giving these orphan children better treatment and more aid and pensions, and that it will co-operate with the various provincial soldiers' aid commissions throughout Canada that have the care of orphaned children of soldiers. While the municipalities are helping and the soldiers' aid commissions are educating the children, little or nothing is being done for the future of these children—they should be well educated and not made to suffer for their father's death. There are many of these cases of need and help if inquired into, in addition to the one referred to the other day by the hon. member for Fort William and Rainy River (Mr. Manion). I believe in cases where the father has gone wrong, the Pension Board have cut the wife and children right off. Returned soldiers cannot be all 100 per cent efficient—a few less than half of one per cent of them have gone wrong, and in these cases the Pension Board and the new commission should go very slow before they put a wife and children out on the street, as has been done in the past, for the lapse of the husband. The country has a duty to the wife and children nevertheless. I hope the Government will accept some amendments to this report and that we shall have an act that will stand for all time. I hope, when this royal commission is appointed it will proceed to go throughout Canada and investigate these cases and that Canada's soldier problem will be cleaned up once and for all, so that the country will at last be a fit and proper place for soldiers of the King to live and die in, and a country fit for heroes to work in.

Mr. W. F. CARROLL (Cape Breton South and Richmond): Mr. Speaker, the problem of the returned soldier has been with us now for some years, and I think we may presume that it will be with us for some years to come. I appreciate very deeply the non-partisan attitude that has been taken in both the committee and the sub-committees which have been dealing with this question, and in the discussion so far as it has gone in this House. There is nothing that we, as representatives of the people of Canada, can do that can pay for the services of those Canadians who went overseas and did their duty for Canada, for the Empire and for the world. It may be, perhaps, a little unfortunate that, in the early days of recruiting or, more particularly, in the more strenuous days of recruiting in this country, promises were made to men who would join up that, when they returned to Canada, nothing that a government or this country could do would be too much to be done for the returned soldier. They came back as a class more or less dissatisfied; and if I can measure aright, if I can feel the pulse of the returned soldiers of this country fairly accurately, I will say that the discontent, instead of being moderated and coming down to a minimum, is to-day more acute than it has been at any time since 1918. I consider that if we, in this Parliament, are in a position, if not in stentorian tones, then in a voice moderate and calm, to assure the returned soldiers of this country that they have, may I say, the assistance and the goodwill of the representatives of the people of Canada, we shall have done much to suggest to the returned soldiers of this country that the representatives of the people are not against them.

I want to congratulate the chairman of the Committee on Civil Re-establishment because of the many tedious hours, outside of committee hours, that he has given to this work. I do not know of any chairman of any committee in this House during the present session or during previous sessions when I have been a member of this Parliament, who has been more assiduous in his duties or who has been more painstaking in his endeavours to gain an accurate knowledge of the things that come within his purview than the chairman of the committee who has made this report to the House to-day. We have had our differences of opinion. I myself have frequently differed with the chairman of the committee on questions of detail; but, in my calm and moderate moments, I usually came to the conclusion that he had a grasp of questions within the purview of our committee, that he had given the matter a study that very few if any of the committee had given to it.

I am free, however, to say that, notwithstanding that fact and notwithstanding the fact that, I think, every member of the committee did his or her duty as each conceived it, some things may have been left undone. We, for example, discussed the

question of pensions. I happened to be chairman of the sub-committee on pensions, and I want to say to the hon. member for North Toronto (Mr. Church), who, I know, is deeply interested in this problem of the returned soldier, that, as regards our sub-committee, there was not a case that was presented that did not receive absolutely fair consideration on the part of the members of the committee. As an instance, we were supposed to cover ten cases in a night, that is, a night lasting from half past eight until eleven o'clock. When I tell you, Mr. Speaker, that last night we did not cover the details of one particular case that came before us, you will understand that that committee had its difficulties. May I assure my hon. friend for North Toronto that any case in which we have not finished our work, any case which comes before that committee, whether it is deserving of consideration or not, will be given consideration, the details will be gone into, the files will be consulted and the whole circumstances of the case will be placed before the members of the committee. I believe that any recommendation which that committee may make in regard to any individual case will be fair, if not final. Now, on various other questions that came before the Committee on Re-establishment I have had some private opinions of my own. The hon. member for Nelson (Mr. Bird) and I took very strong grounds—and sometimes we expressed ourselves vigorously—that if the medical doctors of this country, appointed by the Government, passed men as medically fit for overseas service in the Canadian Expeditionary Forces, such men, ipso facto, should be considered to have been medically fit, for the purposes of pension or of re-establishment. But certain facts were submitted by witnesses before the committee that would make it absolutely impossible to act on such a principle, and I cannot refrain from saying, Mr. Speaker, that it is a tragedy which the people of this country will long remember, that medical officers in the employ of the government, and paid out of the public treasury, should have passed for overseas service men who they should have known on a half inspection were not fit for such service. The hon. member for Nelson, the hon. member for Victoria and Carleton (Mr. Caldwell), and myself, in our investigation into this subject, discovered that men were taken on the strength of the overseas forces as medically fit who in some cases had but one live leg, the other being cork or wood; while others, as we learned from the departmental officers, were blind of one eye. And the question arose whether or not it was a fair proposition that men who must have been palpably unfit medically when they were examined, but who nevertheless were carelessly passed for overseas service on a doctor's certificate of medical soundness, should now become a charge upon the country. Personally, notwithstanding the evidence submitted to the general committee as well as to the subcommittee on pensions, I still feel that the government of this country has some responsibility in the matter and should carefully investigate the merits of the proposition which has been put forward and which was argued before the various committees that have studied the soldier's problems. If medical doctors, appointed by the government of this country to examine and pass men for overseas service, were derelict in that duty, and passed men who were obviously unfit—and I am not now casting any aspersions on any one—I think that the government must shoulder some degres of responsibility for the action of these men.

Mr. ANDERSON: Is not the hon. member aware that men who went overseas were classified in different grades—Grade A, Grade B, etc.? Grade B was not necessarily altogether fit.

Mr. CARROLL: I know something about the matter, and I can assure my hon. friend that men who were passed for overseas service in the Canadian Expeditionary Forces were not classified in such a way. If they were passed as fit for the Expeditionary Forces, they were fit for any service, except of course for signalling parties and that sort of thing.

Mr. ANDERSON: But later on, when large numbers of men were desired, there were certain classes of men who were accepted although they did not pass as A1. They had certain defects which might not entitle them to full pension.

Mr. CARROLL: That does not detract from my argument. My hon. friend may be right or wrong, but if men were placed in that category I suppose they would be on a different basis, in the matter of pension, from men classed as A1. The unfortunate thing is that in the years 1915-16 colonels of battalions, with noble aspi-

rations, let me say, were so anxious to fill their ranks with all haste that they urged upon their medical officers to accept all-comers. That is the tragedy of the thing. Perhaps this may be somewhat beyond the scope of the report, but the matter is so serious that it requires the earnest consideration of the House. I absolutely agree with my hon. friend from West Calgary (Mr. Shaw) in the amendment which he has offered.

Mr. CHURCH: In order to secure a more just, equitable and efficient administration of the Pensions Act, would it not be better to shift the burden of proof in disability soldier cases from the soldier to the statae, as is done in France?

Mr. CARROLL: If my hon. friend had heard me speaking to a motion the other day, introduced by the Minister of Marine (Mr. Lapointe), he would know my position on that question. I believe it is always unwise law to place the burden of proof upon a criminal; and where the interests of ex-soldiers are at stake, it is, in my opinion, equally unwise and undesirable to place an undue burden of proof upon them. I do not have to develop that phase because tens of thousands of our soldiers who were discharged from the expeditionary force were so proud and happy to get back to their friends that if they had been afflicted with all the ills that flesh is heir to they would not have divulged their condition to the officers who granted their discharge. That fact has on many occasions been brought to the notice of various committees of this House. While the hon. member from North Toronto is sympathetic with regard to the treatment that should be meted out to the returned soldier, may I say that I am perhaps sentimentally sympathetic—for reasons which I shall not disclose.

I was dealing with the amendment proposed by my hon. friend from West Calgary (Mr. Shaw), and I do not know that such an amendment could come from a better source, for the hon. gentleman has a war record that is perhaps unequalled by any other hon. member. Therefore when he proposes an amendment to the very sane and reasonable report which has been brought down by the chairman of our committee, I take it more seriously than if it came from some other quarter. If there is anything to investigate,—and apparently there is, because this committee in their wisdom saw fit to recommend an investigation by a royal commission—then I say, let us refer to that commission everything that needs investigation.

It must be apparent to hon. members that there are many phases of the problem which a parliamentary committee is not in a position to investigate at length. If I suggest the requisite of time I may be told that we were paid to give our time and attention to this particular problem. But unfortunately the members of the committee outside of the chairman and myself, who gave every moment of his time to the work, had other duties to look after, and certain subjects may have been overlooked. Therefore I submit that if those subjects are to be gone into, the recommendation of our committee should be given effect to and a royal commission appointed. If we are to go to the expense of appointing such a commission to investigate the very serious charges made by Mr. MacNeil against the Board of Pension Commissioners and others, then any other subjects which might with advantage to the returned soldiers be inquired into should also be referred to that commission. Such action on our part would assure them that the representatives of the people have some respect for them for what they have done for their country, and any amendment moved in this House would be accepted and acted upon by the proposed royal commission.

I agree with my hon. friend the chairman of the committee that this is neither the time nor the place to say anything about the charges which Mr. MacNeil has preferred against the Board of Pension Commissioners. Although Mr. MacNeil is practically a native of my constituency, I never met him until a few weeks ago, but I feel that I am voicing the sentiments not only of our returned soldiers who are affiliated with the G. W. V. A.—as I am,—but of the great bulk of those outside that organization that he is doing for returned men generally work that no other person could probably do as well and certainly could not do better. He has brought to the attention of the various parliamentary committees which have been appointed from time to time questions some of which he says have been considered and others overlooked. Undoubtedly he is doing a splendid work for the organization with which he is connected and also for other organizations of returned men. When a man who has been placed at the head of such an important organization as the

G. W. V. A. makes these serious accusations I think our committee took the right course in recommending that they be investigated by a royal commission.

It may be said perhaps that this committee should have investigated those charges, but I am not of that opinion. The majority of the committee took the ground that we should not investigate charges which to a certain extent concerned our own honour, for it was considered that a reflection was cast upon the committee as being more or less mixed up with the conspiracy which Mr. MacNeil suggested exists. However, having had a discussion with the national secretary of the G. W. V. A., and having put a question to him in committee, I am free to say that I think the national executive of the G. W. V. A. had no intention of connecting the committee with those charges. But I still think that the report, so far as that is concerned, should be adopted by the House.

There is a question that may, perhaps, be involved in the charge made in this telegraphic communication. What I am about to say may or may not be true; I have to verify it. I have sent to the library seven or eight times to-day to get the statutes of 1920 containing the legislation dealing with soldiers' insurance, but apparently every volume of the statutes for that year has been taken from the library, and I am not in a position to say whether, in the ground I now take, I am right or not. But I am instructed, and I think by competent authority, that it was provided by and was the intent of Chapter 54 of the statutes of 1920, the act dealing with soldiers' insurance, that the medical condition of a returned soldier should not be taken into consideration when he made application for insurance. If there is any member of the House who holds another view and has lately made sure that he is right, I would like him to say so. But the board dealing with soldiers' insurance are interpreting that statute differently; they are taking into consideration to-day the medical condition of applicants for soldiers insurance. I understand they are taking it under section 13 of the act, which gives the minister the right to say whether under certain conditions insurance shall or shall not be granted. But if I am right in my interpretation of the act, then I say that notwithstanding section 13, which gives the minister the power to which I have referred, the medical condition of the applicant is not a question which can properly come under the purview of or be revised by the Minister of Finance. I take it that that is a substantive point of law. I am told on good authority that for some time past the Department of Finance has been informed by its advisers that certain persons are not medically fit to be insured, and that on that ground their applications are thrown aside. If I interpret the law correctly, I do not think the Minister of Finance is well advised in accepting the instructions given in this respect by the departmental officers.

Mr. SUTHERLAND: May I ask who are the officers of the department who so advised the Minister of Finance?

Mr. CARROLL: I never like to be personal. I do not want to mention their names.

Mr. SUTHERLAND: I do not ask for their names—I mean the official positions they hold.

Mr. CARROLL: I do not know; I am not in a position to say that. I presume, however, without having any accurate knowledge of the matter, that it would be the Department of Soldiers' Civil Re-establishment.

Mr. MACLEAN (York): Is not the Department of Insurance under the Minister of Finance?

Mr. CARROLL: I am not in a position to say. I made no statement who the officials were.

Mr. BELAND: The Board of Pension Commissioners stands between the Minister of Finance and the applicant for insurance.

Mr. MACLEAN (York): Could the Minister of Soldiers' Re-establishment say whether that review which seems to be assigned to the Minister of Finance is for the purpose of protecting the applicant from the insurance point of view, or of limiting the number of applications?

Mr. CARROLL: I do not think it is fair to be putting questions to the minister at this stage. Of course, if he wants to answer, it is all right.

Mr. MACLEAN (York): I questioned the minister because he rose a moment ago.

Mr. BELAND: All applications under this act must come from returned soldiers or certain classes of widows, and the Minister of Finance has the right of veto; he may refuse the application for insurance

for certain reasons that are not set out in the act. He has power to refuse an application when he thinks there is obvious or sufficient reason for doing so.

Mr. CARROLL: A friend of mine near by has suggested to me that that is very poor policy for any insurance company to follow. I certainly agree with him, but if a returned soldier is medically unfit, then the ordinary insurance companies will not accept him as a risk. But that is not my argument. My argument is that if the Parliament of this country saw fit to legislate to the effect that the medical condition of a returned soldier should not be taken into account when an application for insurance was under consideration, then whether that is good or bad policy from an insurance standpoint, if it is the law of this country, and I contend that it is, the act should be enforced as Parliament contemplated, or else it should be repealed. I can see reasons, Mr. Speaker, why a returned soldier should be on a different basis from an applicant for insurance in one of our large industrial concerns, and I believe that Parliament was right in making that provision. I believe that the returned soldiers are entitled to a little more consideration in the matter of insurance and everything else than the general bulk of the people of this country.

Mr. MACLEAN (York): Did the committee come across many cases of what the hon. member would call unjust treatment under the present law regarding soldiers' insurance?

Mr. CARROLL: I happened to be chairman of the sub-committee on pensions, and was not so closely in touch with the main committee, but I am assured by gentlemen whom I think are responsible men, and I have read the statement made in the main committee, that the board are today taking into consideration the mental and physical condition of the soldier applicant for insurance.

Mr. FIELDING: Is there not a clause which provides that the Minister of Finance may order a medical examination? If the condition of the soldier's health has nothing to do with it, what does that clause mean?

Mr. CARROLL: Does the minister refer to clause 13?

Mr. FIELDING: I forget the number.

Mr. CARROLL: I have discussed this matter—

[Mr. Beland.]

Mr. FIELDING: I am not discussing it. I am simply drawing it to the hon. member's attention.

Mr. CARROLL: When a statute makes a clear-cut and, I think, fair proposition that the medical condition of an applicant for insurance under this act shall not be taken into consideration, and then further on gives the Minister of Finance discretion to investigate certain phases of that application, though I do not pose as a lawyer, I say that on the ordinary construction of statutes the medical condition of that applicant is not one of the things that the Minister of Finance or his advisers may investigate.

Mr. FIELDING: Then what is the medical examination for?

Mr. CARROLL: If the minister is referring to clause 13—

Mr. FIELDING: I do not want to interrupt the hon. member. I am not taking any position in the matter.

Mr. MACLEAN (York): I should like to hear from the Minister of Finance on that point.

Mr. CARROLL: I would like the Minister of Finance to be speaking rather than myself, but I felt I owed it to the sub-committee of which I was chairman to make some remarks. Unfortunately, I have not the statute before me. The minister may be right, but I said at the outset that I thought that I was giving the effect of the statute correctly. My point is this: If the statute says that the medical condition of an applicant for insurance shall not be taken into consideration, that being a substantive part of the law, the Minister of Finance or his advisers have no right to inquire into the medical condition of the applicant.

Mr. FIELDING: Then why the medical examination?

Mr. CARROLL: If the statute also provides for a medical examination, I say that it must have been very carelessly drawn, and the persons who drafted it were ill-advised in drawing it that way.

Mr. MARLER: I might point out that section 15 of the act does give the Minister of Finance the right to have a medical examination if he thinks proper.

Mr. MACLEAN (York): Is that to pass on the question whether it is a good risk or not?

Mr. CARROLL: I do not care whether the statute, after making the clear-cut provision that the medical examination shall not be taken into account, goes on to provide as my hon. friend states. We as a committee of this House, and as persons who are taking some interest in the matter of soldiers' civil re-establishment must give the statute some interpretation, and I appeal to any hon. member of this House who has given some attention to the interpretation of statutes or the practice of law whether a specific provision such as is in the Insurance Act must not be followed irrespective of what other qualifying clauses may provide. I think all the authorities on the interpretation of statutes will bear me out that you cannot go beyond the main provision.

Mr. DENIS (Joliette): Is my hon. friend aware that since a year or so ago, only 64 applications were refused by the Minister of Finance, and of these, 13 applicants have since died? Under such circumstances, does he contend that the soldiers are not receiving fair treatment?

Mr. CARROLL: If it were a matter of ordinary insurance, my hon. friend would be perfectly right.

Mr. MACLEAN (York): Is it ordinary or extraordinary? That is the very point.

Mr. CARROLL: I say that this is extraordinary insurance. The statute makes it that.

Mr. MACLEAN (York): Then read the statute.

Mr. CARROLL: I am giving what I think is the provision in the statute. I have not been able to obtain a copy, although there are sixteen volumes containing the statute in the Library, and I have tried repeatedly to get one for the last six hours. There must be some of them in this chamber. If any hon. member will gainsay the proposition I have made, that the statute provides that the physical and mental condition of the soldier applying for insurance must not be taken into consideration—

Mr. CALDWELL: Does the hon. member not think he is out of order, and that it is almost contempt of court for a member of the Pension Committee to discuss a matter which has already been referred to a higher tribunal? This matter has been referred to a royal commission. I think, in an ordinary criminal or civil case, it would be considered a contempt of court.

Mr. CARROLL: I have taken fairly good care not to discuss anything that has been referred to the Royal Commission. I think I have taken the same ground as the chairman of this committee, (Mr. Marler) who said he did not feel like discussing whether or not Mr. MacNeil was right in making the charges which he did against the Board of Pension Commissioners, or whosoever he made charges against. In talking of the question of insurance, I was following up the matter which my hon. friend from West Calgary (Mr. Shaw) mentioned in his amendment, and I was suggesting to the hon. member that, if the main resolution which was passed in that committee did not cover the question of insurance, we in Parliament should cover it, and I am taking the broad ground that, if this commission be appointed, it should be given power to investigate everything in connection with the returned soldiers, and with returned soldier problems and grievances, and that is why I am discussing the question of insurance. Section 15 of the act says—

> No medical examination or other evidence of insurance shall be required in respect of any contract issued under this act, provided however, that the minister may, for the purpose of determining whether he shall refuse to enter into a contract of insurance in any case under the provisions of section 13 of this act—

Section 13 says that he may refuse to enter into any insurance contract in any case where there are, in his opinion, sufficient grounds for a refusal.

Section 15 continues:

> —require such medical examination or other evidence of the insurability of the insured as he may deem necessary.

I still say that, under the interpretation of the act, the question as to whether or not a person is in a proper medical condition, under the act, should not enter into the question whether his application should be approved or refused. I do not wish to take up too much of the time of the House in discussing this proposition.

An hon. MEMBER: Hear, hear.

Mr. CARROLL: My hon. friend says, "hear, hear." I have not taken up very much of the time of the House this session, and, in view of the fact that the hon. member said "hear, hear," I think I will go on a little longer. There is the question of the housing proposition in this country. The housing proposition, as proposed and as expounded by the government which made it effective, I think is wrong in principle. The government of

this country gives the money for the purpose of assisting the returned soldiers and others in establishing themselves in homes. I take the position that the government which contributes the money should have the responsibility of expending that money, and it should not pass to an inferior tribunal, or to any other tribunal, the responsibility for the expenditure of that money. What is the proposition to-day? I say the housing scheme, as expounded, was supposed to be in the interest of the returned soldier. To-day it is not especially in the interest of the returned soldier. There are a few things in connection with it, perhaps, which give more consideration to a returned soldier applicant than to other applicants, but I take this view of it—and I believe I am right—that the sentiment of 75 per cent of returned soldiers of this country is that this Canadian government, whether the present Government, the past government, or some future government, should take the whole responsibility of the expenditure of any public money, whether it be as a tribute to the returned soldier, or for any purpose. What is the position to-day? This government passes along the responsibility to the local government of our province, and the local government in turn passes along the responsibility to the municipalities, and the municipalities, in the first instance, as I understand the law, are responsible to the commissioners that undertake to accept tenders, and to let contracts for this housing proposition. I rather think that this Government should take the whole responsibility, and, if this scheme was conceived with the idea of assisting the returned soldier, then I say that its conception has not borne very much fruit, because, so far as I have seen the act operate, there are very few returned soldiers in this country who are getting the desired result from the act.

Mr. McQUARRIE: Is the hon. member speaking of his own district exclusively? Does he know there are other places, for instance, British Columbia, where the scheme has worked out very satisfactorily? They are asking for more money in connection with the same scheme.

Mr. CARROLL: Are they getting it?

Mr. McQUARRIE: That is for this House to decide.

Mr. CARROLL: I am not speaking from a local standpoint. The last remark which I made may have given my hon. friend the impression that I was, but I am taking the broad ground that, if this Government is expending money for any purpose whatsoever, it should take the direct responsibility for expending that money, and, in the vernacular, it should not pass the buck to the local government, and the local government, in turn, pass it along to the municipality.

Mr. McQUARRIE: Explain what is wrong with that?

Mr. CARROLL: I think this Parliament should be responsible for its own expenditures. I am giving my own opinion. I am not saying it is wrong. It may not be wrong; it may be absolutely right; but I say that, as regards our province—and this is the only local aspect that I will mention —notwithstanding the fact that, for the past three years, our various municipalities have been endeavouring to make this act effective alone in the city of Halifax, in the province of Nova Scotia, has it been made effective on account of obstructions placed in the way of our civic corporations. That is the only local aspect from which I view the matter.

When I started to make my brief remarks, I had intended to suggest to this House that it should not only adopt the amendment of the hon. member for West Calgary (Mr. Shaw), but adopt amendments which would give this royal commission, if appointed, powers of investigating, from every aspect, from every point, from every angle, every legitimate grievance of the returned soldiers of this country. I personally have no brief to speak for the returned soldiers, excepting a brief as one who admires to the full what they have done for this country, this Empire and this world. But I think the time has come; it is now here; it has arrived, when this Government should take full responsibility for every matter in connection with the returned soldier problem of this country. While some people say that the Government are evading this responsibility by handing this matter over to a commission, I humbly suggest that this is the most desirable way, and it will prove to be the most effective way of thoroughly investigating every grievance which the returned soldier has or which he thinks he has. I am one of those who believe that the quicker we attempt, at least to make the returned soldiers of this country feel confident that every man who is a representative of the people of Canada is a fair man and is his friend under ordinary circumstances,

the quicker we shall alleviate the grievances of the returned soldiers. First, we can never repay, either in money gratuities, or in insurance legislation, or by any other method, the debt that we owe to those men who have come back martyrs to the war; and, second, there is nothing in the world that the Canadian Parliament or the Canadian people can do which will repay the dependants of those who did not come back. I humbly suggest to this House that they should accept the amendment moved by the hon. member for West Calgary; and I further suggest that, if necessary, there should be incorporated in that amendment words which will give such a body absolute power to investigate anything and everything which may come before it as a grievance on the part of returned soldiers of this country. In doing that we shall be doing but a small part of our duty. In doing that we shall be, to a certain extent at least, showing the returned soldiers of this country that, notwithstanding the fact that the war is three years gone, we have still some idea that they did a work and performed a duty which is worthy of consideration by the Canadian people.

It would take me too long to go into the question of what is termed the attributability clause. That is one of the features that may fairly and well be taken into serious consideration by this commission, if this Parliament undertakes to recommend the appointment of such a commission. There are phases in connection with attributability that might be remedied. I am making no charge against any officers who have the administration of any of those acts; but I still say, and the small experience which I have had on this committee leads me to believe that there are phases of this attributability which might fairly be a subject for a special parliamentary committee or for this special royal commission, if it is the desire of the House to appoint one. I am not going into details.

I concur in the whole report; I do not think there has been brought down to this House a report which has been more fair, equitable and just to the returned soldiers than this one; but if there is one aspect of this report which I consider to be more favourable to the returned soldier than any report which has been brought down to this House, it is the report on the question of appeals. The returned soldier feels, he has felt and, I presume, he will continue to feel that he has been wrongly dealt with by the Board of Pension Commissioners. When I say that, I make no charge. If two doctors disagree as to whether or not an applicant for a pension should receive a pension because his ailment is attributable to war services, there is a doubt; that would raise doubt in my mind, and in those cases the board under the act is supposed to give the benefit of that doubt to the returned soldier and to grant him a pension. But members of the committee who are here will corroborate me when I say that many cases have come before our committee where even the medical advisers of the Board of Pension Commissioners have disagreed as to the attributability of a soldier's disease or trouble, and very many cases have shown in which the board have turned down applicants for pensions. There is another aspect. Civil medical doctors, who are in no way connected with the Department of Soldiers Civil Re-establishment, have undertaken, by affidavit and otherwise, to prove to the Board of Pension Commissioners that such and such a situation was existent at the time of enlistment, and the Board of Pension Commisisoners and the medical advisers, perhaps rightly, I do not know, have said: "No; we have given our decision, and we are not going to disturb it." While I make no charge against the Board of Pension Commissioners, while I have found them reasonably fair and honourable, at the same time I suggest, with all due deference to their honour and fidelity to duty that, if, say last Thursday, I should turn down an applicant for a position, or a pension, or insurance, and he should come back and declare that I had done wrong, it is only the part of poor human nature—and the members of the Pension Board are human—that I should want to be consistent. I should not like to confess that last Thursday I was wrong. I think that the proposal made by the chairman of the committee is the very best that can be made under the circumstances. I endorse it from every standpoint and I think the House should adopt it. The report in this respect casts no reflection upon the Board of Pension Commissioners or upon any one else. If this recommendation goes through, it is my view that the man who is charged with this matter should take the full responsibility for the appointment of that appeal board. The recommendation is that this shall be with the concurrence of the minister. That report went through, I think, practically unanimously in the committee, but I do not think that when the appeal board is established and starts to function the minister should

take all the responsibility for the appointment of its members. If it were otherwise it might perhaps appear as though the Board of Pension Commissioners had been appointed before the court of appeal.

Before I conclude, may I again say that every one connected with the committee gave his time, his energy and his ability to the work in order that a fair and proper solution might be reached of the problems that were placed before that body. There may have been differences of opinion, but when the report was finally adopted, the members of the committee, if they were not unanimous, were at least of the opinion that every member of the general committee and every member of each of the various sub-committees had done his best to contribute to the solution of this very difficult question which will confront this country for some years to come. It is my opinion that the gratitude of this House is due to the officers of the Government for their zealous attendance at the various meetings of the committee. There was never a time when they were asked to appear that they were not present; and whatever may be said as to any position they may have taken in regard to various questions, the charge cannot be substantiated that they did not do all that was expected of them. Those persons who represented the various soldier organizations in the country, I may also add, at all times presented their case and stated their grievances in a fair, manly and perfectly legitimate way. Whatever differences may have existed between themselves and the administrators of the various a[illegible] it was always a pleasure to note that after their grievances had been discussed and disposed of they left the committee room in a fair frame of mind. From the point of view of the soldiers' representatives, and from the standpoint of those who represented the government, it is only just to say that every one did his duty fairly and well as he saw it, and gave to the various committees information which could not otherwise have been obtained. I feel that if the committee had an opportunity again it would tender to all these people its thanks and appropriation for the admirable way in which they have assisted this Parliament in the consideration of a cause we all espouse.

Mr. T. W. CALDWELL (Victoria and Carleton, N. B.): I believe I was on my feet as promptly as any of the other hon. gentlemen who desire to speak, but I am always willing to give way to a larger man than myself. There are a few remarks which I desire to offer on this subject. Before I proceed to discuss the report, I want to emphasize what has been said with regard to the very efficient and able manner in which the chairman of the general committee and the chairmen of the sub-committees have discharged their duties. They spared neither time nor pains, nor effort to investigate every matter that was brought before the committee; and in this connection, while the hon. member for North Toronto (Mr. Church) has rather censured the committee for not going far enough, I want to say that every step taken by the committee this year has been one step further than any taken previously. Of course, new problems develop every year. The hon. member referred to the pensions allowed by the committee last year, which were increased by a bonus. That bonus expires in September next, I believe, although I am not sure as to the date. This committee has renewed the bonus for two years. With regard to the other recommendations, every step that has been taken by the committee this year is in advance of what was done by any previous committee. The committee worked very harmoniously. Every member of it, I think, did his best to solve the problems that were under consideration. It is possible we may have erred in judgment, but if we have I hope the next committee will have a greater grasp of matters than we have. A question was asked by the hon. member for Bonaventure (Mr. Marcile) when the chairman of the committee (Mr. Marler) was giving his report, whether any change had been made in regard to pensions to widowed mothers. There has been a change in regard to this class of pensions every year up to now. In 1919 the act provided that:

> The pension of a widowed mother shall not be reduced on account of her earnings from personal employment.

That was practically the only reference to widowed mothers in 1919. In 1920 a further amendment was made to the act. It was found that deductions were being made from widowed mothers' pensions on account of income other than earnings, and this amendment was added to the Pension Act of 1919:

> That the pension to a widowed mother shall not be reduced on account of her earnings from personal employment or on account of her having free lodgings or so long as she resides in Canada on account of her having an income from other sources which does not exceed $240 per annum.

In 1921 this clause was further amended as follows:

Such income being considered to include the contributions from children residing with or away from her whether such contributions have actually been made or are deemed by the commissioners to have been made.

We found that deductions were being made from a widowed mother's pension if she owned her home, the amount of the rent being deducted. In 1920 another amendment was made to the act which I did not approve of quite as readily. This is the amendment:

When a parent or person in the place of a parent has unmarried children residing with him or her who should, in the opinion of the Commission, be earning an amount sufficient to permit them to contribute to the support of such parent or person, each such unmarried child shall be deemed to be contributing not less than ten dollars a month towards such support.

That meant that $10 a month was deducted from her pension for every child she had who should be contributing, whether actually doing so or not. So there has been a continual change in the law regarding pensions to widowed mothers. In 1921 an amendment was moved to the act of 1920 substituting the words "children and child respectively" for the words "sons and son," which meant that a widowed mother receiving a pension in 1921 would have her pension reduced because she might have several daughters.

I urged very strongly last year that this clause should be repealed. This year, I think about the 1st May, the hon. member for Quebec South (Mr. Power) moved a resolution with regard to widowed mothers' pensions which I need not repeat. It provided that no deduction should be made on any account whatever. I could not follow the hon. gentleman that far, but the resolution was accepted by the House. I did think, however, and later called attention to the fact, that although this Parliament had accepted the resolution, I objected to its being referred to the committee on the ground that it was taken out of the purview of that committee because it had been accepted by the government. I think the government accepted that resolution without due consideration, and without realizing what it meant as fully as some of us who had been on this Pension Committee a number of years. But I did think that the clause penalizing a widowed mother because she had children should be eliminated. I urged that very strongly in committee last year, and again this year. It was defeated last year by a majority of only one, and was disallowed again this year by the committee. Outside of that one item I am perfectly satisfied with the report, and I hope a future committee will attend to that particular item.

I do not think that a widowed mother should be penalized for raising a family, for that is what this clause amounts to. We speak of the need of increased population, and we spend large sums of money to attract immigrants, and yet in this respect we penalize the mother who raises a family.

I think the recommendation of the commiteee in regard to land settlement are quite proper. It is possibly the only thing that will enable soldiers to remain on the land and pay for their farms and make good. I think it would be a national calamity if they are not able to make good, for if 50 per cent of these farms were abandoned and came back into the hands of the Government we would stand to lose three times the amount that will be remitted in interest under this scheme.

A couple of years ago I placed on the Order Paper a resolution covering in part what is recommended by the committee. My resolution provided that the time for the repayment of the loan for stock and equipment to a returned soldier settler should be extended over a period of twenty years. I was not allowed to move the resolution because of the rule that a private member cannot bring forward a money resolution. I talked the matter over with the then Minister of the Interior, now the official leader of the Opposition, under whose department the act was being administered at that time. He admitted that something should be done and brought in a resolution extending the time to six years instead of four. Under the original act the soldier made no payment of interest on stock and equipment loans for the first two years, but he had to pay it all during the next four years. Under the amendment he commenced to pay interest from the date of the loan and did not get any extension of time to pay the balance but had to pay the loan in six years, which I think was a worse arrangement than that provided at first. I am pleased to see this recommendation made by the committee, and I hope it will be approved by the House and accepted by the Government.

This afternoon the official leader of the Opposition raised the same objection to extending the time for repayment of the loan for stock and equipment that he raised

two years ago, namely, that there would be no security. I pointed out at that time, as I do now, a feature which the chairman of the committee has not referred to. The chairman of the committee has pointed out that the equity in the whole property increases with every payment made. But this feature has not been emphasized, that a soldier settler or any other farmer cannot carry on operations without renewing his stock and equipment as it wears out, and this recommendation spreads the payments over a longer period, which means that being smaller each year he will be enabled to renew his stock and equipment from time to time as required.

The hon. member for North Toronto (Mr. Church) called attention to the fact that there was no one appointed to the Pension Committee from the city of Toronto. I think possibly that was rather unfortunate, for undoubtedly such an important centre should have been represented. However, I would point out to the hon. member that the Whip of each party is asked to name the members that his party want appointed on such committees, and if anyone is to blame I think the hon. gentleman will have to consult the Whip of his own party. I have no doubt that the hon. member for North Toronto would have made a valuable addition to that committee.

I also regret, Mr. Speaker, that the hon. member for West Calgary (Mr. Shaw), who spoke so ably this evening on the report, was not appointed a member of that committee. It was certainly an oversight. Being a returned soldier with an excellent war record and knowing the needs of soldiers better possibly than most of us do I think it was unfortunate that he was not appointed.

Mr. BELAND: I would point out that at the time that the members of the committee were selected the hon. member for West Calgary had not been introduced to the House.

Mr. CALDWELL: I believe that is right, Mr. Speaker. I would point out to the hon. member for West Calgary however that although he was not a member of that committee any hon. member, in fact any citizen, has a right to bring any matter before a committee of this House. They have a right to be heard and to adduce any evidence to support their claims. I think it is unfortunate that my hon. friend did not favour the committee with his presence and suggestions while it was in session. All these suggestions which have been made to-night are good and I hope the chairman of the committee, who has moved the adoption of the report, will see fit to accept the amendment. I may say that I am speaking, possibly, without due knowledge of the amendment. I had not the privilege of reading it over, but I heard it read, and from what I gathered I should think it is all right. I think this commission should have the right to investigate anything that needs investigating in connection with soldier problems. With regard to the suggestion of the hon. member for North Toronto (Mr. Church) that there be a roving commission, I would point out to him that there are at present travelling medical boards in every province. Further, the report of the committee recommends that a board of appeal be appointed to which soldiers may take their cases if they are not satisfied with the decisions of the Board of Pension Commissioners, and if there are grounds for such appeal. The ground for such appeal is that there shall be a difference of opinion between the Board of Pension Commissioners and the travelling medical board or any other medical man of sufficient standing to warrant his being recognized as an authority on these matters. The criticisms that have been made in the House to-night in respect to matters affecting pensions are, I think, fairly well taken care of by the recommendations of the committee—as well, indeed, as it is possible to take care of them.

As to the suggestion that this report be not now received but be referred back to the committee, I sincerely hope that an arrangement may be made between the mover of the amendment (Mr. Shaw) and the mover of the adoption of the report (Mr. Marler) under which such action will not be taken. It would be a very unfortunate thing if at this stage of the session this report should be referred back to the committee. I remember the time when the former member for Skeena moved that a like report be referred back to a committee of this House for reconsideration. Although the things he wanted to have considered were the very things I wanted done at that time, I opposed the reference back to the committee, for this reason: the committee had spent two or three months, as we have this session, in the consideration of these very matters; they had arrived at a decision and had made a report. Of course, the motion to refer back at that time was different from the proposed reference at this time; that was

with a view to the committee making a different report in respect to matters on which it had heard evidence and on which it had come to a conclusion. If this report were now referred back to the committee it might mean that the committee would not be able to make a final report to the House in time to enable the Government to take action on the recommendations this session—a thing that would be very unfortunate indeed. As several of the speakers to-night have said, the door will not be closed when this report is accepted; there is nothing to prevent the Government of the day from adopting any new method they may think it wise to adopt, even though the committee may not have recommended it.

In view of the fact that the appointment of a Royal Commission to investigate these matters has been recommended, I shall not go into these matters. I understand that the scope of the proposed commission is in no way limited by the recommendation of the committee; that the Government may refer to it any matter pertaining to soldiers' re-establishment.

Mr. CARROLL: Does the hon. member not think that the recommendation has reference to the appointment of a commission to investigate only the telegraphic communication of Mr. MacNeil of the G. W.V.A.?

Mr. CALDWELL: I do not understand it that way. I understand that the Royal Commission is to be appointed to investigate not only the charges that have been made, but anything that may turn up during their investigation of the matter. I do not think the report of the committee seeks to restrict the investigation in any particular. The member for North Toronto commends the committee for recommending the appointment of a board of appeal. Well, I have been a member of the Pensions Committee of this House for three years, and I know that a board of appeal has never before been asked for. I think I am safe in saying that no situation has developed, not before the Pensions Committee, at any rate—that would lead the committee to believe that a Royal Commission should be appointed. It is just possible that when the investigation is completed, Parliament and the country generally will say that the appointment of this Royal Commission was a superfluity. I hope that will be the fact; I hope it will be found that the Pension Board and the other branches of the Department of Soldiers' Civil Re-establishment are doing the fair and right thing for the returned soldier. Further than that I do not think it is in good taste to go. I do not think it is in order for a member of the Pensions Committee to discuss the charges made or to express an opinion on them one way or the other. As I have said before this evening, if it were a matter of a lower court referring a question to a higher court for investigation, it would be considered improper for members of that lower court to express an opinion on the subject after they had so referred it to the higher jurisdiction.

Mr. CARROLL: Does the hon. member know of any member discussing the question from the point of view of making comments on whether or not the accusations were correct?

Mr. CALDWELL: Well, I do not wish to express an opinion on that. I did think the hon member who has just taken his seat was getting very near the danger line in this respect in the course of his remarks this evening.

Mr. J. A. CLARK (Burrard): Mr. Speaker, at this late hour, I shall not make any lengthy remarks on this subject. I was a member of the committee and had an opportunity of presenting my views during its sittings. However, there is one matter in particular to which I would like to refer this evening and which is mentioned in the report, namely, unemployment amongst returned soldiers. I hope the Government will give this matter consideration.

Before referring to some remarks that have been made by some hon. gentlemen with regard to various subjects touched on in the report, I would like to join with other members in saying a word in respect to the indefatigable labours of the chairman of the committee (Mr. Marler), and also to congratulate him upon the very able manner in which he placed the report before the House to-day. It was a great pleasure to me to serve on that committee. I was particularly struck with the enthusiasm of the members of it, and the earnest desire that was manifested by all to reach a solution of the various problems which confront the returned soldier. I was also struck by the non-partisan spirit which prevailed.

Some criticism has been made with respect to the regulations under the Insurance Act. I think it is only fair that some information in regard to the classes

of persons who can obtain insurance under that act should be placed on record; it is information which was placed before the members of the committee. Hon. members are prone to criticise, but I do not think they realize just how the matter stands. The beneficiaries under this act are: wife, husband, parents, children, brothers, and sisters. These include various other classes.

The dependents referred to below mean potential beneficiaries actually dependent upon the insured for support

Class 1—Applicants who are not seriously ill.
(a) An applicant with dependents, ill with a pensionable disability.
Application is at present accepted.
(b) An applicant without dependents who is ill with a pensionable disability.
Application is at present accepted.
(c) An applicant with dependents, ill with a disability that is not pensionable.
Application is at present accepted.
(d) An applicant without dependents ill with a disability that is not pensionable.
Application is at present accepted.

Now we come to another class of applicants, those who are seriously ill, and there we find that in the case of an applicant with dependents, seriously ill with a pensionable disability, the application is at present accepted. In the case of an applicant with dependents, dangerously ill with a disability that is not pensionable, the application is at present refused. In other words, the applicant who is dangerously ill and in anticipation of death is refused insurance at that moment.

Mr. CARROLL: These regulations are just as I thought. What does my hon. friend think of section 15? Does he think that the Minister of Finance has the right to investigate cases from a medical standpoint?

Mr. CLARK: I do not understand just what section the hon. member refers to. Will he read it? I have not the act before me.

Mr. CARROLL: I have not a copy here, but I have read it already.

Mr. CLARK: I am sorry I cannot answer my hon. friend without the section. In the case of an applicant without dependents seriously ill with a pensionable disability, application is at present refused. In the case of an applicant without dependents, seriously ill with a disability that is not pensionable, application is at present refused.

[Mr. Clark.]

The third class is that of applications from persons in so serious a condition of health that they have no reasonable expectation of life:

(a) An applicant with dependents so seriously ill with a pensionable disability that he has no expectancy of life.
Applications are at present accepted and insurance paid, provided death does not occur before approval of the application for issue of the policy.
(b) An applicant without dependents so seriously ill from a pensionable disability that he has no expectancy of life.
Applications are at present refused.
(c) An applicant with dependents, so seriously ill from a disability that is not pensionable that he has no expectancy of life.
Applications are at present refused.
(d) An applicant without dependents, so seriously ill from a disability that is not pensionable that he has no expectancy of life.
Applications are at present refused.
Class 4—General—
(a) The above is the general procedure of the board. In cases, however, where an applicant with or without dependents, is seriously ill with an injury or disease attributable to service or otherwise, and has been ill for many months with a disease which is certain to terminate fatally within a reasonably short time and has postponed taking out insurance until death is practically imminent.
Applications are at present refused.
(b) In cases where an applicant with, or without dependents, whose health has become impaired as a result of immoral conduct prior to enlistment, during service, or after discharge.
Applications are at present refused.

Those are the regulations and I think it is only fair that members should have them before them before discussing this particular phase of the question.

Some remarks have been made with regard to canteen funds. If the House accepts the proposals made in this report, I wish particularly to draw their attention to paragraph 1 of page 13 of the report which reads:

That a Board of Administration be named by Order in Council to be composed in part of officers of the D.S.C.R. and in part of representatives of ex-service men and in part of representative citizens of the Dominion of Canada having a knowledge of or interested in affairs of ex-soldiers, including education, and that the details of administration including reappointments from time to time to the board which may be rendered necessary, be left in the hands of the board so in the first place to be appointed.

The point is that this money belongs to the ex-service men. Had it been distributed before demobilization, it would have been turned over to the units comprising the Canadian corps at the front. I realize that that is now an impossibility, because many of those units do not a present exist, but many of them do. Those units which do exist should be consulted.

I do not suggest that they should be given any portion of this money. They have not, as I recollect it, made any suggestion about this fund, although they would have had the complete administration of it had the money been distributed before the termination of the war. What I hope to see is that the most representative ex-service men that can be found in this Dominion will be appointed to this commission, and with them representative citizens, ex-service men, who are more or less in the nature of educationalists. There are among others in this Dominion, General Sir Arthur Currie, for instance, of McGill University, and if we go out to the farthest West there is Dean Brock of the University of British Columbia. I just call these to mind. I think if we went over the universities of Canada we would find very prominent educationalists in each one of the universities who are ex-service men, and if educationalists are considered, I think that this type should be appointed.

11 p.m.

With regard to the particular recommendation contained in the report, my understanding is that this committee which is to be appointed should be given an absolutely free hand to do whatever they think is right and proper with this money. I do not think they should be tied down to the suggestions, because they are merely suggestions, that have been made, but should be free to act as they see fit.

Mr. BELAND: If this report is adopted by the House and a board appointed, is my hon. friend of the opinion that the Government, in the Order in Council appointing that board, should leave it to their discretion whether the money should be expended in any other way than that suggested in the recommendation?

Mr. CLARK: Yes. I made that very observation myself before the committee, and these two paragraphs were amended at my suggestion. I am not quite clear that the paragraph will bear that interpretation strictly speaking but that is the interpretation I place upon it, and that was the understanding of the committee.

Mr. BELAND: If the board appointed decides to expend the money of the canteen funds in any other way than the two methods suggested here in the report, my hon. friend is of the opinion that the wishes of the board should be carried out?

Mr. CLARK: That is, certainly, my opinion. I would like to see the board in charge of the expenditure, because I think they would be in a better position to gather the opinion of returned soldiers generally than officials of the Government, because they would have more time to devote to it.

Mr. MARLER: My hon. friend's idea as to the appointment of this commission is perfectly correct.

Mr. CLARK: The question of housing construction was fully dealt with. I do not propose to go into any details. The only thing I can think of, that might be added, is this: If the Government intend to consider a housing scheme, the only scheme that I regard as feasible is the one inaugurated by the late government because under that scheme the government does not incur financial responsibility inasmuch as the various provinces, as I understand the cheme, undertake to repay the money advanced.

Mr. BELAND: It is a loan.

Mr. CLARK: British Columbia is the only province I can speak for. The moneys so advanced were used exclusively to build houses for ex-service men, and I think the scheme worked very satisfactorily and that another loan of that nature would be accepted. I believe it would be advisable for the Government to consider the extension of that housing scheme, and to consult with the province and ascertain whether or not it would be acceptable to them to continue.

A suggestion has been made that there has been a curtailment of the pension. In a word, there has been no curtailment of the pension. The bonus has been extended for a period of two years, and any changes which have been made, I think, have been in the nature of extending the act, rather than narrowing it. It is quite true there are no radical changes in the act but at the same time, there is no curtailment.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I come to what I consider the most important problem confronting the returned soldier to-day. Several speakers have said that we will have this problem with us for some time to come. I think we will have the problem with us for some time, unless we can solve the problem of unemployment. I do not think it matters whether times improve or not, I am afraid the problem of the unemployment among returned soldiers will be with us, unless we can adopt some scheme right away which will have the effect of

finding employment, particularly for those men who are disabled, and those men who are of lowered efficiency, as a result of war service. So far as the fit men are concerned, I think I am safe in saying that, as regards 99 per cent of those who fought during the war, not only were they prepared to make the supreme sacrifice, but I believe, to-day, they are quite prepared to fight the battles of civil life, and that they are prepared to do that without paternal legislation. They did not fight for the money they were going to get, nor for the special favours that they expected to receive. I think I am safe in saying that all they are looking for is an even chance with the man who stayed at home. I think, Mr. Speaker, that you will agree with me that it is rather galling for the returned soldier to have to remove his button when he makes application for employment. That actually takes place. I hear every day epithets applied to returned soldiers, such as "they will not work." It is quite true there are some who will not work. There is a bad element in every class, and, unfortunately, even among returned soldiers, there is the 1 per cent of exploiters, and the man who is prepared to work suffers. He has been reflected upon because of the conclusions that have been drawn that all returned soldiers come within this class. The question is, what are you going to do with these men? I will refer to a remark of the present Speaker of this House, made I think a year ago, when he used the words:

> It seems to me that the enthusiasm, which prevailed when the soldiers left Canada to fight for a common cause, should not diminish as we get far away from the events of those days.

So far as unemployment is concerned, at any rate, I fear that the enthusiasm has diminished. Otherwise, why should we have one returned soldier, with his button removed, receiving employment, and another equally good, who wears it, refused employment. I hear the question asked very often, "Well, did we not give you a generous gratuity? Have we not made liberal provision for re-establishment? Have we not awarded generous pensions? Yes, I agree that has been done, but the fact still remains that there is a very large class of returned soldiers who are unemployed, and I would like to see some policy adopted which will insure employment for all returned soldiers who are willing to work, and we could find out those who are not willing to work, so that we could segregate the good from the bad.

[Mr. Clark.]

I believe if this Government will continue the policy inaugurated by the late government as regards appointing returned soldiers to the Civil Service, they will be doing something that will, in a large measure, if not entirely, solve the problem. I should like to draw attention to the fact that prior to March 31, 1921, there had been appointed to the Civil Service 8,000 returned soldiers permanently and 29,000 temporarily. I hope next year the present Government may be able to bring down figures which will show a great improvement on that. I hope also that they will take some steps to confer with the various provincial governments of this country with a view to the adoption of the same policy by provincial governments; that they will also take steps to communicate with the various municipal and public bodies with a view to having them adopt the same policy. These public bodies could do a great deal in the matter of propaganda to encourage employers to take on returned soldiers, particularly disabled men, to take on even one, because the appointment of even one will do something towards solving this problem. As long as there are men of this class out of work, their mental attitude will be such that the problem will be difficult to solve. On the other hand, if we are patient with them and will take on as many as we can afford in our various businesses, we shall be doing much to solve the situation, because, after all, a great deal of the illness that is suffered by these disabled men is due to the fact that they feel that they are ignored, that employers will not give them the opportunity of acquiring positions; that only the 100 per cent efficient man is considered. I feel quite sure, if the Government will adopt a policy of the kind I have described and will co-operate with public bodies in this country, a great deal can be done towards encouraging employers to improve upon the situation that obtains now, and thus change the attitude from the expression I used a few minutes ago that "they won't work" to an expression of pleasure that "there is such a very large percentage who will work, are working are doing well."

Many appeals have been made in this House for the cultivation of a national spirit. That national spirit can be cultivated by these very men. We are faced to-day with this situation that these men will pass on to the future generations

sentiments resulting from bitterness, or they will pass on the spirit which was prevalent during the time that they served on the battle field. The choice is between the two. I believe that the Government, by taking an energetic course in the matter, can do a great deal towards solving the problem, and I hope we shall see results in this respect at a very early date.

Mr. H. B. McGIVERIN (Ottawa): Mr. Speaker, I wish to join with those hon. members who have already spoken to congratulate the chairman and the members of the committee upon the very able manner in which they have presented this matter to the House. I heartily concur in the report. Many matters that I had in mind have already been placed before the House; but I wish to mention a few points.

The Medical Advisory Board is, I think, an excellent suggestion, independent as it will be of the Pension Board designed to consider appeals; that will do away with a certain amount of dissatisfaction. The second point to which I wish to draw attention is the question of providing burial expenses under the supervision of the Last Post Fund. It seems to me that the least we can do for those heroes who may die in poverty when their families or their friends may not have sufficient means to give them a military funeral, is to assist them in that regard. The matter has been brought to my attention on a few occasions, and I heartily support that recommendation.

The question of unemployment is naturally a very serious one. The recommendation made by the committee that the Government and the various departments should take means to plan out what work could be handled during the winter, should be acted upon at once, not only in this city but throughout the country. With my colleague, I have had some experience in connection with this question of unemployment, and it is one that is brought home to us very strongly. There is naturally the larger question of unemployment which has been referred to, and that must of necessity be taken care of by the Administration and by Parliament.

There is another phase of the unemployment question, namely, that of securing sheltered employment for wounded men. I should like to read an extract from a letter which I have received from Mr. D. F. Rowe, president of the Veterans' Re-establishment Association of Ottawa, which is a local returned men's association. The suggestion therein contained is quite worthy of consideration in this respect. This is part of the letter. He suggests:

> "Divide Canada into the following industrial areas: Vancouver, Toronto, Halifax, Winnipeg, Montreal, Ottawa. Establish in each of these centres, a manufacturing plant, conducted along the lines of the Vetcraft shops, in which the manufacture of toys and other light articles that do not require the labour of physically fit men, can be undertaken under proper supervision; the Government to subsidize each factory, according to the requirements of the industrial centre in which it is located. Employ no one but handicapped ex-service men, who have been unable to obtain work of a permanent nature; each man to be paid a fair, standard rate of wage and to be employed by the hour.

I might say, in regard to employment of wounded or disabled men by the hour, that the great difficulty is that they are not able to work a full day. An arrangement that they should be paid for the length of time they are able to work would be of great assistance to them. The letter continues:

> The Government is holding, in trust, for the ex-service men of Canada the sum of approximately $2,000,000 of canteen funds and this money could be used to no better advantage than to make secure the future of many of these men, who through disabilities suffered in the defence of their country, now find themselves unfit to take their place in the open labour market.

I look upon that as a very good suggestion. The question of the disposal of the goods made by disabled men might be made the subject of patriotic endeavour by different societies, and in that way their output could be got rid of. Of course, as time goes on their work will reach a higher standard; but in the meantime if the public could be encouraged to purchase the things made by the returned men in this way, not only would the returned soldiers be advantaged, but in time it would pay the government, because it would obviate the necessity for paying out money in doles. I agree with what has been said, that the returned men would far rather earn their own wages than depend on charity.

I might refer to the question of housing. I am in sympathy with this scheme and I believe that in the future it should be taken up. The present high cost of construction is a deterring factor. There is no doubt that it would be a great benefit to the returned men if something could be done in this direction, but as at present materials are so high it is impracticable. I believe that the extension of the pension bonus is also a good recommendation. I am in favour of the permanency of that, but in the meantime it has been extended

two years, at the end of which time the matter can be taken up again. I favour strongly the appointment of a Royal Commission such as is proposed, provided it be an absolutely independent commission; and I believe in extending its powers, as the hon. member for West Calgary (Mr. Shaw) has proposed. I think we should be prepared to investigate every question that affects the returned soldiers, and see that the legislation which we pass shall be properly carried into effect. I believe that every hon. member of the House wants to see a 100 per cent re-establishment in return for the services which the soldiers rendered overseas; and there should also be 100 per cent re-establishment provided for the dependents of those who so nobly gave up their lives for humanity's sake.

Mr. A. W. NEILL (Comox-Alberni): Let me hearten the House by the assurance that I will take up only a few minutes. It is not my intention to criticize the valuable and exhaustive report that has been submitted to the House. It would be presumption for me to do so. The report evidences a strong desire to meet the soldier's problems in a fair and even liberal manner; but if there is any likelihood of the report going back to the committee, there are half a dozen things which I desire to bring to the attention of the House in order that they may be considered. It is possible that some of them are in the report. I have not had an opportunity of carefully studying the document, because, it has not been distributed yet. I presume, however, that the gist of it is in the Votes and Proceedings, and I do not see there any of these items to which I wish to refer.

In the first place, there is the question of dependents. A man drawing a pension gets a certain allowance for every child under the age, I think, of sixteen. When the child gains that age the allowance ceases, on the assumption, I take it, that he—or she—is capable thereafter of earning a living. There is no provision in the act for any exceptional cases, and the regulation as it stands at present works a hardship in the case of children over sixteen who are incapacitated either by ill-health or by mental defects. There are some cases of this nature in my own district. In one instance, the pension that has been received by a widow ceases because the child is over sixteen, although that child is incapable of work. In the case of either ill-health or mental incapacity the pension should be continued. This is one of the things in connection with which the officials are blamed, whereas the fault lies not in a lack of sympathy in the officials, but in the law, which is not sympathetic.

Another thing I want to draw to the attention of the House, and I am surprised that it has not come up before, because it has figured on many platforms, and that is the question of equality of pensions. We should have an absolute equality of pensions as between officers and men. We talked that way on election platforms, and I would urge on hon. gentlemen that here is the place and now is the time to give voice to that conviction. I need not argue the question because its merits are well known.

I also want to take up the question alluded to by the hon. member for West Calgary (Mr. Shaw) namely, the care of tubercular men. I have a telegram that reached me this afternoon from the president of the Tranquille branch of the Tuberculosis Veterans' Association. Tranquille is in British Columbia, and the tubercular home is situated there. It was carried on for many years by private funds but the Government has now taken it over. It is a very excellent institution and is in an ideal country. The telegram reads:

> Proposal submitted by Tuberculosis Veterans' Association to parliamentary committee has not received just consideration. Important request apparently overlooked. Our proposal based on expert medical opinion. Would appreciate your earnest endeavour on our behalf during debate. No consideration given board of sanatorium consultant's report.

I do not know what report that was, but presumably it was some suggestion put forward for the purpose of handling tubercular cases, by the board of this Tranquille Asylum. I read this telegram for what it is worth.

Mr. MARLER: That report is being considered.

Mr. NEILL: I am glad to hear it. That settles that question. There is another item I wish to refer to, and that is the land settlement scheme. Let me say a well-deserved word of commendation for the Land Settlement Board, especially the man I have come in contact with most (Major Barnet), the Chairman. The Land Settlement Board had not the experience of scores of years to lend it guidance. It was a new scheme, absolutely unheard of, formulated and put into operation in a period

of enormous inflation, when a perfect riot of expenditures, almost amounting to profligacy, and general high prices prevailed; and the fact that the board has done no worse is a high tribute to the man at its head. There has been no scandal or gross mismanagement in connection with its work, and that is a great tribute to the board. I have had occasion to go before its chairman with dozens of cases, and while officials are often too ready to regard those who intercede in matters of this kind as agitators who seek to upset their ruling —which is a thing they always object to— every case I have taken before the chairman of the board has always met with a sympathetic reception. The chairman has always met me in a spirit of the greatest sympathy towards the men. He has always been anxious to hear any facts that would enable him even to stretch the law if possible to give the men the best chance under the circumstances. In every way he has displayed the greatest anxiety to deal with each case on its merits and from a sympathetic point of view. I do not say that I always got what I wanted, because in some cases those for whom I pleaded were wrong, asking for something to which they were not entitled. But whenever he could not meet my wishes he has often shown that it was not a case of lack of sympathy but one in which the law was restricted. It is easy for us to frame laws here that prove incomplete to meet the conditions that afterwards develop, and then turn round and shelter ourselves behind the officials, declaring that they do not carry out the law properly. The Auditor General, on the other hand, would soon pull them up if they went a step beyond the limits of the law. We are too prone to slam officials both in the House and in the country. I have been guilty of the same thing myself. It is a cheap and easy way of getting a certain amount of credit, but it is only fair when we come across an official who gives of his best to utter a word of commendation, instead of piling his hearse with flowers when it is too late.

There are one or two things in connection with the operation of the Land Settlement Board to which I would call the attention of the House. Under the Land Settlement Act it is possible for a soldier to get a loan of $5,000, that is, if the board buys a farm for him, and all he has to pay is 10 per cent. His total outlay amounts to $500, and the outlay of the Government on that risk is $4,500. In addition, he can borrow for implements a sum not exceeding $2,500. In other words, he can get an advance of $7,500. But in the case of a man who has a farm of his own on which there is a mortgage, or perhaps it is a desirable farm which he has bought with a mortgage on it the act only allows the board to advance 50 per cent of the amount of the mortgage, and the total amount of his indebtedness is not to exceed $5,000, including the advance for stock and implements. So in the one case a farm which is bought for $5,000 costs the Government $4,500; but if the man buys that farm himself for $5,000 with a mortgage against it for $2,500, and he pays out his own money for the balance, the board will lend him only half the amount of purchase price. The result is apparent. Take a man buying a farm costing $4,500 with a $2,500 mortgage on it, he pays $2,000 of his own money and wants a loan from the Government of $2,500, but the place is only valued by the department at $4,300 and the board can not advance him more than half that amount. So in one case where the man has put in $2,000 of his own money he gets an advance of only half the assessed value of the farm, while in the other case the man who has put in only $500 of his own money gets a loan for the full amount, less 10 per cent. That is an unworkable and absurd situation. I have a case here where it worked out in actual practice. A man bought a farm with a mortgage on it and put in $2,000 of his own money, but the board turned down his request for a loan for the balance because they are only allowed to advance him half the value. They would be willing to buy the same place if unmortgaged for the full amount less 10 per cent.

Another point in the one case the man who has $2,000 of his own and gets the Department to pay off a mortgage, can only get a total loan from the board on land, implements and stock of $5,000; but in the other case if he has only $500 of his own he can get a total loan from the board of $7,500. I believe the act was originally drawn in that way with the idea that it would otherwise result prejudicially to loan companies which were charging 8, 9 and 10 per cent, as those interested would naturally prefer to take their money from the board at a much lower rate of interest. If that was the idea it was a very ignoble one and the sooner the act is altered the better. I think these men should be placed on the same basis.

Mr. GEORGE BLACK (Yukon): Mr. Speaker, it seems to me that the time has gone by for indulging in rhetoric in regard to returned soldiers' affairs and for declarations by speakers in various capacities of their affection or concern for the veterans. I think also the time has gone by for boasting as to how many men Canada sent to the front, how many were killed, and how much money we spent. Machinery has been set up for handling returned soldiers' problems, and it has been working now for several years. As I see it, the duty of such a committee as this, is to inspect that machinery, see how it is working and how it can be improved, and ascertain how the officials employed for the purpose are discharging their duties; and, having done all this, to report their findings to this House. Then I think it is the duty of the House and the Government to act on that report to the end that the consideration of these problems may be furthered and that returned soldiers requiring help may be assisted and their dependents who have been deprived of their natural breadwinners properly cared for at the expense of the state.

In going into matters necessarily coming before such a committee as this, one cannot refrain from a feeling of admiration for the late government in regard to the amount of work done and the very thorough manner in which these problems have been dealt with, plans have been prepared, and machinery set up for dealing with returned soldier problems. To such an extent has that work been perfected that the incoming Government found that machinery ready to hand and have had little to do but to carry on, except to introduce from time to time such improvements as circumstances make apparent.

Like members of the committee who have preceded me I can assure the House that every member was actuated by a desire to be just towards returned men and to assist them and their dependents, and the report of the committee is that legislation be introduced that will without doubt implement existing regulations for the benefit of returned men.

Speaking for a moment in regard to some of the details referred to in that report and in the discussion to-night. As to the advisability of the proposal to extend the payments due on land over a period of twenty-five years, and the criticism that men who have met their payments are put at a disadvantage under this proposal, and that during such a lengthy period the chattel property which is taken as security will of necessity disappear, I think that if the chattel property is taken as security, undoubtedly this property, in other words the equipment, will be renewed from time to time and in that way the security will not be impaired.

The sub-committee on land settlement has shown that the scheme is a good one for the country. But suppose it is not a profitable transaction for the country in general, as I take it the basic idea of the committee was not to make a profit but to relieve distress. The man who has been able to meet his payments as they become due and pay his way is not in distress, and if there were no delinquents there would be no necessity for extension of time, but it is the men, who in most cases through no fault of their own are now in default with their payments, that the committee wants to assist.

As to the question of canteen funds, the suggestion of the representatives of the various soldier institutions before the committee was:

> The federal government to appoint a board of trustees, such board to include representatives of the Government and at least six representative ex-service men, nominated by the Dominion Veterans' Alliance or succeeding amalgamated body, and to be empowered with the administration of the Canteen Funds and the interest thereof.
>
> Further that similar boards be created in each province with the object of definitely ascertaining the opinion of ex-service men and women in all sections of the country as to the most equitable means of distributing the said canteen funds.

Now, though not exactly in accord with that recommendation, I think the committee's recommendation is peculiarly along the same lines and will work to the same end. I have heard it suggested, and I think the department might very well consider such a suggestion, that the amount of the funds be allocated pro rata to the various constituencies, and that the returned soldiers within each of these constituencies be left to deal as they see fit with the amount allocated to their respective districts, leaving the matter entirely to them.

As to the housing scheme, although the committee did not see fit to adopt the suggestions made by the allied soldiers' organizations as to an elaborate housing scheme to be financed by the federal Government, I do think the House would be well advised in continuing the present or former policy of making advances to provincial governments, the provincial governments in turn giving credit to municipalities, and they,

in turn, to the returned men. In a number of municipalities that plan has worked out very satisfactorily; it has enabled a number of returned soldiers to own their own homes and has indirectly had a beneficial effect on the condition of unemployment.

In regard to the question of unemployment as referred to by the hon. member for West Calgary (Mr. Shaw) to-night, I think every member of the House is just as desirous as the hon. member for Calgary is to solve that problem. Of necessity, when unemployment exists, our returned soldiers suffer along with the rest of the population, and until general prosperity again comes to Canada the returned soldiers will feel the effects of lack of employment, as other people do. I regret that the hon. member for West Calgary, in making his criticism and offering his amendment, did not see fit to offer to the House, if he did not to the committee during its sessions, some solution of the problem of unemployment. It is easy to say that a problem should be solved, but who is going to do it?

There is one thing I feel I must comment on in regard to the reports of the proceedings of this committee. The general report is followed by a supplementary report, which was adopted at a meeting of the committee held on Friday, June 16. On that day there were two meetings of that committee, one of which took place in the morning, convening at 10.15, and, after a brief adjournment, lasting until nearly 3 o'clock in the afternoon. At that meeting amendments and resolutions were moved and proceedings had, but for some reason there is no printed report of that meeting or its proceedings. It has been omitted—skipped altogether, and without a report of the proceedings of that meeting on the morning of June 16 there is no reason why this supplementary report should be tacked on to the general rport.

Mr. MARLER: The meeting in the morning to which my hon. friend refers was an executive meeting. The proceedings are taken only when witnesses are present and give evidence.

Mr. BLACK (Yukon): I cannot distinguish between the meeting of the morning of June 16th and the meeting of the evening of June 16th in that respect, or the meeting that immediately preceded it, or any other meeting for that matter. They were all general meetings of the committee; no one was more an executive meeting than another. It was not a secret meeting; it was a regular meeting of the committee, and I submit that the proceedings of that committee should be published and presented as the other proceedings were.

Mr. MARLER: I quite agree with my hon. friend; I would be delighted to have the proceedings of these meetings taken down. We attempted to do so from the commencement of the meetings of the committee, but we were not able to prevail upon the authorities to have that done. The rules of the House are that evidence shall be taken down only where witnesses are present, not in the case of executive meetings of committees or meetings which consist simply of discussions between members of the committee. In other words, such meetings are not entitled to an official record. The hon. member will find that in all our committee meetings it is the rule that only when witnesses are present is a report taken. I quite agree, though, with what he says in that respect.

Mr. BLACK (Yukon): I do not know where the hon. member gets his authority for making such a statement, but I do say this: that the reports which are published are supposed to be complete reports of the proceedings of the committee; if they are not, they are of no use to us. I say that at that meeting, the report of which is omitted, important resolutions were presented, some lost and some carried; it was a very important meeting of the committee. Without that report I do not see what reason there is for tacking on the supplementary report to the general report of the committee, nor do I know what authority the chairman had for doing it. If we had had a report of what took place at the other meeting, an explanation of it might be found—but I do not think so.

As to the suggestion that an appeal board be created to which appeals from the decisions of the Pensions Board may be taken, I am bound to admit that the Pensions Board occupies a very difficult and delicate position. In the main, I think, their findings and their proceedings are fair, but there are cases in which appeal should be allowed to some board. Take the case of our courts: their decisions are for the most part, fair; they are usually right, but they are not always right; therefore you provide a court of appeal, and I submit there should be some court, some board to which applicants not receiving satisfaction from the Pensions Board should have the right of appeal. Whether

that board should be just as suggested by the committee or whether it should be some other sort of tribunal is a matter which, I think, can better be discussed when the bill is before the House.

I do not know that I would have been so positive in my opinion as to the necessity for an appeal board had it not been for the fact that as late as last evening the sub-committee on pensions had before it two cases. One was the case of a Mrs. White, a widow, of this city; the other was the case of Mrs. Saunders, a widow, also of this city. Both these cases had been considered by the Pensions Board; decision had been given against the applicants; appeal had again been made to the Pensions Board and a second decision given against the applicants. The sub-committee on pensions heard the applicants, heard the evidence on their behalf and heard also the Pensions Board, and decided in both cases that the Pensions Board was wrong and that the applications should have been granted. Of course, that sub-committee has no power over the Pensions Board, but that shows the extent to which different tribunals or persons differ in respect to evidence coming before them.

Mr. BELAND: May I ask my hon. friend whether the representatives of the Board of Pension Commissioners admitted that they had made a mistake?

Mr. BLACK (Yukon): No, they did not.

Mr. BELAND: There was a divergence of opinion, then, between the commissioners and the members of the committee?

Mr. BLACK (Yukon): So far the committee has had no reply from the Pensions Board as to what it will do in regard to the committee's recommendation. But the board had, both in the first instance and on appeal, turned down these two applications; and as I have said, having heard the applicants and their witnesses, and having heard the Pensions Board in reply, the committee came to the conclusion that the Pensions Board was wrong in both cases and that these widows should be pensioned. I trust that the minister will see that the recommendations of the committee are very seriously considered.

Mr. BELAND: I am willing to see to it, Mr. Speaker, but I may assure my hon. friend that my recommendations are treated by the Board of Pension Commissioners just as his own are.

Mr. BLACK (Yukon): That, I think, emphasizes my suggestion and the committee's suggestion that some tribunal should be established to which there could be an appeal from the decisions of the Pensions Board.

Mr. BELAND: That emphasizes also the fact that the Board of Pension Commissioners act quite independently of the minister.

Mr. BLACK (Yukon): I quite understand that.

As to the appointment of a royal commission, which is recommended in this supplementary report of the committee, and as to its scope, personally I am not in favour of enlarging the scope beyond the powers recommended by the committee. The committee has been in session for several months, has devoted a great deal of time and has done a great deal of work examining into questions affecting soldier's civil re-establishment, including pensions, and that work has not yet come to an end. The work of a royal commission in that respect would never come to an end. Such work will not come to an end in this generation. It will be considered not only by this Parliament but by succeeding parliaments in other sessions of the House for many years to come. The situation will be continually changing and new problems will arise for consideration. I submit that we have a fully equipped and duly constituted department of government, the Department of Soldiers' Civil Re-establishment, presided over by a minister who will give the matter of soldiers' civil re-establishment sympathetic attention. That department, I submit, is quite competent to deal with these questions, with the special assistance which is sought to be given to it at each session by a special committee of this House, and I see no reason why the whole matter should be turned over to any royal commission. The question as to the necessity of a royal commission arose out of certain publicly stated charges in a strongly worded communication made to the press by the secretary of the G.W.V.A., in which he openly charged the Pension Board with a contemptible and cold-blooded conspiracy to deprive ex- service men of their rights previously granted by Parliament. It was evidently the desire of the Government, or at any rate with the consent of the Government, that the chairman of the committee introduced such a resolution, because he would never have presented it if he had not been quite sure that the Government would be satisfied with it.

Mr. MARLER: May I correct my hon. friend? The suggestion was entirely my own, after several days consultation with these various officials, all of which I advised in the body of the committee.

Mr. BLACK (Yukon): I am very glad indeed that my hon. friend agrees with me. I did not for one moment suggest that what is contained in the resolution is not his own suggestion, but what I do say is that he must have felt confident that what is contained in the resolution would meet with the approval of the Government, or else he would never have introduced it.

Mr. MARLER: No more so than I felt that any other part of the report would meet with the Government's approval.

Mr. BLACK (Yukon): That may be so, too. As to Mr. MacNeil, the secretary of the Great War Veterans' Association, I am sure the committee is under an obligation to that gentleman for the assistance he has rendered it in the marshalling of facts relating to the various problems before it. As to whether he was justified in using the language and making the statement he did with regard to the Pension Board, that was not a matter to be considered by the committee. I take it that it is not a matter to be considered by the House at this time. In the opinion of the committee, it is a matter for a royal commission, whose report will be presented in due time.

As to the question of an additional cash bonus to be paid by the Government to returned soldiers, that also was urged upon the committee by the representatives of returned soldiers' organizations, but the committee could not meet their views on that question. I think that by this time the Government of the day must be fairly well persuaded of the difficulties which its predecessors encountered in dealing with such questions, and I am inclined to think that perhaps it may regret that even as late as December last the dissatisfaction existing among returned men was fostered and increased by the promise of a cash bonus, which I doubt if hon. gentlemen opposite ever had the slightest idea of carrying out. The shoe is on the other foot to-day and the Government is experiencing the difficulties its predecessors had to meet with, and I think it must realize that its predecessors did everything that was humanly possible to deal fairly with these questions, as I believe the Government of the day is also doing.

12 m.

As to other suggested amendments to the act, hon. members will have an opportunity when the bill comes before the committee of offering appropriate amendments, and I do not think that they will be in any wise hampered or limited in their suggestions by what the committee may have recommended in its report. The report is simply to assist the House and the Government. It must of necessity have its limitations, because it could not possibly cover the whole subject.

As to the returned soldiers in my constituency, I am happy to say that neither in the past nor in the present has the Government been subjected to any annoyance or any extraordinary applications from them. I am happy to say that due to the very generous and very proper action of the Minister of Militia, quite a large number of returned soldiers who enlisted from the Yukon have now been enabled to return to that territory, where remunerative employment awaits them. They were interrupted in their journey home. They could have gone home at government expense immediately on discharge but for various reasons they were delayed, and now when an application was made on their behalf to the Department of Militia, authority was extended for them to complete their journey at Government expense, which is a very happy solution of the difficulty.

The efforts of the committee, of the House, and indeed of the whole country, on behalf of returned soldiers will by no means reach a finality at this session. The matter cannot be brought to a conclusion during this generation, and I do not think that hon. members of this House should send out to the public, and to the returned soldiers particularly, anything in the way of criticism that would lead them to suppose that their interests are not being properly served in so far as it is humanly possible for that to be done by the members of this House.

Mr. E. R. E. CHEVRIER (Ottawa): There are at this moment two thoughts uppermost in my mind and at this late hour I shall endeavour to express them in as few words as possible, and at the same time with the utmost sincerity. I first desire to thank and congratulate the chairman of the special committee, and the hon. members who composed it, for the very careful attention which they have given to the preparation of this very elaborate report.

The second thought in my mind is, that the sentiment that underlies this question and that permeates this whole discussion is the desire to re-establish the returned men and the dependents of those who failed to return.

This House sits as a jury with the imperative obligation cast upon it to do its duty loyally and fearlessly, and that duty is to place the returned men and the dependents of those who failed to return as nearly as possible in the position they were in before they went overseas to win an everlasting debt of gratitude from humanity. That duty we owe to them, and the thought that we should have in our minds at any time when we approach this question should be that these men have deserved well of their country.

Mr. D. W. WARNER (Strathcona): Mr. Speaker, I would like to have a few minutes to voice my approval of the report of this committee. I have given considerable thought to the problem of the returned man, and, especially, to the land settlement part of the scheme. Since I have heard the evidence, and have learned the conclusions of the committee, I have changed my mind somewhat. I had an idea that we needed a revaluation. I believe yet that we need it, but, after learning more of the difficulties than I knew before seeing the report of the committee, and talking with different members of that committee, I have made up my mind that their report, relinquishing the interest, will, perhaps, give better satisfaction, and less trouble, than if these properties were revalued, as I at first thought would require to be done. I have had considerable correspondence, and have discussed this matter, with the returned men personally, and I feel that they seriously need some sort of help and a relinquishment of their obligations. I have nothing to say in the way of criticism, particularly, of the scheme we have undertaken, but at the time that it was undertaken, with the experience I had had in farming, I was quite sure that many of the men could not come through and make good, with the obligations that were imposed on them at the time they received their loans. I am not complaining of the way the money was spent. I believe that all the care was given that it would have been possible to give to the re-establishment of those men, with that amount of money, at that time. Everything was at the peak of high prices, and I could see, as I thought, that difficulty was coming to the men who were loading up with that heavy obligation, and investing in property that must come down in price, especially the live stock that they bought, and I had warned many of them who talked to me regarding this matter, and told them of this difficulty. I felt that men who had had experience for years would hardly have undertaken to carry through such a scheme, financed altogether on borrowed money, and it looked to me, at the prices they were paying, that it was going to be almost impossible to succeed. At the same time, I approved personally of it, and I believe that it was a good idea to give all the men that were capable and willing to go on the land an opportunity of doing so. I believe, as the committee have reported, that those men placed on the land have have been an asset to the country and perhaps a better asset than if they had not been established on the land. At the same time those men have been considered by some people a liability, but I have not looked at it that way myself.

While there is no use attempting to enumerate the glorious achievements of these men in the field of battle, I feel that we cannot pay them in money for what they did for Canada. I do not think we will ever be able to discharge that obligation with money, but if we revalue their land by cutting off the interest, and make it possible for them to make good, we will prevent them becoming, perhaps, a liability, more or less, to the Dominion. The loss is already made through the shrinkage in value, and if these men could not make good after the deflation had taken place, then the government, or the people of Canada, would have to assume the property that these men have been given under this loan. That loan was made, and I approve of the idea of the committee in allowing these men to make good by cutting off the interest and will make good when given the opportunity of getting three years' use of the money, without paying interest.

If it is necessary, to enable these men to make good on their homes, and get them paid for in a reasonable length of time, I am in favour of going even further, when it becomes necessary to do so. I feel that if the country needs to go further in that direction, it is little enough for us to do, and, therefore, I approve of giving these men that opportunity. They would be discouraged, and they would, perhaps, join the other discouraged unemployed people

in this country, if we did not keep them on the land and give them the opportunity to make good. We have millions of acres of land yet in Canada that should be put into use by someone, and who should, if not our soldiers, get the right to take the land and receive all the encouragement, in a financial way or in any other way, that we can give them, to enable them to go ahead and establish their homes, after they have made their great fight for liberty and humanity. Then, I say, Mr. Speaker, it is up to the Canadian people to give these men an opportunity to have homes of their own, whether they went to the front or whether they stayed at home and did their duty. We all enjoy our homes, and I am quite sure that many will make good if they receive the kind of encouragement that the committee has held out to them.

Mr. L. J. LADNER: (Vancouver South): At this late hour, I would not detain the House more than a few moments.

Some hon. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

Mr. LADNER: I believe the atmospheric conditions of the Chamber seem charged with a lightning haste-for-home-spirit, and I do not propose to stand in the way of the lightning. There are two or three matters in connection with this question which have not been brought out in the House. My purpose in rising at this late hour is to say, Mr. Speaker, that these are matters which could be well considered when the Government faces the problem of bringing down both bills, and carrying out the provisions contained in this report. The report contains two divisions. It contains some matters which are specifically discussed, and the nature of the legislation is set out. There are further matters that are referred to generally and a sort of directory notice to the House and the Government to carry on their investigations. As regards the former, we shall be favoured, in a few days, I presume, with some bills. As regards the latter, I hope the proposed royal commission will have sufficient scope to inquire into them. I wish very strongly to stand behind the amendment of the hon. member for West Calgary (Mr. Shaw) as regards the appointment of the royal commission. The problems of the returned soldiers are so complex that they cannot be undertaken and worked out by a parliamentary committee or by a government; but they can, perhaps, more effectively be worked out by some body which is empowered to investigate the matter and which can come to an intelligent conclusion. I wish to urge upon hon. members the wisdom of extending the scope of this commission to inquire, not only into questions in relation to the charges made by the Great War Veterans' Association and the secretary of that association in connection with the Pension Board, but into the wider field.

The question of unemployment is dealt with in this report. We have all been faced at one time or another by that question; but I would urge upon the Government, the Minister of Labour (Mr. Murdock) and the Prime Minister (Mr. Mackenzie King) the necessity and expediency of preparing at this moment for the unemployment question of next winter. We are going to have unemployment next winter; and if plans are not laid now, we are going to be faced with a very serious question when the fall and winter months come on.

Some time ago the matter was raised in the form of a question in this House about the payment of exchange on money coming from the Old Country to Canadian soldiers and Imperials in this country. The matter was referred to the committee, and the committee has made a report that this be extended until June of this year. I wish to submit to the House and to the Minister of Finance (Mr. Fielding) that, according to my information, accounts between Great Britain and Canada have never been balanced. In other words, a balance has never been struck as to which is the creditor and which the debtor, and under those circumstances, certainly payment has not been made. Prior to this date and for some time past the credits and debits have been worked out on a basis of a common denominator, $4.68⅔ being used, so that accounts which were paid by the Canadian government in Great Britain would be paid by loans in sterling by the British government and the account of Canada over there would be credited. That is the information I have, and I think it is correct. The point I wish to make is this, that, until the balance is actually struck and paid, soldiers on this side of the water should be given their cheques and their payments at par, because if that is not done and whatever balance exists is carried on for a number of years, it is easily conceivable that exchange may by that time be righted, and the Government will find itself in possession of a profit out of the small exchange taken off soldiers' accounts. I know the Government does not want that. I may be mistaken; but I might tell the Minister of Fin-

ance that my information comes from a very reliable source. I make the suggestion that that portion of the report should be carried out with that thought in mind.

The report contains a reference to burials. This is really a matter for the committee, and I hesitate to refer to it in the House; but the committee has evidently seen fit to make provision for burials of ex-members of the Canadian Expeditionary Force in cases of destitution. My suggestion to the House is that that provision should be extended to the widows and pensioned children of ex-members of the Canadian Expeditionary Force where destitute cases arise. That is not provided for in this report, and as I understand it has been considered, it cannot be said that the matter has been overlooked. I would like to urge that very strongly on the House. I think it is only fair, and I do not think there is in Canada a citizen who would hesitate for one moment over the slight additional expenditure which would be required. Sentiment so over-rides the question of expediency on account of economy or parsimony, that I am sure the Government would be commended rather than condemned for an extension of generosity in that respect.

Another point which has not been discussed is the case where the full gratuity is paid to a widow whose husband has returned, but who has died before receiving the gratuity. That is, an ex-soldier comes to Canada; before he gets his gratuity, he dies, and his widow is then able to claim and collect the full gratuity. On the contrary, the widow of a man who happens to die overseas in England receives, I understand, only one-third of the gratuity. This matter is not referred to in the report. I do not know why it is omitted; but my suggestion to the House and to the minister is that consideration be given to the fairness of paying the gratuity to the widow who happens to lose her husband on the other side of the water instead of on this side. Why that situation should exist, I do not know; but I am told on reliable authority that it does exist.

I wish to commend the committee for bringing in a favourable report as regards the Camp Lister and Courtenay soldier settlers in British Columbia. A confusion and an unfortunate experience exist there in which the Government will do right to come to the assistance of those soldiers. The recommendation contained in the report is that an official should be appointed to go there, to look into this problem, with the idea of co-operation between provincial and Dominion officials in that connection. I might say, for the benefit of some hon. members who may not be informed on the subject, that these men took up community settlements on some kind of a tentative arrangement, that was not in writing, that they would pay, on a pro rata basis according to the value of the land taken up, the cost of clearing and developing those lands. It was found that there was extravagance; that the expenditure was altogether out of proportion to the value of the land. These men have spent their time and labour; they have stayed there with their wives and families in the hope of getting some solution of the question. They are faced with insurmountable obstacles and are in poverty. This is a matter which a competent official can well handle by going out there on behalf of the Government.

In conclusion, I would say a word on the question of insurance. The act of 1919 contained, necessarily, an insurance element. Since then modifications by statute have taken place; interpretation by regulation has been carried out, and the actual operation of the act is now entirely different from what it was in 1919. That, in my opinion, was due to some confusion which arose from the fact that we endeavoured to provide for the permanent force as distinct from the Canadian Expeditionary Force, and that the provision was all put into one section. This matter might be more effectively considered when the bill is brought down; but I should like to intimate to the minister that I have an amendment to propose in that respect when the bill is before the House. The purport of this amendment is, in a word, that men who enlist with an original disability and who have aggravation during service, will in case of disease, be entitled to claim pension, even though the aggravation be reduced to the original disability and even though the case be one after 1st September, 1920. The question of defining and drawing a line of demarcation between the original disability and the aggravation is fraught with so many obstacles as has been the experience of many hon. members on the Pension Committee, and my own experience, that I believe there should be some provision in the act giving greater power to the commission to render justice to some claimants who in my opinion have not received it. My last point, Mr. Speaker—

An hon. MEMBER: Hear, hear.

Mr. LADNER: An hon. gentleman says "hear, hear". I presume he wants to speak, and I promise him that I will sit and listen to him when he gets up. My last point, which I submit is a very important one, is with reference to the question of appeal. I suggest to the Government that instead of the appeal being made to a special board of appeal it should be made to the courts of the land which already exist, so that any man may have the right to have his case properly decided, just as any civil case would be decided on appeal.

Mr. CALDWELL: Does the hon. member realize the expense that would devolve upon the returned soldier? Under the present arrangement he has no expense.

Mr. LADNER: Under the present arrangement he has no expense because he is denied all rights of appeal.

Mr. CALDWELL: I am referring to the present recommendation.

Mr. LADNER: The recommendation of the committee has reference to a limited class of appeals, purely on medical questions where there is a difference between a local doctor and the medical board. But there may be other questions to be decided. I have known cases to come before the committee where, in my opinion, as a lawyer, I thought the board was entirely wrong in construeing statutes. There is only one effective way of reaching a sound conclusion in matters of appeal, and that is by having disputed questions settled by a judiciary of trained minds. The case in the first instance, is submitted for the plaintiff and for the defendant, the issues are stated clearly and fairly before the court, and the judge decides on the evidence before him. Under this system there is the least possibility of injustice.

Mr. BELAND: I know my hon. friend is a learned and able lawyer, but does he seriously think that what he proposes is really feasible, that appeals should be permitted to the courts of the land in the matter of pensions? My hon. friend is surely aware that the Board of Pension Commissioners decide thousands of cases during the course of a year, and appeals would be extremely costly if they were taken to the courts; and in the case of an appeal being turned down by the court, who would pay the costs? Naturally, the soldier. Where all the circumstances have been carefully looked into by a body of men such as the Board of Pension Commissioners, who have the benefit of expert medical advice, the presumption is that in most cases the decision is right. In most cases I have no doubt that if resort were had to the courts the appeal would be turned down, the soldiers would have to pay the cost, and they would come to the Government to be reimbursed.

Mr. LADNER: Undoubtedly there are objections. But it does not necessarily follow, because the Board of Pension Commissioners have a large number of cases to deal with, and they would all be taken before the courts. In any city there are hundreds of cases that are dealt with, but they are generally all sifted before the trial judge, just as these cases would be sifted before the Board of Pension Commissioners. But the right of appeal from the decision of the board would have a beneficial effect on their judgment, and they would be apt to exercise more care in arriving at decisions. The minister says that the process would be expensive to the appellant. Well, I have no doubt that in matters of such great consequence to the soldiers as a body, some returned soldiers' organization would be only too willing to take one of these cases before the courts in order to obtain a proper and just decision. The Board of Pension Commissioners have no doubt had a wide experience, but they are only human, like the minister and myself; whereas our courts are constituted of men more learned in the law than either of us. I know of cases, such as the hon. member for Yukon (Mr. Black) has referred to, where a decision has been given by the ordinary trial judge, which, on being taken to another body of learned justices, has been entirely reversed; and on being referred to the Supreme Court of Canada the first decision has been upheld. This shows the extreme care that is exercised by the judiciary of the land. Whatever disadvantages in the way of expense may attach to appeals to the courts, I think that any man who desires to avail himself of the courts should have the right to do so. Why should he be denied that right? Why should a group of pension commissioners arrogate to themselves the final decision on the question? The principle is unsound. It does not further the interests of the board, nor does it render justice to the men. Our courts are used to weighing expert evidence on questions relating to every walk of life. They consider and weigh medical testimony, testi-

mony with regard to mining and engineering, evidence in structural cases, and cases having to do with shipping and architecture, and other matters of this kind. All this evidence is submitted to the courts and is weighed and sifted by them. Now, with all deference to the Board of Pension Commissioners, I say that the medical men on the board are very apt to allow their technical views to interfere with their judgment, and attach more importance to evidence from their own point of view than to the essential facts that are submitted to them. Now, I promised that I would be brief, and I shall now conclude. I have discussed this matter with many hon. members and with people who understand it, and I say that any man who desires to avail himself of the courts of the land in this matter should have the right to do so.

Mr. J. L. BROWN (Lisgar): Mr. Speaker, I realize that those of us who continue this debate at this late hour of the night run the risk of losing whatever reputation for good judgment we may possess. At the same time this is a subject on which I have felt that I would like to make a few remarks, but these remarks will necessarily be much more brief than I would have made them had the hour not been so late.

When I began my duties upon this special committee I felt somewhat handicapped by the fact that I knew very little of the various statutes under which the work of soldiers' civil re-establishment was being carried on. I only knew that I wanted this country to discharge as fully as possible its obligations to our returned soldiers. I have experienced a great deal of pleasure in the work of the committee, for the reason that the relationships there were very pleasant; there were no disposition on the part of anyone, so far as I saw, to do anything else than to carry out to the best of his ability the duty entrusted to him. I felt we were all animated by the one purpose of fulfilling our obligations. Indeed, it seemed to me the conditions were almost ideal in that none was seeking his own interest but all were seeking the welfare of others.

At the same time while I have had some pleasure in that work, I also feel a measure of regret—regret that perhaps we were not able to do all that might have been expected of us or all that we would like to have done. The immensity of the problems we had to consider were impressed upon me then as never before, and if any person thinks that these problems can be finally settled by the appointment of a royal commission or by any other means within the next few years, he must have his mind disabused of the idea. These problems will be before us in some form or another for many years to come. Every one who is given to serious reflection must have felt the tremendous tragedy that we witnessed when about two hundred and fifty veterans marched from Toronto to Ottawa and assembled on the green outside the House. The spectacle impressed itself upon my mind as one of the tragedies of the war and one of the problems which to me seemed to be almost impossible of solution.

I shall not attempt to discuss at any length the various phases of the report. I had intended to say something upon the question of "attributability to service" which very early in the meetings of the committee was impressed upon me as one of the great problems that we have to consider. As the years go by an increasing number of men will be falling into ill-health, and the question of attributability to service will become more and more difficult of a solution. I will only say this, that I think we have taken the only possible step in regard to that question in recommending the means whereby an appeal may be made upon that question.

I was not upon the sub-committee that dealt with the soldiers' settlement question. That is the one question on which I had intended to make somewhat lengthy remarks; however, for the reason already stated, I shall be very brief. As one who knows what it is to work upon the land and the conditions by which those so engaged are surrounded, this is the one question I did feel competent to express an opinion upon. I felt very keenly, perhaps more keenly than many have done, that there was grave danger of the whole scheme being brought to naught because of the conditions into which we have fallen. Indeed, I expressed these views when, in my capacity as President of the United Farmers of Manitoba, at one of the annual conventions some years ago I stated that I thought the conditions that surrounded agriculture made it quite possible that the whole scheme of soldiers' land settlement would be brought to naught, and I still feel that we are faced with that possibility.

I believe that that scheme was entered upon in all good faith, and I would not think for a moment of casting any reflec-

tion upon those who initiated and carried the scheme into effect. I know that much of that work was done by men who are thoroughly sympathetic and honest in carrying out the duties entrusted to them. It was my privilege to be in close contact with the qualifications board which sat in Winnipeg. I know some of the men who sat upon that board were eminently qualified to perform their duties, and I believe they discharged those duties as well as any other men could possibly have done. At the same time, knowing the circumstances under which they worked, the difficulties they had to encounter, the way in which soldiers themselves were apt to look upon this scheme of farming as something that any person could take up successfully, I realized that mistakes had been made by that board.

I wish I could feel so sure that some of the work done in the inspection of land had been done as well as the work of the qualifications board. Undoubtedly some at least of the land upon which our returned men were allowed to settle should never have been taken up by any one at all. I do not want to speak of the inspections as a whole, for I would not wish to deal with anything that has not come within my personal knowledge. I considered it my duty to visit the country between the lakes, in Manitoba known as the Amaranth district, and although perhaps it would be too strong to say that none of the land should have been settled upon, there can be no doubt that much of what is occupied to-day by returned soldiers can never be brought into such a state of cultivation as will provide satisfactory homes for the men who are undertaking farming operations there. I felt very keenly therefore the necessity for some scheme of re-valuation, and I have urged that very strongly.

I wrote home to many of my constituents to get from them statements in regard to the deflation of land values. Invariably they tell me that land has depreciated 30, 40 and 50 per cent. My opinion has always been that land has been held too high, that even those who were not soldier settlers but buying on their own initiative were paying prices that were not warranted if we were to consider their investment in land from the same standpoint as an investment in any other line of business. I felt, and urged very strongly the need for re-valuation as time went on. I was constantly in contact with the chairman of the sub-committee and I felt that perhaps the scheme they were advocating was the wisest possible under the circumstances.

We must look upon this scheme then not as an attempt to do something for the returned soldiers, but to consider it, as has been pointed out, as a colonization scheme. We must look at it only from that standpoint. How can we best protect the interests of the country, at the same time trying to do the best we can for the men who have taken land under that scheme? I do not feel that any further discussion of this matter is necessary at this time. I hope so. I hope with all my heart that proposed, and while I admit the full force of the objections made by the right hon. leader of the Opposition (Mr. Meighen), I feel that what has been offered to us as a settlement of this problem is the best solution that can be offered at this time. It seems to me that the country is face to face with an inevitable loss; I am by no means satisfied that even under the arrangement that has been suggested we shall be able to avoid a very great loss in the future, nor am I satisfied that even with the help that may be afforded by returned men under these proposals, many of them will not fall by the wayside. Perhaps I have been unduly pessimistic in regard to this scheme; I hope not. I hope with all my heart that it may fulfil the objects had in view by those who brought it into being and that the suggestions that have been made will put us further on the way toward the solution of this and our other problems.

Mr. A. E. ROSS (Kingston): Mr. Speaker, I crave the indulgence of the House while I discuss this subject for a short time, and I trust that what I have to say will be in the way of suggestion in regard to what has been done in the past as well as in regard to what may be done in the future in respect to this matter.

Re-establishment of returned soldiers is a very old question. We are treating it, perhaps, as a new question, but re-establishment has come down through the ages; ever since history has given us any account of war, nations have endeavoured to place their soldiers in such a position that they may become useful and contented citizens. Many of England's colonies have been built up as a result of England's endeavour to provide for soldiers who had taken part in her wars. Canada also has done something along this line. I am sure we are all proud of the report that was brought in to-day, a report which indicates that Canada is making a sincere effort to deal in a satisfactory way with this question.

Never before had such large numbers of our men been in the field; never before had we had so many disabled men to provide for. As far as medical aid could restore these men, it was applied; new departments were created and administrative machinery set up to take care of the various classes of cases. There is no doubt that mistakes have been made; mistakes must be made in dealing with these matters. But a certain amount of criticism has been offered to-night in respect to the medical profession, and I wish for a few moments to refer to those criticisms.

Criticism has been offered in respect to the examination of the men. I do not think, however, that the blame should rest entirely on the shoulders of the medical profession. Practically all the medical men who had been trained in the needs and conditions and regulations of the service had gone to the front, and the medical men left behind had no acquaintance with these matters. It is the old story over again; if you are to have success, you must have training. Men who know nothing about military service and military regulations cannot with any success examine men for military service. Moreover, new conditions had arisen which we had never met before, and only those who had been at the front were familiar with those conditions and were in a position satisfactorily to examine men for service at the front. There were also varying conditions of enlistment; and I want to differ from those who say that there were not different degrees of physical fitness involved. Take, for example, one unit which was largely recruited in British Columbia, the First Canadian Pioneers. These men were given to understand that they were going out for special service as carpenters, plumbers, and so on, at the front, but when they reached the front they found that as a unit they had to perform quite a different service from that for which they had been recruited. The result was that many of these men suffered greatly through the service and became disabled. In addition to that, men were recruited as bandsmen, but when they reached England they found that the bands were not to be used very much at the front, and they had to go into some other service, though they were not fit men. All these criticisms fall upon the medical profession, though, as you will see, they were not entirely responsible for the conditions to which I have referred. There were conditions of enlistment and of service in respect to which the men at the back were not as well informed as the men at the front, and that was one cause of dissatisfaction. I think that if we could get to the bottom of the causes of dissatisfaction we might, perhaps, solve these problems more easily.

I wish to refer now to another cause of dissatisfaction along medical lines. There is no doubt that many medical men have been and are engaged in the examination and treatment of men and in the disposition of their cases who know nothing about what the conditions were at the front. If you could get medical men to-day who, by their service with units at the front, are familiar with the effects of the different forms of gas—because they are not all treated alike—who are familiar with the effects of mustard gas, of chlorine gas, of combined gas, then you could solve many difficulties; you could alleviate many of the troubles from which the men are suffering to-day. I will give you an instance of the disadvantage resulting from a lack of knowledge of the unit service. I went into a hospital after I came back from the front, in which there was a ward occupied by men who were supposed to be cases of shell shock. I asked the medical officer in charge if he had ever found out from these men where they served or with what unit they served. Well, the very first man I questioned—and he was supposed to be a case of shell shock—told me that he had been with the forestry corps. Now, you must not run away with the idea that all men in the forestry corps were not within the zones where shelling was carried on; a great many men in those units were men who had become unfits at the front and had been marked as "B" men and sent to the forestry corps. But this man had never been near France, and had the medical officer in charge of that ward been familiar with the service of the different units he would have been able to deal with the case more intelligently. If, therefore, you can distinguish between men who are really disabled or who are suffering as unfits; if you can separate the sham from the real thing, you will get rid of a good deal of dissatisfaction. The real man of service to-day is often ashamed to go into the hospital because he would have to associate with men who never gave much service. These different classes can be distinguished only by the medical officer who has had actual service at the front.

If you get that, you will get rid of a great deal of dissatisfaction. The man feels that he cannot get the sympathy of the medical officer. If he felt that he had the sympathy of the medical officer, that he was dealing with a man who was acquainted with the conditions under which he served, I think there would be a great deal more satisfaction. I have not had any great trouble in the cases that I have taken up personally. It was simply a case of getting a medical officer who understood the service the man had given, the conditions under which he had served at the front and the possibility of disability, then your case went on with sympathy between the disabled and the medical officer. In the same way, I find a great deal of dissatisfaction among the tubercular men. To me it is not a question of the duration of the disease. It is simply a question whether the man has been in touch with conditions which would produce or aggravate tuberculosis, and I do not think there is any great difficulty in determining that. You cannot get two men who will tell you that a certain case of tuberculosis began two months, six months or a year ago. The question is did that man serve under conditions which were likely to produce that condition? He should be given the benefit of the doubt in every case. I think all that is needed to give more satisfaction is first to get men who have had knowledge of conditions at the front, secondly, sympathetic treatment, and then you can settle any case.

Coming to the question of the appointment of a royal commission, to my mind this question is really a legal one. It could have been settled in twenty minutes or half an hour by reference to the Justice Department, and that was the stand I took in the committee. There is a judicial department here which would in a short time have given a decision as to whether the Pension Board was correct or not, but if this recommendation is accepted we will have a royal commission sitting for months and months, and as the hon. member who has just spoken has said, you will never get a settlement of this question. Why do I say that? The conditions of this war will produce conditions which you will meet with for years. The effect of high explosive shells, the smashing and destruction it has produced on the bone, will go on for years and years, and your surgical men will be operating on these cases and removing pieces of diseased bone for years and years to come. This country must realize that it has this question on its hands. I have no hope that a few years will wipe out the conditions produced by the war. You will have more tubercular men, more heart disease cases, more kidney disease cases, as the result of the war in the next five or ten years than you have had altogether in the past, if my diagnosis of the conditions under which these men served is correct, and I was with these men for five years. Therefore, I have not been in any great sympathy with that part of the report which recommends that the military hospitals be done away with as speedily as possible, although I concur in the report for we cannot all come to the same conclusion. My reasons for not being in sympathy with that recommendation are these: These men can be treated in military hospitals in a way in which they cannot be treated in the general hospitals, because the general hospitals in this country have not the electrical equipment and the equipment for massage, and the masseurs and masseuses that the military hospitals have. Special treatment is given in these military hospitals for which the general hospitals are not at present equipped. The men in the military hospitals are living under healthier conditions to-day than at a general hospital. Furthermore, the general hospitals have not the accommodation that will be required in the future.

1 a.m. Therefore, I can see that this department and these hospitals must continue in operation for some years to come if the soldiers of this country are to get the treatment and the justice they deserve.

I am not going to say anything further to-night. I have spoken of medical conditions only as I found them. The suggestions I have made with regard to using men who have had large experience at the front, I think will tend to offset a great deal of dissatisfaction that is met with at the present time.

Mr. WILLIAM IRVINE (East Calgary): Any hon. gentleman who addresses the House at this late hour should assure the House that he will not speak very long, so I give the assurance now. If it had not been that there are a few things which seem to me have not been emphasized sufficiently I do not think I would have inflicted myself upon the House as I have been afflicted by many this evening. It has been a very happy discussion on the whole. There has been a very marked unanimity of opinion on the question be-

fore us. Almost every hon. member who has spoken has expressed himself as being favourable to doing the utmost possible to solve the returned soldiers' problems Some hon. members have even gone so far as to say it was well to keep this question out of politics. That statement was a strong indictment of our politics, but I should hope to see the day when we will discuss all questions as we have discussed this one, namely on their merits.

I have a few observations to make. I believe that the task before this committee was a very complicated one, very difficult indeed for a parliamentary committee to handle. I am pleased to support the amendment moved by the hon. member for West Calgary (Mr. Shaw) and I am in hopes that the Government will take it into consideration and possibly include it in the main motion. There is much dissatisfaction throughout Canada among the ranks of the returned soldiers, as has been evidenced by the agitation that has taken place in the past few years. No doubt the committee has been convinced of this from the evidence it has received.

I wish to emphasize very briefly a few cases that have not been provided for in the report of the committee but which I think are important. First of all I mention the neurotic cases, what might be called the sub-normal men who seem to be in perfect health on physical examination but who owing to certain neurotic conditions are unable to work except intermittently and are thereby really unfitted for work, because employers of labour do not wish to hire men of that type. Something should be done for this class.

Then there is the class of older men who went to the front and who came back perhaps fairly fit physically but who have lost a very great deal through their war service and who have been made practically unfit for work. They to-day are a clog on the labour market. Something should be done for them.

Then there are the tubercular cases, which have been emphasized by a number of speakers. I want to mention this class especially because I have a couple of telegrams here from soldiers' organizations with regard to tubercular cases. I believe there should be a definite system for giving after care and sheltered employment to the tubercular patients. I think such a policy would be good not only for the country but most excellent for the men themselves. I shall not take up the time

of the House to read these telegrams. The hon. member for West Calgary has read one, of which I received a copy; the other is from the Tuberculosis Veterans' Association of Ninette, Manitoba.

Then there should be something done with the men who have taken vocational training, so that they may be properly fitted to take their part in the work for which they have been training; otherwise the time already spent shall have been wasted. The failure of vocational training in this respect constitutes one of the grievances of returned men. The classifications seem to be so varied, the degrees of disability so different and the information so difficult to get, that it is a question for a royal commission, such as has been suggested by the amendment. Many of the difficulties that these returned soldiers are complaining of to-day are of such a character as to require judicial decisions that a parliamentary committee is not in a position to give. A royal commission, for instance, could visit many parts of the country and take evidence of varying kinds. That commission would be in a position to assemble its knowledge and its data gathered, and to form a basis for legislation to take effect later. For these reasons I favour referring all returned soldiers' questions to a royal commission.

I want to refer, briefly, to one or two points of more or less importance that were mentioned by the committee. First of all, I will refer to the canteen fund. I have a telegram here signed by Mr. Petley, of the Great War Veterans of Calgary. I believe the hon. member from West Calgary received a copy also and has already given it to the House. I will not repeat it, but merely mention it so as to show that the returned soldier organization is very much interested in this question. They are opposed to this committee, or this Parliament, having anything to do with the fund known as the canteen fund, which really belongs to the men. I hold the opinion that, in so far as spending this money on education is concerned, as the report advises, that would not be fair to the men. Education of the children of fallen soldiers is the business of the state, and is being undertaken to some extent by the provinces. This canteen fund should be spent in a manner satisfactory to the men themselves and should be decided by a committee, upon which committee the men should have representation.

I want very briefly to speak on unemployment, because that is, perhaps, the

most important question touched on by the committee. I want, first of all, to quote very briefly a few figures dealing with the number of soldiers in our western cities that were on the relief list last winter. The hon. member from West Calgary gave the House some figures showing the extent of unemployment among returned soldiers. I am speaking of those who were forced to accept relief from the relief committees of Winnipeg and Vancouver at certain dates last winter. I have not the figures for all the cities. I am quoting from the report given by the Manitoba government Department of Labour. This is dated February, 1921—

In Winnipeg at the present day there are approximately 1,400 families obtaining relief and 900 single men. Of these there an 270 married returned men and 220 of them returned soldiers who are single.

I have a report also from the city of Vancouver relief camp, which states that there were, in that city, 1,273 single men receiving relief last December. Of these 608 were returned soldiers. So that you see a considerable number of our returned soldiers were forced to accept the dole system in this country,—their home for which they fought in France. I have here the report which appeared in a Vancouver paper giving a very sad picture, indeed, of a Canadian returned soldier in New York, who is forced to beg to get a bite to eat. The heading is:

Canadian Soldier Homeless and Ill-Clad in New York, gassed and wounded Overseas unable to get employment.

I am not going to take up the time of the House to read this report but I will tell the House that this man was practically incapacitated for work, having been gassed. He tried every possible means of finding work in Canada, eventually he went to New York, could not find work there, was forced to beg for a meal, and was taken to the court. In the court, he was so ashamed of the fact that he had to beg that he broke down and cried. The judge refused to sentence the man, a collection was taken up and he received some money from the court. That is a very sad case indeed, only one case, of course, in the United States, but you will see from the report of the figures I have given that when you come to Canada that is not an isolated case. There were, indeed, very many of these cases during the last winter, and, so far as I can see, there will be more during the winter coming. I have a letter from a returned soldier, from which I will read an extract to show what hope he has for the next winter, and, incidentally, I hope the department under which this young man is working will take notice of his grievances, as he states them in this letter and if correct, I am sure the department will take steps to give relief. He says that he is working as an unskilled labourer on a survey party, under the Dominion government and the wages have been cut from $93 per month to $45 per month which is practically a 50 per cent reduction. This letter is written to Mr. Russell, President of the G.W.V.A. of Calgary, and was forwarded to me for purposes of investigation. This letter says further:

"The reduction has only been made on the unskilled men. As to the few inquiries I have made I find that the instrument men and cook are getting the same as last year, only that 50 cents a day has been taken off and held back till the end of the season's work, which they call the bonus. I understand that less money was appropriated this year for the work, and it seems to me to save any reduction in their own wages they are making such a dig into ours. Of course, those 600 applications for positions on the survey parties as stated in the daily papers gave them an idea we would accept anything, like kicking a man when he is down. What with the wear and tear of our clothes through the bush we will have very little to start the winter months with, so our only hope is that McKillop will have his hotel as usual during the coming winter months and there is every prospect of us being his guests."

The McKillop referred to here is the man who is in charge of the relief work in Calgary, and who keeps a shelter for those who have no means of support. That is a very sad outlook for this returned man as indeed it is for all other men who have to live by their work in these days of industrial depression. It has been said that it is the duty of the state to take care that the returned men who served in the war receive justice. If this Parliament represents the state, as I presume it does, and if it is the duty of the state to make proper provision for its soldiers, then Parliament must hold itself responsible for the conditions from which the returned soldiers now suffer. The greatest problem before us to-day, both with regard to the returned soldier and with regard to the working men in general is that of unemployment. So far the Government does not seem to have tackled the problem seriously; nor has a great deal of attention been so far given by the Government to it; in fact it is optimistic according to the Minister of Labour (Mr. Murdock) as to the outlook for next winter. I hope his optimism is well founded but from all evidence that can be gathered the next winter is going

to be perhaps worse than the one through which we have passed, and I hope the Government will see its way clear to give us some real constructive remedy for the unemployment problem that is now facing this country. I do not suppose that unemployment problem can be solved, so far as the soldiers are concerned, without solving it, so far as everybody else is concerned. I think that is a fair view to take, but that shows all the more need, perhaps, that the problem should be taken into consideration now.

I will mention one thing more. I understand that on the exchange our soldiers had to suffer a loss of something like $8,000,000, this was the difference between money values in France and Great Britain, and between Canada and Great Britain. This means that $8,000,000 was taken from the soldiers of Canada through the exchange system. I hope that when the royal commission is investigating, it will also investigate that matter, and tell us whether that $8,000,000 went into the pockets of the bankers; or did it remain in the treasury of the state? I do not think it is fair in any case that the soldiers should have had to bear that loss. I am not by any means through; but I am not going to take up any more of the time of the House. I want merely to express my sympathy with what has been attempted on behalf of the returned soldiers, and to set forth that which has been advocated by returned soldiers in my constituency. I trust that this problem will be tackled with all seriousness; that the amendment will be accepted and passed by this House; that the royal commission will investigate every problem that is troubling returned soldiers at the present time; and more especially, the question of unemployment and suggest some constructive remedy therefor; I am sure we all hope sincerely that our returned soldiers will not have to be begging for bread nor find themselves in a position that they cannot support themselves in this country of democracy for which they fought and for which many of them gave up their lives.

Mr. HERBERT MARLER (St. Lawrence-St. George): Mr. Speaker, I have listened very carefully to what hon. members have said in reference to the amendment which the hon. member for West Calgary (Mr. Shaw) has placed before the House. Of course, I and all the other members of the committee must realize that the report which I brought down to-day is nothing more or less than recommendations, suggestions to the House of Commons to adopt or not, as it may think proper. If a majority of members in this House apparently want the scope of this commission extended, there is no reason, so far as I can see, why they should not have that scope extended as they suggest. I have heard members from all sides of the House speak along the same lines. The hon. member for Fort William and Rainy River (Mr. Manion) recommended an extension before the amendment was moved. In the evening the hon. member for West Calgary (Mr. Shaw), the hon. member for South Cape Breton and Richmond (Mr. Carroll), the hon. member for Ottawa (Mr. McGiverin), the hon. member for Vancouver South (Mr. Ladner) and the hon. member for East Calgary (Mr. Irvine) who has just spoken, in fact the majority of those who have spoken, are all apparently in favour of extending the scope of the royal commission to take in, as I understand the matter, all things that it is necessary to inquire into or that the Government would like to inquire into in regard to returned soldiers. That being the case, it does not seem to me to matter what my feelings on the subject may be. Whether I think the extension of the scope of a royal commission is proper or not, I should certainly accept the amendment that is placed before the House. But I would suggest to the hon. member for West Calgary, if he is willing to accede to my request, that he withdraw the amendment and support the main resolution, strictly on the understanding that the Government would include in the powers of the royal commission these suggestions in substance with additions, if necessary, which he has brought forward in the amendment. There is in the amendment only one question which I have been talking over. The question of exchange of has been brought up. That would mean investigating about 400,000 accounts; it would cost an enormous amount to do that, and I would suggest to the hon. member for West Calgary that these few words be taken out of his amendment but that the resolution be extended in such a manner that any matters that the Government thinks should be investigated in regard to the returned soldiers may be placed before the royal commission.

Mr. SUTHERLAND: In view of the statements which have been made by the hon. member for South Cape Breton and

Richmond (Mr. Carroll) and some other hon. members, I would ask the chairman of the committee if he thinks it is fair to the other hon. members of this House to allow the impression to prevail, which apparently does prevail, that the committee were unanimous in the report which is now before the House?

Mr. MARLER: I did not know that the impression prevailed that the committee was unanimous. I have not given that impression.

Mr. SUTHERLAND: As a matter of fact, it was not.

Mr. MARLER: I am perfectly well aware that the committee was not; but I have not given the impression that the committee was unanimous. Where did the hon. member get that impression? He did not get it from me.

Mr. SHAW: In view of the suggestion of the mover of concurrence in this report and on the understanding contained in his last remarks, I withdraw the amendment as I feel satisfied that the purpose aimed at will be achieved by adopting that course.

Amendment withdrawn.

Mr. E. J. GARLAND (Bow River): Mr. Speaker, like the hon. member for East Calgary (Mr. Irvine), I would hesitate to take up very much of the time of this House on this subject to-night; but I owe it to my constituents to mention one or two matters that have not, perhaps, been dealt with as completely as they would have wished. I am glad that the committee has brought in the report that they have on the question of unemployment; but I am sorry that the committee was not able to go further in recommending some means of meeting that situation. I congratulate the committee on this paragraph:

> In the past, particularly the last two winters, relief has been given to returned soldiers by means of grants in money and in kind. The committee calls the attention of the House to the fact that such relief will almost with certainty be required during next winter, and desires that the House be fully seized with the importance of taking the necessary immediate measures to assist the unemployed soldiers over what will likely be another critical period next winter.

That is a very frank statement and a very true one. We all hope for the best; but hope as we may, present conditions do not point to very much alleviation of the unemployment situation. I would suggest to the Government that they might take into consideration, in this connection, the introduction of some recommendation or some legislation at this session looking towards the holding of an industrial conference during this year, if at all possible. Again, I heartily concur in the committee's recommendations that if possible all unemployment relief be in the form of work and not in the form of doles. I would suggest that in order to prevent the possibility of unemployment recurring next winter, the Government might well make use of the Public Works Department during the season that is now ahead. Let them send a party of engineers scouring the country in search of public works that could be left over until the season of unemployment commences. In that way it would be possible to give more employment than if you use up all those works during the summer. As I said, I am sorry the recommendations of the committee have not been more definite in this matter. I sympathize with the committee; I realize that the immense quantity of material which they have had to handle has prevented the subject being thoroughly considered, and I hope the royal commission will go into this matter.

As regards land settlement, I am earnestly satisfied that the contentions put forward by Major Barnett, I think it was, as to the impossibility or non-advisability of revaluation are not strong enough. I might point out to the House that he based his statement on the sales of 532 parcels of land and on offers received for a smaller number, about 300. In all, 2,352 parcels of land have been returned or abandoned. I have no doubt that the land resold was in the best districts. Therefore, the lands that have not been sold are, say in the southern part of my constituency or in that of the hon. member for Medicine Hat (Mr. Gardiner). I agree with the hon. member for Lisgar (Mr. Brown) in this respect, that an enormous quantity of land has been sold to settlers at prices at which that land could not possibly be sold to-day or anything like them. I venture to say that, in the southern part of my constituency, you could buy all the land you wanted for the price of the taxes, or for from $7 to $10 an acre. Many soldiers were settled under that scheme in these districts, and I frankly believe that before this question is solved, the committee in future sessions will come to agree with me that revaluation will have to take place. In the meantime I congratulate the committee on the alleviation which it proposes to meet

the situation by the removal altogether of interest for some years. That is an admirable step. In addition to that I would suggest that the regulations be enforced in a very elastic manner. Further loans will probably be necessary. I say this because I know that in my own constituency during the last two years men have not raised one bushel of grain for sale. And returned soldiers have been compelled to slaughter the stock they purchased from the board in order to feed themselves. I venture to say that a great many of these soldier farmers would not have been able to get over the winter had it not been for the relief given by the provincial government of Alberta. Some of these men went to the board in Calgary last fall and submitted their cases, but they were informed at that time that the board could do nothing for them. They had no credit at the banks and none in the stores, and everything they owned was mortgaged to the board. They were penniless, and on asking for some advance from the board they were informed that they could get none. That was the situation with which they were faced then, and it is the situation that will possibly confront them again. We hope not, but we must be prepared to meet it if it does recur; and I would suggest that some arrangement be made for further loans to men who find themselves in such a situation as I have cited. There should also be an "adjustment board" in connection with the Soldier Settlement Board for the purpose of investigating cases where land has been sold to the soldiers at more than its real value. The hon. member for Lisgar (Mr. Brown) mentioned some cases in this connection and I could cite a good many examples in my own constituency to show that the land is not worth the money that has been paid for it. At the present time, at any rate, it is not worth very much and I question if it ever will be, judging from the reports that are coming from the West to-day.

With regard to the question of tubercular patients, I would point out to my impatient friends to the left opposite that our tubercular soldiers when they reach the stage of convalescence are always anxious to go to work again. As soon as they get out of hospital their pension is reduced to the point that they must go to work, and if they work eight or ten hours a day, in a very short time they are troubled with a recurrence of the disease and have to go back to hospital. I should have liked to see further attention given this matter in the report. The hon. member for Cape Breton South and Richmond (Mr. Carroll) suggested that the whole question of insurance of returned men should be left to the royal commission. He went further, indeed, and stated that all the troubles of the returned soldiers should be submitted to this body. I agree with the hon. gentleman, but I believe that so far as the investigation of the Land Settlement Board itself is concerned, you would require more than a purely judicial commission; you would want to have one or two practical farmers with an understanding of conditions in the West on that commission.

With regard to the canteen funds, I simply wish to have it understood that I reiterate the remarks made by the member for West Calgary (Mr. Shaw). I would suggest to the House that perhaps the committee had not had drawn to its attention, when they brought in the recommendation that the fund should be used for educational facilities for children of ex-service men, and so forth, that this has already been put into effect by the provincial government of Saskatchewan and, to some extent, in Manitoba as well. The provincial government recognizes that this is a state matter, and I do not think myself that the canteen fund should be used for the purpose proposed, but should continue to be at the disposal of the soldiers.

Now, I sincerely trust that the amendments to the Pensions Act which we shall have to consider in committee will not in any way narrow the scope of the act. I would rather have it left where it was, if it could not be extended. That matter, of course, can be discussed to greater advantage later on when in committee on the amendements. I am glad indeed to know that the chairman of the committee is willing to accept the amendment offered by the hon. member for West Calgary and I congratulate him on his decision to do so.

Mr. J. H. HARRIS (East York): I have read the report that has been submitted by the committee, and in my opinion there is room for a good deal of criticism, constructive and not destructive. What has been running through my mind—and it is constructive in its character—I shall endeavour briefly to state. When war was declared a large number of men rushed to the colours in this country and when the armistice was signed there was a similar rush of men to resume their ordinary avocations as quickly as possible. Some of the men who served in the theatre of war, as we all know, suffered only slight

injuries, while others were afflicted with diseases such as trench fever, contracted while in actual service. Most of these men invariably got back to their occupations and were known as discharged soldiers; and whether they were discharged on the short or on the long form is a matter of no consequence for the moment so far as my argument is concerned. Chapter 3, section 3 covers more or less in detail the proposals which the Government have in hand with regard to the discharged soldier. There are quite a number of discharged men who after having been engaged in their avocations for from three weeks to four months have suffered from a recurrence of the diseases that they contracted overseas. The result has been that they have been more or less of a hazard to themselves in their work. Some of them have met with serious accidents, and being discharged soldiers they have no recourse to the Board of Pension Commissioners, who cannot take care of them. I respectfully submit that cases of this nature should be given some favourable consideration. I have particularly in mind the case of a man who was discharged and who on resuming his ordinary occupation, which was rather of a dangerous character, had a recurrence of trench fever. He applied to the Department of Soldiers' Civil Re-establishment for treatment and was receiving treatment as an out-patient of one of the hospitals while carrying on his occupation. During that time his nerves gave way and he unfortunately had an arm cut off. You will readily realize the extreme gravity of such a case as this, which is one that should, I think, be considered by the Government. In my opinion it would be well when the bill is brought down if cases of this kind are provided for instead of leaving them over in abeyance to be dealt with by the royal commission that will be established.

Mr. T. G. McBRIDE (Cariboo): I had intended to speak at some length on this question, Mr. Speaker, but I have been informed by the Minister of Soldiers' Civil Re-establishment (Mr. Béland) that he is coming out to British Columbia, so I do not think I shall inflict upon the House at this hour of the morning the punishment of listening to what I have to say. I will reserve it until I meet the minister at Kamloops.

Mr. DONALD SUTHERLAND (South Oxford): At this late hour I would hesitate to impose upon the House were it not for the fact that I have been four or five years a member of a committee similar to that whose report is now before Parliament. The work of the committee this year has naturally been somewhat of a review of what has taken place during previous sessions. I have not been able to attend the meetings of the committee as regularly as in past years owing to the fact that I have been a member of two other committees which invariably met on the same day and at the same hour. However, I was present on quite a number of occasions and was impressed with the earnest desire of the committee, and particularly of its chairman, to do everything possible to arrive at an understanding as to the best methods to pursue for the re-establishment of returned soldiers.

When I say that I have been a member of that committee during those years, let me also point out that shortly after the war began in August 1914 during the special war session of this Parliament I had the honour of moving the address in reply to the Speech from the Throne, and in order that there may be no misunderstanding as to what my views have been from that time down to the present I should like to quote one paragraph from my speech on that occasion which will be found in Hansard of August 18, 1914, when I stated:

> The war may be a long and bitter one; the loss of life is sure to be enormous; suffering and want may come to many who are dependent on those who go to the front, or who may fall in battle. It is therefore the duty of the people of Canada and the government of Canada to make provision for the alleviation of such suffering and want. Would not the tribute we would be called upon to pay be most beggarly when compared with the sacrifice, the tribute of life-blood paid by our country's defenders. There is no sacrifice the occasion demands that the people of Canada are not prepared to make. Let our response to the needs of the Empire be immediate and sufficient.

The sacrifice, suffering and want have surely been even greater than anyone could have anticipated. The war was prolonged for many years, and today we are face to face with the consequences of that struggle. I listened with great interest to the remarks of the hon. member for Kingston (Mr. Ross), who had such a wonderful experience at the front in his capacity as Director of Medical Services overseas, and who had a wide experience also in the South African war. His remarks must be convincing evidence of the fact that this problem will confront us for many years to come.

On the whole the report is a good one and much care has been exercised in its preparation, but there is an appendix to the report with which I do not agree. On the last page of the report you will find the following:

Supplementary to the foregoing and to form part thereof is the following:—

Now, my understanding is that this was not a part of the report at all. The committee met on the morning of Friday last and a prepared resolution was submitted. Reference has been made by the hon. member for Cape Breton South (Mr. Carroll) to what took place in the committee, and several other members of the committee have referred to the matter, but I would point out that the minutes disclose that the committee sat at 8 p.m. There were two previous meetings which are reported in the proceedings of that date. A report was adopted previously to the meeting which is referred to in this report. On Monday last it may be recalled that I drew the attention of the Minister of Soldiers' Civil Re-establishment to an article which appeared in the press of that date, and which I contended was an incorrect report of what actually took place. I merely did so to disabuse the mind of anyone that the Great War Veterans' Association had been asking for the appointment of a royal commission to investigate these charges. Charges had been made, it is true, and the committee which was appointed to investigate charges of that kind are evidently running away from them rather than investigating them. The Secretary and President of the Great War Veterans' Association evidently intended and expected that the committee which was appointed to deal with such matters would deal with those charges. That is apparent on the face of the telegram sent broadcast throughout the country to the different branches of the association.

Mr. CHURCH: Why did not the committee deal with those charges?

Mr. SUTHERLAND: Perhaps I had better read the telegram which was sent out by Mr. MacNeil.

Following recent disclosures surrounding parliamentary inquiry we openly charge Pension Board with contemptible and cold blooded conspiracy to deprive ex-service men of rights previously granted by Parliament.

Mark the words, "previously granted by Parliament."

There has been deliberate concealment, secret regulations pensions and insurance in direct violation intention of Parliament and deliberate attempt to disguise facts before present parliamentary committee.

An attempt to conceal something from the Parliamentary Committee.

This is culmination unsympathetic policy of increasing severity during recent months.

This policy has set in during recent months so this telegram says.

Chairman committee has consented to re-open question—

What does that mean? It certainly means that the Great War Veterans' Association expected their charges to be investigated by the committee of the House to which these matters were referred. There can be no other interpretation taken from it.

This plot challenges basic rights ex-service men nullifies in principle established privileges and frustrates further re-establishement efforts required.

That is a very plain statement and yet the hon. member for Cape Breton felt it was casting some reflection on the committee. I ask you to read carefully the words of the telegram which was sent out: where do you find in them anything reflecting upon the committee? The only impression that can be gained from it in that respect is that an attempt was made by the Pensions Board to conceal from the committee something which Mr. MacNeil or the Great War Veterans' Association claimed had been done. Is that not true? That being the case, why the necessity for the appointment of a commission? The committee was called together hurriedly on the morning of Friday last. This matter was submitted to them and what was the next move? The next move was an amendment to have Mr. MacNeil brought before the committee and given an opportunity to prove his statement. Was that amendment accepted? You would have expected it to be accepted, but it was not; the resolution was voted down by the committee, though the members broke almost even in the vote. This goes to show that the report now before the House is not by any means a unanimous report; it represents the view of only a little more than half the membership of that committee.

Mr. CHURCH: Was a vote taken?

Mr. SUTHERLAND: Several votes were taken; yet there is an attempt to create the impression that this is the unanimous report of the committee. This motion having been voted down, the next move was to adopt the second and final report of the

committee, and the next move was to adopt a resolution recommending the appointment of a commission.

Mr. MARLER: If my hon. friend will permit me to interrupt him, I would point out that the second and final report was adopted before the meeting to which he refers, but I do not think he was present at the time.

Mr. SUTHERLAND: Before the meeting on Friday?

Mr. MARLER: Before the meeting on Friday the 16th. It was readopted or reconfirmed by the meeting of Friday.

Mr. SUTHERLAND: That makes it all the more objectionable. A report was adopted previous to the meeting on Friday last; the second and final report was adopted to be presented to Parliament; I believe the chairman was anxious to have it adopted so that he might place it before the House. But he did not do so, and on Friday the same excuse was offered, and after the report had been re-adopted it was not presented but held over until after Mr. MacNeil had appeared before the committee. What was the use of bringing Mr. MacNeil before the committee after it had adopted a resolution recommending the appointment of a royal commision? Is Mr. MacNeil accused of something? Is he the party against whom a charge has been preferred? Are you going to bring him up for examination for discovery? The Chairman knows that what I am saying is correct. I cannot understand why this—

Mr. MARLER: I do not know what my hon. friend is trying to get at. Would he inform us as to that?

Mr. SUTHERLAND: I am trying to bring something before the House that apparently no one has been anxious to bring before it all the afternoon. It is nearly two o'clock in the morning; the Government is evidently determined that this thing shall go through before the House rises. I have been on my feet at least a dozen times in the hope of getting a word or two in, and if I am speaking at two o'clock in the morning it is not through any desire on my part to do so.

Now, what will be the result of the appointment of a commission to investigate this matter? Here is a very serious statement made regarding the men who have suffered in their country's cause. I contend, Sir, that we are not treating these men generously, as the Chairman intimated in his opening remarks; we are simply attempting to do justice to them, that is all. We cannot do full justice to them; we connot recompense them for the sacrifices they have made. If this report is adopted in its present form, a commission will be appointed and will proceed to call witnesses in the same manner, I suppose, as witnesses were called before the committee. Witnesses have already been examined before the committee under oath, and the evidence submitted there is just the kind of evidence that a commission would take.

Now, a reflection has been cast upon the Government, upon the Minister of Finance, in respect to the holding up of applications for insurance. The head of the insurance branch of the department, who appeared before the committee the other night, stated that sixty-four applications for insurance had been held over during recent months. When asked when this rule went into effect, he stated that it was within the last ten weeks. Did that not substantiate the statement made by Mr. MacNeil in his letter—that recently those changes had taken place; that secret instructions had been sent out in regard to the reduction of pensions? It is well known to every member of this House that something has taken place in recent months, because of the number of complaints which we have been receiving from every quarter. That is quite apparent to everybody; yet we are asked to appoint a royal commision to do the very work that was delegated to us as a committee. The first thing the chairman does on that occasion is to come in with a report carefully prepared and ask for the recommending of a royal commission, saying, in effect, "We are going to run away from these charges." Why is that the case?

Mr. MARLER: Why did not my hon. friend, if he is so anxious about the report, attend more meetings in order to help us make the report?

Mr. SUTHERLAND: When my hon. friend has attended as many meetings of a similar committee as I have, he will be a good deal older than he is now.

An hon. MEMBER: What about this committee?

Mr. SUTHERLAND: And when he will have exhibited as much interest on behalf of the returned soldiers as I have on these committees, he will do a great deal more work than he has done this session.

Mr. MARLER: The attitude my hon. friend is taking now is not in favour of the returned soldiers at all.

Mr. SUTHERLAND: I took my stand in the committee, and I was voted down; I have not said anything further in regard to the matter. But I did point out that we were shirking our duties; that we were running away from the work which had been delegated to us.

Mr. CANNON: I wish to call my hon. friend to order. No member of the House has the right to contend that members of a parliamentary committee, in bringing down a report, are shirking their duty or shirking their obligations.

Mr. SUTHERLAND: If the evidence before the committee had been published as it took place, there would be no necessity for my making that statement, because I made it in the committee.

Mr. CANNON: I would ask for your decision, Mr. Speaker, on the point which I have raised.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: I think the point of order is well taken. The hon member has no right to charge any members of the committee—

Mr. SUTHERLAND: Mr. Speaker,—

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER:—with breach of duty. That is not the motion before the House, and I feel that the hon. member is going beyond his rights.

Mr. SUTHERLAND: As a rule, Mr. Speaker, when a point of order is raised, the person to whom it applies has the right to speak to the point of order. This is the first time in my experience that I have seen the Speaker take the stand that nothing may be said on the point of order.

Mr. BOIVIN: The Speaker did not take that stand.

Mr. SUTHERLAND: Most assuredly he did take that stand. I wish to point out that there has been a change in the policy in regard to insurance. I have here a summary of the activities of the Government in connection with the Pensions Committee during all these years, and the outstanding feature of the insurance scheme is that no medical examination will be required in order to obtain insurance.

Mr. CANNON: Am I to understand, Mr. Speaker, that the hon. member has taken back the expression that the Chair has ruled out of order?

[Mr. Sutherland.]

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order.

Mr. CANNON: The Chair has given a decision, and I suppose my hon. friend is subject to the decisions of the Chair the same as we all are.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: A decision has been given, which has not been received by the hon. member who has the floor.

Mr. BUREAU: It should be.

Mr. CANNON: He should take it back.

Mr. MEIGHEN: There was no decision on your part, Mr. Speaker, at least I earnestly hope not, that the language "shirking duty" was beyond the pale of parliamentary language. What I understood you to say, and I must admit that it went pretty far even then, was that the hon. member was not speaking to the point in referring to the performance of duties by members of the committee. It is most absurd to say that one is forbidden by the rules of Parliament to say that another member is shirking his duty.

Mr. BUREAU: He is imputing motives when he uses that language. I think he is out of order.

Mr. SUTHERLAND: If I may be permitted to proceed, I should like to repeat what I have said, that the director of the Insurance branch came before the committee. Mr. MacNeil was also brought before the committee, when there was nothing to be gained by bringing him there, after the committee had decided upon the appointment of a commission, although I am credibly informed that he was not aware of the fact that the committee had decided to recommend the appointment of a royal commission before he appeared. He appeared before the committee and gave his evidence under oath, and my contention as a member of that committee is that the Great War Veterans' Association was justified to the very limit in the statement which was contained in that telegram. Yet in face of that we are asked to consent to the appointment of a royal commission which will delay matters for months. Parliament will not assemble in all probability inside of ten months at least, and consequently there will be no redress for these men during all that time if the claims which they advance are correct. We do not even know when the report will be submitted. We have not the faintest idea how long it will take. Some hon. members have, in fact, suggested that this committee should probe all the work of the Pensions Board, and there are many

other things that it is suggested it should go into, which, of course, would mean not bringing in a report for a long time. For my part, I would much prefer to see the committee of which I was a member fulfill its duties and take this matter up and get to the bottom of it. We have had a whole week or more in order to do so, and while we had three meetings on one day, I presume we will go on to the end of the session now without another meeting of the committee. The second and final report of the committee is now before the House. If this is not a new innovation on the part of the Government to get away from charges which reflect on members of the Government, then I do not know what to call it. I am sorry to think that the suspicion should go abroad throughout this country uncontradicted, that a change has taken place in the regulations during recent months. The evidence of that goes out in an official document which states that this new ruling went into effect about ten weeks ago.

2 a.m.

Mr. BELAND: Does my hon. friend know the date of the new regulations?

Mr. SUTHERLAND: This question was asked of Major Topp:

Q. How long have these regulations been in effect?—A. These regulations were drawn up by the Board of Pension Commissioners about two months or ten weeks ago, as a suggested procedure for the approval of the Minister of Finance.

It goes on to show that as a result of that ruling sixty-four applications for insurance have been held up, and in the meantime several of the applicants have died. My belief has always been that it is the intention of the framers of the law that is the deciding factor with a judge in interpreting a statute, and clearly the intention of Parliament was that the soldiers who were unable to get insurance with the old line companies by reason of their disability should, those of them who were not pensioners, be able to get it in this way. That was clearly the intention of Parliament, and it is clearly indicated because the act provides that no medical examination shall be required in the case of soldiers making application. This regulation has been changed during recent months, and I ask the Government for the sake of their own reputation, and in order to set at rest this suspicion which is now abroad throughout the country in the minds of returned men, to take immediate steps to see that this Pensions Committee is reassembled and carries on its work. I would suggest to the chairman of the committee that this last supplementary report, which has been attached to the main report that was adopted by the committee one or two days before the supplementary report was brought in, be detached from the main report, and that the main report be adopted. So far as I am concerned I desire to place myself on record as being absolutely opposed to the appointment of any such commission as is recommended in this report.

Hon. H. S. BELAND (Minister of Soldiers' Civil Re-establishment): At this late hour it is not my intention to detain the House at any length. I shall simply state the position of the Government in the face of the report which has been laid on the table of the House by the chairman of the committee on Pensions, Soldiers' Insurance and Re-establishment, and also in the face and in the presence of the different opinions which have been expressed throughout this debate. It is, I think, a matter of gratification that such a fine spirit should have pervaded this debate from beginning to end. As a matter of fact, I have not heard any hon. gentleman express complete dissent from the different recommendations which have been submitted in this report. It is true that immediately before it was my privilege to address you, Mr. Speaker, my hon. friend from South Oxford (Mr. Sutherland) gave vent to some divergence of opinion as between himself and the majority of the committee, but his divergence was confined to that point which is reported on the last page, and which concerns only the matter of the appointment of a royal commission to investigate certain charges which have been levelled against the Board of Pension Commissioners. Before I proceed further, I may state that I am credibly informed that Mr. MacNeil, the secretary of the Great War Veterans' Association, is in sympathy with the appointment of a board of investigation to inquire into the charges which he has brought. I will go one step further, Mr. Speaker, and I will give you the opinion of the chairman of the Board of Pension Commissioners on this very subject of investigation. I think it was the day after the press of this country published the allegations which have been levelled at the Board of Pension Commissioners, the chairman of that board sent me a letter, as minister of the department in which he served. I will quote only a couple of paragraphs from the letter, which are self-explanatory. The letter reads:

The officials of the G. W. V. A. charge the Board of Pension Commissioners with contemptible and cold-blooded conspiracy to deprive ex-service men of rights previously granted by Parliament.

The chairman continues:

There are other charges, also, which you will find in the clippings enclosed.

And he concludes the letter with the following words:

Those are very serious charges, and, writing on behalf of the board, I would ask that a Royal Commission be appointed to investigate them.

Yours very truly,
JOHN THOMPSON (Chairman).

Mr. CLARK: What is the date of that letter?

Mr. BELAND: June 16th. I think that is the date on which the committee held its last meeting. I have read the stenographic report of the meeting of the committee on the evening of June 16th. Mr. MacNeil was heard, and heard extensively, on the subject of the charges. On the other hand, the representatives of the Board of Pension Commissioners, the chairman himself, and the director of Medical Services, have also been examined on those charges, and, as far as I can make out, no decision could have been reached there and then, and when I found in the report that the recommendation was made to the House that a commission should be appointed by the Government to investigate those charges, I was of opinion that the position taken by the committee, under the circumstances, was entirely and absolutely commendable, but I have not had anything to do, need I say, with the proceedings, or the actions, or the recommendations of this committee. I do not think I have addressed one single member of the committee since they have begun their arduous work. On this very subject, Mr. Speaker, I may congratulate not only the chairman, but all the members of the committee on their work. I have read the reports as they came out day after day. It has been my privilege, in previous years, to sit on all those committees appointed by Parliament to study the problems of re-establishment. I know how long, tedious and arduous those duties of attending the sittings of that committee are, and I believe that the members who composed the committee this year have, perhaps, outdone their predecessors in this regard.

Many suggestions have been offered to the House, or to the Government, in the carrying out of the recommendations contained in the report. I have listened, with a great deal of attention and interest, especially to the hon. member from Vancouver South (Mr. Ladner) and also the hon. member from Kingston (Mr. Ross), both of whom, with many other hon. members, have been very closely connected with the veterans on the other side. The suggestions on treatment, on re-establishment generally, on the care that should be given to the so-called problem cases, like tubercular cases, or the cases of the blind, and the cases of those who are called sub-standard, and whose disabilities due to war service are not so large as to entitle them to the pension that would be required for their maintenance, will receive the very careful attention and consideration of the Government, with a view to meeting them in a most generous spirit. The question, I think, of paramount importance amongst the questions discussed this evening is that of unemployment. We cannot overlook the fact that there is still a good deal of unemployment in Canada. It is less than it has been, as the figures that have been published since Januaray last will indicate. The number of unemployed in this country has been reduced from 300,000 to 43,000. This is a very satisfactory reduction. With respect to unemployment, however serious the situation may be in Canada, it is still much more serious and alarming in Great Britain. Would you think for one moment that a cry of joy comes out of every home in Great Britain, because the number of unemployed now has come below the figure of one million and a half? If you consider the population of this country, in relation to the population of the United Kingdom, you will find that it is about one to five, and if we had unemployment in Canada on the same scale as they have it in Great Britain, you would have in this country 200,000, at least, unemployed at the present time. What remedy has been applied in the United Kingdom to alleviate the situation? Would you think that the government of Great Britain had resorted to some kind of government employment? Not at all. I may inform you Mr. Speaker that from November 1920 to this day, eighty five million pounds sterling have been paid out by the government of the United Kingdom in alleviating unemployment, and extending relief to the unemployed. Eighty five million pounds sterling would give you over three hundred million dollars and provision has been made now in the

United Kingdom for the expenditure, from now on till the Month of July 1923, of fifty one million pounds sterling, which reduced to dollars, would mean about two hundred and fifty million. But that is not to provide industrial re-establishment—not in the least. It is simply to assist those needy families of Great Britain who are suffering from unemployment—to give them some relief, some food, some shelter and some clothes. It is a question of dollars and cents.

Mr. CLARK: Does the minister approve that policy?

Mr. BELAND: I was coming to that. If statesmen of the ability of the present rulers of Great Britain found that it was, after all, the best way in which you could relieve unemployment, would we be justified in adopting any other policy? I do not say that I should remain idle; I do not say that the members of this Government and the members of the House of Commons should disinterest themselves entirely from the problem by saying: "We will simply pay out the money." Far from that; but I make an allusion to conditions in Great Britain only to draw hon. members' attention to the fact that paying out money simply for relief of unemployment is not to be condemned and absolutely thrust aside with a wave of the hand. I do not say that we should remain idle. Far from that; I think we should endeavour to devise means by which this unemployment, however large or however small it may be, may be entirely disposed of in a satisfactory manner by some kind of employment. With that in view, I have already taken steps through the officials of the department over which I have the honour to preside, in order that conferences might be held with the Canadian Red Cross Society with a view of establishing some industrial establishments of some kind, at least to find employment for those returned soldiers who are disabled or who are in such a physical condition as will preclude them from entering the open labour market. Some results have already been produced, not as regards employment, but as regards devising some plans; those plans will mature with a few weeks or a few months, and provision will be made in the supplementary estimates in that connection.

I know I should not at this hour delay the House any longer. My attitude towards the returned man is well known, and I need not say that I do and shall approach all these problems in a most sympathetic spirit. Anything that can be done to relieve the suffering of the returned man has been done and it will be done in the future, that is anything that is compatible with the financial resources of the country.

Mr. CHURCH: Why was the evidence taken before this committee not published the same as the evidence taken before the Railway Rates Committee. The conclusions that have been reached now are very important; but why was the evidence not printed for the information of the members? If we do not have it, when this report is being discussed, we cannot very well discuss the conclusions.

Mr. BELAND: I understand my hon. friend's objection. I have sat on this committee during the last three or four years. As was very well pointed out by the chairman of the committee (Mr. Marler), a committee has two absolutely different kinds of sittings. One kind is the sitting that is held for the purpose of taking evidence of witnesses who are called before the committee and who are subjected to interrogation by members of the committee. The other kind is the executive sessions which take place after all evidence has been taken, for the purpose of discussing the evidence that has been submitted and drafting a report. That has been the custom in the past for the parliamentary committee on pensions, and I think it has been the custom with every other committee. There is not that I know of the least desire on the part of any member of that committee to conceal anything that has taken place. Why should that exist, I wonder? If time permitted I could go over some of the subjects that have been approached very ably by hon. gentlemen this evening; but the hour is late, and all I can say in conclusion is that, if the House adopts the report of this committee as presented by the chairman, we shall try, as a Government, to carry those recommendations out to the best of our ability with a view of reconciling the public interest of Canada with the interest of the returned men.

Mr. SUTHERLAND: While this report which was adopted by the committee two days before the supplementary report was adopted, was held in abeyance, was the minister consulted in regard to the matter of holding it up and as to the advisability of making such a recommendation as is attached to the final report which was adopted and then afterwards had this recommendation attached to it?

Mr. BELAND: My answer will be very simple and direct. I was never consulted by the chairman or any member of that committee on any work at all that they were carrying on, and I never knew anything of the report until it was published.

Mr. SHAW: What is the attitude of the minister towards the amendment which I moved, and which I withdrew at the request of the mover of concurrence in the report (Mr. Marler), on the understanding that the suggestions contained in the amendment would be approved by the Government and made part of the report?

Mr. BELAND: The answer is "yes."

Mr. GRAHAM: All except the part referring to exchange, as, I believe, was understood.

Mr. BELAND: All that was understood between the chairman of the committee (Mr. Marler) and my hon. friend (Mr. Shaw) in the presence of the House this evening. Is that satisfactory?

Mr. SHAW: Yes.

Mr. CHURCH: I have an amendment that I should like to move.

The CHAIRMAN: The hon. member is out of order. He has already spoken and he cannot move an amendment.

Mr. CHURCH: I should like to move an amendment that the report be sent back to the committee with instructions to amend it by providing that in cases of total disability, the blind be paid a straight annual pension of $900 in addition to any bonus granted to them.

Mr. GRAHAM: Of course, as the hon. gentleman, perhaps, is not aware, he could not himself, having spoken once, move that amendment.

The CHAIRMAN: I declare the amendment out of order.

Motion agreed to.

PRIVATE BILLS

FIRST READINGS

Bill No. 177 (from the Senate), respecting a patent of Simon W. Farber.—Mr. Chevrier.

Bill No. 178 (from the Senate), respecting a patent of Daniel Herbert Schweyer. —Mr. Maclean (Halifax).

[Mr. Sutherland.]

Bill No. 179 (from the Senate), respecting certain patents of the Holophane Glass Company.—Mr. McMaster.

SPECIAL LOANS

Hon. GEORGE P. GRAHAM (for the Minister of Finance): Moved that the House do to-morrow go into Committee of the Whole to consider a resolution respecting the raising of special loans.

He said: The subject matter of this resolution having been communicated to His Excellency the Governor General, he has been pleased to give his assent thereto.

Motion agreed to.

PENSION ACT AMENDMENT

Hon. GEORGE P. GRAHAM (for the Minister of Finance): Moved that the House do to-morrow go into Committee of the Whole to consider a resolution to amend the Pension Act, 1919.

He said: The subject matter of this resolution having been communicated to His Excellency the Governor General, he has been pleased to give his assent thereto.

Motion agreed to.

THE SOLDIER SETTLEMENT ACT, 1919

Hon. GEORGE P. GRAHAM (Minister of Militia) moved that the House do to-morrow go into Committee of the Whole to consider a resolution to amend the Soldier Settlement Act, 1919.

He said: The subject matter of this resolution having been communicated to His Excellency the Governor General, he has been pleased to give his assent thereto.

Mr. CHURCH: Many hon. members are away and it is not proper to railroad these resolutions through. They are important.

RETURNED SOLDIERS' INSURANCE ACT AMENDMENT

Hon. H. S. BELAND (Minister of Soldiers' Civil Re-establishment) moved that the House do to-morrow go into Committee of the Whole to consider a resolution to repeal section 10 of the Returned Soldiers' Insurance Act.

He said: The subject matter of this resolution having been communicated to His Excellency the Governor General, he has been pleased to give his assent thereto.

Motion agreed to.

OLEOMARGARINE ACT AMENDMENT

Hon. W. R. MOTHERWELL (Minister of Agriculture) moved that the House do

to-morrow go into Committee of the Whole to consider a resolution to amend the Oleomargarine Act, 1919.

He said: The subject matter of this resolution having been communicated to His Excellency the Governor General, he has been pleased to give his assent thereto.

Motion agreed to.

On motion of Mr. Graham, the House adjourned at 2.30 a.m. Thursday.

Thursday, June 22, 1922.

The House met at three o'clock.

TREATIES WITH HUNGARY AND TURKEY

Right Hon. W. L. MACKENZIE KING (Prime Minister): I beg to lay on the Table of the House copies of:

1. Treaty of Peace between the Allied and Associated Powers and Hungary, and Protocol and Declaration, signed at Trianon, 4th June, 1920, (with maps);

2. Treaty of Peace with Turkey signed at Sevres, August 10, 1910, (with maps).

OFFICIAL REPORT OF DEBATES

Mr. G. H. BOIVIN (Shefford): I beg to present the second report of the Select Standing Committee appointed to consider the official report of the Debates as follows:

The Select Standing Committee appointed to supervise the official report of the Debates, begs leave to present the following as its second reading report:

Your committee has had under consideration the desirability of having printed at the end of each session an index to the unrevised edition of the Debates of the House of Commons;

Your committee is aware that a current index of the said debates is prepared daily and kept in the Debates office and is assured that said index can be printed as an addition to the last issue within forty-eight hours after prorogation;

Your committee considers that the said index will prove of great value to all persons who are entitled to receive the daily unrevised edition of the Debates and specially to those subscribers who are not entitled to receive and who are not supplied with the revised edition;

Your committee therefore recommends, with a view of increasing the usefulness of the unrevised edition of the Debates, that the current index kept in the Debates office be printed as an addition to the last issue and supplied to subscribers and persons who are entitled to receive the daily unrevised edition of the Debates of the House of Commons.

If I can obtain the unanimous consent of the House, I beg to move, that the second report of the Select Standing Committee appointed to supervise the official report of Debates be now concurred in.

Motion agreed to.

PUBLIC ACCOUNTS COMMITTEE

Mr. A. R. McMASTER (Brome): I beg to present the second report of the Select Standing Committee on Public Accounts; and, if I may have the unanimous consent of the House, I beg to move that the first and second reports of the Select Standing Committee on Public Accounts be concurred in.

Motion agreed to.

INCOME WAR TAX ACT 1917 AMENDMENT

Hon. W. S. FIELDING (Minister of Finance) moved for leave to introduce Bill No. 187, to amend the Income War Tax Act, 1917.

Mr. MEIGHEN: I would ask for an explanation, and also would direct the attention of the minister to the fact that the title of the proposed bill, as now stated, is not exactly as given on the Order Paper.

Mr. FIELDING: There is just the omission of the word "War" in the Order Paper. If my hon. friend desires to have the motion postponed on that acount, I shall not proceed.

Mr. MEIGHEN: Oh, no; I do not wish to have the motion postponed, I simply wanted to draw the omission to the attention of the minister.

Mr. FIELDING: I shall have the correction made. It is not the intention of the Government to propose anything like a revision or an extensive change in the Income War Tax Act for the present year. I have no doubt that when the bill comes before the House hon. gentlemen will have many suggestions to offer, and I may state now that we do not contemplate any general revision or any extensive changes. There are, however, several points that will be covered by the bill. For example, the exemption of $200 in the case of dependent children we propose to increase to $300. There has been difficulty in connection with the travelling expenses of commercial travellers, who have complained that they are not getting fair consideration in this matter. We are making an amendment to meet the situation. It will be remembered that the House passed legislation based on the practice of the American authorities at the boundary line of imposing certain taxes on Canadians employed across the border. In conformity with that resolution we are introducing a clause in the bill, with the proviso that it shall take effect only on proclamation by the Governor in Council. This proviso is based

on the hope that regulations may be passed at Washington that will render this legislation unnecessary. These are the chief purposes of the bill.

Motion agreed to and bill read the first time.

PRIVATE BILLS

FIRST READINGS

Bill No. 180 (from the Senate), for the relief of Margaret Maud Evelyn Clark Leith.—Mr. Euler.

Bill No. 181 (from the Senate), for the relief of Mary Ann Phair.—Mr. Church.

Bill No. 182 (from the Senate), for the relief of William Park Jefferson.—Mr. Church.

Bill No. 183 (from the Senate), for the relief of Eva Maud Ginn.—Mr. Church.

Bill No. 184 (from the Senate), for the relief of Louise Janet Maud Bigford.—Mr. Ross (Kingston).

Bill No. 185 (from the Senate), for the relief of James Dickson Couch.—Mr Boys.

Bill No. 186 (from the Senate), for the relief of Cecil Grenville Bell.—Mr. Maclean (York).

QUESTIONS

(Questions answered orally are indicated by an asterisk.)

SUBMARINE CABLE—IRELAND—HALIFAX

Mr. MacLAREN:

1. Has the Canadian Government contributed towards the purchase of the submarine cable running from Ireland to Halifax, which is stated was acquired by the British Government about a year ago?

2. If not, has the Canadian Government under consideration the subject of supplying in conjunction with the British Government, a Brtish owned cable between Great Britain and Canada?

3. Of the seventeen trans-atlantic cables has the Canadian Government a financial interest in any?

4. Does the Government propose to extend the Canadian National Telegraph system from Moncton to Halifax, and so connect with the British Atlantic cable?

5. When official cablegrams are sent from Ottawa to the British Government in London, are they transmitted for a part of the distance through United States territory?

6. Does the Canadian Government Telegraph system directly connect with the British owned Pacific cable?

7. If not, is it proposed that this connection be made?

Hon. Mr. KING (Kootenay):

1. The Government has been unable to ascertain any record of any such contribution having been made.

2. No.

3. No.

[Mr. Fielding.]

4. Canadian National Telegraphs now connect with Atlantic cables by direct Western Union-Canadian National wires between Montreal and North Sydney. The Western Union Telegraph Company own and operate the telegraph lines east of Moncton, but Canadian National Telegraphs have an option for the lease or purchase of such lines, and the matter may be said to be under consideration to that extent.

5. Cable messages by Canadian National Telegraphs pass solely through Canadian territory.

6. No.

7. Connection cannot be made as, under an existing agreement, the Canadian Pacific enjoys an exclusive arrangement with the Imperial Government to handle this westbound cable business.

STEEL BOUNTIES

Mr. COOTE:

1. In what years were steel bounties paid by the Canadian Government?

2. What was the amount paid in each of these years?

3. What was the total amount of bounties paid?

Hon. Mr. ROBB:

1. During each fiscal year from 1895-6 to 1911-12, inclusive.

2.

Years ended—	Bounties on steel	Bounties on manufactures from steel
June 30, 1896	$ 59,499	Nil
1897	17,366	Nil
1898	67,454	Nil
1899	74,644	Nil
1900	64,360	Nil
1901	100,058	Nil
1902	77,431	Nil
1903	729,102	Nil
1904	347,990	15,321
1905	676,318	231,324
1906	941,000	369,832
Mar. 31, 1907 (9 months)	575,259	338,999
1908	1,092,201	347,135
1909	838,100	333,091
1910	695,752	538,812
1911	350,456	526,858
1912	Nil	166,750

3. Bounties on steel, $6,706,990; bounties on manufactures of steel, $2,868,122.

DENNIS BUILDING, HALIFAX

Mr. GENDRON:

1. Did the Government, or any branch thereof, rent offices in the Dennis Building, so called, in the city of Halifax, for any time between January 1st, 1914, and December 31st, 1919?

2. If so, (a) for what purpose and (b) what was the total amount paid by the Government as rentals for said Dennis Building, and (c) to whom was it paid?

3. For what length of time were said offices rented?

Hon. Mr. COPP:

Department of Public Works—

1. Yes.

2. Premises: Portion of 5th and all of 6th and 7th floors; occupants: M. and D. headquarters; term, 1st January, 1914, to 31st December, 1919; rental paid: $47,782.00. Premises: two rooms on 4th floor; occupants: recruiting office, M. and D.; 17th December, 1915, to 17th May, 1916; rental paid: $151.00. Premises: two rooms on 4th floor; occupants: taxation office; term: 17th May, 1916, to 1st May, 1918; rental paid: $691.53. Total paid 1st January, 1914, to 31st December, 1919, $48,624.53. Paid to the Dennis Realty Corporation, Halifax, N.S.

3. 5th floor rented from 1st May, 1916, to 1st May, 1920; 6th floor rented from 1st October, 1913, to 1st May, 1920; 7th floor rented from 1st August, 1914, to 1st May, 1920; two rooms 4th floor for recruiting offices rented from 17th December, 1915, to 17th May, 1916; two rooms 4th floor for taxation officer rented from 17th May, 1916, to 1st May, 1918.

Department of Public Printing and Stationery—

1. Yes.

2. (a) Printing of voters' lists; (b) $60.40; (c) Dennis Realty Corporation, Limited, Halifax, N.S.

3. Eight weeks.

Department of Railways and Canals—

1. Yes.

2. (a) For purposes of Hudson Bay Railway, Port Nelson Terminals, and Canadian Government Railways (Marine Superintendent). (b) The total amount paid for rental of the Dennis Building was: Hudson Bay Railway, $1,308.72; Canadian Government Railways, $602.19; total, $1,910.91. (c) Rental was paid to the Dennis Realty Corporation.

3. From June, 1914, to September, 1918.

Department of Soldiers' Civil Re-establishment

1. Yes.

2. (a) The Halifax District Office of the Board of Pension Commissioners for Canada, was located in the Dennis building, Halifax, from August, 1917, to January 3, 1920. (b) Total rent paid, August, 1917, to January, 1920, $2,592.03. (c) The Dennis Realty Corporation.

3. Answered by No. 1.

JOHN N. McDONALD

Mr. HOCKEN:

1. Was John N. McDonald dismissed from the position of inspector of dredges, Prince Edward Island district?

2. (a) Was he employed as a hand on dredge Prince Edward from September, 1884, to January, 1897, and (b) was he promoted to captain of dredge during this period?

3. When appointed as dredge inspector for said district in 1912, and up to May 6 last, were there any charges brought against him by his superior officials to the department?

4. If so, what charges?

5. Were there deductions made from his salary for retirement?

6. Was he on the permanent list?

7. On what grounds was he dismissed from the service in May?

8. Did he ask for an investigation of all charges against him?

9. Was such an investigation granted him? If not, why?

10. Is the vacancy caused by his dismissal filled? If so, by whom?

Hon. Mr. KING (Kootenay):

1. Yes.

2. (a) Name does not appear in departmental records prior to 1890; (b) Yes.

3 and 4. None on record.

5. Yes.

6. No.

7. In the public interest.

8. Yes.

9. Representation having been made by most responsible parties an investigation not considered necessary.

10. No.

HUGH RITCHIE

Mr. CHURCH:

1. Has Hugh Ritchie, a civilian, been appointed to a position in the Sales Tax Branch of the Customs Department in Toronto at $960 per year?

2. What are his qualifications for this position?

3. Was the said Ritchie in the Civil Service before?

4. If so, why did he leave?

5. Has the rule providing that ex-soldiers be given preference in appointment to the Civil Service been rescinded?

6. Have any complaints been received about this appointment from G.W.V. Associations?

Hon. Mr. COPP:

1. Yes, temporarily.

2. His experience in excise work, gained during seventeen years' previous service in the department, made him particularly well fitted for the position.

3. Yes.

4. He resigned.

5. No, it is a provision in the Civil Service Act.

6. No complaints have been addressed to the commission by any veteran association.

CANADIAN UNEMPLOYED

Mr. COOTE:

1. Has the Government any information as to the number of unemployed in Canada at the present time?

2. To what occupation or profession do they belong and how many in each profession?

3. How many are married and how many are single?

4. How many of these are returned men?

Hon. Mr. MURDOCK:

1. The number of unemployed in Canada at any particular time cannot be stated at all exactly. To give the information required it would be necessary to take a complete census of the unemployed. As the result of telegrams sent to the superintendents of all employment offices in the Dominion on June 9, the Employment Service of Canada was advised that there were approximately 43,000 unemployed in Canada as of that date. On January 1 last the records of the Employment Service of Canada indicated that there were approximately 200,000 unemployed in Canada.

2. No accurate information available for all unemployed in Canada.

3. Information not available and would require census of the unemployed to secure.

4. Applicants at employment offices are not required to state whether they have had military service or not.

SALE OF LAND TO W. REUBEN PARSONS

Mr. MILLAR:

1. When did the sale take place of the forty-acre portion of the South East ¼ of Section 29, Township 14, Range 9, West of the 2nd Meridian, marked on the survey as lake?

2. To whom was the sale made and at what price?

Hon. Mr. STEWART (Argenteuil):

1. An area of 49.73 acres was sold at the rate of $8 per acre to Mr. Reuben Parsons at a sale of school lands held at Windthorst on the 23rd October, 1917, and sale was subject to adjustment in accordance with the latest revised township plan of survey. Surveyor General approved plan of survey 14th August, 1918, showing former lake area, comprising 100.10 arces, as hay land and sale adjusted as of the 30th November, 1918, in accordance with terms of contract.

2. Answered by No. 1.

CANADIAN GOVERNMENT MERCHANT MARINE

Mr. CHURCH:

1. Before disposing, by sale or otherwise, or the laying up of the twenty-seven smaller Canadian Merchant Marine ships, will the Government look into the utilization of those suitable for the formation of a Government Merchant Lake Marine, to act as a feeder to the Canadian National Railways, and to act as a regulator of lake rates?

2. If not, why?

3. Will the Government before making any disposition of these ships by tender or otherwise, afford an equal right to tender to the Hydro Radials Commission of Ontario, and to any Harbour Commission on the lakes that may desire to purchase any of said ships for lake and marine purposes?

Hon. Mr. KENNEDY:

1 and 2. The Government has not considered the establishment of a lake marine.

3. Yes.

DEATH OF PENITENTIARY INMATES

Mr. CHURCH:

1. Will the Government order an inquiry into the death of two inmates of Kingston Penitentiary who were killed through drinking shellac which contained wood alcohol?

2. Will the Government make inquiry into the overcrowding of this institution, the proper classification of inmates, and the need of additional accomodation?

3. Will any commission or other form of inquiry be instituted during the recess of Parliament to make a thorough inquiry into the whole problem of prison reform in Canada and report their findings at the next session of this Parliament?

Hon. Sir LOMER GOUIN:

1. An inquiry will be made into this matter.

2. The population at Kingston Penitentiary is being taken care of and there is still cell accomodation for additional inmates. The erection of another building is under consideration.

3. The creation of such a commission has not been considered.

INCOME TAXPAYERS

Mr. SPENCER:

1. What is the total number of income taxpayers in the Dominion?

2. What is the total number of income taxpayers for each separate gradation of the act?

3. What is the aggregate of incomes represented by the amount collected under the Income Tax Act?

Hon. Mr. FIELDING:

Fiscal year 1920-1921—

1. 194,257.

2. Incomes.

		Corporations	Individuals	Total
Exceeding $ 1,000	and not exceeding $ 6,000	1,590	171,230	172,820
" 6,000	" 10,000	665	11,534	12,199
" 10,000	" 20,000	529	5,339	5,868
" 20,000	" 30,000	236	1,240	1,476
" 30,000	" 50,000	226	776	1,002
" 50,000	" 75,000	101	238	339
" 75,000	" 100,000	85	98	183
" 100,000	" 200,000	130	85	215
" 200,000	" 400,000	74	17	91
" 400,000	" 600,000	22	2	24
" 600,000	" 800,000	11	.....	11
" 800,000	" 1,000,000	8	.....	8
" 1,000,000	"	19	2	21
		3,696	190,561	194,257

When the tax payable under the Special War Revenue Act or the Business Profits War Tax Act exceeded the tax payable under the Income War Tax Act no assessment was levied under the latter Act.

Corporations are only taxable on profits in excess o $2,000.

3. $912,410,428.89.

MR. THOMAS MULVEY

Mr. McKILLOP:

1. Has any allowance, honorarium, or grant of money been made to Mr. Thomas Mulvey, Under Secretary of State, for his services as Deputy Custodian of Alien Enemy property?

2. If so, what is the amount of such money grant or allowance, and under what authority was it made?

Hon. Mr. COPP:

1. Yes.

2. The question of payment to Mr. Mulvey as Deputy Custodian of Enemy Property, was referred by the Right Honourable A. L. Sifton, then Secretary of State, to Messrs. O. M. Biggar and Christopher C. Robinson, the legal members of the Enemy Debts Committee. The following is an extract from their report, dated 17th September, 1920:

Mr. Mulvey's work has extended over a period of about four and a half years, and in our opinion an extra allowance at the rate of $1,500 a year, or a total of $6,750, would be a small recompense for the special services rendered.

Payment of $4,000 was made to Mr. Mulvey by direction of an Order in Council dated 17th December, 1921, P.C. 4631: The payment was made under the authority of the Treaty of Peace (Germany) Order in Council, 1920, and was paid out of the proceeds of enemy property as part of the cost of administration.

ANIMAL CONTAGIOUS DISEASES ACT

Mr. LEADER:

1. What amounts were expended during the fiscal year 1921-22 in connection with the administration of the Animal Contagious Diseases Act, (a) on the administration of the act, (b) in compensation for animals slaughtered under authority of the act?

2. What amount of compensation was paid for (a) horses, (b) cattle, (c) hogs, and (d) sheep?

Hon. Mr. MOTHERWELL:

1. (a) The cost of administering the Animal Contagious Diseases Act, as far as the inspection and condemning of animals is concerned, was, approximately $360,000. The exact figures could not be arrived at without analyzing each account, as while nearly all inspectors do more or less work in this connection only a small proportion devote their whole time to the work. It must be remembered of course that this amount includes the cost of inspecting horses, cattle, sheep and swine, both healthy and unhealthy. It is worthy of note also that in the case of the cattle subjected to the tuberculin test by the inspectors only about 8 per cent or less on the average react, hence about 12 or 13 cattle are tested for each one for which compensation is paid. (b) $661,725.71.

2. (a) $2,519.98, (b) $652,840.87, (c) $6,364.86, (d) Nil.

J. CLOVIS SAVOY

Hon. Mr. BAXTER:

1. Was J. Clovis Larivy appointed a fishery guardian for Gloucester county, N.B., last year?

2. Was he appointed on the recommendation of the Civil Service Commission?

3. Who has been appointed this year to discharge the same duties?

4. Was the appointee of this year appointed upon the recommendation of the Civil Service Commission?

5. If not, why?

Hon. Mr. LAPOINTE:

1. No. J. Clovis Savoy was so employed.

2. No. He was appointed by the Inspector of Fisheries following advertising the position. The appointment was confirmed by the Commission.

3. Phillippe Landry.

4 and 5. No. Such appointments do not now come within the purview of the Commission.

RILEY'S ARMY

Mr. BOYS:

1. Did the Government or any minister thereof, offer free transportation, from Ottawa to Toronto by special train over the Canadian National, to the Veterans known as Riley's Army?

2. Did the members of Riley's Army refuse to accept transportation over the Canadian National?

3. If so, on what grounds?

4. Did they return to Toronto by Canadian Pacific Railway?

5. If so, why was such transportation provided instead of by Canadian National?

6. Were three cars supplied by the Canadian Pacific Railway for such transportation?

7. If not, how many?

8. What extra cost to the Canadian National system, if any, would have been incurred had a similar number of cars been added for such purpose to its train instead of the Canadian Pacific?

9. What amount was paid to or charged by the Canadian Pacific Railway for such transportation?

Hon. Mr. MURDOCK:

1. No.

2. No.

3. Answered by answer to No. 2.

4. Yes.

5. The hikers arrived in Union Station, Ottawa, about 3 a.m., June 6, and requested a special train to take them back to Toronto at once. They were told a special train could not be supplied, but that extra coaches would be placed on the Canadian National train leaving Ottawa at 1 p.m. same date. They claimed that leaving at 1 p.m. would land them in Toronto at night and insisted that they would not go; that the city of Ottawa would have to keep them, etc., unless they were sent forward earier than 1 p.m. About 5 a.m. it was decided as inadvisable to ask or expect these returned soldiers to lie around on the floors or the benches of the station until 1 p.m. and that it was consistent and advisable to send them forward to Toronto at 9.40 a.m., and arrangements were made accordingly.

[Mr. Baxter.]

6. No.

7. Four.

8. No accurate information available.

9. $1,422.72.

LETTER RATE; CANADA-GREAT BRITAIN

Mr. GARLAND (Carleton):

1. What is the one ounce letter rate from Canada to the British Isles?

2. What is the one ounce letter rate from Canada to the Republic of Mexico?

3. Is it the intention of the Government to put the Mother Country on a par with Mexico in the matter of letter postage by reducing the rate to three cents?

4. If not, why?

Hon. Mr. MURPHY:

1. Four cents—the rate from Canada to places within the Empire—established by the late government in October, 1921.

2. Three cents—the Canadian Domestic rate—extended to Mexico by the terms of a long-standing postal convention with that country.

3. and 4. Should it be decided to change the rates of postage from Canada to places within the Empire due announcement will be made.

CIVIL SERVICE REMUNERATION

Mr. GARLAND (Carleton):

1. Why did the Government grant the increase of $1,000 to Deputy Ministers?

2. Why does the Government propose to cut off the bonus from all civil servants receiving $2,400 or over, and from many single persons under that amount?

3. Does the Government intend to grant more equitable salaries to the Civil Service?

Mr. SPEAKER: I would ask the hon. member to consult me with reference to the drafting of this question.

BUSINESS OF THE HOUSE

SUPPLEMENTARY ESTIMATES

On the Orders of the Day:

Right Hon. ARTHUR MEIGHEN (Leader of the Opposition): I really do not know what the Government have in mind as to the closing of this session. I have heard statements that they expect to close on Saturday. If so, I am bound to presume that there will be no supplementary estimates.

Mr. FIELDING: I think there will be.

Mr. MEIGHEN: Well, this is Thursday. While very small supplementary estimates, secondary or tertiary to the main supplementary estimates, sometimes do come down late, I have never seen the

supplementary estimates in general delayed to this time. I hope there will be none this session.

Mr. FIELDING: There will certainly be supplementary estimates. The only part of my right hon. friend's statement that I would have to object to is that anyone expects the session to end on Saturday. I have certainly no such expectation. There will be supplementary estimates, and I hope to have them ready to-morrow. More than that I cannot say at present.

Right Hon. W. L. MACKENZIE KING (Prime Minister): In reply to my right hon. friend's remark to the effect that the Government intends to close the session on Saturday, I would remind him that the Government has no control over Parliament in these matters. The Government has understood it was the wish of hon. members to get away as early as possible, and the Government has done all in its power to facilitate that end. The Government will continue so to do but I should not like my right hon. friend or any other member of the House to be under the impression that the Government will attempt in any way to control or limit discussions.

Mr. MEIGHEN: It would have facilitated matters to have had the supplementary estimates down in reasonable time.

Mr. FIELDING: They will be down in good time.

SOLDIERS' RE-ESTABLISHMENT

Mr. MEIGHEN: May I ask the Government if they propose bringing down any legislation this session in pursuance of the recommendations of the special committee on pensions and re-establishment?

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: My right hon. friend will find on the Order Paper to-day some resolutions based upon those recommendations, and they will be taken up in due course.

Mr. MEIGHEN: Do those resolutions cover all the recommendations? Those resolutions were put on before the report was adopted.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: Yes, but not until after the report had been printed and was before the House.

Mr. MEIGHEN: But the House had not decided to adopt the report.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: The House adopted the report all right.

Mr. FIELDING: In the supplementary estimates provision will be made for the financial side of those resolutions.

LOSS OF THE LAMBTON—CANADIAN NAVY MEN

On the Orders of the Day:

Mr. T. L. CHURCH (North Toronto): I should like to ask the Government a couple of questions. What is being done for the families of twenty-two of the crew of the Canadian Government steamer Lambton that foundered in Georgian bay a couple of months ago with a loss of twenty-two of a crew? Some of the dependents of those men are in very distressing circumstances, and I should like to know if the Government is prepared to do anything in the matter for them.

I have received some correspondence with respect to the members of our Canadian navy who are now being demobilized at Halifax. Some are stranded and cannot get home, and are out of work and in need of help. Some of these men belong to the city of Toronto, and I should like to know what the Government intends to do for them. Their enlistment papers I understand called for eight years' service with transportation to and from their homes.

Hon. ERNEST LAPOINTE (Minister of Marine and Fisheries): I am glad to be able to tell my hon. friend that I have asked that a certain amount be placed in the supplementary estimates to provide compassionate allowances for the families of the men who lost their lives in the wreck of the Canadian government steamer Lambton. Of course, we will have to bring down supplementary estimates if those dependents are to be assisted.

Hon. GEORGE P. GRAHAM (Minister of Militia and Defence): As to my hon. friend's second question, I wish he would let me see the correspondence which he has received from the navy men who, he says, have been left stranded in Halifax.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION—MR. DESLAURIERS

On the Orders of the Day:

Mr. DESLAURIERS. (Translation).—Mr. Speaker, before the Orders of the Day are called, I should like to raise a question of privilege. Last Friday, referring to the Civil Service Commission estimates, I quoted and commented upon a certain case in the Department of the Secretary of State, which I gave out as an example, without, however, naming the person

whom I had in mind and whom I still have in mind. This had the effect of causing some alarm amongst the staff of that department. I must, in all justice, state in this House that my remarks were not directed against the chief of the Naturalization Branch who, I acknowledge, is very competent to fill the post which he now holds; I must further add that the staff of that branch must in no way cast doubt upon the honour of some of their comrades, because I must admit and assert that I received my information from an entirely outside source, and not from any one connected with the Department of the Secretary of State.

I had no intention nor have I at present—I am speaking for the future, as I intend to again bring up this subject—to attack persons whom I think are very lucky to be recommended by the Civil Service Commission. What I have proved by my argument is that the commission is incompetent and unjust in the classification of employees. You will find further proof of this by looking over the Official Gazette of Canada, of June 3, 1922; you will note that the commission recommends a maximum salary of $3,600 per year for an ordinary shipping agent, while a little further it recommends a maximum salary of $2,100 for an expert in irrigation. . . .

Mr. SPEAKER. (Translation): I would request the hon. member to kindly confine himself to the question of privilege. On a question of privilege a member may not enlarge upon a speech already made. The hon. member has stated that what he said the other day in no way reflects upon the character of two or three employees of the Department of the Secretary of State. That does not come under questions of privilege, but rather under personal explanation. This having been clearly stated I would ask the hon. member to desist and not further transgress the Rules of the House.

CANADIAN PATRIOTIC FUND

On motion of Hon. W. S. Fielding (Minister of Finance) the House went into committee to consider the following proposed resolution, Mr. Gordon in the Chair:

That it is expedient to provide that whenever the Governor in Council is satisfied that the resources of the Canadian Patriotic Fund are inadequate to the continued performing of the relief work that has been carried on by that organization and that the result of the cessation of any part of such work would throw upon the public authorities additional burdens for the relief of distress, the Governor in Council may by Order in Council authorize the payment from the Consolidated Revenue Fund to the Canadian Patriotic Fund of such sums as may be required from time to time to enable the said Canadian Patriotic Fund to continue its work, such sums not to exceed $900,000.

Mr. FIELDING: Soon after the outbreak of the Great War, the Canadian Patriotic Fund was organized for the noble purpose of providing for the dependents of the soldiers who went overseas. It was a great organization for a great purpose, and during all the years of the war did splendid work, as most hon. members are aware. After the close of the war, the operations of the society were naturally restricted. The society, owing to the generosity of the Canadian public, received very large contributions, and it has, to-day, about four and a half million dollars still in the treasury. The society divides its obligations into two classes. There are what you call continuous cases, concerning which they have come under obligations covering a number of years in future. Families have been taken care of by the fund, and they will have to be cared for, for a number of years to come. Besides that, the society has been dealing with a number of emergency cases. I may, for convenience, describe the two classes as permanent charges and temporary charges. They have recently had an actuarial survey made of their obligations and their resources, and they have found that, if they are to fulfil their obligations to what I have called the continuous cases, those which are continuing for a number of years, they cannot continue the work I have described as of an emergent or temporary character. It will be obvious at once that if the large amount of work of that kind hitherto carried on by the Patriotic Fund ceases, in view of the possibilities—and I am afraid the probabilities—we will still have some hardship in the coming winter, if the fund ceases to discharge that duty, they will naturally throw upon the public authorities, Dominion, provincial and municipal, a very large responsibility. After much consideration, we have reached the conclusion to propose to the House that the Canadian Patriotic Fund shall be permitted to continue its work. It is not the fund that is asking for this money. They have merely intimated to us that without some such arrangement, they will have to cease that part of their work. We think, in view of the excellence of that organization, and

of the large number of men and women all over Canada who have assisted in building up that splendid system of relief, that it would be unwise, in reference to that local work, that they should be disbanded or rendered useless. Some will say, "If you want to continue the work of that character, why not put it in the hands of the Government's own officials?" I think most people familiar with the work will think that it is no disparagement to the Government officials to say that the work that has been carried on by the ladies and gentlemen connected with that organization will, at least, be as well done by them as it would be done by Government officials, and therefore, we are making an exception in this case by suggesting to Parliament that we should be placed in a position, as the necessity arises, to make this grant, not exceeding the sum of $900,000, in order that the Patriotic Fund may continue, not only its larger and wider obligations, which they call the continuous cases, but that they may also continue the other class of work to which I have referred. I have had my attention called to the fact that in Manitoba there is a separate organization, and that the Canadian Patriotic Fund has not been operating in that province. When we come to the committee stage of the bill founded on this resolution, I shall endeavour to make provision which will deal with the Manitoba case. Here is a great organization which has been doing noble work. We think it is a pity we should not avail ourselves of the machinery which has the confidence of the country and is composed of ladies and gentlemen who have no other interest in the world except to carry on the work of relief, and we think that on the whole, it is better to continue that organization in its work, than to throw the responsibility upon the public authorities, whether local, provincial or municipal. That is the whole purpose of the motion.

Resolution reported, read the second time and concurred in. Mr. Fielding thereupon moved for leave to introduce Bill No. 188, respecting the Patriotic Fund.

Motion agreed to and bill read the first time.

SALE AND INSPECTION OF ROOT VEGETABLES

House again in Committee on Bill No. 133, to regulate the sale and inspection of root vegetables, Mr. Gordon in the chair.

On section 3—Potato grades.

Mr. SPENCE: I wish to thank the Prime Minister (Mr. Mackenzie King) and the hon. Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Motherwell) for their courtesy in permitting this measure to stand over till to-day. I felt that the committee had not sufficient knowledge of this question to be able to give it a square deal. And I was getting much valuable information in regard to this matter, which I wish to give to the committee. I realize that this is one of the most important Bills introduced in the House this year, and it should receive serious consideration. It pertains to one of the biggest industries in Canada and I hope the bill will go through as recommended by the Department of Agriculture.

Mr. MARTELL: I do not like to interrupt, but the Bill has not been distributed.

Mr. SPENCE: I think it has been distributed. I am sorry the hon. member has not the bill before him.

The CHAIRMAN: It has been distributed for weeks, and was before the committee a week ago.

Mr. SPENCE: I asked that this bill be held over because I was getting certain information I wanted to give to the committee. This bill had its origin in certain representations made to the department for many years by growers of potatoes and dealers in root vegetables asking for examination of cars of potatoes received which were not graded. The department very wisely started to get in touch with the different potato growers all over Canada and with the dealers in these commodities, and a conference was held at the Chateau Laurier two years ago last fall. The conference was attended by men of prominence from all over the Dominion connected with the potato industry. The official delegates appointed from the various provinces were as follows:

Prince Edward Island—Representing growers: W. N. McGregor, Central Lot 16. Representing dealers: Nelson Ratterbury, Charlottetown.

Nova Scotia—Representing growers: F. W. Foster, Kingston. H. M. Palmeter, Grande Pre. Representing dealers: A. E. McMahon, Kentville.

New Brunswick—Representing growers: *A. A. H. Margison, East Centreville. Representing dealers: O. R. Estey, Woodstock.

Quebec—Representing growers: Joseph E. Parent, Rimouski; Roger Gagnon Riviere-du-Loup; John McEvoy, Montreal. Representing dealers: William Bell, Montreal.

Ontario — Representing growers: Henry Broughton, Sarnia; J. G. Fleming, Blenheim; J. M. McNaughton, Orangeville. Representing dealers: David Spence, Toronto.

Manitoba—Representing growers: R. P. Andrews, Birds Hill. Representing dealers: J. G. Anderson, Winnipeg.

Saskatchewan—Representing growers: E. W. Marvel, Indian Head. Representing dealers: *J. M. McCrae, Moosejaw.

Alberta—Representing growers: R. Noel Hammon, Edmonton. Representing dealers: S. Savage, Calgary.

British Columbia—Representing growers—C. E. Barnes, Walhachin; J. T. Mutrie, Vernon; *R. M. Winslow, Vernon. Representing dealers: E. L. Fraser, Vancouver.

Representing Consumers: Mrs. F. S. Mearns, Toronto.

Representing Retail Trade: E. M. Trowern, Ottawa.

*Unable to be present.

The Provincial Departments of Agriculture also sent representatives, who took part in the discussion and acted in an advisory capacity, as follows:

Prince Edward Island, Wilfred Boulter, Charlottetown.
Nova Scotia, Dr. M. Cumming, Truro.
New Brunswick, A. G. Turney, Fredericton.
Quebec, J. H. Lavoie, Quebec.
Ontario, A. H. MacLennan, Toronto.
Alberta, J. D. Smith, Edmonton
British Columbia, R. C. Abbot, Vancouver.

In addition to federal officers with headquarters at Ottawa, the following were present:

S. J. Peppin, Botanical laboratory, Charlottetown, P.E.I.
G. C. Cunningham, Botanical laboratory, Fredericton, N.B..
R. G. L. Clarke, Chief Fruit Inspector for British Columbia.
F. H. Steele, Chief Fruit Inspector for the prairie provinces.
R. E. Robinson, Chief Fruit Inspector for Quebec and E. Ontario.
G. H. Vroom, Chief Fruit Inspector for the maritime provinces.
P. J. Carey, Fruit Packing and Orchardist Specialist, Toronto.

I have read these names so that the committee may see the class of men who were present at that conference. They discussed this matter for one whole day, and in the evening two special committees were appointed to bring in a recommendation of a designated grade. The next day the committee brought in its recommendation, and after a few slight amendments had been made it was carried unanimously. I hope that the Government will see that this bill goes through in the form recommended by the Department of Agriculture. In that way the public will get a square deal that they could not otherwise get. It is the public I am considering, not myself. I may say that the bill as recommended by the department has the approval of every potato growers' association from the Atlantic to the Pacific. We had as advisers to the committee the vegetable specialist

[Mr. Spence.]

of the Department of Agriculture, Ontario; the Potato Specialist from the maritime provinces, and the Provincial Markets Commissioner from British Columbia.

My hon. friend from Victoria and Carleton (Mr. Caldwell) made the statement in the Committee of Agriculture that a certain gentleman whom I know by repute had told him that it was impossible for him to make a living in the potato business if the grade he recommends does not go through. I immediately got in touch with the headquarters of the potato industry in this Dominion, at Woodstock, and I have here three wires from men who thoroughly understand the potato business. The first is from Mr. O. R. Esty:

Heartily approve of grading act as outlined.

The next is from Nelles & Clark:

We strongly urge the adoption of the potato grades as outlined in the report of proceedings of potato and onion conference held Ottawa February 24 and 25, 1920. Working under great difficulties, both shippers and farmers, present conditions without grading law.

The next one is from the New Brunswick Potato Exchange, Limited:

As representatives of several of largest shippers here we find all shippers favour the adoption of potato grades similar to those in effect in United States.

I have not much further to say. My objection to the first subsection of section 3 as read the other night is that it is proposed that certain words be struck out. It now reads this way:

Canada A quality, which shall include only sound, reasonably mature potatoes of similar varietal characteristics—

And so forth. Then it goes on:

In this grade the diameter of potatoes of the round varieties shall not be less than one and seven-eighths inches, and of potatoes of the long varieties one and three-fourths inches, and not over twenty per cent by weight of any lot shall be less than two and one-quarter inches in diameter.

That means that eighty per cent must be two and one-quarter inches in diameter or over, and only twenty per cent one and three-quarter inches in diameter. My hon. friend from Victoria and Carleton thought that was very hard on the grower of potatoes, and he moved that the last line be struck out. I have here in my hand a sample of the potatoes that the hon. member for Victoria and Carleton suggests should be called grade A. If his amendment is agreed to, a man could ship a carload of potatoes this size, and the inspector could say to the dealer "That is A grade, and you must accept it as such." I would

move, if I am in order—I am not accustomed to moving amendments—that the amendment be struck out, and that the grade be as recommended by the department.

Mr. MOTHERWELL: Does my hon. friend want the bill to stand as originally drafted?

Mr. SPENCE: Yes. The Deputy Minister of Agriculture, to my knowledge, has been studying this question for the last five or six years, and surely after his recommendation and the recommendation of the conference of representative men whose names I have given, it is ridiculous to turn the whole committee against their recommendations.

The CHAIRMAN: I would ask the hon. member which words he desires to strike out in clause 3.

Mr. SPENCE: I would let the whole thing remain as it is, and not strike out the last words of the subsection as was proposed.

The CHAIRMAN: Shall the words "grown in Canada" remain?

Mr. SPENCE: Yes, that will be all right.

Mr. HANSON: I am sorry to delay the consideration of this bill but I only rise for the purpose of asking the minister some questions and obtaining information. Unfortunately, I am not a member of the Committee on Agriculture, and did not know that this bill had been before that committee at all. I would ask the minister to say, on his responsibility as a member of the Government, that this measure has been thoroughly discussed with the representatives of the Potato Growers' associations, as well as with the dealers, of the various provinces, and that they agreed upon the provisions of the bill as he originally introduced it?

Mr. MOTHERWELL: When this matter was before the committee I took the ground that, seeing that the bill was a new one and that the principle of grading farm produce was being introduced pretty rapidly all along the line, perhaps it would be just as well not to have the grades too severe at the outset until the people became familiar with the idea of grading roots and vegetables. I further expressed my belief that although this legislation was a little severe at the beginning, it would be all right in the course of a year or two. I may say that theoretically the proposed legislation, framed in the way spoken of by the hon. member for Parkdale (Mr. Spence), is sound, but I think that if its provisions were a little milder it could be introduced with less disturbance. Probably it would be better in the direction desired by the hon. member for Victoria and Carleton, N.B. (Mr. Caldwell). In considering the bill the committee were very evenly divided; numerically there was not much difference between the two schools of thought. The dealers, and a number of others, wanted legislation according to the bill as originally draughted, with fairly severe provisions and fairly high grades. The farmers present at the Committee on Agriculture—including my hon. friend (Mr. Caldwell), wanted grades of a little easier character; and I must say that I felt that at the outset that was preferable until the provisions of the bill had been in force for some time when we could tighten them up and demand grades that were a little higher. The vote in the committee stood seven : eight in favour of legislation such as the farmers wanted. Had the chairman voted the division would have been eight: eight. However, inasmuch as there was not a tie his vote was not called for. As I say, the committee were pretty evenly divided; there was not a strong preponderance of opinion either way. I took the ground, and I have had no reason to change my opinion, since that while the grading set forth in the bill as brought before the committee was technically and theoretically right, I did feel that for a year or two the grades demanded might be a little milder and a little easier until we got people familiarized with the idea of grading. After all, there is bound to be a certain amount of disturbance in new legislation, and the idea at first should be to familiarize people with it, and then tighten up later on.

Mr. HANSON: I asked the minister a question and he has entirely ignored it. I did not ask him what took place in the committee but whether the bill, as originally draughted, had been submitted to the representatives of the growers and the dealers from the different provinces, and whether they had agreed upon the principles enunciated in the measure as it was originally framed?

Mr. MOTHERWELL: Yes.

Mr. HANSON: When did that conference take place?

Mr. MOTHERWELL: I thought my hon. friend took it for granted from my reply that such was the case. The hon. member for Parkdale (Mr. Spence) made it quite plain. The conference took place about two or two and a half months ago—

An Hon. MEMBER: Two years ago.

Mr. MOTHERWELL: —and after some two or three days' debate the conclusions embodied in the original bill were arrived at. However that does not mean to say that such recommendations must be concurred in by this House; even the decisions of the Committee on Agriculture are not always adopted here. Parliament must be the supreme authority with respect to this matter. Let me say further that no bill that I know of is ever introduced into this House, on behalf of the Department of Agriculture, that is not first submitted to all the bodies interested throughout the country. That is the general policy which is always adopted, and in this case we brought in and consulted with people from various parts of Canada, including the dealers. That is strong presumptive evidence that the provisions of the bill are not far from being right. Nevertheless they have to be assented to by Parliament.

4 p.m.

Mr. CALDWELL: I was rather interested in the statement of the hon. member for Parkdale (Mr. Spence) and the telegrams which he read to the committee. Those telegrams state that the shippers and dealers in New Brunswick approve of the United States grade. Well, that is just what we have here with the amendments made by the Committee on Agriculture.

Mr. SPENCE: Mr. Chairman, I would like to—

Mr. CALDWELL: Have I the floor, Mr. Chairman, or the member for Parkdale?

The CHAIRMAN: Mr. Caldwell has the floor.

Mr. CALDWELL: The hon. member for Parkdale held up two small potatoes and declared "Here are No. 1's." I have graded too many potatoes, and seen too many potatoes graded, to think that any such potatoes are No. 1 potatoes. In reality, they are a poor No. 2, and I object very strongly to any hon. member trying to stampede the committee by exhibiting such small potatoes and claiming that they are what this bill calls for. Furthermore I wish to say this: The bill as amended by the Committee on Agriculture will provide for even better grades than the United States grades, and I propose to prove that to the committee. Our No. 1 grade includes all the potatoes above 1¾ of the long variety and 1⅞ of the round variety. The United States grade provides for a Fancy grade that may be taken out of their No. 1 grade, and the balance above 1¾ or 1⅞ are No. 1. We are not providing for any Fancy grades. The Fancy grades in the United States are all potatoes from 2 to 3½ inches weighing from 10 to 16 ounces. The balance of the United States potatoes larger than 1¾ inches are No. 1. In the case of our No. 1 the grade is 1⅞ for the round potatoes and 1¾ for the long potatoes.

[Mr. Hanson.]

Mr. HANSON: You have just stated that the growers desired to conform to the American grade. Will you please explain why no provision is made for the fancy grades such as the American public have?

Mr. CALDWELL: Our growers do not want that because it means lowering the quality of our No. 1 grade. They want the grades to conform with the United States No. 1 and No. 2 grades which are commercial grades. The Fancy grade in the United States is not a commercial grade: it is the grade that is in demand by railroad companies for baking purposes in their dining cars, but it is not a practical grade for farmers to conform to. Due to the fact that we are not making provision for this Fancy grade, our No. 1 grade includes the United States No. 1 and Fancy grades. I think the members of the committee are hardly in a position to arrive at a sound judgment on this matter from the bill as it appears on their files. The bill as amended by the Committee on Agriculture should have been distributed among the members generally and then they would have been in a better position to pass judgment on the proposed legislation. Here is the United States Fancy grade:

> This grade shall consist of sound potatoes of one variety which are mature, bright, smooth, well shaped, free from dirt or other foreign matter, frost injury, sunburn, second growth, growth cracks, cuts, scab, blight, soft rot, dry rot, and damage caused by disease, insects, or by mechanical or other means. The range in size shall be stated in terms of minimum and maximum diameter or weight following the grade name, but in no case shall the diameter be less than two inches.

Now I give the United States grade No 1:

> This grade shall consist of sound potatoes of similar varietal characteristics which are practi-

cally free from dirt or other foreign matter, frost injury, sunburn, second growth, growth cracks, cuts, scab, blight, soft rot. dry rot, and damage caused by disease, insects, or mechanical or other means.

The diameter of the potatoes of the round varieties shall not be less than one and seven-eighths inches, and of potatoes of long varieties one and three-fourths inches.

Now, the description of the grade ends there. Our No. 1 or A grade will be the same, with the amendments as recommended by the Committee on Agriculture. The hon. member for Parkdale has read telegrams from dealers who say they are in favour of a grade conforming with the United States grade. I want to say, Mr. Chairman, that I was one of the first men in New Brunswick to ask the Government to pass a grading act, and we want it passed for these reasons. We have been under a handicap in times past with regard to shipping potatoes. We ship potatoes to men posibly like Mr. Spence in Parkdale, who is a potato dealer. If the market went down before a car arrived, they would wire back that the potatoes were not good. As we had no standard grade, we had nothing to decide whether the potatoes were No. 1 or not. I want to cite an instance that happened in Toronto. I would hate to think that Mr. Spence was the man involved; I doubt if he was. Let me tell the committee what happened and why we want this grade. The man whose letter I am going to read shipped a car of potatoes to a man in Toronto, and the man in Toronto wired back and said the potatoes were no good. The market had gone down.

Mr. McMASTER: Even though they came from New Brunswick?

Mr. CALDWELL: The shipper had an agent in Ontario and he wired him immediately to proceed to Toronto and investigate this case. This man landed in Toronto the next morning. He went into this dealer's office, and he said: "Have you any good New Brunswick potatoes for sale?" The dealer said, "Yes, I have a car of the finest stock I have ever handled." The agent said: "I would like to see them." The agent had the number of the car, and he went in and was shown his own company's car, recommended by the dealer as the best potatoes he had ever handled. After talking with the dealer for a few minutes, the agent presented his card, and I am free to inform the committee that he received a very good settlement for that car of potatoes. If a New Brunswick shipper ships a car of No. 1 potatoes to Toronto and the man in Toronto turns them down, we can, under this measure, ask the Government to send an inspector to Toronto or wherever the point may be. If the inspector says that the potatoes are No. 1 according to this specification, the man in Toronto must pay for them. This will also protect the dealer in Toronto, because if they are not No. 1 potatoes, he will not have to pay for them. I am one of the strongest supporters in this House of grading. I want to read a letter from possibly the biggest shipper in Canada of potatoes, a man who had the advantage, not of reading a telegram from any hon. member of this House as to what he thought was some theoretical Grading Act but of having a copy of the bill.

Mr. SPENCE: What is his name?

Mr. CALDWELL: I will give his name directly. Mr. MacIntosh, Acting Fruit Commissioner had sent this man a copy, not of the amendments, but of the original bill. I do not think I will read the whole letter; I will read the last paragraph.

Mr. SPENCE: I would ask the hon. gentleman to read the whole letter.

Mr. CALDWELL: With pleasure.

Mr. G. E. MacINTOSH,
Acting Fruit Commissioner,
Ottawa, Ont.

Dear Sir:—

We have your letter of the 12th instant enclosing official grading rules as are in force at present, also copy of bill covering compulsory grading of potatoes.

We do not think the grading regulations as mentioned in this act are any good. In fact, the act as we see it, does not contain any grades or state any standard quality, and if put in force it will leave the potatoes to the mercy of inspectors, who can go into farmers' cellars, shippers' warehouses or receiver's store and condemn any potatoes for no reason whatever and just using their own judgment. So far as we can see there is no redress. There is a clause in the act stating that no one can sell or offer for sale any potatoes so diseased as to be unfit for human consumption. We believe this is unnecessary, as any local health officer has the authority to prevent the sale of food unfit for human consumption. Section 2 of the proposed act covers faced packages. We do not believe there is any facing done in packing potatoes, as they are handled in such large quantities, we do not believe they would be able to do this. In fact, in our experience, we have never seen it done.

This is the pragraph I proposed to read, but my hon. friend wanted it all:

So far as we can see, after a complete and careful examination of the proposed act, it does not mean anything nor get us anywhere. What the potato industry of the country needs is com- would recommend that a grade be made to

pulsory grading of a practical sort, and we correspond with the United States grade one and two. This will make the potato grading regulations uniform in both Canada and United States, and will enable the farmers to grade the one grade only, and when stock of this grade is produced they can sell it in either United States or Canada. Grades as mentioned in the Inspection and Sales Act are practically the same as regulations of the United States grades, but there are some minor differences. We have asked the United States Department of Agriculture to forward us up-to-date grading regulations, and when we receive these will forward to you.

This is signed by Mr. Guy G. Porter, of Perth, N.B., one of the largest exporters and shippers of potatoes in Canada. He wrote me this letter accompanying the copy of the letter which he had mailed to Mr. MacIntosh. This is dated June 16, 1922:

Dear Mr. Caldwell, we are in receipt of a report from the House, giving us proposed bill for the regulation of sale and inspection of root vegetables. We have gone very carefully over the proposed regulations, and as near as we can find out, it does not mean anything. There is no grade or standard quality established but gives the inspector authority to use his own discretion in condemning any potatoes as he wishes.

Under the provisions of the proposed act, an inspector can go into a farmer's cellar, or warehouse, or the receiver's store and condemn any potatoes he finds there, and so far as we can see we have no redress. If the enforcement of the act is left in the hands of the usual half-baked inspectors the Government usually appoints, we will have to go out of business.

Guy G. Porter.

Mr. HOEY: Is he a grower of potatoes?

Mr. CALDWELL: He is a grower as well as a shipper. He was one of the first men in New Brunswick to ask for a Grading Act. Five or six years ago, before the New Brunswick Potato Growers' Association, of which I was president at the time, he gave a very able address on the grading of potatoes. This was an organization formed by some of the foremost growers of potatoes in New Brunswick as a means of educating farmers to the necessity, not only of grading, but of selecting better seed and other factors along the line of growing potatoes.

Another clause of this bill that my hon. friend from Parkdale (Mr. Spence) wants cut out, the cutting out of which will have the effect of allowing United States potatoes to come into Canada and not bear this inspection and compete with our home grown potatoes—

Mr. SPENCE: I asked that nothing be cut out. I did not make that statement.

[Mr. Caldwell.]

Mr. CALDWELL: Left in then. The hon. member wants the words "grown in Canada" left in. I am speaking of the bill as amended by the committee on agriculture.

Mr. SPENCE: I was willing to accede to the wishes of the hon. member to cut that out if he so wished.

Mr. CALDWELL: I do not think I am unreasonable. If there is one thing about which I know more than any other one thing, it is growing, grading and marketing potatoes. I know what the wishes of the people of New Brunswick are in that regard. I was president of the New Brunswick Potato Growers' Association for the first two years that it was formed; in fact, I was one of the originators of it, and it was started for the purpose of educating the people to select better seed, to use better methods of cultivation and to grow a better crop per acre so that they might make it pay. This organization was carried on by men who gave their time and energy to it without cost to anybody. We, the officials of it, spent our time; we paid our own expenses; there were no funds in connection with it. The work was done for the purpose of assisting the potato growers of New Brunswick. I would respectfully submit that we should not pass a Grading Act that would put a greater handicap upon our own potato growers than is necessary. We want a Grading Act; we want to conform to the United States grading, because we are selling in competition with United States shippers in every market in which we are selling, even in our own. We are shipping to Cuba in competition with United States shippers. If we quote a No. 1 grade to the buyer in Cuba and the United States shipper also quotes a No. 1 grade, we do not want to be under any handicap. Further than that, as well as asking for a Grading Act, in New Brunswick, we have been grading our potatoes for something like three or four years. We have bought grading machinery, the same as the United States shippers use, which conforms with United States regulations. The mesh in our machinery for a No. 1 grade is $1\frac{13}{16}$ths of an inch. Every potato that goes through that mesh is not a No. 1; every potato that goes over it is a No. 1. would be according to the United States Act and should be by our act. What machinery can you get with a $1\frac{7}{8}$ths inch mesh or some other size that will tell you how many of the potatoes which go over that mesh are some other size? That is the

reason I want this cut out, because it is impracticable, impossible. No one ever saw a crop of potatoes like the one the hon. member for Parkdale held up. We feed practically all such potatoes to hogs. There is a demand in the West Indies for those small No. 2 potatoes, but there is no demand anywhere else that I know of. I hope the committee will see fit to accept this measure. It is getting pretty late in the session and we are all anxious to go home; but I would be willing to stay here until the end of July rather than see a bill passed the provisions of which the shippers of New Brunswick could not comply with.

Mr SPENCE: Our potatoes are not up to the standard of the American potatoes. Our A1 grade is in competition with the American Fancy grades. I was in Toronto the other day and visited the markets, and they were selling American potatoes there. The people of Virginia handle an enormous quantity of potatoes. They have several thousand acres on the eastern shore of Virginia and they quote Fancies at $5 a barrel and Straights at $4.75. The different states have different laws and my hon. friend is not right when he says that the United States No. 1 is in competition with our A1 grade. In the United States 25 farmers, say, will fill a 200-barrel car, and because the potatoes are taken from different farms they are sold at so much less. If one man produces the whole carload the potatoes are graded as Fancy. Our A1 grade is in competition with those potatoes, and we have no Fancy grades. Our A1 is our fanciest. My hon. friend says that the gentleman to whom he refers, Mr. Porter, is one of the largest dealers in the country. Let me tell him that there are men in this country who route more cars than he has individual potatoes; and that gentleman is not even the third, fourth or fifth largest shipper in the province of New Brunswick, nor does he ship on as large a scale as many potato growers in Ontario. The firm of N. Ellis and Clarke will ship more in one year than Mr. Porter will in probably three years.

Mr. CALDWELL: You are misinformed.

Mr. SPENCE: My hon. friend from Victoria and Carleton (Mr. Caldwell) knows the conditions in his own little locality, but I want to tell him that he is not as familiar with conditions generally throughout the country as I am. I have given this matter careful study and I know what I am talking about. The hon. gentleman does not know all the shippers.

Mr. CALDWELL: My hon. friend says that I do not know these men, although I live within twenty miles of each of them.

Mr. SPENCE: You have lived there all your life and you are acquainted with the conditions in that particular area, but you do not know what is done elsewhere. Nothing has come up in this House touching any question at all, with which the hon. gentleman has not conveyed the impression that he is absolutely conversant. He appears to know everything, no matter what it may relate to. Now, I am not a potato dealer; I am a wholesale fruit merchant, and although I handle potatoes on the side it does not matter to me a two-penny piece whether this legislation goes into effect or not. It does not mean one cent to me; whether it is passed or not my pocket will not be affected. I am working purely in the interests of the potato growers and dealers of the country, and I can say that 25 per cent of the dealers are unscrupulous and will give no one a square deal. Seventy-five per cent of our farmers and dealers are absolutely honest and will give every man a proper deal, and I do not see why the other 25 per cent cannot do the same thing. I appeal to all hon. gentlemen to pass the legislation as recommended by men who know what they are talking about and who have given consideration to this matter for five or six years. There is no sense in any hon. gentleman sitting here and indulging in carping criticism, reading such letters as my hon. friend has quoted from Mr. Porter, saying that these inspectors are only half-baked men. Fourteen years ago when the Fruit Marking Act was passed you could not buy an honest basket of peaches or barrel of apples in Canada.

Mr. CALDWELL: Oh, my.

Mr. SPENCE: No, Sir, you could not do it. But to-day the average grower would no more think of reverting to the old condition of things than he would think of flying in the air. Everyone is satisfied with the way in which the act has been enforced, and the fact that only five convictions have been registered in four years is ample proof of the efficacy of the law. I should like other hon. members to express their view on this subject.

Mr. HALBERT: As a member of the Committee on Agriculture I desire to say a word or two in regard to the facts that

have been submitted to the committee. For some years the potato growers of New Brunswick have been grading their potatoes in accordance with the regulations proposed in this bill, which corresponds to an act, a copy of which I have seen, prescribing the grades of American potatoes. I understand that the Fancy grade of American potatoes is used only for special purposes. I was somewhat surprised to hear the hon. member for Parkdale (Mr. Spence) criticising the hon. member for Victoria and Carleton (Mr. Caldwell) in the way he did and suggesting that that hon. member did not know anything about potatoes. I heard the member for Parkdale say in the committee that the best potatoes he got came from New Brunswick.

Mr. MOTHERWELL: Under the grading system?

Mr. HALBERT: Yes. It is evident therefore that the grading system has been successful, since the potatoes which the hon. member for Parkdale praises were marketed under that system. I cannot see where his objections come in. I agree absolutely with the minister in regard to these regulations. Every place is not like New Brunswick, and as the grading system is not general throughout the country it is as well to go a little slowly. But the men who load potatoes on the track from the farmers can, I think, comply with the regulations.

Mr. CALDWELL: There is one other point I want to have cleared up. The hon. member for Parkdale says that our A1 grade corresponds with the United States Fancy grade.

Mr. SPENCE: It is in competition with that grade.

Mr. CALDWELL: There is no comparison whatever. The regulation with regard to the United States fancy grade requires that this grade shall consist of sound potatoes of one variety. That means that the potatoes must be either Irish Cobblers, Green Mountains, Gold Coins, or any other one particular variety. Our No. 1 grade does not comply with such a regulation. Our A1 grade, it is required, shall include only sound and reasonably mature potatoes of similar characteristics, which means that all white potatoes can come under this grade. The United States Fancy grade, on the other hand, must be all of one variety. There is therefore absolutely no comparison between the United States Fancy grade and our No. 1. I hope the member for Parkdale will not insist that the United States Fancy grade is put on the market in competition with our No. 1 grade, or that the two are in any way comparable. Our No. 1 grade includes the United States No. 1 and Fancy, because we take nothing out of our No. 1 grade, while they take out of their No. 1 to make up their Fancy grade.

Mr. ROBINSON: I understand that this bill has been drafted on the advice of a conference of potato growers, sellers and handlers, and it seems to me that we shall be on safe ground if we follow that advice. I have nothing much to say on this question except that I support the amendment of the hon. member for Parkdale.

Mr. CALDWELL: In that connection I want to say a further word. This matter was not submitted in all its details to the committee. The member for Parkdale has several telegrams from various men, one of whom was at the conference, and the general desire is to have our Grading Act correspond to that of the United States.

Mr. SPENCE: I suppose the hon. member is a particular friend of the supporter.

Mr. CALDWELL: These men in New Brunswick are all my friends. There are very few people in that province who are not my friends. If the bill in its entirety were submitted to the men who sent the telegrams to the member for Parkdale I am sure they would want our act to correspond with that of the United States. I want something that will correspond with the United States grade.

Mr. SPENCE: The hon. gentleman makes a statement that is absolutely false.

Some hon. MEMBERS: Order.

Mr. CALDWELL: I object, Mr. Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN: Order.

Mr. CALDWELL: I ask the hon. gentleman to retract.

Mr. SPENCE: If I have offended, Mr. Chairman, I apologize. The hon. gentleman has stated three or four times that those wires came from men who say they want grading according to the United States act. I say that is not so. The telegrams are in the hands of Hansard now and a perusal of them will bear me out. I am asking for nothing that is not fair. What I am advocating does not come from any narrow-minded group at all. I claim that the highest grade in Canada should

compare favourably with the highest grade in the United States. And anyhow, is Canada not big enough to make a grade for her own without reference to the United States? We always find that the United States have a higher standard than our own. Honourable men have been driven out of the business because of the conditions prevailing, and it is only by establishing proper grading and picking the business out of the mire that you will get men of that type back into the business again. It should be here as in the States, that if a man in his office receives a wire from the country, "I have five cars of first grade potatoes at a certain siding," he can feel absolutely assured of their quality and reply, "I will accept them. Ship two to Pittsburg and three to Buffalo." I have done that many times. To-day you cannot trust any shipper sufficiently to do that. Why should we be in that condition in this country? Only three weeks ago I received a wire from Charles Kelly, Sons & Co., Pittsburg, for a few carloads of high grade potatoes. Those here who know the potato dealers in the United States are aware that that firm buys hundreds of cars of potatoes in this country to ship across the line. I could not get any in Ontario, and I had no time to try Nova Scotia or New Brunswick. They grow good potatoes down there, and down in Prince Edward Island they excel in that business—in fact I have never got a crooked car of potatoes from Prince Edward Island. I met Mr. Nelles on Colborne street and asked him, "Can you do anything for Kelly?" He replied, "Mr. Spence, it is no use trying, you cannot get those potatoes in Ontario." Are we to tolerate a condition of affairs like that? I say, No, that this House has sufficient backbone to pass legislation as recommended by the department. What do we have departments for? To make recommendations, of course. Their experts have been on the job for years. They put through the Fruit Grading Act, and every one today can buy a basket of peaches fully assured that the fruit will be as good at the bottom as on top. That is the condition we should have in the potato trade.

Mr. CALDWELL: Sure.

Mr. SPENCE: Some members may think that I am personally interested in this bill, that its passage will enure to my benefit. Not a bit of it. But it will be a good thing for the country. We had objections raised at the conference. Some of our good friends from the East said that we should allow them to export potatoes of an inferior grade to what would be handled in the home market. I objected to that, but when they explained to me that the people of Bermuda and the West Indies wanted this small stuff which my hon. friend desires to grade No. 1, as they were very poor and can buy these potatoes at a very cheap rate, I withdrew my objection. I was also given to understand that the people there bought these small potatoes for seed. Anyhow we allowed our friends to have that privilege.

Mr. SINCLAIR (Queens): I am glad to see that hon. members are practically unanimous in the view that it is a good thing for us to establish grading in the marketing of potatoes. We have accomplished a good deal in that way in other lines of agricultural products, and we hope to be equally successful in respect to potatoes if this bill is adopted. This grading has been discussed for many years by producers' associations as well as by dealers, and at the conference which has been referred to the grade was pretty well agreed upon. But we are a little divided on the standard to be adopted. It is that point I shall deal with. The grade adopted by the conference has been approved by the experts in the Department of Agriculture, and therefore my hon. colleague has introduced this bill. But in the Agricultural Committee some division of opinion arose in regard to allowing certain smaller varieties than some thought was advisable to come within the grade. It is a great benefit to the producers to have not too low a grade. The samples exhibited to the committee by the hon. member for Parkdale showed potatoes of 1⅞ inch size, which size our experts consider is rather small for the No. 1 grade. I was a little surprised to hear my hon. friend from Victoria and Carleton question the accuracy of the size. Evidently with him seeing is not believing. I think the potatoes shown here are similar to those shown in the committee, and according to our experts they are true examples of the small size that is allowed in the grade. In the commercial varieties of potatoes sold in eastern Canada, and especially in the province which I know a little better than I know the other provinces, potatoes of the size of 1⅞ are not allowed. It is very rare and only by mistake that they ever get into our commercial shipments.

Mr. SPENCE: You can grow larger potatoes than that.

Mr. SINCLAIR (Queens): In fact 2¼ inches is considered a very small potato. In order that the producers and others who are ready to put proper potatoes in their shipments may get the full benefit of their honesty, it is necessary to meet the views stated by the conference and embodied in the bill which was amended in committee. But I feel it would be doing a benefit to the trade to retain in the bill those words which are sought to be struck out. However, I am merely expressing the views as I see them from the standpoint of the potato producers in eastern Canada, and I know that in my province it would be of much greater value to us to have the grade kept at not less than 2¼ inches, making allowance for 20 per cent to be as low as 1⅞.

Mr. GOOD: One point in connection with the size I think has been overlooked. I presume that the samples exhibited by the hon. member for Parkdale measure 1⅞ in their greatest transverse diameter. But as a matter of fact the grading screen has a square mesh, and the potatoes are of such a shape that they pass through the mesh diagonally, and I think hon. members will find that potatoes very much larger than those exhibited will pass through the screen. If every potato went through exactly across the square it would be different. This I think ought to be kept in view, as it very largely does away with the objection raised by the hon. member for Parkdale as to the size of the potatoes which he has produced.

Mr. CALDWELL: Before the vote is taken, seeing that the hon. member from Parkdale (Mr. Spence) has exhibited what he calls a No. 1 potato, I want to show the House a potato 2¼ inches, of the long variety, and my hon. friend from Queens (Mr. Sinclair) says they do not use any smaller potato than that. I will submit that that is a pretty good sized potato.

Mr. CHAPLIN: What is it?

Mr. CALDWELL: Judging from the look of it, I would think it was a Green Mountain. As regards that potato, we are saying there shall not be more than 20 per cent smaller than that.

Mr. CHAPLIN: What size is that?

Mr. CALDWELL: It is 2¼ inches. I think surely the hon. member from Queens who knows a lot about potatoes, has hardly measured the potato. I am not doubting his honesty or sincerity, because he is one of the most sincere men in this House, but I am afraid he has been stampeded by the hon. member from Parkdale.

[Mr. J. E. Sinclair.]

Mr. CHAPLIN: Show us the potato 1¾ inches.

Mr. CALDWELL: I have not got one.

Mr. SPENCE: Prince Edward Island scarcely ever ships a potato of that size. We are asking that 20 per cent be allowed on 1⅞, which, I think, is a fair proposition. In the United States, there is nothing less allowed than 2¼. We are not asking that.

Mr. CALDWELL: My hon. friend says that Fancy in the United States is nothing less than 2¼ inches.

Mr. SPENCE: I object to my hon. friend making that statement. I have been making a logical comparison, I think.

Mr. CALDWELL: The United States Fancy Grade is not under 2 inches. He says 2¼.

Amendment (Mr. Spence) negatived on division: Yeas 37, Nays 64.

Section as amended agreed to.

On clause 13—Vegetables to be sold by weight.

Mr. McMASTER: This clause provides that vegetables have to be sold by weight. Would that apply to a sale by a farmer to a neighbour, or to a man living next door to him?

Mr. CALDWELL: It applies to all sales, I take it.

Mr. MOTHERWELL: I think not—not any more than to a sale of grain. It is not necessary to grade, where one farmer deals with another. Potatoes are exposed, and both parties can see them. It speaks about that question in the former section, where they have to buy in barrels.

Mr. CALDWELL: It is not included in this clause, and I submit it might be well that clause 13 should only apply to closed packages.

Mr. HANSON: I think there should be a safeguard there for potatoes sold openly by the farmers, in the open market. I would suggest that the amendment proposed by the hon. member from Victoria and Carleton (Mr. Caldwell) be added to clause 13. It seems to me it is

not necessary they should be sold by weight. It is not done locally in my city.

Mr. CALDWELL: This only applies to the open barrel, because the clause says:

Or when potatoes are sold or offered for sale by the closed barrel, this section shall not apply to the same.

I think you should substitute the words "open barrel or package" for "closed barrel" in this section. This should only apply to the open package. I can see a very great hardship will result. Farmers will haul potatoes into the market, as my hon. friend from York-Sunbury (Mr. Hanson) says. They have no scales there, and they sell them by the bag or barrel, the standard bag being 90 pounds and the standard barrel 165 pounds. Clause 12 provides for the closed barrel as follows:

No person shall sell or offer, expose or have in his possession any potatoes for sale by the closed barrel unless every such barrel is well and properly filled.

Mr. SPENCE: Is it not the intention of the department that everything shall be sold by weight? There have been complaints in the past about people selling potatoes in different-sized bags. I believe the fairest thing is to sell by weight. We have a number of a cheap class of jobbers in every city in the world, and they will sometimes fill the bottom of the receptacle with hay or wood or anything else.

Mr. CALDWELL: Is that done in Toronto?

Mr. SPENCE: Yes, and in your country too.

Mr. CALDWELL: Never.

Mr. SPENCE: It is done everywhere no matter where you go. There have been repeated convictions for this offence. The weight system of selling is the only feasible and proper thing.

Mr. MARCIL (Bonaventure): In Montreal the custom for a long time has been to sell potatoes by the eighty-pound bag whereas the regulation size is ninety pounds. This matter has often been discussed in the House, but the old custom still prevails and very often the person buying a bag of potatoes is not in a position to know whether he is getting an eighty- or a ninety-pound bag. Has there ben any final ruling on that point by the department, and will the bill put an end to that difficulty and establish the weight for a bag of potatoes?

Mr. MOTHERWELL: Bags vary so much in size that it is difficult for a person to know just what he is getting. Consequently, weight seems to be the only logical way of selling potatoes, especially when dealing with men at a distance. This system will disturb some of the old usages my hon. friend speaks of, and that is why we are adopting the system of grading so as to reduce this disturbance to a minimum during the first year or two of the operation of the bill. I do not think it will cause much friction, and once the people get familiar with the idea of buying by weight they will no longer want to hang on to the old system of buying by the bag. A bag is usually understood to be a bushel and a half, or ninety pounds, but sometimes bags contain only eighty pounds. This bill will remove the uncertainty that now prevails in that respect.

Mr. SPENCE: The matter of selling by weight was taken up at the conference and I remember that a gentleman from Quebec stated there that in his province the bag was eighty pounds. There is no law regulating the size of a bag of potatoes at all. A bushel of potatoes is sixty pounds and a bag may hold any quantity. In British Columbia they want to make the bag from 150 to 200 pounds. We cannot get people around Toronto to handle that size, but they have the labour out there in British Columbia and want it that way. In Nova Scotia also they have large sacks. What we want is to have uniformity, and the only way to get that is to sell by weight. In the fall of the year when potatoes are heavy, you will only get six pecks to the bag; in the spring potatoes are much lighter, and ninety pounds weighed into a bag will measure out sometimes seven pecks. This is giving the consumer the worst of the deal. My experience has been that selling by weight is the only proper and fair way.

Mr. CALDWELL: As usual, the hon. member for Parkdale is absolutely wrong when he says there is no definite size for a bag of potatoes provided in the law. By an amendment to the Inspection and Sale Act in 1914 it was provided that:

A bag of any article mentioned in this subsection shall contain that number of Dominion standard pounds of such article which is shown in this subsection opposite the name of such article.

Description of Article	Weight in Dominion Standard pounds
Artichokes	84 lbs.
Beets	75 "
Carrots	75 "
Onions	75 "
Parsnips	66 "
Potatoes	90 "
Turnips	75 "

So my hon friend is wrong again, as usual.

Mr. SPENCE: I am not wrong. It has been decided in court over and over again that a bag full of potatoes may be only that size. That is the law to-day, as my hon. friends who are in the legal profession will know.

Section agreed to.

Mr. MOTHERWELL: I would again call attention to section 13. I believe the act as drafted is the correct way. The weight was not meant to apply to the closed barrel, because the size of it is designated in inches and therefore in that case it is not necessary to sell by weight. I think that is the intent of the act, and it is only intelligible from that standpoint.

Mr. CALDWELL: I have no very serious objection to this, only I did not want to disturb the method now in vogue at all. I want the man to get what he pays for, certainly.

Mr. SPENCE: The hon. member for Victoria and Carleton was opposed to this because he had a certain size of barrel down there that he wanted to use for his own purposes.

Mr. MOTHERWELL: Has section 13 passed?

The CHAIRMAN: Yes.

On section 16—penalty for violation of act:

Mr. SPENCE: The committee will notice that the hon. member for Victoria and Carleton imposes a heavy penalty on the man who deals in the stuff, and the penalty is all taken off the grower. Is that square? Does not the dealer deserve consideration? The penalty suggested by the department was $40. My hon. friend suggested that it be made $100. Why should that be changed? Why should we legislate against the dealers any more than against the growers? I just want to draw attention to the class of legislation we are getting.

Mr. CALDWELL: My hon. friend says that I object to a penalty for the grower. I do not object. Section 16 provides a penalty for the grower.

Section agreed to.

On section 22—Repeal:

Mr. CALDWELL: This is one clause that I object to because it would upset the well-established practice throughout the country, that a bag of potatoes shall be 90 pounds, a bushel 60 pounds, and a barrel 165 pounds. Our barrel of potatoes used to be 180 pounds. In 1914, after a very strenuous session, possibly almost as strenuous as the debate this afternoon, we got the act amended to provide that 165 pounds of potatoes should be a barrel. Now I am not objecting to selling by the pound, in fact we do that now; but this applies to selling in a local market by farmers. It is a custom that has been followed for a long time. I would like to know what my hon. friend from York-Sunbury (Mr. Hanson) thinks of this. He lives in a town that is supplied by local farmers, and he is familiar with the customs and conditions there. I am a little afraid you are going to make confusion in Canada this year by doing what is proposed. It may be possible to cut this provision out at some later period, but I do not think it is advisable at the present time. I do not think it will affect the operations of the present bill if the existing legislation is left as it is in that particular.

Mr. MOTHERWELL: Is that in regard to cutting out section 22?

Mr. CALDWELL: Yes. I would like to know what my hon. friend from York-Sunbury thinks about it because he lives in a potato growing section.

Mr. HANSON: One hundred and sixty-five pounds is the accepted weight of a barrel of potatoes in the province of New Brunswick, and unless there has been a demand for a change on the part of the dealers or growers I would like to have that stand.

Mr. MOTHERWELL: Then, you would suggest cutting out section 22?

Mr. HANSON: I do not know what the effect of that would be.

Mr. CALDWELL: I would suggest that you let it stand. If you find next year that it would be unwise to allow the provision

to remain it will be easy to make the change. To cut out the provision now might simply create more confusion in the trade.

Mr. MOTHERWELL: I believe in simplifying legislation of this kind as much as possible.

The CHAIRMAN: The two acts will be absolutely in conflict as to measure and weight.

Mr. CALDWELL: I do not like to differ with your opinion, Mr. Chairman, but I cannot help but do so. The act provides that the weight of these vegetables offered for sale shall be so many pounds avoirdupois. This clause that we are proposing to repeal provides that a bag of potatoes shall be ninety pounds, a barrel one hundred and sixty-five pounds and a bushel sixty pounds. In my humble opinion the present bill will not conflict with the existing act. If I thought it would I would not urge this action on the minister. My theory is that unless my suggestion is acted upon it will create very great confusion in the trade as it is carried on at the present time.

Mr. ROBINSON: Does my hon. friend wish to reduce the size of the barrel?

Mr. CALDWELL: No, I wish to leave the law as it is.

Mr. ROBINSON: Section 10 fixes the size of the barrel.

Mr. HANSON: The law merely applies to closed barrels. What we propose here applies also to open barrels and to the local trade.

Mr. MOTHERWELL: I would not like to agree to the elimination of this section until I had looked into the matter and ascertained just how it would affect the rest of the act. I think we might report the bill from committee so that it might stand for third reading. This would give opportunity for reconsideration and if it were deemed necessary to refer the bill back again into committee that course might be taken.

Mr. CALDWELL: That is perfectly satisfactory.

Mr. MARCIL (Bonaventure): In my constituency potatoes are sent out in carload lots. Does this bill provide that hereafter they will have to be sold by weight?

Mr. MOTHERWELL: Yes, sold by weight.

Mr. MARCIL (Bonaventure): Is that a new provision?

Mr. MOTHERWELL: It is a provision in the present bill that potatoes shall be sold by weight.

Mr. HANSON: Before you leave the chair, Mr. Chairman, I would like to ask the minister if he would give still more consideration to the provisions of section 13. Now, that section will affect the market gardeners. If you enact a law that all vegetables shall be sold by weight and it does not apply to closed barrels it must mean open barrels. I would like to have a definite understanding on the point.

5 p.m.

Mr. CALDWELL: It does apply to open barrels.

Mr. HANSON: I am sure it does from the construction of the section, and, from the point of view of the local consumers, that ought not to be. The bill enumerates the vegetables that are to be sold by weight and then provides that when any of these vegetables, or potatoes, are sold by the closed barrel the section shall not apply. The inference to be drawn is unmistakeable.

Mr. MOTHERWELL: I will be very glad to discuss the point with my hon. friend to-morrow before the third reading. Then if deemed desirable the bill can be referred back to the committee to make such changes as may be found necessary.

Mr. CALDWELL: I presume the bill will not apply to potatoes sold in closed packages. The section mentions "closed barrel" but it does not refer to a closed bag.

Mr. MOTHERWELL: We can inquire into that and have all such matters cleared up to-morrow.

Section agreed to and bill reported.

CANADIAN WHEAT BOARD

House again in committee on Bill No. 176 to provide for the constitution and powers of the Canadian Wheat Board, Mr. Marcil (Bonaventure) in the Chair.

The CHAIRMAN: The only thing left to consider is an amendment by Mr. Johnson (Moosejaw), which reads as follows:

The Board shall have power by regulation, approved by the Lieutenant Governor in Coun-

cil of any province which has enacted such legislation as in the last preceding section described; to prohibit, or to impose such conditions or restrictions as may be deemed advisable upon the export of wheat from that province, except by or under the authority or direction of the Board.

It is proposed that this amendment shall be included in the bill as Section 18.

Mr. ROBB: If my hon. friend from Moosejaw will agree to an amendment to this effect—

—and also approved by the Governor General in Council—

the Government will accept the new clause.

Mr. MACLEAN (Halifax): I would like to ask the mover of the amendment if he seriously thinks it is desirable legislation to give power to this Wheat Board to prevent a man from exporting his wheat from one province to another, or if he considers it fair to tell a man in any of the provinces, say the maritime provinces, that power should be vested in this Board to prevent him from buying wheat from any persons in these provinces who wish to buy from him? On what principle can anybody defend a proposition of this character? I think it is most vicious legislation, and I am astonished that it gets support from any person in this House.

Mr. SPENCER: Someone—I think it was the hon. member for Comox-Alberni (Mr. Neill)—mentioned that those who knew most about farming were always those who live in the cities. We have a good deal of criticism from hon. members who do not happen to be farmers and who probably know very little about farming except from hearsay.

Mr. MACLEAN (Halifax): Farming has nothing to do with this question, has it? What relation is there between the occupation of farming and determining intelligently the effect of this bill? Is there any remote or close relationship between the two questions?

Mr. SPENCER: There is this in it that it is surmised by hon. members that this legislation is not asked for, is not wanted by the people of Canada for whom the legislation is being passed. Speaking for myself, as a member representing one constituency in the West, I have received no fewer than 202 resolutions, not from individuals, but from organized communities, making demands for this sort of legislation, and other hon. members have received similar numbers of resolutions along the same lines. The people of the West, through their organized conventions, have for some time past made a definite demand for this sort of legislation. This is not a matter of doing some harm to some other part of the Dominion; it is not a matter whether we are penalizing individuals or not. If we are penalizing anybody, we are penalizing ourselves. We are simply asking for legislation so that we can market our crop to the very best advantage, so that we may do away with certain customs that have been detrimental to the best interests of the farmers. Moreover, it was suggested the other day by an hon. member on the other side of the House, if this legislation is passed it would be detrimental to immigration, but I say if it does not pass, after it has been asked for by such a huge majority of the people of western Canada, I can safely say that that fact will have a detrimental effect on immigration, because it is the people of western Canada who, in the long run, are going to say if we are to have immigration into that country or not. If those people do not want immigration to go into the West, they will certainly stop it from going in; if they want immigration, they are the best people to encourage it. If hon. members refuse to give those people the legislation they are continually asking for and which they have to have if conditions are to be improved, it will certainly be very harmful to the best interests of agriculture. I would therefore ask for the passing of this act.

Mr. McMASTER: I am afraid that I cannot have any great hopes of converting this committee to a serious appreciation of what we are doing, but at least I will do my best.

Mr. MEIGHEN: I admit myself a convert.

Mr. McMASTER: I am glad to know that the leader of the Opposition is a convert; but I wish he would have the zeal of a convert; that he would not take it out in strong language, calling this thing a famished, deformed monstrosity with teeth. I wish he would get himself and his supporters, if he has any serious men amongst them, to withstand this legislation which, as has been said in the most kindly and amiable manner by the hon. member for Halifax (Mr. Maclean), is, I believe, the most vicious legislation that

has ever been presented to this House. What does it mean? It means that it will be in the power of this board, with the concurrence of a Lieutenant-Governor in Council and the Governor General in Council to prohibit interprovincial trade in Canada; that this board shall have the right to say that grain grown in Alberta shall not have free course into Manitoba; and if I mistake not, it also gives the board the right to prohibit the importation of grain from one province to another. I say this in all kindness to friends with whom, as a rule, I agree largely on public questions in this House, that they hardly realize what they are doing. Such a proposal, if I mistake not, would be prohibited by the constitution of the United States where trade must flow freely from one state to another. I take it and I believe students of history will bear me out, that one of the reasons for the tremendous material prosperity of the United States has been that, since the American revolution and since the formation of the thirteen original states, trade has always been absolutely free between the different states of the American union. That is one of the great reasons for their tremendous material prosperity. You are proposing by this legislation to do what, if you were south of the line, would be a violation of the constitution of that country.

Mr. McCONICA: Does the constitution of the United States not provide that the United States Congress shall have control over interstate trade and commerce, and does the Interstate Trade and Commerce Commission not to-day control interstate commerce in the United States?

Mr. McMASTER: I believe they have the right to regulate it; but I apprehend, and I believe I am right in the statement, that nobody in the United States, without a constitutional amendment, would have the right to prohibit trade from flowing freely from one state to another. The experience of that great people has been that they have never attempted to interfere with the free flow of commerce to and from the different states. Before the American revolution, when they were all colonies of Great Britain, you could not bring a load of wood from New Jersey into the city of New York without paying a customs tariff. One of the great benefits given to the United States by the revolution was the wiping away of such economic absurdities. Whether or not the protests made by the senior member for Halifax (Mr. Maclean) and myself may have any effect in this committee, I know not; but this I know, that our voice has been raised in protest; and in all sincerity, I ask: What is the situation that we meet in this committee? This legislation is asked for by a body at least one-third of which do not believe it is wise, it is given by another party, the whole of which think it is unwise, while a third party, after taking it out in hard language, apparently sit idly by without any effective protest against such legislation.

Mr. MEIGHEN: Although I would not dare impugn the sincerity of my hon. friend (Mr. McMaster), one would gather from his remarks, if one has followed the course of this debate, that his object in rising was to try, if he could, to set hon. members on this side against himself.

Mr. McMASTER: No, I want all hon. members of good sense to agree with me, and if they will express their honest opinion, I think they can do nothing other than agree with me.

Mr. MEIGHEN: Therefore, the hon. member addresses himself in hostile language to the party in this corner, which has all along led the way in regard to this question, and which has presented to Parliament the only possible method of meeting the wishes of the people in this regard, a method wholly free from any of the objections urged by my hon. friend, but a method which he failed to support and which, had he supported it and used his influence to have it adopted, would probably to-day be accepted by this House. Does he want to intimate that I favour this legislation? I do not know what protest I could offer stronger than I have already made. Sit idly by! Well, I have sat by with some amusement watching this discussion, I must admit. But the Government with, the concurrence of my hon. friend—well, I am not sure whether it had the concurrence of the hon. gentleman from Brome (Mr. McMaster), although I did not hear any protest from him or his friend to the left—

Mr. McMASTER: I protested in a speech of an hour and a half.

Mr. MEIGHEN: My hon. friend says he protested—

Mr. MACLEAN (Halifax): I did.

Mr. MEIGHEN: —so he was evidently the lone sparrow. The Government, at any rate, accepted the report of the committee, which report recommended that a bill should be introduced into this House by which Parliament would give all the powers that Parliament could give, of whatever character, to this board up to the limit of the powers held by the old board; and that when two provinces added to those powers all the powers that the provinces could give, up to the limit, again, of the powers enjoyed by the old board, then the act could be called into effect by the Governor in Council. Parliament first had to give all the powers that it possessed. Now, no one disputes that the control of interprovincial trade is a federal power. Is Parliament undertaking to confer this power on the board? Is the Government fulfilling the pledge of the Prime Minister (Mr. Mackenzie King)? I did not urge that that be done; I urged another method altogether. But that was the pledge of the Prime Minister. This board the other night was wholly denied that power by the Minister of Trade and Commerce (Mr. Robb) who has charge of the bill, for he gave a blank refusal. Then, on reflection, he comes back to-day with a change of front. But still he does not fulfil the undertaking of the Government. He says, "We will give the board this power, exercisable, however, only on two conditions." Here is the restriction by which the Government fails to carry out its undertaking. These two conditions which the minister now lays down are: First, that the province concerned out of which the grain is to be exported shall, through its Lieutenant Governor in Council, approve; secondly, that the federal government, through its Governor in Council, shall give its approval. Those two conditions render the legislation in this regard, if in no other,—and there are at least ten others—wholly opposed to the undertaking of the administration, and to the order of this Parliament by resolution supported by the Prime Minister himself. But let me ask again,—and in this I know I shall have the agreement of my two hon. friends opposite, the members for Brome (Mr. McMaster) and the member for Halifax (Mr. Maclean): Where is the principle by which any special control should rest in any province with regard to the rights of transportation? Let us say, for example, that some people in the province of Ontario desire to purchase some wheat from the province of Saskatchewan, and some people in the latter province desire to sell that wheat. The province of Saskatchewan has the power to say: "You cannot sell that wheat". The province of Ontario has no power in the premises at all. What gives the province of Saskatchewan any better right than the province of Ontario in that regard? Why should there be a compulsory power in Saskatchewan and not in Ontario? Now, it is all right to have control of these matters vest in the Governor in Council for all the provinces, and that is what I suggested myself in the first place by way of general principle in the bill. But here is an acceptance by the Government to-day, its first change of front,—and there may be more—of the principle of particular power resting with the government of the province in which the vendors reside in respect of interprovincial trade, all power being denied to the government of the province in which the purchasers are located. How does the Government justify that? The hon. member for Battle River (Mr. Spence), says that he has 202 resolutions supporting this legislation. I do not doubt his word, and I do not think he intended to mislead the House at all; but I would ask him to reflect on what he says. I venture to say that he has not a resolution or a letter asking for such an amorphous botch as this is in the way of legislation. He has doubtless resolutions asking for a wheat board such as the farmers are desirous of seeing established, namely, the wheat board of 1919.—he has, no doubt, resolutions requesting that. He may also have resolutions—I have some—asking for a voluntary board. The establishment of a voluntary board is the only way we can meet the demand of western Canada. But this method of trying to dispose of the matter, by proposing one thing one day and another thing the next, will not work. Hon. gentlemen will realize that, and if they do not realize it by the denial altogether of the legislation, at the hands of either the provincial governments or this Government, they will realize it by experience under the act when passed.

Mr. MOTHERWELL: This legislation is fashioned after the Australian system of disposing of wheat. That system was instituted shortly after the war broke out, and it is not an experiment at all. It has been in force there five or six years, first as a compulsory system and later as a voluntary method of disposing of wheat; and while it may require some fine adjust-

ing in this case in order to get matters dovetailed into each other as regards the provincial and the Dominion, the system is not by any means unworkable. It has not proven unworkable where it has been tried, and there is no reason why it should not operate satisfactorily in Canada as well as in Australia.

Mr. MACLEAN (Halifax): The amendment is far-reaching, and I am inclined to doubt its constitutionality. I may ask the minister whether it has the approval of the Department of Justice? It appears before us for the first time, although I heard of it before; but I did not read it as carefully as I did a moment ago. I think we should have a little time to consider it. This is a piece of legislation that affects not only the western provinces, but the whole Dominion. It is a violation of the whole spirit of Confederation, and as we are to be here a considerable time yet, I think the bill should remain over until next week. In the meantime hon. members could study the amendment carefully. I move that the committee rise and report progress.

Motion negatived.

The CHAIRMAN (Mr. Marcil): The hon. member for Moosejaw (Mr. Johnson) moves to amend the bill by adding thereto clause 18 the following:

The Board shall have power by regulation, approved by the Lieutenant Governor in Council of any province which has enacted such legislation as in the last preceding section described, to prohibit, or to impose such conditions or restrictions as may be deemed advisable upon the export of wheat from that province, except by or under the authority and direction of the Board.

The Minister of Trade and Commerce (Mr. Robb) moves to amend the proposed amendment as follows:

The Board shall have have power by regulation approved by the Lieutenant Governor in Council of any province which has enacted such legislation as in the last preceding section described, and also approved by the Governor General in Council, to prohibit or to impose such conditions or restrictions as may be deemed advisable upon the export of wheat from that province except by or under the authority and direction of the Board.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: Do I understand that the amendment proposed by the Minister of Trade and Commerce is acceptable to my hon. friend?

Mr. JOHNSON (Moosejaw): It is quite acceptable to me, Mr. Chairman. I have gone over it carefully and I did not consider it necessary to say anything on the subject. The amendment is quite satisfactory.

Amendment agreed to.

Mr. ROBB: Mr. Chairman, I desire to add another clause, to be known as Clause 6 (a):

Sales of wheat to Canadian millers and other cereal manufacturers shall be on the same basis with respect to prices, terms of delivery and so forth, as sales to foreign buyers either for immediate or future delivery, provided that such wheat is to be milled or manufactured in Canada, and the purchaser when required must give proof of its manufacture.

In that connection, it is due to my hon. friends who have been urging this legislation that I should say they have made a fair attempt to approach all interests in the trade in a reasonable way. That amendment has been prepared after consultation with the gentlemen who were promoting the legislation and the millers, who feared that they might be discriminated against. I found the attitude of my hon. friends from the West most reasonable, and I think that the large millers—who, after all, are our friends' best customers because they mill 70,000,000 bushels of this wheat crop—went away satisfied that if the act should be approved by the two provinces and come into operation and be administered in the same spirit as that shown by the promoters of this legislation, the milling dairy and other interests linked up with the agricultural interests have no reason to fear the operations of the wheat board.

Mr. MEIGHEN: Can the minister say whether this clause is compulsory or not?

Mr. ROBB: As it leaves the House no feature of this bill is compulsory. My right hon. friend must keep in mind that the act is subject to revision and approval by two concurring provinces.

Mr. MEIGHEN: I am asking if this clause is not in its nature and essence a compulsory clause. Does it not compel the board to sell wheat to millers at a price fixed in a certain way by reference to the export market? And therefore is it not compulsory?

Mr. ROBB: I should not think so.

Mr. MEIGHEN: Then the board will not be compelled to sell at all in accordance with the clause?

Mr. ROBB: So far as this legislation is concerned, when it leaves this Parliament, the board will not be compelled to sell or to buy wheat; the board will not be created at all until the legislation has the approval of two concurring provinces.

Mr. MEIGHEN: We will say that it does reach that stage—I have my doubts, of course—and gets into operation, then is or is not the board compelled to sell wheat to millers at a price arrived at in accordance with that clause?

Mr. ROBB: Supposing I answer my right hon. friend that this is merely a chart, a direction to the board.

Mr. MEIGHEN: I am just showing the hon. minister that he has here a compulsory clause, indeed, he has more, a compulsory clause affecting civil rights. Now, will he answer me this: Has he consulted the Justice Department as to whether that clause will have the slightest effect if passed?

Mr. ROBB: Is my right hon. friend objecting to this clause?

Mr. MEIGHEN: I am asking the question: Has he consulted the Justice Department as to whether that clause would be enforcible if passed by this Parliament?

Mr. ROBB: No.

Mr. McMASTER: Mr. Chairman, I wish to associate myself with the kind words spoken by the Minister of Trade and Commerce about those who are asking for this legislation. I agree with him that they are as mild-mannered men as ever scuttled the ship of interprovincial trade or cut the throat of an economic principle. In order to make this legislation a little less undesirable, I beg to move, seconded by Mr. Maclean (Halifax), the following amendment:

That the following paragraph 6 (b) be added after paragraph 6 (a): The board shall have the power to take such steps as in its discretion it may deem advisable for the fulfilment of bona fide contracts for the sale and purchase of wheat outstanding at the time when this act shall come into operation. Such outstanding contracts shall be intimated to the board within fifteen days of said date.

Mr. ROBB: Do I understand that this amendment has the approval of my hon. friends who are promoting the legislation?

Mr. JOHNSON (Moosejaw): I did not understand that the first amendment had been carried, Mr. Chairman, but you are the judge of that, of course. I have studied both these amendments very carefully. So far as I can see there is no objectionable feature in them from our viewpoint. I want to say on behalf of the people who are associating themselves with this legislation that if anything can be done to make it more acceptable to other interests without detrimentally affecting the purpose of the whole plan, we want to meet them all half way in a reasonable spirit. As to the point mentioned by the right hon. leader of the Opposition, (Mr. Meighen) I am not prepared to say whether there are compulsory features in the first amendment. Its object is to remove discrimination, and I think it does so. Both these amendments are quite acceptable to me, Mr. Chairman; others must speak for themselves.

Mr. MOTHERWELL: I think the substance of that amendment was voted on before and defeated; therefore it would be out of order to re-introduce it now.

Mr. JOHNSON (Moosejaw): I have compared carefully the substance of this amendment with the wording of the amendment offered a few days ago by the hon. member for Halifax, (Mr. Maclean), and there is a difference. The earlier amendment was objectionable to us in some of its features, but those features are not present in this amendment, and we think it is quite acceptable.

Mr. MEIGHEN: What is the difference? I did not see any as it was read.

Mr. CRERAR: The differencee, as I recall it, is that for one thing this limits the power of the board—

Mr. MACLEAN (Halifax): To bona fide contracts.

Mr. CRERAR: Another difference is that it cannot apply to contracts entered into after the passing of this act, while the amendment moved by the hon. member for Halifax, covered contracts that might be entered into a month after the legislation was enacted.

Mr. MEIGHEN: Does the hon. member mean by "the passing of the act" its coming into effect, or its passage by this House?

Mr. McMASTER: The operation of the act.

Mr. JOHNSON (Moosejaw): Section 17 provides:

This act shall come into operation as soon as two or more of the provinces shall have enacted such legislation,—

And so on. The wording is copied into the new resolution.

Mr. MEIGHEN: This amendment, then, is just the same as the amendment defeated the other day.

Mr. JOHNSON (Moosejaw): No.

Mr. MEIGHEN: Of course it is. This amendment is to apply to bona fide contracts. Does anyone suggest the other would have applied to malafide or fraudulent contracts? Nobody would dream of such a thing. The hon. member from Halifax (Mr. Maclean) would never rise and say he intended it should apply to fraudulent or fictitious contracts.

Mr. MACLEAN (Halifax): No, but it was open to the objection that it might cover a purely speculative contract.

Mr. MEIGHEN: A speculative contract is just as bona fide as any other contract.

Mr. MACLEAN (Halifax): But the goods might not be delivered under some of these contracts.

Mr. MEIGHEN: I really sympathize with my hon. friend from Halifax. He wants to get the amendment through, and he is ready to exert all his ingenuity to see a difference between it and the one that was defeated, in order to put it through. The fact is as hon. members know, bona fides applies to all contracts, save such as are fraudulent. He never intended for a moment that his amendment should apply to fraudulent contracts. The next difference is that this amendment only applies to contracts entered into up to the coming into effect of the act. I do not think my hon. friend, in his amendment the other night, ever intended that it should apply to contracts made after the act was in operation. The very spirit of it is antagonistic to such an idea. It was contracts up to the time of the coming into operation of the act that he had in mind and argued in favour of, and all the objections urged on this side of the House were against protecting contracts made up to that time. Why have those objections all vanished into thin air? The fact is that there has been a reconciliation, and the animosity to my hon. friend's amendment has died away. It has passed into oblivion, and the House is left to guess the reason why.

Mr. JOHNSON (Moosejaw): I think the right hon. leader of the Opposition (Mr. Meighen) is handicapped in this matter, in not having the former amendment before him. The wording of that amendment would cover losses incurred by reason of the bringing into effect of this act, including losses of a speculative character. The amendment now offered is to enable those who have made bona fide contracts for the actual delivery of wheat to deliver wheat.

Mr. MACLEAN (Halifax): It gives power to the board to do it.

Mr. MEIGHEN: That is all he intended to do. He never intended when men made losses, to make good those losses. He intended to enable those men to make good their contracts, and that is all this amendment intends.

Mr. MACLEAN (Halifax): There is clearly a distinction between my amendment and this. The first part is the same, but this amendment excludes the demands for damages which might be made against the board by any person who had purchased grain speculatively.

Mr. GOOD: Does it not leave it in the discretion of the board?

Mr. MACLEAN (Halifax): Yes.

Mr. GOOD: Was that in the former amendment?

Mr. MACLEAN (Halifax): No.

Mr. McMASTER: It probably was not put forth so clearly and distinctly in the other amendment.

Amendment agreed to.

Mr. MILLAR: I would like to protest against this amendment. I think it is a dangerous one, and I would like to say that no one in this House can always tell the difference between bona fide contracts and dealing in futures, or tell when a contract is purely speculative and when it is not. Take the case of a farmer who decides that the price of wheat in October is satisfactory to him and he sells. Later on, if his threshing is delayed, he cannot deliver in October, and, he switches the delivery to the next month. Again he finds that he cannot deliver in November and switches to December. It seems to me those are bona fide deals, and yet he has not delivered the wheat on those deals. He probably will deliver the wheat in December, but he did not deliver it in October or November. It seems to me this leaves the door wide open

for the imposition of a great deal of expense on those who are producing the wheat. I do not like the look of it.

Mr. CRERAR: I think a word will enlighten my hon. friend from Qu'Appelle (Mr. Millar): Precisely this same difficulty arose in 1919, when the wheat board was created under Order in Council. It will be recalled that, at that time, the markets in Winnipeg were open for a period in July. They were closed again towards the end of July, when the Wheat Board Order in Council was passed and there were certain contracts then outstanding. Now, in the final adjustment of those contracts a clear distinction was made between the contracts that were of a bona fide character and those of a speculative character. The contracts of a bona fide character were compensated for. The distinction was made then, and I see no reason why it cannot be made again.

Mr. MEIGHEN: What right has this Parliament to dictate to the board the principle on which they may sell the grain, if the provinces, and not the federal treasury at all, are solely responsible for losses and solely entitled to profit?

Mr. ROBB: That is a very reasonable question, and the provinces may take that into consideration whey they have this legislation before them. I repeat that this was put in after a joint conference with the gentlemen who were promoting the bill and their best customers, who thought they might be affected. If they have reached a reasonable compromise, and we are going to have peace and confidence where before there was dissatisfaction, why should we not accept the legislation and let it go through?

Mr. MEIGHEN: I quite accept the answer of the hon. minister which, being interpreted, is just this: There is strong hope that this clause will be such that it will frighten the provinces so that they will never accept the act.

Mr. MACLEAN (Halifax): Might I ask hon. members opposite, who are the strong proponents of this legislation, if I should propose an amendment to the effect that, before either of the acts passed by any two of the legislatures becomes effective, it shall be submitted to a plebiscite of the electors of that province?

Some Hon. MEMBERS: No, no.

[Mr. Millar.]

Mr. MACLEAN (Halifax): Perhaps the hon. member from Saltcoats (Mr. Sales) will answer that, and if he objects to that, would he agree to an amendment that before these acts came into force, in either of these western provinces, it shall be submitted to a vote of the people of Nova Scotia? Would he agree to that? I wish my hon. friend would give me an answer, because if he, and everybody around him, replies in the negative, perhaps, it would not be worth while proposing it. If I can get any support at all, I would like to propose it.

Mr. SALES: It is absolutely impossible for me to answer about the people of Nova Scotia. I have never been there.

Mr. MACLEAN (Halifax): That is quite evident.

Mr. SALES: I can only answer for the people of my own province. I can assure this House that none of the fifteen members from my province, nor the member who sits on the other side of the House from my provinces, would have been here to-day, if we had not been willing to support this measure.

Mr. MACLEAN (Halifax): Is that the reason the hon. member is supporting it?

Mr. SALES: I say I would not have been here, if I had not been supporting it.

Mr. MACLEAN (Halifax): Has the hon. member changed his mind on the principle?

Mr. SALES: No, I have not. The hon. member speaks of a plebiscite. I can only say that our provincial government, with a practical grain man at its head, in the person of Mr. Dunning, passed this resolution through the House, without one vote against it. There could not be any plebiscite there which would change public opinion on the question.

Mr. MACLEAN (Halifax): Is there not one righteous man in the hon. member's province?

Mr. SALES: I think there are a good many, and they are all on our side.

Mr. MEIGHEN: There is one more question I would like to ask the minister. His colleague the Minister of Agriculture was elected on a propaganda of his committee declaring that he was the outstanding champion, followed by all the other Liberals of Saskatchewan, of the Wheat Board, which I had been knave enough to put out of existence in 1920. He afterwards repeated

and declared himself an apostle of a purely voluntary board, and that he has reaffirmed in this House in this discussion. How has the minister managed to persuade him to accept this bill, which at many points is compulsory, and those the most perilous points of the bill?

Mr. ROBB: Not having taken part in the election in Saskatchewan, I am not in a position to enter into a discussion of that question.

Section as amended agreed to.

Bill reported, read the third time and passed.

THE CANADIAN RED CROSS SOCIETY

On the motion of Hon. H. S. Beland (Minister of Health) Bill No. 175 respecting the Canadian Red Cross Society, was read the second time, and the House went into committee thereon, Mr. Marcil in the Chair.

On section 3—emblem and badge:

Mr. MacLAREN: The society is here designated as "the Canadian organization which is authorized to act in matters of relief under the said treaty." I take it that under this section special privileges are granted to the Canadian Red Cross, so that it will be designated as "the Canadian organization which is authorized to act in matters of relief under the said treaty." In 1914, the very old and honourable society, St. John Ambulance Asociation, was incorporated in this Dominion, to carry on its work both in peace time and in war. The Canadian Red Cross had previously been incorporated, but only to carry on during war time. It was five years later, in 1919, that the Canadian Red Cross obtained authority to carry on its work during peace time. With both of these excellent organizations I have been personally connected, and still am at the present time. It is felt, however, by those associated with the St. John Ambulance Association, and it has been represented to me by my colleagues on the executive of that association, that subsection 3 of section 3 may restrict the work and the powers of the St. John Ambulance Association. The St. John Ambulance Association has a section in its incorporation which is much on the same lines as the section of the Red Cross Act regarding the work of the Red Cross for the improvement of health, the prevention of disease, and the mitigation of suffering. The St. John Ambulance Asociation feels that under subsection 3 of section 3 its activities might be restricted, because the Canadian Red Cross is there designated as the organization to do certain special work. Now the act of incorporation of the St. John Ambulance Association, previous to the inception of the Red Cross Society, conferred upon it the authority to carry on much the same work as the latter organization is empowered to do. The St. John Ambulance Association therefore feels that subsection 3 will have the effect of considerably reducing its authority and powers. Accordingly I would suggest to the minister that the sub-section in question be modified in some such way as the following:

> The society is hereby authorized, with or without the co-operation of any other society, association or organization which has been accorded similar powers by act of the Parliament of Canada, to act in matters of relief under the said treaty.

I may say that the two organizations were associated during the Great War. They worked in close co-operation and, to the extent that they carried on its splendid work, remained in friendly association. The position is still one of entire friendliness and of a desire to co-operate, on the part of the St. John Ambulance Association; but I would submit that it would be well that in this bill there should be such an amendment as I have indicated to protect the powers which have already been granted to that organization.

Mr. BELAND: I do not think it was the intention of the Canadian Red Cross Society in seeking this legislation to exclude all other organizations from the privilege of carrying on humanitarian work in Canada, but the sub-section as at present framed might convey the impression that it was the only Canadian organization authorized to carry on the noble work of relieving and mitigating human suffering. The amendment which my hon. friend has suggested would meet with my entire approval if the words "in co-operation with" were omitted. If that omission did not take place the amended sub-section might be construed to mean that the Red Cross Society would have to act in co-operation with any other society. The object of the St. John Ambulance Association is not to force the Red Cross Society to work in co-operation with it; of course its desire is that either society should work alongside of the other. With that object in view I submit to my hon. friend that the

following would meet the wishes of the St. John Ambulance Association:

The society is hereby authorized, with or without the co-operation of any other society association or organization which has been accorded similar powers by act of the Parliament of Canada to act in matters of relief under the said treaty.

The amendment, in a word, means that the Red Cross Society is authorized to act, in matters of relief under the said treaty, with or without the co-operation of any other society. It does not, however, preclude the St. John Ambulance Association from carrying on similar work.

Mr. MacLAREN: I appreciate the minister's attitude but I am not quite sure that the words which he suggests will express exactly what I have in my own mind. I think that even the minister's amendment would not entirely meet the case. If it is acceptable to my hon. friend, I would like to ask that further consideration of the matter be deferred until the committee resumes after the dinner hour.

Mr. BELAND: I have no objection.

At six o'clock the committee took recess.

After Recess

The committee resumed at eight o'clock.

Amendment (Mr. Béland) agreed to.

Bill, as amended, reported, read the third time and passed.

RETURNED SOLDIERS' INSURANCE ACT AMENDMENT

On motion of Hon. H. S. Béland (Minister of Soldiers' Civil Re-establishment), the House went into committee to consider the following proposed resolution, Mr. Gordon in the Chair:

That it is expedient to repeal section ten of the Returned Soldiers' Insurance Act, chapter fifty-four of the statutes of 1920, and to provide in lieu thereof:—

1. That if on the death of the insured a pension becomes payable under The Pension Act or the Pension Law of the United Kingdom, or of any of His Majesty's Dominions (other than the Dominion of Canada) or of His Majesty's Government, or of any of His Majesty's Allies or Associated Powers in the Great War, to any person or persons within the classes mentioned in section four of the Returned Soldiers' Insurance Act, there shall be deducted from the benefit payable under the said Returned Soldiers' Insurance Act the aggregate present value of the pension or pensions so payable computed on such basis as may be prescribed by regulation made under the provisions of section seventeen of that Act. and in such case there shall be returned to the beneficiary or beneficiaries in proportion to their respective interests under the contracts the proportion of the premiums paid (with interest at four per cent per annum compounded annually) which the amount of the said deduction is of the total amount assured under the contract; Provided,—

(a) That in case the contract is for the benefit of the wife of the insured, or of his children, or of some one or more of his children, and the death occurs after six months from the effective date of the contract, the sum of five hundred dollars, if the amount of the insurance is five hundred dollars or over. or the full amount of such insurance if it is less than five hundred dollars, shall be paid to the widow, or to the widow or some one or more of the children, as the case may be, and the return of premiums, if, any, shall be based on the balance of insurance after payment of the amount due under this resolution and deduction of the aggregate present value of the pension as above provided;

(b) that in no case shall the benefit together with the amount of premiums and accrued interest to the beneficiary or beneficiaries under this provision exceed the face value of the policy.

(c) that this provision shall not operate when the beneficiary of the insurance is the wife of the insured and a penson is awarded under the Pension Act to some other person or persons named in section four of the Returned Soldiers' Insurance Act.

2. These provisions shall apply to all policies which have been issued or shall be issued under The Returned Sodiers' Insurance Act, and any amendment thereto, provided however, that this amendment shall not operate to deprive holders of policies issued prior to the passing of this amendment of any rights or privileges now vested in them.

3. That no application for insurance shall be received under the said Act after the first day of September, 1923, and the Act to be based upon these resolutions shall become effective on the first day of July, 1922.

Mr. STEVENS: I should like to have an explanation from the minister of what appears to me to be a departure from the principle that was originally laid down, that any returned man who served in the forces overseas would be entitled to insurance. I understand that under section 13 of the act certain restrictions have been imposed. I do not wish to criticize the minister or the department unfairly at all, but I was certainly under the impression, from utterances in Parliament last year when the matter was up, and on previous occasions as well, that any returned soldier who had served in the forces overseas would be entitled to insurance without medical examination. That was the understanding. I gather from statements which I have not had an opportunity of looking into closely that that principle has been departed from and that the authorities are now, in some cases at least, demanding medical examination. I wish the minister would be good enough to reply to that allegation, to put it mildly.

Mr. BELAND: The act provides for the insurance of every returned man, and in certain cases of widows, without medical inspection. That is clearly set out in the act. There is also a provision in the same act, section 13, which says that the minister may refuse to enter into an injurious contract in any case where there are, in his opinion, sufficient grounds for his refusal. It would seem that the intention of the lawmakers when the act was passed was that, in certain cases, the application for insurance should not be allowed under such circumstances as would warrant the Minister of Finance in refusing it. I presume that this section was enacted because it was foreseen that a returned man, being very seriously ill and not expecting to live, might seek insurance on which his dependents would receive an amount varying from $500 to $5,000. Reading over the act, and bearing in mind what took place when it was pased in 1920, I take it that the intention at the time was that such cases should be refused in the wisdom of the Minister of Finance. Section 13 empowers the Minister of Finance to refuse applications in such cases. Last night in the course of the debate my hon. friend from Burrard (Mr. Clark) read certain regulations passed for the guidance of the Minister of Finance by the Board of Pension Commissioners. I had not a copy of those regulations before, and I may quote from them again to clear up the matter and answer the point raised by my hon. friend:

Class 1—Applicants who are not seriously ill.

(a) An applicant with dependents, ill with a pensionable disability.

Application is at present accepted.

(b) An applicant without dependents who is ill with a pensionable disability.

Application is at present accepted.

(c) An applicant with dependents, ill with a disability that is not pensionable.

Application is at present accepted.

(d) An applicant without dependents ill with a disability that is not pensionable.

Application is at present accepted.

Class 2—Applicants who are seriously ill.

(a) An applicant with dependents, who is seriously ill with a pensionable disability.

Application is at present accepted.

(b) An applicant with dependents, dangerously ill with disability that is not pensionable.

Application refused.

The third class is that of applications from persons in so serious a condition of health that they have no reasonable expectation of life

(a) An applicant with dependents so seriously ill with a pensionable disability that he has no expectancy of life.

Applications are at present accepted and insurance paid, provided death does not occur before approval of the application for issue of the policy.

(b) An applicant without dependents so seriously ill from a pensionable disability that he has no expectancy of life.

Applications are at present refused.

(c) An applicant with dependents so seriously ill from a disability that is not pensionable that he has no expectancy of life.

Applications are at present refused.

(d) An applicant without dependents, so seriously ill from a disability that is not pensionable, that he has no expectancy of life.

Applications are at present refused.

Class 4—General.

(a) The above is the general procedure of the board. In cases, however, where an applicant with or without dependents, is seriously ill with an injury or disease attributable to service or otherwise, and has been ill for many months with a disease which is certain to terminate fatally within a reasonably short time and has postponed taking our insurance until death is practically imminent.

Applications are at present refused.

(b) In cases where an applicant with, or without dependents, whose health has become impaired as a result of immoral conduct prior to enlistment, during service, or after discharge.

Applications are at present refused.

These regeulations laid down will throw some light upon the grounds that may be invoked by the Minister of Finance when he decides to hold up an application for insurance. I understand from the Pension Committee that some 64 applications out of a total of 7,354 have been held up, and that since those applications were filed 13 of the applicants have died.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: When the duty of looking after the Soldiers' Insurance Act devolved upon me these particular regulations were not in force. We had regulations in force—I have not them before me as I did not know this matter was coming up to-night—which practically followed the statute and reserved the right to the Minister of Finance to pass upon applications. It seems to me that in the present regulations there is danger of overlooking the great underlying object of the act, which was to provide a returned soldier with insurance at a low rate, irrespective entirely of his condition of health; there was to be no medical examination. Under the original act there was no question as to whether he was seriously ill or not, he had the direct right to obtain insurance. And the object of that was quite clear. The returned man, coming back in a bad state of health, could not get his insurance at anything like the same rate which would apply to the ordinary risk; and, further, he had of necessity been delayed in making his application owing to his absence overseas. Therefore the idea was to put him back as nearly as possible to the condition he would have been in hav-

ing regard to insurance if he had never been at the front at all, and the act particularly dispenses with any medical examination as a general rule. It is true we can ask for it if we desire, but I think my hon. friend will agree that, as intended by the act, physical disability was not to be a reason for refusing insurance. All I want to do is to call the minister's attention to the matter because the changing of these regulations will be in his hands. Take, for example, the important clause that my hon. friend has just read:

> In cases however, where an applicant with or without dependents is seriously ill with an injury or disease attributable to service or otherwise, and has been ill for many months with a disease which is certain to terminate fatally within a reasonably short time and has postponed taking out insurance until death is practically imminent.

That case is refused altogether. I desire to remind my hon. friend that this is an insurance to be taken by the returned man as and when he pleases, that there is nothing whatever in the act to indicate that he must take it before he knows he is seriously ill. The idea underlying the act was to at least make sure that men returning from overseas with injuries which would ultimately result in death should be able to take advantage of that insurance. If the whole question were left open there might be some force in the present position, but it was not left open. The hon. minister will see that the soldier is told he has two years within which at any time he may write insurance. That is the position as it was left under the act. So a man suffering from a disease which may or may not terminate fatally is still entitled to write insurance within that two-year period.

We talk of deathbed cases. Ordinarily it might be said there is fraud in connection with deathbed insurance, but it is hard to say there is any fraud when the insurance is a matter of right irrespective of physical condition. Frankly, my view of the position was: never mind how desperate the case might be, where a man returns from overseas with an injury which ultimately causes death, or, to quote the words of this section, "he dies of an injury attributable to his service overseas" it does not matter when his application for insurance is received, in order fairly and properly to carry out the terms of the statute that insurance should be granted. it is a matter entirely in the hands of the Government and I draw this position to the attention of my hon. friend in the hope that these regulations may be modified.

[Sir Henry Drayton.]

Mr. BELAND: As the hon. member for West York was in the House when this act was passed in 1920, I should like to ask what his interpretation would be of clause 15, which provides:

> That no particular examination or other evidence of insurability shall be required in respect of any contract issued under this act;—

Had the clause stopped there I would understand that every single application made at any time in the course of any illness coming from whatever source would be and should be accepted. But if we proceed one step further in the same clause, we read:

> Provided, however, that the minister, may, for the purpose of determining whether he shall refuse to enter into a contract for insurance in any case under the provisions of section 13 of this act, require such medical examination or other evidence of the insurability of the insured as he may deem necessary.

I was not instrumental in drafting the act. I was present in the House when it was passed and I supported that clause. I understood then that in a general way any returned man might apply for insurance without any examination, but that as some abuse might spring up in the carrying out of the provisions of the act—some applications might be filed only for the purpose of getting insurance in a case where death was certain to happen within a short time—it was provided that the Minister of Finance in the circumstances would be clothed with power to instruct some one to make a medical examination for the purpose of obtaining sufficient information to decide whether the application should be received or not. If that is not the meaning, I do not know what the clause means at all. Is it desirable, I ask the House, that every application, regardless of the time and circumstances under which it is made, should be accepted? If it is the wish of the House, let the House say so, and if it is the desire of the House that there should be some discrimination, then this clause is there for that purpose, and it is in the hands of the Finance Minister to say whether the application should be accepted or not.

Mr. MACLEAN (York): What is the amount of the insurance?

Mr. BELAND: $500 to $5,000.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: In answer to the question put by my hon. friend, whatever the clause may mean, I have no difficulty in telling the hon. member that it never did mean the reservation of a

right to deny insurance to a man whose death resulted from injury, or from a state of health or disease contracted as a result of overseas service. On the other hand, as I recollect, the question that was troubling the framers of the bill was that if the matter was left entirely wide open, the returned soldier dying from diseases clearly other than those as a result of overseas injury or exposure, might fraudulently obtain a death-bed insurance. The clause, certainly, was never drawn for the purpose of contracting the right which we thought we were giving to the returned soldier of an absolute insurance, within the two year period, if the soldier was suffering as a result of injuries received overseas, or exposure overseas. There is another matter covered by these regulations which was also in mind, and that was the case where the fatal illness results from the acts or misconduct of the man himself. That would be a proper case and proper circumstances for consideration but, in answer to my hon. friend's question, our view is that the statute does not contemplate such restrictions as are now put upon the insurance.

Mr. CHURCH: I want to ask the minister one or two questions, to clear up some doubt about this resolution. In the first place, the resolution is based on the act of 1920. That act says that no medical examination is necessary; still in some cases they have insisted on it. In some cases an examination is held. I think the new resolution should state clearly, first, that in the case of soldiers' insurance no medical examination will be necessary and, second, that it will apply equitably to the soldiers who have served on the land, on the sea and in the air. Some people seem to think it applies only to soldiers who served on the land. It should apply also to those who served on the sea and in the air. Clause 1 of the resolution says that applications will only be received till September 1923—a little over a year. I think that is a short time to receive applications from an army of nearly half a million men. I hope there will be no more difficulty about the administration of this act. It is a very splendid act for the insurance of returned men, if properly administered, but if it is to be surrounded with a lot of red tape and technicalities which have characterized the administration in the past, some soldiers will get relief, and others will not take the trouble to apply for it. I would like to have the point that no medical examination is necessary cleared up and I think that the provision should apply to all members of the forces, land, sea or air, and that there should be a little extension of the time to receive applications.

Mr. CLARK: Are the applicants required to be medically examined?

Mr. BELAND: No, medical examination is not required at all.

Mr. CLARK: How does the minister determine whether a man is seriously or dangerously ill, as provided by these regulations which govern?

Mr. BELAND: The minister will be informed that an application is made by a returned soldier who is seriously ill and without any expectation of life, and under clause 15 of the act the minister has the power to order an examination, to satisfy himself that the applicant should be accepted or rejected.

Mr. STEVENS: The reason I brought this matter to the minister's attention was that, in my estimation, the pledge was given that any soldier who made application within a period of two years would be entitled to insurance without medical examination. Without going into any details, and arguing finely upon some possible cases, I think we should extend the privilege for that period. That would be up till next September. If, in the wisdom of the parliamentary committee, the Government and the House, it is felt that, in the future, there should be some restriction for the next year, that is another matter, but I think we should keep faith for that period. That is the reason I brought up the matter, and if the minister will take it into consideration, he can deal with it in the bill. I urge that upon his attention. I refer to the period of time fixed in the original bill and the amendment last year whatever that period is.

Mr. BELAND: The period was extended for this year, and it is this year again extended.

Mr. STEVENS: I refer to the period prior to the extension now before the House.

Mr. STEWART (Leeds): The minister has given to the House the regulations adopted and laid down for the guidance of the Minister of Finance in granting or withholding his approval of certain appli-

cations. Could he tell the House when those regulations which he has read were adopted?

Mr. BELAND: These regulations were not laid down as something that should govern the minister in every case but, as I read them, they were establishing what the custom was with regard to applications in general. I call them regulations, but, of course they do not bind the minister.

Mr. MACLEAN (York): Are they contrary to the intention of the act? That is the point. If they are, I submit the House should insist on the intention of the act being observed during the continuance of that act.

Mr. BELAND: The hon. member asks if they are contrary to the meaning of the act. That is a matter of interpretation.

Mr. MACLEAN (York): Were they approved by the House?

Mr. BELAND: Yes, by the House, also by the lawyers and by the soldiers themselves, because I have heard from returned soldiers, from officers and others, as to some applications which were made with an obvious desire of getting insurance when, really, the insurance should not be granted. If it is the intention of Parliament that every returned man who makes an application for insurance should receive insurance, let Parliament say so. That is very simple. Why should there have been a provision in the act that the Minister of Finance might order medical examination when he has reason to believe that there is a fraudulent intent in the mind of the applicant, unless it was the desire of Parliament at that time that not all applications should be received without question? Generally speaking, the act was drafted and passed by Parliament to afford to returned men who otherwise would not get insurance, the privilege of being insured. That is quite clear, and that the intention of Parliament has been carried out to a very large extent is indicated by the fact that 7,300 applications for insurance have been received, and only 64 of these have been held up for final decision.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: These 64 cases have all been delayed under the present regulations, have they not?

Mr. BELAND: I am not in a position to say.

[Mr. H. A. Stewart.]

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: And those regulations were only put in force about eight weeks ago, were they not?

Mr. FIELDING: If it was the intention of Parliament that there was to be no question as to the physical condition of the applicant, then you ought to repeal section 13, which gives the Minister of Finance an over-ruling power. Then section 15, if I remember correctly, goes on to say that the Minister of Finance shall have power to order a medical examination with a view to determining the applicant's insurability. What do these things mean? If it is to be understood that irrespective of the condition of the returned soldier applicant, he is to receive the insurance, then why give the Minister of Finance power to over-ride that? Why give the Minister of Finance power, and implied instructions, to have a medical examination? I grant you there is a conflict perhaps in the intention. What has happened is this. Only a few cases have been held up, and recently in view of the fact that the Pension Committee was taking up that class of subject, I gave instructions that the matter was to be held over until we might ascertain the wish of the committee, and endeavour to conform to it. It is under these circumstances that lately there has been some delay. What would my hon. friend say if an application came in, from a returned soldier, it is true, accompanied by a medical certificate from the Pension Board that this unfortunate man had but a small expectation of life? I saw a letter written to a member of Parliament the other day in which a good lady wrote, "Hurry up the insurance because my son cannot live many weeks." That raises the question: Is it intended that in a case of that kind, where it is obvious the poor man cannot live many weeks, perhaps many days, he should be considered to be within the pale of insurability, whatever that word means? I am not laying down any policy. I am only trying to have the committee understand some of the difficulties which have arisen. If you want to take the rule laid down here to-night by some hon. gentlemen, that no matter what the physical condition of the applicant may be, he is entitled to insurance, even though he may die next week, then just repeal these two sections, and there will be no trouble. I do not want these sections. I will be exceedingly happy to have them left out, but being there they must have been intended to give the Minister of Finance some kind of reviewing power, I do not know just what.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: Perhaps my hon. friend would tell me when these regulations were adopted.

Mr. FIELDING: They are hardly regulations at all. We are struggling for some understanding. When the Pension Board brought this matter up, I gave them some indication of what I thought would be sound rules to govern the matter, and while we were considering it the Pension Committee was appointed, and I gave instructions to my officials to withdraw these cases until the Pensions Committee could look into them.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: Then what are these things the Minister of Health has referred to as being regulations? Are they not regulations?

Mr. FIELDING: I do not think they were formally adopted as regulations.

Mr. BELAND: The first time these regulations were heard of, if they are regulations, was when the medical advisers of the Board of Pension Commissioners were before the parliamentary committee on pensions. They were asked what were the regulations laid down for their guidance in considering applications for insurance, and they gave to the committee, as I understand from the chairman, these regulations, if you wish to call them such, as being the principles which should guide them in accepting or refusing an application. I had never seen them before they were published in the report in Hansard and read to the House last night by my hon. friend from Burrard (Mr. Clark). I do not know that you can lay down regulations governing this subject. It is rather a matter of appreciation. I share my hon. friend's view, however, that to a large extent, even when there is no expectation of life and it is expected that the illness from which the man suffers will terminate fatally, if that illness was traceable to war service; the application should be accepted.

Mr. FIELDING: If he has dependents.

Mr. STEVENS: Would my hon. friend consider adding to clause 3 of the resolution the words:

> Provided that no application under this act shall be refused except from persons suffering from disease caused by immoral conduct.

I know that that is not legal phraseology so far as a bill is concerned, but it will secure the opinion of the House, and if adopted, will indicate what the bill should contain when it is brought down.

Mr. BUREAU: You must define immoral conduct.

Mr. MARLER: The resolution now before the committee is based, not on section 13, which gives the Minister of Finance power to make certain provisions under the act, but on section 10, which gives to certain beneficiaries additional privileges. That is to say, the bill to be founded on this resolution will give privileges which beneficiaries have not at the present time. In the meantime hon. members have been discussing whether section 13 of the act should remain in effect as it is now, which gives the Minister of Finance the right to make certain regulations. These so-called regulations, as to which the House is being advised, have not been put into effect, but were submitted by the Minister of Finance to the parliamentary committee for its approval, in order to allow that committee while it was sitting to determine whether or not these regulations were fair and equitable, not only under the act itself, but under the intention of the act as originally framed. Those regulations or applications, call them what you will, were placed before the parliamentary committee on several occasions; were discussed one by one, as all members of the committee will bear me out, and not changed in respect of one word; discussed at subsequent meeting and again confirmed, again discussed and again decided to be fair and equitable. Consequently, the parliamentary committee came forward and in its recommendation to you—chapter 4, section 5 of the report—stated that in its opinion the regulations as read to that committee were fair and equitable. The hon. member for West York (Sir Henry Drayton) has brought up the question as to why and how this act was framed. Let us take the reasons for the act from its inception. In 1919 the question came up as to an Insurance Act for returned soldiers, and this is part of the resolution which was put before the then parliamentary committee at the time, which shows what was expected to be placed in the act itself. I am not reading from the original document itself but from notes which, I believe, are accurate. This is the effect of the resolution:

> Now therefore we, the Dominion Executive of the Army and Navy Veterans of Canada, do urge upon tht federal government the urgent necessity of issuing life insurance policies to all pensioners and all returned men at present unable to obtain life insurance through disabilities occasioned by service.

In other words, these policies were to be issued to such men as could not obtain policies otherwise on account of their disabilities. That same theme has consistently prevailed through the various parliamentary committees which have been appointed from year to year. Now let us take these regulations, study them for a moment, and see whether the original intention is fairly carried out or not, bearing in mind that it was on account of the pensioner's disability and for the purpose of assisting his dependents that this act was originally framed.

Mr. STEVENS: I am not disputing anything my hon. friend is saying, but what I wish to point out to him is that the act which has been in operation for two years, or nearly two years, distinctly gives this privilege which I am arguing should be given here to returned soldiers generally without any question as to disability. That is not provided for in the act except in a somewhat ambiguous, saving clause. Some of us hold that that saving clause was designed to prevent fraud or for application to persons suffering from disease through their own fault. Certainly last year on the occasion of the presentation of the report to the committee the House was distinctly given to understand there was no reservation whatever, except as I have intimated, and it is to keep faith with the understanding given to the men, and to give effect to the wording of the act, that I propose this amendment.

Mr. MARLER: If the amendment which my hon. friend suggests is carried it will leave the whole act wide open, and we might as well not have section 13. I am sorry but I have to disagree with him. Section 13 of the act is perfectly clear and distinct. It was placed in the act for certain reasons, and its language is of the plainest character:

> The minister may refuse to enter into an insurance contract in any case where there are, in his opinion, sufficient grounds for his refusing.

It is true that section 15 declares that no medical examination for insurability shall be required but goes on to say:

> Provided, however, that the minister may, for the purpose of determining whether he shall refuse to enter into a contract of insurance in any case under the provisions of section thirteen of this act, require such medical examination, or other evidence of insurability of the insured as he may deem necessary.

[Mr. Marler.]

Those clauses are perfectly clear and distinct. But what I was endeavouring to convey to the committee was the intention of the act originally, and there is every desire on the part of the parliamentary committee to see that that purpose is carried out. There is no intention whatever on the part of the parliamentary committee to defraud any returned soldier of the right to insure under that act in accordance with the intention of the act as originally passed, and I claim that these so-called regulations are eminently fair in all respects because they do give the returned soldier—where he is suffering from war disability, and in cases even where he has no dependents—the right to insure under the terms of the act. I do not want to trouble the committee by reading these so-called regulations over again, but hon. members should clearly understand this: If they desire the act to be thrown wide open, let them repeal section 13 which will have that effect. In that case the country is going to be deluged with applications for insurance which at present we could not entertain under the Returned Soldiers' Insurance Act. The act in question intended that soldiers suffering from war disabilities, who could not obtain life insurance elsewhere, should obtain insurance under its provisions. They do obtain insurance under that act and, as will be seen by a reference to the record of the department, which is placed before you in the report of the parliamentary committee, there has been a vast number of applications for insurance.

Mr. STEVENS: How could the minister, or any officer of the minister, know whether an applicant was suffering from war disability when they had no medical examination?

Mr. MARLER: The Returned Soldiers' Insurance Act is administered by the Board of Pension Commissioners, and the board has reliable information in regard to practically all returned soldiers. The application comes in to the Board of Pension Commissioners and a superficial examination is invariably made. Where there is no question of serious illness the man is not examined; he is given the insurance policy.

Mr. MANION: According to the regulations that are in existence I do not think that any medical examination was necessary at all, and this insurance, according to my understanding, was open to any re-

turned man without medical examination. I do not know where the limit would be, I am only suggesting that for information really, because, right or wrong, that is my understanding of the act.

Mr. MARLER: I am very sorry to have to disagree with my hon. friend from Fort William and Rainy River (Mr. Manion). It is quite true the act does say it is open to any returned soldier, but under sections 13 and 15, as I have previously explained, there is a restriction and the act is not thrown wide open.

Mr. MANION: Read section 13 again?

Mr. MARLER: Here is section 13:

The minister may refuse to enter into an insurance contract in any case where there are in his opinion sufficient grounds for his refusing.

Mr. STEVENS: There is nothing in that to call for discrimination between a pensioner and a non-pensioner, between a man suffering from war disa-
9 p.m. bilities or a man suffering from disability due to other causes.

Mr. MARLER: That is quite true. Now, let us take section 15:

No medical examination or other evidence of insurability shall be required in respect to any contract issued under this act: Provided, however, that the Minister may, for the purpose of determining whether he shall refuse to enter into a contract of insurance in any case under the provisions of section thirteen of this Act, require such medical examination or other evidence of insurability of the insured as he may deem necessary.

Mr. STEVENS: Exactly the same thing applies to that as applies to section 13.

Mr. MARLER: What does my hon. friend claim?

Mr. STEVENS: I claim that Parliament in that act said to the returned soldiers of Canada: "We will give you insurance without medical inspection for a period of two years. Simply apply and the insurance is yours." Parliament made one reservation, or two, if you like—it is all one—in sections 13 and 15, that the minister might, where he considered that desirable, ask for medical examination and refuse the application.

Mr. FIELDING: For what reason?

Mr. STEVENS: In the regulations as framed, for certain reasons, but no reasons were given in the act.

Mr. MARLER: What was section 13 inserted in the act for? To give the minister power to frame regulations? What regulations would he frame?

Mr. STEVENS: To detect fraud and to deal with diseases from immoral causes.

Mr. MARLER: I do not think my hon. friend can draw such a conclusion as that. That is a wide conclusion to draw from a section of that description.

Mr. MACLEAN (York): Did the committee, which was recently in session, know of the 60 odd cases that were held up by the Minister of Finance (Mr. Fielding)?

Mr. MARLER: Yes, we know of those cases.

Mr. MACLEAN (York): What action did the committee take in regard to them?

Mr. MARLER: The committee took no action at all. It was not within the purview of our powers to take action; we were not administering the Insurance Act. We were finding out whether the laws pertaining to soldiers were right or wrong. We went into the regulations.

Mr. MACLEAN (York): Did the committee investigate the 60 odd cases?

Mr. MARLER: The 64 cases, no.

Mr. MARCIL (Bonaventure): One of these cases was reported to me from British Columbia. A former constituent of mine, who went to reside there, informed me that one of his sons is very ill in hospital at Vancouver. This boy helped to support his mother, and if the boy died, the mother would be left without his support. We have been talking about the returned soldiers. We should also consider the dependent, because if the soldier dies he gets no insurance, the dependent gets it. What I am interested in knowing is what will be done in the case of a mother who loses her son under those circumstances. This case has been held up by the board.

Mr. FIELDING: I do not know what the experience of my predecessor was in the matter; but when I came into office as Minister of Finance, if my memory serves me correctly, I think, as regards the first case of this kind that came before me, I was disposed to over-rule, and I think I did over-rule, the judgment of the Board of Pension Commissioners. I thought there would be very few cases of that kind; but a number of days later other cases came in, and I saw that the situation was grave. What would you do, for example, in the case of a man who was unfortunately ex-

pected to die very soon and who had no dependents? Would you say that insurance should be given? There is much to be said as regards liberally interpreting the law when a man has dependents. It has been suggested that a man who had no expectation of life beyond a few weks, who had no dependents, might have acquired a dependent by marrying and upon the man's death occurring a few days later, a wife, who had not been a dependent for more than a few days, a newly-discovered wife, would get the insurance. If I had to discuss the question at length, I would like to take individual cases. I can assure my hon. friends opposite that there was no desire on the part of the Board of Pension Commissioners or on my part to strain the law against the soldiers; but if the amendment passes, you are opening the door very wide. I would rather say: Repeal sections 13 and 15, and let the Minister of Finance have nothing to do with the matter. After having had a number of these cases before me, I entered into correspondence and conversation with the chairman of the Board of Pension Commissioners, and I think what we call regulations, really means that I made memoranda and suggested to the chairman of the Board of Pension Commissioners certain lines upon which I thought this matter might be arranged. While the matter was under consideration, before these took the final shape of regulations, the Pension Committee was appointed, and I deferred action until I could learn the judgment of that committee. After learning the judgment come to by the committee and confirmed by the House, I can begin to see what is my duty under the regulations. That is the situation so far as I know anything about the matter.

Mr. POWER: I am very sorry I have been unable to hear the greater part of the debate; but I gather from the chairman of the Commitee on Pensions and Soldiers' Civil Re-establishment that it was the intention of either the Department of Soldiers' Civil Re-establishment or the Department of Finance to make a distinction between soldiers who were pensionable and soldiers who were not pensionable in the application of this act. If such be the case, may I call the attention of the chairman of the Pension Committee to the act itself?

"Returned soldier" means any person, male or female, who served as an officer or warrant officer or who enlisted or was enrolled or was drafted for service in the naval, military or air forces of Canada in the great war, or having been domiciled in Canada on the 4th day of August, 1914....

The minister may enter into an insurance contract with any returned soldier domiciled or resident in Canada or with any widow—

And so forth. Simply because section 15 of the act says that the minister may refuse to enter into an insurance contract, I do not think that gives the minister the right to say that such and such a class, because they are not pensionable, shall be refused insurance. That was not the intention of the act. I remember following the debate upon this subject with considerable attention. The former member for Muskoka, Mr. McGibbon, first brought this matter to the attention of the House, and it was in order to give something to the dependents of what he call sub-standard cases. A sub-standard case, if I understood him aright, was the case of a soldier who could not obtain insurance in an ordinary company, for instance, a man who returned to Canada with heart disease or with tuberculosis. There was no intention of taking away from him his rights to obtain an insurance policy, simply because he was not pensionable. In fact, the idea was to cover men who were not pensionable, who could not be pensionable, and who could not obtain policies in the ordinary line companies. The further idea was to give insurance to dependents of soldiers who were unable to obtain a pension. For instance, as regards a man who married after the appearance of the disability or the injury of which he afterwards died, under the terms of the Pension Act it was impossible for his dependents to obtain a pension. In order to give this man a chance to leave something to his dependents, this Insurance Act was brought into force. If there is any intention on the part of the committee or of the department to annul this privilege and to annul the privilege of the sub-standard risk, I for one must oppose it as bitterly as I can.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: I agree very largely, in fact I think almost altogether, with the remarks of the hon. member for Quebec South (Mr. Power). We did want to give that soldier insurance; that was our intention. Let me explain how we came to insert those sections that have been referred to by the minister, sections 13 and 15. I think that they should be in the act; but I do not think they should be applied for a purpose which was entirely foreign to the intention of the House i

originally passing the act. Let me make clear two points: First, that the whole of these regulations are predicated really upon the state of health of the insured at the time the insurance is received, and not a single word about that will be found in the original act; second, that you have two different classes of people insured under those new regulations, and a distinction is made between pensionable and non-pensionable cases. With a view to bringing the matter to a head we passed sections 13 and 15 as something necessary to protect the treasury, not against the claims of bona fide returned soldiers, but absolutely against fraud.

Mr. FIELDING: What do you call fraud? What would be a case of fraud in that connection?

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: There are many ways in which fraud could be practised, and the question is a very large one, I admit. For instance, a returned soldier suffers injuries entirely dissociated from any effects of war service, and on his deathbed he takes out insurance. That is a class of insurance that should be refused, because it is fraudulent; and it was for the purpose of protecting the treasury against that sort of thing that the provision was put in. I beg therefore to move:

That in the opinion of this House no bona fide returned soldier with dependents may be refused insurance by the Minister of Finance under sections 13 and 15 of the Returned Soldiers Insurance Act, except in cases of fraud.

Mr. FIELDING: I do not believe that any bona fide case would be turned down to-day. The committee having given great care and attention to this matter, I do think the House should accept its recommendations. There is no desire on the part of anyone to do any injustice to the returned soldiers. If my hon. friend likes to strike out that provision I have no objection, but while that section is there you must allow for some reasonable measure of interpretation of it. I have no fear of any bona fide application being refused. I have not had the regulations before me for some time, but I am pretty certain that no application will be turned down if it is not fraudulent.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: Let me read class 4:

The above is the general procedure of the board. In cases, however, where an applicant with or without dependents, is seriously ill with an injury or disease attributable to service or otherwise, and has been ill for many months with a disease which is certain to terminate fatally within a reasonably short time and has postponed taking our insurance until death is practically imminent.

Applications are at present refused.

Now, take the case of a man dying of serious injuries received overseas.

Mr. POWER: It was typical cases of that nature that the act was framed to cover.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: My hon. friend has finished the sentence for me.

Mr. MARLER: The report of the parliamentary committee was discussed at great length in the House yesterday and last night, and it contains a clause which declares in no uncertain terms that these so-called regulations were approved by the committee. That report was approved by this House. Is the House now going to recede from the position it took in approving that report last night, or is it not? The amendment would have the House go back on its approval. Surely the House, after having approved the report, cannot a few hours afterwards repudiate it and say that it will no longer stand by what it approved last night but will pass the amendment and start something new. It is not a question of discussing the so-called regulations at all. The question is, is the House going to stand by the report it has adopted?

Mr. STEVENS: There are two flaws in my hon. friend's argument. In the first place, this resolution was on the Order Paper before the debate took place last night, and before the report was adopted. In the second place, the minister stated a moment ago that these regulations were not really regulations, that we were using a term that was altogether inappropriate in describing them as such. The Minister of Finance says he has not seen them for a long time; and hon. gentlemen opposite would give us to understand that the so-called regulations, as they call them, are, to use one of their own expressions, merely a chart to guide them. Why not incorporate the regulations in the law? Make them a part of the report. They are not a part of the proposed legislation, because the minister himself says they can be changed at any time.

Mr. MANION: If what the hon. chairman of the parliamentary committee (Mr. Marler) says is sound, then it seems to me the committee would be precluded from changing any part of the report. I take

it, from what he has said, that we should not be permitted to offer any suggestions that would tend to change the report in any way. Now, I cannot accept that view at all. We agreed with the principle of the report; I do not think that my hon. friend will deny that I for one did. But we are perfectly at liberty, when these questions are being discussed in committee, to make any changes that may be deemed necessary. That is the object of considering a question in committee. We agreed to the principle of the report but not to the details of it. Some of the suggestions of the leader of the Opposition (Mr. Meighen), for instance, in regard to the Soldier Settlement Board might be dealt with in committee, and I think the committee is within its rights to suggest any desirable alterations to the report, not in principle but in matters of detail.

Mr. MACLEAN (York): The Minister of Finance states that the matter is one of interpretation. Well, he will have to go to the law officers for an opinion, and these 64 cases now before him will be subject to the interpretation which is based on their advice. The result will be that the applications will in all probability be refused.

Mr. FIELDING: It is more than a legal question; I would not interpret them in a strictly legal manner.

Mr. BELAND: There is no question that the committee now sitting has a perfect right to amend the resolution under consideration. It may change it in any way it chooses. Now, these regulations are not in the report of the committee; they are not before the House at the present time. It is open to the committee however, to suggest any amendment, and propose, for incorporation in the bill that is to be based on the resolution, anything that will help to make the administration of the act clearer and easier, and to bring it into conformity with the original intention of its framers. My hon. friend from West York (Sir Henry Drayton) has submitted an amendment that all applications should be accepted, except in case of fraud. That appears quite clear. But there still remains the question of interpretation. What would he describe as a fraudulent application? That is a difficult question to solve sometimes. Let me state a concrete case. I am a returned man; I have been in good health; I am single; I have no dependents; I am taken ill with typhoid fever.

[Mr. Manion.]

I become delirious; in the opinion of the attending physician I will certainly die. Next day I have some short periods of lucidity; I am coaxed into signing an application for insurance for $5,000; this application is filed with the Minister of Finance. Is there any fraud? Some will say no, others will say yes. Some will say the application should be refused, others may think it should be accepted. In a word, there are so many features about the different cases which may come before the minister that it is very difficult to frame a clause to cover them all unless you say that all applications without exception shall be entertained. If you do not say that, you cannot determine by legislation exactly what applications should be refused and what should be granted.

Mr. MANION: Would the minister suggest medical examination in a case of that sort to protect the department?

Mr. FIELDING: No, that would do no good.

Mr. MANION: What would my hon. friend suggest to protect the department in that case?

Mr. STEVENS: How does he know the applicant is ill in that case?

Mr. FIELDING: It is a mistake to assume that these applications come to the Minister of Finance in the first place; they go to the Pension Commissioners, who sit in judgment on them, and in nineteen cases out of twenty they approve of the application; but when some difficulty such as suggested comes up now and again it is referred to the Minister of Finance. In no case is the law strained against the man. Cases arise here and there, and it is difficult to discuss this question unless you have a concrete case before you. I suggested a little while ago the case of a sick man who had no dependents and was induced to marry, although it was certain he would not live many days. In such a case the wife is not a bona fide dependent at all. I have not had such a case brought to my notice, but in the discussion it was suggested to me that if the door is opened as wide as that many of these poor men will be induced to marry on their deathbed and you will be presenting $5,000 to women who do not deserve it. I think the committee has given the matter careful consideration, and the House having adopted their report, we should not now go back on it.

Mr. MARCIL: In the case I mentioned where the application was turned down by the Pension Commissioners and referred to the Finance Department, the committee have done nothing. The boy may die and his mother lose the benefit of his insurance.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: The Minister of Health asks for a definition of fraud. I should like to tell him in the first instance that there is not a single insurance policy but may be vitiated by fraud; and, further, that no court has ever yet attempted to set a limit to the endless possibilities of fraud, and that each case has to be dealt with on its own merits. The administration of this as of all other business requires judgment, knowledge and tact. I start out with the premise that our Minister of Finance has judgment, knowledge and tact, and I am quite content to leave to him the question of fraud. In doing that we are going further than we have done in connection with the ordinary contract of insurance; we are here giving him the right ab initio, before anything is done, to go into the whole matter. Following up this question of fraud, let us take the case presented by the Minister of Finance. Here we have a man who knows he is going to die, a man without dependents and an intriguing woman, and they go through the farce of a marriage in order that this insurance may be effected. I have not the slightest hesitation in telling my hon. friend that he will have no difficulty in dealing with that case as a matter of fraud pure and simple,—

Mr. FIELDING: I do not think so.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: —but here we cannot possibly cover all the different cases that may arise. You could not do it by legislation, you have got to leave it to some one. To my mind we cannot very well have these regulations recognized unless we go back, not upon the report as was suggested a little time ago, but go back upon the underlying intention of the act; in other words, go back upon the soldier. All I am asking in my amendment is that the bona fide returned soldier with dependents have an absolute right to insurance under this act except in causes of fraud.

Mr. LAPOINTE: My hon. friend says that the Minister of Finance will have to use judgment, knowledge and tact. Well, that is the intention of the law as it is to-day. Does my hon. friend think it is necessary to have this amendment to enable the Minister of Finance to use knowledge, judgment and tact? When my hon. friend was Minister of Finance he never thought he should be limited in the exercise of his discretion by such an amendment as this. At the time Parliament thought he was able to use judgment, knowledge and tact. Why does he not think that his successor in office is able to exercise the same qualities without this amendment?

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: The answer is so plain to my mind—

Mr. LAPOINTE: It is very plain.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: —that I wonder at his getting up to make the statement. The manner in which the act was previously enforced was agreeable to the terms of that resolution. I was not fettering the exercise of judgment, knowledge and tact by such regulations as these; I was not saying that because the returned man has been very ill for a long, long time with a war injury from which he will ultimately die that he shall not get insurance; but that is what these regulations say. Strike out these regulations and I want no amendment.

Mr. FIELDING: May I suggest another thought? I believe it was never intended that this Insurance Act should be a permanent or enduring act.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: I agree.

Mr. FIELDING: I am advised that it was originally proposed for one year only to afford an opportunity for returned soldiers who desired to immediately take advantage of it. Then a proposal was made to extend the act for a further period of one year and that was carried, to the regret of many members. Now it is to be extended for another year, and next session you will be asked to deal with it again. All the soldiers for whom this act was intended have, I believe, taken out their insurance, and those who come in at this late hour to take advantage of the act will probably be persons who, to use an insurance term, are not insurable at all. If you open the door wide in this matter I am afraid you will open it to a very large extent beyond what the House really intends. So far as I am personally concerned, I would be well pleased—and I am now speaking personally only—but I would not want the House to think that the Finance Department was grasping for more power. I am not complaining, but if you want the

minister to have some discretion—and he does not want it—better leave the law as it is.

Mr. MANION: The hon. minister used the expression "men who are insurable." Of course, this whole act is for the purpose of relieving men who are not insurable.

Mr. FIELDING: Then what is the meaning of chapter 15 of the act, which says the Minister of Finance may take steps to ascertain whether they are insurable? That is in section 15

Mr. MANION: If they were insurable, they would be insurable in ordinary companies, under ordinary policies. This was for the purpose, in my view—of course, I may be wrong—of giving insurance to men who were not insurable in ordinary companies. They were not insurable, and the act was framed for the purpose of providing insurance for them. I admit the point made by my hon. friend; there are cases, for example, where a man is on his death bed, and he endeavours to take out insurance; he perhaps pays one premium, and his relations draw the full policy. I admit that is a very difficult case to take into account, but, suppose insurance is refused a man, who had he made application six months before he was in a dying condition, would have been accepted. That man would have paid the same premium and would have been accepted. That makes it a very difficult thing to deal with. I know the matter is beset with difficulties but, at the same time, I think it is scarcely consistent with the intention of the act to impose a restriction at a certain stage, and say that this man shall not be insured, when, six months before, he could have been insured. If some rule could be made that would be equitable and fair, it would be better. I would not like to embarrass the Government by extending the limits of the insurance, but it is a very difficult case where a man could get his insurance, perhaps, to-day, and, three months from to-day, he would be sick in bed, and could not get insurance.

Mr. CLARK: As a member of the committee that considered this matter, I would like to say that in the case of the returned soldier who applied for insurance, who had dependents, where the returned soldier was suffering from such an illness that he had no expectation of life, provided that disability was a pensionable disability, the intention of the committee was that that returned soldier should receive the policy of insurance.

Mr. BELAND: Hear, hear.

Mr. CLARK: There is the other class of returned soldiers, without dependents, who are suffering from such serious illness that they have no expectancy of life, and in respect to these the committee came to the conclusion that, in fairness to the country, they should not be given insurance as of right. I think, if you will recall the original application of the returned soldiers for such an act, you will remember that they only asked for such an act as would give insurance to the returned soldiers who were suffering from a war disability, and, I think, that that was the intention when the act was passed. In the committee, I suggested that if we are going to have any regulations which will cover the classes of returned soldiers who will be eligible they should be incorporated in the act. That was not considered advisable, but, in view of the misunderstanding of these regulations, and of the intention of the committee, I would suggest that the following regulations be incorporated in the act in some manner so that the question will be clearly defined, and, I think, these regulations can be limited fairly well to these particular classes of cases. They are found in the third class of the so-called regulations which have been read as follows:

> Third-class is that of application from persons in so serious a condition of health that they have no reasonable expectation of life:
>
> (a) An applicant with dependents so seriously ill with a pensionable disability that he has no expectancy of life.

Those should be made insurable in every instance.

Mr. BELAND: Without any qualification.

Mr. CLARK: Without any qualification.

Mr. BELAND: There is a qualification.

Mr. CLARK: That is the usual legal qualification, where there is no contract.

Mr. BELAND: The qualification is—

> Provided death does not occur before approval of the application for issue of the policy.

Mr. CLARK: I say where there is no contract—the contract has not been concluded by acceptance.

Mr. BELAND: I want to make it clear. We are discussing it in a very friendly spirit, but if the application were held

over for three or four weeks for further examination, and death should occur in the meantime, then would the insurance be valid? That is the point. The regulations read:

(a) An applicant with dependents so seriously ill with a pensionable disability, that he has no expectancy of life.

Applications are at present accepted and insurance paid, provided death does not occur before approval of the application for issue of the policy.

But applications would be unduly delayed.

Mr. CLARK: I do not think there should be any delay in the acceptance of the application from a bona fide applicant with dependents, who is so seriously ill with a pensionable disability that he has no expectation of life. I think there should be no delay. Then the next paragraph reads:

(b) An applicant without dependents so seriously ill from a pensionable disability that he has no expectancy of life.

I do not think he should be insured.

Mr. BELAND: Then the regulation would be all right.

Mr. CLARK: The act, clearly, in my opinion, was framed for those soldiers who are not ordinarily insurable. I would add that, in the case of an applicant, with or without dependents, whose health has become seriously impaired because of immoral conduct, insurance should be refused.

Mr. BELAND: My hon. friend would cut off class 4 (a).

Mr. CLARK: I would strike that out.

Mr. BELAND: Will the hon. member read the clause, so that hon. members will know what it is?

Mr. CLARK: reading):

(a) The above is the general procedure of the board. In cases, however, wnere an applicant, with or without dependents, is seriously ill with an injury or disease attributable to service or otherwise, and has been ill for many months with a disease which is certain to terminate fatally within a reasonably short time and has postponed taking out insurance until death is practically imminent.

I think if those regulations are made perfectly clear, it will result in all bona fide applications being expeditiously and satisfactorily dealt with. I would be afraid, as I was in the committee, that if it is not clearly defined who are insurable, it may result in bona fide applications being held up. I think the right of the retrned soldier should be clearly defined under the act. I think also that every class of returned soldier which it was originally contemplated to include should be embraced within the act as it now stands, at any rate up to its expiration. Those classes which I have read are the classes which I understand from reading the act to have been intended to be included, and coupling my reading of the act with the original application which came from the returned soldiers confirms the interpretation which I have put upon the act.

Mr. BELAND: I entirely agree with the suggestion which has been made to the committee by the hon. member for Burrard. I think it would be a simple matter when the bill is in committee to have a clause inserted mentioning the classes referred to, say in Schedule A annexed to the bill.

I also share the view expressed by the hon. member for West York that the class of cases known as Class 4 (a) where an applicant with or without dependents, if seriously ill with an injury or disease attributable to service or otherwise, and has been ill for many months with a disease which is certain to terminate fatally within a reasonably short time and has postponed taking out insurance until death is practically imminent, should be refused insurance, because you might have the case of the returned soldier with dependents, seriously ill with an injury attributable to war service. If that were struck out, I think the amendment would meet the spirit of the act and the intention of the committee as it has been expressed to-night.

The CHAIRMAN: The question is on the amendment moved by Mr. Stevens.

Mr. BELAND: I understood that my hon. friend had withdrawn his amendment or was willing to withdraw it, and that the hon. member for West York had moved an amendment covering cases of fraud.

The CHAIRMAN: The amendment before the committee is the amendment moved by Mr. Stevens. As the amendment moved by the hon. member for West York is not an amendment to the amendment, it must be moved separately.

Amendment negatived.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON moved:

That in the opinion of this House no bona fide returned soldier with dependents may be refused

insurance by the Minister of Finance under section 13 and 15 of the Returned Soldiers' Insurance Act, except in cases of fraud.

Mr. FIELDING: I must say that I do not think it is sound legislation to leave it to the Minister of Finance to determine what is fraud. You are only adding to your troubles if you ask the Minister of Finance to determine what is fraud. There is a great deal of difficulty even from a legal point of view in determining fraud. I suggested a case a moment ago, and my hon. friend said that was clearly a case of fraud. That was a case of insurance taken by a woman within a few days of the death of the policy holder. I do not think it is a case of fraud. I think it is a privilege you are going to give them under this act.

Amendment negatived; yeas 33, nays 94.

Resolution reported, read the second time and concurred in. On the motion of Mr. Beland Bill No. 191, to amend the Returned Soldiers' Insurance Act was read the first and second times, and the House went into committee thereon, Mr. Gordon in the Chair.

Progress reported.

PENSION ACT AMENDMENT

On motion of Hon. Mr. Beland the House went into committee on the following proposed resolution, Mr. Gordon in the Chair.

Resolved, that it is expedient to amend the Pension Act, chapter forty-three of the statutes of 1919, as amended by chapter sixty-two of the statutes of 1920, and chapter forty-five of the statutes of 1921, and to provide:—

1. That "widowed mother" may, in the discretion of the commission, include a mother deserted by her husband, when the circumstances of the case are, in the opinion of the commission, such as would entitle her in a court of law to have her husband declared legally dead.

2. That section eleven of the said act, as enacted by chapter sixty-two of the statutes of 1920, be amended by adding the provision that any disability from which a member of the forces who served in an actual theatre in the Great War was suffering at the time of his discharge, shall for pension purposes be deemed to be attributable to or to have been incurred or aggravated during his military service, unless and until it be established by the commission that the disability was not attributable to or incurred or aggravated during such service.

3. That section thirteen of the said Act, providing that a pension shall not be awarded unless an application therefor has been made within three years after the declaration of peace, be amended to provide that that provision shall not apply to an applicant claiming dependent's pension who was not resident in Canada at the date of the soldier's death and has not continuously resided therein.

[Sir Henry Drayton.]

4. That section twenty-one of the said act be amended so as to provide that pensions for disabilities of less than twenty per cent in extent shall be paid at the pension's option semi-annually at the end of the months of March and September in each year.

5. That section twenty-three of the said act be amended by adding the provisions,—

(a) That when a member of the forces in receipt of an additional pension on account of his child or children dies under conditions which do not entitle his dependents to pension, a bonus equivalent to such additional pension for one year at the rate being paid at the time of death shall be paid by the commission for the benefit of the child or children to such person as the commissioners may direct.

(b) That on the death of the wife of a pensioner pensioned on account of a disability the additional pension for a married member of the forces may, in the discretion of the commission, be continued to him for so long as there are minor children of pensionable age, provided there exists a daughter or other person competent to assume, and who does assume, the household duties and care of the children.

6. That section twenty-seven be amended to provide that the extra allowance for helpless disability shall apply to cases where the person is helpless in respect of his pensionable disability.

7. That section thirty-three be amended by inserting the additional provision that no pension shall be paid to a widow of a member of the forces unless she was married to him within one year after date of discharge from the forces.

8. That section forty be amended to provide that the pension of any female pensioner who is immoral shall be suspended, discontinued or cancelled.

9. That the bonus payments provided for by schedules A and B, as enacted by chapter forty-five of the statutes of 1921, be continued during the years commencing the first day of September, 1922 and 1923.

10. That all cases affected by the proposed legislation shall be reviewed and future payments shall be made at the rates and in accordance with the provisions of these resolutions, and the proposed legislation shall come into force on the first day of September, 1922.

Mr. POWER: With reference to paragraph 1 of the resolution may I ask the minister to explain under what circumstances a court of law would be entitled to have anybody declared legally dead. I do not know of any one in the province of Quebec becoming legally dead. We have the person who becomes an absentee—

Mr. LAPOINTE: There is la morte civile.

Mr. POWER: My hon. friend mentions la morte civile, but civil death was abolished something like twenty years ago.

Mr. LAPOINTE: That is what is meant. It may have been abolished in the province of Quebec but still that is what would be intended by this resolution.

Mr. POWER: That may be the meaning of the resolution but I am quite sure it is

not intended by the chairman or the members of the committee to declare that civil death was brought about by the party incurring certain civil disabilities, or having served a certain term in gaol.

Mr. BUREAU: Death under the law and nothing else.

Mr. POWER: I think the intention of the committee was to provide for the case where a woman had been deserted by her husband for a certain number of years. Under those circumstances the Board of Pension Commissioners, in their discretion, would be able to give her a pension as they would to a widowed mother; but under no circumstances where the man had been condemned to gaol for a certain number of years, or had been condemned to be hanged or something of the kind. The question is, to find out exactly how long a man must be absent before the Board of Pension Commissioners is able to award a pension.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: How many years does the hon. member suggest that the husband should be away before the woman would be entitled to a pension?

Mr. POWER: This has arisen in consequence of a resolution of the House of Commons which has been interpreted, I think wrongly, by the committee which interpretation has had the effect of changing the state of the case altogether. The resolution in question, which passed the House unanimously, asked that the Board of Pension Commissioners should have the right, when the mother of a deceased soldier had been deserted, to grant her a pension in their discretion. When this resolution was unanimously passed and referred to the committee dealing with the subject there was no question as to how long the husband had to be an absentee before the pension was granted to the deserted wife. I think the government should have acted under the terms of the resolution and changed the law so as to meet the wishes of the House but since the committee has taken upon itself to act, I think the least it should do is to abide by the terms of the resolution as passed. In any case the recommendation as now submitted does not convey what was in the minds of the members of the committee themselves.

Mr. MacLAREN: So many members wished to take part in the discussion on this subject yesterday, and so much time was consumed, that other members who desired to do so were not afforded the opportunity of expressing their views. There were several matters to which I had wished to refer but owing to the time taken up yesterday I was prevented from doing so. There is one subject, having a bearing on the matter of pensions that I would like now to refer to, and it is connected with the organization known as "The Inter-Allied Permanent Committee on questions affecting disabled soldiers."

10 p.m.

It is an organization which deals with all phases of disabled soldiers; that is to say, pensions, artificial limbs, vocational training, and all other phases which arise in connection with disabled soldiers and sailors. It was organized during the war, and it is composed of representatives of the various Allies and also of the British dominions. The Dominion of Canada was represented on that committee. I had an opportunity of attending a number of those meetings and, in fact, I had the privilege of being one of the Canadian representatives on several occasions. It holds several meeting a year for discussions. It is a collecting bureau of all that takes place on the subject of disabled soldiers. It collects information as to what is done by all nations, and it issues a monthly periodical giving the latest information regarding these different subjects. It is an organization with which any Ally or any Dominion may communicate by correspondence in order to ascertain up-to-date information regarding various phases of this question. It enables all dominions and all Allies to obtain information as to what other countries are doing, and the value of participating in such an organization as I have described is obvious. I know Canada was a partner and participator in this organization and made the necessary subscription, a small one, I think a few thousand dollars, to meet expenses and enable the Dominion to be a portion of this organization. At the present time I do not know actually whether Canada is a member of the permanent committee or not; but I am bringing this matter up now for the information of the House, and I wish to urge this upon the minister. When I say "minister," there is some doubt on this point. This matter hitherto, as regards Canada, has come under the Minister of Militia, I understand, because there was at that time no Minister of Civil Re-establishment in Great Britain. I think it would more naturally come under the Minister of Re-establishment. That, however, is

immaterial. I would urge upon the minister of whichever department would consider this subject, the necessity of maintaining that connection with an inter-allied committee at a small expense, thus keeping in touch with movements taking place in all the other allied countries. There are too many returned men, too many pensioned men, and the question is too large for us not to associate ourselves in the first rank with such progress as is being made from year to year.

Mr. CHURCH: I think the first clause of this resolution—

That "widowed mother" may, in the discretion of the Commission, include a mother deserted by her husband, when the circumstances of the case are, in the opinion of the Commission, such as would entitle her in a court of law to have her husband declared legally dead.

—is one of the most difficult matters for a widowed mother to prove, because under the civil law a man must be seven years absent continuously and not be heard of in order that he may be declared civilly dead, and it is difficult for a wife to prove a case like that.

With the permission of the committee, I would like to move this amendment to section 1. This is the amendment which I endeavoured to move yesterday evening:

That in the case of the blind—total disability cases—the pension be increased from $600 per annum to $900 in addition to the regular bonus of $300.

A deputation of blind returned soldiers appeared before the committee and made representations on behalf of the blind returned soldiers in Canada. During the war between 200 and 225 men in our forces of all ranks lost their eyesight. This is a total disability. Blind men do not want anything because they are blind; but there are certain disadvantages that accrue to blind men to-day, especially in the larger cities where these men are principally working. Evidence was taken before the committee from representatives of the blind organizations of Canada.

The CHAIRMAN (Mr. Marcil, Bonaventure): I am afraid this amendment is out of order because it is increasing a charge upon the revenue, and it has not been recommended by the Governor General in the usual course.

Mr. CHURCH: I do not wish to dispute the ruling at all, but late last night I endeavoured to bring this matter up in the House, and was promised an opportunity when in committee.

[Mr. MacLaren.]

The CHAIRMAN (Mr. Marcil, Bonaventure): The rule provides that a resolution in which there is a charge on the revenue must be introduced by a minister of the Crown with the consent of the Governor General.

Mr. BELAND: I would suggest that we take up the resolution, clause by clause.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: Just on clause 1, I should like to suggest to the minister that he put this upon something like a business basis. Instead of having these unfortunate deserted women having to go to all this trouble, I hope he puts in some reasonable period. The whole thing is in the discretion of the commission, and I do not think it would do much harm if we struck out all the words:

When the circumstances of the case are, in the opinion of the commission, such as would entitle her in a court of law to have her husband declared legally dead.

Why not strike this all out if the idea be to help these people?

Mr. BELAND: How would it read?

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: It would read:

That "widowed mother" may, in the discretion of the commission, include a mother deserted by her husband.

That is all, and that is the sense of the committee as I understand it.

Mr. BELAND: I have no objection.

Section 1, as amended, agreed to.

Mr. CHURCH: Will the minister on behalf of the Government, when the bill is before the House, undertake to give an opportunity to discuss this question of the blind, because it is one of the most important problems which we have? The rules of the House are so framed that my amendment can not be discussed now because of a mass of technicalities. These blind soldiers have been heard by the committee, and no technical question should stand in the way of bringing up a matter of this kind. It is too bad if a member cannot bring up a matter concerning 200 blind men. This is a matter of life and death with these men, and I would ask the minister to show some sympathy for those heroes, the blind men, who fill our blind institutes and walk our streets.

Mr. BELAND: I can assure my hon. friend that I have a very deep sympathy for that class of disabled soldiers, and every opportunity will be afforded him and other hon. gentlemen who wish to discuss the question, when the bill is in committee.

Resolution reported, read the second time and concurred in. Mr. Beland thereupon moved for leave to introduce Bill No. 192 to amend the Pension Act.

Motion agreed to and bill read the first time.

THE SOLDIER SETTLEMENT ACT, 1919, AMENDMENT

On motion of Hon. Charles Stewart (Minister of the Interior), the House went into committee to consider the following proposed resolution, Mr. Gordon in the Chair:

Resolved, that it is expedient to amend The Soldier Settlement Act, 1919, chapter seventy-one of the statutes of 1919, and to provide:—

1. That section fifty-nine of the said act, as amended by chapter nineteen of the statutes of 1920, be further amended by adding the provisions that in the case of any settler who has not abandoned the land or whose agreement with the board has not been terminated or rescinded, the board be empowered to vary the provisions of the act so that the total indebtedness and liability incurred by such settler prior to the first day of April, 1922, may, on a standard date to be determined by the board, be consolidated, inclusive of accrued interest, taxes and insurance to date of consolidation, and the consolidated indebtedness made payable in twenty-five or less annual instalments, such indebtedness bearing no interest from the date of consolidation for,—

(a) two years in the case of any settler to whom advances commenced within the twelve months next preceding the first day of October, 1921;

(b) three years in the case of any settler to whom advances commenced within the twelve months next preceding the first day of October, 1920;

(c) four years in the case of any settler to whom advances commenced prior to the first day of October, 1919; the first instalment, consisting of one twenty-fifth of the consolidated indebtedness, to be paid by the settler on the date of consolidation and two, three or four further instalments (as the case may be, according to the period of interest exemption), each of the same amount as the first instalment, to be paid on the standard dates next consecutively following, the remainder of the consolidated indebtedness to be paid with interest thereon at the rate of five per centum per annum in equal consecutive annual instalments on the amortization plan during the balance of the term of payment. Provided that if default be made in the payment of any instalment of one twenty-fifth herein referred to, the amount of such instalment or the unpaid portion thereof shall bear interest until paid.

2. That the said section fifty-nine be further amended to provide that the board shall be empowered,—

(a) to vary the terms of payment as provided in the act so that stock and equipment advances or sales heretofore or hereafter made to any settler shall be payable within the same period as payment of advances for land purchase, removal of encumbrances, or permanent improvements;

(b) to vary the terms of payment as provided in the act so that in the case of any settler whose advances commence between the first day of July and the standard date in any year, the dates on which the settlers' first and subsequent instalments shall become payable may be fixed as if such advances had not commenced until after the standard date in that year; provided that interest accruing during the period of this deferment shall be consolidated with the principal indebtedness and amortized therewith;

(c) in the case of unimproved lands to vary the terms of payment provided by section 16 of the said act as amended by paragraph (d) of subsection 1 of section 59 so that payment shall be made in twenty-five equal annual consecutive instalments with interest on the amortization plan, the first of such instalments commencing not later than two years from the standard date next following the date of sale.

3. That "standard date" shall mean the first day of October in Manitoba and the provinces west thereof, and the first day of November in the provinces east of Manitoba.

4. That notwithstanding anything in the said act, or in any agreement, contract, or other document, in any case in which the indebtedness of a settler is consolidated, the board may cause to be delivered to the settler personally or to be directed by mail to him at his address last known to the board, a notice signed by such official as the board may designate, setting forth the amount of the total indebtedness of the settler at date of consolidation, the dates and amounts of payments to be made thereon by the settler, and the amount then due and payable, and the production of a copy of such notice certified under the seal of the board shall be accepted for all purposes and in all courts as prima facie evidence of the due service of the notice on the settler and of the amount of the settler's indebtedness, the dates and amounts of payments to be made thereon, and the amount then due and payable as in said notice set forth.

5. That the provisions of subsection four of section twenty-two of the said act, relating to the surplus of resale being paid to the settler, and the deficiency paid by the settler, be added to by providing that in the case of a settler who has not, in the opinion of the board, established an equitable claim to such surplus by having taken possession of the land affected and by effecting improvements thereon or otherwise, or who has abandoned the property without notice, the board may pay the surplus or, in the discretion of the board, that part of the surplus in excess of the initial payment made by the settler, to the Receiver General to the credit of The Soldier Land Settlement Assurance Fund.

6. That section twenty-seven of the said act relating to forfeiture by settler of title to land when he is in default be amended by striking out all the words after "surplus" in the second last line thereof, and inserting the following: "except as otherwise provided, may be paid by the board to the settler if he has completed the settlement conditions required for obtaining patent in accordance with the terms of his entry, or to the Receiver General to the credit of the Soldier Land Settlement Assurance Fund if such compliance by the settler with the conditions of his entry has not been established to the satisfaction of the board; provided, however, that if a settler who has not complied with the conditions of his entry has effected valuable improvements on the land with his own capital or means to which he has an equitable claim for compensation, the board may, out of the

surplus, if any, pay to the settler an amount which the board has determined that improvements added to the price realized by the sale of the land."

7. That section sixty-two of the said act be amended by adding the provision that every land inspector, field supervisor, official employee or servant of the board, and every agent engaged by the board or acting for it or on its behalf who knowingly or negligently makes any false or deceptive statement in any report, return, appraisal, statement or other document respecting or referring to any real or personal property, the subject-matter of any inspection, appraisal or examination made for or on behalf of the board or on the direction, instructions or request of the board or of any of its officials, shall be guilty of an offence and liable on summary conviction to a fine not exceeding one thousand dollars or to imprisonment for a term not exceeding one year, or to both such fine and imprisonment.

Mr. WARD: Section 1 of the resolution empowers the board to vary the provisions of the act so that the total indebtedness and liability incurred by the settler prior to the first day of April, 1922, may, on a standard date to be determined by the board, be consolidated, inclusive of accrued interest, taxes and insurance to the date of consolidation, and the consolidated indebtedness made payable in 25 or less annual instalments. As I understand the matter when discussing it with some members of the committee, the back taxes and accrued interest were to be exempted entirely for two, four or five years, as the case might be. That is not the case, however, according to the resolution. Now, I submit that if the soldier is not able to meet his indebtedness in the first years of his experience, he will not be able to meet it twenty-five years hence if present conditions continue. I imagine that members of the committee were not fully aware of the nature of many of these farms. I know something about this matter, and I can inform hon. members that in the case of many of these farms the settlers will be less able to meet their indebtedness twenty years from now than they are today. Take, for instance, a second or a third grade farm where the soil is only three or four inches deep. If the first eight or ten crops from that farm will not discharge the owner's indebtedness, the next eight or ten crops will not. If all this accrued interest and the back taxes, coupled with the interest for the years in which we understood that interest was to be exempted, are to be paid in addition to the principal, then I think we are merely prolonging the agony of the returned soldier. I am opposed to the carrying of this resolution until we have some explanation from the minister on this point.

[Mr. Charles Stewart.]

Mr. SPEAKMAN: Perhaps the minister would like me to explain the matter as I am largely responsible for the wording of the resolution in this connection. And I thought I saw the minister sending an S.O.S. signal. The hon. member has hardly understood the full import of the section or the import of my previous explanations. As I said yesterday, we came to the conclusion that neither the wiping out of capital debt nor re-valuation was possible or advisable at the present time; but we solved the difficulty by cancelling the interest. We took all that the man owed up to this year, whether back payments that he could not make, or interest that had fallen due which he had not been able to meet, or extra loans made him for subsistence, together with taxes he owed to the municipality which the board paid for him, and put these amounts all together into a new loan, the first payment to fall due in October, the standard date mentioned. For the first four years of the loan, in the case of 1919 men, no interest is chargeable. That is cancelled; it is not piled up as accrued interest later on, but is absolutely cancelled. At the expiration of that period the balance of the loan is amortized with interest, and the interest payments then start. There has been a real cancellation of nearly $12,000,000 of interest. We have not deferred the interest, but, as I say, we have cancelled it.

Mr. WARD: But the resolution says, "inclusive of accrued interest." We must take it as it stands.

Mr. SPEAKMAN: That is the back interest that has not been paid, the interest accrued up to date. That is not the interest that we are cancelling. We are cancelling the interest on the whole new loan, the first payment under which is to made in October.

Mr. WARD: As I pointed out some two or three weeks ago, many of the farms I have personally visited have been valued at possibly three times their real value. Now, if these men are to pay the accrued interest to date on, say, a 300 per cent overhead charge, what hope have they for the future? I do not think we are relieving them to any extent. If we expect that these men are going to carry that load a few years longer we shall find that eventually they will have to abandon their farms. If the load is too great now, it will certainly be too great later.

Mr. LEWIS: Although I do not see this matter exactly in the same light as my

hon. friend to my left (Mr. Ward) because in my district the farms are not quite so badly inflated, yet it does seem to me that it is simply prolonging the burden four years. According to Hansard I find the Chairman of this committee has stated that in the space of four years the Government will lose interest in the neighbourhood of $11,700,000. If this amount, which is approximately $12,000,000, was taken away from the consolidated amount of $76,000,000, it would leave about $64,000,000 total indebtedness, for a little over 21,000 soldier settlers. This deduction of $12,000,000 from $76,000,000 is practically one-sixth of the total indebtedness. If this $12,000,000 which the Government is willing to lose was taken from the consolidated amount of the loan it would mean a saving to the farmers in twenty-five years of no less than $15,000,000 of interest, and it would not mean very much greater loss to the Government. Working out this plan on a basis of $5,000 to each soldier settler, I find that the amount of interest which will be exempted during the four years will be $940, viz., $250 the first year, $240 the second year, $230 the third year and $220 the fourth year. But if, on the other hand, the Government were willing to lose this $12,000,000 in one year that would reduce the capital loan to the individual soldier to one-sixth of his total amount, which at 5 per cent interest would be $800 on $5,000. This sum of $800 at 5 per cent with compound interest would amount in twenty-five years to no less a sum than $2,320. In other words, on the plan which is offered as a relief to the farmer at the present time, he gets relief of $940 in four years; but on the reduction of one-sixth of his total indebtedness in twenty-five years he would be exempted to the extent of $2,320.

Of course, I can readily understand that the chairman of the sub-committee has given this matter a great deal of careful attention, and the one difficulty I see in my plan would be to justify or equalize this one-sixth basis. It might take a great deal of time, but if the farmer-soldier was not able to pay his interest in the first place on the original loan without the accrued taxation and the accrued interest on farm liens, I do not believe he will be able to pay it when the original loan with its accrued interest, taxation and seed liens are consolidated. It seems to me that although re-valuation does not seem feasible according to the evidence presented to the committee, yet it would be an easy matter to take this $12,000,000, which practically amounts to one-sixth of the total indebtedness and divide that equally amongst all those 21,000 soldier settlers. It would mean the greatest relief to them in the years to come. As my hon. friend says, if you cannot make farming pay during the first four years on light soil, I do not see how you are going to make it pay when you have to put something back into the ground. Moreover, we have had ample evidence from this group that a farmer who owns his land and implements under present conditions cannot even make a living. That being so, how do you expect a returned soldier to go on the land and make a living when he has at the same time to pay for his farm and meet accrued interest and taxation. It seems to me that the whole thing is impossible.

Mr. NEILL: Is it the minister's intention to take into consideration the point I brought up last night? Under Section 16 of this act we find a man can buy a farm worth $5,000 by paying 10 per cent; he puts up $500, the Government puts up $4,500. Under Section 25, which is an identical proposition, the only difference being that there happens to be a mortgage on the farm when he buys it, he can get only $3,500 from the Government and he has to pay 50 per cent of the amount. In the one case the Government is willing to put up $4,500—that is to pay 90 per cent of the amount; in the other case it is only willing to put up $2,500, or 50 per cent of the total value of the farm. There may be a reason for it, I do not know, but it appears to me to be very unfair and likely to work very unjustly. Why is it that a man who has been industrious enough to accumulate sufficient money to buy the equity in a farm before going overseas, and when he comes back home wants a loan from the Government to pay off the mortgage, should be helped to the extent of only 50 per cent as against the 90 per cent assistance in the case of the man who pays down only $500?

Mr. STEWART (Argenteuil): Is it my hon. friend's opinion that any particular settler has to put up more than 10 per cent to secure his loan?

Mr. NEILL: Section 25 says so plainly. I will read it:

> The board may from time to time advance to a settler to enable him to discharge the incumbrances upon agricultural land which is owned and used by him as such loans in money not exceeding in the aggregate $3,500—

Although they will go as high as $4,500 if the land belongs to somebody else.

—and not exceeding 50 per cent of the value of such land.

The Government will only put up 50 per cent.

Mr. MARLER: The class of loan referred to in that section is made only to a settler who already owns the land; it is not a loan for the purpose of buying new land. I might give an example of that. Supposing a settler owns a piece of land worth $5,000, the Government could advance $2,500. The settler might already have a $1,000 mortgage on the land, and if he wants to get $1,500 the Government will advance him $2,500, which will enable him to pay off his first mortgage and leave him a balance of $1,500. The loan is 50 per cent of the value of the settler's own land. Does that reply to my hon. friend's question?

Mr. NEILL: I am sorry to say it does not. It gives an explanation in a way, but the vital fact remains that there is the difference I have mentioned. Take the case of a man who has a mortgage on his farm. I had a case in my own district which is now under consideration by the Government. The man was told to go into the district and buy a farm. He looked around and the most suitable farm he could get was one which had a mortgage on it, and therefore he bought that farm. Technically, that brings him under the section I have just read. But the condition is indentically the same in both cases. A returned soldier seeks to become established on land and because he happens either to have a farm with a mortgage on it, or to buy a farm with a mortgage on it, the Government will lend him only 50 per cent of the value of the farm. Is not that correct?

Mr. MARLER: I do not think that the case my hon. friend cites is correct. If the soldier buys a farm with a mortgage on it and the title is taken in the name of the Government, all he would be required to put up would be 10 per cent of that value; the Government would pay off the prior liens.

Mr. NEILL: That may be the intention, but it is not the way the act is being interpreted because I have a concrete case which I have taken up with the board, and they gave that decision. I went further than that; I suggested the very thing the hon. member has suggested.

[Mr. Neill.]

I said, "I am willing to find somebody who will buy the farm nominally, pay off the mortgage and resell it to the government, so that the whole transaction in connection with the mortgage might be wiped out," and I was told that was impossible, because the board or the government, being cognizant of the existence of this mortgage, could not evade it in that way, and they could not, and would not, and refused to grant more than 50 per cent. I am told this was put in when the act was first introduced in that way for the benefit of mortgage companies who held a large number of loans, which they had at a substantial rate of interest, and they were afraid it would lead to these men changing their loans from the loan companies at 8 and 10 per cent to the government at 5 per cent. And why should they not, if they had been frugal enough to accumulate a farm before they went to the war?

Mr. CALDWELL: I think I can throw a little light on the subject as to the difference in the two cases. In the case of the farms that were bought by the board, the property was vested in the government. They did not have to take any action at law, because they took possession of the farm on account of default. In the case of paying off the mortgage the board simply took up the mortgage. They were in the same position as any person taking a mortgage, they would be under the necessity of resorting to the law to foreclose the mortgage there would be more or less costs taxed, and they could not go into possession without taking proceedings. That is one feature of it.

Mr. NEILL: I would not call it a feature. I would call it an excuse. I have no doubt that is one of the reasons advanced by the board, or the legal gentlemen, in favour of the act. I submit it is an excuse, because there is nothing to hinder the government saying, "We will lend this man $4,500"; and, instead of paying over the $4,500 to Tom Jones, they will pay $2,500 to pay off the mortgage, and $2,000 to Tom Jones. I do not wish to be discourteous to the hon. member from Victoria and Carleton (Mr. Caldwell). I understand the point he is making, but the function of this act is supposed to be to establish men on the land. They are willing to advance up to 90 per cent, but by this mere quibble, taking advantage of the fact that the land is mortgaged, they deprive the men of that land in many cases. It is natural to conclude that the best

farms will be taken up first, cleared and perhaps a mortgage put on them, but there is not a mortgaged farm that a man is not handicapped in taking up under the act for this reason. I, therefore, suggest that the section be left over and looked into.

Mr. MARLER: I think the point taken is a perfectly sound one. I do not know of any section in the act under which the Government can effect such procedure. It must be done under regulations, and I entirely agree with the hon. member that if such a regulation exists it should be changed, because the case he cites is most common. I think 50 per cent of the farms in the country are mortgaged and 50 per cent of the houses in the cities are certainly mortgaged. It is perfectly absurd to think of a man going to look at a mortgaged farm and being told you can only have 50 per cent, and then going to look at a farm next door, which is free, and being allowed 90 per cent of a loan, so that the point is well taken. I have studied the act with some degree of care, and I think it must be under regulations. I will be most happy to look into that to-morrow morning, and find out the situation. The amendments to the act are strictly in accordance with the report of the committee brought down by me.

Mr. BAXTER: I think you will find on investigation the board has made an error in considering the value of the property as only the value after deducting the amount of the mortgage, which is evidently not correct. All you have to do is to see that the money loaned by the board is applied to get rid of the mortgage.

Resolution reported.

Mr. CALDWELL: Before this resolution is concurred in, I may say there are several clauses that were not read, or considered clause by clause. We were only on the second clause. I wanted to make some remarks on the later clauses.

Mr. SPEAKER: The hon. member will have an opportunity when the bill is introduced.

Resolution read the first and second time and concurred in. Mr. Stewart (Argenteuil) thereupon moved for leave in introduce Bill No. 193 to amend the Soldier Settlement Act.

Motion agreed to and bill read the first time.

WAYS AND MEANS

SPECIAL WAR REVENUE

The House, in Committee of Ways and Means, resumed consideration of the proposed amendment to the Special War Revenue Act, 1915, as amended by chapter forty-six of the statutes of 1918, chapter seventy-one of the statutes of 1920 and chapter fifty of the statutes of 1921, Mr. Marcil (Bonaventure) in the Chair.

Resolution No. 11—Sales tax:

Mr. FIELDING: When the committee had these resolutions in charge before, we went through the sections respecting the sales tax, and had one discussion on them; then they were held for final approval. Several suggestions were offered on both sides of the House for adding items to the list of exemptions. Some of these suggestions seem to encounter difficulties which we are not able for the moment to overcome, and we have not agreed to act upon them. Several others, however, seem to meet with general favour. I am, therefore, going to ask the committee to agree to amend the resolution by including the words "self-raising flour" in the interpretation of the word "flour", and to include, also, an item urged on both sides of the House very strongly, namely:

Condensed milk, evaporated milk, and powdered milk.

There is another item which has attracted considerable notice from the printers of the country. It is proposed that what may be called the small printing offices, doing a job printing business not exceeding $3,000 a year, be exempt. It has been represented to us that while that, as far as it goes, is all right, it fails to meet the case of a large number of small offices chiefly associated with country newspapers where the work of the weekly newspaper and job printing run hand in hand. It is exceedingly difficult to deal with this question, because many job printing offices in this country are conducted on a very large scale, and do a great deal of business. We do not want to adopt any form of resolution which will exclude them, so we have concluded to ask the House to change the words "three thousand" to "ten thousand". That will include most of the small weekly newspapers. Some of these newspapers are doing a considerable business, and probably will be doing a job printing business of more than $10,000 a year. These are the only changes in regard to the sales tax.

Mr. STEVENS: Do I understand that up to $10,000 they are exempt?

Mr. FIELDING: Yes, in the job printing line. The intention is to include the small country weeklies. Three thousand dollars for a whole year's business is not a great deal, but $10,000 is a considerable sum, and most of the newspapers do that, and some of them more. Our object is to make a line of demarcation which will allow the small country newspapers to operate, while not cutting out the large printing offices which are doing business on a very large scale. That is the object, and I think perhaps we have accomplished it.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: How would the exemption work out? Take the case of a printing plant doing a business of $10,000. It is not taxed. In the case of a plant doing a business of $10,500, will the tax be on the excess, namely $500, or on the whole $10,500?

Mr. FIELDING: I think in that case we will assume that they are fairly prosperous and can pay on the whole.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: They would be much more prosperous if they did not make that extra $500.

Mr. FIELDING: I now move:

That resolution No. 11 be amended as follows:—

By inserting in the fifth paragraph after the word "flour" in the first line of said paragraph, the following:—

"including self raising flour,"

By inserting after the word "buttermilk" in the third line of said paragraph, the following:

"condensed milk, evaporated milk and powdered milk";

By striking out the word "three" in the thirty-fourth line of said paragraph and by inserting the word "ten" in place thereof so that the item amended will read:—"job printed matter produced and sold by printers or firms, whose sales of job printing do not exceed ten thousand dollars per annum";

Amendment agreed to.

Mr. FIELDING: I now invite the attention of the committee to Resolution No. 5 at the foot of page 1 of the Ways and Means resolutions. This is a resolution which touches the question often discussed here of depreciated currency. My hon. friend the member for Vancouver Centre (Mr. Stevens) offered the suggestion—I am not sure whether he moved an amendment, but at all events we know what his object was—that in addition to whatever protection is afforded by the resolution as it stands on the Order Paper there should be a special provision for anti-dumping;

that is, in addition to whatever might be the rate of duty levied according to the valuation provided in this resolution, he proposed there should also be an anti-dumping provision. There was no such provision in the legislation of last year. The general dumping law was left to apply, and we think that with the resolution as amended, and with the general dumping law remaining unchanged on the statute book, the difficulties which at one time were represented in connection with this matter will be largely, I hope altogether, overcome. At all events, while I appreciate the attention my hon. friend gave to the subject, we think that the case does not call for the additional duty which he suggests, and I would therefore recommend that resolution No. 5 be amended to read as follows:

Resolved, that it is expedient to amend section 40 of the Customs Act by providing that in the case of importations of goods the manufacture or produce of a foreign country, the currency of which is substantially depreciated, the value for duty shall not be less than the value that would be placed on similar goods manufactured or produced in the United Kingdom and imported from that country, if such similar goods are made or produced there. If similar goods are not made or produced in the United Kingdom, the value for duty shall not be less than the value of similar goods made or produced in any European country the currency of which is not substantially depreciated.

The minister may determine the value of such goods, and the value so determined shall, until otherwise provided, be the value upon which the duty on such goods shall be computed and levied under regulations prescribed by the minister.

Mr. STEVENS: Before this carries, I wish to thank the minister for such consideration as he has been able to give to the representations that have been made. I must, however, express my disappointment that he has not seen his way clear to making good what I think the country fully understood he intended to do when he first suggested this amendment a week or more ago. I am convinced of this, that the commercial world understood that the minister intended to place the exporter of German goods and the exporter of goods of other countries with a similarly depreciated currency on the same footing as the British exporter; in other words, not to give them an advantage greater than that of the British exporter. I myself felt that we should maintain the clause of last year, perhaps reducing, as I suggested, the 50 per cent depreciation of currency to a point a little lower, but in the event of the refusal or failure of the minister to accept that suggestion I had

hoped that he would provide for the application of his well-known principle of the dumping provisions to this measure. I think the committee ought to realize that in opening this country to the importation of goods from European countries with a depreciated currency, they are not subjecting the Canadian manufacturer and dealer to fair competition. If it were fair, that is, if the value of the goods were based on an economic system similar to our own, I would not object, but it is not. German goods in particular, and the same thing applies to Austria and other European countries, are based upon a value that is entirely artificial. I am sorry the minister failed, as I think, to appreciate that point. I do not desire to-night to labour the question again, but it is in my estimation unfortunate that the minister could not have approved of the suggestion of bringing the German exporter to the same level as the British. Certainly we are going to give the German exporter a decided advantage. I am not going to protest further. I have placed all the arguments I can before the House, and we shall have to bow to the decision of the Government in this matter.

Mr. McMASTER: I think the hon. member for Vancouver Centre (Mr. Stevens) is not quite appreciative of the fact that one man's finished product is another man's raw material, and it may be of real benefit to certain of our manufacturers to have certain goods from Europe which have been excluded for some time come on to our market. For instance, I saw a letter the other day, a copy of which I hold in my hand, which is I think of interest to all the members of the committee. The letter which is from a Canadian manufacturer reads as follows:

> In pre-war times we used to buy our bag frames in Germany, as they are not manufactured in Canada and the goods laid down very much cheaper than when procured in the United States. Since 1914, however, it has been necessary for us to purchase these from the United States manufacturers, and we have been paying exorbitant prices. For some time we have been up against serious competition in our business as the American baggage manufacturers are flooding our country with cheap baggage, with which it is impossible for us to compete, unless we can secure some of our raw materials for considerable less money. Can you suggest someone who is in a position to give us the names of suppliers of th's commodity either in Germany or elsewhere?

The point which has been stressed so strongly by the member for Centre Vancouver is only part of the case. What he forgets is, that when you get goods cheaply into a country that may not only be a benefit to consumers in the ordinary sense of the term but also a benefit to our own industrial life in that it will enable our manufacturers to take this finished product of some other manufacturer which, however, is their raw material, work it up and get a profit.

Mr. RYCKMAN: In further protest—and leaving this matter with the Government and their officials—I desire to point out that the United States proposes to take care of the importation of German goods by levying a specific duty as high as 400 per cent.

Mr. FIELDING: They have not done it yet.

Mr. RYCKMAN: They propose to do it.

Mr. FIELDING: Proposing is one thing and doing it is another.

Mr. RYCKMAN: That is what they say they are going to do.

Mr. FIELDING: But many people in Washington say they are not going to do anything of the sort, and who is right? Let me point out to my hon. friend from Centre Vancouver (Mr. Stevens) we are dealing with the question simply of valuation, and we are bringing the German goods, in point of valuation, to the standard of the English article of similar character, We are not dealing with the cost of production. We are dealing with the question of valuation and we are establishing the English valuation for the German article. In that way we are bringing it on exactly even terms with the English valuation. Now the Dumping Act, by the way, is broader and goes much further than my hon. friend supposes. I think the Dumping Act, as it has been applied for years, is a measure of protection. With this clause combined with the English valuation, and the provisions of the Dumping Act as understood and applied by the Customs Department I really think the difficulty that my hon. friend had in his mind will be largely, if not wholly, met.

Mr. STEVENS: The Minister of Finance appears to satisfy himself in his answer to my hon. friend from East Toronto (Mr. Ryckman) by saying that the American act is not in force. I hold in my hand a copy of the regulation that the American government have issued and that is now effective against Canadian

goods. I had not intended to delay the committee, but the minister having taken refuge in the way he has, perhaps I had better read it.

Mr. FIELDING: We are not talking of Canadian goods but of German goods.

Mr. STEVENS: I will just read it. Here is what is in force in the United States; and I may say that the resolution that I suggested to my hon. friend is framed very largely on the same lines:

That in the case of all imported merchandise, whether dutiable or free of duty, of a class or kind as to which the Secretary has made public a finding as provided in section 201, and as to which the appraiser or person acting as appraiser has made no appraisement report to the collector before such finding has been so made public, if the purchase price or the exporter's sales price is less than the foreign market value (or, in the absence of such value, than the cost of production) there shall be levied, collected and paid, in addition to the duties imposed thereon by law, a special dumping duty in an amount equal to such difference.

Just exactly what I proposed to the minister. Now then this is the order based on that issued by the Secretary of the Treasury:

(T.D. 39071.)
Antidumping Act, 1921—Finding by the Secretary of the Treasury.
The Secretary of the Treasury makes finding under section 201 (a), antidumping act, 1921, of dumping in the case of wheat flour from Canada.

Treasury Department, April 22, 1922.
To Collectors of Customs
and Others Concerned:
Section 201 (a) of the antidumping act, 1921, provides as follows:

Then follows section 201 which I have just read. Then the finding continues:

After due investigation I find that the industry of making wheat flour in the United States is being or is likely to be injured by reason of the importation into the United States of wheat flour from Canada and that such merchandise is sold or is likely to be sold in the United States at less than its fair value.

This finding is signed by the Assistant Secretary of the Treasury. It is apparent, therefore, that the anti-dumping provision is applied and to-day our flour is held up in United States ports in consequence. The Minister of Finance says the proposal I make is not being applied in the United States. He is undoubtedly wrong because it is being applied, and it is being applied against the country giving fair or equal competition. All I am asking is that the unfair artificial situation created by the German economic system shall be met by a similar action, that is all.

[Mr. Stevens.]

Mr. FIELDING: I understood my hon. friend from East Toronto (Mr. Ryckman) to refer to the action taken by the United States customs authority on German goods. My hon. friend from Centre Vancouver (Mr. Stevens) is talking about Canadian goods.

Mr. STEVENS: It applies to all goods.

Mr. FIELDING: Yes, but the fact that the existing law of the United States does not serve that purpose is evident from what transpired in Washington when new legislation was proposed. Any hon. gentleman who has had time to pay attention to it will have read a rather interesting exhibition that took place the other day at Washington when those who wanted protection, and further protection against German goods brought in an example such as my hon. friend has brought in, and they had quite a show on the floors of the Senate Chamber, illustrating the need, as they said, of additional legislation to protect them. However, to come back to the point we are dealing with here, that of valuation. We are not discussing the cost of production or anything of the kind. Here is the question: The customs duty is imposed in certain cases on the value of the goods. Now what is the fair value of goods? We say under this that the fair value of these German goods, or French goods, or any other goods shall be the price at which similar goods are made in England. Now, in addition to that we have the Dumping Act under which the duties are assessed pretty nearly to the extent my hon. friend has quoted.

Mr. STEVENS: No, it limits absolutely the dumping duty to 15 per cent which, of course, against German goods is entirely ineffective.

Mr. FIELDING: Well, 15 per cent in addition to other duties. If you take the duty of 35 per cent and add
11 p.m. 15 per cent to it you get what many people think is a pretty heavy duty. But the Anti-Dumping Act that has been in force for years includes this section:

When the value of the goods for duty purposes is determined by the Minister of Customs under the provisions of the Customs Act, by reason of the goods being exported or imported under unusual conditions, the value so determined shall be held to be the fair market value thereof.

My hon. friend (Mr. Stevens) thought that would not apply, but I am advised

by the Customs Department that they have for years held that in this case the English value would be held to be the fair market value and the anti-dumping duty would go far to meet the case. However, I suppose my hon. friend and I must differ on the subject. I hope he is mistaken.

Mr. MEIGHEN: I have read the anti-dumping clause pretty often and I think it would be a contortion of the law to apply that clause as it exists to-day to the class of goods that are imported here at the market value in the country of export and to say that that market value in the country of export is not the fair market value there. Why it is the only market value there.

Mr. FIELDING: I read the clause.

Mr. MEIGHEN: Yes, I know. I venture to make this prediction: If the Minister of Finance will submit that clause to the Justice Department it will not be held that that clause applies to any such case as the imports from Germany when the imports are invoiced here at the fair market value of the country of export. My hon. friend is not permitted to apply the fair market value in some other country under the dumping clause if words mean what they say. What I do like in a law is to have set out definitely and clearly what is intended to be done and not to resort to a contortion of an existing statute, in order to avoid putting frankly on the statutes what ought to be there. The minister stated quite clearly and rightly what the effect of what he is doing to-day is. It has undoubtedly the effect of bringing the duty on goods up to what it would be upon British goods. The duties are equalized; indeed, the duty is made a little more because of the preference; but it is not sufficient to equalize the duties. That will not meet the case at all; it will go only a small fraction of the distance towards meeting the case. There is something else which has to be done besides equality of duty. This is not a case of importing goods under the fair market value of the country of origin. It is a case of importing goods at an artificial value, due wholly to the depreciated currency of the country of origin. It is a new, a wholly uncontemplated case, never in mind at all at the time when the Dumping Act was passed. The Dumping Act was never meant to apply to a case of this kind at all. If such a case could have been met by a right interpretation of the Dumping Act, there would have been no necessity for the act of last session nor of what the minister proposes to do now. This is done because the case cannot be met under a fair meaning of the Dumping Act. There is no use in going part of the way to meet this situation. You only admit the principle and you fail to apply it. You fail to get actual results by your legislation. The minister has, of course, decided and we have to abide by his decision; but I submit that he would be better to sink his pride a little more and meet us fairly on this matter, because there are undoubtedly going to be serious consequences if he does not. He has met the Opposition pretty fully; except in three or four vital matters he has really brought the stray ends of his budget into line with what the old government was doing. He has got pretty close into our footsteps now, and I venture to suggest this to him: Meet us in this and two or three other matters of importance, and then just appoint before the close of this session, though we are anxious to get home, a day as a sort of a day of thanksgiving on the part of the Government and the Government's supporters for the pitfalls out of which the Opposition has taken them, not only many times during this session, but especially in the budget discussions.

Mr. FIELDING: If my hon. friend finds comfort in those reflections, I would not be willing to deprive him of it.

Amendment agreed to on division.

Mr. BUREAU: I beg to move the following:

Resolved that it is expedient to amend the Customs Act by adding thereto, the following section:

(47a) If any time it appears to the satisfaction of the Governor in Council on a report from the Minister of Customs and Excise that natural products of the class or kind produced in Canada are being imported into Canada either on sale or on consignment under such conditions as prejudicially or injuriously to affect the interests of Canadian producers, the Governor in Council may, in any case or class of cases, authorize the minister to value such goods for duty notwithstanding any of the provisions of this act and the value so determined shall be held to be the fair market value thereof.'

Mr. MEIGHEN: Will the minister be good enough just to explain clearly and in simple language the full effect of the amendment? I do not care what tongue he speaks in so long as it is fully understood by my hon. friends to my left.

Mr. BUREAU: This is to replace the provision that the value for duty of new or

unused goods shall in no case exceed the actual cost plus a reasonable profit. We are doing away with that provision. We have received complaints from certain parts of the country that this would affect their market, and in those cases I told the parties that the actual cost plus a reasonable profit was nothing more than foolishness, and it is. How are you going to ascertain the actual cost of a cherry that classes No. 4 or No. 5 over a No. 1 cherry? How are you going to ascertain the cost of a cull or first grade lumber? They cost the same thing. How are you going to base your valuation on that? Under this provision the minister has the right to determine what the valuation will be for purposes of duty, and the intention is to protect those who are producers of fruit, grain or any other commodity. I have had complaints that people were throwing on the Canadian market barley or corn or things like that. If the minister or the Governor in Council sees fit that these gentlemen be protected, as he will see fit if they deserve to be protected, then the minister, under the authority of the Governor in Council will determine the value and will not go on the false basis of a fictitious valuation, which is supposed to be the actual cost plus a reasonable profit.

Mr. MEIGHEN: What will be the basis upon which the minister will fix the value?

Mr. BUREAU: That will depend on the conditions each time, and the interest of the Canadian producer will be the primary matter which the minister will take into consideration. That might be the price of the goods on the Canadian market. I do not know what it will be. The matter will all depend on conditions at the time the producer asks the minister to protect him from those goods being dumped into Canada.

Mr. MEIGHEN: I do not know whether this is fully understood or not by the hon. gentlemen to my left; but I admit that it is fully understood by me. This provision is protection personified. This is the last emanation from the Government that denounced protection two or three days ago. For purposes of valuation the minister can fix the value where he likes, and any basis he likes, on any principle he likes, to suit any interest he likes, as low as he likes, as high as he likes, and when he likes. In a word, this simply puts into the power of the minister the whole elevation of the tariff of this country.

[Mr. Bureau.]

Mr. BUREAU: Has my right hon. friend any objection to that? If he will give the minister credit for any degree of commonsense and patriotism, about, which my right hon. friend has been preaching so much, he must know there will be no abuse on the part of the minister, and that he will do what is right by Canada. There is nothing wrong. This is better than putting on the statutes a law that means nothing and allows the minister to put fictitious values, as has been done, on the ground that he is following a law that has never been followed in the Customs Department.

The CHAIRMAN: Shall the amendment carry?

Mr. MEIGHEN: It would be, indeed, amusing if this amendment carried without discussion. Let me say this. The law as it stood placed a limit beyond which the minister could not go, the limit being the cost of production plus a reasonable profit.

Mr. BUREAU: Which cost could never be ascertained.

Mr. MEIGHEN: The minister says that could not be found. I venture to say that he cannot produce a memorandum from the officers engaged in the task that they were unable to do it. I never heard of an instance of any difficulty whatsoever; in fact, I always understood quite the contrary, that it was working well and that, in relation to the only classes of goods to which it was necessary to apply it, there was no difficulty in ascertaining the cost and a fair profit, the profit usual in the business. But now this clause enables the minister to apply any profit he likes. He can put on any valuation he thinks fit. In other words, it virtually enables him to fix the tariff where he pleases, and the House is asked to support the minister in that. We are asked to do so by a Government who have denounced protection, but who, nevertheless, are introducing the most distinctly protectionist measure ever submitted to Parliament. There has never been anything that embodied every element of protection so clearly as does this clause. And furthermore—

Mr. BUREAU: Why do you not congratulate us?

Mr. MEIGHEN: We might, I think, congratulate ourselves on our conquests. But the House is being asked to support an administration that takes to itself the power virtually to fix the tariff by Order in Coun-

cil—an administration composed of gentlemen who howled for months against the ordinary functions of Order in Council.

Mr. BUREAU: You cannot fix the value by law.

Mr. MEIGHEN: Parliament has never been asked to pass anything like this before. Of course, it is what you might expect from hon. gentlemen who filled the air with threats of slaughter—

Mr. DUFF: And we did slaughter you too; we slaughtered you in good shape.

Mr. MEIGHEN: By what means?

Mr. DUFF: We slaughtered you in Portage la Prairie; that is what you got.

Mr. MEIGHEN: Was it by proposals of legislation of this kind?

Mr. DUFF: No, it was on your record. You had to sneak out at Portage la Prairie into Grenville after being defeated in your own constituency.

Some hon. MEMBERS: Order.

Mr. MEIGHEN: The old reply, "We won the election." Just in proportion as you succeed in exposing the hollow hypocrisies, the black trickery, the chicanery, the perfidy—just in proportion as you succeed in exposing all these attributes of hon. gentlemen, the louder becomes the reply: "Well, we won anyway." Now, let me repeat, if ever a government came down to Parliament with a measure distinctly, emphatically, superlatively protectionist, that measure is the one now proposed.

Mr. MARTELL: What is your kick?

Mr. MEIGHEN: If ever a Government demanded order in council powers to the very infinite, that demand is made in this proposed measure. The Government proposes simply to arrange the tariff by Order in Council—

Mr. BUREAU: Not at all; my hon. friend does not understand it.

Mr. MEIGHEN:—and that in the very dying hours of the session, in a debate in which one minister denounces protection and another supports him. Most of them are silent, and particularly those are silent who know that they owe their election to this denunciation. And this measure is supported by the Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Motherwell); it is supported by the Minister of the Interior (Mr. Stewart); it is supported by the Prime Minister (Mr. Mackenzie King), the author of all those phrases about hypocrisy, the hon. gentleman who held me up to scorn as a young autocrat. That hon. gentleman is now standing up and asking Parliament to give him power to exercise a degree of autocracy unknown in any country in the world. And this is supported by hon. gentlemen behind him. I do not know what hon. gentlemen to my left will say, but I know what they will think.

Mr. DUFF: You must be a mind-reader.

Mr. MEIGHEN: Well, most of us can add and subtract. I did not think that this moment would come so soon. I expected conduct of this sort, of course, but I did think that hon. gentlemen would have displayed a little more skill. However, it is enough for me now to see the whole farce exposed, to see the grand climax close the whole tragedy of hypocrisy, if ever one was perpetrated in any country of the civilized world. The minister comes along with an amendment to the budget, before the session takes its last gasp, by which he is to be the dictator of the tariff, no matter what the terms of the rest of the budget may be.

Mr. JOHNSTON (Last Mountain): The leader of the Opposition (Mr. Meighen) has made several references to the party to his left, but I shall not take them up. I want to ask the minister a question with reference to his allusion to some producers who had made representations to him as to changes in the Customs Act. What classes of producers, and who were they, that made these representations?

Mr. BUREAU: I received representations from the fruit producers. May I say that this measure, which is so scandalous, is just curtailing the powers that the minister had under the old law. My right hon. friend, who is a lawyer, will understand that. Section 46 of the act says that the minister may determine the value for duty of goods. The provision reads:

> Whenever goods are imported into Canada under such circumstances or conditions as to render it difficult to determine the value thereof for duty because,—

It then states the various reasons, and proceeds:

> The minister may determine the value for duty of such goods . . . . The minister shall be the sole judge as to the existence of all or any of the causes or reasons aforesaid.

Who is the judge of the unusual manner or conditions? Not the Government, but

the minister. He shall be the sole judge as to the existence of all or any of the causes or reasons. I wanted to take power into my own hands but the other members of the Cabinet said that they would curtail that power. Hence the resolution.

Mr. MEIGHEN: Do I understand the minister to argue that this was the law before, only it was under the administration of another minister?

Mr. BUREAU: That has been the law all along.

Mr. MEIGHEN: Then why is your motion here now?

Mr. BUREAU: Because they wanted to curtail my powers.

Mr. MEIGHEN: And give them to the Minister of Finance. Why is not the motion merely one to change the name of the minister?

Mr. BUREAU: To change the name of the minister?

Mr. MEIGHEN: Yes; according to the minister, that is the only change that is being made.

Mr. BUREAU: They wanted to limit the power of the minister in regard to natural products.

Mr. MEIGHEN: Not for a minute. I do not want any hon. member to go away with that impression. That will not be the effect of the amendment. The old dumping clause is very limited in its application.

Mr. BUREAU: So limited that you cannot apply it.

Mr. MEIGHEN: Exactly. It will not apply to the case of German goods or the fruit industry. But the dumping clause we provided would have fairly applied. The old dumping clause is very limited in its application; it applies only to certain cases, and those limitations were defined after fifteen years of experience.

Mr. BUREAU: To what clause is my hon. friend referring?

Mr. MEIGHEN: The old dumping clause, to which the minister has referred, has certain specific applications. It cannot be applied generally.

Mr. BUREAU: The minister will be the sole judge of that.

[Mr. Bureau.]

Mr. MEIGHEN: And 15 years of experience has restricted its application to a very limited number of cases. It cannot be applied generally, and the minister is not the sole judge.

Mr. BUREAU: Absolutely.

Mr. MEIGHEN: Not at all.

Mr. BUREAU: Absolutely.

Mr. MEIGHEN: No, otherwise there would never have been any need for these specific provisions. Parliament would never have passed them. There have been certain limitations and it is proposed now to wipe away all those limitations and vest the sole power in the minister to fix the duties as he sees fit.

Mr. KENNEDY (Glengarry): How is this going to work out in the case of an ad valorem duty of, say thirty cents on a box of apples? The duty is going to be the same whether those apples are worth $1 or $5 a box.

Mr. BUREAU: Then the dumping clause applies, and the amount of the differences between the value put on the box and the price it is sold for shall be added to the specific duty.

Mr. KENNEDY (Glengarry): So that in effect the power which the minister is taking is the power of valuing those goods for sale and not for duty purposes.

Mr. BUREAU: For duty purposes.

Mr. KENNEDY (Glengarry) For sale.

Mr. BUREAU: No.

Mr. KENNEDY (Glengarry): It practically amounts to this, if a box is valued at—

Mr. BUREAU: Fifty cents.

Mr. KENNEDY (Glengarry): —one dollar a box in the country of production, and the apples are brought in here and the duty is thirty cents a box, they could naturally be sold for $1.30. If, however, those apples are being offered for sale at fifty cents a box, and the duty is thirty cents a box, they cannot then be sold here for fifty cents plus thirty cents, which would be 80 cents a box; but the minister would have power to add fifty cents more to the value of that box. He would practically have power to set the value for sale purposes and not for duty purposes.

Mr. BUREAU: The value for duty. Then the dumping duty shall apply, plus speci-

fic duty, thirty cents a box as my hon. friend says. I do not mean the selling price at all.

Mr. EVANS: I rise to protest against this amendment. The old Dumping Act was surely sufficient in itself for any purposes of this kind. When that was placed on the statute books no other country in the world had such a measure for putting its people into such bondage as the people of Canada at that time suffered. The old Dumping Act was sufficient for all purposes of protection, but this proposal goes beyond everything. When we came here as a progressive party we were prepared to back up the Liberal party in putting their platform into practice. But this resolution reminds me of a poem I once read about a bear that walked like a man. The party which since at least before 1896 consistently preached free trade is to-day the most protectionist party in the world.

This amendment is brought forward seemingly in the interests of growers of fruit and grain, but I venture to say that no organized body either of fruit or grain men has asked for this measure. A few days ago the statement was made in this House that apples were being dumped into Calgary last year at forty cents a box. I want to say, Sir, that no apples at that price ever struck the prairie provinces.

Mr. MacKELVIE: I think I was the author of that statement. I did not say last year; I was referring to 1914 and 1915 before the ad valorem duty was imposed.

Mr. EVANS: I am somewhat acquainted with the apple trade. For some years past our co-operative company has done business along this line, and I can truthfully say that during any of the years that my hon. friend has already mentioned no forty cent apples ever struck the prairie provinces. Protection of this kind is not going to help the grower at all. It is not for lack of protection that the apple industry to-day in British Columbia is suffering. The lowest price the British Columbia grower got last year was eighty-one cents a box; we paid at least four dollars. I leave it to hon. members to find out who got the difference between the 81 cents and the $4. The grower does not benefit by these measures of protection. The prices that British Columbia growers have been able to charge for their apples in the prairie provinces have simply killed their own market. We have never bought apples in the prairies, not even windfalls, for less than $2.60 a box.

I have before me a very interesting letter which came from Magna Bay, B.C., in which the writer says:

> You want to know the reason why you have to pay $4 a box for apples. Well, I do not know why you have to pay that price, but I do know that for the same box of apples we here receive just 81 cents.

And he continues:

> Now, I am going to ask you why we have to pay $2.60 for 100 pounds of what we call screenings for chicken feed. So it takes a little more than three boxes of apples to pay for it, and, remember, it is mostly weed seed and there is very little wheat in it.

He paid three boxes of apples for 100 pounds of chicken feed. Well, we have to pay over 1,200 pounds of that chicken feed for a similar box of apples. I repeat that the grower does not benefit by any of these measures of protection.

The hon. Minister of Finance some days ago said that this budget was calculated not to disturb business. Well, according to his own words in 1911 he recognized that this system of protection was disturbing business in various parts of the country and creating unrest. It is a fact to-day that business is not only being disturbed in our agricultural operations, but our industry is being gradually choked to death.

I witnessed here the other night one of the most degrading incidents imaginable. I think that incident was a shame to this Parliament, and I am saying that in all seriousness. I am referring to the fact that when the hon. member for Brant got up to speak a night or two ago jibes were flung across the House from protectionist members on the opposite side and were kept up for some time in a determined effort to prevent him speaking, and not once were those hon. members called to order. How far do the advocates of protection in this House consider it safe to go in tampering further with the temper of the people in the different industries in this country? It is for them to determine. The Progressive party in this House will have done their duty when they have made plain those conditions.

To-night again we see the re-enactment of the scene that took place in this House in 1897, when the leader of the Tory party at that time threw a jibe across to the Government side for breaking their pledges and promises. What was the answer? It was this: "Well, we are here and you

are there. What are you going to do about it?" That question still stands. We are here for a square deal. We came here pledged to back up the Liberal party in the putting into practice of their platform. We have to go back to our people again with a disappointing tale.

Mr. McMASTER: Mr. Chairman, I crave the indulgence of members of this committee at this late hour of the night and of the session in hindering the progress of the debate just for the moment, but I cannot remain silent and allow this resolution to pass, and I am not going to. The Liberal party, at the last election, went before the people with a programme. We went with that programme—

An hon. MEMBER: Where?

Mr. McMASTER: Where did we go? We went from the Atlantic to the Pacific with that programme, and sent it out in our literature. I have seen that programme, not murdered, in the house of its friends, but not treated with any too great respect or kindness. I have kept my faith, as far as I could, in declarations made by the Finance Minister that his party did not stand for the protective principle, and with that declaration in my ears, I have stood by the party that I have served for a quarter of a century. What is the proposal moved by the Minister of Customs (Mr. Bureau) to-night? He proposes to do away with a very absurd enactment. The enactment was that, where it appeared that the Canadian people were getting things too cheaply, the Minister of Customs would have the right to assess what it cost to produce these things, to add what, in his opinion, was a reasonable profit, and then to collect the duty upon the value so assessed. That was a perfect absurdity, as the Minister of Customs has well said. But what is the proposal now? The proposal now is that if goods are coming into Canada at too cheap a rate, the minister, or the Governor in Council, shall have the right to assess the sum that they shall be valued at, and, I suppose, in that task the competing producers in this country will lend a considerable amount of aid. I cannot support a proposition of that sort. I am going to vote against that resolution, although I am a member of this party, and, in so voting, I will stand by Liberal principles, the principles I have advocated, and which have been advocated by the party which I represent and stand for,

for the last forty years. It is not a pleasant thing to oppose men whom one has been connected with by ties of party affiliation, aye, and affection, for years and years past, but we have to have a showdown in this country, whether the Liberal party is to live up to its principles, or whether we are just a sort of second-rate protectionist party, because for consistency in protection, we will give the palm to the party led by the hon. leader of the Opposition (Mr. Meighen). But, consider the ingratitude of the protectionist. Here is a proposal made which should fill him with joy. He has no gratitude, not a bit—merely bitter words. I trust that the Minister of Customs will not see fit to press this resolution. It will not help this country. I never cared for the dumping clause. It was passed, I think, about 1904. I never knew why Canadian merchants should be deprived of the advantage to them and the advantage to the country of getting a bargain and bringing that bargain in, and paying duty on that bargain at the price they had to pay. It only occurs now and again, and, I think, it was a law meant to cover the exception, and, on that ground, it was not wise. I trust that the minister will not press this amendment and I trust, if he does press it, that I will not be the only man on this side of the House to vote against it, but if I am the only one I am going to vote against it, just the same.

Mr. KING (Kootenay): I think there is a misconception. This arrangement is not to affect the ordinary trade of the country, and not intended for that purpose. It is intended to take effect when unusual and unfair conditions occur in trade; where the Canadian producer comes under unfair and unreasonable conditions in trade. Then the minister, or the Governor in Council, may have the opportunity to effect a remedy for that unjust and unfair condition. There is nothing unusual in that. We find it all through our laws. I have an example here. Breadstuffs, grain, flour, and meal of all kinds, when damaged by water, in transportation, or prior to transportation, are subject to a general duty of 25 per cent. What is the purpose of that provision? It is for protection against unfair and unreasonable competition, and that is all that is intended in this amendment, namely, to overcome conditions that do arise at certain times, where there is an unfair condition, a condition that the grower of natural products cannot exist under. That

is the intention, and the only intention, as far as the amendment is concerned. I do not agree with the remark of my hon. friend from Brome (Mr. McMaster) although, in a wider sense, it might be considered applicable. If used in a wider sense, I would be with him, but you have to legislate, and this legislation is to help to cure unreasonable and unfair conditions that occur occasionally in the matter of trade, and to protect the producer of natural products in the Dominion of Canada.

Mr. McBRIDE: I did not intend to speak on this matter, but I feel that I must say a few words. Here we find the Progressive members applauding doctrines of free trade and that sort of thing. I may say that I made an inquiry in connection with the price of apples, and, while the producer in British Columbia was getting from 85 cents to a dollar a box, I found on investigation that the co-operative organizations run by the Progressive party, were charging 60 cents per box for handling the apples. If the people in British Columbia who are in the fruit business do not get some protection, the people in Washington will run them out of business, and they make no bones about it. They say it would be a good thing to have a market like British Columbia for their surplus fruit. As I stated the other night, when I was in the building supply business in Vancouver, brick was selling at $8.50 in Vancouver. That did not pay for the expense of making them. I went over to an American city, where brick was selling at $10.50, but when they found I was from British Columbia, and was going to take the brick back to that province, they were quite willing to sell them for $6 a thousand. How can our manufacturers in British Columbia stand up against that? These people said it was good business to sell at that price, although it was less than cost. They said they wanted to keep the British Columbia market for their surplus, and, as long as they could keep it for their surplus, they could run their yards steadily. We want to be fair and square in this matter. I want to back the Progressive party as long as they do what is right, but we, in British Columbia, must have protection. That province is a part of Canada, and we are paying our share of the taxes, as well as any other part of the Dominion, and we want a square deal.

Mr. WARD: I should like to reply to what has been said regarding the charges of the co-operative organizations on the prairies in the handling of apples. I have handled some twenty odd cars of apples for the locals in my constituency, and the most profit that ever was charged was 10 cents a box.

Mr. McBRIDE: If they want the proof of the statement I have made, Mr. Chairman, I can go upstairs and get it.

Mr. JOHNSON (Moosejaw): I do not know what proof the hon. member for Cariboo proposes to bring. I do not know what other people may charge as a profit on apples, but I do know the system on which the biggest co-operative enterprise in Saskatchewan conducts its business, and that is on a strictly competitive basis. Wherever I have had the opportunity of seeing apples sold by this organization, and I have had opportunities in a retail and wholesale way, sixty cents profit is considered abnormal and is not charged. They sell these apples in competition with others who are selling like commodities, irrespective of what the profit may be. They are sold in competition, and the profit is returned to those who buy them on a co-operative basis.

Mr. COOTE: This dumping clause has always been a very interesting thing to me. I have wondered why it was not carried a little further. When one of the department stores in Ottawa puts on a special fire sale, I consider that that is exactly similar to what our protectionist friends call the dumping of goods, but no one suggests that the city of Ottawa protect its bona fide merchants by prohibiting such sales.

The hour is too late for me to enter into a discussion of the dumping clause, but I just wish to say that the amendment proposed by the Minister of Customs would probably be very convenient for this present Government because the minister if he wished to go that far could set the value in each locality to suit the tariff views of tthe cabinet minister representing that particular district.

Mr. MEIGHEN: That is the idea.

Mr. COOTE: In regard to apples, I have never seen on the prairies any forty cent apples, but I have seen apples that were not worth forty cents—yes, and they came from British Columbia. I have nothing whatever to say against British Columbia. I lived there for several years, and some of my best friends live there now, but in all fairness to the people who live on the prairies, I say they should not be compelled

to buy British Columbia fruit if they do not like it. Last year I bought from British Columbia some peaches that were almost as hard as hailstones. This British Columbia co-operative association advertised tree-ripened fruit. They asked us to buy this fruit on the ground that it was ripened on the tree and was really good stuff. When these peaches came to hand, we could not get our teeth into them, and we were compelled to buy Washington peaches, or do without. I think it ill becomes any grower of natural products in Canada to invoke a dumping clause to make the people on the prairies pay more for their fruit than they should pay. If my memory serves me right, a few years ago the government spent considerable money in an advertising campaign to persuade the people to eat more apples, that it would be good for their health. I believe that. I like apples myself, but the hard part of it was this. After they had created an appetite for apples, the government saw fit, at the solicitation, I have no doubt, of their friends in British Columbia, to increase the tariff on apples. That was taking an unfair advantage of the people on the prairies. If they had wanted to put this special tariff on apples they might have had regard enough for these people not to whet their appetite for apples before putting on the tariff. I think it was very unfair and I am protesting against it now because I have never yet heard any public man voice a protest against it. I hope the government did not pay for the advertising every season, because if they did, it is we who have been helping to pay for the advertisement. Then a tariff was put on, making apples harder to get. That seems a very strange procedure. I think the British Columbia fruit men might pay for their own advertisements.

In answer to the hon. member for Yale, so far as I know the Progressive party are not in the apple business, and it is certainly news to me to hear they are able to go into the business and make the handsome profit of 60 cents a box. I am sure that is very enlightening to most of my friends in this corner of the House.

I think it is the duty of the Minister of Customs to withdraw such an outrageous amendment to the Customs Act as the one he now proposes. I do not think there is any use in my moving an amendment, because I do not think this House would support it. We have had sufficient instances of that, but I certainly could not allow the amendment to pass without voicing a very strong protest against such an outrageous proposal.

Mr. SALES: I should like to know what right this country has to kick about dumping. It has been dumping its goods for years in other countries. Twenty-two years ago when I came to Canada I was able to buy Davies' beef-fed ham in the old country at 12 and 13 cents a pound retail. I came to Toronto in July of the same year, twenty-two years ago, and went into one of the Davies shops, and they charged me 20 cents a pound for the same article, and I had to pay it too. That is what always happens, and it is always going to happen just as long as you have this accursed thing protection, whereby you bleed the people at home and give the people in some other country the benefit of the increased charges here. I have the proof right in my own room to-night that Davies bacon sold in the Old Country at 23 cents a pound, prime Wiltshire, fifty or fifty-five pound sides. I should like to know where you can buy the same article in this country for 23 cents a pound. It simply means that they are dumping their goods in England, and who is paying for that? The workingman of this country and some time he is going to wake up to the fact, and then there is going to be trouble.

My friends from British Columbia can ask for protection on their apples if they like. That is their business, but whether I buy them or not is my business, and I serve warning on them right now that they are losing the prairie market and they will never regain it. Why? We are planting more rhubarb; we are planting everbearing strawberries, because we can grow them, and gooseberries and currants and citrons and squash. Furthermore, we can do the same as we did twenty-two years ago when British Columbia did not grow enough—we can do without them. In this case the fruit growers will be losing a market because we shall have to do without their products. As I said to this House before, when it costs me 300 pounds of wheat to buy 40 pounds of apples I am going to do without the apples, because that is not a fair basis of exchange. However, that is exactly what happened last October, and it demonstrates that for my hon. friend from British Columbia to ask for protection on their apples will only prove a boomerang.

Mr. MEIGHEN: The discussion has been very interesting. I have, however, not

seen any sign of tears or lamentations no matter in which direction I turn. There is a desire, as usual, for a mild protest, but anything in the way of indignation is not perceptible to me. I do not believe in this amendment at all. I do not believe in giving the Governor in Council this power. I know the need of a dumping clause, particularly in regard to fruit. I do not want to see the large fruit areas of this country a desolation, or driven towards desolation, under any circumstances whatever.

Mr. McMASTER: Have you no faith in the Canadian strawberry?

Mr. MEIGHEN: I have no faith in the Canadian strawberry maturing as early as the strawberry in the south, nor the Canadian apple; and I venture to think this—with all respect for the member for Brome, and I have a lot more respect for him than I have for many an enthusiastic supporter of this amendment—I venture to think that if he lived in the Okanagan valley and just spent a few weeks there in the season of marketing and if he himself cultivated an area there as a practical fruit grower, he would soon convince himself—he could not escape the conviction—that to wipe away a dumping duty on apples, and on fruit generally, would mean desolation to that whole area, one of the gardens of this country.

Mr. McMASTER: I would like the right hon. gentleman to explain to me why apples grown in British Columbia cannot be produced as good and as cheap as those so grown in Washington?

Mr. MEIGHEN: Well, I will explain the matter, although that was not what I rose for. I think I understand the situation although I do not live out there. The production in those States to the south is, first of all, so immense, relatively to the production in that area of Canada we are considering, or in any area of Canada, that a small surplus of it will supply the whole demand. That small surplus will get in before the maturity of our crop, and once it gets in the American growers can afford to sell it for almost nothing because they get a fair price for the apples and the rest of the fruit in their own country. Anything they get beyond that is just that much velvet to them, just that much salvage. When they get into the Canadian west with their surplus and sell it they have destroyed for that year all the Canadian crop, they have destroyed the whole industry—that is to say in so far as they can do that in one year. Continue that for one, two and three years and there is no industry left. That possibility is inherent in the earlier American production. From that our fruit growers must be saved. We certainly cannot take the chance. We do not intend to in this country; it is not the spirit of Canada to do it. But there should never be an unrestrained discretion in the hands of any minister or any government. There should be some principle laid down by this House to which the Government must abide and beyond which they cannot go. That is sound, sensible legislation. That is the protective principle democratically and fairly applied. What is proposed here is the protective principle autocratically, and perhaps unfairly, applied. But where are we? The Government has repealed a moderate measure, a measure that defined a fair, just and practicable principle. The Government has repealed it and we have not got it. At all events if the Government has not repealed that principle I propose to stand and vote for it; but I am not in the position of having to stand and vote for this proposition, or vote in favour of the annihilation of our fruit industry in one part if not in two parts of Canada. While I am between these alternatives I support the measure—

Mr. COOTE: Would the hon. member explain why it is possible for the British Columbia fruit growers to sell apples in Minneapolis, St. Paul and even in New York. We were told that by I think, Mr. Lanigan in the freight rates committee?

Mr. MEIGHEN: I have no doubt those familiar with the industry—and particularly my hon. friend's colleague from the apple country who has just left the House to get his data—could give the details of that better than I. However, I would think it would be owing to this: There would be some special periods of the year, when the apples are at their best, when probably they could get a market there that would pay. There would always be some export. Hon. gentlemen to my left are often very indignant if they are not at all times allowed to say what is best for farming in Canada. Why will they not be good enough to let the fruit farmers say what is best for fruit farming in Canada? The fruit farmers are virtually united on this matter, there is practically no difference of opinion among them at all.

Mr. EVANS: Can the hon. member say that any organized body of fruit growers have asked for this measure?

Mr. MEIGHEN: They have sent a special representative here who has been round the House since the matter has been under consideration. Does the hon. member think that they would have done that if they were not united?

Mr. COOTE: Would the hon. member be willing to consider the opinions of the farmers on the prairies as readily as he does the farmers in British Columbia?

Mr. MEIGHEN: Undoubtedly, and many a time I have done so but have received very little credit for it, particularly from the politically organized body of that country. The hon. gentleman will recall that many a measure that he now regards as splendid was made the weapon of castigation of myself at the time it was enacted.

Mr. COOTE: Which particular weapon was that?

Mr. MEIGHEN: I am thinking of the wheat board at the moment. Perhaps I could stop there if my hon. friend would explain that.

Mr. COOTE: I would just like to tell the hon. member that when he first introduced the wheat board I supported it, and I have stood up for it ever since.

Mr. MEIGHEN: I do not remember receiving any communication from the hon. member to that effect, but no doubt if I had gone out to his town or village I would have seen him standing up. I did receive many a communication the other way and the resources of vitriolic literature were almost exhausted in the attacks upon myself. However, that is not the question now and let that all pass. I am glad to see a conversion in any respect.

Mr. COOTE: It is too bad to let it pass so easily.

Mr. MEIGHEN: If the hon. member does not want to let it pass he can come again; I should have no objection whatsoever.

The question is to-day what is best in the interest of the whole Dominion? In the interest of the whole Dominion we certainly do not want to destroy the fruit industry of this country, we certainly do not want to do that. When I am between the alternative of this resolution and that result I vote for this resolution. I do not believe in this method of action, and I have my opinion of an administration that, denouncing protection, repeals a moderate protective measure and substitutes one far more vicious and far more extreme.

12 m.

Mr. MacKELVIE: Perhaps I can furnish some information for the hon. member from Macleod (Mr. Coote) that will be a little more authoritative than that which has just come from the leader of the Opposition. The hon. gentleman asked if any organized body of fruit growers had made representations.

Mr. COOTE: I would just like to correct the hon. gentleman. I never asked the question.

Mr. MacKELVIE: It was asked anyway, and in reply to it I should like to read the following telegram, a copy of which was sent to me after it was sent by the British Columbia Fruit Growers to the Minister of Finance (Mr. Fielding). It reads:

> British Columbia Fruit Growers desire to register most vigorous protest against any change in the act relative to the dumping clause as referred to in your budget speech. American growers already hold highest priced early Canadian market due to their earlier ripening season. Surplus American fruit at height of their season is very often thrown on Canadian markets just as the Canadian product is beginning to reach the market in quantity, this unrestricted dumping being disastrous to sales of British Columbia fruit. British Columbia growers can supply total demand of home markets and only urge that Americans be not permitted to relieve their own markets by indiscriminate throwing of low priced fruit upon the Canadian markets. The matter is vital to British Columbia growers.

The writer of this, Mr. Barss, secretary of the British Columbia Fruit Growers' Association, goes on to say:

> In further explanation I may say that in the latter part of the summer of 1921 the Americans proceeded to throw lower grade pears in on the prairie market at prices far below cost of production. Later, a similar attempt was made with prunes and apples, the whole motive being to relieve their own markets from congestion and consequent serious drop in prices by removing the lower grades entirely from these markets, ship them to Canadian prairies where they will return some money to offset the cost of picking, grading and packing, although not nearly approaching the full cost of production. This attempt was successfully blocked by invoking the dumping clause with the effect of which procedure you are entirely familiar.
>
> In addition, you might be interested in knowing that in conversation with the manager of one of the largest fruit packing houses in the State of Washington, the admission was made

frankly to me, that their company had the deliberate intention of flooding Canadian markets with their poor products to save their own home markets for the better goods, fully realizing that in so doing they also interfered with the sales of the better Canadian fruit in these Canadian markets.

I may further state that at the recent convention of the Fruit Growers' Association held in Victoria, a resolution was unanimously passed urging the continuance of the dumping clause as put into effect during the past season.

Mr. COOTE: I do not doubt for an instant that the British Columbia men all want some protection. I will admit that, and I think most of the manufacturers in Canada want protection. To be very fair, if you are going to protect the manufacturer and protect the fruit grower, you should protect the grain grower. My income is every cent of it, derived from the sale of wheat. Will any hon. gentleman in this House tell me that protection in Canada increases the price of my wheat one cent a bushel?

Mr. BUREAU: Wheat is a natural product, is it not?

Mr. COOTE: Yes.

Mr. BUREAU: Well, if the hon. member has any complaint that wheat is being dumped into Canada, let us hear it.

Mr. COOTE: I do not think the minister will hear any such complaint. Nobody is going to dump wheat into Canada—

Mr. BUREAU: There is the difference.

Mr. COOTE:—it is always cheap here because we are several thousand miles from a market, I think the furthest from the ultimate market of any grain growing country in the world, and hon. gentlemen ought to realize that.

Mr. STEVENS: What about Australia?

Mr. COOTE: The bulk of Australian wheat is grown close to water, and the hon. member (Mr. Stevens) knows that water transportation is very cheap. I want hon. gentlemen to realize the position that the grower of wheat is in. Protection does not increase his income, but protection certainly gets at his outgo. When I buy my implements, my clothes, my furniture, my food and my building materials, 90 per cent of them have had their cost increased to me by protection. This committee has sat long enough on this item and I am not going to keep it very long.

Mr. BRETHEN: Hon. members are getting tired of it.

Mr. COOTE: Yes, but we have to get equity in this country if you want to keep this country together. We have hon. gentlemen here from British Columbia who are very insistent on a protective tariff on their fruit; but I notice they are not above going to the Minister of Finance (Mr. Fielding) and asking for the lowering of the tariff on the gasoline that they use.

Mr. CRERAR: I shall not detain the committee for more than a few minutes. I am sorry that I missed the earlier part of the discussion. I have had, however, an opportunity to glance over the amendment moved by the Minister of Customs (Mr. Bureau), and it is not one that I can support. I take it that the purport of the amendment is to assist the fruit growers of Canada and particularly the apple growers of British Columbia. I have a good deal of sympathy with the position that the apple growers of British Columbia are in. Their difficulties, however, will not be solved by an artificial means of excluding foreign fruit. The great difficulty of the British Columbia fruit grower to-day is the toll that is taken between the man who grows the fruit and the man who eats it. The system of distribution of this commodity is probably more expensive than it is in the case of any other commodity in Canada.

Mr. STEVENS: Practically all of the producers are co-operative, and they sell directly to the co-operative purchasers. Who gets an unfair profit between those two?

Mr. CRERAR: I just wish to say this to my hon. friend (Mr. Stevens). I have seen the prices that the fruit growers in the Okanagan receive for their fruit, and I know what I pay for it in Winnipeg. I know the spread indicates a cost of distribution that is probably greater than it is on any other commodity in Canada.

Mr. STEVENS: Can the hon. member explain the point that I raise? He cannot escape this, that the producers are practically all, I might say all, within the co-operative system and it is a splendid co-operative system. They sell, as nearly as possible, directly to the consumer. The hon. member may buy retail in Winnipeg; but I am asking him, in common with my hon. friends to my left who are all speaking about co-operative buying and whose arguments are all based on the co-operative buying system: Between the co-operative

producer in the Okanagan and the co-operative purchaser on the prairie, who gets the unfair differential?

Mr. CRERAR: That point is very simple? Those on the prairies who are organized to buy co-operatively are only a small part of the consuming population on the prairies. The great consuming population on the prairies is found in the cities, larger towns and villages.

Mr. STEVENS: It is the co-operative purchaser that is complaining.

Mr. CRERAR: My hon. friend does not appear to catch my point.

Mr. STEVENS: My hon. friend fails to catch mine too.

Mr. LAPOINTE: Reciprocity.

Mr. CRERAR: I admit that his point is so far in the mists and clouds and bogs of obscurity that it is impossible to see it.

Mr. STEVENS: I admit the co-operative system is in the bogs, all right.

Mr. CRERAR: While the fruit growers of British Columbia have perfected their marketing organization—and this has only been done in recent years—they still sell to wholesalers who sell to retailers who sell to the consumers. The real remedy for the fruit growers of British Columbia—and I have taken the liberty of suggesting this to some gentlemen who spoke to me about it and with whom I have every sympathy—is to create their own wholesale co-operative association and sell directly to the consumer, in the same way as the orange growers and citrous fruit growers of California have done. My objection to the amendment is that it supports and confirms a principle to which I am entirely opposed. I try to be consistent in the position I take on matters of public policy in this House, and for that reason I cannot support the amendment. Reference was made by the leader of the Opposition (Mr. Meighen) to the fact that American fruit was imported into Canada to the detriment of the British Columbia apple growers. I think it is a fact, and I am proud of it, that British Columbia apple growers are exporting their apples to the United States every year, not in odd carload lots, but in hundreds of carloads. And their market in the United States will grow for their fruit, and for a sumple reason. The fruit in Washington and in the United States generally matures earlier than the fruit in Canada, and if it matures earlier it is also exhausted earlier; and when the United States apple crop is exhausted the Canadian apple grower has an opportunity to get into that market.

Mr. STEVENS: Is my hon. friend aware that last year there was one lot of 200 cars shipped to New York which, if I remember correctly, was practically all lost? My hon. friend says that the American market is growing. Well, it was tried last year and proved practically a failure.

Mr. CRERAR: I may be wrong in the information I have received, but if I am correct, the market in the United States for British Columbia apples has been increasing every year.

Mr. MacKELVIE: It has increased during the past year or so because of abnormal conditions. In the first place there was no crop in the eastern states; New York, a great apple producing state, had no crop. Another factor was that while the western states had large crops there was a very marked car shortage in the early part of the season and the crop could not be moved. A third factor was the exchange situation, which during the shipping season about offset the duty. As a matter of fact, what the hon. member for Vancouver Centre (Mr. Stevens) says is absolutely correct. We had 400 cars of apples stored in New York on which storage charges had to be paid for months. Some of the apples had to be re-picked and re-packed and the shipment brought practically nothing.

Mr. TOLMIE: Last year the American apple crop was only 43 per cent of normal. It is in these short years that the Canadian apple growers are able to ship to the United States at a profit, but in the full years the United States growers can dump their surplus into this country to the detriment of local growers.

Mr. CRERAR: If that is correct, then there are far too many apple growers in both the United States and Canada. But I do not believe that is the case. I think my hon. friends from British Columbia are altogether too modest in respect of the splendid quality of British Columbia apples. Why, you can get British Columbia apples in the stores in this city and even in St. John, New Brunswick; and with perfect methods of marketing, it is only a matter of a very few years until British Columbia apples will have the largest market in Can-

ada. My hon. friends have nothing to fear in that respect. Now, I am opposed to the amendment on principle, and for that reason I shall vote against it. But I shall be glad to do everything in my power to assist the apple growers of British Columbia to cut out the expense in connection with the cost of distribution, so that they may get their produce to the consumers at reasonable prices.

Mr. MEIGHEN: There is just this to be added beore the debate closes. I well recall when the duty was put on. This is one of the few articles upon which the late government increased the duty. The late government diminished the duty very substantially in respect of many articles of manufacture, but it increased the duty on apples. At the time that increase was met with violent opposition from all who were opposed to the government. The government was pictured as stretching out its hand and tearing from the grasp of the child the apple it was about to eat; and no language was too strong in denunciation of that increase. All that has taken place in the interval has been the formulation of a platform demanding the abolition of the duties on the principle articles of food, within which category, one would suppose, fruit is included. The fulfillment we are getting to-night is the enactment of a law which maintains the old duty, as the late government increased it, as a minimum, and gives the power to the Government to increase it further to whatever extent it likes.

Mr. EVANS: Last year the British Columbia apple grower got 81 cents a box for his apples, notwithstanding the fact that there is a duty of 30 cents in the way of protection on every box of apples. I should like to know who got the difference between that and $4 a box. I still maintain that the British Columbia apple grower does not benefit by the tariff, and if anyone can show me that the apple industry needs protection when apples are 6¼ cents in Ottawa to-day I shall be surprised. If the apple grower cannot make the industry pay it is not because he needs protection, but because the cost of living has driven up the cost of production out of all proportion to world prices.

Amendment agreed to on division: Yeas, 122; Nays, 44.

Mr. MEIGHEN: I think that in voting on a protectionist amendment it is hardly fair to count the protectionists first.

Mr. BUREAU: It is a precautionary, not a protective amendment.

Resolutions reported.

OLEOMARGARINE

On motion of Hon. W. R. Motherwell (Minister of Agriculture) the House went into committee to consider the following proposed resolution, Mr. Gordon in the Chair:

Resolved, that it is expedient to amend the Oleomargarine Act, chapter twenty-four of the statutes of 1919 (first session), and the amending acts, by providing that notwithstanding anything contained in the Dairy Industry Act, 1914, chapter seven of the statutes of 1914, or in any other statute or law, the manufacture in and importation of oleomargarine into Canada shall be permitted until the thirty first day of August, 1923, and the offering for sale, the sale, and the having in possession for sale of oleomargarine shall be permitted until the first day of March, 1924.

Mr. MOTHERWELL: This resolution is the basis of a bill the purpose of which is to extend for one year the time for the manufacture, importation and sale of oleomargarine. The committee will recall that five or six weeks ago we had a very full debate on this question, the import of which was an intimation by this House that they desired the legislation to be continued for another year, and it is in compliance with that vote that this resolution is brought forward. The bill upon which it is based is now printed and will be submitted in due course.

Mr. PUTNAM: When does the present law expire?

Mr. MOTHERWELL: On the 1st September as to manufacture and importation; as to sale, the 1st of March.

Mr. KENNEDY (Glengarry): Does the minister intend to make any other changes in the law?

Mr. MOTHERWELL: No, only the extensions.

Mr. JACOBS: Why is is that we have to have annually an oleomargarine day the same as we have to have the King's birthday? Why cannot we dispose of this matter once for all and allow the manufacture, sale and importation of oleomargarine indefinitely? I understand it costs the country $30,000 per day to keep this House open. We devote two or three days every year to this question, so it costs $90,000 annu-

ally. Now, we have had this matter up ever since I have been in the House, and that is for the last five or six years, and we have always arrived at the same conclusion. So why not dispose of it once for all?

Mr. MOTHERWELL: Because to at least half the members of this House this is a new question. Furthermore, it will be recalled that while the majority in favour of the oleomargarine legislation was quite substantial, nevertheless the vote was taken when something like ninety-five members were either absent or did not express themselves. Consequently we did not feel justified in settling the matter once for all.

Mr. MEIGHEN: I wonder whether the hon. member for George Etienne Cartier is satisfied with that explanation. Would he mind letting us know?

Mr. JACOBS: I am always glad to give information to the right hon. gentleman. I think this is the sixth session that this matter has come before the House—

Mr. MEIGHEN: Hear, hear.

Mr. JACOBS: —and there has always been a substantial vote in favour of permitting oleomargarine to come into the country. My hon. friend the Minister of Agriculture seems to think that nothing was done until he came into the House, but I can assure him that this matter has been thoroughly threshed out during the last five or six sessions, and always with the same result.

Mr. MEIGHEN: I have just as poor an opinion of the explanation as has the hon. member for George Etienne Cartier, for the minister suggests that this is a new question to hon. members here—

Mr. MOTHERWELL: To half of them.

Mr. MEIGHEN: —and therefore the Government does not feel justified in settling the matter once for all. Well, it is just as new as every other question to the same half. Why do the Government decide any question? I suppose the minister might answer that they do not—and he would not be very far wrong.

Mr. JACOBS: I might point out to the right hon. gentleman that he was himself in charge of the Government for four or five years, but still he introduced resolutions of this kind each session. Therefore it is not for him to complain of the Government's action to-day.

[Mr. Jacobs.]

Mr. MEIGHEN: No. There was one resolution introduced to extend the time for a year—rather, it was not for a year, but indefinitely, and so place the matter on a permanent basis. The Government took its stand there, but we were within two days of the end of the session—I have the debate before me—and in order to get through, as it was essential for me to go overseas, we yielded the point and amended the resolution to make the extension read for a year. That was a year ago. But what happened? Hon. members one after the other denounced the government even under those circumstances for not dealing with this matter permanently. I do not doubt that the hon. member for George Etienne Cartier was one of those who protested.

Mr. JACOBS: No.

Mr. MEIGHEN: Perhaps he was not. I have not the slightest doubt, though, that if the present Minister of Agriculture had been in the House at that time he would have been the loudest of them all in protesting. I propose to read a short extract from the speech delivered by the present Minister of Finance who now supports this resolution of the Minister of Agriculture. He said:

> It is much to be regretted that the government has spoiled a good bill by encouraging this amendment. There is no reason in the world why we should shilly-shally with this thing from year to year. If oleomargarine is a bad thing, let us put the ban on and stop it; but this bringing in a bill, as the minister has done this year, to provide that oleomargarine shall be treated like any other article of commerce, and now because the bill has met with a little criticism to postpone, as he is doing, a final decision for another year, is not wise politics; it is not good statesmanship; it is not commonsense. Let us settle the thing and be done with it, and not go on in this way for another year.

And then he repeatedly, time after time, used language of a similar character. He said further on—

> Let the question be dealt with to-day without any further shilly-shallying. Let the government deal with it as they would deal with anything else.

I can give the explanation, I think, that the Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Motherwell) failed to give, and I will oblige the hon. member from George Etienne Cartier (Mr. Jacobs) by doing so. It is because the Government does not know its own mind on the question. This House has debated the question, and this House has decided. The Minister of Agriculture is against this measure, but he comes here introducing it. Perhaps, I should not have

said that, but he was against this measure about a month ago. Perhaps, a month ago he did not make his last will and testament on that subject. He may have made another since. He was against the admission of oleomargarine a month ago. Unless he has changed his mind since, he is against the bill he is introducing. Other ministers are in favour of the admission of oleomargarine and its manufacture. The Government has no information on the subject, but they cannot conform to constitutional practice in this matter. If they did it would mean that one of them would lose his salary, and everything in constitutional practice must bow to that consideration. The Minister of Agriculture introduces a bill with which he has no sympathy at all, against the whole principle he has declared himself in the most emphatic language. He comes here as the sponsor of the measure in the House, rather than taking the ordinary course of resigning from the Administration, which is the usual course in every government, according to constitutional practice.

Mr. JACOBS: The hon. member would not think he would resign on oleomargarine?

Mr. MEIGHEN: I would not think it, no. The Minister of Agriculture, after the speeches he made in the campaign, on the wheat board, on the tariff, and everything else, is ready to abide by the Government that follows the late administration that he denounced, steps in its footprints every time he can, and then, if it steps out, it comes back, just as soon as the voice of criticism is lifted. Any minister that will remain in the ministry after these declarations will never be bothered about oleomargarine. This is the spectacle we have witnessed, and will witness, as long as this Government adorns the government benches in this parliament.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: I do not understand why the hon. leader of the Opposition (Mr. Meighen) should work himself up to this state of mind, in view of what took place when this question was discussed previously. I think I said that the members of the Government were not all of one mind on this question. We were quite prepared to hear the House discuss it, to have it debated, and to be guided by such action as the House might take on the resolution before it. A day was set apart for it, the debate lasted the day, and the resolution was carried. It is perfectly true there was not a very full attendance of the House at the time. Under the circumstances, the Government does not think it wise to extend the act beyond the period of one year, but we feel, in going that far, we are implementing the promise we made to be guided by the views of hon. members in the House, and doing it in a manner which, in the end, we think will work out all right

Mr. MEIGHEN: The explanation of the shilly-shallying policy is about as good as the explanation of the Minister of Agriculture. The attendance during the oleomargarine debate was just as good as the average attendance during any debate this session, The Government pledged itself to be bound by the opinion of the House. The Government now says we must be bound, not by the opinion of the House, but by some who did not express an opinion, who were not here. That is what follows when a government tries to shirk a responsibility that belongs to it.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: How can the hon. member say that, in view of the fact that we are asking to put through this act at the present time?

Mr. MEIGHEN: A shilly-shallying act, to use the language of his own Finance Minister (Mr. Fielding).

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: My hon. friend can move to amend it.

An hon. MEMBER: And stop the shilly-shallying.

Mr. MEIGHEN: Yes, stop the shilly-shallying, and have the Government come down with a policy they believe in, and on which they unite. This method of action is always going to follow, if the Government shirks its responsibility, saying "We have no opinion, or we have two opinions, or ten opinions, and cannot get together, and, therefore, we will wash our hands of the whole thing, and whatever parliament says we will do". If that is the attitude, then we are going to have shilly shallying. The hon. Minister of Marine and Fisheries (Mr. Lapointe) pounds his desk in applause at the assertion that the Government has no opinion on the question. What are we coming to in this country?

Mr. LAPOINTE: No more autocracy.

Mr. MEIGHEN: There is just as much reason in everything they do as there is in their action in regard to oleomargarine. Why did we not have the Government

coming to Parliament and saying "We do not know what to do about the tariff, we have no opinion on that". Really they had not any, but they thought they had, and they came here with two or three tariffs. They should have said "We have no opinion on that, so we will just throw the whole thing into the air and everybody can say what he likes and vote as he likes, and after it is done we will act as clerks and put it into the act". That is the administration we have—afraid to face its responsibilities or to discharge them, and the country suffers in consequence, and is going to suffer in future.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: My hon. friend's argument would be for the abolition of Parliament, and for the establishment of autocracy.

Mr. MEIGHEN: No. The function of Parliament is to pass on the Government's proposals, after the Government makes them, and the duty of the Government is to come to Parliament with its proposals upon which it can unite. If it cannot unite, then it is for those who cannot come to a conclusion to leave the Government. The function of the Government is to come to Parliament with definite proposals on public questions, submit them to Parliament, and ask for its judgment upon them. That has been the practice in the world, and in this country, until we had the present phantom of a government in office.

Mr. MOTHERWELL: Mr. Chairman, the committee must not take my right hon. friend too seriously. He is just having one or more of his political catfits. The policy of the Government is embodied in this bill and in this resolution. A mandate was given by this House, and I am coming here with this bill obeying the mandate. What other course could I take? Absolutely, no other course. It does not matter whether I believe it or not. I am obeying in a democratic way the mandate of this House. A vote was taken in the House where 95 members did not express themselves; it was on a Monday, when a large number of members were away. There are limitations to that mandate, and we have put limitations in this resolution by putting it in force for only one year. Even my hon. friend should be able to see that and, what is more, I am satisfied that if we had a reasonably full House, or if the vote were taken on any other day than Friday or Monday, there would be a different result.

[Mr. Meighen.]

An hon. MEMBER: Can you prove that?

Mr. MOTHERWELL: No, I cannot prove that. That is another reason why there is a limitation in the bill, and what is more, this is a new kind of House. There are 133 new members here, more than half the House. We had some general knowledge of oleomargarine, but we had not discussed it as we discussed it here. We had not taken the responsibility of action that we did here. We did it in a hurry. We had not more than five months to consider the question. We are simply doing now what my hon. friends did last year, after a longer time to consider, and extending it for one more year. It has been done before, but done without these 133 new members expessing their views. They have a right to give the matter consideration, just as did the Parliament that preceded this. It considered it two or three times, and more. Now they want to rush 133 new members into a decision in five months.

Mr. MEIGHEN: Pretty quick.

Mr. MOTHERWELL: We refuse to be rushed. It is too important a question. Furthermore, the dairying interests are becoming more extensive and more important every day in this country, and as long as the charge of those interests reposes in my hands, I am going to protect those interests. I am going to defend them. I believe those interests are jeopardized by the suspension of that law that was in existence in this country for a quarter of a century. On the other hand in order to give hon. members of this House an opportunity to express their views, we are bringing this bill down to-day in good faith, restricting importation to one year, which was the restriction imposed by Parliament last year.

Mr. MEIGHEN: I hardly know at what end of the tangled scheme to begin, to bring some gleam of light from the conglomeration of adjectives and nonsense to which the hon. minister has just given vent. The minister, among his other defects as a public man, cannot apparently distinguish between impertinence and argument. To describe his course on this subject or any other is really some task. To picture the grotesque position he is in, particularly in his own constituency and throughout western Canada, would really demand some powers of invective as well as a command of adjectives. I do not think I should attempt the task. Sometimes the claims of mercy are really stronger than the demands of justice.

Mr. BUREAU: You ignore those claims very often.

Mr. MEIGHEN: Does the minister think that this is a case for mercy?

Mr. BUREAU: No.

Mr. MEIGHEN: What is the Minister of Agriculture trying to say to Parliament to-night? He says: We are carrying out here the mandate of Parliament, but the reason that Parliament mandated us to do this was that Parliament was not here, and if Parliament had all been here, they would have mandated us to do the opposite. One only needs to state that to expose it. Nobody except the Minister of Agriculture can utter such a fallacy with a straight face in Parliament.

Then he says: We have another reason. We are doing this because there is nothing else for us to do after that vote. Why, of course, but why did he not come down to Parliament with his policy before the vote? Why did he not follow the course that governments worthy of the name always follow? That is what I ask. Then he says: I won't make this legislation permanent. Why? Because these suspensions are damaging to the dairying industry of Canada, and as long as I am here, I am going to protect that industry. Really, I was sorry for the minister that he could not think of a better word than "protect." He usually manages to avoid that, but it slipped from his lips to-night. I am going to protect that industry, he says, and this suspension is damaging to the industry. Here we have the sponsor of the legislation saying: The bill I am bringing down here is damaging to the interests I am going to protect. That is the position he is in, but it is not anything more ignominious than the position he is in with respect to every other question of consequence that has come before this Parliament.

Mr. ROBB: Does the hon. member who represents the constituency of Leeds, which is one of the best dairying counties in the Dominion, favour a permanent oleomargarine measure?

Mr. MEIGHEN: I would favour the Government declaring its course. I declared my opinion on this when we brought in our legislation, and I declared it in a constitutional way. I came to Parliament with the Government's proposal and asked the judgment of Parliament upon it. By my opinion then I stand now.

Mr. CRERAR: I think the Government would have been well advised in this matter if they had brought in a bill that would have been permanent in its character. This question has been up before this and preceding parliaments on successive occasions, and the judgment of Parliament always was that the importation and manufacture of oleomargarine under proper restrictions and regulations as to the purity of the product in its food value should be permitted. There is no doubt that if this Parliament is sitting again next session, the Government will be obliged to bring down a further measure providing for the importation and manufacture of this article. Oleomargarine is a healthful and good food, and as such public opinion throughout the country is steadily developing in favour of it. I think the Government would have been well advised if they had made their measure permanent, instead of for a year. I do not hold quite the same view that my right hon. friend the leader of the Opposition does in his criticism of the Government for failing to accept full responsibility and bring down its measure. I think the position taken by the Government in asking the judgment of the House on this question, as it did a few weeks ago, was a fair and a very defensible position. If that were done a little more frequently in Parliament—

Mr. MEIGHEN: We would get into this mess more frequently, would we not?

Mr. CRERAR: No, I do not think so at all. I think we would have better results. My criticism of the Government in this case is that once the judgment of Parliament was taken they did not implement that judgment to the full, and make this measure permanent.

Mr. MEIGHEN: Is that not just because they did not come to a judgment on it before?

Mr. CRERAR: Not necessarily so at all. There is nothing wrong, in fact, the Government is to be commended a great deal for seeking the opinion of Parliament on measures that come before it.

Mr. MEIGHEN: Certainly, but the measure must come before Parliament. They asked the opinion of Parliament before the measure was brought down.

Mr. CRERAR: That is all very well, but if the view of my hon. friend is held to the letter, it simply means that a dozen gentle-

men composing the Government of this country will decide in Cabinet Council what is good for the country, and then come to Parliament and say; you must take this or turn us out.

Mr. CASGRAIN: Toryism.

Mr. MEIGHEN: That is right.

Mr. CRERAR: My right hon. friend says that is right. That certainly is the essence of Toryism.

Mr. MEIGHEN: It is the essence of Gladstonian Liberalism, too.

Mr. LAPOINTE: Never; Gladstone consulted Parliament.

Mr. MEIGHEN: After he brought in his measure.

Mr. CRERAR: When my hon. friends have completed their exchange across the floor, I shall be glad to resume. I say that that is the spirit of Toryism in the real sense of the word. Now in matters of government the world is advancing. I sometimes think that one of the great defects of my right hon. friend is that he does not realize that the world is advancing.

Mr. MEIGHEN: I am living in Canada where we have a Government that does not advance.

Mr. CRERAR: Now, I submit that it is a perfectly proper thing for the Government to seek the judgment of Parliament. If a government—let me repeat—in Cabinet Council relying on its own judgment—no matter how good that judgment may be—decides on a measure that it thinks is for the good of the country and comes to Parliament and says, "You must put this measure through or we will have a general election," I certainly cannot endorse that doctrine in the manner in which my right hon. friend does.

Mr. MEIGHEN: I did not say that.

Mr. CRERAR: My right hon. friend says he did not say that. But if the Government to-day in power follows that method, if it brings down a measure and says to Parliament, "This measure must go through as we present it to you," what position does it put the members of this House in, or what position does it put its own supporters in?

Mr. MEIGHEN: Just where they ought to be.

[Mr. Crerar.]

Mr. CRERAR: My right hon. friend says, "Just the position they ought to be in." Then there is only one conclusion I can come to and that is that then the need of having 235 representatives in this Parliament disappears. We had better send them all home, elect an executive of twelve or fifteen members, and say to them, "You run this country's business just as you think fit."

Mr. LAPOINTE: He is a middle-aged reactionary.

Mr. CRERAR: I am sure that my right hon. friend when he reflects on this will see that there is nothing improper in the opinion of Parliament being secured on a question of this kind. What is the purpose for which we are sent here? We are sent here as representatives of the people, to consider legislation as a Parliament and not to engage mainly in party combats across the floor of the Chamber—often to the detriment of the country. And, Sir, I think this: That if on questions of this kind—let me repeat again—the opinion of Parliament was secured and legislation brought down expressing that opinion it would be a great deal better for this country.

Mr. BRETHEN: I would just like to say that I agree with this resolution as brought down by the Minister of Agriculture and for this reason: In talking with many members of the House I find that there is the desire that this oleomargarine business be restricted in some way, and as this measure is brought in at this time without any arrangement whereby that restriction can be effected, I think it is quite proper that the matter shall go over for a year, and in the meantime that we take the opportunity to consider the question carefully.

Mr. MEIGHEN: I just wish to say a word or two as to the remarks of the hon. member for Marquette (Mr. Crerar). The subject that he brings up is well worth discussing.

Mr. CRERAR: I agree with you.

Mr. MEIGHEN: I do not doubt at all that his mind leans in the direction that he has expressed here. He must remember, however, that this subject has been discussed by the highest authorities in political economy and government the world over, and I do not think he will find any authority on British history and British constitutional government, who

will ratify the idea that he seeks to convey tonight, or say that it is practicable under our system of government.

Mr. HOEY: Can my hon. friend give me any writer, or any authority, that has dealt with the question of cabinet solidarity in a House constituted as this House is with the government in the minority?

Mr. MEIGHEN: No. Most governments in a minority are not governments at all; we have very much that spectacle here.

Mr. HOEY: They have to be in this case.

Mr. MEIGHEN: I do not know that they have to be. If a government is in a minority, or feels that it is in a minority and has not the confidence of the House, it is the business of that government to resign. Then it is the business of the Governor General or the King, as the case may be, to call upon that one next entitled to be called to see if a new government can be formed. If we do not pursue that course here, we depart from a principle without which we cannot obtain constitutional government at all.

Mr. GRAHAM: Who would His Excellency call on in this case?

Mr. MEIGHEN: It is not my part to suggest that. I wish to keep within my own functions, and I would like the government to keep within theirs and not run away.

Mr. BUREAU: Would you like to suggest an election?

Mr. MEIGHEN: The Government is virtually standing up and asserting "We are so helpless, we are so powerless, that we ask that the ordinary constitutional principles be abandoned. We ask that we be mere clerks of the House of Commons; we ask that we do not have the responsibilities of government at all; we ask that we be allowed to sit here and ask Parliament, by a vote, to decide what we ought to do as a government. We will be good enough to take that down, and we will be good enough to carry it out and draw $10,000 a year each to do it." You cannot carry on government that way and no one knows it better than the Minister of Militia and Defence (Mr. Graham); you cannot maintain the authority of government throughout the country that way. Parliament has its functions of course. Has the British parliament for the last five centuries had no functions? Has it none to-day? It is merely an automaton? The minister knows better. Parliament's function comes after the government has declared its course on matters of government policy. Parliament has ito functions to review this. It may not be that on matters of no great consequence hon. members will feel that they do their duty by adhering to the government plan as brought down, although they may differ from it in detail and though they may consider it a matter of no great consequence, and may think it would be better to support it rather than to vote the other way. It may be that will result; that has always resulted; that has in no way been a weak feature of the British constitution; but it will be a disastrous thing if governments are to be relieved of responsibility for coming forward with definite principles as to government policy, submitting those principles to parliament for parliament's approval or disapproval, and taking the constitutional consequences of their own action. If the hon. member Mr. Crerar) looks with sympathy, or looks with leniency, upon the present course then he just absolves the government from all constitutional consequences and he will get just the kind of government that that action merits. Does he not want to keep responsible government? Surely responsible government is something that is worth preserving.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: I do not propose to take up the time of the House. The discussion is really out of order, but it deals with a fundamental question. My right hon. friend has made his appeal to political economy, constitutional history and constitutional law. I do not think that political economy has anything to do with the matter but I would say this: The whole evolution of constitutional government has been that it is gradually subjecting the executive to the will of Parliament and there is an effort to make Parliament more and more an expression of the will of the people. I contend that is exactly what we are attempting to do to-day and if it means further evolution in giving expression to the constitutional rights of the people we will continue to do all that we can to develop that evolution.

Mr. MEIGHEN: I will not let the Prime Minister put me in the position of saying that a government is not answerable or subject to the will of parliament. Undoubtedly it is subject to the will of parliament expressed at the proper time.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: How do you know the will of parliament if you do not listen to it?

Mr. MEIGHEN: After the government has brought down its proposals to Parliament it can listen to the will of Parliament. Governments run in a constitutional manner have always done that.

1 a.m. I would like the Prime Minister to give me an instance in British constitutional history where any government on a matter of governmental policy—fails to come to parliament with its proposals but instead comes and says "We ask you to discuss it and tell us what to do" and then submits its proposals to parliament. I do not think he will get an instance of that ever being done. How can it be done? If it is you will get just what we are getting now: A minister rising in his place and sponsoring a measure with which he has declared himself to be not in sympathy, and which he declares to be damaging to interests that he is bound to protect. Surely that is not in the interest of constitutional government. It cannot proceed, and I want to warn the Government that it cannot proceed. The spirit of the country will not permit it to proced. Certainly the government is subject to the will of Parliament, but the will of Parliament is expressed after the government performs its constitutional function.

Mr. MOTHERWELL: It was not the Government or any member of the Government that brought this matter before the House in the first instance; it was the hon. member for Comox-Alberni (Mr. Neill), a member of the Progressive party, and I supported it just as heartily and as strongly as I knew how. The whips were off; the vote was a "free-for-all", and everybody took his course. We are now carrying out the wish of this Parliament as expressed by that vote; there is no other course to take. The leader of the Opposition (Mr. Meighen) is expressing anxiety about my so-called lamentable condition in changing my attitude. The only offence I have committed that I know of, that is unpardonable, is that I was found on the same platform with my right hon. friend on the matter of the Wheat Board.

Mr. MEIGHEN: I did not know that.

Mr. MOTHERWELL: I was charged with a grievous offence, and I think the term "voluntary wheat board" will be an offensive term for many a year because of my hon. friend's advocacy of it, spoiling it for anybody else to carry out such a proposition. There is only one thing to do. I may say further, with regard to the question why we did not bring down a permanent bill, that every member of the Government has been as busy as nails during the past five months, and we have not had time to bring down a proper oleomargarine bill. We are just extending the period provided for by the old bill. If there is to be permanent legislation, I want first of all to acquaint myself with a proper analysis of oleomargarine as we have it in this country. We have had before this House evidence indicating that it was more nutritious and also evidence indicating that it was less nutritious than butter. I want to know which is the fact and other conditions in connection with oleomargarine before a permanent bill is brought down if that is found to be desirable. I want time during the recess to find out if it is desirable to bring down a bill, and, in that event, to know exactly what I am doing. That I could not know at the short time at my disposal. Hence, I bring down this rotten old bill that my hon. friends have passed on three or four occasions.

Mr. SUTHERLAND: I am glad that I am in no way responsible for the present situation. For a minister to get up and advocate the adoption of a measure when he knows it is a rotten old bill, I can only attribute that to the effect of this nut oil that has been coming into this country during the past two years to be mixed up with this stuff. Undoubtedly we have a peculiar situation in this country at the present time, and it must be due to some influence that we have had in years gone by. Only a few minutes ago we were putting through budget resolutions exempting materials which are imported from the United States for the manufacture of this article. These things are exempted from any tax, and practically all things that go into this article come from the United States. This is my chief objection. Personally, I am not opposed to the importation or the manufacture of oleomargarine in this country, and I never have been. I have always made that quite clear; but I want that to be put on the same basis as that on which other commodities are placed. It is quite true that the Minister of Finance (Mr. Fielding), after a good deal of pressure and urging has been brought to bear upon him, has consented to exempt dairying products in the form

of condensed milk and cream and powdered milk from the effect of the sales tax. Why should this oleomargarine and all the ingredients that are imported from the United States be permitted to come into this country free from duty and free from a sales tax? It may be somewhat interesting in view of the tariff which has been enacted against our exports into the United States to know that practically all the ingredients that go into this stuff come from the United States. I know that some hon. member will say that this affords a splendid market for our oleo oil and things of that kind. The percentage of Canadian oleo oil has never yet been given in this House; but I will point out the quantity that was imported from the United States during eleven months of the past year.

	Pounds
Lard, compound	335,161
Oleo oil	1,731,005
Cottonseed oil	348,583
Cocoanut oil	219,132

This is where the troublesome feature of the disturbing element comes from to-day:

	Pounds
Peanut oil	125,889
Butter oil	823,558
Salt	279,634

The Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Motherwell) consents to imposing a duty of 7½ cents per hundred pounds on importations of the salt, that the dairyman uses in this country. Yet this article was exempted from taxation and last year 279,634 pounds of salt were imported free of duty. This makes a total of 3,862,962 pounds. It is true a duty was collected on these articles when they came in, but 99 per cent of it was rebated. Last year, as the minister himself so eloquently put the matter at the meeting of the Livestock Association at Toronto, the Canadian dairy cow could not compete with the packing company. Last year two of these packing companies, on the ingredients upon which the Minister of Finance (Mr. Fielding) refuses to impose a sales tax, received a rebate in the customs duty of $180,944 that should have gone into the Canadian treasury. I would ask the minister if he considers this is fair treatment to a legitimate and old-established industry in this country. Dairying has been carrying on under great difficulties, and at no other time has it been carried on under greater difficulties than exist to-day. Yet all these favours are being shown to these substitutes for butter, and we find even under those conditions, during the past year, there was imported into this country from Great Britain 2,036,471 pounds of butter. This all came in free of any sales tax. From the United States, we imported 1,332,210 pounds of butter without any sales tax imposed on it. The United States have put up an absolutely prohibitive tariff against our dairy products going into that country. I wonder why an industry such as the dairying industry should be selected to be compelled to compete in this way under this unfair treatment which is being meted out by the Government. I fail to understand why this should be the case in view of the complaints that are being received from every part of the country that we cannot keep on the farm the boys or the people who have been brought up in the rural districts. Is it any wonder that that should be the case, when you find that the industry in which they are engaged is singled out in this way and receives such scant consideration at the hands of the Government?

Mr. PUTNAM: Does the hon. gentleman know any mode by which we can prevent the recurrence of an annual debate on this question?

Mr. SUTHERLAND: Yes, it could easily be prevented if the Government had backbone and courage enough to take a stand and either make the law permanent or abolish it entirely.

Mr. PUTNAM: Do you stake your word as a responsible man that that would necessarily do away with an annual discussion on this question?

Mr. SUTHERLAND: An annual discussion will be inevitable so long as the conditions to which I have referred exist. This Parliament is responsible for the exemptions I have mentioned. All the ingredients that go into the manufacture of oleomargarine in Canada are exempt from inland revenue tax and the sales tax, which are imposed on all other articles. In addition to that they are free from customs duties.

Mr. PUTNAM: What does the hon. gentleman propose as a means of obviating this annual discussion?

Mr. SUTHERLAND: If the hon. gentleman wants to have a discussion on the question at any session there is nothing to prevent him.

Mr. PUTNAM: Well, that is my point. What are you wasting time for, then?

Mr. SUTHERLAND: I am registering my protest as a free citizen. I represent people engaged in a legitimate industry who are being subjected by the Government to a most contemptible and unfair competition.

Some hon. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

Mr. PUTNAM: I do not want to be discourteous to the hon. member, but—

The CHAIRMAN (Mr. Marcil): Order. The hon. member may not interrupt the member who has the floor.

Mr. BUREAU: Put your question later. The hon. gentleman will cool off in the interval.

Mr. PUTNAM: The hon. member complained that this was a shilly-shally policy and that the discussion would be provoked again one year hence. I want to find out from him if he has any proposal by which we can prevent an annual discussion on the subject, on which the opinion of the country is sharply divided.

Mr. SUTHERLAND: The discussion could very well be avoided if this industry were put on a reasonable footing.

Mr. BUREAU: Oleo has no feet.

Mr. SUTHERLAND: Hon. members may try to be funny, but this is a serious subject. This industry ought to be made subject to the same taxes that other industries, legitimate and native have to pay. But do not single it out and give it a preference over a natural industry, as has been done in the past.

Mr. PUTNAM: Does the hon. member think that an annual discussion of this question would be avoided if we had a unanimous opinion in the House on the subject?

Mr. SUTHERLAND: There is no need for the hon. member to ask that question. If he wants a discussion at any time he can have it.

Mr. PUTNAM: Do you think your side would be unanimous?

Mr. SUTHERLAND: Let me state some of the things that are exempt from the sales tax.

Some hon. MEMBERS: Oh, oh.

Mr. SUTHERLAND: Hon. gentlemen say that the Government are anxious to get revenue. Yet, in the face of that, we find this condition existing in the past year: There was imported last year into this country the following materials: Butter, 3,741,000 pounds; lard, 11,493,000 pounds; lard compounds, 3,245,000 pounds; oleomargarine, 4,630,000 pounds; grease in the rough, 1,431,000 pounds; oleo raw material, free of duty, 3,668,000 pounds, or a total of some 41,102,000 pounds of these articles which were brought in free of sales tax and most of them free of customs tariff. These are the things that I object to, and so long as such a state of things exist you may rest assured that this question will come before Parliament. Apparently the Government is ashamed of the measure.

Mr. BUREAU: Oh, no; we are not a bit ashamed.

Mr. SUTHERLAND: I hear some one say, "Oh, no." No member of the Government can inform us what constitutes oleomargarine and yet they tell us it is wholesome. How do they know it is?

An hon. MEMBER: How do you know it is not?

Mr. SUTHERLAND: Not a member of the Government can tell us what this stuff is made of, but they say it is wholesome.

Mr. BUREAU: We eat it.

Mr. SUTHERLAND: One thing is certain, and that is that it has kept down the price of butter. Hon. gentlemen say it is to help the poor. Yes; the poor may use some of it inadvertently, but it will do them more injury than good. We have a Minister of Health in this country. Why does he not analyse this commodity and let us know whether it is really wholesome? Now, I am not going to take up more time, as the hour is late, but just so long as this unfair competition prevails, so long will I oppose this legislation. I would advise the Government if they want to establish the industry permanently to put it on a fair basis in comparison with other legitimate industries. Let them remove the preference which it has over the old established industry. Do not attempt, as the Minister of Agriculture stated in Toronto at a live stock meeting, to make the dairy cow compete with the packing companies; and that is what you are doing when you permit all this material to come in at a preference over everything else.

Resolution reported, read the second time and concurred in.

Mr. Motherwell thereupon moved for leave to introduce Bill No. 194 to amend the Oleomargarine Act, 1919.

Motion agreed to and bill read the first time.

The SPEAKER: When shall this bill be read the second time?

Some hon. MEMBERS: Now.

Mr. SUTHERLAND: Before the bill is read the second time the House ought to have an opportunity of studying its contents. I really think the second reading should be deferred.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: The bill is an exact replica of the resolution, but if the hon. member feels that time should be given for its perusal, the Government will not press the matter.

Some hon. MEMBERS: Question.

Mr. SUTHERLAND: The matter is an important one and should not be disposed of lightly. It is much more objectionable than formerly.

Mr. SPEAKER: Next sitting of the House.

LAKE OF THE WOODS REGULATION ACT, 1921

On motion of Right Hon. W. L. Mackenzie King (Prime Minister) Bill No. 141 to repeal the Lake of the Woods Regulation Act, 1921, was read the third time.

Mr. SPEAKER: Shall the bill now pass and the title be as on the Order Paper?

Right Hon. ARTHUR MEIGHEN (Leader of the Opposition): Not at all. I am opposed to this measure as I stated when the bill was up for second reading; I am opposed to it still and—

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: I submit, Mr. Speaker, that the bill was read a third time. You were asking if it should pass and the title be as on the Order Paper when the right hon. gentleman spoke.

Mr. MEIGHEN: I challenge a division upon this motion. I intended to oppose the third reading.

The House divided on the motion (Mr. Mackenzie King) "that the bill do now pass and that the title be as on the Order Paper" which was agreed to on the following division:

YEAS

Messrs.

Archambault,
Binette,
Black (Huron),
Boivin,
Bouchard,
Boucher,
Bourassa,
Brethen,
Bureau,
Cannon,
Cardin,
Casgrain,
Chevrier,
Coote,
d'Anjou,
Déchêne,
Demers,
Denis (St. Denis),
Deslauriers,
Desrochers,
Elliott (Dundas),
Fafard,
Fansher,
Findlay,
Forrester,
Fournier,
Gendron,
Graham,
Hammell,
Hunt,
Johnson (Moosejaw),
Johnston (Last Mountain),
Kay,
Kennedy (Glengarry and Stormont),
Kennedy (Port Arthur and Kenora),
King (Kootenay),
King, Mackenzie (York),
Kyte,
Lapointe,
Lewis,
Logan,
Lovett,
Lucas,
Macphail,
McBride,
McConica,
McCrea,
McDonald (Timiskaming),
McGiverin,
McKay,
Marcil (Bonaventure),
Marler,
Morin,
Motherwell,
Munro,
Murdock,
Neill,
Ouimet,
Parent,
Pelletier,
Pritchard,
Putnam,
Raymond,
Reed,
Rinfret,
Robb,
St. Père,
Sales,
Séguin,
Sexsmith,
Sinclair (Queens, P.E.I.),
Speakman,
Stewart (Argenteuil),
Stewart (Humboldt),
Stork,
Thurston,
Tobin,
Vien,
Wallace,
Ward,
Woods—81.

NAYS

Messrs.

Bancroft,
Baxter,
Bowen,
Boys,
Chaplin,
Charters,
Garland (Bow River),
Hanson,
Harris,
Hoey,
Hubbs,
Irvine,
MacKelvie,
MacLaren,
Maybee,
Meighen,
Millar,
Milne,
Ryckman,
Senn,
Spence,
Stevens,
Stewart (Hamilton),
Stewart (Leeds),
Sutherland,
Thompson,
Tolmie,
White,
Wilson—29.

PAIRS

Mr. JACOBS: I was paired with the hon. member for Centre Toronto, (Mr. Bristol). Had I voted, I would have voted for the motion.

Mr. POWER: I was paired with the hon. member for East Hamilton (Mr. Mewburn). Had I voted, I would have voted for the motion.

Mr. MALCOLM: I was paired with the hon. member for North Grey (Mr. Duncan). Had I voted, I would have voted for the motion.

Mr. McKILLOP: I was paired with the hon. member for South Ontario (Mr. Clifford). Had I voted, I would have voted against the motion.

Mr. ETHIER: I was paired with the hon. member for South York (Mr. Maclean). Had I voted, I would have voted for the motion.

Mr. STANSELL: I was paired with the hon. member for Halifax (Mr. Blackadder). Had I voted, I would have voted against the motion.

On the motion of Mr. Mackenzie King, the House adjourned at 1.40 a.m. Friday.

Friday, June 23, 1922

The House met at three o'clock.

NATURALIZATION ACT AMENDMENT

Hon. A. B. COPP (Secretary of State) moved for leave to introduce Bill No. 195 to amend the Naturalization Act, 1914.

He said: Certain changes are contemplated, the first of which is to alter the system under which applications are made for naturalization. Under the act as it stands applications are made to the Secretary of State, through the courts in the different provinces. It is proposed to change the method of application, which, under section 2 of the bill, shall be made directly to the Secretary of State. Section 7 of the Naturalization Act of 1920 is also to be repealed. That section provides for the cancellation of certificates issued to alien enemies during the war, and also prohibits the issue of certificates to persons of enemy origin for ten years from the termination of the war. It is proposed to repeal both these provisions so that former alien enemies may have the same right to naturalization as persons of other nationalities. Sections 2, 3 and 4 provide for an amendment which has already been the subject of correspondence between the British Government and the Canadian Government. The acquiescence of Canada in the draft bill to amend the British Nationality and Status of Aliens Acts, 1914 and 1918, is contained in Order in Council, P.C. 768, dated April 12, 1922. The original Naturalization Act was discussed at numerous

Imperial Conferences and is, as a matter of fact, a pact between the British Government and the Dominions, the legislation being uniform except perhaps in matters of administration. This bill is proposed for the purpose of bringing the Canadian legislation into accord with that of the United Kingdom.

Right Hon. ARTHUR MEIGHEN (Leader of the Opposition): There is no reason why the introduction of this bill, if it is of any importance, should have been delayed until this hour of the session. I am informed that the bill has been prepared for weeks. From the explanation given by the hon. minister I would judge very considerable importance attaches to at least three of the suggested amendments, which apparently are contentious. The first amendment—of course, this is not the time for discussion—but the first amendment would appear to be ill-advised. If it is intended to get through the session early, I would suggest seriously and respectfully to the Government that they at once give consideration to the abandonment of this bill.

Motion agreed to and bill read the first time.

PRIVATE BILLS

FIRST AND SECOND READINGS

Bill No. 189 (from the Senate), for the relief of Nykola Pirozyk.—Mr. Kay.

Bill No. 190 (from the Senate), for the relief of Margaret Mary Ivor Horning.—Mr. Bristol.

TRENTON HARBOUR

Hon. ERNEST LAPOINTE (Minister of Marine and Fisheries) moved that the House do to-morrow go into Committee of the Whole to consider a certain proposed resolution relating to the improvement and management of the harbour of Trenton, Ontario.

Motion agreed to.

VACANCY, SUPREME COURT, NOVA SCOTIA

On the Orders of the Day:

Mr. RICHARD B. HANSON (York-Sunbury): I desire to draw the attention of the Government to the fact that a vacancy has existed on the Supreme Court Bench of the province of Nova Scotia for upwards of four months. I am informed on what I consider good authority that the business of the court has been impeded

by reason of the delay in filling the vacancy. When does the Government intend to make the appointment?

Sir LOMER GOUIN (Minister of Justice): The matter is under consideration, and I have reason to believe that immediately the session ends the vacancy will be filled.

Mr. MEIGHEN: Perhaps the minister would give a list of the applicants?

Sir LOMER GOUIN: I do not think I have any applicants for the vacancy.

Mr. FIELDING: As to the condition of public business, the late lamented judge had leave of absence, which has not yet expired.

GRAND TRUNK EMPLOYEES PENSION RIGHTS

On the Orders of the Day:

Mr. W. A. BOYS (South Simcoe): I should like to inquire of the Prime Minister whether or not any progress has been made in the negotiations between the representatives of the Grand Trunk Railway Company and the Government with regard to the pension rights and status of the men referred to in the resolution standing in my name.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: Progress is being made.

Mr. BOYS: May we expect an announcement before the House prorogues?

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: That depends on how soon the House prorogues.

Mr. BOYS: Will it be long?

INTERNATIONAL LABOUR CONFERENCE

On the Orders of the Day:

Mr. MEIGHEN: I wish to ask the Government whether they have received, and, if so, when, the report and recommendation of the International Labour Conference held last November?

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: I cannot answer my right hon. friend at the moment, but I will try to get the information for him to-morrow.

Mr. MEIGHEN: If they have been received they should, of course, be laid on the table, and I would ask the Prime Minister to see that they are brought down to-morrow.

CHINESE IMMIGRATION

On the Orders of the Day:

Mr. T. G. McBRIDE (Cariboo): Is the Prime Minister aware that some 360 Chinese were dumped into Vancouver the other day?

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: I am not aware of it, but seeing that the hon. member has mentioned the subject I will have inquiry made into the circumstances at once.

CANADA SHIPPING ACT (PILOTAGE)

On motion of Hon. Ernest Lapointe (Minister of Marine and Fisheries) the amendment made by the Senate to Bill No. 79 to amend the Canada Shipping Act (Pilotage) was read the second time and concurred in.

RETURNED SOLDIERS' INSURANCE

House again in Committee on Bill No. 191, to amend the Returned Soldiers' Insurance Act, Mr. Gordon in the Chair.

On section 1—

Mr. BELAND: When the House was in committee last night on the resolution on which this bill is based, some suggestions were made as to what the regulations for the guidance of the minister should be. I undertook to have a schedule prepared and annexed to the bill embodying those regulations. In order to carry out the wishes of the committee, and in accordance with the agreement reached, I move that the following clause be added to the bill as clause 1A:

> In the exercise of the powers conferred upon the minister by sections 13 and 15 of the said act, the minister shall be governed by the provisions of the schedule of this act:

It was suggested, in view of the fact that it had been provided last year that the provisions of the act should remain in force until the first day of September, 1922, that a clause be inserted to make it clear that no change in the regulations is contemplated so far as applications made up to that date are concerned. The remainder of the proposed section 1A, covers that point and is as follows:

> Provided that applicants with or without pensionable disability who are so seriously ill that they have no expectancy of life and who have dependents who are entitled to become beneficiaries under the contract as provided under the act, shall be insurable under The Returned Soldiers' Insurance Act up to, and inclusive, first September, 1922.

Then the schedule is the one that was agreed upon last night.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: It is true that a schedule was passed last night on division, but I do not understand that we agreed upon any schedule. I suppose my hon. friend was referring to the list of provisions which some hon. members called regulations and others said were not regulations; but there was no agreement. I recognize that my hon. friend has gone a long way towards carrying out the sense of the amendment I offered last night. He is taking a proper step in the direction of extending relief. I wish, however, to make a further suggestion. It has been pretty well advertised in the press that the provisions of the Returned Soldiers' Insurance Act would be extended for another year. I quite understand that by his amendment the minister is implementing what may be regarded as the underlying principle of the original act, which was to run until the first of September of this year. But in view of the fact it has been generally regarded as a matter of government policy that this act would be extended for another year, I am afraid that a good many of these unfortunates—and after all, they are the unfortunate soldiers; they are ill, and they are the ones we particularly desire to help—might not know anything about the restrictive period within which the original intent of the act should have effect. I suggest, therefore, that the limitation made by the amendment now introduced be effective until the first of January, 1923, and that all the different soldiers' organizations be immediately notified accordingly.

Mr. BELAND: I agree to that.

The CHAIRMAN: The last part of the proposed section 1A will now read:

Provided that applicants with or without pensionable disability who are so seriously ill that they have no expectancy of life, and who have dependents who are entitled to become beneficiaries under the contract as provided under the act, shall be insurable under The Returned Soldiers' Insurance Act up to and inclusive, first January, 1923.

Section 1, and new section 1A agreed to.

On section 2—operation extended for one year.

Mr. GARDINER: I suggest that this section be amended by extending the time to 1925. Under the section as it stands this insurance will be available to the returned man only for another twelve months. I think it would be greatly to the benefit of the returned men if the time were extended as I suggest.

Mr. BELAND: I did not catch the reasons for the suggested amendment. Does my hon. friend move an amendment?

Mr. GARDINER: No, I merely suggest the substituting of "twenty-five" for "twenty-three" in the last line of section 2. I would suggest to the minister that this insurance scheme should be extended for some further period.

Mr. BELAND: I would be ready to accept the suggestion of my hon. friend if I thought it would meet with the intention of the framers of the act. My hon. friend must remember that this act was passed in 1920, and in the following year its provisions were extended for a further year, to 1st September, 1922. This year the parliamentary committee recommended a further extension of one year, to 1st September, 1923. For the life of me I can see no good reason why we should extend it beyond that date. If any circumstances should arise in the course of next year which would warrant any further extension my hon. friend would be welcome to move accordingly at the next session of Parliament, but I think for the present it should remain as it is.

Mr. GARDINER: I am satisfied that many returned men would like to take this insurance if they had the money, but as we all realize, many of the returned men are in more or less poor circumstances financially, and I think it would be to the credit of the House and to the benefit of the returned men if they were assured that this insurance would be available to them for the period I have mentioned.

Mr. CARROLL: As a member of the committee I may say that this matter was very fairly and fully gone into, and for the reasons given by the representatives of the returned soldiers who came before the committee and those given by the Board of Pensions Commissioners, the committee undertook to extend the period for one year. I believe that if the same reasons were presented at the next session of Parliament warranting a further extension, the committee would come to the conclusion that it should be granted, but I do not think at this particular time we should provide for an extension beyond 1923.

Mr. FIELDING: I think it would be a mistake to encourage the soldiers with the idea that this is to be a continuing measure. I do not think it was ever intended to be so. I think that in the years that have already elapsed the House has more than met the original intention, and I hope my hon. friend will not encourage the notion that there is to be a further extension.

Section agreed to.

Bill as amended reported, read the third time, and passed.

PENSION ACT AMENDMENT

On the motion of Hon. H. S. Beland (Minister of Soldiers' Civil Re-establishment) Bill No. 192, to amend the Pension Act, was read the second time, and the House went into committee thereon, Mr. Gordon in the Chair.

On section 1—"widowed mother" defined:

Mr. BELAND: This section appears in a some what different form from the resolution as it came from the committee last night. The original intention was to amend the act so that "widowed mother" might in the discretion of the board include a mother deserted by her husband when the circumstances were such in the opinion of the board, as to entitle her in a court of law to have her husband declared legally dead. In the course of the discussion last night my hon. friend from Quebec South (Mr. Power) suggested that a certain number of years should be fixed during which a mother should have been deserted before she could be considered as a widowed mother. In looking over the debate last night I find that he said:

> I think the intention of the committee was to provide for the case where a woman had been deserted by her husband for a certain number of years.

On the other hand—I find that the hon. member for West York (Sir Henry Drayton) asked the hon member for Quebec South the question:

> How many years does the hon. member suggest that the husband should be away before the woman would be entitled to a pension?

That statement I have read and the question asked by the hon. member for West York would suggest that it is the intention of the committee that a certain number of years should be specified before a deserted wife should be considered as a widowed mother. Consequently, I have consulted the Department of Justice as to how long, in the various provinces, a wife must be deserted before her husband would be considered legally dead, and the department has advised me that in the province of Ontario the limit is seven years. I do not know what the condition is in other provinces but in the province of Quebec a period of five years is fixed. So, I would be adverse to including all deserted wives with widowed mothers. It will occur to hon. gentlemen that there might be complicity between a man and his wife, and that as a sequence to that complicity the husband might disappear, say for five or six months, for the purpose of securing a pension for his wife. In order to avoid that, the clause should be amended somewhat. Last night it was made to read:

> That "widowed mother" may, in the discretion of the commission, include a mother who has been deserted by her husband.

I propose that we should add something to that. I have here an amendment for the consideration of the committee which would read as follows:

> That "widowed mother" may, in the discretion of the commission, include a mother who has been deserted by her husband for a period of seven years, provided that during such separation she was not aware of her husband's whereabouts, and was not supported by him.

I think this provision would do away with any possibility of husband and wife acting as accomplices for the purpose of securing a pension.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: The minister has referred to Hansard. I will also refer to Hansard. The matter was finally left in this way; I will read what I said myself:

> Just on clause 1, I should like to suggest to the minister that he put this upon something like a business basis. Instead of having these unfortunate deserted women having to go to all this trouble, I hope he puts in some reasonable period.

I was there referring to the suggestion made by the hon. member for South Quebec (Mr. Power):

> The whole thing is in the discretion of the commission,—

I then departed from his suggestion and went further. I said:

> —and I do not think it would do much harm if we struck out all the words:
>
> When the circumstances of the case are, in the opinion of the commission, such as would entitle her in a court of law to have her husband declared legally dead.

I proposed to strike all these words out. I said:

> Why not strike this all out if the idea is to help these people?

Then the minister asked:

> How would it read?

I said:

> It would read:
> That "widowed mother" may, in the discretion of the commission, include a mother deserted by her husband.

And I added:

> That is all, and that is the sense of the committee as I understand it.

There is a misprint there. I was not referring to the sense of the committee but to the sense of the House when the resolution of the hon. member for South Quebec (Mr. Power) was adopted. To the suggestion made the minister said:

> I have no objection.

Now, the proposed amendment is entirely out of consonance with what the minister accepted last night, and he might just as well leave the original provision in. Because it might very well take legal action to establish "absence for seven years" and there might be a complete lack of knowledge, as between the parties, of the whereabout of one another. Where is the widowed mother helped by this? I hope the minister will again change his mind. His change of mind yesterday was a change in the right direction. I simply point out to him that there is no fear of deception in the manner in which he indicates. There is no absolute right given here. If the minister has confidence in his commission his commission surely will see that it is only in cases of genuine desertion that the term "widowed mother" can be applied to the unfortunate woman who was deserted by her husband. The power is discretionary; there is no absolute right conferred by the act. The commission must be satisfied in the matter. This is no concession from the original proposal. The provision simply says the period must be seven years or over, instead of the five years which would otherwise be the case in Quebec. As far as the widowed mother in Quebec is concerned she is worse off than she was before. The question is very simple. Do we want to help these deserted mothers of returned soldiers? If we do, we can leave it to the commission to properly administer the section as accepted last night by the minister on my suggestion.

[Sir Henry Drayton.]

Mr. BELAND: I agree that last night I said I had no objection to my hon. friend's suggestion. But my hon. friend is a very able lawyer and as such may be disposed to review his own opinion on legal matters.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: Very often.

Mr. BELAND: I think that is the case with all lawyers. However, I think my hon. friend will realize immediately that it is possible for a man and his wife to come to an agreement by which the man will, say, move to the United States and live there for a time for the purpose of affording to his wife the opportunity of making application for a pension as a deserted wife. My hon. friend does not deny that; I am sure he does not. Well, if he admits that, does he say, then, that this woman is entitled to a pension? My hon. friend says the board has discretion. That is true, but how can the board know that this woman is not deserted in consequence of a secret agreement arrived at between the man and his wife that he will disappear, "from circulation" as we say in Quebec, and will go away to the United States? There is no possibility in such a case of the board being able to establish that there was complicity between that man and his wife. In some cases it may be possible to establish it, but in many cases—especially if the complicity has been carefully planned—it will be almost impossible for the board to arrive at the truth.

Mr. ARTHURS: What would happen under the amendment proposed by the minister in such a case as this. A man actually deserts his wife and goes away with another woman. What would the deserted mother of the soldier do in that case? Under the provisions proposed by the minister there would be no redress at all. Seven years would not help her because he could not be declared legally dead, being still in existence. In such a case the mother would be actually cut off from relief. And yet that is the class of cases we are most anxious to look after. I think my hon. friend from South Quebec (Mr. Power) will bear me out in that.

Mr. BELAND: This phase of the question has been examined in previous years; it has been examined by parliamentary committees and they have always come to the conclusion that in such a case a deserted wife would not be pensionable.

Mr. ARTHURS: Such cases are serious and there should be some means of dealing with them.

Mr. BELAND: Does my hon. friend realize that if a man knows that in the event of abandoning his wife and running away with another woman, she will be pensioned by the state, he may be induced to leave her sooner than he otherwise would?

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: I am not going to deny that the minister would have a right to change his mind. I think that in so doing he would be governmentally running true to form. The only thing I object to is that the last change is not the right one.

Mr. BELAND: Does the hon. member think the term is too long? If so, we will make it shorter.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: How is the woman to prove all these allegations? The minister speaks about the difficulty of proving the real situation in six months. What is going to happen, if these allegations are not proved? Surely, when you have a body of men who are accustomed to enquire into these things, and leave it entirely in their discretion, you will be safe. After all, it is a comparatively small thing. I should think, in so far as their discretion is concerned, that what would chiefly move them would be the absolute requirements of the unfortunate woman. If they find the mother of a soldier deserted, without funds, and without support, I should have thought that was a case in connection with which they would like to have a discretion, rather than to be placed upon the basis of strict rules of law. This whole pension scheme has nothing to do with strict rules of law. It is an endeavour to do the right thing, and to do it to the fullest extent. I submit again to my hon. friends that, if there is any real intention to help the woman, if this is not entirely a sham, the only fair thing to do is to leave it, as it was agreed last night, to the discretion of the commission.

Mr. GERMAN: I have sympathy with the suggestion made by the hon. member for West York (Sir Henry Drayton). It would be almost impossible to prove the death, in a case of this kind. In Ontario, legal death is only assumed where there has been an absence for seven years without the husband being heard of. That would work a great hardship on the deserted mother, for the reason that you have to advertise for the man who has deserted his wife. You require to have a lot of publicity, and take a lot of expensive proceedings, in order to prove a legal death, according to the statutes of the province of Ontario. If a woman has been deserted by her husband, I submit, Mr. Chairman, that the commission can easily find out whether that is a bona fide desertion, an intentional desertion, or simply a sham. All the commission will have to do will be to make reasonable inquiry in the neighbourhood where these people live. The neighbours and the friends would know better whether or not it was an intentional desertion, or a sham on the part of the husband and wife. If it was a real desertion, the woman deserted should receive the pension, as the commission could easily ascertain that fact. I submit it should be left wholly to their discretion as to what the length of the desertion should be, and to what extent they would have to make inquiries.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: Hear, hear.

Mr. BAXTER: I suggest to the hon. minister a little further consideration. I think we must all agree with what has been said by the hon. member from Quebec South (Mr. Power) with reference to the unsuitability of the language as originally proposed. I do not want to say anything that would sound in the least severe, but I should like to caution the hon. minister in regard to relying too much upon the suggestions which will be made to him in regard to this and other subjects from departmental officials. I do not wish to be classed among the body of men who ruthlessly criticize departmental officials—not at all. But a spirit of endeavouring to get some kind of rigid rules which will save a body trouble grows, and in dealing with this particular problem, the dependents of deceased soldiers, we do not want rigid rules to save somebody trouble, but we want the very broadest humanity. While the minister may be thinking of the possible cases of fraud—and we must all think of those—yet I would ask him not to leave some deserving woman starving for seven years until the rigid rule has been complied with, before he would be able to give her any help. I know that is not his personal heart, it is not his personal feeling, and I am satisfied it is not the feeling of this House or the country. Even if it

were necessary to deal with the class of women who were deserted before their sons went overseas, surely there can be no question of fraud in that case. People were not anticipating the war and making preparations for desertions. Surely that class of persons ought to be taken care of by this legislation.

4 p.m.

With reference to a woman who might otherwise be dependent upon a son, and who has been deserted by the husband since the death of the son, is it not enough for the commission to have absolute discretion? If they cannot find any evidence of a fraudulent agreement, surely the case is one in which, at least, the doubt ought to be resolved in favour of the suffering woman. Furthermore, it seems to me, if there is to be a test at all other than the discretion of the commission, we might fairly say that, where it is evident to the commission that the woman cannot obtain an effective redress through the employment of any legal means, the commission should have the discretion to act. The deserting husband may be in the same town with her; it may be utterly useless, because of the character of the man, to bring him before a court and have him punished for non-support of his wife; and yet that woman may be living on the charity of relatives or others, with the only one in the world who would have been true to her and would have supported her—her son—dead in the service of his country. Under these circumstances, I think we do not want to have too much technicality, nor would I ask that there should be a rule so rigid the other way that the commission would have to give a pension in either case. I only want to see adopted some form of words that will leave it open to the commission to give the help, and require them to give the help, unless it is apparent to them that a real fraud is practised or intended. Surely we can find some expression that will have that effect. I know the chairman, who has done so much valuable work in connection with this subject this year, has been struggling with that proposition, and I think it would be well for the committee to hear the conclusions at which he has arrived, which, I am sure, are not the same as those expressed in the first section of the bill.

Mr. CHURCH: The lawyers in the House know how difficult it is to confirm presumption of death in the case of desertion, and in my opinion it would be almost impossible for a widowed mother to establish her case under this section. She must prove that she has not only not seen, but not heard from or of, her husband for seven years. Suppose a woman lives, say, in Hamilton and has been deserted by her husband for a number of years. He turns up in some other part of the country, remote from the residence of his wife, and does not communicate with her, and has no intention of doing so. Technically, of course, the wife's case falls to the ground, although to all intents and purposes she is no better off than if she were widowed. She will receive no consideration under such circumstances, for technicalities like this are always fatal. Now, I do not think it is at all just that the burden of proof should rest on the widowed mother; it should be shifted to the state. The law is so finely drawn that as the section stands it would be practically impossible for any woman's claim to succeed. These women deserve all the help we can give them, because to-day they are a charge on the municipalities, and many of them have to go out and work every day of the week. It is not fair to put obstacles in the way of any relief they might be able to obtain.

Mr. MacLAREN: If it is the intention of the amendment, as I presume it is, to afford relief to deserted mothers, then I am afraid that as at present drafted it will not achieve that purpose, for the very obvious reason that a period of seven years must elapse before that relief can be obtained. Seven years is too long. In many cases the seven years would quite possibly exceed the duration of life of the deserted mother. I would suggest a shorter and more reasonable period. I quite understand that the matter is open to objections and that there are difficulties in the way. But if the desire is to give these women some relief, I trust that the minister will revise the amendment to provide for a shorter time than seven years.

Mr. CARROLL: I agree with the member for St. John (Mr. Baxter) that, if there must be an amendment such as is proposed by the minister, the period here provided is too long. The provision will give relief to a great many mothers who were deserted by their husbands two, three or four years ago. In the case of a woman whose husband has been away for two years she would have to wait five years before she could get any relief. I take it that the

intention is to give relief to those mothers also who may be deserted in the future. I think that a period of two years would be reasonable, with the provision, of course, always, that it shall be in the discretion of the Board of Pension Commissioners as to whether or not a mother is in the position of a widow.

Mr. CLARK: I do not think it was the intention of the parliamentary committee to lay down any definite term of years. Their object, I believe, was to make provision for mothers who were deserted; and I would cite the case suggested by the minister of a man going to the United States for six months. As I understand the matter, the Board of Pension Commissioners have in their department the necessary machinery to enable their representatives to investigate all these cases, and if there is any attempt on the part of a mother to frame up a case with her husband to defraud the board, the board can detect the fraud. The amendment refers to the discretion of the commission, and I think that the parliamentary committee had in mind leaving the matter open to the discretion of the board to deal as they saw fit with what they considered to be deserving cases. Possibly the word "desertion" may have been used in the report, and apparently it is being interpreted in its legal sense. No doubt that is how the misunderstanding has arisen. I suggest that the matter be left to the discretion of the Board of Pension Commissioners.

Mr. ARTHURS: I suggest that all the words after the word "her" in the eleventh line be struck out and that the words "to a pension" be substituted therefor. The section would then read:

(p) "widowed mother" may, in the discretion of the commission, include a mother deserted by her husband when the circumstances of the case are, in the opinion of the commission, such as would entitle her to a pension.

That would fully cover the ground. It would take care of widowed mothers deserted in the past, as well as those who are now, or may in future be deserted. That, I think, would carry out the evident intention of the parliamentary committee.

Mr. POWER: Just before the House met the Minister of Soldiers' Civil Reestablishment (Mr. Beland) mentioned this matter to me and asked if I would be prepared to accept a period of five years. I was willing to accept that, not that I thought that after five years a man is legally dead in the province of Quebec, because, with all due respect to the Minister of Justice, I think he will find on consulting the Civil Code that a man is never legally dead in that province, whatever may be the law in other provinces. A man is considered absent after five years and his property may be looked after; and after thirty years' absence on his part his property may be divided. If he returns, however, he comes into his property again. So, he cannot be dead. Under our laws relating to marriage the wife of a man who is absent cannot legally marry again. She may set up against an action for bigamy the fact that she has not heard from her husband for seven years; but she cannot legally marry. It was because I thought it desirable that some definite term should be fixed that I accepted the minister's proposal. I quite realize that the minister might encounter cases in which fraud had been attempted, but I am not so much afraid of fraud as he is. I know that when the Board of Pension Commissioners exercise their discretion they do not do so very often in favour or on behalf of pensioners. It is quite likely that the claims of pensioners will be very closely scrutinized, and there is therefore very little fear of the government being defrauded.

There is another point, however, which has occurred to me since I entered the House. The House on May 1st unanimously passed the following resolution:

That, in the opinion of this House, it is expedient that the Board of Pension Commissioners be given discretionary power to award pensions to mothers of deceased soldiers in cases where such mothers have been deserted by or become separated from their husbands, such pensions to be paid at the same rate as those awarded to widowed mothers.

It will be noticed that in this resolution there is no time limitation. In connection with that, let me remind the House of the new theory of constitutional law which was enunciated last night by my hon. friends the leader of the Progressive party (Mr. Crerar) and the Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Motherwell), that once the House passes a resolution it is the duty of the Government to promptly bring down a bill in pursuance thereof, whether the ministry agrees with it or not. Under this new theory—in which, by the way, I have not much confidence—the Government should promptly accept the amendment of my hon. friend from West York (Sir Henry Drayton).

Mr. BELAND: Several suggestions have been made to the committee regarding the proper amendment of this clause. Most hon. gentlemen are of the opinion that a term of seven years would be too long, and my hon. friend from Cape Breton South (Mr. Carroll) suggests that we make it two years. On the other hand, my hon. friend from Parry Sound (Mr. Arthurs) makes a suggestion which, on the whole, appeals to me more than any other that has been made so far. It would be incorporated in the clause as follows:

"Widowed mother" may in the discretion of the commission include a mother deserted by her husband when the circumstances of the case are in the opinion of the commission such as would entitle her to a pension.

That, of course, leaves it entirely to the discretion of the Board of Pensioners to decide whether such deserted wife would be pensionable or not. True, there is no limit of time set, but if there is any collusion between the husband and wife, she would naturally not be entitled to a pension and it would be so determined by the board. If that is agreeable to the committee I am willing to accept it.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: We certainly accept it, Mr. Chairman. It is exactly what we said last night we would do.

Mr. MacLAREN: If a deserted mother has sufficient private means of her own would this section apply to her?

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: It is discretionary.

Mr. BELAND: A deserted wife is on the same footing as a widowed mother when it comes to deciding whether she has sufficient means or not.

Mr. MARCIL: We grant a large number of divorces every year, and the number is steadily increasing. At the last meeting of the Private Bills Committee, of which I am a member, a record was established, twenty-three divorce bills having been dealt with in twenty-five minutes. I have been wondering what becomes of the divorced mother and her children under this new legislation. Is she deserted, in the eyes of the minister?

Mr. BELAND: She is not considered as a deserted wife.

Mr. MARCIL: If she obtains a legal divorce from her husband and is given the custody of the children, she is certainly a deserted mother.

[Mr. Power.]

Mr. POWER: I would direct the attention of my hon. friend from Bonaventure (Mr. Marcil) to Article 4 of Section 33 of the act of 1919, which reads:

A woman who has been divorced or legally separated from a member of the force who has died shall not be entitled to a pension unless she was awarded alimony or an alimentary allowance, in which case she shall be entitled if she is in a dependent condition to the equivalent of the widow's pension or to the equivalent of the alimony or alimentary allowance which was awarded her, whichever is the smaller in amount.

So, she is looked after.

Amendment agreed to.

Section as amended agreed to.

Mr. LADNER: I observe the bill does not contain any amendment in compliance with the report of the committee and the resolution discussed last night which contains a provision that:

—any disability from which a member of the forces who served in an actual theatre in the Great War was suffering at the time of his discharge, shall for pension purposes be deemed to be attributable to or to have been incurred or aggravated during his military service, unless and until it be established by the commission that the disability was not attributable to or incurred or aggravated during such service.

The idea was to make an amendment to Section 11, but I observe it has not been incorporated in that section. It is my intention, Mr. Chairman, to move that the amendment be added to Section 25, subsection 3, of the main act.

Mr. MARLER: This does apply directly to section 25, subsection 3. It is placed in this part of the act by the advice of the Department of Justice.

Mr. LADNER: But it is not in the bill. It should be there.

Mr. MARLER: Certainly, my hon. friend is quite correct, the amendment should be in the bill.

Mr. LADNER: When we deal with section 25 perhaps that amendment can be inserted.

The CHAIRMAN: Yes.

Mr. LADNER: I desire also to make an amendment to section 11 of the main act. It is not in the amendments here, but I understood that a resolution was passed last night that Section 11 would be under consideration to-day. Naturally, it would be if there had not been this omission. I propose the following amendment:

The CHAIRMAN: Is that a new paragraph?

Mr. LADNER: Yes.

The CHAIRMAN: Then the hon. member's amendment will be in order after all the other paragraphs of the bill have been dealt with.

Mr. LADNER: Then with respect to section 25—the matter we discussed just now —would it be in order to move an amendment, or will that more apropriately come when the rest of the clauses are adopted?

The CHAIRMAN: If it involves the proposed insertion of a new section it should be offered after all the other sections of the bill as it stands have been adopted.

Mr. LADNER: I will propose these two amendments later.

Section agreed to.

On section 2—application for pension within three years after peace declared.

Mr. McQUARRIE: Will the minister explain this clause? Does it cover the case I discussed with him—that of Mrs. Burton? That was a case in which an application was not put in within three years after the death of her husband.

Mr. CLARK: I moved this amendment in the committee for the very purpose of covering the cases of dependents who, through unfamiliarity with the law, or for some other good cause, overlooked the fact that they were entitled to pension. For instance, it might apply to a sister who had been supported by a deceased soldier but who only recently ascertained that the act entitled her to a pension. If it covers cases like that, I should think it would cover the case mentioned by my hon. friend (Mr. McQuarrie).

Mr. McQUARRIE: That is what I wanted to know. This amendment provides that application be made within three years of the date of the declaration of peace. What was that date?

Mr. BELAND: I think the amendment is sufficient to cover the case my hon. friend refers to. Mrs. Burton, the widow of a soldier, did not make application until after three years after the death of her husband. Section 13 of the act reads as follows:

> A pension shall not be awarded unless an application therefor has been made within three years,—
>
> (a) after the date of the death in respect of which pension is claimed;

That would be the case of Mrs. Burton, but let us go further:

> (b) after the date upon which the applicant has fallen into a dependent condition;
>
> (c) after the date upon which the applicant was retired or discharged from the forces; or,
>
> (d) after the declaration of peace.

It would seem that the Board of Pension Commissioners would here have to exercise their discretion. It was on the 31st of August, 1921, that peace was declared. But apparently the board kept close to subsection (a), which provides that the application must be received within three years after the death in respect of which the pension is claimed. In order to meet such cases it was recommended in the report of the committee that his amendment be made.

Mr. POWER: The marginal note of section 2 reads:

> Application for pension within three years after peace declared.

In the original act the marginal note is: "Time within which application must be made." It seems to me that if this marginal note as appearing in the bill were struck out, there would be no difficulty. The time is not limited only to three years after the death in respect of which pension is claimed. A man may die ten years from now of disability contracted on service, and his widow will be entitled to pension.

Mr. MARTELL: I have in mind the case of a soldier who was the only support of his mother and who was killed a couple of years before the war ended. She made application for pension, but her application was turned down under that provision of the act which says that the application must be made within three years after the death of the soldier. It so happened that she had saved some money and for some time after her son's death her son-in-law helped to support her. Unfortunately, her daughter died; her son-in-law no longer thought it necessary to support his mother-in-law, and she was left without any means of subsistence. I believe, however, that this condition is now remedied, by the amendment to the act.

Mr. CALDWELL: What is the effect of adding this new provision to paragraph (d) of section 13?

Mr. McQUARRIE: Could we have the other matter cleared up first?

Mr. BELAND: Under the proposed amendment to section 13, the case of Mrs. Burton and other cases of a like nature, would be covered, at least until the first day of September, 1924.

Mr. CALDWELL: And if at any later date the husband, being a returned soldier, died from the effects of service, the widow could claim pension at any time within three years of his death.

Mr. BELAND: Yes, that provision always applies.

Mr. CALDWELL: I did not get a reply to my question as to the effect of this addition to paragraph (d).

Mr. MARLER: The provision that the person applying for pension should be resident in Canada applied only to those coming under the original paragraph (d). That is to say, the person must have been resident in Canada before applying for a pension. The clause reads:

> Provided that the provision of subsection (d) shall not apply to an applicant claiming dependent's pension who was not resident in Canada at the date of the soldier's death and has not continuously resided therein.

The intention of the committee was to restrict the pension to those who had resided here continuously during that period.

Mr. CALDWELL: I do not remember the discussion in the committee. But take the case of the soldier on leave in England from France who marries a wife in England, goes back to France, and is killed. That wife would not be in Canada at the time of the husband's death, and would not be entitled to apply for pension under clause (d).

Mr. MARLER: Not after that period, it is quite true. We have extended the period to August 31, 1924.

Mr. CALDWELL: Or if the wife was in Canada at the time of her husband's death, and she moved to the United States, she could not apply for pension?

Mr. MARLER: Quite true.

Mr. CALDWELL: I do not think we should exclude those cases, especially the wife who married the soldier in England who was afterwards killed in France. One hon. member tells me of an application for a pension that was not made until three years after the husband's death. We should not shut out anybody who should have a pension, and I can see where hardship might result if we passed this section the way it is. It would shut out the woman who was in England at the time of her husband's death, and who possibly did not come to Canada for some little time afterwards, and who would not know the provisions of our act as well as the woman who resided in Canada right along, but I think she would be just as much entitled to a pension.

Mr. MARLER: We can come back to the section afterwards.

Section agreed to.

On section 5—allowance for total and helpless disability:

Mr. POWER: Section 27 of the Pensions Act of 1919 provides that:

> A member of the forces who is totally disabled and helpless shall be entitled to an addition to his pension.

The effect of the amendment now proposed, which is to insert the words "helpless in respect of his pensionable disability," would be that a pension would be refused to a man who has a pensionable disability, if in addition he has some other disability which he has perhaps not acquired directly through service. It is the intention of the board in these cases to take away the "helpless" allowance. I submit that when a man is fairly badly wounded, other disabilities are bound to develop which may or may not make him totally disabled and helpless, and I submit that in cases of this kind, where the beginning of the disability was caused by action overseas, the man is entitled to the "helpless" allowance if he afterwards becomes helpless, but the amendment would prevent that. It means that we would have every doctor on the Board of Pension Commissioners looking to see whether, for instance, in the case of a man who had lost both legs, he lost only one leg and a quarter overseas and the remaining three-quarters after he came back, and similarly with other cases. The act as it was before was perfectly clear. It ordered the Pension Commission to give to a member of the forces totally disabled and helpless, a "helpless" allowance, and I do not think it should be changed.

Mr. BELAND: I have no objection, if the committee is willing, to striking out this clause.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: What was the idea of the amendment? Was it to limit the claims as suggested by the hon. member for Quebec South (Mr. Power)? If so, I certainly think the clause should be struck out.

Mr. MARLER: The amendment is to make clear the intention of the act. It provides that the "helpless" allowance shall be paid only in cases where the helpless condition is directly attributable to war service. As a matter of fact that is the practice in vogue by the board at the present time, and inserting this amendment will in no way change that practice. But if the members of the committee have any fear in their minds that the practice will be changed, I am quite agreeable, so far as I am concerned, to striking out the proposed amendment. But it will not change the practice.

Mr. POWER: Then why put it in?

Mr. MARLER: The Pension Act in certain cases can be made more self-explanatory.

Mr. BELAND: I move that section 5 be struck out.

Motion agreed to.

On section 6—pension to widow:

Mr. POWER: This means that from now on the widow of a soldier who married after the concurrence of the disability, that is to say, after the soldier's discharge from the army, will obtain a pension. This question has come up before almost every pensions committee. To make myself more clear, let me give a specific example. We have refused to give a pension to the woman who marries a man afflicted with tuberculosis. We feel that the woman who marries a man, knowing that he is suffering from a disability which will sooner or later cause his death, is not entitled to a pension. We have taken that stand because we thought there must be some finality in pensions. We did not wish to have in Canada the state of things which has occurred in the United States, where the pensions to-day, I am told, are higher than they were ten years after the Civil War. We are granting a pension now to the woman who marries within one year of the soldier's discharge. But who knows that at the next election—because all of us are politicians and want to get votes—we shall not be asked to extend this to five years? That is what happened in the United States. Who knows that we may not have a young girl marrying a doddering old soldier of eighty and drawing a pension? We are opening the door to that from the moment we grant these amendments. I will take the time of the committee to read the reports of previous committees. The report of the 1919 committee was based on the principles of administration which had been enunciated by the executive committee of the Canadian Patriotic Fund with respect to the administration thereof. The details of these principles are enumerated and, amongst others, this appears:

> No ex-soldier's wife shall have any claim unless marriage occurred prior to the ex-soldier's discharge.

In the 1920 committee the same question was brought up and fully discussed. Here was the suggestion:

> That the dependents of a pensioner who contracted marriage subsequent to the appearance of disability or to discharge from the Forces be not discriminated against in the benefits of the Pension Act.
>
> Note.—As the law now stands, a woman who marries a soldier after he is disabled is not entitled to a pension on the death of her husband. Should, however, her husband's death be due to service, his children may be awarded a pension. The above suggestion has been before former committees; it received the earnest and repeated consideration of your committee Under the proposed plan for the insurance of returned soldiers, dealt with later in this report, a disabled man will hereafter be in a position to protect his wife by taking out a policy on his own life. This insurance will be available at a low cost to all returned soldiers no matter how seriously they may be disabled. In view of this new provision, and for other reasons, your committee was unable to reach a decision in favour of the proposal.

Now let me take the report of the committee of 1921, in which this suggestion was dealt with:

> That pension be awarded to a widow married after the appearance of the disability if the marriage takes place six months before death.
>
> This suggestion received the very earnest consideration of your committee and the administration of the law in this respect by the Pension Board was thoroughly inquired into. As the law now stands, a woman who marries a soldier after the appearance of the injury or disease which resulted in his death, is not entitled to pension but the children may be awarded pension at orphan rates. This suggestion has been before former committees which did not recommend any material alteration. Under the Returned Soldiers' Insurance Act a disabled man can protect his wife by taking out insurance on his own life. Your committee was unable to reach a decision in favour of the suggestion.

Mr. CALDWELL: Does my hon. friend say that in 1921 the suggestion was made

that if the soldier was married six months previous to his death his widow would get a pension?

Mr. POWER: I have just read from the "Appendix to the Journals of the House of Commons of Canada, 1921. Report of Special Committee on Pensions, Insurance and Re-establishment". Of this committee the hon. gentleman was a member.

Mr. CALDWELL: May I be permitted to make a statement. I want to say there is either a misprint or some other error in the record, because I moved that resolution myself last year. I first moved that the widow be granted a pension if the marriage took place within five years of the soldier's discharge. That was defeated by a majority of only one. Then I moved that the pension be granted if the marriage took place within two years after discharge. Nothing was said about death at all but simply that the soldier should receive the pension. I want to say also that my hon. friend from South Quebec (Mr. Power) supported that resolution both last year and the year before.

Mr. POWER: Never.

Mr. CALDWELL: Then I am mistaken; I thought my hon. friend had done so. My proposition was defeated in the one case by a majority of one and in the other case by a majority of two. This year the committee have seen fit to recommend that a pension be granted under these conditions, and I think it is no more than justice that it should do so. On previous occasions I cited the cases of young men who enlisted, possibly in some Canadian town, and married. I know two cases of the kind where young men happened to meet girls in the town where they enlisted and married them although it would have been far better if they had not done so. These women were granted their separation allowance while the husband was overseas and got a pension if he came back wounded and died of the wound. On the other hand the young man who was engaged to be married and went overseas but returned with a disability and married when he came back—that man's wife gets no pension; she is not recognized as the man's wife, for the purposes of the pension, either by the Pension Board or by the government of this country. I think a great injustice has been done in this respect and I think the House should pass the recommendation brought forward. I would like to point out to the minister in charge of this bill that there is a little discrepancy in the wording. Section 6 of the bill reads:

> Subsection one of section thirty-three of the said act, as amended by chapter sixty-two of the Statutes of 1920, is further amended by inserting after the words "married to him" in the second line thereof the words "within one year after date of discharge from the forces or".

And the act goes on to say "before the appearance of the disability which resulted in his death." This would be contradictory.

Mr. ARTHURS: The word "and" should be substituted for the word "or".

Mr. CALDWELL: The "or" should be omitted and the clause should be worded—"and after the appearance of the disability which resulted in his death."

Mr. ARTHURS: The argument advanced by my hon. friend for Quebec South is a very contradictory one. He has said that because the recommendations of previous committees along these lines were rejected, consequently this recommendation should be rejected by the House.

Mr. POWER: I did not say that. I was simply pointing out that the recommendation had already been considered by previous committees and I was giving their reasons for rejecting it.

Mr. ARTHURS: I might return the compliment to my hon. friend from Quebec South by saying that he has assented to many of these changes which were also reviewed and rejected by previous committees. Although the committees did not see fit to recommend them at the time they have since been accepted by the House. My hon. friend's argument therefore, would not apply. My hon. friend from Victoria and Carleton (Mr. Caldwell) has already given instances of unsatisfactory operation of this act in regard to certain classes of widows. I might point out another class whose claims, I think, are indisputable. We had many thousands of wounded men in England who were there discharged from hospitals as convalescents. They married young women over there, in some cases Canadian girls who had gone to England to see them. They married in England believing themselves to be convalescent. On the other hand many men returned to Canada wounded and married girls in this country, knowing absolutely nothing of this provision of the act in section thirty-three. They married under the supposition that if anything did happen to them on account of

their wounds received in war their widows would be given a pension from the government. This is the class of widows for whom this act is intended to provide and I have no hesitation in supporting the amendment as proposed.

Mr. CLARK: Under the section as it stood a woman who was living with a man would be entitled to a pension, but if she refrained from living with him and married him after the war she would not be entitled to it.

Mr. BELAND: That is under the act as it stands without the amendments contemplated by the bill?

Mr. CLARK: Yes. It does seem to me that the woman who waited until after the termination of the war and then married, should be given a little more consideration than the woman who happened to be living with a man before the war.

Mr. CALDWELL: Sub-section 3 of section 33 of the Pension Act of 1919 reads:

> A woman who, although not married to the member of the forces, was living with him in Canada at the time he became a member of the forces and for a reasonable time previously thereto, and who, at such time, was publicly represented by him as his wife may, in the case of his death and in the discretion of the commission, be awarded a pension—

And so forth. Then it provides for another class, the woman who was not recognized as the wife in public, not married to him, but living in open prostitution. She is granted a pension. Yet, in the case of the conscientious couple, who do not marry until after the soldier comes back from the war, the widow is denied a pension. I submit, there is a great injustice done in this case, and I think the House would be well advised to accept the recommendation of the committee. My hon. friend from Quebec South has always been solicitous on behalf of the pensioner, in fact, one of the most anxious men in the House in that respect.

Mr. POWER: But you have to think of the country, too.

Mr. CALDWELL: There is a small class of these women.

Mr. POWER: The class will grow.

Mr. CALDWELL: No, it cannot.

Mr. POWER: Why not?

Mr. CALDWELL: Because the time has expired during which they can apply. I am strongly opposed to leaving this wide open, as it is in the United States, but, I think, there should be provision for those bona fide married within one year?

Mr. CLARK: The hon. member for Victoria and Carleton (Mr. Caldwell) has expressed what I intended to say, perhaps in clearer language than I could have done, but the class of case which this is intended to cover includes, in fact, all returned soldiers, you might say, and they were absolutely ignorant of what were going to be the regulations up to about the beginning of 1920. This only covers those who were married prior to about the commencement of 1920; so that two years have already elapsed since application could be made. We must bear in mind that, up to that time, there has been no opportunity for returned soldiers to familiarize themselves with the law. At that time the law was fairly clear, and by that time they had had a fair opportunity to familiarize themselves with the effect of the law.

Mr. POWER: I wish to answer two statements which have been made. First, the hon. member for Victoria and Carleton states, with some justice, that I have always endeavoured to look after the soldiers. That is true, but we must look after the country. I quite agree that the hon. member for Victoria and Carleton and the hon. member from Burrard (Mr. Clark) are absolutely sincere when they state that we will stop at one year, but, surely, they have been in politics long enough to know that, at the next election, we will be asked to extend this time to another five years, and, before long, we will have exactly the same situation as has arisen in the United States. That is the reason I object to this clause being inserted in this act. I do not wish the door to be open to people who, after all, do not deserve the pension. It is all very well to say that a young girl was engaged to a soldier who came back disabled, and that she should be entitled to marry, but I do not see why the country should pay a pension to this young girl for the next twenty, thirty, forty or fifty years. There is always a certain amount of justice in paying for the widow, or giving a pension to the girl who was married to the soldier before he went overseas, but I cannot, for the life of me, see why we should pay the pension to the girl who married the soldier when he came back disabled. I cannot understand what claim she has on the country, or what possible claim she

ever will have. I admit there are some hard cases. It may be a little hard for the engagement to be broken off, or for the girl to get married and find that she is not entitled to a pension and will not get it. The comparison between the unmarried woman and the engaged girl is, perhaps, a good one, but there are other anomalies in the act, too. You give a prostitute a pension, but you will not give the widowed mother a pension. The committee in this House, in spite of the order of this House, has for years refused to give the widowed mother a pension. Is she not more entitled than the girl who is engaged?

5 p.m.

Mr. CALDWELL: Is the widowed mother not getting a pension now?

Mr. POWER: Not getting half enough.

Mr. CALDWELL: But she is getting a pension?

Mr. POWER: Yes, but not getting as much as the engaged girl is receiving.

Mr. ROSS (Kingston): I am somewhat in sympathy with the hon. member for Quebec South. I took this point in committee, and my strong argument was that, so long as we refuse increased pensions to those who are suffering at the present time, and so long as we refuse the required assistance to tubercular cases now on our hands, and to blind cases, we should not go round looking for other people to whom we could give pensions. If this country is rich enough to give the blind all they require, and to give tubercular cases all they require—

Mr. CALDWELL: Does the hon. member claim that he advocated increases to any of these classes?

Mr. ROSS (Kingston): Yes, I took that stand the other night in regard to tubercular cases. I think I took the stand more than once that, if this country were rich, and if we had satisfied those who are wounded or had suffered from the war to the full extent that they required, then I would go further. This amendment also opens up certain cases, which, I think, we should proceed very slowly with; that is advanced tubercular cases, advanced mental cases, and so on. If a person had married, and the soldier had a wound which developed into a very bad case afterwards, that might be dealt with, but I do not like the wide-open door, as demonstrated in the amendment.

[Mr. Power.]

Mr. CALDWELL: I understood the hon. member from Kingston (Mr. Ross) to say he advocated increase of pensions all along the line.

Mr. ROSS: No.

Mr. CALDWELL: He was one of the men who opposed the concession to the widowed mother that I pressed for in committee most strenuously. He was one of the strongest opponents of any man in the committee to that proposition.

Mr. ROSS: My contention was that the man who had suffered should be pensioned.

Mr. McQUARRIE: The hon. member for Quebec South made some remark with reference to the pension for widowed mothers. A resolution was passed in this House, on the motion proposed by the hon. member not very long ago, which, I understood, called for a pension to be given to widowed mothers, irrespective of whether they had other children who might be able to support them.

The CHAIRMAN: The question is on clause 6. We have passed the clause 1 regarding the widowed mother.

Mr. McQUARRIE: Is an amendment to be brought in by the minister, carrying out the resolution introduced in the House on the motion of the hon. member for Quebec South? Has this committee entirely disregarded that motion?

Mr. MARLER: This subject was fully considered and discussed in committee. The committee investigated the resolution which was passed in the House on 3rd May last, and we also examined the law on the subject; and I dealt with this particular section of the act in my address to the House. The committee appointed by this House in March last recommended that that section of the law relating to the matter be not changed.

Mr. ARTHURS: The word "or" there should be "and."

Mr. MARLER: The provision as amended by this section is that no pension shall be paid to the widow of a member of the forces unless she was married to him within one year after date of discharge from the forces, or before the appearance of disability which resulted in his death. I think the amendment should stand. The word "or" is obviously the right word to express the intention.

Mr. BELAND: I think the section is perfectly plain; I do not see how there can be any misunderstanding.

Mr. MARLER: There are two things to be considered, the date of discharge and the appearance of disability, either of which is a deciding factor. The section is quite in order.

Section agreed to on division: Yeas, 49; nays, 10.

On section 8—Bonus payments continued.

The CHAIRMAN: Shall section 8 carry?

Mr. POWER: No, Mr. Chairman; I was about to discuss section 7 when you declared it carried. I object to the section as it stands and I want to discuss it. I move that we return to that section.

The CHAIRMAN: Is it the unanimous wish of the committee to return to section 7?

Some hon. MEMBERS: Yes.

Motion agreed to.

On section 7—Power to cancel pension of prostitute.

Mr. POWER: This section amends section 40 of the act, which provides that the pension of a female pensioner who is found to be a common prostitute, or who openly lives with any man in the relationship of man and wife without being married, shall be suspended. This section now adds the words "or who is immoral." Why add those words at all? There is such a wide difference, for instance, between my interpretation of what is immoral and the interpretation of some of my hon. friends opposite. One of my friends opposite might possibly think it immoral to bet at the race track; I do not think so. Some hon. gentlemen may think it immoral to smoke cigarettes; I do not think so. And when new commissioners are appointed it is not improbable that we may find them depriving some woman of her pension because she happens to smoke cigarettes. I think we had better leave the act as it is. It is enough to provide that she shall receive no pension if she is a prostitute or is living openly with a man in an unmarried state. I object to making the section so broad.

Mr. BUREAU: You would have to define "immoral."

Mr. POWER: Exactly.

Mr. CALDWELL: I think that these words are superfluous. It is sufficient to provide that no prostitute or unmarried woman living with a man shall be given the pension.

Mr. BELAND: My hon. friend from Quebec South (Mr. Power), my hon. friend from Victoria and Carleton (Mr. Caldwell), and I, are not, I fancy, quite qualified to discuss questions of morals. May I suggest that the chairman of the parliamentary committee undertake the task?

Mr. BUREAU: Hear, hear; that is one on the chairman.

Mr. MARLER: The amendment is approved by the Board of Pension Commissioners. The object is to empower the commission to suspend the pension of any woman who, while not coming within the legal definition of a prostitute, has, by her immoral conduct or misbehaviour, rendered herself ineligible, according to the intention of the act, and proved unworthy of further consideration.

Mr. CALDWELL: Would the hon. member give us a definition of the various acts that might be considered immoral?

Mr. MARLER: I am afraid I am no better able to do that than my hon. friend.

Mr. HANSON: This amendment raises some fine questions of ethics. I am inclined to support the view of the hon. member for Quebec South; I suggest that these words be deleted. If they were incorporated in the act I am afraid some hardships would ensue. We have Puritans in this country who would even argue that smoking tobacco is immoral; and I have read speeches of the hon. member for Marquette (Mr. Crerar) which would seem to indicate that the policy of protection is immoral. And with that I wholly disagree. I do not see the necessity for the amendment, even after the explanation of the chairman of the Parliamentary Committee. I will vote against it.

Mr. VIEN: The words "or who is immoral" ought certainly to be removed. Why should a woman be declared to be immoral by the officers of the board simply because she takes a glass of beer when beer is illegal? This is an encroachment on the freedom which everyone should be allowed to exercise to the limit. If this section were enacted as it stands, with these objectionable words in it, some woman might be deprived of her pension because she did

something which some cranks believed should be prohibited. These words should be struck out, and I am quite sure the committee will support that view. If I were a constituent of my hon. friend from Quebec South I would congratulate him on his motion. If he will move that the word, "immoral", be deleted from the statute, I shall be pleased to second his motion.

Mr. BELAND: I do not see any definition of the word "immoral" in the interpretation clause, so under the circumstances I do not think any harm will be done by withdrawing the section.

Section withdrawn.

Mr. LADNER: The amendment which I am suggesting should come after section 25, subsection 3, of the main act. The amendment is substantially in the words recommended by the committee. It reads:

Provided further that any disability from which a member of the forces who served in an actual theatre of the Great War was suffering at or prior to the time of his discharge shall for pension purposes be deemed to be attributable to or to have been incurred or aggravated during his military service, unless and until it be established by the commission that the disability was not attributable to or incurred or aggravated during such service.

I have inserted the words "or prior to". I think the minister will have no objection to this alteration.

Mr. BELAND: What is the object of my hon. friend in moving the amendment?

Mr. LADNER: I understood that last night when the House discussed and passed the resolutions on the Pension Act it was the intention that this very section should be embodied in the bill.

Mr. MARLER: The amendment which my hon. friend moves is more or less in the same terms as those recommended by the parliamentary committee. We discussed Section 25, subsection 3, at very great length, and a sub-committee was appointed to draft a suitable amendment, which was afterwards submitted to the Justice Department, and the officers of that department then drafted the amendment in the following form; to apply after section 11:

Any disability from which a member of the forces who served in an actual theatre of the Great War was suffering at the time of his discharge shall for pension purposes be deemed to be attributable to or to have been incurred or aggravated during his military service unless and until it be established by the commission that the disability was not attributable to or incurred or aggravated during such service.

[Mr. Vien.]

This statement is submitted after days of argument and careful consideration of a great deal of the evidence given before the parliamentary comittee. I cannot impress too strongly upon hon. members that it is very dangerous to insert in the act any new section without the most mature consideration and the best legal advice. If the committee think that any amendment should be accepted without such consideration and advice they are taking a very grave responsibility which I for one would not dare assume.

Mr. CALDWELL: Do I understand that the chairman of the Pension Committee is moving the amendment which was drafted by the law officers of the Crown?

Mr. MARLER: The minister will move the amendment.

Mr. CALDWELL: That amendment, I think, should be accepted instead of the amendment proposed by the hon. member for Vancouver South; it covers the same ground.

Mr. LADNER: I wished to add just three words, "or prior to", but I think legally the construction works out about the same in the absence of those words. I withdraw the amendment.

Amendment withdrawn.

Mr. BELAND: Then, Mr. Chairman, I beg to move that section 11 of the act be amended by adding thereto the following:

Any disability from which a member of the forces who served in an actual theatre of the Great War was suffering at the time of his discharge shall for pension purposes be deemed to be attributable to or to have been incurred or aggravated during the term of his military service, unless and until it be established by the commission that the disability was not attributable to or incurred or aggravated during such service.

That is the amendment proposed by the parliamentary committee in its report.

Mr. LADNER: I would suggest that that amendment should come after section 25; that is a more appropriate place than section 11.

Mr. MARLER: I am sorry to disagree with my hon. friend, but as the Justice Department thought it right and proper that the amendment should be inserted after section 11, I do not think it would be wise to adopt his suggestion, because I for one do not know what effect those particular words would have if placed after section 25.

Mr. ARTHURS: I can easily understand the attitude taken by my hon. friend (Mr. Ladner). The bill as brought down is not strictly in accordance with the resolution as adopted yesterday. That, I understand, was an inadvertent omission. There was a long debate in the committee on the subject, and as I recall it, the ideas expressed by my hon. friend were concurred in by the committee. So that the difference is apparently only one of degree; there was practical unanimity with regard to it. It is simply a matter now of whether the original submission of the committe shall be accepted, or the proposal of the hon. member for Vancouver South.

Mr. LADNER: Do I understand that the question of where this provision should be in the act was referred to the Justice Department, and that they expressed the opinion that it should come in section 11?

Mr. MARLER: I give my hon. friend that assurance.

Amendment (Mr. Beland) agreed to.

Mr. LADNER: I have an amendment to offer to section 11 which, in the circumstances, will come just before this proviso. The amendment is that section 11 be repealed and the following substituted therefor:

The commission shall award pensions to or in respect of members of the forces who have suffered disability, in accordance with the rates set out in schedule A of this act, and in respect of members of the forces who have died, in accordance with the rates set out in schedule B of this act, when the disability or death in respect of which the application for pension is made was attributable to or was incurred or aggravated during military service.

Provided further that when a member of the forces has suffered disability or death originating in military service undertaken after the declaration of peace, no pension shall be paid unless such disability or death was attributable to military service as such.

I may say that the wording of the last part of this amendment is taken from previous sections of the act, and undoubtedly it has been passed upon by the Justice Department. The reason for this proposal is that prior to the amendments of 1920 and 1921 of this particular section, the insurance principle was introduced and maintained in respect of members of the Canadian Expeditionary Forces. Subsequently section 11 was amended in the manner indicated, with the intention of discriminating between those who served in the Great War and those continued in military service provisionally. The actual effect, however, of the amendments as now interpreted by the Pension Board is to deprive former members of the forces and their dependents who now present their claim for pension of the rights formerly established on their behalf by Parliament. If a disability terminated fatally prior to September, 1920, the dependents became pensionable whether or not the disability was directly attributable to military service as such. The dependents of former members of the forces whose disability terminated fatally subsequent to September, 1920, are not pensionable unless it can be shown that the disability or death was directly attributable to military service as such. I submit that that is a discrimination which was not intended and should not prevail. Those who served in the Great War and were demobilized at the conclusion of hostilities should be treated on the same basis, provided that their disability or death may be definitely related to the period of service dealt with in the original Pension Act. In other words, Mr. Chairman, this amendment arises to some extent out of alleged interpretations made, or practices carried out, by the Board of Pension Commissioners. In a memorandum issued by them on September 29 there is a suggestion that section 25 (3) of the Pension Act does not apply to any case unless entitlement exists under section 11 of the act. However sound the legal opinion behind that interpretation may be, its effect is that the provision of section 25 (3), which states that no deduction shall be made from pension under certain conditions, does not commence to operate until the man becomes pensionable under section 11. So it may happen that a man who sustained disability during service and subsequently suffered an aggravation of that disability may have that part of his pension relating to the aggravated disability lowered until it equals his pre-enlistment disability. Under these circumstances, the Pension Board has the power, and does in fact carry out the principle, of cutting off the pension entirely, particularly in those cases which have been dealt with since September, 1920. Now, the original idea of the Pension Act as was disclosed in the debates at the time it was under consideration by Parliament, was that there should apply fundamentally the principle of insurance, and that is why you find in the act of 1919 the words "or was incurred or aggravated during service." But when the war was over and the services of the

Canadian Expeditionary Force were at an end, it was necessary to make provision for those in the permanent forces, and in doing so the principle of insurance was taken away. So that in 1920 the words "or was incurred or aggravated during" were taken out of section 11, and there were added in 1921, after the words "military service," the two words "as such."

In the working out of that legislation it is found that certain injustices arise. In the case of certain diseases it is impossible for medical opinion to determine the true line of demarcation between pre-enlistment disability and aggravation. The result is a great deal of dissatisfaction. These amendments have so narrowed down the underlying principles of the act, and it has been administered in such a way by the board, that there is a considerable amount of dissatisfaction in all parts of the country. Some of the criticism levelled at the board is, in my opinion, perhaps too strong and should rather be levelled against the act under which they operate. When the permanent force was organized it was seen that men might very easily at times meet with an accident on the street, a bicycle or street car accident, for instance, and as the act was originally framed a man would be entitled to a pension for injury obtained in that way; but that was not the intention. The object of the amendment I have proposed is to make the first portion of section 11 conform with the original intention of 1919, so that there will be a broad avenue of approach under the law to the Pension Board, and so that the members of the Canadian Expeditionary Force will all have an equal right in that respect. The idea of the proviso which I have added is to take care of the permanent force, because you will notice, Mr. Chairman, that the words are put in there "undertaking service after the declaration of peace". In this way the applications for pensions are divided into two classes, those from the Canadian Expeditionary Force, and those from the permanent force. I admit that that is an important step, but the amendment in my opinion would have the effect of doing away with a great deal of the dissatisfaction throughout the country. A claimant approaches the board in many instances without expert assistance to present his case, or perhaps with that assistance, and he finds himself confronted with insurmountable legal technicalities. The board have to make their own decisions; there is no superior court to which they can go. The result has been in the actual working out of this act that in many cases where pensions should have been awarded they have not been granted. I have personal knowledge of such cases. Under the amendment I propose, the board will have a freer hand, and the members of the Canadian Expeditionary Force, as distinct from the permanent force, will have a better opportunity of presenting their just claims, and without fundamentally altering the principles laid down in the act.

[Mr. Ladner.]

Mr. MARLER: This question was very fully discussed in the committee, and the result was the amendment which has been moved by the minister. This amendment places the onus of proof directly on the commission to establish whether any disability the soldier may be suffering from was or was not attributable to or aggravated by war service. Let me assure the House, in the first place, that the special committee have every possible sympathy towards the returned soldier in every particular. The act has been very carefully revised by the committee, and the amendments which are brought in to-day are the amendments which the committee appointed by yourselves have recommended. I would ask, with all respect, whether my hon. friend would really consider it advisable to place in a complicated act like the Pension Act such a clause as he proposes without submission to legal advice.

Mr. LADNER: I submit that I am only reinserting the clause which was placed in the act in 1919, and under which the board operated for a number of years. I am simply trying to re-establish the breadth of that provision, as against its contraction, which is now proposed.

Mr. MARLER: Does my hon. friend suggest that the board does not pension a man whose disability has been aggravated by war service?

Mr. LADNER: I make no such submission, but I do submit that even with the amendment which has been made, in the case of a pre-enlistment disability with aggravation, if the aggravation ceases after September, 1921, there is no award for the pre-enlistment disability.

Mr. MARLER: Does my hon. friend suggest that if a man suffering from disability entirely recovers and is perfectly well on his discharge, he should be given a pension?

Mr. LADNER: That is not proposed at all. The proposal is that if a man is enlisted as A-1, with no disabilities that come under the exceptions here, and goes into a theatre of war, any disability from which he suffers on discharge must be due to the war, and my point is that it is so difficult to draw a line of demarkation between pre-enlistment disability and aggravation that the act should be broadened. In the actual working out, in the case of a man dying after September, 1920, no pension would be granted to his dependents in such a case.

Mr. MARLER: The dependents will get a pension provided the disability is due to war service. Would my hon. friend attempt to broaden the scope of what is clearly medical testimony by legal verbiage? The question of whether the disability is due to war service or not is a question of medical evidence, and we here in Parliament cannot simply by putting a few words in the act affect that in any way. I have not had sufficient opportunity of studying the matter carefully, but I would suggest that if we accept my hon. friend's amendment we run the risk, not of broadening, but narrowing the act, because at the present time medical testimony is the testimony the soldier must rely on in order to connect up the disability he is suffering from after September 1, 1920, as being directly attributable to war service. The act as it stands is eminently fair, as any returned soldier will tell you, and sufficient to protect any soldier who is suffering from any disability which has been incurred on or aggravated through service, and these were the cases which Parliament intended should be pensionable.

Mr. CLARK: I should like to place on record the resolution which the parliamentary committee passed when this amendment was being considered, and I would ask my hon. friend (Mr. Ladner) whether this resolution meets his point. It reads as follows:

> The committee came to the unanimous conclusion that the act should be so framed that it will mean that a soldier who saw service in a theatre of war will receive a pension commensurate with the disability as it exists on discharge, except in cases where the departmental medical officer can show beyond peradventure that the disability existed prior to enlistment and has not been aggravated on service.

I know that the amendment was designed to meet that, and I should like to ask my hon. friend whether this resolution as passed by the parliamentary committee meets the point he is making, because I am not quite clear in my own mind as to just in what respect it would not achieve the object he has in mind.

Mr. LADNER: The effect of the resolution is simply to shift the onus to the board. In fact, we have been told time and again that there was no such thing as onus of proof under the rulings of the Board of Pension Commissioners, but many of us have found that there is such a thing, and the object of the resolution and of the proposed amendment is to settle that question. It is shifting to the board the duty of establishing whether there is a right to a pension under the existing law. That is entirely different from the proposal I am submitting. My proposal goes more deeply to the principle underlying the Pension Acts. My object in amending section 11 is to enable all members of the Canadian Expeditionary Forces to come in under the protecting words which existed in the 1919 act "or was incurred or aggravated during military service." When those words were taken out it changed the principle of the act. As to the intention of the act, let me refer hon. members to the report of the committee of May 26, 1921. In that report this very section was under consideration and men learned in the law, and other able men, gathered together on that occasion thought there was no question about this matter. I read from pages 84 of the report of 1921:

> That in the case of a pensioner suffering from a disability incurred in a theatre of war, no deduction be made because of disability shown to have existed prior to enlistment, and that section (25) paragraph 3 of the existing Pensions Act be accordingly amended.

I ask hon. members to follow this closely:

> Mr. Nesbitt: Is that not the case now?
> Mr. Redman: I think that is the law.
> Witness: It is obvious.

And so the committee carry on their investigation and make their decision on the strength of the conclusion that that was an obvious interpretation of the law. But we find that in September of last year the Pension Board found another interpretation and they made a ruling that subsection 3 of section 25 does not apply to any case unless entitlement exists under section 11. Now what is the consequence of subsection 3 of section 25. That subsection reads:

> No deduction shall be made from the pension of any member of the forces who has served

in a theatre of actual war on account of any disability or disabling condition which existed in him previous to the time at which he became a member of the forces.

And then there is a proviso:

Provided that no pension shall be paid for a disability or disabling condition which at such time was wilfully concealed, was obvious or was not of a nature to cause rejection from service.

Now, any ordinary member of the House —any layman or lawyer—reading that section would understand it to mean that the soldier would have the advantage of claiming a pension notwithstanding a pre-enlistment disability. But it appears that before a man can come under that section he must show that there is a pensionable claim under section 11. Therefore very few men with pre-enlistment disabilities get any advantage of the section providing that no deduction shall be made for a pre-enlistment disability. Consequently, I claim that in view of the interpretations by the Board of Pension Commissioners, and the legal technicalities that exist, the provisions of the law should be broadened. Under my amendment they will be broadened so that in future we shall not have the confusion which has been pointed out.

Mr. IRVINE: Would my hon. friend explain, by citing a simple illustration, what will happen if the provision of which he speaks is inserted?

Mr. CALDWELL: Before the vote is taken on the amendment, I wish to say that I fully appreciate what the hon. member for Vancouver South (Mr. Ladner) has in mind, and I fully agree with his expressed wish to see the law carried out as he suggests. I submit, however, that the amendment offered by the minister fully covers the ground—I refer to the amendment to section 11. Did I not think so I certainly would support the amendment proposed by the hon. member for Vancouver South, but I am well convinced that such is the case. The matter was given due consideration. I was one of the three members selected by the Pension Committee to confer with the law officers of the Crown and have a section drafted that would cover this very thing. We were all satisfied—the law officers of the Crown and ourselves—that the phraseology of the amendment would meet the case. I believe that the amendment submitted by the minister fully covers the ground and will take care of the cases alluded to. I realize, as the hon. member himself says, that possibly the regulations prepared by the Pension Board might have a little different meaning from this present section. But it was in order to clear up any doubt with regard to these regulations that the section in question was drafted and submitted by the minister to-day—I feel sure of that. In view of my willingness to admit this, and I am one of those who fought for the amendment, I think that the amendment proposed by the minister ought to be acceptable to my hon. friend.

Amendment (Mr. Ladner) negatived.

Mr. LADNER: We desire to have a vote on it.

The CHAIRMAN: There could have been a vote had hon. members indicated their desire by standing up.

Mr. LADNER: A number of members did stand. I submit there is no need of hurrying matters through in this fashion.

The CHAIRMAN: I put the amendment and declared it lost, in accordance with the evident wish of the majority of the committee. I did not observe that any hon. members had risen.

Mr. CHURCH: In the discussions which have taken place in this House this session on the subject of caring for our returned soldiers comparatively little has been said about our blinded men. Now there were 225 of our men in all who lost their sight during the war directly or indirectly as the result of military service. At the present time they are finding it hard to get along, and they get little active help.

These men were heard before the Pensions Committee, and they only occupied a few minutes' times in presenting their case. They made a strong plea for action by this legislature. I do not propose to speak at any greater length in urging their demands on the present occasion. They presented two matters for the consideration of Parliament. One was that the direct pension allotted to them be increased from $600 to $900, and the other was that more sympathetic consideration be given to several special cases where extenuating circumstances might be involved. The high cost of living may be reduced, but it is quite impossible to reduce the high cost of being blind.

Mr. POWER: I rise to a point of order. Is there anything before the committee to which the hon. member is speaking?

The CHAIRMAN: Yes.

Mr. POWER: What is it?

The CHAIRMAN: The matter we are dealing with, with the consent of the committee.

Mr. CHURCH: It is one of the most important questions yet dealt with. Think what these men have suffered on account of the war. If they had stayed at home, they would have had their sight. They might have become profiteers during the war, become millionaires and received a title or a baronetcy. They would have retained their sight, and would not have to go around seeking a miserable pittance of a pension, as they are doing at present. They have to do all kinds of things to make a living.

I want here to commend the great work being done by men like L. M. Wood, and Capt. Baker and other patriots for the Pearson Institute in Toronto. They have been making efforts to improve Pearson Hall and to provide facilities for efficiently taking care of the blind. Yet they have to depend on voluntary subscriptions and on even a tag-day for help. The increase asked is only $300 for 200 men, or $60,000 a year—about what Parliament would toss off for a small wharf or lighthouse. I may say they are also asking that the Pension Board be given power to consider these cases. I am glad to see the act is broadened because the amendment may take care of such cases. I want to refer to some of the difficulties—because they are difficulties—which confront the soldiers suffering total disability on account of blindness. In the first place, there is a prejudice against the blind man. He can do certain work, but he cannot do any work which requires sight. There is a prejudice against the blind man to-day and people try to shun him. They do not want to employ him. People consider them totally disabled, and not fit for any occupation. They get discouraged.

I desire to point out one or two of the difficulties which confront these men. Approximately 200 or 225 men lost their sight during the war, directly or indirectly as a result of military service. They have tried to adapt themselves to their former positions. I think about 80 per cent were trained at the Dunstan Institute for Blinded Soldiers and Sailors, under the direction of Sir Arthur Pearson, and 66 were trained in the Department of Soldiers' Civil Re-establishment, working in conjunction with the Institute for the Blind and Pearson Hall, Toronto. There are certain things which the blind can work at.

The CHAIRMAN: It is six o'clock.

Mr. BELAND: I should like to say a few words before the bill is reported.

Mr. CHURCH: The Chairman has called it six o'clock, and the hon. member is out of order. The bill is not yet going to be reported without the blind soldiers' case being fully dealt with here and now.

Mr. PORTER: I have just received a letter from the office of the Master of the Supreme Court of Ontario, Belleville Mr. S. S. Lazier, and the best way to present the case to the committee will be to read the letter, so that it may be placed on Hansard. The letter reads:

E. G. PORTER, Esq., K.C.,
House of Commons,
Ottawa.

My dear Porter:—

You will remember no doubt Mrs. Wrennick formerly of Belleville, now of Pleasantdale, Sask., for whom you had some correspondence and interviews with the Militia Department some time ago. She is in serious trouble now and I am giving you the particulars, hoping that you may be able to do something with the Pension Department that they may give her what I think she should reasonably be entitled to.

The facts connected with the enlisting of the young man, which probably you may have forgotten, are practically as follows: Mrs. Wrennick, with her four sons, went west some 10 or 12 years ago and eventually located at Pleasantdale, having located a half section. Shortly after going there one of the sons was killed by the horses running away with a reaper. Another son, William, as you will remember, lost an arm and leg on the Grand Trunk here before going west, and the other son, Louis, was delicate and has been gradually getting worse with lung trouble. Ernest, who is entered in the Militia Department as Lance Corporal E. J. Wrennick, No. 440998, 5th Battalion, was the only one of the family who had good health and was able to earn money. He was earning, when he enlisted, something over $2,000 a year on the railroad and was able to keep the family in very comfortable condition. He went overseas and was killed. I received a letter from him from France in which he said he had made a will leaving everything to his mother and Willie, the cripple. However, no will could be found, and the lot which was located in his name was patented after his death in his name, which was practically of very little use to Mrs. Wrennick or William, as there are a number of others in the family, married daughters, who would be entitled to share in the property, if it was ever sold or divided. In fact they could have claimed their share at any time, as you know. They started in with a pension to Mrs. Wrennick of something like $45 a month but last year or the latter part of the year before it was reduced to $25 a month, as they deducted the proceeds of the farm from the amount they had been allowing her. I cannot

conceive of any reasonable men adopting such a picayune system in dealing with the relatives of those men who lost their lives in the service of their country. It is true that after paying actual expenses they were at in their harvesting and threshing and things of that sort, there was a surplus of some $300 left, but this had been made by such work as the two boys were able to do on the place, and did not take into account any wages payable to them or the cost of their living. As a result the family of three with all the necessary incidental expenses was expected to live out of the $45 a month. It is simply impossible for them to live on any such sum, and it is not reasonable to expect that they should, under the circumstances. There is no reason why this small surplus from the farm should be taken from her pension, as anything there was in it was made from the work of the boys and should go towards their living. Mrs. Wrennick is in actual want, and it is too bad that a woman who has been as comfortably off in her time as she has been should be reduced to the condition that she is now in because her son on whom she depended for her living lost his life in the Great War. The least they should do for Mrs. Wrennick would be to give her the full allowance, which I think is $60 a month, to enable her to live with some degree of comfort for the remainder of her life, which is not likely to be very long as she is now over 80 years of age. She has written me often asking me to get you to take the matter up for her with the authorities, but things have been so upset nearly for the last year that I did not like to bother you with it.

I shall be personally obliged, and I know you yourself would be glad to do anything you can to see if some arrangement cannot be made to give her something reasonable to live on.

Should you require any further information of any sort I shall be glad to furnish it. I know by personal knowledge that the facts are as I have stated them and they can be proved substantially by affidavit, if necessary.

Does the law, as it stands, entitle the Board of Pension Commissioners to make the deduction they have made, or is this woman entitled to the full pension? Do the amendments now brought in make provision for a case of this kind?

Mr. BELAND: The letter which the hon. member has read to the House will appear in Hansard. I will read it to-morrow morning, and I will see that my hon. friend is furnished with an answer.

At six o'clock the Speaker resumed the Chair and the House took recess.

After Recess

The House resumed at eight o'clock.

PRIVATE BILLS

CONSIDERED IN COMMITTEE—THIRD READINGS

Bill No. 151 (from the Senate), respecting The Edmonton, Dunvegan and British Columbia Railway Company.—Mr. Kennedy (Edmonton).

[Mr. Porter.]

Bill No. 154 (from the Senate), to incorporate National Casualty Company—Mr. Kay.

Bill No. 134 (from the Senate), for the relief of Roy Wilbert Shaver.—Mr. McGiverin.

Bill No. 138 (from the Senate), for the relief of Frank Clifford Gennery.—Mr. Rankin.

Bill No. 139 (from the Senate), for the relief of Sarah Brackinreid.—Mr. Kay.

Bill No. 140 from the Senate), for the relief of Mildred Catherine Touchbourne.—Mr. Kay.

Bill No. 143 (from the Senate), for the relief of Frederick McClelland Aiken—Mr. Macdonald (Pictou).

Bill No. 155 (from the Senate), for the relief of Eva Florence Heavens.—Mr. Rankin.

Bill No. 156 (from the Senate), for the relief of Dorothy Lillian Jewitt.—Mr. Ross (Kingston).

Bill No. 157 (from the Senate), for the relief of Gladys Mae Larivey—Mr. Ryckman.

Bill No. 158 (from the Senate), for the relief of Gladys Caroline Hilton.—Mr. German.

Bill No. 159 (from the Senate), for the relief of Eva McRae.—Mr. Ross (Kingston).

Bill No. 160 (from the Senate), for the relief of Warren Garfield Young.—Mr. Stewart (Hamilton).

Bill No. 161 (from the Senate), for the relief of Benjamin Charles Bowman.—Mr. Hocken.

Bill No. 162 (from the Senate), for the relief of Ivy Elsie Myron-Smith.—Mr. Ryckman.

Bill No. 163 (from the Senate), for the relief of Lillian May Maybee.—Mr. Rankin.

Bill No. 164 (from the Senate), for the relief of Phœbe Levina Simpson.—Mr. Ryckman.

Bill No. 165 (from the Senate), for the relief of Thomas Preece.—Mr. Stewart (Hamilton).

Bill No. 166 (from the Senate), for the relief of Frederick Greenhill.—Mr. Ryckman.

Bill No. 167 (from the Senate), for the relief of Hazel May Dillon.—Mr. McQuarrie.

Bill No. 168 (from the Senate), for the relief of William Arthur Parish.—Mr. White.

Bill No. 169 (from the Senate), for the relief of James Hayden.—Mr. Clark.

Bill No. 170 (from the Senate), for the relief of Bertha Plant.—Mr. Church.

Bill No. 171 (from the Senate), for the relief of James Murray Johnston.—Mr. Rankin.

Bill No. 172 (from the Senate), for the relief of Arthur Percival Allen.—Mr. Porter.

Bill No. 173 (from the Senate), for the relief of Thomas Leonard Armstrong.—Mr. Macdonald (Pictou).

Bill No. 174 (from the Senate), for the relief of Henry Hardy Leigh.—Mr. McMurray.

SECOND READINGS

Bill No. 177 (from the Senate), respecting a Patent of Simon W. Farber.—Mr. Chevrier.

Bill No. 178 (from the Senate), respecting a Patent of Daniel Herbert Schweyer.—Mr. Maclean (Halifax).

Bill No. 179 (from the Senate), respecting certain Patents of the Holophane Glass Company.—Mr. McMaster.

Bill No. 181 (from the Senate), for the relief of Mary Ann Phair.—Mr. Church.

Bill No. 182 (from the Senate), for the relief of William Park Jefferson.—Mr. Church.

Bill No. 183 (from the Senate), for the relief of Eva Maud Ginn.—Mr. Church.

Bill No. 184 (from the Senate), for the relief of Louise Janet Maude Bigford.—Mr. Ross (Kingston).

Bill No. 185 (from the Senate), for the relief of James Dickson Couch.—Mr. Boys.

Bill No. 186 (from the Senate), for the relief of Cecil Grenville Bell.—Mr. Maclean (York).

Bill No. 180 (from the Senate), for the relief of Margaret Maud Evelyn Clark Leith.—Mr. Euler.

Bill No. 181 (from the Senate), for the relief of Mary Ann Phair.—Mr. Church.

BILL WITHDRAWN

Bill No. 4, to incorporate Canada's sons.—Mr. Gordon.

PENSION ACT AMENDMENT

House again in committee on Bill No. 192, to amend the Pension Act, Mr. Gordon in the Chair.

Mr. CHURCH: Mr. Chairman, when the House rose at six o'clock I was suggesting that the minister do something for the blind beyond what is recommended in the report of the committee. The proposal made is that the rate be increased from $600 to a straight pension of $900. It is true they got a war bonus of $300 and a small allowance for an attendant. The representatives of the blind organizations met the committee. They did not occupy very much time, only a few moments, and their request was first that the straight pension should be increased from $600 to $900, and that consideration should be given to a few special cases. The number who would benefit would be about 200 men, which, at $300 each, would mean an expenditure of $60,000, or about as much as it would cost to build a breakwater in some little port in this country on which no one would tread. It was said during the debate yerterday that there is no country in the world that has done more for its soldiers than Canada. I admit we have done a great deal, but there is no country in the world whose soldiers have done more for it than the soldiers of Canada have done for this country. When you talk about what Canada did for the soldiers and what Canada did for its builders of character, the school teachers, I would ask what Canada has done on the other hand for the builders of railways in this country. We have three transcontinental railway lines now where one would have done, and the builders of these railways—very many of them—have become very wealthy. I understand that up to the present time we have expended $487,000,000 in pensions, gratuities and so forth, but let us not forget how differently Canada has treated the builders of railways in this country to its soldiers and teachers. If these blind men had been like a lot more, they might have stayed at home and have had their sight to-day. They might have been war profiteers and millionaires with a title like some others who stayed behind, but their desire was to sacrifice everything and go to the war. They served their country at the front and lost their sight, and every true Canadian must think with feelings of sorrow and pity and of respect—and even of pain and remorse—of these gallant men who now have lost their sight and who fill our hospitals and walk our streets to-day. I think there is a unanimous desire among the people of Canada, indeed, almost an anxiety, "lest we forget" the 225 men who are afflicted in this way,

and who get a miserable pittance from a none too grateful country. What is $300 in a case of this kind? Would any man in this Chamber, would any one of us who were not fortunate enough to be able to join the colours, be willing to lose our sight for twenty-four or forty-eight hours for that amount? These men have lost their sight forever. I know a great many of them in my own city, and God forbid that the day will ever come in Canada when we shall forget the great debt of gratitude that we owe to these blind heroes and patriots. I believe that the people of Canada would very glady approve the voting of this trivial and insignificant amount.

I went to meet the train on which some of these blinded heroes returned, and saw the pity for them of fathers, mothers, wives, brothers, sisters, and children as they waited at the station for the troop trains, bringing these men home from the front. How these relatives grieved for them and wondered what they could do for them, and how they could stand it. They had no work to support the home. Would they be able to get any employment or to take part in anything at all, even in any recration? I heard one little fellow whose chief regret was that his father would not be able to see a football or lacrosse match again. His father was an amateur sportsman, and took part in these sports, and this little boys keenest regret was that his father would not be able even to see a game again. I know a graduate of Queen's University, a man of great ability, who would be earning $25,000 or $30,000 a year if he had his sight, but who to-day is practically earning only a couple of thousand, because he is blind.

A blind man needs an attendant to take him out on the street, and other people to wait on him. That is not an isolated case. There are other cases where the the men can do a little work, but there are a great many who can do no work, and what the great majority of them can earn would not keep body and soul together. I have seen these men at the Pearson Institute. They probably earn a little money making baskets, but there are baskets galore on the market now, and that calling probably will not last very long. I deeply sympathize with these men. I sympathize with them as a representative of a big city which has probably more blind men than any other city in Canada, and that is why I am asking Parliament to take this step. These mens' lives are made miserable by the loss of their sight—they can never more look into the loving faces of father and mother, brother and sister, wife or children. There are 70,000 Canadians buried in France to-day, sleeping until the resurrection morning. We owe it to the men who have fallen and who will never return to see to it that the sacrifices they made—will not have been made in vain—by looking after these blind comrades.

Mr. MARTELL: What my hon. friend seems to be advocating seems fair to my mind. I know two or three cases in my own county where the man's wife has to lead him around by the hand, and the man is only getting a pittance of a pension. Would my hon. friend advocate that those who have become blind as a result of the war should receive the maximum bonus? If so I would agree with him.

Mr. CHURCH: Yes, certainly I do. That is a detail that the committee could work out. If any hon. gentleman lost his sight for twenty-four hours, he would not be satisfied with a pittance of $300.

Mr. MARTELL: I was not speaking of those only partially blind, but totally blind.

Mr. CHURCH: We devoted two days to the discussion of oleomargarine. We have devoted two days to the consideration of the needs of soldiers who have not lost their sight. Surely we can spend a little time in considering the necessities of the 225 men who lost their sight in the service of their country. When the committee rose at six o'clock I was referring to the report of the Pensions Committee. That report is a good one in many ways but it is seriously lacking in any consideration for the demands of the afflicted men in whose behalf I am now speaking. We have passed legislation which provides for large expenditures of the public money where cattle, sheep and swine are concerned. It is not out of place to ask Parliament to vote such a comparatively small sum as $60,000 in order to provide for the welfare of those men who lost their sight in struggling to uphold the freedom and liberty which we all enjoy to-day. In order to demonstrate to the committee the grevious handicap under which these men are labouring and the justness of their demands for consideration at our hands, let me quote a few paragraphs from the evidence given this session before the parliamentary committee. The witness is Mr. D. J. McDougall, and I ask hon. members to pay care-

ful attention to the power and eloquence with which he urges the case of the blinded men. The evidence of the question is to be found at page 355 of the committee's proceedings of May 11 last. Mr. McDougall says:

However, while we are not here to claim any preferential treatment for a special class such as the blind soldiers, we feel that there are certain difficulties which confront a soldier suffering from the particular disability of blindness which it would be well to place before you. There have been approximately 200 or 225 soldiers who lost their sight during the war, either directly or indirectly as the result of military service. These men have been for the most part trained to re-adapt themselves to changed conditions. Many of these men—I believe 80 is the correct number—were trained at the St. Dunstan's Institute for Blinded Soldiers and Sailors, under the direction of Sir Arthur Pearson; sixty-six of these men were trained under the direction of the D.S.C.R., working in conjunction with the National Institute for Blind at Pearson Hall, Toronto. It has always been assumed that there were certain handicrafts at which the blind could earn a more or less secure livelihood, but it must be admitted from practical experience that many of these hold very little opportunity for anything but a very precarious existence. A very great many of these men who have been trained at Pearson Hall have been trained in such handicrafts as making baskets and doing netting, and some of them at St. Dunstan's were trained in various occupations, such as boot and shoe repairing, mat making, and so forth, all of which have been found entirely impracticable in Canada as far as earning a livelihood is concerned. It is quite true that there are exceptional cases where these men earn sufficient money by these means to keep themselves going and to support their wives and families, but the majority of these men, if they are earning anything, are doing very little to add to their pension. Not only does the blind man lose at least 75 per cent of his earning capacity as a result of his blindness, but the expense to which a man is put as a consequence of his blindness is, I have no doubt, increased. Consider some of the situations with which a blind man might be confronted. For example, many of the men who have been trained at Pearson Hall and St. Dunstan's have engaged in small businesses. In Toronto there are several blind soldiers attempting to run tobacco stores, newspaper stands, and ventures of that kind. It is not possible for a totally blind man to do this work without sighted assistance. A blind man may start his tobacco store, but he must pay for sighted assistance to conduct that business; otherwise it is impossible. The sighted man, no matter what other disabilities he may have, is quite able to conduct his business without any assistance. Further, take the case of a man in Toronto at the present time who is preparing to enter University. A sighted man, no matter what other disability he may have, is able to go ahead and do his work, but a blind man must pay for assistance. This particular man is at the present time preparing to enter university next fall, and he is paying from $14 to $18 a month simply for reading simply to have somebody read the work to him, something which would be entirely unnecessary in any other class of disability. Another man engaged in the life insurance business, of course, needs a guide to conduct him about the city to and from his places of business. He must pay this guide, at a conservative estimate, from $35 to $40 a month—I do not know the figures, but it is not likely that he could employ a boy for less than $8 or $9 a week to work for him day in and day out. Any blind man who is required to travel about from place to place must have assistance. It is quite impossible for a blind man to do much travelling without having assistance, and that assistance must be paid for, and in a very great many cases it is necessary for the blind man to take an escort right along with him, and consequently have to pay a double fare.

There are one or two paragraphs more I wish to quote:

The disability of blind ex-service men is permanent. They are blind and will remain blind. In ten to fifteen years from now they will still be carrying on as they are carrying on now, but probably with even less success than at the present time, because although it is generally assumed that a blind man becomes more efficient as time goes on, that only holds good up to a very limited time. Perhaps during the first few years of his blindness he does become more efficient, but after that his progress is very, very limited indeed, if there is any progress at all. He strikes a groove and must remain therein. Ten or fifteen years from now these blind men will, in all probability, be making a few baskets occasionally, but the country will then be flooded with the products of this class of work. Already there is a very limited market for them, because the patients in the D.S.C.R. workshops and hospitals all over the country have turned them out by the ton and the country has been flooded with them. Although these conditions may change, the permanent disability of these blind men cannot change. At present they are receiving a pension of $600 a year, plus a high cost of living bonus of $300 a year, plus their attendant allowance of $300 a year. The attendant allowance is supposed, like charity, to cover all things; but, gentlemen, like charity it does not cover very much. You can readily understand that $25 a month is inadequate to cover the expenses of a guide in the case of a blind man whose business necessitates his moving from place to place. For example, if I had employed a guide to come to Ottawa from Toronto I would, in all probability, have exhausted my $25 for this month. It is quite certain that the $25 a month attendant allowance is not sufficient to cover all requirements. The pension of $600 a year, no matter how the high cost of living may be reduced, will always be inadequate. The high cost of living may be reduced, but it is impossible to reduce the high cost of being blind. The pension now paid—$900 a year including a bonus of $300 a year—will never be too much.

The present pension of $600 a year plus the bonus of $300 a year will never be more than sufficient. We have therefore come before you to petition that the $300 a year now called "bonus" be included in the permanent pension. It is possible that some may regard this petition as premature. It may be said that there are no indications that this bonus of $300 a year is going to be cut off.

I would also like to refer to the evidence in regard to the few special cases which the minister told me the other night he would take care of if I gave him the particulars. The evidence of one of the blind witnesses I presented to the Committee, Mr. Lynes, is as follows:

The Chairman: You also urge more sympathetic consideration of special cases where extenuating circumstances may be involved. Would you mind telling the Committee a little more fully just what you mean by that?

Mr. Lynes: Several members of the Blinded Soldiers' and Sailors' Club are men who have been very unfortunate; they have lost their sight through V.D.S.—venereal disease—or from drinking wood alcohol. The fact remains that they were in the army at the time, and it was their misfortune. We would like the Committee to give very sympathetic consideration to these men. They are out in the world now without any means of support, not receiving any pension or allowances, and the majority of them have wives and families to support. I think something should be done for them. They were members of the C.E.F. It is their misfortune, not their fault, that they lost their eyesight through drinking wood alcohol or from V.D.S.

The Chairman: Do you suggest that in such cases they be not given a full pension, but that certain considerate treatment be given them?

Mr. Lynes: I ask for considerate treatment for them.

The Chairman: On compassionate grounds?

Mr. Lynes: Yes.

The Chairman: Although their blindness has been caused more or less by their own fault?

Mr. Lynes: Yes.

The Chairman: Not like other cases, where the blindness was directly attributable to service?

Mr. Lynes: That is it.

Mr. MacLaren: Did these cases occur in Canada or overseas?

Mr. Lynes: Some of them in Canada and some overseas, some of them in England.

With respect to the minister let me say that he served his country well in the late war. I have received letters from many men who were brought into contact with him overseas and who spoke most appreciatively of his services. I wish to say further, Mr. Chairman, that the more I look into the record of these blinded men the more I regret that the government and Canadian public have not a better conception of the duty which they owe to them and to their families and I do appeal to the House to take some favourable action tonight. Next I wish to read to the committee a letter with regard to the case of one who lost a son and got nothing:

To T. L. CHURCH, Esq., M.P.,

re. Soldiers' Re-establishment etc.

Dear Sir,—May I take the liberty of calling to your attention while "debating", to the fact that the War Gratuity has been given to all soldiers who returned as you know, and also in recognition of some of the fallen. I should like to know in the name of justice how such a discrimination can be made between the dead; it is out of all faith and justice. It cuts me to the heart, and I know thousands besides, to see such treatment meted out to those who have given their all. And I trust it is not too late to have that matter rectified, and that the Pension Board and all concerned will remember, "Worthy is the lamb that was slain", which appeals to one and all. Trusting I am not troubling you too much by asking your kind support in this matter.

This is signed by the mother of one of the unrecognized soldiers who fell in the war. He was 18 years old, going to school, enlisted, and was killed when he was nineteen and a half. She had another son, an office boy, and, as he was earning a few dollars a week she lost her pension—through technicalities—red tape. Shame—on such treatment! I appeal to the minister in this case. I do not say that all of the mothers whose sons went to the war should get something. There are hundreds of cases similar to this, where, for instance, the mother has to go to work, and receives no pension merely because a younger child is an office boy or has some petty job. This is not a very creditable state of affairs for a country which contributed $900,000,000 to the railways. Will the minister give the blind men what they ask? I will be very much disappointed if the chairman of this committee and the committee's report is small in soul and shows a spirit lacking in generosity towards these blind soldiers, and I regret the committee did not give them favourable treatment. These 200 men will be very much discouraged, if they do not receive something. All it will mean, as I said, is $300 per year for 200 men or about $60,000—the price of a small breakwater. Let this Parliament do its duty by these poor men who sacrificed all for Canada.

Mr. MARTELL: My hon. friend from North Toronto (Mr. Church) seemed to think that I was opposing what he had to say. My hon. friend seemed to think that I was referring to partial blindness, whereas, as a matter of fact, I said total blindness. I had a case of a young man named Spence, who had a wife and two or three children. It is a pitiful case, because he is totally blind, as a result of the war. He is going through the streets, and he is only receiving a pittance. However, that is not my purpose in rising. I have every confidence in the chairman of the committee. In my short experience in this House, I do not believe any member of a committee has devoted himself more assiduously, and with greater ability, to the task

assigned him than the hon. member from St. Lawrence and St. George (Mr. Marler). I had not many cases to present to him. In fact, I did not deem it necessary to appear before the committee. I gave him what information I had, privately, and placed before him my contention, in so far as my constituents were concerned, in regard to the matter of pensions. I find, now that his report is brought down to this House, that he has done his utmost, in so far as it was equitable and just, to meet my contentions, but where my contentions were not considered equitable and just by him, he did not hesitate to disregard them, even though I was his colleague on this side of the House. I do not believe there is one man in the House who has sacrificed more time and done more work. While other members were permitted to remain in the corridors of the House, during the ordinary routine, the hon. member from St. Lawrence-St. George was either in the committee room, or in his own room, devoting himself to private study and consideration of the question of the advancement of returned soldiers throughout Canada. I congratulate my honoured chief, and the members of the Government, that they saw in the hon. member from St. Lawrence-St. George, who was unknown to a great many of us, the great ability which he subsequently showed that he possessed. He is not actuated by any personal motive. He has a great business in his own constituency, and his time could very well be taken up with that business, but he has given that time and great ability to the service of Canada. I am sure that, while most men are very anxious to have the honour of being appointed chairman of a committee, this position was not sought by him, but he undertook to comply with the request of the members of the Government and of his fellow members, and the confidence that they have had in the hon. member was justified, because they could not have found an abler representative, or a more fair-minded man, than he. My hon. friend from North Toronto is a very excellent and affable fellow, and my object in rising to-night was to correct his statement when he said that I had suggested that I was not in sympathy with the blind men. I simply rose to ask my hon. friend if he would advocate extra treatment for those who had, as a result of the war, been deprived of their sight for life, and, if so, I was in favour of every word he could possibly say, because, in my own constituency, one of the brightest intellects has been deprived of the opportunity of taking his place in life, having lost his sight as the result of the war.

Before resuming my seat I desire to congratulate once more my hon. friend the member for St. Lawrence-St. George, who is a returned man himself, and I want to say that we love and admire the hon. Minister of the Department of Soldiers' Civil Re-establishment (Mr. Beland) and if he wishes to know how he is loved and admired, he should come down and find it out from the ladies of the province of Nova Scotia. Sometimes, when we ask too much, the hon. minister has to turn us down, but we have found, in the final analysis, that he is a mighty good minister and has done his best.

Mr. SPENCE: I do not wish to enter into this discusion at any great length, because I feel I am not confident. I know very little about the matter, and there are hon. members in this House who are very competent to look after the interests of the returned men, because they know more about the subject matter than I do. I desire to say that the hon. member for North Toronto (Mr. Church), in advocating these the cause of the returned soldiers, and making these requests, is doing so in all sincerity, because, if any man ever was acquainted with the returned man, that member was. He was a most indefatigable man in their interests. When the men came home from the front, whether they reached Toronto at five in the morning or five in the evening, my hon. friend never failed to meet them. All that he has done has been done in perfect sincerity. I believe the hon. Minister of Soldiers' Civil Re-establishment is an excellent gentleman, and that he has shown cordiality in his treatment of every one. I feel however, that there are some hon. members in this House who have not shown the respect to the hon. member from North Toronto that is due to him. He is presenting the case of these men before the House in all sincerity, and I hope they will listen to the remarks of the hon. member, the same as they would listen to any other member in this House.

Mr. CALDWELL: There is nothing provided for in the way of transportation for the blind under certain conditions.

Mr. BELAND: I will deal with that when I speak.

Mr. BANCROFT: I heartily agree with what has been said by the member for North Toronto (Mr. Church) regarding the blind

returned men. A man who lost his sight overseas should be given a pension that would place him beyond the need of dependence on relatives, and $600 is certainly not sufficient for that purpose. These men should be made to feel independent, and I think that every hon. member would agree to the suggestion to have the $600 increased to $900, which would be little enough.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: There is no doubt at all that the blind men ought to be treated as special cases and that we should do everything possible for them. As I recollect the matter, the blind man gets a total pension of $900 a year, with a special helplessness allowance of $750, which is the maximum. Has there been any change in regard to that special allowance?

Mr. BELAND: I will explain that in a minute.

Mr. BLACK (Yukon): I will go a step further than hon. gentlemen in this matter. I submit that this Parliament would not be doing its duty by those men who were blinded in the war if it did not provide a pension for them of $200 a month. The sum of $2,400 per year would be considered by members of this House as less than they are entitled to as a sessional indemnity. Members of Parliament receive $4,000 for an attendance of four months at the outside, and I certainly do not think that these returned men, who were blinded in the service of the country and had been deprived for all time to come of any possibility of earning their living or making their way in the world, should receive less than $200 a month. They may make a few baskets or trivial things of that kind, but that sort of thing will not support them; and I earnestly submit that this Parliament should make provision for at least the amount I have suggested.

Mr. HARRIS: With regard to the point raised by the hon. member for West York (Sir Henry Drayton), my understanding is that the special allowance of $750 to which he has referred is more or less of a temporary nature, the pension, including bonus, being $900. The other allowance, which has been made from year to year, is, I believe, really only temporary. If the Government would increase the pension to $900, with the $300 bonus, these men would be placed in a somewhat better position than they are in at present. I trust the minister will accede to this request.

Mr. BELAND: I should be devoid of all gratitude if I did not acknowledge the encomiums that have been showered upon me by my hon. friend from North Toronto (Mr. Church) and the hon. member for Hants (Mr. Martell), although I must disclaim much of the merit they have ascribed to me. Before the bill is reported I feel that I had better give some information to the member for North Toronto in regard to the totally disabled and the blind. They receive a maximum pension of $900, $300 of which is a bonus. My hon. friend suggests that we make this $300 permanent. The parliamentary committee has recommended that the bonus in the case of all pensions be extended for two years, and I have no doubt that before that time has expired that bonus will have become part and parcel of the pension of at least the blind men. The special allowance of $750 is not, as the hon. member for East York (Mr. Harris) has said, a temporary allowance. Section 15 of the Pensions Act makes it imperative for the department to pay a helplessness allowance up to a maximum of $750. So that a blind soldier receives $900—$600 pension with $300 bonus —and if his condition of helplessness warrants the full amount, the maximum allowance of $750, or a total of $1,650. The committee has also recommended that the blind men shall receive free transportation. That is part of their report. Many of the recommendations of the committee are not provided for in the bill because they require no statutory enactment. But apart from those that have been submitted to the House in the form of bills, all recommendations, according to advice from the Department of Justice, can be carried out by Order in Council or by regulations; and I can assure the House that it will be my agreeable duty to carry out those recommendations and to do all I can to relieve painful situations wherever they may be found. There is no class of returned men that deserves more consideration than those who have been blinded in the service of their country. Their case appeals to our sympathy. It appeals to me, it appeals to the Government, and I am sure it appeals to every member of the House. I may tell the hon. member for North Toronto, who has taken such a deep interest in this class of the disabled, that I shall be pleased to have brought to my attention any special case that calls for consideration, which I shall be pleased to give it. If it is the pleasure of the committee to report the bill I may say that all the recommendations will be carried out to the letter.

Bill reported, read the third time and passed.

SUPPLEMENTARY ESTIMATES FOR 1922-23

A message from His Excellency the Governor General transmitting Supplementary Estimates for the year ending March 31st, 1923, was presented by Hon. W. S. Fielding (Minister of Finance) read by Mr. Speaker to the House, and referred to the Committee of Supply.

CANCELLATION OF LEASES OF DOMINION LANDS

On motion of Hon. Charles Stewart (Minister of the Interior) Bill No. 153 respecting Notices of Cancellation of Leases of Dominion Lands was read the second time, and the House went into committee thereon, Mr. Gordon in the Chair.

On section 1—Written notice of cancellation to be deemed effective from date on which it is given.

Mr. STEWART (Argenteuil): Mr. Chairman, inasmuch as the bill as originally drafted has been amended, I deem it advisable to state shortly its purpose. It provides for validating the cancellation of mining, timber and grazing leases simply for the purpose of bringing up to date the statutory validation of such cancellations as have taken place. In most cases there is no doubt as to the validity of the cancellation, but in a few cases where neglect may have taken place in respect to service or other procedure it was thought wise to place the cancellation beyond doubt.

There is, however, one cancellation in question. Some years ago a lease of coal lands on the Smoky river, in the province of Alberta, was granted to one Johnson, of the city of Edmonton, which was subsequently transferred to an American citizen named Isenberg, who was represented by an agent named Hoppe. During the war Hoppe was proved to be an alien enemy and left the country, and inasmuch as Isenberg had failed to pay the fees due on the lease the department cancelled it. Subsequently this particular area was re-staked and granted to other parties, with whom the department had a dispute, and eventually my right hon. friend, the leader of the Opposition (Mr. Meighen) cancelled this second lease. Since January I have been approached on various occasions by representatives of the estate of Isenberg, who contend that his estate is being unjustly deprived of the benefits accruing from the lease as the cancellation was not in order and should be withdrawn. I felt I was not competent to deal with the matter and turned it over to the Department of Justice. I mention these facts because I have been notified that an hon. member is to move an amendment to withdraw this particular cancellation from the operation of the bill and have the rights of the parties determined by the courts.

With respect to clause 3 of the bill, when we reach it I intend to move that it be stricken out, for three reasons. The first reason is that the late government by Order in Council subsequent to the cancellation of leases held, I believe, by Shillington and Bernard, set aside this area, which is eighty miles distant in one direction from railway facilities and sixty to seventy miles from Grand Prairie, the nearest railway station, in the other. By section 3 the Senate has endeavoured to change the method of dealing with these particular leases, by putting the matter under control of Parliament. The second reason is that all these leases have been granted by the Department of the Interior subject to approval by the Governor in Council. The third reason is that this is a matter of negotiation between the Dominion government and the province of Alberta. That is to say, negotiations for the transfer of natural resources, which would include these particular areas, are going on, and I do not think we should by legislation put that area under the control of the Dominion Parliament. I mention these things briefly, so that hon. members will understand the situation when I move that clause 3 be struck out of the bill, and also when an hon. member moves an amendment, a copy of which was laid on my desk. I may say also that the Prime Minister was two days ago approached by the Consul General of the United States who, representing the Department of State at Washington, stated that a citizen of the United States was being deprived of his rights in that connection and asked that his claim be settled in the court. I think it is only fair that the committee should know these facts.

Mr. McBRIDE: May I ask the minister why he is cancelling all these leases? It is a very serious proposition.

Mr. STEWART (Argenteuil): I am not cancelling any leases. I am validating all cancellations of leases that have been made up to date; that is all.

Mr. MEIGHEN: This is a bill that will have to be considered as a whole. There is not very much reason for passing clause 1 unless we determine virtually to pass the whole bill. I have no exception to take to the recital of facts made by the Minister of the Interior. First of all, perhaps I may be permitted to restate the purpose of the bill. It is to validate cancellations of leases. The minister does not himself officiate in the granting leases. Unless his attention is specially called to the matter, he does not know when a lease is granted; it is done by the officials of the department under the terms of regulations approved by the Governor in Council and authorized by this House. They contain a provision for cancellation. That provision is exercisable upon default—default in payment; default in living up to the conditions of the lease as to working the mine; default in any respect. The minister himself officiates in case of default; he must exercise his personal discretion and supervision in the cancellation of the lease. The purpose of the bill is to validate cancellations that have taken place to date. The Senate has inserted a provision that no lease shall be granted without the special authority of this Parliament in respect of an area of land near the Smoky river, being a district very rich in coal between the Grand Trunk Pacific railway and the Canadian Northern, away near the eastern boundary of British Columbia. That amendment of the Senate has very little relationship to the bill; it is just a precaution, looking to the continued preservation of that area for the country, that the Senate decided to take. Coming back to the main provisions of the bill and to the suggested or anticipated amendment that is to be moved excepting from its provisions certain cancellations, I may point out that in the year 1918—well, I cannot say what year it was, but in that year or the year previous, this Smoky river lease was granted under the provisions of the regulations, just as the Minister of the Interior says. I say I do not know when it was granted, because the minister does not know about these things personally. But in the year 1918 that least was cancelled. It had come into the property of one Isenberg, or, as I understood it, into the joint property of Isenberg and Hoppe. In my absence in England, the acting minister, the late Hon. Mr. Sifton, being persuaded that the lease was in arrears—and, I have no hesitaiton in saying, being doubtful also of the loyalty to the allied cause of the lessees; being, indeed, suspicious of their active intervention against us—took cancellation proceedings. That the lease was in default there was no doubt; that ample notice had been given there was no doubt. In my judgment, there was not the least doubt as to there being quite sufficient cause for the cancellation, nor do I know of anything defective in the cancellation. The cancellation was made. Subsequently, in the regular course, through the departmental officials, the same property was re-leased. Upon my return the facts were brought to my attention chiefly through evidence before a Senate committee. It appeared that everything had not been quite regular in the granting of that lease, whereupon I immediately cancelled it on the ground of irregularity. That brought the property back to the Crown, and I then, as Minister of the Interior, issued a recommendation which took the form of an Order in Council reserving to the Crown that area and putting it out of the power of the departmental officials to make any further leases thereon, being of the belief that that area would ultimately be of great value, for the purposes chiefly of our national railways. Now, since that time persistent efforts have been made on the part of the first lessees, the Isenbergs and Hoppes—for myself, I came in contact only with the latter family—to secure a revival of that lease. I say they have been made ever since; I know they were made during the continuance of my office as Minister of the Interior, all of which efforts were resisted. This bill, if it passed in the form presented by the minister, would validate and clear away any doubts that might exist as to the regularity and effectiveness of all the cancellations, including that cancellation. An effort is being made to make an exception in the case of that cancellation. The minister was good enough to intimate to me a few hours ago the facts as he stated them to the House. I cannot see any reason at all for any exception. If it is right in principle to validate cancellations, then the validating should apply to all cancellations. I cannot see any reason for making any exception. It may be the Hoppes have commenced some legal proceedings. Others have a right just as good as theirs—at least, we are not in a position to say they have not, and there is no difference in principle between cancelling rights that are in litigation, and cancelling rights that

are just as good that are not in litigation. Consequently, I say to the minister, either stand by the bill validating all these cancellations, or withdraw the bill. Speaking on this subject only for the present, for I think it is better not to have that confused with the other question as to whether the Smoky River area should be statutorily reserved, I express my judgment unreservedly that we ought to treat all alike, and if we are going to validate irregularities, validate all of them and do not make exceptions of any of them.

Mr. STEWART (Argenteuil): When this bill was introduced I was made aware that there would be an amendment moved for the purpose of allowing action to be taken on this particular property. We have been notified through the Consul General of the United States that one of their citizens had appealed to them for protection in connection with this matter. I have no knowledge of this case except as I have already stated to the House. Perhaps the hon. gentleman who intends to move the amendment may have something to say.

Section agreed to.

On section 2—limitation of time for actions claiming relief against cancellations:

Mr. McMASTER: I have an amendment to propose in connection with this clause. I have listened with attention to what the right hon. leader of the Opposition (Mr. Meighen) has said, and were I responsible for government policy I would feel inclined to say it is a wise thing not to have post hoc legislation, but not being in that position, I think that it is right for me to propose this resolution which I think is of importance in regard to section 2 as it stands. Section 2 now provides that no action or other proceedings shall lie or be instituted "unless the same was or shall have been instituted within one year from the date of the giving of the said notice." If we are to make any exceptions, I think we should safeguard any rights which have been acquired by the institution of proceedings up to the passing of this act, and I therefore move that clause 2 be struck out and the following substituted therefor:

No action, suit, petition of right or other proceeding shall lie or be instituted, prosecuted or maintained against His Majesty or against the Minister of the Interior, or the Attorney General, or any officer of the Government of Canada, claiming any relief or declaration against or in respect of the cancellation or forfeiture of any such lease, license, permit or other authority by means of any such notice as aforesaid, unless the same was or shall be instituted or presented before the date of the passing of this act.

Mr. MEIGHEN: The minister, I think, should speak first, but surely he could not accept that amendment.

Mr. STEWART (Argenteuil): My difficulty in the matter is this. So far as I know, no proceeding has been instituted with respect to any lease for the purpose of obtaining action at law except this particular one, if proceedings have been instituted in this case. I am not sure that they have. If so, it has not yet come to my knowledge. The amendment would mean, as I understand it, that proceedings could not be instituted unless taken before this act was passed.

Mr. MEIGHEN: The minister has not grasped the full effect of the amendment. The present section 2 provides this: that either in respect of a lease already granted or to be granted no action may be effectively taken unless it is commenced within a year after the cancellation of that lease. In respect of any cancellation past or future, one year is given after cancellation for action, and no action can be taken thereafter. The amendment says that in respect of any of such leases no action shall be taken unless it has been taken already. What about leases in the future? No man could take an action at all under the amendment. I do not think the hon. member for Brome intended that, but that is exactly the effect of his amendment.

Mr. VIEN: I understand that the bill has only the effect of validating cancellations already made. If the bill had for its purpose the giving of power to the minister to cancel such leases in future, I think my right hon. friend's point would be well taken, but as the bill simply refers to cancellations in the past, and as the amendment refers to cancellations in respect of which legal proceedings have been already instituted, I think my right hon. friend's point that in future the minister will not have the right to cancel any leases does not apply.

Mr. MEIGHEN: The hon. member should read clauses 1 and 2 separately, and then he will see I was quite right. The first clause validates past cancellations. We are past that; that is done with. The second clause says that in respect of any cancellation whether it has been made or is to be made, the right of action for relief against

the cancellation must be taken within a year. If the hon. member will read only the second line, he will see that it refers to the future as well as the past. It says:

> No action, suit or other proceeding, either at law or in equity, shall lie or be instituted, prosecuted or maintained against His Majesty. . . claiming any relief or declaration against or in respect of the cancellation or forfeiture of any such lease, license, permit or other authority . . . . unless the same was or shall have been instituted within one year from the date of the giving of the said notice.

So that if the amendment passes it would have the effect of stopping all relief in respect to cancellations already made unless action has already been instituted, and would prevent any relief in the future altogether.

Mr. McMASTER: That is not the intention.

Mr. MEIGHEN: It is the effect of it.

Mr. McMASTER: I would submit for the consideration of the committee whether, as clause 1 refers to permits or leases granted before the date of the passing of this act, that should not be read in conjunction with this amendment which I have proposed, which I think would make it clear that it only referred to leases granted before the passing of this act. That is my intention in moving the amendment. If my right hon. friend can suggest any words which would make that meaning clearer I would be very glad of the benefit of his legal acumen and mastery of the English tongue.

Mr. BAXTER: Will the hon. member kindly explain why these particular people should be given greater rights than the other people whose leases have been cancelled—all of them, we will say, with equal informality?

Mr. McMASTER: The only reason I can suggest from a somewhat cursory examination of the record is that these people had spent, according to the information I have received, some $235,000 in connection with this matter; and if there is any possibility of irregularity about the cancellation, it seems to me that their rights should be safeguarded to prove this before the court. After all, the only thing that this amendment does is to prevent the doors of the court being shut in the face of these people. If my hon. friend asked me why, as a matter of general policy, I would not prefer to see that treatment meted out to everybody I would have to agree with him, but that is not the question we are discussing at the present moment.

Mr. BAXTER: Having passed section 1, which validates all these notices and makes the cancellations good, what is the point of letting men go to court about it? Not the notice but the law has destroyed those previous existing leases. Having destroyed them under section 1 of the act what has a man got to go into court with?

Mr. McMASTER: There is this to be said in favour of the resolution, that it is somewhat more of a hardship, after people have started their legal proceedings, to have the possibility of those legal proceedings being successfully taken away from them. After all this ought to appeal to my hon. friend—the fact that people have spent thousands and invoked the aid of the court, while not an absolute guarantee, is certainly evidence of their bona fides and of their belief that they have a just and reasonable cause to promote.

Mr. BAXTER: Is not my hon. friend's objection really to passing section 1 of the act which is already adopted? That destroys any right that man could possibly have. It might be doubtful before whether his lease was really dead or not by the act of the department, but once you pass that section there can be no question about it—it is absolutely destroyed. Now, my hon. friend proposes to give him the right to go into court. I should think, perhaps, my hon. friend had better limit the right to a coroner's court because it will only be an inquest.

Mr. McMASTER: I think my hon. friend has hardly grasped the distinction—it is a distinction in fact although it may not be a great distinction in principle. While the door may be closed to those who have not started their proceedings it remains open to those who have actually commenced them. That is the difference.

Sir LOMER GOUIN: I think my hon. friend should wait until we consider clause 5. In that clause we reserve any recourse which may belong to the party in respect of cases now pending.

Mr. McMASTER: I am willing, with the permission of the committee to withdraw my amendment at this time, reserving my right to move it when we reach clause 5.

Mr. MEIGHEN: The matter of wording is one thing which is very simple; the matter of what we ought to do is another thing. I quite agree with the Minister of Justice that if we intend to give effect to what the hon. member wants, the right way to do is to add at the end of the bill a clause exempting pending litigation from these effects. Now I am opposed to what tthe hon. member is seeking to bring about aside entirely from the wording of his instrument. It is perfectly proper when you are changing an existing law as to the distribution of civil rights to except pending litigation. That is right and proper. That is not what we are doing here at all; we are validating cancellations, not as between individuals but we are validating cancellations of the Crown as against individuals. When we are doing that we have no right at all to select one and say "Here, we will save you, we will protect you from the desolating effect of this act." What better right does a man get merely because he has issued his writ? Does that at all improve the status of his claim? Not in the least. The hon. member says these people have expended $235,000. Well, first of all, I do not think they have expended a fraction. I, perhaps, should not impart here information that came to me as minister, and still I am free to do so. We had an investigation made. I am speaking only from memory but it is pretty good, and I feel certain the result of the investigation was that there was no evidence of any real work done at all. There was not work done to amount to as many dollars as there are thousands of dollars in the information given the hon. gentleman. It may be they spent money employing engineers, prospectors, and lawyers, incorporating companies, trying to sell charters, and all those things; but I do not think they spent any substantial money at all in actual coal development. Why? Because there is no way to get the coal out after they develop it; there is no railway in there. As I understand, it is a deposit of tremendous wealth that some day—after there is population to use it, and transportation to reach it—will be of very great value indeed because it has a quality very high, is very accessible after you reach it by transportation, and easily worked. But I do not think there is any ground for the claim that very substantial actual money has been spent in operation or in work that amounts to anything. But even if there had been, of all the lessees whose rights, if they have any, are cancelled by this bill, there is not one of them that cannot come forward and show that he has invested money too. He will come forward just as soon as we recognize that he has a claim and he may be able to make his claim just as well as these people, if not better. Why should the fact that they have asked for a petition of right or perhaps got a fiat, have any application to the matter? This was four years ago. They start and ask for a fiat a month ago and we say, "All right; we will not let this act apply to you at all." But here is a man whose lease was cancelled thirteen months ago and we say to him, "We will never let you apply for a fiat at all. We gave this to Mr. Hoppe and Mr. Isenberg because we allowed them four years but we will not give you four months." How can the minister stand up against argument of that kind? He cannot. If it is proper to cure the informality of these cancellations—which is purely technical if it exists; for the life of me I do not know what the informality is—but if it is proper to cure them, cure them all, and, if it is not right to cure them, leave them all to their legal rights, Hoppe, Isenberg and all the rest.

Mr. JOHNSON (Moosejaw): Would this debar a person whose lease has been cancelled, whether it is a specific one or otherwise, from making a claim for monies invested, provided he proved his claim?

Mr. MEIGHEN: Unless he has no claim for monies invested and if his lease is cancelled—

Mr. JOHNSON (Moosejaw): If he has no claim, he will not get in?

Mr. MEIGHEN: No.

Mr. JOHNSON (Moosejaw): But if he has a claim, he will.

Mr. MEIGHEN: Yes. It is to cure the informality in the lease. It is so that they will not come back and say that there is an informality in the lease, and claim that lease over again.

Mr. MACLEAN (Halifax): I understood a certain lease was cancelled some time ago for departmental reasons. The persons who now control these leases, or are alleged to control them, say they were illegally cancelled, and I suppose the purpose of this clause is an effort to protect their rights, if they have any. That is pretty fair legislation. It may be quite true that the Department of Justice is

very strongly of the view that the claim alleged is not well founded in law, but such claimants are usually given the benefit of the doubt, and their rights, whatever they may be, are protected. It is exceedingly difficult for this House, or the committee, to try out the alleged rights, and determine the question.

Mr. MEIGHEN: That is all right, but why shut out everybody else and let Hoppe in?

Mr. MACLEAN (Halifax): It is difficult to answer that. I cannot. But I presume the idea is that one particular party who has commenced proceedings, or about to commence proceedings has been pressing his claim and, perhaps, the others have abandoned whatever rights they might have. That usually happens in these matters.

Mr. MEIGHEN: Perhaps, they have not.

Mr. MACLEAN (Halifax): If the hon. member would make that apply to everybody, I do not know that I could answer it, but, on general principles, I would think it not unfair legislation to protect whatever rights there may be of persons who allege that their leases were unjustly cancelled.

Mr. SHAW: Why should we validate the cancellation in any particular case? Why not leave these parties to the courts in the regular way? If they have any claim they can prove them in the courts of law.

Mr. MACLEAN (Halifax): Because they cannot get into the courts of law, unless this amendment be passed.

Mr. MEIGHEN: Oh yes.

Mr. SHAW: Why validate the cancellation?

Mr. MEIGHEN: The hon. member makes a statement that they cannot get into the courts without this amendment. They can go into the courts whether the bill is passed or not, but they must get a fiat, because the proceeding is against the Crown. The only thing that will shut them out of the courts is this bill. If we are going to shut out of the courts all the people who have had leases cancelled, then shut them out, but do not let in Hoppe and Isenberg, and then bang, bolt and bar the door.

[Mr. A. K. Maclean.]

The CHAIRMAN: Shall leave be given to withdraw the amendment?

Amendment withdrawn.

Section agreed to.

On Section 3—Certain coal mining rights and coal lands in Alberta not to be disposed of without special statutory authority.

Mr. STEWART (Argenteuil): I move that section 3 be struck out.

Mr. MEIGHEN: I object to the hon. minister's motion. If Parliament believes it is in the public interest, why should Parliament not say this area is not open for leasing? There is no reason why it should be open for leasing. There is no railway there. If you open this for leasing, it is merely a matter of speculation. The minister may say "I will not grant the lease". There is no reason why Parliament should not say that special area should be reserved; that the discretion of the department will be exerciseable over all the reserves, but that special area, which is one of very great potentiality and future value, particularly in relationship to our national railways, shall be left, and Parliament alone shall dispose of it. There is no reason in the world why that should not be done. The minister says that that may interefere with our settlement of the natural resources question with Manitoba. How in the world could it? In fact, it is the best way to be sure it will not interfere. If the minister grants the lease, the lease is given and the reserve is gone to the lessee, but if we shut the reserve up, then the reserve stays there in the position it is to-day and if it is transferred to the province, it goes with the rest of the property that is not leased. This makes certain that there will be no hindrance at all, as respects this land. I do not know why the hon. minister objects to it, unless he believes it is in the public interest to grant a lease of the property, and, really, I do not think he does. If it had ever been brought to my attention before the lease was granted, I am sure there would never have been one granted, and I took the first opportunity I could to cancel it, set the leases aside and forbid all leases of it.

Mr. STEWART (Argenteuil): My hon. friend's argument is that now, for the first time, we should change the well established policy of handling the natural resources of Canada, because forsooth trouble has arisen in reference to a lease

which has been set aside by an Order in Council. I can thoroughly agree with him. So far as I am concerned, I will abide by the terms of the Order in Council. There is no good reason why leases should be granted upon this particular area, but I do not know why at this particular stage, after 35 or 40 years of dealing with the natural resources through the Department of the Interior, subject to Order in Council, it becomes necessary that any particular tract of land which is part of the natural resources of the province of Alberta, and in regard to which negotiations are proceeding between the provincial government and the government of Canada for the return of those resources, should be placed absolutely under the control of the Parliament of Canada, and not where these leases have always been, not only coal mining leases, but other leases, of timber and grazing lands. You might as well say we ought to set aside our various reserves by act of Parliament, because perhaps they will be a matter—

Mr. MEIGHEN: They are set aside.

Mr. STEWART (Argenteuil): That may be your opinion, but it is not mine, and I do not know why, at this particular time, if I may be permitted to say so, the Senate should take action upon a bill of this kind, with which this particular amendment has no more connection than the sun and the moon have, one to the other. That is my objection to the action at this time, and that is why I am asking that this section be stricken out of the bill.

Mr. MEIGHEN: As far as the connection is concerned, I am disposed to agree with the minister. The only connection is this—and doubtless this is why the amendment is here—the one conspicious cancellation is the Hoppe and Isenberg cancellation. The Senate, of course, were aware of that, because it was a Senate committee that made inquiries into the matter, and, consequently, when this subject came up, many of the senators, who had been made aware of the immense value of this area, thought it should not be included in the general area that was subject to disposition by the departmental officials, but should be specially kept out, and simply returned as the property of the Crown. The minister is wholly wrong in thinking that he will be, in the least, hampered in connection with the natural resources and their transfer to the province by this, because only Parliament can transfer one acre of this land to the province of Alberta. If the minister comes to an agreement with the government of Alberta, and wants to put it into effect, he has to come to this Parliament, and consequently the statutes of this Parliament will operate over the Hoppe lease and over every other lease in the district. It would be just as free as if this were at his disposition for leasing. I am sure the Senate did not put this section in because of any distrust of the Minister of the Interior. The only reason it was done, and quite evidently, was because the matter was brought to their attention by a bill that related to the very subject. The Senate apparently is convinced that no matter what minister comes in—and another minister may be in next week, one never knows,—no chances should be taken of the alienation of this tract. And unless the minister feels that this is a tract that really should be subject to the ordinary regulations he should not ask to have this section struck out. If he does think that it is a tract that should be subject to the ordinary regulations as to lease, then of course he is right in moving his amendment. But I do not think he is of that opinion. In fact, he says he is not. Well, if it is land that should not be alienated at all, as any one who looks at the map will admit, then there is no possible exception to be taken to the section, because it protects the property, no matter who may be Minister of the Interior or what government may be in power.

Mr. STEWART (Argenteuil): It is all very well for the leader of the Opposition (Mr. Meighen) to say he has entire confidence in the Minister of the Interior, but this lease has been a matter of controversy, I believe there was an investigation into the question in the Senate in 1919, and no suggestion was made by the Senate at that time to take the property from the control of the Department or from the Government. My hon. friend cancelled the lease. He passed an Order in Council by which the property was set aside and taken from the control of the Department of the Interior, and that Order in Council has continued until to-day. I heartily agree with him as to the advisability of preserving this particular area, but I cannot understand why it should become necessary at this time for the Senate or the Parliament of Canada to change entirely the policy that has been followed with respect to any portion of the natural resources of

Alberta, or indeed of any other part of the Dominion. If it is necessary, why should not the Parliament of Canada take the same action with respect to all the resources in the Northwest territory that are very far removed from any means of transportation? You might as well take the Norman oil lands, and the whole subject that is involved in the prospect of oil discovery in the Northwest, and place them under the control of Parliament. If that is the proper thing to do I have no particular objection. But I do say that it is strange at this time, upon this occasion, that this particular area that is now involved in the transfer of natural resources to the province of Albera, should be taken from the control of the department. This matter is not settled by any means, and I want to serve notice on this committee that so far as I am personally concerned I intend to resist this thing to the limit.

Mr. MEIGHEN: Resist what?

Mr. STEWART (Argenteuil): Resist the incorporation of this particular section in this bill.

Mr. MEIGHEN: I thought the minister meant that he would resist the alienation of the land.

Mr. STEWART (Argenteuil): So far as I am concerned, I do not think that there should be any leases granted on this land until railway facilities are within the vicinity.

Mr. MEIGHEN: The minister's mind has somehow got into the wrong groove.

Mr. STEWART (Argenteuil): The minister's mind has not.

Mr. MEIGHEN: Yes; my hon. friend is proceeding on the assumption that this is something exceptional.

Mr. STEWART (Argenteuil): Will my hon. friend say it is not exceptional?

Mr. MEIGHEN: Yes; I was going to show why.

Mr. STEWART (Argenteuil): Will my hon. friend show me any other instances in which the same thing has been done in connection with natural resources?

Mr. MEIGHEN: I can.

Mr. STEWART (Argenteuil): Well, do so.

Mr. MEIGHEN: The minister himself has given one instance, that of forest areas. The minister is prevented by statute from leasing forest areas as he can ordinary lands. The statute provides that they must be dealt with only in a certain way; but they cannot be alienated.

Mr. STEWART (Argenteuil): By permanent lease.

Mr. MEIGHEN: They cannot be alienated at all; that is forbidden. Now here is an area of land which, in the judgment of the Senate—and I think it is also in the judgment of this House—should not be alienated because it has potentialities in respect of coal. Why, then, should it not be set aside and protected against the ordinary regulations, even though the minister himself now in office can be trusted not to alienate it? I might refer also to our game preserves and many other things. If it were the opinion of this House that those northern areas which are supposed to have some oil in them should not now be opened to lease, then it would be right for this House to close the gate and say, "We will not leave it to the departmental officials or to regulations at all to shut off that area". I do not think that would be wise. It is better, I think, to lease those lands to see if we cannot develop oil there. But it is not better that we should lease this particular coal area. If I were of the opinion that the area around the Norman oil well was such that it should not be developed for oil purposes, I would support a bill to prevent that. I am not so convinced, however. But the minister is convinced, I am convinced, we are all convinced that this particular area should not be leased or made subject to the ordinary regulations. Why not say so, then? It is no reflection whatever on the minister so to declare.

Mr. SHAW: I think that probably the minister is construing the action of the Senate, as a reflection on himself, but I see no reason why he should do so. It does occur to me that this anthracite coal field, of a very extensive area, is not only of great actual value but is of great potential value and should therefore be preserved, and preserved in this particular way. It is because the Senate realized the potential if not the actual value of these coal lands that this particular section has been incorporated in the act, and I think the Senate is to be commended for its action. The minister, I think, is misconstruing the intention of the Senate in that regard. I agree with the leader of the Oppositioin (Mr. Meighen) that the mere fact that this section is incorporated

in the legislation will not in the least militate against the transfer of the natural resources to the province of Alberta. It will be necessary, in transferring those resources, for this Parliament to pass an act, and all that you would have to do would be to include in that act a clause providing for the revocation of this section, if you like, or include these lands specifically in the transfer. I heartily support section 3.

The CHAIRMAN: The minister of the Interior moves to strike out section 3. Is it the pleasure of the committee to adopt the motion?

Some hon. MEMBERS: No.

The committee divided on the question: Yeas 46, Nays 46.

The CHAIRMAN: There being a tie I vote in favour of the amendment, which I declare carried.

Amendment agreed to.

On Section 5—Rights saved.

Mr. McMASTER: I beg to move the following amendment to Clause 5:

That the clause as it appears in the bill be stricken out and the following be substituted therefor:

This act shall not affect any rights under any judgment rendered before the date of the passing of this act or claim in any action, suit or petition of right or other proceeding instituted or presented before the 1st day of July, 1922.

Mr. STEWART (Argenteuil): Our original bill stopped at Clause 2, but I have no particular objection to Clause 5 as drafted here.

Mr. McKENZIE: I submit, Mr. Chairman, that this amendment involves very nice principles of law as to the general effect of the bill, and I do not think it should be accepted on the spur of the moment.

Mr. MEIGHEN: The real effect of the amendment is simply to say that this shall not apply to the Hoppe-Isenberg lease.

Mr. McMASTER: Or any other.

Mr. MEIGHEN: There is no other, as the hon. member knows.

Mr. McMASTER: As a matter of fact the hon. member does not know whether there are half a dozen.

Mr. MEIGHEN: I mean he is pretty sure of it. There is only one piece of litigation, and that doubtless has been commenced since or about the time of the introduction of the bill. The amendment simply excepts that litigation. Really I cannot see any basis for such exception. If you say to Isenberg and Hoppe: "Although you have had four years since the cancellation and only enter your action now in order to be relieved against the cancellation, your case shall be considered"; how can you say to their brother over here, who has had only thirteen months to enter action: "Your case shall not be considered; we will not give you even fourteen months"? It is unfair to act like that. I respect the appeal of the American government, but if that appeal is sound we should not pass the bill at all. Isenberg and Hoppe have not one particle more right than the poorest skeleton coal or oil operator in western Canada. If there has been informality in their cancellations, they should have just as much right as any one to plead that informality. I think there is justification from the public standpoint for the department to validate informalities if they are informalities of the most technical character; but I do not think it is right to go beyond that. I understand that that is the only class of informalities to be validated. If that is so, then let us validate the whole of them and not make fish of one and flesh of the other; particularly, do not open the door to these big men and shut it to other men whose rights are just as great but whose influence is very much less.

Sir LOMER GOUIN: The amendment added to the bill by the Senate is general. It reads:

This act shall not affect any rights under any judgment rendered before the date of the passing of this act, or under any action, suit or other proceeding instituted before the first day of May, 1922.

This applies to all parties interested. Now it is proposed that Clause 5 shall be amended so as to read:

This act shall not affect any rights under any judgment rendered before the date of the passing of this act or claim in any action, suit or petition of right or other proceeding instituted or presented before the 1st day of July, 1922.

I do not see any objection to that. Those who have cases now pending, or who may be desirous of instituting an action or asking for a petition of right up to the 1st July may do so. This amendment is general. It does not give any particular right to the gentleman mentioned by the right hon. leader of the Opposition, and from what I know of the record I am not at all sure that even if they have a petition of right now pending there is much chance of their obtaining judgment in their favour.

Mr. MEIGHEN: What the minister says is in theory quite right, the amendment in its language is general; but the effect is very particular. I do not see any justification for fixing the 1st May or any other date. Why should those who have entered action by the 1st May be specially favoured?

Sir LOMER GOUIN: This is to cover any pending cases up to the 1st July.

Mr. STEWART (Argenteuil): The original bill ended with Section 2; Sections 3, 4 and 5 were added by the Senate. We did not contemplate anything beyond Section 2.

Mr. MEIGHEN: I think in that respect the original bill was right. I do not agree with the Senate amendment. But in actual application the Senate amendment does not favour anybody, because there was no litigation; in actual application my hon. friend's amendment does favour somebody, because there is litigation; consequently the actual effect of my hon. friend's amendment is really serious and creates a discrimnation. I do not believe in saving those who happen to have entered action by the first of May. Why, their cases may be seven years old; the only case in question, now, indeed, is four years old. Another man's case may be only a few months old; why should you shut him out? He has the right to ask for just as much time as the other fellow has. When the Crown is dealing with its contractors it must treat all alike; when Parliament is dealing with its contractors it must treat all the same. When Parliament is making legislation affecting the civil rights of individuals, then it excepts pending legislation between them; that is quite proper. But when Parliament is dealing not with rights as between individuals but with rights as between itself, the country, and citizens, why it must treat all precisely the same; and a man's right is not one whit better because it is entered in court. To say that a man who, before he knew anything about this litigation, had the good luck to have entered his case shall have any stronger position than the man who, though his case may be only one-quarter the length—may be a very young case—did not enter it, is discrimination of the most indefensible kind.

Mr. McMASTER: The right hon. leader of the Opposition the other day declared himself a convert to some remarks I made about the wheat board.

[Sir Lomer Gouin.]

Mr. MEIGHEN: I was converted before the hon. gentleman made them.

Mr. McMASTER: I simply repeat the right hon. gentleman's own words; I would not have attempted to make such a statement without those words to rely upon. Now, there is a great deal in what he says with which I am in entire agreement. I am going to suggest to the minister that if he protected the rights of any people who took action within two months, that would put every one on an equality and, I think, render the legislation quite unobjectionable.

Mr. BAXTER: If the Minister of Justice will look at section 2 he will see that the condition of entering any action or proceeding is that it must have been instituted within one year from the date of giving the notice of cancellation. I really cannot tell whether the provisions of section 5 as drafted by the Senate or the amendment of the hon. member for Brome (Mr. McMaster) are intended to dispense with that condition. I suggest that there would be no difficulty in changing section 5 so as to read "the first day of July" if my hon. friend wants that done, and adding to it: "subject to the provisions of section 2 of this act." In that event only those people could come in who had instituted their proceedings within a year from the cancellation, and everybody would be on the same plane.

Sir LOMER GOUIN: If you do not want to affect a pending case I do not think the amendment would be fair. Suppose a case had been pending for five years or for two years? There was no prescription before.

Mr. BAXTER. But section 2 is drawn in such a way as to prevent the bringing of any action,

Sir LOMER GOUIN: In section 5 an exception is made of pending cases.

Mr. BAXTER: Well, why not simply protect the rights of people who commence an action or proceeding within one year from the cancellation of notice?

Sir LOMER GOUIN: There was no proscription before; any interested party had the right to take action three or four or five years after. I think my hon. friend (Mr. McMaster) should strike out the words "or other proceeding" in his amendment. What does he mean by "other proceeding"?

Mr. McMASTER: Other legal proceeding.

Sir LOMER GOUIN: The amendment says "other proceeding." A letter might be a proceeding.

Mr. McMASTER: I did not intend the word "proceeding" to have that broad interpretation; I simply meant legal proceeding.

Sir LOMER GOUIN: The words "action, suit, or petition of right" appear in the amendment. Why not strike out the words "or other proceeding."

Mr. McMASTER: I am willing to do that.

Mr. MEIGHEN: I do not think it is material to strike these words out unless we intend to pass the amendment; and the hon. member suggested a change in it. His argument is good, but I think he frankly yields my point. But if he is making provision for two months he should make it six, because the holders of these leases could never get notice and have their actions entered within two months. They live in various parts of the world and they would not likely hear of it for a long time. But my own suggestion is: if you are validating these leases, validate the whole of them; cut the whole clause out.

Sir LOMER GOUIN: The House is perfectly free to reject the amendment, but I do not think we should accept the suggestion that we grant two months more within which new cases may be brought against the Government.

The CHAIRMAN: Mr. McMaster asks for leave to strike out of the amendment the words "or other proceeding." Shall the amendment carry?

Mr. BUREAU: Read it.

The CHAIRMAN: Moved by Mr. McMaster that section 5 be amended to read as follows:

This act shall not affect any rights under any judgment rendered before the date of the passing of this act or claimed in any action, suit or petition of right instituted or presented before the first day of July, 1922.

Amendment (Mr. McMaster) agreed to on division: yeas, 85; nays, 45.

Section 5, as amended, agreed to on division.

Bill reported, read the third time and passed.

SOLDIERS' SETTLEMENT ACT AMENDMENT

On the motion of Hon. Charles Stewart (Minister of the Interior) Bill No. 193, to amend the Soldiers' Settlement Act, 1919, was read the second time, and the House went into committee thereon.—Mr. Marcil in the Chair.

On section 1—To consolidate indebtedness of settlers who have not abandoned the land or terminated agreement:

Mr. ARTHURS: Will the minister kindly explain?

Mr. STEWART (Argenteuil): This is to enable the Board to grant relief to settlers already on the land by changing the terms of the repayment of their loans so that every settler will have twenty-five years within which to pay the indebtedness incurred by him prior to the 1st of April, 1922. This period will be reckoned from the date of consolidation to be fixed by the board.

Section agreed to.

On the preamble:

Mr. ARTHURS: Before the bill passes, I should like to move to add a section. There has been a great deal of dissatisfaction in the ranks of all the returned soldiers so far as their re-establishment is concerned. It is claimed that returned soldiers who have settled under this land settlement scheme have been given a certain advantage over those soldiers who are anxious to establish themselves in other ways: in other words, who desire that grants should be made for housing purposes along exactly the same lines followed in the land settlement scheme. Our sister colony of New Zealand has an act for the purpose of settling the soldiers upon the land or in any position in New Zealand, and their scheme is almost exactly on the same lines as the land settlement scheme now before Parliament. It provides three options in the repayment of loans; first, the whole principal on demand at an annual interest of five per cent; secondly, payment on an amortization plan covering a term of twenty-five and a half years, with 7 per cent interest; thirdly, payments or an amortization plan which allows the payments to be extended over a period of thirty-five and a half years. All these plans have been included not only in a land settlement scheme comparable with the one now before the House, but in their scheme for those who wish to establish themselves in the urban parts of New Zealand. There can be no doubt that we cannot consider any returned soldier as being re-established until he has some interest in the country,

until he has a home for himself. I therefore move that a new clause be added to the bill to be known as clause 7, as follows:

That loans upon the terms of previous sections be made for the purpose of building or purchasing houses for returned soldiers.

The CHAIRMAN (Mr. Marcil, Bonaventure): The resolution constitutes a new charge upon the revenue which, according to section 54 of the British North America Act is out of order. That section says:

It shall not be lawful for the House of Commons to adopt or pass any Vote, Resolution, Address, or Bill for the Appropriation of any Part of the Public Revenue, or of any Tax or Impost, to any Purpose that has not been first recommended to that House by Message of the Governor General. In the Session in which such Vote, Resolution, Address, or Bill is proposed.

Bill reported, read the third time and passed.

SPECIAL LOANS

On motion of Hon. W. S. FIELDING (Minister of Finance) the House went into committee on the following proposed resolution, Mr. Marcil (Bonaventure) in the Chair.

Resolved, That it is expedient to bring in a measure to authorize the raising, by way of loan, of certain sums of money for the public service, and to provide:—

1. That the Governor in Council may, in addition to the sums now remaining unborrowed and negotiable of the loans authorized by Parliament by any Act heretofore passed, raise by way of loan, under the provisions of the Consolidated Revenue and Audit Act, by the issue and sale or pledge of securities of Canada, in such form, for such separate sums at such rate of interest and upon such other terms and conditions as the Governor in Council may approve, such sum or sums of money as may be required, but not to exceed in the whole the sum of three hundred and fifty million dollars for paying maturing loans and obligations of Canada.

2. That the principal raised by way of loan under the proposed Act and the interest thereon shall be charged upon and payable out of the Consolidated Revenue Fund.

Mr. FIELDING: The purpose of this resolution is to authorize the issue of new loans to meet obligations arising during the coming year, or in the early future. We have treasury bills outstanding of $143,000,000; we have a loan maturing on 1st of December of the current year of $182,000,000. These two sums make, for the current year, $325,000,000. Against that we have already raised in New York a loan of $100,000,000, so our needs in that respect will be $225,000,000. But we take authority also to provide for a loan, maturing November 1, 1923, of $172,000,000, and a loan maturing November 1, 1924, of $108,000,000, the two making $280,000,000. This added to the previous sum gives a total of $350,000,000. As these amounts will cover only existing liabilities I do not imagine there is any occasion for further explanation.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: I suppose the proceeds are ear marked?

Mr. FIELDING: They will go into the common pot.

Resolution reported, read the second time and concurred in. Mr. Fielding thereupon moved to introduce Bill No. 197, to authorize the raising by way of loans of certain sums of money for the public service.

Motion agreed to and bill read the first and second times, and the House went into committee thereon, Mr. Marcil (Bonaventure) in the chair.

On section 1—Loan authorized.

Mr. FIELDING: The bill is in exactly the words of the resolution which has just been adopted.

Section agreed to.

Bill reported, read the third time and passed.

WAYS AND MEANS

CUSTOMS ACT AMENDMENT

The House proceeded to consider certain resolutions reported from the Committee of Ways and Means, resolutions reported, read a second time and concurred in.

Hon. Mr. FIELDING moved for leave to introduce Bill No. 198, to amend the Customs Act, 1907.

Motion agreed to and the bill was read the first and second times and the House went into committee thereon, Mr. Marcil (Bonaventure) in the chair.

On section 1—Governor in Council may order imported goods to be marked, stamped, branded or labelled.

Mr. FIELDING: This is a bill founded on the resolution which has been already agreed to.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: I suppose it is exactly the same as the resolution.

Mr. FIELDING: I think in this case it is exactly the same. In one of the other bills, I am not sure whether the definition

here and there may be slightly different. Substantially, in each case, the officials have made a transcript of the bill.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: We will have to rely on my hon. friend's statement. I have no doubt it is absolutely correct.

Mr. FIELDING: I can give that assurance. I do not wish to press the bills tonight. They might stand over.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: I am quite willing to take the hon. minister's word for it.

Section agreed to. Bill reported, read the third time and passed.

INLAND REVENUE ACT AMENDMENT

Hon. Mr. FIELDING moved for leave to introduce Bill No. 199, to amend the Inland Revenue Act.

Motion agreed to, bill read the first and second times and the House went into committee thereon.

On section 1—Excise duty changed—

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: I presume the bill is in substance exactly the same as the resolution.

Mr. FIELDING: Yes, in substance it is exactly the same. There may be a few slight differences in matters of formality but in substance the bill is a transcript of the resolution.

Section agreed to.

Bill reported, read the third time and passed.

SPECIAL WAR REVENUE ACT, 1915, AMENDMENT

On motion of Hon. W. S. FIELDING (Minister of Finance) Bill No. 200 to amend the Special War Revenue Act, 1915, was read the first and second times and the House went into committee thereon, Mr. Gordon in the Chair.

On section 1—Purely mutual insurance companies subject to tax:

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: This, I take it, is in the same position as the other bill.

Mr. FIELDING: Yes, I give my hon. friend the same assurance.

Section agreed to.

Bill reported, read the third time and passed.

CUSTOMS ACT

On motion on Hon. W. S. FIELDING (Minister of Finance) Bill No. 201 to amend the Customs Act and the Department of Customs and Excise Act, was read the first and second times and the House went into committee thereon, Mr. Gordon in the Chair.

On section 1—Consular certificates, valuation for duty, and of currency:

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: Does the minister give the same assurance in regard to this bill as in the case of the others?

Mr. FIELDING: Yes.

Section agreed to.

Bill reported, read the third time and passed.

CANADIAN PATRIOTIC FUND

On motion of Hon. W. S. Fielding (Minister of Finance) Bill No. 188 respecting the Canadian Patriotic Fund was read the second time, and the House went into committee thereon, Mr. Gordon in the Chair.

Mr. FIELDING: Mr. Chairman, the purpose of this bill was explained on the first reading, indeed, the words of the resolution very fully explained it. I mentioned at the time of the introduction of the bill that I would find it necessary to suggest an amendment as respects the province of Manitoba. It appears the Canadian Patriotic Fund has not been operating there, but that similar work has been carried on by other organizations, notably, I think, by the Red Cross. I propose therefore, if the committee will agree, to add to the bill a second subsection as follows:

> In the case of the province of Manitoba, in which province the Canadian Patriotic Fund is not operating, the corporation may make arrangements with any association or organization established therein for purposes similar to those of the corporation for the carrying on of such relief work in the said province and may out of funds provided by this act pay to such association or organization such sum or sums as may be mutually agreed upon between the corporation and such association or organization.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: I take it that the distribution of the fund will be left entirely to the management of the Patriotic Fund?

Mr. FIELDING: Yes.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: That, as before, they are agents of the Government,

the matter being left to their own discretion as it has been very satisfactorily left in the past?

Mr. FIELDING: Yes. I do not know that I would call the Patriotic Fund agents of the Government. However, they are the recognized agents of the people of Canada, and we make no change whatever. We assume they will be capable and will apply this money in the same manner as they have done in the past. The constitution of the Fund is established by act of Parliament, and its expenditure is subject to audit by the Government of Canada. In these respects there is no change.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: When I used the term "agents" I meant agents only for the purpose of disbursing the money.

Mr. FIELDING: Yes, not technically.

Mr. PUTNAM: In Manitoba I suppose they will deal only with the provincial branch of the Red Cross?

Mr. FIELDING: Whatever organization is found performing similar service in Manitoba might be chosen by the Patriotic Fund. It is left pretty largely to their judgment.

On section 1—In case of need Governor in Council may pay sums not exceeding $900,000 to Corporation.

Mr. LOGAN: The Canadian Patriotic Fund is a great institution. It did remarkably fine work during the war for which the country owes it a great debt of gratutide. But, Mr. Chairman, the Canadian Patriotic Fund in the majority of places has been absolutely demobilized. It was not intended to be a peace organization. But although this is a splendid institution and did extremely good work during the war, at the present time I doubt very much whether it is wise to give it all this money. I find a bill introduced by the Minister of Soldiers' Civil Re-establishment in connection with the Canadian Red Cross Society empowering it to do the very work that is intended to be done by the Patriotic Fund. Then why select the Canadian Patriotic Fund, which is operating only in the larger places. In many small towns and villages you will not find any Patriotic Fund society functioning to-day. Therefore I submit that some of this $900,000 might well be given to the Red Cross or some other institution such as the Knights of Columbus, who are taking a very keen interest in our peace problems. But if you want to do really good work for the unemployed—and I say this from the bottom of my heart—give a portion of this $900,000 to the Salvation Army. After all, this is the best institution to look after our unemployed, for those in charge of it know the needs and troubles of ordinary men probably better than any other institution in the world.

Mr. IRVINE: I am not entirely clear what this vote is for, but I understand it is intended for the Patriotic Fund, and I am wondering if the money is to be spent for the purpose of giving relief to unemployed returned soldiers who are not disabled. If that is the purpose, I have a few remarks to make. I understand that at the close of the war the Patriotic Fund had in hand some $7,000,000, and decided to look after the dependents of returned soldiers who had not been provided for by the statutory regulations. I am informed that this entails an annual liability of about half a million dollars, and that at the present moment the Fund has in hand over four and a half million dollars. If that be so, then it has sufficient money to keep going for about nine years. I may be wrong, but it seems to me there must be some intention of enlarging the scope of the activities of this organization and of asking it to administer relief to unemployed. If so, that relief could only go to returned soldiers, because the charter of this organization does not permit it to deal with anybody else. If, then, this relief is to go to returned soldiers only, what about all the other unemployed? So far as I am aware, there has been no provision made for unemployment generally; I do not think any solution of the unemployed problem has been made from the point of view of returned soldiers on the one hand and other classes on the other. If we are to deal with this question at all we should deal with it from the national point of view. If this legislation is to relieve unemployment I want to oppose it, first, because this organization lacks administrative facilities. It has a head office, with, I think branch offices in each province, and its administrative services would depend upon local voluntary committees. Now, local voluntary committees have not given satisfaction in the past. While, no doubt, their intentions were the very best, they were more or less unaccustomed to that kind of work and they performed it in the sense of giving charity. They sometimes ask—I was going to say impertinent questions about certain things belonging to

people in need of relief. They would condition the relief to be extended on the possession by these people of certain articles. They would ask, for instance, if the person whose case was being inquired into had a piano; and if he did they would say: "You do not need relief if you have a piano." That sort of thing gave a good deal of dissatisfaction among the returned soldiers largely through the charitable nature of the administration of the work of this organization. I therefore say that satisfactory results would not be produced if relief to returned soldiers were administered under this organization. Further, we should not distinguish between returned soldiers and other unemployed persons excepting only the cases of returned soldiers suffering from a disability. Every able-bodied returned man should be placed on the same basis as any other workingman; if he is not, a great deal of dissatisfaction and suspicion between one workingman and another will be created. If one workingman is receiving relief where another is not, there will be trouble. It might be possible under that arrangement to give relief to returned men who had no dependents at all while a married civilian with a large family and in need of relief would not get any assistance. If this money is to be paid out by the patriotic fund organization for unemployment relief, its scope should be extended to meet all cases of unemployment. I must always say "if", because I am not certain of this. If it is not to be expended in relieving unemployment, I hope I will be corrected.

Mr. BELAND: None of this money will be used to relieve unemployment.

Mr. IRVINE: May I ask, then, what it will be used for?

Mr. BELAND: To relieve sick soldiers and their dependents.

Mr. IRVINE: Am I correct in saying that they have already $4,000,000 in the treasury?

Mr. BELAND: $4,500,000.

Mr. IRVINE: Then I cannot see the necessity for this legislation, especially if they are expending only $500,000 annually. That is why I made the remarks I did; I could not see the necessity of this provision unless it was intended to carry on relief work. If I am assured that no relief work is intended, then I do not need to prolong my remarks. Otherwise I would have had something more to say on the matter.

Mr. BELAND: It is a fact that the Patriotic Fund has $4,500,000 left. The activities of the Patriotic Fund have been confined to the returned men; none of their money is being used to relieve unemployment. The main purpose of their expenditure is in relieving the families of sick soldiers—the sick soldiers themselves and their dependents. My hon. friend seems to think that if the patriotic fund has $4,500,000 left it should ask for no more money. The association is really not asking for further money, but the executive council of the association have come to the conclusion that they cannot under present conditions extend to what they call emergency cases the assistance which they have heretofore extended. In his very clear statement the other day the Minister of Finance (Mr. Fielding) referred to the classes of persons which are the subject of the association's activities. First, there are the continuous cases, and then there are the emergency cases. The class of continuous cases they consider as having a first lien upon their funds. For the information of the committee I will give a concrete case. A returned soldier who had been in good health until a year ago lost both his legs through an accident, thus sustaining a disability in no way attributable to his war service. This man and his family were therefore placed in the most pitiful condition.

Mr. IRVINE: I am glad to know that attention has been given to returned soldiers; I concur in that. But would the returned soldier whose case the minister has cited be any worse off than the ordinary workingman who might meet with a similar accident? And if you are going to vote public money to look after the one, why not vote public money to look after the other?

Mr. BELAND: My hon. friend seems to take the position that we should not help anybody if we do not help all. But if the one class only should be helped, my hon. friend will be the first to admit that the returned man should first be attended to. That does not mean that the Government should not come to the relief of the other, but I say that the point made by my hon. friend, who has a logical mind generally, is not well taken. Let me explain further the activities of the Canadian Patriotic Fund. These continuous cases are considered as a first lien on the fund. The case of the man who lost both his legs is being relieved and will be until his death,

I might say, and his wife and dependent children will be looked after until they are in a position to provide for themselves? It is a continuing case, and there are a large number of cases of that kind throughout the country. The organization consider that they are obliged to support these cases to the end. Considering the funds that remain at their disposal, and after having had some actuarial work done, they have come to the conclusion that is impossible for them to discharge their obligations to this class of cases unless they give up the emergency cases.

What is an emergency case? It would be, for example, the case of a soldier who, in good health yesterday, is suddenly taken ill to-day with pneumonia and laid up, absolutely unable to provide for himself and family. The Patriotic Fund steps in and helps him provide for medical assistance and subsistence for himself and his wife and family until he has recovered and is in a position to resume his occupation. The Patriotic Fund has come to the conclusion that they are no longer able to attend to these emergency cases. They are not coming to the Government asking for money or assistance. They have simply laid the facts before the Government, and the Government has come to the conclusion that as the Patriotic Fund has the machinery to continue this emergency work, we should step in and provide the amount spent last year. My hon. friend may look upon the figure as being extraordinary, and indeed, $900,000 is a large amount of money, but I asked the officials of the association what amount they had spent during last year, and their answer was that they had spent on an average $80,000 a month on emergency cases. Then the question for the Government to decide was whether we should allow the care of these emergency cases to fall back upon public authorities, municipal, provincial or federal, or come to the assistance of the Fund and provide the money they have expended, and expended to the satisfaction, I believe, of everyone concerned. That is the situation.

Mr. LOGAN: Suppose an emergency case arises in a place where there is no Patriotic Fund.

Mr. BELAND: The idea is that the Government by providing the amount that was spent last year will enable them to carry on exactly the same work they were doing last year. It is possible that the Patriotic Fund may decide to extend their activities to places where they are not represented so far. They may be able to do that if the emergency cases diminish to a certain degree in the larger cities. I grant you that their activities have been largely confined to the larger cities and towns, but I know of cases in the smaller towns which have been relieved by the Patriotic Fund.

As to the discrimination between the returned soldier and the ordinary emergency case, the Patriotic Fund has nothing to do with the ordinary emergency case. The only cases that they consider are returned soldier cases. Are we going to step in and say to the Patriotic Fund: You should look after the unemployed and any emergency cases that arise among civilians. That would be contrary to their act of incorporation and against their regulations. Their activities are confined to the returned men, and that is why the money has been granted. Emergency cases outside of the returned soldier class is another matter entirely, and a matter for further consideration, and for the time being I am not in a position to elaborate any policy in that respect to my hon. friend.

Mr. MACDONALD (Pictou): The Patriotic Fund, if I recollect correctly, was formed for the purpose of dealing with cases of necessity that arose during the period of the war. The organization extended generally throughout the whole country, but when the war ended the organization entirely disappeared in many parts of the country. The ladies who had been interested in its operation ceased to take any part in carrying on the work because entirely new conditions had arisen. This is a very large sum of money, and I do think that the committee should have information before it as to the parts of Canada where the Patriotic Fund is still in operation. I think we are entitled to more information than the minister has given us before we are asked to vote approximately $1,000,000 to be distributed in various parts of the country. I know that in our part of the country the organization has disappeared. It may be that in other parts of Canada, particularly in the larger cities, certain well-disposed people have maintained the organization.

Closely allied with this question, is the larger question of the unemployed and the aid which this country may be called upon to give in that connection during the coming year. The case as put by the minister

appeals to my sympathy in a general way. The statement has been made that the Patriotic Fund has $4,500,000 in its possession. That is a very large amount, and if the benefits that flow from the expenditure of this money are confined to a few localities in the country, you will naturally have men and women in those parts of the country where the fund is not operating, and who might otherwise receive assistance from it, point to the fact that the Government is coming to the assistance of people in other localities, but not in theirs. We ought to know in what parts of Canada this organization is now operating, and we should be able to exercise our judgment after that information is obtained. I submit that the bill ought to remain in committee until we have the facts before us.

Mr. MANION: I should like to say a few words about this organization. I remember well when the Patriotic Fund was formed during the war. It may be of interest to the committee to explain that when the war ceased the Patriotic Fund, which had collected funds throughout this country, had in their possession about $7,000,000,000, and it was decided at that time that the organization should go on, utilizing the interest on that principal, and possibly a part of the principal, for purposes of relief in such cases as were not reached by the ordinary departments of the Government, such cases, for instance, as the minister cited a few moments ago. Sir Herbert Ames, who took a very prominent part in the work of the Patriotic Fund, was the one to organize this post-war relief organization which continued the work of the Patriotic Fund. The matter was gone into very thoroughly for some weeks—it was in the old Museum building I remember—and the returned soldiers many of whom were in the House at that time, were very pleased with the organization. Now if, as my hon. friend states, there are some sections of the country to-day that are not being served by this organization it is no doubt the fault of those particular districts themselves. For example just the other day I had a letter from a man who was a returned soldier and who was sick in one of the Toronto hospitals. His wife was also sick in a place near Regina—I have forgotten the exact locality but it was some little village not far from Regina. I took the matter up with the Patriotic Fund people here in Ottawa and they wrote out to their branch nearest the little town where the woman lived, and they provided her with help. I know this to be a fact because the woman's husband was in my office a few days ago and told me that the Patriotic Fund had given his wife a good deal of assistance. That is just one instance of the work being done. There are many cases of returned soldiers and their families who will come under an organization of this kind. Let me give a further illustration: A man who has been receiving a pension dies and his family become more or less destitute. If he has not died from war disability there is no provision made that I know of whereby that man's family is looked after, and there may be a period—it may be only a few months, perhaps it may be a few years—during which those people will require some help. My hon. friend from Calgary (Mr. Irvine) suggests that that should be done for everybody. I agree with that principle, but unfortunately the country cannot follow it at the present time. However, I believe that in the case of the men who served overseas and risked their lives for this country and the cause of liberty, if we can get the country to aid them and their dependents we should attempt to do it. The granting of assistance by the Government to the amount of $900,000 is rather a surprise to me; I did not know they had intended doing anything of the sort. I am speaking of the principle involved in a general way. I believe the principle is an excellent one, and that this organization should be carried on for the assistance of the returned soldiers and their dependents who do not happen to come under any fund in any branch of the Government at the present time. As a general rule I am very pleased to give whatever support I can to the minister on an occasion of this kind, and I am sure that my hon. friend from Pictou (Mr. Macdonald) and my hon. friend from Cumberland (Mr. Logan) will take the same view. If there are parts of the country that are not being served by this patriotic fund I think it can be taken for granted that, that service will be extended to them—I think I am correct in the statement—by establishing in those districts branches such as now exist in other parts of the country. In my own city at the present time practically the same organization exists which existed throughout the war. There may have been some slight change in the officers but the organization is still there carrying on its work. I know that on many occasions I have had the dependent of a soldier write

me and tell me of some pitiful case and I immediately referred it to this branch of the patriotic fund. I know, the organization has done a good piece of work in my own city, and I am sure it performs the same type of work in other parts of the country.

Mr. ROSS (Kingston): I would like to say a word or two about the work of the Patriotic Fund. Immediately after the war the organization which was being carried on temporarily, and without any expense to the public, was, to a certain extent, broken up. A central organization was formed which divided the country into districts, and you will find to-day that the organization is in touch with many parts of the country which we do not perhaps hear much about. There are representatives of the Patriotic Fund in different parts of Canada covering not one but two or three counties. They look after all these deserving cases, and I think that the minister will find there is a fairly good organization yet. Although they have not by any means the number of branches that existed during the war yet the central parts of the country are looked after by some central representative of this organization and every meritorious case is dealt with. Manitoba has its own organization, but the rest of the Dominion is looked after by the Patriotic Fund; and I am sure representatives of this fund will be found in Nova Scotia who look after large areas embracing two or three counties.

Mr. IRVINE: I am not entirely satisfied with the explanation the minister gave. I wish first of all to make it clear to the committee that I am certainly not opposed to doing the very best for the returned soldier in any way whatsoever. It is not that you are giving him more money than I want you to give, nor giving him better attention than I want him to receive—that is not my point of contention at all. If it comes down to this that we cannot help everybody and we should therefore help those that are most in need then I am willing to say that the returned soldier should receive the help. But that is not the point I have in mind. I want to show this: First, if there is going to be an emergency case, would not the Patriotic Fund consider the case of a man who had not had work, say for some months, who had no coal to put in the stove, and no food for his family, to be an emergency case? And if they help that man who is in that condition, because of unemployment, would it not be unemployment relief? There is my first point. The next is, that I claim that this organization—while it may have done very necessary work during the war—work which the government was slow in undertaking—although it has done that excellent work, I am prepared to say that the organization is not efficient. It does not hold the confidence of the returned soldiers themselves. It does not hold the confidence of the returned soldier, therefore its work will not be appreciated in a manner that will give the highest satisfaction. Moreover it is really not a national organization to-day. If you are going to spend this money for emergency cases—such as those explained by the minister, or for any other purpose in regard to returned men—then I would suggest that you allow the returned soldiers' organization to spend this money itself. It is a national organization. The G.W.V.A. are organized all over this country. They know the cases of their brother returned men better than any society people of this country, and I suggest that you spend this money—if you are going to vote it—through the G.W.V.A. organization of this country. One other point. I do not think that the returned soldiers of Canada want to get charity. I think if they are subject, as they are, to accident and to come under this emergency measure, so is every other citizen of this country; and if you assume the working conditions to be such that every man who has the misfortune to suffer an accident ought to be a subject for this particular relief, make it so that he will get that relief, and you will satisfy the returned soldiers. I claim in conclusion that they do not want anything that savours of charity handed out by a charity organization that does not have sufficient machinery to administer the funds that you are going to place at their command. Next, I say, if you are going to spend this money for the returned soldier, expend it through the returned soldiers' organization.

Mr. McBRIDE: I do not think the hon. member (Mr. Irvine) has ever taken a very active part in the Patriotic Fund, or helped people connected with that fund or he would not have talked as he has done. I may say that while I have not been very actively identified with its work, I did considerable collecting in one way and another when the war was on, and I wish to state that there was a class of people identified with this work animated by the very highest motives they were people whose loyalty

money would not purchase. They were working from a patriotic standpoint, they were men and women who were above reproach, and so far as I know the organization out West is still in existence. I am not going to take up the time of the House, it is not my custom to do so, but I wish to refer to a case that was brought to my attention some time ago. It was the case of a man who had served four years overseas. He was discharged and after he came back was working for about two and a half years, when he developed asthma. Under the present laws he could not get any assistance in the way of a pension. I took the matter up with the Pension Board in Ottawa, and with the Minister of Health (Dr. Beland), but did not succeed in getting any relief. That man cannot work and is at present in the hospital. Now the people in charge of the Patriotic Fund are looking after his wife and three children. They are visited regularly by representatives of the Patriotic Fund; they not only get assistance but they receive attention. Out in British Columbia people of the highest type are connected with the organization and they give their services without any hesitation to the cause of the returned soldier. It has been said by an hon. member that all classes of people should come in. I say that the returned soldier has a special claim on this country. He did a special work for the country overseas. I am not going to slight men that are out of work, but I know men here were earning $3 to $5 a day when returned soldiers were being paid $1 a day. Should these men who remained at home be placed on the same level as the man who risked his life for his country? I do not think so. I think the returned soldier should receive first consideration every time. The organization out west, as far as I know, is quite capable of taking charge of the funds, and giving the country a good service.

Mr. LOGAN: The hon. member represents one of the largest constituencies in Canada. How many Patriotic Fund societies are there in his constituency, at the present time, which are actually at work?

Mr. McBRIDE: One at Kamloops and there was one at Merritt.

Mr. LOGAN: There was one.

Mr. McBRIDE: Yes, a year ago there was still one at Merritt, and there was one at Prince George when I was there two years ago. I understand that it is still in existence; in fact, they were talking to me about it when I was up there, before coming to Ottawa.

Mr. LOGAN: I think the hon. member's answer is a fairly good argument against granting $900,000 to one institution. The Patriotic Fund societies in his large constituency seem to have ceased to function. My criticism is that this institution has become, to a certain extent, defunct in a large part of Canada, particularly in the small villages, small towns and country places. I am not objecting to the amount of $900,000, because there is no doubt that sum is required, but I say that we should not vote the whole $900,000 to one institution which is strong in the large cities, but in the towns, villages and country places has become a thing of the past. We have in those places Red Cross Societies doing splendid work, being reorganized again to-day just as strong as ever—organized for peace as well as they were for war. Why vote all this money to one institution and ignore all other institutions which can better carry out the purpose for which this bill is introduced?

Mr. BLACK (Yukon): If there is one item which should pass, it seems to me it is this small vote of $900,000 to the Patriotic Fund. To say that that fund does not reach all parts of Canada is not correct. Speaking for a constituency about in the same latitude as that which the hon. member from Cariboo (Mr. McBride) represents, I may say I have the honour to be one of the original directors of the Canadian Patriotic Fund. The constituency of the Yukon subscribed sufficient to take care of all the cases there, and they sent thousands of dollars to the fund at Ottawa. It reaches the class of people and cases which none of the government institutions could reach, and it is meant to take care of soldiers' families who need help, in addition to the separation allowance and the soldiers' pay. I say that that institution in the various constituencies of Canada to-day does a work which no other institution can. It includes all sects. People who belong to various institutions, such as have been mentioned to-night, are all represented in that fund. There is no branch of that fund existing in this or that small town. The matter of organizing one and getting the benefit of $900,000 and additional funds

which may be subscribed in the various localities is a mere matter of detail, and can be arranged. I submit the motion should go through, and, if anything can be added to it, all right.

Mr. KNOX: I wish to say that I had a case a year ago where a returned soldier had died of "flu," and left a widow with a number of small children unprovided for. There was no possibility of getting a pension for them, and I took the matter up with the headquarters of the Patriotic Fund in Ottawa, and by referring the case back to some people in the city of Prince Albert, who knew the circumstances, I secured a pension for her, of, I think, $75 a month. I point this out as an instance of the good that may be done by a vote of this kind, and I give it my support.

Mr. LOGAN: Was it a pension from the Patriotic Fund?

Mr. KNOX: Yes.

Mr. BROWN: I am not sure that the objection taken by the hon. gentleman from Cumberland (Mr. Logan) is altogether well founded, but these institutions are not locally organized to the extent that they were during the war. It is hardly to be expected that that fervor should continue, and that these organizations should exist in such large numbers as they did, but the fact that this organization is in existence, even in the larger cities, I think, warrants the belief that it is prepared to carry out the work that is entrusted to it. What seems to me most necessary is that the people through the country should be well informed in regard to the privilege and the opportunity they may have of having distress relieved, and, if the members of this House would make it a point to fully inform their constituents of the privileges that are available to them, it seems to me there is no reason why this fund, as already organized, should not meet the needs which it was specially intended to meet.

Mr. SHAW: Might I ask the minister if the Canadian Patriotic Fund will be called upon to account to this Government for the funds received and the disposition thereof, and if not, if the minister has considered the advisability of having this fund disbursed by the Department of Soldiers' Civil Re-establishment?

Mr. BELAND: Yes, I think I may answer my hon. friend that the Patriotic Fund sends the Government a synopsis and a report of its work. This association is in a position to carry on this work more economically than any Government agency. That will be admitted. The second point is that on every important committee of the Patriotic Fund the G.W.V.A. is represented. If this money were to be given to the G.W.V.A., or if we had proposed this evening to appropriate $900,000 to the G.W.V.A., my hon. friend from West Calgary (Mr. Shaw) would have asked: "what about the Grand Army of United Veterans, and what about the Army and Navy Veterans? You are discriminating."

Mr. IRVINE: Does not the hon. gentleman think it would be an excellent way to unite them all?

Mr. BELAND: It would be mighty difficult.

Mr. LEWIS: In regard to this $4,500,000, is it at the present time let uot as a loan, or is it bearing interest?

Mr. BELAND: Oh yes, it is bearing interest. I do not know at what rate.

Mr. LEWIS: It would mean $225,000 interest. Are they utilizing this interest at the same time? I want to say as far as the value of the work is concerned, the Red Cross is practically doing the work you speak of as being done by the Patriotic Fund Association. For that reason it seems to me that the Red Cross is also deserving of help from this Government, and if it would be possible to give $200,000 to the Red Cross, it would be a good disposition of the money because that is the institution that is reaching the men in the villages and rural places. I believe the larger institution is naturally working in the more congested places in the cities. In the rural places, and also in the small villages, there is still work to be done which falls on the Red Cross Society.

Bill reported, read the third time and passed.

THE INCOME WAR TAX ACT, 1917, AMENDMENT

On motion of Hon. W. S. FIELDING (Minister of Finance) Bill No. 187 to amend the Income War Tax Act, 1917, was read the second time and the House went into committee thereon, Mr. Gordon in the Chair.

On section 1—Exemption in respect of children.

Mr. FIELDING: As I have already explained, it is not the purpose of the Government to undertake a general revision of, or make extensive changes in, the Income War Tax Act. I have no doubt that in a matter of such importance many hon. members may have in mind changes they would like to suggest. For myself, I have always felt that the forms of return and so forth were rather cumbersome, but it may be that in the light of experience these difficulties will be found unavoidable. However, that may be, I did not attempt to deal exhaustively with that question. There are three or four outstanding points, however, that are dealt with that are not likely to be the cause of any difference in the House.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: My hon. friend, I think, has covered some of the cases I drew to his attention in the budget debate. If I read the bill properly I think he has covered the case of widowers and widows with dependents, as well as others having indigent and ill relations depending on them.

Mr. FIELDING: It is broadened a little in that respect.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: Yes; and the case of commercial travellers and others in a similar position is also dealt with.

Mr. FIELDING: Yes.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: It appears, however, that the scolding that we got in regard to the form of returns has been groundless. The minister will find it pretty hard to improve upon what he has already got.

Mr. FIELDING: I have not attempted to do so, and my hon. friend may be quite right. We look at the matter from a different point of view; but if it is found possible to make improvements that will be done. I know there is a widespread opinion that the present system of making up returns is cumbersome and irritating, but it may be that we cannot help it. I hope, however, before another session comes that we may be able to investigate the matter, and if we cannot do better I shall have to acknowledge that I was mistaken.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: I, too, hope that my hon. friend will be able to do better, because we are getting more experience every day. But I did not think that he would be able to do it in six months. Now, I wonder whether the minister has been thinking of the necessity for amending the bill having regard to cases where the income, which would otherwise be liable to taxation, is held by incorporated companies—that is to say, companies incorporated for the purpose of receiving and holding income on which the taxpayer would otherwise have to pay a tax. This is a matter I have always had before me in the past. Looking at the returns I was not in a position to say that any ratepayer was incorporating companies for the purpose of defrauding the revenue, but it is an evil that has to be watched for. Has the minister considered the advisability of amending the act to meet the case? In other words, does he find that ratepayers are taking advantage of the incorporation of companies for the purpose of avoiding taxation?

Mr. FIELDING: I think there have been some cases, and my hon. friend is right; the matter needs to be carefully watched and looked into. We are not able to deal with it in this bill.

Section agreed to.

On section 2—Travelling expenses:

An hon. MEMBER: Does this apply to railway men?

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: It is intended to cover trainmen and commercial travellers.

Mr. FIELDING: Yes, that is the intention.

Mr. McBRIDE: Does this exemption apply to railwaymen, engineers, conductors, etc.? These men are put to a lot of extra expense when they are away from home, and they should be allowed a reduction of at least $300 a year.

Mr. GRAHAM: It applies to them.

Mr. FIELDING: It is intended to cover trainmen.

Section agreed to.

On section 4—Normal tax on person not resident in Canada and not a British subject:

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: What is the object of the reservation as to proclamation?

On section 5—Banks not now entitled to former deductions:

Mr. FIELDING: This relates to a provision which to our regret was inserted in the American law by which Canadians on our border line are placed at a disadvantage. We want to think it was a

mistake, but a resolution having been already adopted in the House to say that we shall have a similar provision in our law, we are giving effect to it by this amendment. We hope that on the representations now being made to the American government they will change their legislation in that respect, but if they decline I suppose we will have to put this into operation.

Mr. CARMICHAEL: I would call the attention of the minister to the fact that the forms prescribed for agriculturalists are almost not understandable by them. I have helped a great many to prepare their income tax returns, and I know many others have had to pay a fee to have the forms properly completed for the income tax department. Is it not possible to so prepare a form for agricultural people that they can easily comprehend it and complete the return themselves?

Mr. FIELDING: I recall that in this and other respects there is a good deal of dissatisfaction over the forms. Some portion of these returns which is demanded may be unavoidable. All I can do is to assure my hon. friend that in the interim we will look into the matter very carefully.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: I would ask my hon. friend to go further and give a general invitation to every member of the House to send in forms which he thinks would suit.

Mr. FIELDING: Did my hon. friend give that invitation when he was Minister of Finance?

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: Yes.

Mr. FIELDING: And did he get any response?

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: I got no forms.

Mr. FIELDING: He cannot expect me to be more successful now.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: I would ask my hon. friend to give that general invitation.

Mr. FIELDING: I do now.

Mr. GARDINER: Has the hon. minister taken into consideration that members of provincial legislatures have to spend a great deal of their indemnity in looking after the interests of their constituents?

Mr. FIELDING: Do my hon. friend's remarks refer entirely to the members of provincial legislatures?

[Mr. Fielding.]

Mr. GARDINER: I am speaking on their behalf at the present time.

Mr. FIELDING: I have heard a gentle suggestion that some consideration should be allowed to members of this legislature; but the suggestion regarding the members of provincial legislatures is quite new to me.

Section agreed to.

Bill reported, read the third time and passed.

DOMINION ELECTIONS ACT

SENATE AMENDMENT

On motion of Hon. D. D. McKenzie (Solicitor General) the amendment made by the Senate to Bill No. 92 to amend the Dominion Elections Act was read the second time and concurred in.

THE ESCHEATS ACT

SENATE AMENDMENT

On motion of Hon. D. D. McKenzie (Solicitor General) the amendment made by the Senate to Bill No. 124 to amend the Escheats Act was read the second time and concurred in.

SALE AND INSPECTION OF ROOT VEGETABLES

Hon. W. R. MOTHERWELL (Minister of Agriculture) moved the third reading of Bill No. 133 to regulate the sale and inspection of root vegetables.

Mr. CALDWELL: The minister promised to give some consideration as to the last section of that bill, which provided for repealing part of an old act, which I urged upon him should not be done at this time. I hope he will allow Section 22 of the old act to stand.

Mr. MOTHERWELL: When this bill was in committee I promised that I would not ask for its third reading until two sections were further explained. The first of these was Section 13, as to the meaning of which there was some doubt. I find that the meaning is just as I intimated yesterday, namely, that all potatoes and roots shall be sold by the pound with the two exceptions stated here, that is, green vegetables and potatoes sold by the closed barrel. I think that is quite satisfactory, as the cubic capacity of the barrel is designated. With regard to Clause 2 referred to by my hon. friend from Victoria and Carleton (Mr. Caldwell), if it were cut out we would have four different acts

dealing with this question, which would be an impossible situation. The very passing of this legislation necessitates the repeal of parts of three other acts. Consequently this section should remain. I think the bill is all right as it stands, and I would therefore move that it now be read the third time.

An hon. MEMBER: What is the reason for this?

Mr. MOTHERWELL: Complaint has been made that when a customer goes to buy a small quantity of vegetables and they are not sold by weight he does not know what he is getting. A bag of potatoes is usually looked upon as containing 90 pounds, but in some cities an 80 pound bag is recognized.

Mr. CALDWELL: I agree with the minister that this cuts out Section 22 which states that 60 pounds of potatoes is a bushel. I asked the minister last night if it would not be possible to have this still apply to local sales. I do not think that would affect the present act, otherwise I would not suggest it.

Mr. SPEAKER: I would remind the hon. member that the committee stage is now passed. The only question that can now be raised is whether or not the bill should be recommitted and a motion would have to be made to that effect. I mention this simply to point out that hon. members may speak only once on the third reading; there can be no discursive arguments as in the committee stage.

Motion agreed to and bill read the third time and passed.

OLEOMARGARINE ACT, 1914, AMENDMENT

Hon. W. R. MOTHERWELL (Minister of Agriculture) moved the second reading of Bill No. 194, to amend the The Oleomargarine Act, 1919.

Mr. DONALD SUTHERLAND (South Oxford): Mr. Speaker, I fully expected that the Minister of Agriculture Mr. Motherwell) would say something before the bill received its second reading. This is the only opportunity we shall have of discussing the merits of the bill. I did hope, when the second reading of the bill was adjourned last night that the Minister of Finance (Mr. Fielding) would be present on the occasion of the second reading, in view of the attitude he took a year ago and also when the resolution was before the House.

Mr. GRAHAM: That was not the reason given by my hon. friend last night.

Mr. SUTHERLAND: No; I have not had an opportunity of looking over the bill since. The bill contains nothing but a provision for a continuance of the regulations for another year—the regulations being, I assume, those that were in existence a year ago. I can see in my mind's eye the Minister of Agriculture standing up last night, waving this bill before the House, and characterizing it as a "rotten old bill," on which the House was asked to vote. Now, it is going pretty far for the Government to ask Parliament to adopt a measure which is characterized by the mover of it as a "rotten old bill". It is pretty nearly the border-line of anything that has ever happened before in Parliament.

Now, I am not going to take up very much of the time of the House to-night because this matter—

Some hon. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

Mr. SUTHERLAND: My hon. friends to my left applaud that statement, and well they might, in view of the assertion made by their leader last night that ever since this bill came before Parliament it was the sense of Parliament that the provision should be made permanent. It was upon the recommendation of the hon. leader of the Progressive party that the measure was by Order in Council adopted in the first instance. At the next session Parliament was told clearly and distinctly that the measure was a temporary one, necessitated by the exigencies of the war. At the next session the same thing was repeated, and on that occasion I predicted that this procedure would continue for a little while and eventually we would be asked to make this a permanent measure.

Now, I am inclined to agree with the Minister of Agriculture in what he stated last night in regard to the dairying industry. Any one who has looked over the returns of the imports into this country during 1914 and throughout the last few years cannot but be alarmed by the extent to which we are to-day buying our dairy products from foreign countries, particularly from the United States. Only an hour or two ago we passed a provision under the budget proposals exempting from sales and inland revenue taxation all ingredients that enter into the manufacture of this article. The Minister of Finance states that this is a legitimate article of food and that it in no way interferes with

the dairying industry. My contention all along was that oleomargarine as manufactured in this country is not oleomargarine at all but is simply a process by which butter is adulterated by the addition thereto of cheap ingredients by the manufacturers. The manufacturers of this product receive an advantage over any other class of manufacturers in this country. They alone are permitted to adulterate butter—and there are strict regulations in regard to the manufacture of butter in this country, the result being that those who buy butter know what they are purchasing. This article of food, if it is as good as they say it is, what harm would be done if there was stamped upon the containers in which it is put up a statement giving the proportions of the different ingredients entering into its manufacture, so that the purchaser might know what he was paying for? That, would be a reasonable thing to do, and would bring no hardship to anybody. I believe that the Government are determined to put this measure through this session, and I advise them to consider this suggestion. It is done in connection with many other commodities under the Pure Foods Act; it is done in the case of patent medicines and it is done in the case of fertilizers. I believe greater fraud is being perpetrated on the people of this country in regard to this article of food than is the case with any other product. Why was it that last year we lost $200,000 of revenue collected in the form of duty but refunded to the two manufacturers of this article, at a time when the resources of our country are strained as they are? That is something I quite fail to understand, particularly in view of the fact that nearly all this stuff comes from the United States. There is a measure before the United States Senate to-day the object of which is to place a duty upon oleomargarine and all butter substitutes, as well as butter itself, to the extent of 8 cents a pound. That is practically a prohibition on our butter; it will not now be able to find a market in the United States; yet you are going to permit all these raw materials to be brought into Canada and to enter into competition with a Canadian industry that is struggling for existence. I ask, is that fair? I would like the minister to consider the advisability of incorporating in his regulations some such provision as they have in the United States and in other countries—because a tax of ten cents a pound is imposed on oleomargarine manufactured in the United States if it is coloured to look like butter.

[Mr. Sutherland.]

In order to protect the people of that country it was found necessary to impose a tax of quarter of a cent of a pound on the stuff. We are told that this is the only country where this article of food is subject to such stringent regulations. I made the statement when the resolution was before the House that the manufacturers of oleomargarine in this country enjoy greater privilege and greater freedom in the manufacture of this stuff than anywhere else in the world. They are in absolute control of the situation. It is true that some veterinary inspectors are appointed to look after the manufacture of this article in the packing houses, but I do not know that a veterinarian is a very competent judge of what should constitute food for human consumption. He may be able to treat animals for disease, or a dog for fleas or something of that kind, but I do not think he is a competent man to judge whether an article is fit for human consumption. We have a department of Health, and I cannot understand why this article has not been referred to them long ago for analysis, to find out just what it consists of. We are giving the manufacturers all these liberties—I see some hon. gentlemen opposite smiling, among them the Minister of Trade and Commerce, who loudly denounced this iniquitous measure a year ago. I remember how he denounced it as an injustice to the dairying interests of this country.

Mr. ROBB: I remember very well my hon. friend's speech of last year in opposition to this measure. Will he say that he voted against it when it came to a vote?

Mr. SUTHERLAND: I certainly did, and I moved an amendment. The chairman of the Agricultural Committee also loudly denounced this measure, yet to-day he is absolutely willing to let it go through without a protest. What a change in hon. gentlemen opposite since they have taken seats on the right hand of the Speaker. The hon. member for Joliette also denounced this measure, as well as many other hon. members opposite who are now willing to let it pass without a protest.

Under the conditions that prevail in this country we are asked to continue this measure for another year. That is the very thing the Minister of Finance denounced last year. He said the measure should be made permanent. Yet now he is willing to have it extended for another year. Apparently this is a compromise,

and I am afraid that it is the Progressive party who are dictating the policy of to-day. I cannot understand the present attitude of the Minister of Finance and of the chairman of the Agriculture Committee, and of the hon. member for Glengarry (Mr. Kennedy), who also denounced this measure strongly last year. Yet his voice is silent now. I do not intend to move an amendment to-night.

Mr. MARTELL: I voted against the resolution, but as it passed, does not my hon. friend think it is a waste of time to be opposing this measure now?

Mr. SUTHERLAND: My hon. friend is very anxious to save time when it suits his purpose.

Mr. BUREAU: Time is money.

Mr. SUTHERLAND: I would suggest to the minister that perhaps he may see fit to incorporate in the bill when we go into committee the resolution that I moved a year ago, which reads:

> Section seven of the said act is amended by adding thereto the following words "and are also marked or labelled with a statement of the ingredients and the proportion of each ingredient used in making the oleomargarine contained therein".

This I think would overcome all objection to the measure, because I am not, and never have been, arguing against the exclusion of oleomargarine or the prohibition of its manufacture in this country, but under present conditions I think it is a very short-sighted and foolish policy for this Government to permit the bulk of this stuff to be brought in here from the United States and be manufactured in the two large packing houses which are carrying on the business in this country, in competition with the products of those who are very seriously handicapped by the conditions I have referred to.

Comparing 1914 with 1922, in 1914 there were 91,900 pounds of butter imported into Canada. During last year there was imported into Canada from Great Britain 2,163,984 pounds of butter. There was also imported from the United States 1,100,781 pounds more than was imported in 1914.

I have very imperfectly endeavoured to point out the most objectionable features of this measure. This stuff is not being used as a spread for bread, as most people contend. We have the statement of the head of the Dairy Branch of the Department of Agriculture that over fifty per cent of this stuff is used for shortening and cooking purposes. I pointed out last night, and I may as well refer to it again, that there were 41,102,118 pounds of butter, lard, and oleomargarine and lard compounds imported into this country free of duty and free of sales tax. Yet we heard the Minister of Justice claiming in this House the other day that the Liberal party was a free trade party, but that they were in favour of maintaining a reasonable amount of protection for the industries of this country. Those were not his exact words, but that was the only implication they carried, and I have no doubt that was the impression he desired to leave on the House. In the face of that statement, this stuff is coming in to-day absolutely free from the sales tax or restrictions of any kind, and at the same time it is handicapping and discouraging agriculture at a time when it needs encouragement more than ever from the hands of the Government.

Motion agreed to, bill read the second time, and the House went into committee thereon, Mr. Gordon in the Chair.

On section 1—time extended for importation, and sale:

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: Before the clause carries, I would ask the minister a question. He stated in the House last night that he was introducing a rotten old bill. I wonder if he has re-vamped it.

Mr. SUTHERLAND: Has it decayed any more since last night, or is it in better health?

Section agreed to, Bill reported, read the third time and passed.

SUPPLY—CONCURRENCE

The House proceeded to consider certain resolutions reported from Committee of Supply.

Resolutions concurred in.

CONGRATULATIONS TO MR. SPEAKER

TWENTY-SIXTH ANNIVERSARY OF ENTRY INTO PARLIAMENT

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: I desire to congratulate you, Mr. Speaker, on this the 26th anniversary of your entry into this Parliament.

Mr. SPEAKER: I thank the right hon. the Prime Minister (Mr. Mackenzie King) for his kind words of congratulation, and the House, generally, for joining in the words of the Prime Minister. I feel that I am as young as I was twenty-six years ago. I am bound to say this: That there

is no senatorship, no judgeship, no governorship comparable to the friendship of the hon. members of this House. As long as Providence and my electors send me to Parliament, I shall remain here. The greatest honour that could be bestowed on me after twenty-six years of parliamentary life is the speakership of the House of Commons, where I fully realize that service must after all be the guiding star of the public man. I thank you for your great kindness and courtesy during the session.

Motion agreed to and the House adjourned at 1 a.m. Saturday.

Saturday, June 24, 1922.

The House met at three o'clock.

INTERNATIONAL LABOUR CONFERENCE

Right Hon. W. L. MACKENZIE KING (Prime Minister): I beg to lay on the table draft convention and recommendations filed at the third session of the International Labour Conference on the 25th October, 1921. This is the document requested by the right hon. leader of the Opposition yesterday.

MEMORIAL TO THE LATE COLONEL G. H. BAKER, M.P.

On motion of Mr. W. F. Kay (Missisquoi) the second report of the Special Committee appointed to confer and act with the like committee of the Senate in further considering and determining the form of the memorial to be erected in the Parliament buildings to the late Lieutenant-Colonel George Harold Baker, member of Parliament for Brome, was concurred in.

PEACE TREATIES

On motion of Right Hon. W. L. Mackenzie King (Prime Minister) Bill No. 203 for carrying into effect the Treaties of Peace between His Majesty and Hungary and Turkey was introduced and read the first time.

On motion of Mr. Mackenzie King that the bill be read the second time:

Right Hon. ARTHUR MEIGHEN (Leader of the Opposition): Could not the second reading stand over till a later hour of the day?

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: Yes.

[Mr. Speaker.]

Hon. T. A. CRERAR (Marquette): What is the explanation?

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: The bill is simply to provide machinery to enable the Government to deal with former enemy property and debts in Turkey and Hungary in a manner similar to that which is already provided for dealing with former enemy property and debts in Germany, Austria and Bulgaria. The House will remember that treaties between the Allied and Associated Powers and the latter countries were ratified by His Majesty, and that subsequently legislation was adopted to enable the Government to give effect to certain provisions of those treaties. A similar enactment was not passed with respect to the treaties with Hungary and Turkey, for the reason that they were not ratified at the same time as the others. The treaty with Hungary has been ratified by His Majesty, but not the treaty with Turkey, although it has been signed.

Mr. CRERAR: Are we likely to get anything out of Turkey?

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: That the House may see the significance of the legislation asked for I might mention that one concern in Canada has a claim against these countries amounting to $600,000. I am informed that steps cannot be taken to deal with that claim until machinery is provided which will give the Governor in Council power to act under authority conferred by statute.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: Is the bill printed?

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: Yes.

Mr. SPEAKER: By unanimous consent the second reading of this bill stands until a later hour this day.

DOMINION CHAIN COMPANY LIMITED

On motion of Mr. S. W. Jacobs (George Etienne Cartier), Bill No. 196 respecting a Patent of The Dominion Chain Company, Limited, was introduced and read the first time.

Mr. JACOBS: If I am in order, I would ask that this bill be read a second time and referred to the Committee on Miscellaneous Private Bills.

Mr. SPEAKER: I would ask the hon. member if the requisite petition has been lodged with the Clerk of the Private Bills Committee?

Mr. JACOBS: I believe it has, but I cannot speak positively.

Mr. CRERAR: What is the explanation of the bill?

Hon. J. A. ROBB (Minister of Trade and Commerce): I would ask that the second reading stand until we can get from the department a report on the bill.

Mr. SPEAKER: The second reading stands.

UNEMPLOYMENT

On the Orders of the Day:

Right Hon. ARTHUR MEIGHEN (Leader of the Opposition): On the 24th of April this House passed a resolution, which was accepted by the Prime Minister for the Government, in the following words:

> That, in the opinion of this House, in view of the widespread unemployment with which the municipalities and provinces find themselves unable to cope, it is desirable that the federal government should devise some means of dealing effectively with the situation.

That was the order of Parliament; would the Government tell us now, before we prorogue, what means they have devised, since this resolution was passed, dealing with the situation?

Hon. JAMES MURDOCK (Minister of Labour): The explanation, I think, can best be given in the language of a letter recently addressed to the mayor of one of our western cities, in which it was stated:

> The intention is that the general question of unemployment and relief for distress growing out thereof will be the subject of further careful general review within the near future and in anticipation of the needs of Canada during the coming winter.

It seemed inadvisable to convene a gathering of representatives of organizations in the various provinces interested in this matter while Parliament was in session. As soon as possible after Parliament prorogues the matter will be given the attention which it deserves and of the importance of which the Government is fully advised. It is only proper to say, though, that we think the unemployment situation has materially improved during the past few weeks.

Mr. MEIGHEN: It very usually does in summer time. The answer of the minister is that nothing has been done by the Government but that others will be called in to do something later.

CHAIRMAN OF THE RAILWAY COMMISSION

On the Orders of the Day:

Right Hon. ARTHUR MEIGHEN: On the 10th day of June, attention being called by the member for Macleod (Mr. Coote) to certain commitments of the present Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Motherwell) as regards the removal of the Chairman of the Railway Commission, the Prime Minister stated, as reported on page 2872 of Unrevised Hansard, that the Minister of Agriculture had made certain representations to the Government as regards such removal; that the same had been considered, but that no definite conclusion had been reached. May I ask if a definite decision has been reached, and if so, what is it?

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: No conclusion has been reached. The matter is still being considered.

ASSINIBOINE RIVER FLOODS

On the Orders of the Day:

Right Hon. ARTHUR MEIGHEN: On the 19th of May the attention of the Government was called to a very great flood disaster between Portage la Prairie and Winnipeg. The Prime Minister stated that that was being considered but that the Government had not come to a decision whether to grant relief or not.

Mr. STEWART (Argenteuil): The Assiniboine river?

Mr. MEIGHEN: Yes. I have not observed yet that any relief has been provided. Has the Government decided to do anything or not to do anything, and if to do anything, what is it?

Mr. STEWART (Argenteuil): The matter was taken up with the provincial government and an offer made that a survey of the whole situation in connection with the flooded areas of that river be undertaken at the expense of the federal government, on the clear understanding that that would not involve on the part of the federal government responsibility for

the carrying out of any plans that might be suggested; that matter was to be decided upon later. The idea was primarily to get a complete survey and a knowledge of what would be required to obviate, if possible, a recurrence of the floods on that river.

Mr. MEIGHEN: I can see that the survey might have something to do with preventing floods in the future, but what it has to do with relieving the damage caused by a flood of the past I do not know. Has the Government decided to relieve those who suffered, or not, and if so, to what extent?

Mr. STEWART (Argenteuil): So far as I know, no claims have been made by any individuals to this Governmnet.

Mr. MEIGHEN: They were made by the member for Portage la Prairie (Mr. Leader), on May 19th and consideration was promised.

Mr. STEWART (Argenteuil): I would say—though I am not saying it in any way to make it official—that this matter should come through representations from the provincial governments, and I have so intimated on the occasions when the question has been brought to my attention. I do not think it would be the business of this Government to step into the province of Manitoba in this respect unless requested by the provincial authorities so to do, or to assist.

Mr. MEIGHEN: If so, I think that should have been the answer given to the hon. member for Portage la Prairie.

Mr. BELAND: I do not know what the views of my right hon. friend are on this subject, but I may direct his attention and the attention of the House to the fact that in a district in the province of Quebec called the Chaudiere valley, as a result of rains last week continuing for forty-eight hours, the whole of the area of the valley was flooded, and at least a thousand farmers lost all their crops. I do not understand, however, that they are submitting any claim to this Government. I believe, though, that they are submitting some claim for relief to the provincial government. I may say that a similar unhappy situation developed four years ago in the same valley, and no application was ever made to this government for relief.

[Mr. Charles Stewart.]

Mr. SPEAKER: Of course, this debate is out of order.

Mr. MEIGHEN: I was not arguing the matter; I merely called the attention of the Government to their promise and asked what they were doing. What I object to is the holding out of false hopes.

Mr. CALDWELL: May I ask one question in regard to this matter? While on the subject of floods, I may point out that according to recent reports in the press a very serious flood has occurred in New Brunswick, with the result that much property has been swept away and considerable damage done. If relief is to be afforded by the federal government in the matter of floods in other parts of the country, I think we will have to put in a claim from New Brunswick. The destruction has included about six million feet of lumber, a sawmill, some bridges, farm property—

Mr. SPEAKER: Order.

Mr. MICHAUD: I wish to endorse what my hon. friend (Mr. Caldwell) has said in that respect.

Mr. BAXTER: Mr. Speaker—

Mr. ARCHAMBAULT: Who started the flood?

Mr. SPEAKER: I must remind hon. members that we cannot be flooded with a discussion of floods at this stage. The attention of the Government has been directed to these floods, and I think we should leave the matter there at present.

Mr. HARRY LEADER (Portage la Prairie): As one of the members most concerned with the overflowing of the Assiniboine river, I should like to ask if there will be an opportunity to discuss this matter when the Supplementary Estimates come up.

Mr. SPEAKER: Certainly. The hon. member will have full opportunity for discussing the matter when the estimates are before the House.

PRIVILEGE—MR. BAXTER

On the Orders of the Day:

Hon. J. B. M. BAXTER (St. John City and Counties of St. John and Albert): Mr. Speaker, I wish to bring up a matter which

is not a pleasant one to deal with, but it is serious in its character, and I think as a matter of justice it ought to be brought to the attention of the House. Hon. members have always an opportunity of defending themselves from any attack made upon them within the walls of this chamber, and I am glad to say that such attacks seem to be rare. Persons outside of this House, officials in the public service, striving to do their duty, have no opportunity to defend themselves except in the way in which I have been asked to present a defence on behalf of a gentleman who was attacked on the twelfth of this month by the hon. member for Victoria and Carleton (Mr. Caldwell). My hon. friend, in the course of his remarks, reflected very severely on the returning officer for that constituency. The returning officer has had his attention called to the report in Hansard of the remarks of the hon. member, and he desires to have a statement made on his behalf. He was charged with having made electoral subdivisions which were not warranted by law. He desires that this House should understand—

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: May I ask, Mr. Speaker, if the hon. member is in order?

Mr. SPEAKER: I was just about to remind the hon. member that there is no such privilege. Bourinot at page 302 says:

> Questions of privilege may always be considered in either house without the notice necessary in the case of motions generally. By the 47th rule of the Commons it is provided:
>
> "Whenever any matter of privilege arises, it shall be taken into consideration immediately."
>
> It is the practce in the House of Commons to bring up a question of privilege after prayers, and before the house has taken up the orders of the day. Only in very aggravated cases, requiring the immediate interposition of the house, will any business be suddenly interrupted. If a member be insulted or attacked, or some disorder suddenly arises, a debate may be interrupted; for as it has been clearly expressed by an ancient authority, "Whether any question is or is not before the house; and even in the midst of another discussion, if a member should rise to complain of a breach of prvileges of the house, they have always instantly heard him."

So it must be a question affecting the honour of a member of the House. Hon. members cannot take up the cudgels on behalf of all the officials in this country. They have their recourse.

Mr. BAXTER: I bow to your ruling, of course, Mr. Speaker, and I give notice that I shall take up this matter when the House is moved into committee of Ways and Means.

ELECTRICAL STORM IN THE WEST

On the Orders of the Day:

Mr. O. R. GOULD (Assiniboia): The morning newspapers make note of the fact that there has been a severe electrical storm involving loss of life and considerable damage by hail in the western country. Hon. gentlemen laugh. It is no laughing matter when people lose their lives as the result of a severe storm. I rise to ask if the Government has received any more definite information than was contained in this morning's papers concerning the loss of life and property in that storm.

Hon. CHARLES STEWART (Minister of the Interior): If my hon. friend is referring to the storm in western Canada, we have no information other than the press reports.

CHINESE IMMIGRATION

On the Orders of the Day:

Mr. T. G. McBRIDE (Cariboo): Has the Prime Minister any information with respect to the Chinese immigrants I inquired about yesterday?

Hon. CHARLES STEWART (Minister of the Interior): I have made inquiry and our information is that none have landed. However, I learn from another source that there are supposed to be that number on board ship.

TRENTON HARBOUR

On motion of Hon. Ernest Lapointe (Minister of Marine and Fisheries) the House went into committee to consider the following proposed resolution, Mr. Gordon in the Chair:

> Resolved, That it is expedient to bring in a measure to make better provision for the improvement and management of the harbour of Trenton, in the province of Ontario, and to provide:—
>
> 1. That boundaries of the harbour be defined: harbour commissioners and a harbour master be appointed; and rules and regulations, and a tariff of rates and dues, be made.
>
> 2. That the commissioners shall keep separate accounts of all moneys received and expended, and account therefor annually to the Governor in Council in such manner as may be directed.
>
> 3. That the commissioners shall expend the moneys collected, after payment of the salary of the harbour master and the necessary expenses of maintenance of the harbour, in improving the harbour and its appurtenances according to plans to be approved by the Minister.

He said: The town of Trenton possesses the larger part of the harbour property, and they have quite recently incurred a

rather heavy expenditure for the acquisition of another property. It has been represented to me by the town authorities, and strongly urged and recommended by my hon. friend from West Hastings (Mr. Porter) that the only way in which the town could collect dues was by the organization of a harbour commission. The town desires to get some revenue on the capital they have expended, and this resolution is simply for the purpose of enabling them to organize a harbour commission. It will not involve any expenditure on the part of the Government. It is simply for the purpose of allowing the town of Trenton to get some return on the investment they have made.

Resolution reported, read the second time and concurred in.

On motion of Mr. Lapointe, Bill No. 204, respecting the Harbour of Trenton was thereupon read the first and second times, and the House went into committee thereon, Mr. Gordon in the Chair.

On the preamble.

Mr. GERMAN: I would like somebody to explain why it is necessary to create a harbour commission at Trenton. There is not water enough at the present time for a vessel of any size to reach that harbour. Coming through the channel from the west there is only twelve feet of navigation. From the east up through the bay of Quinte there is certainly not fourteen feet of navigation, and the channel is a very crooked one. I cannot understand why it is necessary to have a harbour commission at Trenton, and I would like to have an explanation as to why this bill is necessary from the Minister of Marine and Fisheries. I know something about the harbour of Trenton—having been there many times in my boyhood days, and on a number of occasions since then—and to my mind it is absolutely unessential to have a harbour commission there.

Mr. LAPOINTE: I can only refer my hon. friend to the hon. member for West Hastings (Mr. Porter). He has succeeded in convincing me and I hope he will convince my hon. friend from Welland of the necessity for this legislation.

Mr. PORTER: I am afraid it is so long since my hon. friend from Welland (Mr. German) was familiar with conditions at the port of Trenton that he has either forgotten what they were or he has not been keeping track of what has been going on there in recent years. Trenton is at the southern terminus of the Trent canal where that canal enters the bay of Quinte, the latter being the outlet for shipping from either direction. Trenton is a town with a population of about 6,000 people, and a very large amount of shipping passes through the port, apart altogether from what may be developed by the use of the Trent canal.

Mr. GERMAN: Can my hon. friend give me any figures as to the extent of the shipping?

Mr. PORTER: I will give the information in a general way; I cannot at the moment offer any exact details. The freight that enters the port of Trenton consists of material brought in from the United States to supply the large creosote works there, and the fertilizer works that are now manufacturing fertilizer and creosote in Trenton. There is also a large amount of coal shipped to the port of Trenton for distribution to various sections of Midland, Ontario. In addition a very large lumber industry is about to be developed there. A company has been formed with a capitalization of about $5,000,000. They have acquired the timber limits of other companies in the vicinity containing large quantities of timber and it is their intention to manufacture this timber into lumber in the town of Trenton and ship it from the port. Now Trenton heretofore had only owned a small portion of the dockage or wharf privileges at Trenton but recently, by expropriation proceedings, have acquired the whole or major part of these privileges. That involved the expenditure of a large sum of money on their part. The dock and wharf facilities have been acquired by the municipality for the purpose of enabling them to develop the harbour as far as they can. They will necessarily be put to considerable expense in maintaining the harbour but, as conditions now are, will be unable to collect any harbour dues whatever, or any revenue enabling them to maintain the harbour in proper condition. The present bill is for the purpose of enabling the municipality to collect such dues as will afford them means to improve and keep the harbour in a proper state of repair. As to the number of vessels that trade at the port of Trenton, I may say that the same boats trade at Trenton that trade at the port of Belleville, which has been a government harbour, and under a commission, for a period of from twenty to twenty-

five years. The same class of boats and of freight passes through the port of Trenton as through the harbour of Belleville. I may say that although the town of Trenton is considerably smaller than the city of Belleville, yet the tonnage which passes through the former is very nearly equal to that which passes through the latter. This legislation will not entail the expenditure of a single dollar on the part of the Government, it is only a matter of protection in the interest of the municipality of Trenton to enable them to maintain the harbour in good condition and improve it whenever found necessary. The depth of water in the harbour is from fourteen to sixteen feet, which is ample to accommodate any and all boats passing through.

Mr. GERMAN: Does my hon. friend say that there is fourteen feet navigation in either direction?

Mr. PORTER: Coming by way of the Murray canal there would not be fourteen feet, but in the other direction. Through the Narrows at the port of Deseronto there is a depth of fourteen feet or more. There was that depth last year and the year before, when the water was very low as I am advised.

Mr. GERMAN: I would ask the Minister of Marine and Fisheries if there is any intention on the part of the Government to spend a dollar of the public money on the Trenton harbour?

Mr. LAPOINTE: Not a dollar that I know of.

Mr. GERMAN: As a result of this legislation I am afraid we shall see a demand in future for the expenditure of public money on Trenton harbour. Notwithstanding what the hon. member for West Hastings has said there is not a sufficient depth of water in the approaches to Trenton harbour to permit navigation by a vessel larger than a few hundred tons, and to construct a channel navigable for larger vessels through the Murray canal or the bay of Quinte from Kingston will need a very large expenditure.

Mr. PORTER: Let me tell my hon. friend that the sum of $100,000 has already been expended in improving Trenton harbour and the approaches thereto, so that what my hon. friend is apprehensive of has already taken place.

Mr. LAPOINTE: The hon. gentleman's statement is a strong argument in favour of the bill. The only way to recoup the town for the money spent on that harbour is by collecting dues from the ships. As far as the fear of these gentlemen coming back and asking for more money is concerned, I would refer them to the hon. Minister of Finance.

Bill reported, read the third time and passed.

SECOND READING

Bill No. 196, from the Senate, respecting a patent of the Dominion Chain Company, Limited.—(Mr. Jacobs).

SUPPLY

The House again in Committee of Supply.

CHANGES OF MANAGEMENT.

For the purchase of five machines for affixing a distinguishing device and serial number on each Dominion Note, after the notes have been delivered by the printer and engraver to the Minister of Finance, and while the notes are in the custody and control of the officers of the Department of Finance, as provided for by Sub-section 2, of Section 3, of the Dominion Notes Act, 1914, $12,500.

Mr. FIELDING: The object of this item is to make a change with regard to the method of issuing Dominion notes. The notes are printed under proper supervision and they bear the signature of the deputy minister. Then, when they came to the Finance Department, there is a counter signature put on them by one of the young ladies employed for that purpose. It is a matter occupying a good deal of time, and it is proposed to substitute for that a stamp which will be kept in the Finance Department, dispensing with the services of these young ladies. Considerable economy will be effected in that way.

Item agreed to.

JUSTICE DEPARTMENT.

Department of Justice—Salaries—	
James White, Technical Adviser to the Minister of Justice, transferred from the Conservation Commission	$6,000
Assistant Private Secretary..	1,600
Two Clerk-Stenographers at $960.00 each..	1,920
Assistant Structural Engineer, Penitentiary Branch..	2,700

Mr. MEIGHEN: It would look from this as if the minister has been imposed on, and the whole balance of the staff of the Conservation Commission wished on his department. Really, I do not know how Mr. James White can be a technical adviser to the Justice Department. He

may be one of those men, quite a number of whom I have met, who believe themselves natural lawyers.

Mr. GRAHAM: They have their uses.

Mr. MEIGHEN: I know something about this matter, and I suggest to the minister that in self defence he ask that this item be deferred.

Sir LOMER GOUIN: I may say that Mr. White was previously on the Commission of Conservation, and he has been transferred and put in charge of research work in connection with the Department of Justice.

He has been engaged recently upon the Labrador-Newfoundland boundary. We have some work to perform in connection with that, and Mr. White has been employed upon it. He is very useful, I am told, to the staff and the deputy minister, and, I understand, he is to be there for one year.

Mr. MEIGHEN: Is there not some danger there? I do not know what special qualifications he has for investigating the boundary of Labrador. I have no fault to find with his qualifications for the position he held as secretary of the Conservation Commission. I am not discussing that at all, but that position was done away with for the sake of economy. Now there is no economy at all, if the members of that commission are going to be drafted back into the departments, into more or less artificial and ornamental positions. Mr. White was retired, and he was entitled to his pension. I do not know just what it was, some $4,000 odd for life, and I do not think he has any complaint. If he comes back now, I presume it would mean that the higher salary, if he is getting a higher salary now, for this short term, will be utilized to add to this $4,000 pension that he is entitled to for the remainder of his life.

Sir LOMER GOUIN: His present salary is $6,000. If he had been pensioned last year, it would have meant a difference of about $1,500 or $2,000 at the most. If he was retired the Government might save $2,000 per year. I may say that the expenses of the Conservation Commission were over $300,000 per year. The only officer retained is Mr. White, and one shorthand writer, who draws a salary of between $900 and $1,000.

Mr. MEIGHEN: This is only the commencement of it.

Item agreed to.

[Mr. Meighen.]

Administration of Justice

To provide differential salary for certain judges of the Court of King's Bench and Superior Court of Quebec, from July 1 to July 25, 1920, notwithstanding anything in the Judges' Act, 32 at $134.30, 15 at $268.81, $8,332.95.

Mr. GUTHRIE: Will the minister give us some explanation of this item?

Sir LOMER GOUIN: The salaries of all the judges were substantially raised by 10-11 George V, chapter 56, dating in the case of every province except Quebec from 1st July, 1920, on which day the act came into effect. By section 5 of the act, however, it was provided that the section raising the salaries of the Quebec judges would come into operation upon and after a day to be named by proclamation of the Governor in Council. This proclamation was made on July 26, 1920, only, the result being that the judges of Quebec were twenty-five days behind the other judges of Canada in receiving their increases. This item, I understand, was approved by my predecessor, but we could not have it voted before.

Mr. LEWIS: Has any provision been made in the Supplementary Estimates for a judgeship at Gravelbourg in Saskatchewan, and have any other similar appointments been made in Saskatchewan?

Sir LOMER GOUIN: Representations have been made to us with regard to the appointment of a judge at Gravelbourg, and I hope we shall be in a position, after the session, to give satisfaction to the people of that district.

Mr. MEIGHEN: May I make this suggestion to the minister? The province of Quebec has, of course, a different system from that of the rest of Canada. In Quebec, there is no county or district court, as it is known in other provinces. In the other provinces these district court judges do not rank with the superior court judges, either as to salary or as to jurisdiction. They have jurisdiction up to small amounts running from $300 to $1,000, and they receive a salary of $5,000. The province of Quebec has no such court, and as a consequence all the judges are superior court judges, and draw the $9,000 salary of the superior court judges, although most of the time they are trying only $600 or $900 cases. Of course, nothing could be done that would disturb the status of any judge now appointed. Nobody would ask that; but not only would it be in the interest of economy, but it would

be more in accord with common sense, if it could be effected, necessarily by provincial legislation, that a county court would be established in Quebec, thereby bringing the courts of that province into harmony with the courts of the other provinces of Canada. There would, of course, have to be new appointments to the county court, and the others would lapse only as the members of the court were to retire or to die. That would seem to me a great reform, and the Minister of Justice (Sir Lomer Gouin) having very considerable influence in the government of Quebec as well as in this Government, he would seem to me to be particularly designed by Providence to exert some really great influence to produce this reform.

4 p.m.

Sir LOMER GOUIN: We have superior court judges in Quebec, and in the city and district of Montreal we have four circuit court judges. As to cases of minor importance referred to by the leader of the Opposition (Mr. Meighen), a change was effected in Quebec lately. At the last session of the provincial parliament, amendments were made giving jurisdiction, in circuit court cases up to $100, to the magistrates, so that there would be so much less work for our judges of the superior court. The number of our judges is certainly not too large with the increase in population in the different districts. With this amendment, which I have just mentioned and which has been brought about by the provincial government, I have reason to believe that the representations now made by the leader of the Opposition will be met; that is to say, no objection could be made for the future as to the jurisdiction given to our superior court judges. Small matters will be decided by the magistrates.

Mr. MEIGHEN: I see clearly that that will in time effect the same result. With the growth of the province, if magisterial jurisdiction is expanded instead of the superior court being expanded in point of numbers, the same result will be achieved.

Item agreed to.

ROYAL CANADIAN MOUNTED POLICE.

To provide for the establishment of three detachments, two on Ellsmere Island and one on or near Bylot Island, Arctic Regions, $60,000.

Mr. GARLAND (Bow River): Are these new stations?

Sir LOMER GOUIN: Yes.

Mr. GARLAND (Bow River): For what purpose?

Sir LOMER GOUIN: For our Mounted Police.

Mr. GARLAND (Bow River): What is the necessity for these stations?

Sir LOMER GOUIN: It is necessary to protect our rights against foreigners; to protect our fisheries, and to take care of our property generally.

Item agreed to.

To assist in the suppression of the White Slave Traffic, $2,500.

Mr. HANSON: It seems to me that $2,500 is not at all adequate in connection with work of this character if anything effective is to be accomplished.

Sir LOMER GOUIN: The same amount has been voted since 1914 under the recommendation of Colonel Sherwood. I am informed by the Chief Commissioner that the appropriation is sufficient.

Item agreed to.

Amount required to pay legal expenses etc., in connection with the case, Dominion Iron and Steel Co., Ltd., vs. The King re ships plates, $8,200.

Mr. MEIGHEN: Should this item carry in the absence of the hon. member for Laprairie and Napierville (Mr. Lanctot)?

Item agreed to.

Grant to R. G. Chamberlin, for special police service on the occasion of the visit of His Royal Highness the Prince of Wales to Canada in 1919, $1,000.

Mr. GUTHRIE: How does this come up now after an interval of three years?

Sir LOMER GOUIN: Mr. Chamberlin's services were retained because Colonel Sherwood was engaged at the time and the government had to appoint someone to take his place. Mr. Chamberlin never received anything from the government.

Mr. GUTHRIE: Did he ever send a bill in?

Sir LOMER GOUIN: It was left to the government and Colonel Sherwood. Mr. Chamberlin was always expecting something, and we now propose that $1,000 be paid him. I do not think it is too large a sum.

Mr. MEIGHEN: One cannot remember all the particular items here of this character. Doubtless claims were made at the time and were refused by the late government for pretty good reasons. Of course, if the presentation of additional facts dis-

closes that an error was made at the time, that error should be corrected now, but I do not want the minister to undo all the good work the late government did.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: Unless my right hon. friend wishes this item to go through, I am perfectly agreeable to let it drop.

Mr. MEIGHEN: I do not know anything about it.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: The Under Secretary of State, Sir Joseph Pope, at the time of the Prince of Wales' visit thought it necessary to have some officer to take charge of the whole tour. That work would naturally come to Colonel Sherwood if he was available, but he was not, and Mr. Chamberlin was borrowed from the Canadian Pacific Railway Company in whose employ he was at the time. On the representations of both Sir Joseph Pope and Mr. Newcombe, Deputy Minister of Justice, Mr. Chamberlin contends that he had good reason to expect the government would give him some remuneration for the services he rendered. He received no compensation from the government, but he did receive his regular salary from the Canadian Pacific Railway Company. The work he was doing throughout the tour was different in character from his regular work. This happened while my right hon. friend was in office, and unless he wishes to have the undertaking of Sir Joseph Pope and Mr. Newcombe implemented, the passing of the item is immaterial to us.

Mr. MEIGHEN: I was in office, but not in the Department of External Affairs.

Mr. GRAHAM: You were on the exterior.

Mr. MEIGHEN: No, I was very much in the interior. I remember though that Mr. Chamberlin, who was at that time the head of the constable service of the Canadian Pacific Railway, did accompany the Prince of Wales. If Sir Joseph Pope and the officers of the department state that Mr. Chamberlin had a right to expect compensation upon the understanding they arrived at, I have no objection to the item passing; but no such representations were made to me.

Mr. JACOBS: Was not Mr. Chamberlin paid by the Canadian Pacific Railway?

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: No.

Mr. JACOBS: He was in the employ of the Canadian Pacific Railway Company.

[Mr. Meighen.]

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: Yes; but had he been at his regular work his duties would have been much less exacting. He had to spend his entire time going all over the country with the Prince. For that extra service he got no remuneration from the Government or from the Canadian Pacific Railway Company.

Mr. JACOBS: Could we not get out of our liability by giving him a decoration or something of that kind?

Mr. GOOD: I understand the gentleman was receiving a pretty good salary from the Canadian Pacific Railway Company during the time he was engaged in this work and under the circumstances I would think the honour accruing to him would be sufficient recompense. I think we are under no particular obligation unless we entered into an agreement with him at the time. The item ought to be dropped.

Item agreed to.

MILITIA AND DEFENCE

Civil Government — Department of Militia and Defence—Salaries—	
To provide for arrears of salary due to Alexander Tetu from the 15th July, 1919 to the 31st March, 1922	$ 120
Secretary to Executive	1,800
Senior Clerk-Stenographer	1,320
Clerk-Stenographer	960
Confidential Messenger	960
	$5,160

Mr. GUTHRIE: Are these all additions to the present staff?

Mr. GRAHAM: The first item explains itself: this gentleman was promoted but strange to say was never paid the additional salary of $120. The other items refer to secretaries to the executives. Under the Order in Council and by the full consent of the Civil Service Commission, each minister is entitled to make appointments to these positions. Should any of the temporaries on my staff be refused re-classification, I would be in a peculiar position if I had not some way of making such appointments.

Mr. GUTHRIE: The idea would be to take them on again?

Mr. GRAHAM: In some instances we may, in others we may not take them on again.

Mr. MEIGHEN: I understand that if it had not been for the amalgamation and resultant "economy" these expenditures would not be necessary.

Item agreed to.

Militia and Defence—Civil pensions—	
Life pension to Robert Allen.. ..	$269 52
Life pension to Ronald Morrison..	330 00
Life pension to Walter Pettipas..	515 90
	$1,115 42

Mr. KYTE: These items have appeared for some years. I would like to have some explanation as to why they are paid.

Mr. GRAHAM: These pensions were granted before the act was passed by which such pensions may be paid year by year without a special vote. They have been voted in this way each year since 1917.

Mr. KYTE: They are for persons who were formerly employed in the Militia Department—ordinary pensions?

Mr. GRAHAM: Oh, yes.

Item agreed to.

Gratuity to the widow of the late H. N. P. Chesley, $466.67.

Mr. GRAHAM: Mr. Chesley had been in the employ of the government for forty-one years. He was retired on the last day of April. Had he died on the last day of April his widow would have been entitled under the act to two months' pay, but he died four days after, and this item is to give his widow the two months' pay as if he had not been retired.

Item agreed to.

Department of Secretary of State—Salaries—	
One Clerk-Stenographer..	$ 960
One Senior Clerk-Stenographer—	
Further amount required..	15
Contingencies—	
Further amount required..	2,320
	$3,295

Mr. MEIGHEN: Why is the minister asking for contingencies at this late hour?

Mr. COPP: My officers gave me an itemized statement, but I do not happen to have it with me. It is for further contingencies required.

Mr. MEIGHEN: Let it stand.

Item stands.

Miscellaneous—expenses under the Canada Temperance Act—further amount required, $20,000.

Mr. GUTHRIE: How is this money to be spent?

Mr. COPP: At the last session of the Prince Edward Island legislature authority was taken for the holding of a plebiscite during the year and this is to make the necessary provision for it.

Item agreed to.

Air Board—to provide for the construction of a building to house a wind tunnel for aeronautical research, $5,000.

Mr. KENNEDY (Edmonton): Explain.

Mr. GRAHAM: For some years Toronto University has been carrying on experiments in aeronautical research. They wish now to carry on their work in another part of the grounds and we are assisting in the erection of a new building for the purpose. The work is of great value to the Air Board.

Item agreed to.

Department of Immigration and Colonization—Salaries—	
To provide for one new Chief Clerkship..	$3,360
To provide for a further amount for a promotion from Head Clerk to Chief Clerk..	120
To provide for a further amount for one Head Clerkship..	480
To provide for a further amount for a promotion to a Principal Clerkship..	240
To provide for a new Division Immigration Inspector, Grade 1 . ..	2,040
To provide for one Senior File Clerk	1,320
To provide for one Senior Clerk-Stenographer..	1,320
To provide for a further amount for a promotion to Senior Clerk-Typist	180
To provide for eight Clerk-Stenographers at $960..	7,680
To provide for nine File Clerks at $960..	8,640
To provide for one Clerk..	960
To provide for five Junior Clerk-Stenographers at $600..	3,000
To provide for one Junior Clerk..	600
To provide for one Office Boy.. ..	330
	$30,270

Mr. STEWART (Argenteuil): This vote is necessary owing to the fact that the Civil Service Commission will no longer allow us to carry thirty-three temporary employees. There are two new positions here, one occupied by Mr. Buskard, who has been transferred from the Prime Minister's office to the Department of Immigration, and one division immigration inspector. Of the thirty-three employees mentioned in the item, thirty-one have been in the employ of the department at Ottawa for a number of years in a temporary capacity, and their salaries have been provided and paid for out of the vote for immigration contingencies. The positions of these thirty-one employees are now declared to be of a permanent nature, and the payment of salaries is no longer to be made from the appropriation for contingencies.

Mr. GOOD: Will this mean a saving so far as the main estimates are concerned?

Mr. STEWART (Argenteuil): Yes, with the exception of three new officials on the Continent. There of our men are operating in the Baltic ports this year for the purpose of putting the visé on passports, which has heretofore been done by British consular officers. This will obviate the necessity of continental immigrants passing through England in order to have their passports vised. Outside of that there will be a saving.

Mr. SALES: Where is the new immigration inspector to be stationed?

Mr. STEWART (Argenteuil): Eastern Canada.

Mr. SALES: At what point?

Mr. STEWART (Argenteuil): These men travel between the ports of Quebec, St. John and so on. This official will not be stationed at any particular place in that respect.

Mr. JACOBS: Has the Government considered the question of merging the Department of Immigration and Colonization with the Interior Department and having the three branches administered as they were before 1917? Everyone understands why this Department of Immigration and Colonization was created in that year. There was no immigration and no colonization in the midst of the war, but a position had to be created for Mr. Calder, who was at that time taken into the Government. Now that Mr. Calder is settled for life in a higher Chamber, does the Government not think that we might get back to the old system? The Department of the Interior handled this question of immigration from 1896, when Sir Clifford Sifton took charge, and has brought into this country millions of immigrants. The policy of the department now seems to be to prevent immigrants from coming to this country altogether, because an Order in Council was passed on the 9th of May declaring that after that date immigration into Canada is prohibited. That being the case, it does seem to me, it is the part of unwisdom to continue this elaborate department, which costs I do not know how many millions of dollars annually. The department was very well run as an adjunct of the Department of the Interior by the different ministers of the Interior who occupied that position and by the very efficient Deputy Minister of the Interior, Mr. Cory. This Department of Immigration seems to be used as a kind of refuge for every individual and official who is being dispensed with or whose services are of little value. For instance, we find that Doctor Black, who, I think, occupied prior to November or December, 1921, the position of official organizer of the National Liberal and Conservative party, was found to be such a valuable assistant to that organization that when his services were no longer required he was forthwith made Deputy Minister of Immigration and Colonization, just immediately before the government went to the country, and when they were in what I might call articulo mortis. The government knew they could never come back, but evidently Mr. Black had to be provided for, for some reason unknown to me, and he was given this position of deputy minister at $6,000 a year, while other officials who had been in both the Immigration Department and the Interior Department were ignored and passed over. As I said before, inasmuch as we are not admitting immigration into this country at all, with the exception of female domestics and farm labourers, it does seem to me that these millions of dollars which are being spent might be saved, and the department go back to where it was before it was separated from the Interior Department. I have no doubt that the very efficient Minister of Immigration and Colonization, who is also the Minister of the Interior, could function just as well from his department in the Langevin block, as when he is divided up and spends half his time in the Norlite building and the rest of his time in the Langevin block.

Mr. MEIGHEN: The hon. member did not fail to disclose what the originating impulse was of his desire for economy. He seems to have something in his bosom against Doctor Black.

Mr. JACOBS: None whatever. I never spoke to Doctor Black in my life.

Mr. MEIGHEN: Perhaps that is why it is in his bosom. I am pretty sure that if he had, the prejudices he now entertains would be very soon swept away. I only rose to say a word with regard to Doctor Black. It is true he occupied the position of organizer of the party for a time, and while doing so he gave his entire time to it, but if that is an offence while a man is free, drawing no public money, disqualifying him from public office, then I am afraid the decks would have to be swept clean of very many deputy ministers, and

very many other high officials, and included in those not only men appointed twenty or twenty-five years ago, but an almost equal number in the short but miserable term in office of my hon. friends.

Mr. JACOBS: Miserable?

Mr. MEIGHEN: Perhaps the word wretched might have been better. I have in mind now Mr. Duncan Marshall, appointed without reference to the Civil Service Commission, a job created for him and trips found, etc. The position Doctor Black occupies was not created for any one. It is an office of great importance, and can only be filled by a man of efficiency and high qualifications.

Mr. JACOBS: Will the right hon. gentleman allow me to tell him that before Doctor Black's appointment we never had a Deputy Minister of Immigration and Colonization? The position was created for Doctor Black.

Mr. CASGRAIN: Hear, hear.

Mr. MEIGHEN: The hon. member says "hear, hear." I assure him he knows as little about it as the hon. member who spoke. When the position was created, Doctor Black was Commissioner of Agriculture for Canada, had not the slightest thought of moving from his position, and was in a position for which he was eminently qualified. Those were the facts when this position was created. Subsequently he became head of the Soldier Settlement Board. It would not look from that as if the position had been created for him, when he was promoted to a very much more responsible position, even more responsible than that which he holds to-day. Hon. members of this House of all political persuasions, and I refer particularly to hon members to my left who were in the last House, were not at all ungenerous in their tributes to the very great success of Doctor Black's work as head of the Soldier Settlement Board.

Mr. JACOBS: He wrote the tributes himself.

Mr. MEIGHEN: I am sorry for my hon. friend's opinion of other hon. gentlemen in this House. I have in mind the hon. member for Victoria and Carleton (Mr. Caldwell). Does the hon. member suggest that his speech relative to Doctor Black was written by Doctor Black? I did not know that hon. gentlemen were so impotent either in the way of forming opinions or in the way of their utterance. No, the work done there by Doctor Black was as eminent public service as has ever been rendered by an official of this country. It is a comparatively easy task to-day, with the lines laid down, the trail blazed, and all the main difficulties surmounted, to take a piece of machinery and by a little sandpapering and oiling let it proceed with its work, but the big difficulties and the big dangers were faced by Doctor Black, and they were surmounted by him, and surmounted with eminent success.

Mr. JACOBS: And his present position is a reward for his services in that direction.

Mr. MEIGHEN: If it were, it would be eminently justified, but it is not. His services there most clearly show that he is big enough, yes, more than big enough, for the position he holds now, and whether the functions of the Department of Immigration are concerned more with bringing immigrants in or with sifting immigration and seeing that only the right kind come in, no matter which function is the more important, there is no officer of this Government, I venture to say there is no one outside the realms of the service, who is better qualified to perform that work than is Doctor Black. I would ask those who have been acquainted with his work, whether in one office or the other, if it has not been performed with a single eye to duty and with marked efficiency, demonstrating no ordinary powers.

The hon. member says the office was created for him. There is no hon. member of this House who thinks that. It is utterly inconceivable. Doctor Black was in an office, he had previously been president of the Manitoba Agricultural College, he was filling an office after the creation of this one, let me repeat, and was promoted to that most responsible position of head of the Soldier Settlement Board, whose responsibilities he discharged with much success, and during a period of about three years. No, the Department of Immigration and Colonization was made a separate department, or rather, a branch of the Interior was made a separate department, in order that that work growing in importance in this country might have the undivided attention of a minister. That became impossible, with the contraction of the government later, but while it remained a separate department, the Mines Department was brought back into the Interior Department. The Mines Department is now added

to the responsibility of that office, and, as well, the functions of the Interior Department have grown and multiplied in these years, and I venture to say that the Interior Department, as administered to-day by the minister is four times in magnitude what is was in 1906.

Mr. JACOBS: When the natural resources of the western provinces are returned to those provinces what will be the functions of the Interior Department?

Mr. MEIGHEN: That will be the occasion for a re-consideration of the subject, but if my hon. friend expects that in the very near future then, in the words of the Finance Minister "I have not seen so great faith, no not even in Israel". We will pass that milestone when we reach it. But let me impress this on the Government: I do not object to the expansion of the Department of Immigration and Colonization; I do not emphasize one function more than another—both are of paramount consequence; the getting of the right immigrant and the exclusion of the wrong immigrant. Far better have the Mines branch in the Department of the Interior and have a separate Immigration and Colonization branch than to move the Mines branch out and to bring the Immigration branch back. I think it is one of the most important services the Government can render to expand the functions of that department and increase its usefulness. And in doing so they cannot get a better man than the present deputy—in fact I doubt if they can get his equal.

Mr. JACOBS: By reason of his success as organizer for the National Liberal Conservative party?

Mr. MEIGHEN: I do not know that I should answer that question. If I did it would be in the affirmative, but I do not want that to be any inducement to the minister to get him for his own purposes.

Mr. JACOBS: I suppose the fact that the hon. gentleman is now sitting on the opposite side of this House indicates how successful Dr. Black was.

Mr. MEIGHEN: If a man has to be a success as a political organizer to get into the government service—that apparently appears to be the view of my hon. friend—I assure him that his party seems to be living up to that policy.

Mr. JACOBS: May I point out to the right hon. gentleman that there was no Deputy Minister of Immigration and Colonization prior to the appointment of Dr. Black, and the department got along fairly well. Mr. Cory, who was also the Deputy Minister of the Department of the Interior performed the duties of both offices and discharged those duties very well, and Mr. Scott, Commissioner of Immigration, acted as a sort of deputy minister in that branch. Now why should we be paying $6,000 a year to this gentleman when the work was done as well, and perhaps better, before he ever came into the department?

Mr. MEIGHEN: Well, I would say this as to why there was no deputy before: The minister of the day was not able to find just the man he wanted for the position; but as the hon. gentleman ought to know there have been two or three officers of that department, one very prominent one, who have not been able to perform their services for some time. I have nothing in the world to say against Mr. Cory, he is an able man, but Mr. Cory or any other man cannot really perform the functions which the Deputy Minister of Immigration really performs—not merely by proxy but performs in his own person—and at the same time do justice to the office of Deputy Minister of the Interior.

Mr. JACOBS: Does Mr. Cory agree with that statement?

Mr. MEIGHEN: I have not conferred with Mr. Cory on the subject for some time, perhaps my hon. friend has; but I do not always take men at their own valuation in respect of ability to discharge the duties of several offices.

Item agreed to.

Immigration and Colonization. Outside Service, Salaries—
Further amount required, $35,000.

Mr. STEWART (Argenteuil): This is identical with the other item except that it applies to the outside service. I want to say to the committee that I have endeavoured, in administering three, four or five different branches to get to understand the Civil Service Act, and I must confess that I do not understand it yet. The last item referred to the inside service, that is the service here in Ottawa. This is to provide for the appointment of employees at agencies and inspection points whose positions have been filled for some years by temporary appointments, but which positions are now considered of a permanent nature. All of these positions

are to be advertised in the usual way, by the Civil Service Commission, and appointments made from the list of those who have qualified under competitive examinations held under the regulations of the Civil Service Commission. No doubt the appointment in a permanent capacity of properly qualified employees to these positions will lead to greater efficiency and be of benefit to the department.

Mr. KENNEDY (Edmonton): Will the minister explain where these officials are located?

Mr. STEWART (Argenteuil): They are located at Toronto, Montreal, Quebec, St. John, Halifax, Fort Erie, Lacolle, Niagara Falls, Walkerville, Port Arthur, Winnipeg and Vancouver.

Item agreed to.

Repatriation Expenses, $25,000.

Mr. STEWART (Argenteuil): I think this money was formerly paid out of the demobilization vote, but there is no demobilization vote for this year. Last year, I think the sum of $165,000 was spent in repatriating soldiers who had remained in Great Britain. I presume these were soldiers who took their discharge in Great Britain and subsequently desired to come back to Canada. We are voting $25,000 this year to take care of cases of that kind.

Item agreed to.

To pay the balance due on rent of house leased by W. T. R. Preston, while engaged as Commissioner of Emigration, in London, England, $1,509.95.

Mr. GUTHRIE: What are the facts in connection with this item?

Mr. STEWART (Argenteuil): It appears that when Mr. Preston was in the immigration service in London, part of his remuneration consisted of the rent of a house in which he lived. When he was transferred to the Department of Trade and Commerce part of this rent was due him. In the estimates of 1913-14 a sum was voted by Parliament to meet the claim but Mr. Preston objected to the amount and refused to accept it. Subsequently the amount was again voted but through some oversight Mr. Preston was never made aware of the fact. He contends that although the item was voted he did not receive the money and has made a fresh application to be paid this amount which he claims he is entitled to from the government. I am therefore asking for the sum of $973.33, which is the amount voted in 1913-14, plus 5 per cent interest, thus accounting for the total of $1,509.95.

Mr. GUTHRIE: I think it must be twelve years since Mr. Preston left the government service. This, therefore, is a pretty old claim, and if the sum of $973.33 was the amount of the claim allowed in the session of 1913-14, and Mr. Preston objected and would not accept it, I do not see why we should now pay him five per cent interest on it. It looks to me like a pretty stale claim. I draw the minister's attention to these facts. In his own statement he says that for some reason or other Mr. Preston objected to the amount.

Mr. STEWART (Argenteuil): That was in reference to the vote on the first occasion. I understand that the amount of $973 was acceptable, but, he being in China at that particular time, through some oversight the vote lapsed before it was paid. That is the explanation I got of it.

Mr. BRETHEN: Can the minister explain why it was not paid the following year?

Mr. STEWART (Argenteuil): It would lapse on the 31st March.

Mr. GUTHRIE: Has there been any application in the intervening years for payment?

Mr. BRETHEN: Would it not be brought forward in the following year?

Mr. KENNEDY (Edmonton): Is this one year's grant or two years'?

Mr. STEWART (Argenteuil): I cannot tell that. The sum asked for was the amount voted in the session of 1913-14, which apparently was agreed upon, and was satisfactory to Parliament at that time.

Mr. KENNEDY (Edmonton): Was it one year's rent?

Mr. STEWART (Argenteuil): I cannot say.

Mr. GUTHRIE: There is this rather outstanding fact. I think a man who has a claim against the government of Canada is disqualified from sitting in this House, and certainly he was the government candidate in the last election in the riding of Durham. It does not look as if Mr. Preston considered he had a claim. However, if Parliament adjusted it at $973 in the

year 1913, I have no objection to paying the money, but why should the Government be called upon to pay a fixed sum of $600 interest in a case of this kind?

Mr. MARTELL: If a person has a claim against the government, he is not disqualified from being a candidate in an election. That is a most peculiar contention.

Mr. GUTHRIE: Read the statute.

Mr. MARTELL: My hon. friend cannot show such a provision in the statute.

Mr. GUTHRIE: I am going to move to reduce the item by the amount of the interest, $600.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: My hon. friend's motion amounts to this: he admits the claim is just and proper. It was agreed to by an administration that was opposed to the present Government. There was no dispute in Parliament about it being a perfectly right and proper amount at that time, and the government has had the use of this money ever since. My hon. friend would deprive a citizen of the country of the proper rate of interest on an obligation owing by the government for a period of years. I think my hon. friend ought to be ashamed of anything so small and mean.

Mr. MEIGHEN: There has been no admission of anything on this side. I have no reason, from my own knowledge, to dispute what the minister says, that this money was voted in 1913-14. I know nothing about it, nor does the hon. gentleman from South Wellington (Mr. Guthrie) or any one on this side of the House. We assume it to be correct. Then, it being correct, nothing has been shown in the way of default on the part of the government, or wrongful refusal to pay on the part of the government. Consequently, there is no right to interest, except what the minister says, and he does not allege facts that give any right to interest.

Amendment (Mr. Guthrie) negatived on division, yeas 39, nays 70.

Item agreed to.

Office of the Auditor General—contingencies—further amount required, $20,000.

Mr. FIELDING: This amount is required for the publication of the Auditor General's report. The practice in former years was to have a general vote for printing out of which this work was paid for. Now each branch of the service is providing for its own printing.

Item agreed to.

Department of Finance—Salaries—additional amount required to provide for the salary of the Commissioner of Tariff, as voted in Supplementary Estimates, 1921-22, $2,100.

Mr. FIELDING: The salary of this gentleman was fixed in the supplementary estimates. This is the corresponding item.

Item agreed to.

Department of Agriculture—Salaries—	
Confidential Messenger Clerk	$1,140 00
Assistant to Chief, Fibre Division..	1,440 00
Senior Clerk-Stenographer..	1,320 00
Amount required to pay difference in salary between Senior and Principal Translator..	240 00
To provide for salary of Secretary-Clerk from February 15th to March 31st, 1922..	397 50
Allowance for Private Secretary..	200 00
	$4,737 50

Mr. KENNEDY (Edmonton): Are these new employees in the department?

Mr. MOTHERWELL: One of them, the assistant to chief, fibre division, is. Two years have been spent in endeavouring to get a gentleman to fill this position, and success has, at last, crowned our efforts; but as this did not occur until after the main estimates came down, we have to provide this salary.

Item agreed to.

Post Office Department—To provide for the payment of salary of Alfred Belley from the 17th October, 1921 to the 28th December, 1921 at the rate of $3,500 a year, during which period he acted as Private Secretary to the ex-Postmaster General, the Honourable L. G. Belley, $696.24

Mr. CASGRAIN: I cannot for myself vote in favour of this item, and I would certainly move that it be struck out. I do so for different reasons. The item provides for the payment of salary to a private secretary to the ex-Postmaster General, the Hon. L. G. Belley, during the period from the 17th October, 1921, to the 28th December, 1921. This was, as every hon. member will recall, during the last election. The ex-Postmaster General, as soon as he was sworn in, took as his private secretary, Major Pacaud; the gentleman who is mentioned in this item, Alfred Belley, is the son of the ex-Postmaster General, and during the whole time of the campaign, nothing more was done by him than to conduct the campaign on behalf of his father in the county which I have the honour to represent in this House. I object to this item, because it would be the payment by the Parliament of Canada of certain expenses of a defeated

5 p.m.

candidate at an election, and this would be creating a very bad precedent. At any rate, the minister was in office only until the 6th of December last, and I do not see why this salary should be voted until the 28th of December, 1921, when he was not in office at that time. For that reason I would move that this item be struck out. I consider it nothing less than political robbery.

Mr. MURPHY: I have no personal knowledge in regard to this item, except the information that was given to me in the department. The gentleman referred to was, I am informed, private secretary to the Postmaster General who occupied the position prior to the advent of the present Administration. My further information is that there was no money available to pay the private secretary of the former Postmaster General, and that his salary would have to be voted at the ensuing session of Parliament, that is at this session. Accordingly, in pursuance of the practice that has hitherto prevailed and in accordance with what one and, perhaps, two of my colleagues have already done this session, I inserted this item as an obligation to be discharged by this Administration irrespective of who the incumbent of the office was. I do not know anything about the length of service. I merely reflect in this item what was given to me by the department. Personally, I leave the item in the hands of the committee.

Mr. CASGRAIN: I do not see that in the case of the other Quebec ministers in the former administration, for instance, Mr. Monty, ex-Minister of Justice, and Mr. Fauteux, former Secretary of State, items were inserted for the payment of private secretaries. It seems to me that this is the only instance where provision is being asked of this House to pay the salary of the private secretary of a defeated minister. None of the other defeated ministers in the late administration have filed with any department of the Government any claim for payment of their private secretaries, and I do not see why we should make an exception in this case.

Mr. MURPHY: My hon. friend is in error in regard to that. The salary of the private secretary of the former Secretary of State was inserted in the estimates in precisely the same way as this item has been.

The CHAIRMAN: The amendment is not in order.

Item agreed to: Yeas, 67; nays, 43.

Mail subsidies and steamship subventions—Pictou, Mulgrave and Cheticamp steam service between—further amount required, $3,500.

Mr. GUTHRIE: Are these new services?

Mr. ROBB: No. Last year a very heavy loss was shown in the operation of this service, which is of very great importance to the west coast of Cape Breton.

Mr. GUTHRIE: Why were these sums not included in the Main Estimates?

Mr. ROBB: The contractors would not accept the amount in the Main Estimates and give the service. We had to make the increase to maintain the service.

Mr. GUTHRIE: Is this an additional amount over last year?

Mr. ROBB: Yes.

Mr. GUTHRIE: I notice there are eight or nine of these items, and if they are ordinary annual current items I do not see why they are all boosted this year by these large amounts. I think the minister should give some explanation.

Mr. ROBB: There are quite a few of these items which we were compelled to increase this year to maintain the services. These subsidized services are compelled to supply the department with a financial statement and a schedule of their freight and passenger rates. They have satisfied the department that they have been operating at a loss and could not continue the service. As my hon. friend is aware, these services are the only means of transportation for people along the coast.

Mr. GUTHRIE: It is pretty heavy.

Mr. ROBB: It does not amount to very much after all.

Mr. MEIGHEN: Could not the minister give the total in each case? It does seem strange that now when ocean rates are only a fraction of what they were this Government is not able to make as good contracts as the old government did under much higher rate conditions.

Mr. ROBB: The reason is that the subsidized companies have come forward and shown a loss in operation. My right hon. friend will remember that in the Main Estimates there were some reductions. Last year a heavy loss was shown in the operation of this service, which is of great importance to the west coast of Cape

Breton. In view of this and also of arrangements then made to increase the number of trips between Mulgrave and Cheticamp from two to three per week during the coming season from May 15th to September 15th, we have agreed to give this additional $3,500. The committe will observe that the service is being improved.

Mr. KENNEDY (Edmonton): The fair wage clause holds good in connection with certain government contracts, and I cannot see why it should not apply to contracts with companies receiving subsidies. What is the practice?

Mr. ROBB: I speak subject to correction, but I would not think there is such a clause in these subsidy contracts.

Mr. GOOD: The statement the minister read is simply that these companies showed a loss in operation. Are their statements audited by the department?

Mr. ROBB: Oh, yes, and the department has a travelling inspector, Mr. Tupper, on the Atlantic coast. He is constantly supervising the subsidized lines.

Mr. KENNEDY (Edmonton): Could any of these routes be served by ships of the Canadian Government Merchant Marine which are now lying idle?

Mr. ROBB: Our vessels are not of the right draft for these services.

Item agreed to.

Charlottetown, Pictou and or New Glasgow steam service between—Further amount required, $6,000.

Mr. HANSON: This is a very substantial increase. What was the amount voted in the Main Estimates, and why is there such a large increase?

Mr. ROBB: Last year and again this year $2,000 was included in the Main Estimates for steamship services on the above route. The service performed last year was very inadequate, and two offers were received for an improved service during 1922-23, one being from the Charlottetown Steamship Company, who offered the steamer Magdalene for a subsidy of $8,000, and the other from last year's contractors, the Pictou Steamship Company, who offered to bring a large boat from England for a subsidy of $12,000, which offer was afterwards amended to $7,000. Our inspectors made a careful examination of each vessel and reported the Magdalene to be the more suitable of the two, and the contract was awarded to the owners for a daily service between Pictou and Charlottetown up to October 1st, after which three round trips a week are to be run to the close of navigation. This vote is therefore required to make the total up to $8,000. Only $2,000 was voted in the Main Estimates.

Mr. HANSON: This route has been established for a number of years, but it is in direct competition with the Canadian National Railways between the island and the mainland.

Mr. ROBB: No, it is not the same route.

Mr. GOULD: The minister, replying to a question, stated that the inspector examined the books of steamship companies to which subsidies are granted. It seems to me that that inspector should have power to audit the books at any time. Further, I think the department itself should have all the financial statements of those companies on file so we can be given more information than we are receiving when these votes are being put through. The minister fixes the amount of the item on the report sent in by his inspector, which perhaps is not based on as thorough an examination as the House has a right to expect.

Mr. ROBB: I can assure my hon. friend that a very careful examination of all these accounts is made by an officer in the department who gives his entire attention to this work. It is not the amounts we are voting here that should count; it is the demands that we have resisted.

Mr. GARLAND (Bow River): Do any of the subsidized services come in competition with our National Railways?

Mr. ROBB: Most of these services are for the population along the coast where there is practically no railway service at all.

Item agreed to.

Charlottetown, Victoria and Holliday's Wharf, steam service between—further amount required, $500.

Mr. GARLAND (Bow River): In order to have the facts on record, I should like the minister to state briefly the necessity for the vote as he has done in relation to some of the other items, as I think the information will be valuable to members next session.

Mr. ROBB: Yes. The provincial government contributes really more than we.

do. This service has shown a considerable loss to the operating company annually for some years past. The loss in 1921 was $1,561.24; in 1920, $1,240, and there was a small loss in 1919. The service is an important one, as all the ports are a considerable distance from the nearest railway station. The contractors are giving an excellent service and state that they cannot carry on without an increase in the subsidy. Their present subsidy is $3,500 from the Dominion government and $5,000 from the provincial government. They asked for $1,500 in order to bring the subsidy from the Dominion government to the same level as the other. We are giving them an increase of $500 instead of the $1,500 asked for.

Item agreed to.

Halifax, Canso and Guysboro', steam service between—further amount required, $2,000.

Mr. KENNEDY (Edmonton): Do I understand that money has been voted for these routes already and that these are additional amounts to be voted?

Mr. ROBB: This is an additional $2,000. The records show that during the past two years the contractors lost $1,500 on this route.

Mr. CALDWELL: Is this $2,000 in excess of what they got last year?

Mr. ROBB: Yes, I should think so.

Item agreed to.

St. John and ports on the Bay of Fundy and Minas Basin, steam service between,—further amount required, $500.

Mr. CALDWELL: Does this include the route between St. John and Digby?

Mr. ROBB: No.

Mr. CALDWELL: Is there any subsidized steamship service between St. John and Digby?

Mr. ROBB: I think so; we will come to that.

Item agreed to.

Port Mulgrave, St. Peters, Irish Cove and Marble Mountain and other ports on the Bras d'Or lakes, steam service between—further amount required, $1,500.

Mr. ROBB: The financial statements respecting this service indicate that the Richmond Company, who operate it, have suffered heavy losses during the last three years. The manager of the line states that during last year he had to pay $5,000 out of his own pocket to keep the steamer running. The subsidy has remained at $6,500 for a number of years; it received no increase during the war period or afterwards with the exception of a temporary increase in 1918.

Mr. CALDWELL: What proof does the department require that a contractor is losing money? Is a letter sufficient for that purpose?

Mr. ROBB: No. They submit their statement and we go into it very carefully. If we have any doubt about it we send it down to our inspector and ask him to go over their books.

Mr. KENNEDY (Edmonton): Are the rates charged by these steamboats subject to any regulation by the government?

Mr. ROBB: They are subject to the approval of the minister.

Item agreed to.

St. John, Bear River and other way ports, steam service between, $2,000.

Mr. MEIGHEN: The conclusion of the minister, from a review of all these matters, appears to be that the late government carried economy too far.

Mr. ROBB: I am bound to say, in justice to my predecessor, that I think he pared to the bone, and that in some places the service was even crippled.

Item agreed to.

MARINE AND FISHERIES

Ocean and river service—amount required to provide a suitable boat to replace the C.G.S. Lambton, recently lost in Lake Superior, $100,000.

Mr. MARTELL: Would it not be possible for the minister to put a few derricks on one of the ships of the Merchant Marine and use it for this purpose?

Mr. LAPOINTE: Unfortunately I am told that none of the Merchant Marine vessels are suitable for that service.

Mr. MARTELL: They are not much good for anything.

Mr. GOOD: Was this vessel owned by the Dominion government?

Mr. LAPOINTE: Yes. it was used in connection with lighthouse and buoy service. We need another boat to replace it.

Mr. McBRIDE: What were the dimensions of the boat that was sunk?

Mr. LAPOINTE: Length, 108 feet; breadth, 25.12 feet; depth, 12.75 feet; gross tonnage, 322.77; registered tonnage 181.85;

speed, twelve miles, nominal horse-power 89; indicated horse-power 700. The net cost of the vessel was $105,114.13.

Mr. RYCKMAN: Was the boat insured?

Mr. LAPOINTE: No; government boats are not insured.

Mr. KENNEDY (Edmonton): I understood that the cost of building steamships had decreased very considerably during the last few years.

Mr. LAPOINTE: I was not made aware of that.

Mr. COOTE: Is it proposed to build a new boat, or is it the intention to purchase one already built?

Mr. LAPOINTE: No decision has been reached as to that, we will try to make the best bargain possible.

Mr. SIMPSON: Has the department decided what the size of the boat shall be?

Mr. LAPOINTE: Not yet. We want to have a strong boat.

Mr. SIMPSON: Having in mind the unfortunate accident that overtook the Lambton and also the fact that these boats have to go out early in the season to put up the buoys and place lighthouse keepers in their stations before navigation is open, and have to go out late in the fall after navigation is closed to take in the lightkeepers and the buoys, you should have a fairly substantial craft in order to meet the weather conditions at those seasons of the year.

Mr. LAPOINTE: I entirely agree with my hon. friend.

Item agreed to.

Amount required to pay Captain Frank Murphy for the loss of his schooner and personal effects as the result of a collision with the departmental steamer Aranmore in the month of August, 1917, $2,201.70.

Mr. GOULD: Why has the payment of this amount been deferred until this time?

Mr. LAPOINTE: An offer was made to Captain Murphy in 1918 of practically the same amount, but that offer was refused. He is now quite willing to accept it, and he is entitled to it.

Item agreed to.

Lighthouse and coast service—administration of pilotage—further amount required to provide for Sydney pilotage district, $44,000.

Some hon. MEMBERS: Explain.

[Mr. Lapointe.]

Mr. LAPOINTE: This is merely a matter of bookkeeping. We get the money back at the end of the season.

Mr. CALDWELL: Where does the money go that you got back last year? Would that not finance this year's operations?

Mr. LAPOINTE: The Sydney pilotage district was placed under the Minister of Marine as pilotage authority by Order in Council in April, 1922. This is the first year. We have figured out the pilotage receipts for the district last year, and we are advancing the money. The money comes back to the department.

Item agreed to.

Amount required to pay freight to point of delivery on steelplates belonging to department at present at Sydney. Also to adjust a difference of 10 cents per 100 lbs. for Lloyd's specification on the steel delivered to the department, $35,000.

Mr. CALDWELL: Does the minister propose to build more ships when the Government have more than they know what to do with already?

Mr. LAPOINTE: We had to take delivery of these steel plates under contract between the Government and the Dominion Steel Company. We disposed of them, but we have to pay the freight to the point of delivery.

Mr. CALDWELL: How did you dispose of them?

Mr. LAPOINTE: An agreement was made with Messrs. Drummond, McCall and Company, Limited, for the disposal of these steel plates on the following basis: The terms of sale to be determined by the base price for plates f.o.b. Pittsburg, to which was to be added the cost of freight from Pittsburg to point of delivery, the exchange on American currency, etc. The department had to pay freight to point of delivery on steel plates shipped from Sydney, and the Dominion Iron and Steel Company, Limited, were requested to prepay the freight, the sales tax, etc. This is simply a reimbursement.

Mr. CALDWELL: How will the department come out on the deal? Will what you get for the plates cover their cost under the contract?

Mr. LAPOINTE: I am unable to say definitely.

Mr. CALDWELL: Have you any fear of losing on the deal?

Mr. LAPOINTE: I am rather afraid so.

Item agreed to.

Department of External Affairs—salaries and contingencies, $6,575.

Mr. HANSON: Why is $5,000 required for contingencies when we voted the Main Estimates only a week ago?

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: I am glad my hon. friend asked that question. In an effort to be economical I cut down the amount for contingencies by $10,000 but my officers tell me they will not be able to manage on that, so I am asking for $5,000. The contingencies vote will then still be $5,000 less than was voted last year for my right hon. friend.

Item agreed to.

Civil Service Commission—salaries, $4,765.

Mr. CALDWELL: Is this to provide for an increase in the staff of the commission?

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: This item is just as it has been handed in by the commission.

Mr. CALDWELL: Do they set their own salaries?

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: Yes.

Mr. GOOD: Perhaps the Government would look into this matter. It seems to me there ought to be some kind of control over the commission.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: I think we all agree with my hon. friend.

Item agreed to.

Legislation—Senate—To provide for the payment of the full Sessional indemnity for the Session of 1922 to members of the Senate for days lost through absence caused by illness, public business, or on account of death. Payment to be made as the Treasury Board may direct, $16,500.

Some hon. MEMBERS: Explain.

Mr. FIELDING: I am afraid the explanation is similar to the one given regarding the Civil Service Commission item The Senate have sent in this item.

Mr. CALDWELL: I thought members were not paid if they were absent. If they are, it is a very poor inducement to members who stay here every day in the session and work day and night.

The CHAIRMAN: It is allowed every year, for days lost by illness.

Mr. CALDWELL: The chairman says it is allowed every year but I submit that that does not make it right.

Mr. STEVENS: I recall one particularly sad case where one of the senators was called to the deathbed of his wife, a very long distance, and he would suffer severe financial loss by a rigid application of the rules. Occasionally in this House cases of that kind arise, and votes are made. I do not think there should be any criticism of the vote.

Mr. GOOD: What is the meaning of the last sentence, "Payment to be made as the Treasury Board may direct"? Is it left to the discretion of the board to make the payment or not?

Mr. FIELDING: Many of these items are voted that way. They are left in some measure to the discretion of the board, but, of course, the board is bound by the language of the item. There will be some of these matters which will be more or less of a debatable character, and that is why some measure of discretion is left to the board. My hon. friend from Vancouver Centre referred to the case of a senator who was called away from his duties under sad circumstances, and there is another case in which a senator died before the end of the session. I imagine it is contemplated that his family will probably get the indemnity. I think that is the intention, though I have not the details beyond what is contained in the item.

Mr. HANSON: Would the minister see that that interpretation is placed on the item, especially with respect to the Senate?

Mr. FIELDING: I think it is intended. I cannot say more definitely.

Mr. GOOD: The point I raised was whether the board had power to withhold payment of part of this amount.

Mr. FIELDING: Hardly that. If any question arises, the board will exercise whatever discretion it has, but it must be bound by the terms of this vote; it must keep within the four corners of this appropriation.

Mr. CHEVRIER: Will the same consideration be extended to the civil servants who are absent through sickness?

Item agreed to.

To enable assistance to be given in fitting out a Canadian fishing schooner for the International fishing Schooner Race, $5,000.

Mr. WOODSWORTH: It seems to me that in view of the heavy expenditures the country is called upon to make just now it is going a long way to vote a grant of this character. We have in Canada all sorts of athletic competitions, and interprovincial as well as international matches. There are also horse races and in particular, ploughing matches, and other similar events taking place. It seems to me that it is hardly fair to pick out one particular boat race and ask Parliament to contribute towards it.

Mr. LAPOINTE: This is to give effect to a resolution which was introduced by the hon. member for Lunenburg (Mr. Duff) during the present session and in respect to which the House seemed desirous of acting generously.

Mr. WOODSWORTH: Was the resolution passed?

Mr. LAPOINTE: No, I moved the adjournment of the debate on it for the purpose of considering the matter, with the intention of later on announcing the decision of the government. That decision finds expression in this item. It gives effect to what seemed to be an expression of opinion from all quarters of the House on that particular day.

Mr. CALDWELL: Just in this connection, may I be permitted to say that a resolution was unanimously passed in the early stages of the session to grant a pension to widowed mothers; no hon. gentleman demurred to that motion. I did not agree with the resolution in its entirety. Nevertheless when the matter was before the Pensions Committee I urged very strongly that some small concession be made to the widowed mother. I urged the same thing when the Pension Bill recently came before us, but the matter received absolutely no consideration. In view of that fact I will vote against the present grant, if some hon. member will move that this item be not passed.

Mr. LAPOINTE: Because one wrong was done must it be followed by another?

Mr. CALDWELL: But this vote is a wrong one; the other was right.

Mr. POWER: Any such sum as this would only be a drop in the bucket when it came to making provision for widowed mothers. From the sporting point of view the item deserves to be supported.

Mr. CALDWELL: The question involved is the principle, not the amount of the grant we are voting. The minister has referred to the fact that a resolution in favour of the grant was moved here as a reason why this vote should carry.

Mr. LAPOINTE: Because a resolution adopted by the House in another case has not been followed by legislation is no reason why I, as Minister of Marine and Fisheries, should not give effect to the wishes of the House in the present instance. I thought I was doing well in recommending this grant. I am not responsible because the recommendation to which my hon. friend from Victoria and Carleton, N.B. (Mr. Caldwell) alludes was not carried out. Let me point out that there is an international aspect to this matter, and the purpose behind it is to encourage the fishermen of Nova Scotia. I understand that last year races took place on the coast of Nova Scotia in which American fishermen participated, and it is proposed that the fishermen of that province should be represented at races in the United States this year. These events are a good advertisement for Canada and a great encouragement for the fishermen.

Mr. JOHNSON (Moosejaw): I would like to ask the minister if the Nova Scotia government has made any contribution for this purpose. I know that when we have competitions in the western provinces any grant of public funds for the purpose comes from the provincial government. That is what should be done in this case.

Mr. LAPOINTE: My hon. friend will understand that the fisheries of Nova Scotia are under federal control.

Mr. MARTELL: I may say as well that competitions of this kind will have the effect of encouraging the building of vessels in the province of Nova Scotia. The town of Lunenburg is practically maintained by the fishing industry. The United States and Canadian fishermen enter into these international races and the American government takes so much interest that it sends a patrol boat, or man of war, for the purpose of facilitating the proceedings. As the minister has said, the fisheries do not come within the purview of the local government, but are under federal authority. By making this grant the Government is going to encourage the people of Nova

Scotia to build the fastest kind of schooners for the fishing industry. My hon. friends on the Progressive side of the House, I think, have no reason to complain of the demands we are making from the province of Nova Scotia. I know that there is a tendency among some hon. members to criticize votes for mail subsidies in the province of Nova Scotia, and elsewhere in the maritime provinces, but such subsidies are matters of vital necessity to the people of the communities which these mail vessels serve. They do not enjoy railway facilities as do the communities in the western provinces. Now in view of the fact that my hon. friends came here and asked for a Wheat Board, for which we from the province of Nova Scotia voted, I think we are perfectly justified in applying for this grant for the purpose of encouraging the fishing industry in Nova Scotia, particularly when it is borne in mind that the Wheat Board is a provincial matter, whereas the fishing industry is directly under the control of the federal authority.

Upon Mr. Hanson rising:

Mr. POWER: Too much wind, no race.

Mr. HANSON: I do not know whether that remark was intended for myself or for the hon. member for Hants (Mr. Martell)—

Mr. LAPOINTE: You do not know whether it is history or prophecy.

Mr. HANSON: —but I do think it is rather a dangerous precedent for this House to establish. This race is a purely sporting event and I happen to know a little about it. It is something that ought to be encouraged but it should be encouraged by the people down there, not by the people of the whole country. It should be encouraged by the fishing industry in Nova Scotia, particularly in the county of Lunenburg. That course has always been adopted heretofore but I fear in this case—

Mr. HATFIELD: Is not this race more or less international in character?

Mr. HANSON: No, I think it is being participated in only by the fishermen on the Atlantic coast.

Mr. HATFIELD: I would like to ask my hon. friend—

Mr. HANSON: All right, if you want to make a speech I will let you have the floor. I say this is a sporting event, it is not a business proposition.

Mr. HATFIELD: I think the idea is to encourage the buiding of a better type of fishing schooner and so promote the welfare of the fishing industry.

Mr. HANSON: I know that idea is given out but I doubt very much whether there is any ground for it. A fishing boat is not a racing schooner; the vessels that engage in these competitions are racing schooners.

Mr. LAPOINTE: Why did not my hon. friend ventilate his objection when the resolution came before the House the other day and everybody was favouring it?

Mr. HANSON: I do not think everybody favoured it; there were lots of members who spoke against the resolution.

Mr. LAPOINTE: Perhaps you were not here.

Mr. HANSON: I was a new member and did not care to thrust my views on the House at the time.

Mr. BUREAU: My hon. friend is getting wiser.

Mr. MEIGHEN: Nobody took this proposition seriously.

Mr. HANSON: I thought it was a mistake at the time. As a matter of fact, I am going to oppose this item now.

Mr. GOULD: I wish to associate myself with the sentiments expressed by the hon. member for York-Sunbury (Mr. Hanson). It does seem to me that it is an excessive demand on the generosity of Parliament to ask that public money be voted for the promotion of races of this nature. I do not gather from the item itself whether it is a race between boats sailing point to point or whether it is a competition, as between American and Canadian fishermen, to see which can secure the largest catches of fish. In the latter event it may transpire that our representatives may have to toil all night and catch nothing. I do not think this House has any right to establish the precedent of voting money, raised by the people of Canada as a whole, for any such purpose. The real object of this is to provide a little recreation, a little sporting event, for a few thousand Canadians who happen to live down in that particular part of the country. Consequently, I am going to move that this $5,000 be deleted from the item.

Mr. SPEAKMAN: I am another farmer who does not know a thing about fishing,

and I am not going to display my ignorance by discussing it. I was one of those who voted for that resolution when it went through, because I took the ground —and until it is proved differently I still take the ground—that it is something similar to grants to encourage agricultural societies, and so on. It is an encouragement to adopt better methods of boat building and better handling of boats; in other words, to encourage the fishing industry, in the same way that certain grants are made to agricultural societies to encourage agriculture. I am going to vote for the item which implements the resolution I supported previously.

Mr. LOGAN My hon. friend from Assiniboia (Mr. Gould) is moving to strike out this item. This is a matter pertaining to the fishermen of Nova Scotia. If this item is to be struck out, let us be consistent and move that the next item, $125,000 for briquetting plants in the province of Saskatchewan, in which my hon. friend from Assiniboia is interested, be struck out, because I say that the fishing industry of Nova Scotia, yielding a product of about $14,000,000, is just as important to that province and to Canada, as the investigation of the briquetting of lignite in Saskatchewan. The item which we will be asked to pass in a few minutes, of $125,000, will bring the amount which this country is paying for the investigation into lignite briquetting in Saskatchewan to nearly a million dollars, and my hon. friend, when a vote is asked for a mere matter of $5,000, to encourage a great international event in this country, moves to strike it out. I am surprised at my hon. friend from Assiniboia. In my humble opinion this $5,000 is not sufficient for this purpose. We cannot live in any country on material things alone. We must have some pride in our people and some pride in our sports. Year after year we have had to suffer the rather unpleasant experience of seeing the boats of our good friend, Sir Thomas Lipton, Shamrock I, Shamrock II, Shamrock III, defeated. Last year the hardy fishermen of Nova Scotia went out to the sea and defeated the best boat they could construct in the United States. If these people should not be encouraged, I do not know who should be encouraged, and if you are going to strike this item out, let us strike out the item which provides for the investigation of lignite in Saskatchewan.

Mr. FIELDING: There is something of a sporting character in this appropriation, that I admit, but that is not a reason against it. There is a manly sport in the world we all ought to admire. Some people say that the battle of Waterloo was won on the cricket fields of England, and we know the devotion Englishmen have to manly, honourable sports, and there is no more manly sport than this race, which so much interests the fishermen of the lower provinces. I do not think anybody has any anti-Nova Scotian feeling in this matter. We should all put aside feelings of this kind. This event has attracted great attention. It is in one sense international. I do not think it is international in the sense that the United States government has taken any part, but there is a large and interested population in the United States concerned in all maritime affairs, who are taking an interest, and the American people are putting up the money. The fishermen of Gloucester are very much concerned in this matter, The fishermen of the New England states are doing their utmost to turn out a type of schooner which will beat our boat. This interests the fishing population of the lower provinces. I am glad to hear one of my friends of the Progressive party state that he is interested in this matter. He shows that he takes a broad view. You have not any salt water out west. My hon. friend from York Sunbury (Mr. Hanson) lives up the river and does not know the smell of salt water. There are many appropriations in these estimates which could be criticised, but I desire to say that if this event is carried on in a manly spirit, and it is an international affair in the sense that our American friends are taking part in it and helping, we might do very much worse than pass the item in order to encourage the fishermen of the lower provinces.

Mr. TOLMIE: While I am interested in agriculture, I feel that we are not going to get Canada anywhere so long as we adopt a narrow policy. I feel that while this is a sporting event to a certain extent, it does a great deal, not only to stimulate our fishing industry, but also our skill in shipbuilding and I can assure Nova Scotians that while it creates a great deal of interest in the maritime provinces, it is also looked on with interest in British Columbia. I therefore feel that I would be quite justified in supporting this item.

Mr. BROWN: I yield to no one in my desire to do anything that will put Canada on the map if it can be done by such an event as this but I would like to ask a

question in regard to this item. Will it have a tendency to make this race a purely sporting event or not?

Some hon. MEMBERS: No, No.

Mr. BROWN: We know that the cup races that have been sailed by those schooners that have come across the Atlantic have almost degenerated into a farce, from the fact that the ships built to compete in this race are not capable of sailing, as the hon. gentleman (Mr. Power) remarked, if there is too much wind, and then it is declared no race. If the intention is to encourage this as a sporting event, I think it would not be well to encourage it. At the same time if we are given the assurance that it is not simply a sporting event—much as I dislike sporting events myself—but that the continuance of these grants will not lead to the development of a type of vessel that cannot go to sea if there is any wind, I would be inclined to favour it. But if the result will be the development of the type of vessel which has been referred to, which cannot go to sea, we will not accomplish the purpose we have in view of developing the fishing industry, and we should be careful how we proceeed.

Mr. FIELDING: Some of the yacht races which the hon. member refers to might well be celled toy races, but here is a real ship race. It is a condition that a boat must be a bona fide fishing boat and must go out into the ocean, and be in the service a season at least on the fishing banks; otherwise the boat will not qualify. My hon. friend's criticism about the toy ships is correct, but this is a real race with real fishermen and real water.

Mr. MILLAR: Notwithstanding the enthusiastic remarks of the Minister of Finance, I think I must voice my objection to this proposal. I believe that I have as much sympathy with the fishing industry in Nova Scotia as any one from the maritime provinces, and I might say that if it were an item of $10,000 or $15,000 to help the fishing industry, I would vote for it at once, because that is where the money should be expended—in the development of the natural resources of the country, but it seems to me that this is about 95 per cent sporting event and 5 per cent fishing industry. When the hon. member for Lunenburg spoke in this matter, as expressed by my right hon. friend to my right (Mr. Meighen), I thought it was a joke. I did not take it seriously at all.

Mr. HATFIELD: Why does the hon. member say it is 95 per cent sport and 5 per cent otherwise?

Some hon. MEMBERS: Carried, carried.

Mr. MILLAR: It is not carried until I finish. A short time ago we had a little discussion on the question of the Hudson Bay railway. I spoke briefly on that matter myself; and following the hon. member for Prince Albert (Mr. Knox) I said that it was not wise to expend money there at the present time, because money is so badly needed for other things, for instance, branch lines. Frequently, when we ask for these things, we are told that the money is not available. Therefore, to spend $5,000 and thus to set a precedent in regard to what is entirely a sporting matter, is a great mistake. While these items have been under consideration, when we have asked for an explanation of a large item, frequently ministers would say: "We have always voted that amount," or "for years back we have voted that amount." I suppose, in coming years, when a grant is asked for an international baseball match, the Minister of Finance will say: "This is a great event, an international event, and we will back it up," and the precedent which we are forming now by granting $5,000 for a boat race will be cited. Therefore, if I have an opportunity, I am going to vote against this item.

Mr. HOCKEN: I come from a section of the country where we have no salt water and no fire water.

Mr. BUREAU: Plenty of it in hiding.

Mr. HOCKEN: We have an international yacht race on our lake, something after the same class of sporting event that it is proposed in this item to subsidize. I am not going to object to this item; but I would suggest to the Government that they make a grant of an equal amount, say for the assistance of those who want to engage in a contest for the Canada cup which is sailed on the lake at Toronto.

Mr. DUFF: I do not intend to keep the committee very long, because I am convinced that most hon. gentlemen are seized with the fact that this appropriation is to help in the development of a great fishing industry in the maritime provinces. My hon. friend (Mr. Millar) said that this was 95 per cent sport and 5 per cent fishing industry. I do not need to have to contradict that statement; but men who come

here and are willing to ask this Parliament to vote money of this country for country fairs where horse racing takes place, should not object to races with fishing vessels; neither should the hon. member for West Toronto (Mr. Hocken) object to our voting this $5,000 item, when this country has spent millions of dollars in the construction of a park in the city of Toronto.

Mr. HOCKEN: I do not object to this item.

Mr. ARTHURS: I have absolutely no objection to this item passing; but a friend of mine in Ontario has a very decided objection to an item of this kind, and on behalf of the Hon. Mr. Raney of Ontario, I would like to ask the Minister of Finance if he will give us the assurance that no betting will take place in connection with this event.

Item agreed to.

At six o'clock the committee took recess.

After Recess

The committee resumed at eight o'clock.

MARINE DEPARTMENT.

Amount required to settle, on the basis of 50 cents on the dollar, the claims of the creditors of the Prince Rupert Dry Dock and Engineering Co., Ltd., for material supplied or services rendered directly or indirectly in connection with the construction of the "Scottish" and "Britisher" in Prince Rupert, B.C., $130,000.

Mr. COOTE: The minister might explain an item of this size before he asks the House to pass it.

Mr. LAPOINTE: In February, 1919, the Department of Marine entered into a contract with the Prince Rupert Drydock and Engineering Company, Limited, for the building of two ships of the Canadian Merchant Marine at a price of $1,603,800 each. As a guarantee the contractors gave a bond for $321,000. In case of default the bonding company was to complete the contract or permit the government to complete it. The contractors failed after the government had paid them $2,449,388.34. The bonding company declined to complete the contract, and the government called for tenders. A new contract was given to the Wallace Shipbuilding Company, under which the department paid the company $1,226,038.51: When the department took over the vessels it was found that the Prince Rupert Drydock and Engineering Company before going into bankruptcy had failed to pay for certain labour and materials, the amount outstanding being about $453,000. The wages owing represented $113,000, and the balance was for materials, machinery, board of men, and so forth. The wages were paid by authority of an Order in Council on the 3rd December, 1920, out of the appropriation for the shipbuilding programme. A subsequent Order in Council was passed in June, 1921, authorizing a compromise with the creditors who supplied the materials which entered into the construction of the ships, and the department paid $45,000, covering a claim of $90,000 on the basis of fifty cents on the dollar. The clause in the Order in Council governing the matter reads as follows:

> The minister therefore recommends that he be authorized to pay the creditors of the Prince Rupert Drydock and Engineering Company Limited who furnished the materials which have been or are to be used in the construction or completion of the vessels 50 per cent of the price payable for such materials.

The Auditor General interpreted that clause as meaning that only the materials which actually went into the construction of the ships should be paid for. So, what was spent on meals for the men, kitchen utensils, claims for workmen's compensation, freight, storage, insurance, tools, coal and other materials which were evidently necessary in the construction of the ships, were not paid for under this Order in Council. Those creditors have always urged their claims, and we have come to the conclusion that we ought to settle them. The creditors are claiming the full amount of their accounts, but we propose to settle on the basis fixed by the previous Order in Council, namely, fifty cents on the dollar. There are, of course, other claims which we will not consider. For instance, there is an amount of $50,558 for which the Royal Bank of Canada presented a claim, there is an item of $63,000 claimed by Albert Kelly, and various other items which the department did not consider as having been necessary to the construction of the ships; with those creditors we do not propose to settle. I may say that this settlement has been urged upon us from everywhere in British Columbia. Members on both sides of Parliament have demanded it.

Mr. BROWN: It represents a liability already incurred?

Mr. LAPOINTE: Yes.

Mr. MEIGHEN: I do not think the minister should have answered in that way. There is no liability whatever.

Mr. LAPOINTE: Was there liability under the Order in Council which was passed last year?

Mr. MEIGHEN: None at all, no.

Mr. LAPOINTE: It is just to extend the provisions of the Order in Council, which the Auditor General found would not include the claims of which I have spoken.

Mr. MEIGHEN: That is quite correct; it extends the provision of the order of last year, but there was no liability on the part of the Government and such could never have been claimed. The Government let the contract, and under the terms of the contract it had no responsibility at all for wages or for materials supplied. It did, however, supervise these expenditures, as had always been done. After the failure of the company it turned out that there were large amounts in wages outstanding and materials supplied and actually put on the ground, and the claim was made that the material would not have been put there and the wage-earners would not have worked had they not felt they could rely upon the Government for payment. They could not, of course, have any legal claim at all, but there did seem some justification for their expecting to be taken care of, the contract being with the Government. So, by the terms of the Order in Council, we decided that all who should come within that class we would settle with—that is, we would pay the wages in full and settle with those who supplied the material at fifty cents on the dollar. In the latter case the persons affected were only those who had actually contracted and put the material there; we drew the line at those who directly supplied, we did not go back to those who supplied the suppliers, who loaned money for the purpose, who carried freight to make the supplies, and that kind of thing. We thought the utmost you could ask the Government to consider at all were those who supplied the actual material, but the Government now proposes to go back of those to the indirect suppliers. I know the pressure is very strong; it certainly was very strong upon us. But I venture to express the fear that this is in pursuance of a pre-election promise.

Mr. LAPOINTE: Well, I hope the hon. member for Vancouver will not say that.

Mr. MEIGHEN: He does not know.

Mr. LAPOINTE: If there was any pre-election promise it was made by the friends of my right hon. friend, and not by us. It it only upon being convinced of the merit of the claim that I have come to the conclusion to settle on the basis which I stated a few moments ago. If there is any strong opposition, I may say that I will move to strike out the item.

Mr. GOOD: What is the total amount which has been paid out for these two vessels up to date, and what is the total contract price?

Mr. LAPOINTE: The total contract price was $3,207,600. We have already paid $4,155,477.69.

Mr. GOOD: The vessels are completed?

Mr. LAPOINTE: Yes. We have already paid over $700,000 more than the contract.

Mr. KENNEDY (Edmonton): Did I understand the minister to say that when the contract fell down the bond company refused to complete the contract?

Mr. LAPOINTE: Yes.

Mr. KENNEDY (Edmonton): Can the minister give the name of the bond company and the reason why it was not possible to compel them to fulfil the contract?

Mr. LAPOINTE: That is very easy to understand. The amount of the guarantee was $321,000. The company is not pledged for more than that amount. I have shown that we have spent over $1,000,000 to complete the contract. It would be better for the company to pay the $321,000 than to complete the ships.

Mr. GOOD: The company has paid the $300,000?

Mr. LAPOINTE: Not yet.

Mr. KENNEDY (Edmonton): Can they be compelled to pay it?

Mr. LAPOINTE: I hope they will.

Mr. COOTE: Has any action been taken to force them to pay?

Mr. LAPOINTE: Not yet—not until this whole matter is cleared up.

Mr. COOTE: To whom is this $130,000 to be paid, or at least the large items in it?

Mr. LAPOINTE: It is a very long list, but I am quite willing to read it. It comprises five pages. Perhaps my hon. friend would look at it.

Mr. COOTE: I will not ask the minister to read five pages. I thought it strange that the board of these men should be still unpaid and I wondered if the minister would tell us to whom payments for the board of the men would go.

Mr. LAPOINTE: I can give my hon. friend the names of the firms who have sent in claims:

P. Burn & Company, Limited	$1,188 47
Atkins Meat Market	116 00
Brackman-Ker Milling Co., Ltd.	474 30
Cassidy's Limited	42 39
Canadian Steam Laundry	896 81
The Clark Fruit and Produce	273 73
Edmonton City Dairy Limited	62 72
G. J. Frissell	7,955 91
Gault Bros.	564 72
The Le Casse Baking	1,929 01
Tom Lee Company	2,006 77
Munro Bros.	16 87
W. H. Malkin & Company	437 85
National Grocery	196 27
The Royal Fish Company	338 97

Some hon. MEMBERS: Dispense.

Mr. LAPOINTE: There are only five or six others.

Mr. BROWN: The minister mentioned the firm of P. Burns and Company, Limited. They, I suppose, would furnish meat to the men who boarded the workingmen?

Mr. LAPOINTE: I should think so, yes.

Mr. BROWN: The boarding house keepers got their pay, but the men who furnished supplies to the boarding houses did not; is that it?

Mr. LAPOINTE: I think the company had a boarding house itself and these were the supplies that were furnished to the company.

Mr. COOTE: I think we are establishing a very dangerous precedent if we are going to meet all unpaid accounts indirectly connected with the construction of vessels.

Mr. LAPOINTE: I am afraid that will always happen when the government is party to a contract. Those who stand to lose will always have a claim on the country, and it is hard to refuse them compensation.

Item agreed to.

To provide for railway and steamship charges for freight on goods for the "Save the Children Fund" for relief of distress in Russia—further amount reuired, $20,000.

Mr. FIELDING: This is to supplement the amount previously granted. We agreed to bear the expenses of the transportation of food supplies to save the children of Russia under what is known as the "Save the Children Fund."

Mr. GOOD: Did the railways give any special rate on those shipments?

Mr. FIELDING: I am not able to answer my hon. friend. The one of my colleagues who has personal knowledge of the matter is absent. When he comes in, I shall be glad to ask him.

Mr. WOODSWORTH: Are these grants from the Government confined to this one organization? I know that in Winnipeg and through the West we have had for the past year or so an organization for the relief of distress in Russia, and some little time ago they wished to ship some grain from the Doukhobor colonies through to Russia. It was then stated, I believe, that they could not avail themselves of this grant for the "Save the Children Fund". I think that any organizations that are really trying to assist the people in Russia ought to be able to come in under some such scheme as this and take advantage of the special rates that are provided.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: I might inform my hon. friend that when this question came before the Government it became necessary to have some one responsible organization that would undertake the work for the whole of Canada, and a voluntary organization having been formed for that purpose, on the understanding that it would permit any other organizations to share with it such opportunities as it might have of transporting commodities the Government agreed to recognize that organization as an official organization for the purpose of the assistance it was giving in the way of transportation. I think that if any association in Canada that has food or clothing to transport to starving people in Russia will communicate with the officers of the "Save the Children Fund", they will see that whatever benefits there may be in the way of transportation of these commodities will accrue also to these other organizations.

Item agreed to.

To provide for the payment to the Canadian Pacific Railway, for removal of span of bridge over False Creek, B.C., at different times since 1918, to permit of the movements of vessels, $32,000.

Mr. MEIGHEN: When did this account come in?

Mr. LAPOINTE: The Canadian Pacific Railway constructed a bridge across False creek in 1886. The bridge was replaced by a larger one in 1898, and in 1918 it transpired that the vessels constructed at the Coughlan shipyard for the Imperial Munitions Board could not pass to sea without the removal of a span of that bridge. There was there a difficulty as between the Canadian Pacific Railway and the Department of Public Works. The Canadian Pacific contended that their plans for the bridge and the construction of the bridge itself had all been approved by the Department of Public Works at the time they were made. On the other hand, speedy action had to be taken so as to allow the vessels to get to sea. The department came to an understanding with the Canadian Pacific that the work should be done, and that afterwards whoever was compelled by law to pay would bear the cost. The work has been done, and the Department of Justice, through Mr. Newcombe, has advised the Department of Public Works that we have not a shadow of a chance in a legal action, that the Canadian Pacific had its bridge constructed and built according to the regulations, that everything had been approved by the Government at the time, and that we must pay.

Item agreed to.

Library of Parliament—two Chief Reference Clerks—further amount required, $400; one Cataloguer, $1,620; one bookbinder $1,500; to authorize the payment of the difference between superannuation allowance and salary, in lieu of leave of absence, to A. D. de Celles, former librarian of Parliament, $556.95; total, $4,076.95.

Mr. SPEAKER: Although there appears to be an increase over last year's vote, as a matter of fact, from the information I have received from the two librarians, there will be a saving greater than the amount asked for in the Supplementary Estimates. Four of the present officials will be eliminated, and a saving will thereby be effected of $4,518.75, so that really there is a decrease in the expenditure on the Library of Parliament. Actually there will be expended of the appropriation of $45,180, only $40,661.25, thus making a saving of $4,518.75.

Item agreed to.

INTERIOR DEPARTMENT.

Dominion Lands and Parks—to pay F. Nelson for services while acting as Secretary of the Department of the Interior, $500; to provide for the payment to Mrs. E. S. Forbes of a compassionate allowance equal to one-half of the salary of her husband, payable monthly, $1,050; grant to the Canada Forestry Association—further amount required, $5,000; total, $6,550.

Mr. FIELDING: The item of $5,000 is an error. I move that it be reduced to $4,000.

Amendment agreed to.

Mr. MEIGHEN: I do not understand the first two items.

Mr. STEWART (Argenteuil): The secretary of the department died on the 31st December, 1920, and Mr. Frank Nelson, assistant secretary, has been performing the duties of secretary from that date up to the present time. This has entailed quite an amount of additional work for Mr. Nelson, and this amount is asked for to compensate him therefor. The question of the appointment of a secretary is before the Civil Service Commission. I do not know the reason, but there is some difficulty about this appointment. Apparently this man has been doing the work without being promoted to the position.

Mr. MEIGHEN: Mr. Nelson is a very fine man but there is very little work.

Mr. STEWART (Argenteuil): I confess I do not know why he has not been permanently confirmed in the position.

Mr. MEIGHEN: The minister has not explained the second item.

Mr. STEWART (Argenteuil): I have a memorandum with respect to this item which reads:

Mr. Edward Stanley Forbes was appointed as a temporary clerk in the Department of the Interior on the 1st May, 1908, and he became permanent on the 1st April, 1910. Mr. Forbes was ill for some time, and as his case was reported to be of such a character that he would never be able to come back to the office, he was retired from the Government Service in August 1921, under the provisions of the Calder Act, and the following allowances were paid to Mrs. Forbes, namely:

2 months' salary gratuity..	$ 350
3 months' retiring allowance.. ..	525
Double gratuity on account of protracted illness..	525
Total..	$1,400

Mr. Forbes is still in the Brockville Asylum and the compassionate allowance above mentioned, is to provide for the payment to his wife of half the amount of salary he was receiving at the time of his retirement, namely:—$2,100.

In reporting on Mr. Forbes' illness, his physician makes the following statement:—

"The onset of the disease which incapacitates Mr. Forbes dates back about twelve years, when, as Secretary to the Minister of the Interior, he was subjected to unusual exposure and strain during a trip on foot through Northern Alberta. The symptoms complained of at the time were those of a peripheral neuritis. In spite of remissions the condition has become progressively worse, and now the patient is

helpless mentally and physically, with a life expectancy according to the neurologist at present attending him in the Ontario Hospital, Brockville, of but a few months at best. The actual pathology in the case seems not to have been definitely determined but it was thought on X-ray examination to be vertebral caries of tubercular origin associated with Tabes Dorsalis and a terminal General Paresis."

Mr. Forbes is now in the Ontario Hospital at Brockville, and the Superintendent in charge states that he does not think there is any probability of his becoming well again.

Item agreed to.

Railways—Canadian Pacific Railway; original construction, $250.

Mr. MEIGHEN: I hope this is not the beginning of another transcontinental railway.

Mr. KENNEDY (Essex): I think not. This is to pay an old account to the Indian Department in connection with land that was granted at the time the Canadian Pacific Railway Company was given its charter in 1881.

Item agreed to.

Canals—Chambly canal improvements—Additional amount required, $36,000.

Some Hon. MEMBERS: Explain.

Mr. MEIGHEN: Cannot we get any explanation of this item at least as good as the last one?

Mr. KENNEDY (Essex): I will give my right hon. friend an explanation as good as the last one if it will satisfy him. This is an item for expenditure in connection with the building of a roadway on the Chambly canal to cover the cost of re-grading and laying water macadam surface over 7.2 miles of roadway situated in the parishes of St. Jean, St. Luc and St. Joseph. An arrangement has now been made with the different municipalities whereby the department will put the road in shape, the municipalities undertaking for all time to keep it in repair, consequently there will be no further charge so far as the Department of Railways and Canals is concerned.

Item agreed to.

Railways—to provide for allowance of full railway pay including their military pay and field allowance, on and after May 1, 1915, to certain employees of the lake Superior branch of the Transcontinental Railways who enlisted prior to May 1, 1915. (Revote), $60,000.

Mr. LOGAN: May I ask the minister for an explanation of this vote, and as to the reason why it was not applied to employees of the Intercolonial railway who went overseas at the same time?

[Mr. Charles Stewart.]

Mr. KENNEDY (Essex): The matter was before the House last year and an item was placed in the supplementary estimates to provide for it. But there was some question as to whether they were employees of the Grand Trunk Pacific Railway or of the Canadian Government Railways. I think, through some misunderstanding it was felt they were employees of the Grand Trunk Pacific Railway after May 1, 1915, and that the government was not responsible. It subsequently transpired that they were employees of the Canadian Government Railways on and after that date. It appears that under Order in Council passed on and after August 4, 1914, the Government railway employees at the outbreak of the war weer entitled to be paid their full pay or civil less military pay, if they enlisted for overseas service. Likewise Orders in Council were passed on the 18th of April, 1916, and the 6th of September, 1918, respectively, granting authority to give to employees on the railway and in the shops of the National Transcontinental Railway who were in the employ of the railway at the outbreak of war and continued in such employment until the taking over of the line and thereafter until their enlistment in the Canadian Expeditionary Force for service overseas, the same treatment as accorded to other employees of the Canadian Government Railways as of date of enlistment effective the 1st of May, 1915.

It has been found that there are certain employees on the lake Superior branch of the National Transcontinental railway who meet the requirements necessary to make them eligible for the above allowance except that they enlisted prior to May 1st, 1915, and that the employees of the Grand Trunk Pacific railway were promised their positions on the lake Superior branch on their return from service overseas, and, therefore, may be considered as employees of the government from May 1st, 1915, the date the line was taken over by the Dominion government for operation to the date of their discharge from the Canadian Expeditionary Force. This vote of $60,000 is to provide money to pay allowances that may be granted to the employees of the lake Superior branch of the Transcontinental railway, who were in the employ of the Grand Trunk Pacific Railway at the outbreak of war, and continued as such until the date of enlistment in the Canadian Expeditionary Force, or other forces of His Majesty or His Allies, in the Great War, prior to May 1st, 1915, so

that they may be granted the same treatment, commencing May 1st, 1915,—the date this branch was taken over—as was accorded to the employees of the Canadian Government railways who enlisted prior to November 1st, 1915, provided they are found eligible in so far as service with the Canadian Expeditionary Force and the Grand Trunk Pacific railway is concerned.

Mr. GUTHRIE: These men have really been entitled to this amount for a considerable number of years, in fact since 1915.

Mr. KENNEDY (Essex): They have.

Mr. GUTHRIE: In the Preston case this afternoon we established a precedent in regard to the payment of interest. Although interest is not payable, as a rule, by the Crown, yet in the case of Mr. Preston the government decided to break that rule and pay interest. Will any interest be paid to these men?

Mr. KENNEDY (Essex): I do not know that there is any provision for the payment of interest in connection with this claim. It would seem to me, however, that if there is any claim for interest, and the men are entitled to it, they should be paid.

Mr. GUTHRIE: I do not think the men are entitled to interest, but the Government having broken the rule in the Preston case is there any reason why it should not break it in this case also?

Mr. LOGAN: I have no cause for objecting to paying the claims of these men, but I would like to ask the minister how far this rule has been carried out in reference to other government railway employees in Canada. I know personally of men who left the Intercolonial Railway and enlisted with the promise that they would be given their railway pay, and that their positions would be kept open for them until they returned, or in other words that their positions would be restored to them. I know of cases where men did so enlist, and for a few months they received their railway pay. Then that pay was stopped. They remained overseas for two, three, or four years, and when they returned they received neither their pay nor their position. Now, I desire to know why these men who are working on the lake Superior branch of the Transcontinental railway should be treated in this way, while men on other government railways are treated in an entirely different manner.

Mr. KENNEDY (Essex): Since I have been in the department this is the only claim of the kind, to my knowledge, that has been made to the department. There has been no claim made on behalf of the men on the Intercolonial railway nor any representations made with respect to them that I am aware of. If such a claim is made it will come up for consideration and the members of the House will have the same opportunity of judging of its merits as they have had in this case.

Mr. LOGAN: I was not criticizing the present Minister of Railways. I do not know of any claim made to the present Minister of Railways in reference to a matter of this kind, but I know that claims were made in years gone by, in 1918 and 1919, and that these claims were refused. They were just exactly in the same position as the claims of the men on the lake Superior branch of the Transcontinental. Why there was this discimination I know not. I am quite satisfied with the statement of the Minister of Railways, that if these claims are put in they will be considered, and that these men will be treated the same as the men are treated on the lake Superior branch.

Mr. MEIGHEN: I do not like to contradict my hon. friend, because his knowledge would be better than mine. I have never heard of any such claims, and I certainly know of no such refusal. If there are claims in the same position as these, I will cheerfully support a vote in favour of them. There is no reason why one should be treated in one way and another in a different way.

Mr. LOGAN: I do not want to go into details and worry the committee, or to refer to very many cases. I know of one case of a young man on the engineering staff at Moncton, who was receiving about $2,500 a year. He left the railway, and enlisted as a private at $1.10 a day; incidentally, he came back as a lieutenant-colonel. He had resigned his position and he went overseas with the distinct promise that he would be paid his salary as an engineer during his absence. He was not paid during the time he was overseas. That is one case; and there are many others.

Mr. MacLAREN: I certainly heard very frequently of complaints arising from men who had been employed on the Intercolonial. It has been a grievance amongst the men who have formerly been employed on that road, and who subsequently went

overseas, that on their return their positions were not held for them, nor did they receive their pay for the period during which they were absent. That is a familiar complaint to me. It came to me not personally, but I read it in the papers. I understand from the minister that it will be quite in order if the attention of these men now is drawn to it, and that their claims will receive equal consideration with those provided for in the vote we are now considering.

Item agreed to.

Miscellaneous—to increase the amount of loan authorized by vote No. 138, Main estimates—1922-23—additional amount required, $800,000.

Mr. KENNEDY (Essex): This vote is to increase the amount of the loan authorized by item 138 in the main estimates, to take care of the interest maturing on the bonds of the branch lines in Alberta and Saskatchewan.

Mr. MEIGHEN: What road?

Mr. KENNEDY (Essex): The total amount is $1,470,409. There are ten branch lines.

Mr. MEIGHEN: What system?

Mr. KENNEDY (Essex): Of the Grand Trunk Pacific branch lines. Before an Order in Council was passed recommending this payment, I had the executive of the Board of National Railways, Mr. Hanna, make a report, and he reported that in his opinion, in the interests of the National Railways, the interest on the bonds of these branch lines should be paid.

Mr. LEWIS: Could the minister give us the names of the branch lines in Saskatchewan?

Mr. KENNEDY (Essex): The branch lines are as follows: Yorkton branch, Melville branch, Regina-Boundary branch, Weyburn branch, Regina-Moosejaw branch, Moosejaw-Northwest branch, Prince Albert branch, Biggar-Calgary branch, Oban-Battleford branch, Cutknife branch—ten in all.

Mr. LEWIS: I would like to know why there is a discrimination in the two branches that are in my constituency. I understand for the last three or four years this Parliament has promised to get the branch lines extended in the constituency to Swift Current. Some time ago they told the people to go into the village, to build and live there, and that last fall the railway would be taken up to a point called Hodgeville—Gravelburg and Swift Current branch. That it is on record and the late Minister of Railways promised it would be done last year. I brought this matter up once or twice in Parliament this session, and the minister promised that, as far as possible, he would look into this matter. He has looked into the matter, but he has overlooked it altogether. It seems to me that there has been a discrimination; the people in my district are, in some instances, twenty to forty miles from a railway, as a result of the non-fulfilment of the promises of the various governments that have been in power during the last three or four years.

Mr. KENNEDY (Essex): I assure my hon. friend there has been no discrimination. This money has not been used for building branch lines, but rather for paying interest on bonds outstanding on lines already built. As far as the lines he speaks of are concerned, they will be taken up and considered.

Item agreed to.

Agriculture—destructive Insect and Pest Act—further amount required, $5,000.

Mr. COOTE: If there is one branch of agriculture which the minister (Mr. Motherwell) should carry on with more vigour, it is this one. I want to bring to his attention, in case it has not been done before, the seriousness of the situation in the southern part of Alberta, on account of the grasshoppers. I saw the statement in a local paper published in that district that on one farm 400 acres of wheat had been eaten up by grasshoppers. That is not an uncommon thing. I would like to know whether the department is furnishing any help to the people in Alberta in fighting this pest. I know that the provincial government are spending a lot of money and there may be overlapping. I think $5,000, the amount in this item is too small. Does the minister appreciate the seriousness of the situation that exists?

Mr. MOTHERWELL: The trouble has become quite serious in certain parts of the West; but up to the present time the municipalities are largely responsible for taking care of the work, and they have succeeded pretty well in doing so. The department at Ottawa has been placing at their disposal such assistance as it had in the way of expert advice; but, so far as I know, we have never laid out any money in these localities. The municipalities concerned, with the aid of the provincial government, have the matter

in hand. It is true that in Alberta, the situation looks pretty formidable, and there has been a very serious invasion of insect pests; but the provincial and municipal forces have got them pretty well rounded up.

Item agreed to.

Cold Storage warehouses—further amount required, $25,000.

Mr. MacLAREN: Is this to provide an additional cold storage warehouse at St. John?

Mr. MOTHERWELL: This is to extend the work of cold storage. We have $25,000 in the main estimates, and this is for the purpose of further development of cold storage facilities throughout Canada. The act now applies only to municipal cold storages. We propose to extend it to others, and that is the reason the additional amount is required.

Mr. MacLAREN: The minister says "throughout Canada." Can he give me the particulars as to where he proposes applying the money?

Mr. MOTHERWELL: Wherever it is required.

Mr. MacLAREN: I understand it is required at St. John, N.B. Do I understand that the minister proposes to establish a cold storage warehouse there?

Mr. MOTHERWELL: What I have in mind is the dairy industry, but more particularly the fruit industry, especially in the Okanagan valley and the Annapolis valley. I cannot particularize. The matter depends upon where requests come from.

Mr. MacLAREN: Does the minister propose to furnish cold storage facilities in the city of St. John?

Mr. MOTHERWELL: I do not think so; I have no knowledge of any application from there.

Item agreed to.

Livestock—further amount required, $60,000.

Mr. TOLMIE: Where does the minister propose to expend this money?

Mr. MOTHERWELL: On the main estimates, I intimated a policy of reducing grants to fairs throughout Canada. The policy of making grants had been continued to such an extent that some small places were getting exceedingly large grants. Strong representations, however, have been made to me by hon. members on all sides of the House and by people throughout the country, so that, instead of reducing the grants by 50 per cent, we have decided to reduce them by 25 per cent. That has necessitated another appropriation, to make up the 25 per cent.

Mr. TOLMIE: Is it the intention of the department to pay the fares of judges this year?

Mr. MOTHERWELL: Yes.

Item agreed to.

Illustration farms—further amount required, $10,000.

Mr. LEWIS: When the main estimates were up for consideration, I asked the minister whether new buildings were going to be placed on the new experimental farm south of Swift Current. He stated that he intended to place certain buildings there this year, but they were not provided for in the main estimates. He told me, however, to look into the matter when the Supplementary Estimates came up. I am wondering if this is the item at which he told me to look. The minister shakes his head. Am I to understand that no provision is made?

Mr. MOTHERWELL: When my hon. friend sits down, I will get up. This is not for new buildings; this is for the construction of cheap silos at the various illustration farms in southern Alberta, southern Saskatchewan, and, perhaps, in southwestern Manitoba, if they are required there. There are a number of illustration farms, and we have worked out a policy of constructing cheap silos, mostly of the trench variety, for the purpose of encouraging dairying in that part of the country. That is what this $10,000 is for. In another appropriation for public buildings, which is not in here by the way, I can give an explanation to my hon. friend.

Mr. LEWIS: That is what I was considering. It is not here, and I was wondering when it was going to be put in.

Item agreed to.

Health of Animals—further amount required, $75,000.

Mr. TOLMIE: Where is it proposed to expend this?

Mr. MOTHERWELL: On the budget, I forecast a possible extension of the work of cleaning up tuberculosis in our herds by adopting "block areas." This is for that purpose. We hope to do something in Manitoba. If the money will go further, it will be used wher-

9 p.m.

ever there seems to be the most encouragement to use it—I do not know where—in Vancouver Island and Prince Edward Island.

Mr. LEADER: Is the regulation still in force, which was in force last fall, and which required that a breeder must have at least twelve pure-bred stock before he could participate in the accredited herd plan?

Mr. MOTHERWELL: I think that has been reduced; but you must stop somewhere; you cannot go around the country examining one animal here and another there. I think, however, twelve is too many. I recommended a smaller number; but whether that has been carried out or not, I do not know. I will see that it is.

Mr. LEADER: This is a matter which the minister should be sure of. There is a discrimination against the small breeder, and the regulation is to the disadvantage of the successful working of the accredited herd plan.

Item agreed to.

Stock grazing and feeding, $41,503.65.

Mr. GARLAND (Bow River): Will the minister kindly explain this appropriation?

Mr. MOTHERWELL: I do not know who is responsible for this classification. It does not mean anything. This money is to be devoted to paying for the carriage of seed in Alberta, Saskatchewan and Manitoba. Most of this goes to Alberta, but I forget the allocation. It is for the "free freight" policy, which has been in force for four years, under which a very considerable amount was spent last year and a smaller amount this year. The notation given does not indicate that.

Item agreed to.

Gratuity to Dr. C. E. Saunders. Dominion Cerealist, on his retirement from the Federal Service, $2,000.

Mr. JOHNSON (Moosejaw): Is this a straight gratuity or an annual amount in the nature of a pension?

Mr. MOTHERWELL: No, just a single gratuity.

Mr. JOHNSON (Moosejaw): The minister will remember that I asked him about this some time ago. I understood Dr. Saunders had been applying for a pension, but that through some technicality he was declared not to be entitled to any. The minister promised the matter would be attended to.

Mr. MOTHERWELL: Whatever the difficulty, it was overcome and Mr. Saunders is now on the pension list. I think his pension comes to $900 a year.

Mr. MEIGHEN: I wish to support the attitude taken by the hon. member for Moosejaw (Mr. Johnson). I do not like making exceptions, for I know how difficult it is for governments to do so, but it does not sound right to me that Dr. Saunders should be allowed a pension of only $900 a year—

Some hon. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

Mr. MEIGHEN: —a man who has accomplished what he has accomplished for this Dominion of so intensely practical a character and under circumstances where he well knew he could not possibly be making any fortune for himself. That man should be treated in some special way, and if the item here could be made annual it certainly would be none too much. Indeed, in my judgment even that is too little.

Mr. MOTHERWELL: I got all I could under the Calder Act for Mr. Saunders, and maybe a little more, by manoeuvring, than the law intended—in fact I stretched it to the breaking point to secure to him the $900. If my right hon. friend will indicate how we can get Dr. Saunders anything more, I am right with him. This pension of $900 does look small.

An hon. MEMBER: He has already indicated how it can be done.

Mr. JOHNSON (Moosejaw): This $2,000 is taken care of for this year. We can pass this item, and possibly next year the gratuity might be taken care of in a more permanent form.

Mr. MOTHERWELL: Surely.

Mr. GRAHAM: It could be taken care of by an annual vote.

Item agreed to.

Pensions—European War—Further amount required to provide for expenditures arising out of the recommendations of the Special Parliamentary Committee on Pensions, Insurance and Re-Establishment of 1922, as contained in chapters 3 and 6 of the committee's second and final report, $256,800.

Mr. MEIGHEN: I have no objection at all to this vote, but I do not like the way it is worded. It is going to be too

easy to apportion the money; the Government could do almost anything with it under this vote. Would it not be possible to outline by divisions the ends to which this money is to be devoted—how much for one purpose, how much for another?

Mr. BELAND: This item has been prepared by the officials of the department. It covers divers recommendations of the parliamentary committee which will be found at page 20 of the report. First of all, it provides for disability and attributability; second, the Appeal Board—

Mr. MEIGHEN: How much to each?

Mr. BELAND: I am not able to give the information in detail. The item refers mainly to those two and to the Medical Appeal Board; pensions payable to widow married after appearance of disability; certain pensions to fatherless children; pensions to deserted wives; allowance equivalent to that awarded a married pensioner on account of his wife to be granted in certain cases on her decease; pensions awarded as a result of tuberculosis; pensions to widowed mothers—which I think is extended somewhat; pensions to mothers of deceased soldiers who have been deserted by their husbands. This total vote has been closely calculated by the officials of the department in conjunction with the Pension Board.

Mr. SPEAKMAN: This large vote, together with the corresponding one under the Department of Soldiers' Civil Re-establishment is a sufficient answer to any charges made throughout the country that the recommendations of our committee reduces pensions in any way.

Item agreed to.

Northwest Rebellion, 1885 and General Pensions—further amount required to provide for pension to Leo Smith, based on the extent of his disability and retroactive to September 1, 1920, $2,700.

Mr. WARNER: I have been asked by some of the soldiers who took part in the Rebellion of 1885 whether they will be allowed pensions, and I would like to know the intention of the Government in the matter.

Mr. GRAHAM: Individual cases are being considered as they come up, but to re-open the subject of Northwest Rebellion pensions would be a pretty large order.

Mr. CLARK: I understand that claims were filed years ago by veterans of the Royal Northwest Mounted Police in connection with the Northwest Rebellion, and that certain promises were made to those men. I should like to know whether their claims have been dealt with and, if not, what the Government proposes to do with them.

Mr. GRAHAM: Speaking for myself, no such claims have been brought before me, except possibly one letter in reference to the Northwest Rebellion of 1885. But when the House rises I will have more time to look into the matter.

Mr. STEVENS: I think my hon. friend from Burrard (Mr. Clark) refers to certain claims which were brought to the attention of my hon. friend's predecessor.

The minister will find filed in his department claims from the veterans of the Royal Northwest Mounted Police who served in the Rebellion, but who at its conclusion were not given the same pensions and land grants as the volunteer force received. These old veterans have been claiming for twenty-five or thirty years that they were unjustly treated, and I think they should have recognition. I must admit that the government of the late Sir Wilfrid Laurier rejected their claim and that the late government did not see its way clear to grant their request. Mr. Rowell, who, I think, was acting minister for a time, did promise consideration; he went into the matter with some care and I really expected that some adjustment would have been arrived at. It is rather late in the session for anything to be done now, but I suggest that the minister look into the matter. The records are in his department and if anything can be done to recognize the claims of these old veterans, certainly it will be appreciated.

Mr. KNOX: This matter has been brought up in the House on a number of occasions, and has previously been referred to by the member for Centre Vancouver (Mr. Stevens). I took the matter up this year with the Minister of Justice (Sir Lomer Gouin), under whose department I understand the Mounted Police now come, and I was assured by him that the number of persons entitled to consideration is now very small—very little over one hundred, in fact, including officers, non-commissioned officers and men. The difficulty, he points out to me, is that in doing anything in the matter you open up the question of pensions. I suggested that something might be done in the way of gratuity, and he promised to look into

the matter, but in the meantime he could not see his way clear to taking action. I would again impress on the Government the necessity of looking into the matter. Many of these old veterans are not able to make a living for themselves and they certainly are entitled to some consideration.

Mr. GRAHAM: It is the police the hon. member is referring to?

Mr. KNOX: Yes.

Item agreed to.

Soldiers Civil Re-establishment—unemployment relief—further amount required to provide further assistance to unemployed pensioners and vocationally trained disabled men and to their dependents in the amounts and under the conditions laid down by the Governor in Council in Orders in Council P.C. 71, dated 31 March, 1922, as amended by P.C. 911, dated 3 May, 1922; and to provide for salaries and other expenses of administering the provisions of said Orders in Council and amendments thereto, $150,000.

Mr. CAMPBELL: I would just like to read a telegram which I have received from the Yorkton branch of the Great War Veterans' Association, as follows:

Yorkton veterans urge you voice urgent need for adequate scheme of housing credits to relieve unemployment and assist re-establishment.

There is very great need of houses in some of the smaller towns and cities of the West. The municipalities are not in a position to shoulder their responsibilities under the old housing scheme, in that their borrowing powers would be curtailed to such an extent that they could not carry on ordinary work. The veterans urge the taking of some action in the matter, which would at the same time have the effect of materially relieving unemployment. I think that something might at least be done as a sort of half-way measure: possibly the municipality might become responsible for a certain portion of the amount involved, a certain portion of any loss that might eventually occur, or something to that effect, thus avoiding the tying up of a municipality to such an extent that its borrowing powers would be seriously curtailed.

Item agreed to.

Mines and Geological Survey—additional amount required by the Lignite Utilization Board of Canada to meet expenditure in connection with the carbonizing and briquetting of lignite coals.—Advances to the governments of Manitoba and Saskatchewan, $125,000.

Mr. GOULD: This item provides for advances to Saskatchewan and Manitoba, which assume one-third each of the liability involved in the carrying on of this work. Are the members of the Lignite Utilization Board paid for their services, or do they give them gratuitously?

Mr. STEWART (Argenteuil): All are gratuitous except in the case of the secretary.

Mr. GOULD: I have wondered whether it would not be a good idea to institute a system under which the members of the board would become paid servants of the Government, with a view to there being more control over their activities. If Parliament had more control over the board perhaps we would be in a better position to suggest in what manner their activities could better be carried on. I have spoken on this subject at different times in the House. Since I last referred to it I was called upon by the secretary of the board who very kindly gave me a good deal of information in connection with the work that I did not have before. I told him that I had been continually asked in my home district what was being accomplished by these experiments, and that I had not been able to give any exact information. The secretary of the Board very kindly furnished me with samples of the briquettes which they are now almost ready to manufacture in quantities. I hold these samples in my hand, and, acting upon the suggestion of the secretary, I knock them together in order that hon. members may hear the sound which results and realize that they are solid articles. It is unnecessary for me to emphasize how necessary it is to have these briquettes manufactured in order that a fuel may be made available to the people of the western prairies. We are quite as much interested in the matter of fuel in our western country as those are who live in the East; in fact, the question is a more serious one to us out there in that we have no other source of fuel. In the past I have questioned whether the board was going to be able to provide a fuel that would successfully compete with other fuels. I have with me a statement in that regard which I would like to have placed on Hansard; I do not think it is necessary to read it, but I would ask the privilege of handing it in.

Mr. STEWART (Argenteuil): Hand it in.

Mr. GOULD: It sets forth the value of this product as compared with anthracite coal which we have been importing in large

quantities into western Canada for a number of years. We are spending some hundreds of thousands of dollars every year for anthracite coal imported from the United States, and I am advised by the secretary of the board that this lignite product will save approximately 45 per cent of the money now expended on imported anthracite. Last year we expended $500,000 on anthracite coal imported from the United States, and we are spending a similar amount each year. I think every hon. member will appreciate the possibilities if investigations are carried on in a scientific manner, of these huge deposits of lignite in the southern portion of Saskatchewan. Nevertheless, when we expend public money, we should have more or less control over the board or institution through which it is expended, and I would ask the minister to look into the merits of the question whether we should not have a board with a paid salary.

Mr. LOGAN: I do not rise to follow the example of my hon. friend from Assinboia and move that this vote be struck out, as he did with reference to a vote this afternoon. I rise to commend this investigation of the wonderful deposits of lignite in Saskatchewan and Alberta. I have had some experience of this work in those provinces in years gone by, and I recognize what a wonderful boon it would be if some process could be evolved for converting that very low grade coal into anthracite or at all events into a much harder coal than bituminous. But there is one thing that astounds me in this connection. It is eight years since I last visited that little plant at Bienfait, where they were then investigating the making of briquettes. At Grand Forks, in North Dakota, investigations had been going on along the same lines for many years prior to that, and I had the opportunity of visiting the School of Mines in North Dakota and seeing this most interesting work going on. They were then briquetting, and I have in my possession some briquettes very much like what the hon. member for Assiniboia has here tonight. What I would like to know is how such a vast sum of money has been spent on this investigation. We voted a large sum in the main estimates this year for this purpose, and on that occasion I asked the minister how much had been spent, and his reply was that over $800,000 had been spent on investigations for the briquetting of coal. I am in favour of these investigations being carried on; I believe there are wonderful possibilities; but where in the name of heaven have they spent $800,000? That is in addition to what the provinces have given, and we are now being asked to vote a further sum for this very purpose. It seems to me it is pretty nearly time we had a showdown as to what is being done with these vast sums of money that are being spent on that little bit of a plant at Bienfait. It is beyond comprehension how such a vast sum of money could have been spent simply in getting coal which you reduce to dust, and when you get some kind of a binder to press it into briquettes. It is not only the length of time these investigations have been going on, but the vast amount of money that has been paid out of the treasury on these investigations, that astounds me. Again I say I commend the work, it has wonderful possibilities; at the same time I would like to commend to the minister the fact that down in Eastern Canada we have low grade coal which in many cases is not merchantable as a fuel, but by chemical and other processes we could convert that coal into very valuable by-products. And I wish to inform the minister that before next session I propose to ask him for a vote by this Parliament to investigate the low grade coals of Canada other than lignite, and the possibility of converting these coals into the by-products which are so valuable. We know that in Germany they long ago mastered the briquetting of coal. They use coal of a much lower grade than ours, with much less carbon than the coal on the prairies, and they have made a tremendous success of that work. We know also that in Germany they have developed to a wonderful extent processes to make the by-products of coal. The dyes of Germany made from coal are known the world over. We in Canada have fifty billion tons of coal containing the same material that in Germany is converted into dyes, benzol, and other valuable by-products, but we are not investigating the possibilities in this direction at all. When we burn coal in a grate or under a boiler, it is said, we lose about 85 per cent of the real value of the coal. Is it not about time that we should, by scientific research and proper investigation, develop this great natural product so as to make it of very much more value than it is at the present time? Therefore, while commending the briquetting of coal in Alberta and Saskatchewan and realizing its great possibilities, at the same time

we should make some scientific research into the possibilities of other low grade coals in Canada.

Mr. JOHNSON (Moosejaw): What are the names of the board?

Mr. STEWART (Argenteuil): Speaking from memory, Mr. Ross is chairman, and Major Thompson the secretary.

Mr. JOHNSON (Moosejaw): Is Mr. Sheppard a member of the board?

Mr. STEWART (Argenteuil): I could not say at the moment.

Mr. GOULD: I should like to have the unanimous consent of the committee to place this document on Hansard.

The CHAIRMAN: Has the hon. member the unanimous consent of the committee to place the document on Hansard unread? Someone objects.

Item agreed to.

Labour — unemployment relief — further amount required, $1,200,000.

Mr. WOODSWORTH: What is to be expended for unemployment relief?

Mr. MURDOCK: This amount is required to pay for bills already incurred, during last winter for the most part, amounting to $111,700. We estimate that we have accounts still to come in, largely from the three provinces of Ontario, Manitoba and British Columbia, aggregating $1,100,000.

Mr. WOODSWORTH: Is any provision being made for the coming winter? I take it that we are likely to have a considerable volume of unemployment before the House meets again.

Mr. MURDOCK: Hon. gentlemen will recall the statement I made in that regard this afternoon. I do not think I can add to it at the moment.

Mr. WOODSWORTH: What I was referring to now was whether any provision was being made at this session for the coming winter.

Mr. MURDOCK: My hon. friend will understand that for the year ending March 31, 1922, the previous government issued Governor General's warrants for $200,000, and the present Government have issued Governor General's warrants for the same amount. The estimate last year only provided $100,000 for unemployment relief purposes while, as the committee will notice by the present item we have incurred liabilities amounting as nearly as we can estimate, approximately to $1,200,000. It must be understood that many of these bills do not come in at the time they are incurred by the municipality. They have to be checked by the province. The municipality pays its share, the province also pays its share, and then the bills come to the federal government for its share. Bills to the amount of more than $1,000,000 worth have not yet come in to us.

Mr. GOOD: Are we considering the vote for unemployment relief?

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: Yes.

The CHAIRMAN: The item has been declared carried. Does the hon. member wish to ask a question?

Mr. GOOD: I wish to speak to the item.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: All right.

Mr. GOOD: It seems to me we have spent thousands, and even millions of dollars in unemployment relief and that what we ought to do is to spend a little thought on studying the problem of unemployment and its causes. I want to impress the committee, in the very few remarks that I am going to make, with that need. To-day I received a letter—and I presume other members have been equally favoured—from Mr. Tom Moore, President of the Trades and Labour Congress, and Mr. C. G. MacNeil, representing the Great War Veterans, in connection with this problem of unemployment. That letter says:

> Considerable uneasiness exists among the organizations, represented by the undersigned, as to the intention of Parliament with regard to the question of unemployment—

And so on. And this pointed question is asked of each member to whom this letter has gone:

> Do you consider that the House of Commons should deal with the question of unemployment, during the present session?
>
> Through the courtesy of the Ottawa Citizen, the Canadian Congress Journal, (the official organ of The Trades and Labour Congress of Canada) and The Veteran, arrangements have been made for publication of your reply. It is confidently anticipated that your frank statement in the matter will do much to make clear what consideraion is to be given the needs of the unemployed by members of the House of Commons.

Now, I presume, Mr. Chairman, that the gentlemen who have sent this letter are acting in a representative capacity. They certainly represent very large and very important organizations in this country, and I think we ought not to, perhaps, follow the

custom which, I understand, is very usual in the closing days of the session, to run through every item without any consideration whatsoever. I remember that time and again in the years gone by this practice, which has become more or less common in our legislative bodies, was very strongly condemned, and I think we ought to take whatever time is necessary to consider, at all events, the important problems that we face. Now in this connection—

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: If I may interrupt my hon. friend I would like to draw his attention to the fact that the House disposed of all the main estimates a fortnight ago. There has been no endeavour whatsoever to railroad any estimates through the House. The practice of which he complains, and of which I think there is just cause to complain, is that of retaining a large part of the main estimates until within a day or two of the close of the session and then, as he says, railroading them through. This Government has taken particular care to distribute the consideration of the estimates this year over the entire session, so many items at a time, with a view to enabling hon. members to have the fullest opportunity of discussing all the questions involved, and we concluded consideration of the entire list of main estimates, as I have remarked, some ten days ago. The subject matter referred to in the item to which my hon. friend is speaking at the moment, was very fully discussed when the main estimates were taken up. This item is to make good an amount which is more considerable than was anticipated at the time but the principle, and all that is involved in it, was fully discussed on the previous occasion. I do not think it can be urged that there has been any effort on the part of the Government to hasten in any particular the passage of a single item.

Mr. GOOD: I think I can quite sincerely, compliment the Government on the practice which has been followed this year in comparison with that which has been followed, I understand, in previous years. My criticism was not so much directed towards the action of the Government as it was towards the disposition on the part of a good many members who are tired—and I include myself in that category—to let things go in the closing days of the session. and not give sufficient attention to the public business that we are sent here to look after. That is all I intended to convey by my remarks in that regard. Now, I did not take the opportunity of discussing this question when the main estimates were up, but I have always felt very strongly on the matter, and I want to make one or two observations to-night—I hope it will not take more than a very few minutes. My first observation is this: I want to repeat what I said in connection with this unemployment when I was discussing the budget. I consider that our protective system is one of the greatest causes of unemployment in this country, for the simple reason that through it we subsidize industries which are not natural, not naturally profitable to the country, and we have to levy a toll upon the industries that are natural to the country in order to subsidize these other unnatural and unprofitable industries.

Mr. STEVENS: I suppose then that the free trade policy of England, where there has been a larger degree of unemployment than there has been in Canada, is not responsible for the unemployment there?

M. GOOD: I think I may answer my hon. friend entirely in the affirmative, but I will come to the question of England in a moment.

Mr. STEVENS: My hon. friend seems to have a single track mind on that question.

Mr. GOOD: As I was saying, Mr. Chairman, the essence of the protective policy—

The CHAIRMAN: I must remind the hon. member that he may not deal with the abstract question of the tariff which has already been disposed of. There is an item here for a specific amount dealing with the unemployment existing or which, as the minister says, has existed, and the hon. member must confine himself to that particular question on this item.

Mr. GOOD: It may be a little difficult to judge of the exact limits within which the discussion must be confined, but I certainly wish to keep within those limits. The only thing I wanted to remark in that connection was that my settled conviction is that unemployment in Canada is increased and not decreased by the fiscal policy we have been following. I think that is entirely pertinent to the question. I want to emphasize again that we are putting a heavy burden upon all our essential natural industries and thereby putting them in a position where they can-

not compete in the labour market with other countries and other industries, and in that way we are forcing people out of employment. Take the agricultural situation. The fact was presented to this House not very long ago that the farmers of the West are placed in the position now where they cannot possibly hire help. We have millions of farmers in this country who would like to hire help if they could, but they are not in the position to do so. The reason why is, I think, a very pertinent question.

Some Hon. MEMBERS. Carried.

Mr. GOOD: I do not wish to impose on the committee. However I have some further remarks to make and perhaps some time could be set next week for the discussion of this question.

Some Hon. MEMBERS: Oh, oh.

Mr. BUREAU: Why not say next month?

Mr. BELAND: May I ask my hon. friend, who, I know, is very well versed in political economy, a question? My hon. friend is objecting to direct relief for unemployment?

Mr. GOOD: No.

Mr. BELAND: Does the hon. member approve of it?

Mr. GOOD: Under certain circumstances, I do.

Mr. BELAND: The door must be either open or closed. If the hon. member is in favour of direct relief, well and good, but if opposed, how would he explain that the government of Great Britain has been spending £131,000,000 sterling in direct relief for unemployment?

Mr. GOOD: I may answer in this way: I think direct relief is absolutely justifiable under many conditions, but I do think it is a very unjustifiable policy on the part of this Parliament to go ahead in the blundering, pig-headed fashion, without studying the question—

Some hon. MEMBERS: Order, order.

Mr. GOOD: I hope I am not reflecting on any hon. member in this House any more than on myself. Here is a great economic and social problem, and, so far as I can see, we are not giving any money, any time, or any thought to study the problem itself. We simply see the conditions that arise, and we give relief to keep people from starving. I think this is a problem we ought to study, and I wish there were some way of studying this problem in connection with the legislation and the grants that we have to make from time to time for the unemployed. There is another aspect of this problem we ought not to forget. I am inclined to think, from the various discussions and investigations that have been made in England and in the United States, that the whole question of the control of credit, which formed the subject of one of our resolutions a little while ago, has a great deal to do with our unemployment, and I should very much like to see the Government take action by way of appointment of some committee to study this question before next session. I presume we cannot do anything under existing conditions this session, but we certainly ought not to come to this House next session and have to treat the question of unemployment as we are treating it this year. I wish to impress that point upon the House. In deference to the wishes of the House, and the desire to get through with the business, I will not add anything more. I hoped to submit certain thoughts in connection with control of credit as it applies to this problem, but I will not do so at the present time.

Item agreed to.

Grant to the Regional Bureau of the International Catalogue of Scientific Literature, $2,000.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: Is that a new item?

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: Is it one of those contributions to the work of science which appear from time to time in the estimates. This is a work of an international character; and this item appears as a contribution on the part of Canada towards that work.

Item agreed to.

Provisional bonus allowance for the Inside and Outside Services to be paid to such persons and classes of persons, in such amounts and at such times as the Governor in Council may determine, $5,500,000.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: On 4th May I made a statement to the House as to the basis on which the Government proposed to distribute the bonus allowance to members of the Civil Service. It will be found in the Hansard of that date. Since that statement was made the Government has received and carefully considered many representations from and on behalf of members of the Civil Service throughout all

parts of Canada, and we have come to the conclusion that it would be in the public interest, as well as in the interests of the Civil Service, to take an attitude a little more generous perhaps in regard to one class of employees than at first we thought it would be possible to take. I intimated on the 4th of May that as respects civil servants drawing salaries of $1,200 and under where there were one or more dependents we would allow the bonus as given last year to be continued. The change that the Government now proposes in the original plan is to increase that amount to $1,560 so that members of the service who have one or more dependents and are receiving a salary up to $1,560 will be granted a bonus for the present fiscal year corresponding to the amount which they were granted last year.

Mr. McGIVERIN: I am pleased that the Prime Minister has changed the resolution to the extent of raising the rate of salary on which the bonus may be paid from $1,200 to $1,560, as this change favourably affects a considerable number of civil servants not only in Ottawa but all over the country. But, I do not think that any change whatever should have been made in the bonus. No cut should have been made from last year. One might think from some of the talk that has been indulged in that this bonus was a gift or a present to the Civil Service of Canada—something that had not been earned or deserved. The Toronto Globe in an excellent editorial May 11th, 1922, supporting the retention of the bonus, closed by saying:

> The word "bonus" is a misnomer. The lower grades of Dominion Government servants should be given a living wage, not by way of a bonus but as a matter of right.

Both the Ottawa Citizen and the Ottawa Journal have published editorials strongly supporting the retention of the bonus. Let me show hon. members how this bonus question arose. There was a salary revision in 1908, but from that time on, despite the war and the enormous increase in the cost of living, nothing was done with regard to the conditions of the Civil Service until 1918, when another salary revision was made. On account of the unsettled conditions, it was decided to base the schedule of salaries on the estimated normal increase in the cost of living between 1914 and 1918, but leaving out of the schedules the abnormal increase due to the war, and meeting that condition by a Cost of Living Bonus. This arrangement was accepted by Parliament. Let me first show how this salary schedule worked out. This is a statement showing the changes in salary rates for the clerical service from 1908 to 1922:

1908			1922		Increase in Maximum
					per cent
Messenger	$ 500	$ 800	Messenger Clerk	$ 600	$ 900	12·5
Clerk 3B	500	800	Junior Clerk	600	900	12·5
Clerk 3A	900	1,200	Clerk	960	1,260	5·
Clerk 2B	800	1,600	Senior Clerk	1,320	1,680	5·
Clerk 2A	1,600	2,100	Principal Clerk	1,800	2,280	8·57
Clerk 1B	2,100	2,800	Head Clerk	2,400	2,880	2·86
Clerk 1A	2,800	4,000	Chief Clerk	3,000	3,600	Decrease 10·

The increases for the mass of civil servants average only about 5 per cent to meet a normal increase of 30 per cent. That was the effect of the salary revision to meet only the normal increase in the cost of living. I have here a detailed statement showing the bonus attached to each class of clerical position and percentage of salary which such bonus represents. I do not want to weary the committee with a lot of statistics and so will only deal with the salaries and percentage of salary for the heads of households, the non-heads of households being practically fifty per cent of the bonus.

Junior Clerks, $600-$900 or $52½ per cent.
Clerks, $960-$1,260 or 32 per cent.
Senior Clerks, $1,320-$1,680 or 21 per cent.
Principal Clerks, $1,800-$2,280 or 11⅓ per cent.
Head Clerks, $2,400-$2,880 or 7⅓ per cent.
Chief Clerks, $3,000-$3,600 or 6 per cent.

No one over $1,800, not being the head of a household, received any bonus. If you will bear in mind that the percentages referred to were to meet the cost of living, you will see that they fell far short of that. The cost of living figures, taken from the Labour Gazette of March 1922, showed that as regards rent, fuel, food and light, to say nothing of clothing, there was a tremendous increase. When the salary

schedule and the bonus were arranged in 1918, the increase was 111 per cent over 1910, two years after the last salary revision, and this year, 1922, there was an increase of 6 per cent over 1918. It is true that there is a decrease since last year of about 15 per cent, but the bonus was cut last year by 25 per cent, and the bonus figures were based on the cost of living in 1918. What this resolution sets out is that the class from $1,560 to $1,800 has its bonus reduced by 33⅓ per cent, the next class, $1,800 to $2,400, by 66⅔ per cent, and the class, $2,400 and up, by 100 per cent. What justification is there for this? In my judgment, Parliament, by adopting the salary schedule and the bonus, committed itself to the payment of the bonus until there was proof that the cost of living had decreased to the level on which the salary rates were computed or a salary revision to meet conditions: As I have shown, the salary rates do not even meet the normal increase, and the cost of living has not decreased since the bonus schedule was arranged in 1918 but actually increased 6 per cent; then it is a grave injustice to the service to cut the bonus. It may be urged that business and commercial salaries have decreased; but they were raised during the period of the war to a very high peak, and reductions are from that peak. The Civil Service never got even the normal increase, and waited years for the bonus.

Great Britain dealt with this matter in a totally different manner from ourselves. There were no restrictions as regards classes or individuals or the single man or woman. Every civil servant received a bonus to meet the cost of liv-
10 p.m. ing; and as the Government figures showed an increase in the cost of living then automatically, the civil servant received an amount of bonus to meet the percentage of increase. At one time the civil servant in Great Britain was receiving a bonus of 130 per cent. That has decreased in the meantime with the cost of living.

In the United States, where conditions are very similar to our own, the cost of living at Washington being practically identical with that at Ottawa, notification was given by the leaders of the Congress of the United States that the present bonus of the civil servants would be continued without deduction until their new classification came into force. It may be noted that the prospective classification of the United States provides for an average salary of $1,500 as compared with the average salary of the Canadian civil servant of $994. The minimum salary for clerical employees in the United States is $1,080, as compared with $600 in Canada. The attitude of the leaders in the government of the United States was that, if the bonus were cut off at this time without any compensating increase in the basic salary, there would be serious distress amongst civil servants, and the bonus was retained.

This is a very serious matter, and I need not apologize for detaining the committee. I have lived in this city for over twenty-five years, and I have twice had the honour of representing it in this House. In that time, I have had much to do with the service in my public capacity, in my profession and in various other ways. I have no hesitation in saying that the great mass of civil servants are energetic, hard working and courteous. Intelligent criticism is a good thing, but wild and erratic statements against the service are to be condemned; they do not get us anywhere. The service is not perfect and it does not pretend to be. I maintain that there is a very high percentage of efficient public servants, as high as in any similar body anywhere. I have already spoken in this House on the question of the Civil Service Commission, and I have mentioned the need of superannuation and the Whitley Councils. This bonus question, closely allied as it is to salary revision, is very vital to the service, and I would therefore press upon the Government the necessity for an investigation into all these matters.

Mr. BUREAU: By Griffenhagen?

Mr. McGIVERIN: Not by Griffenhagen; never again!—an investigation by a subcommittee of the Cabinet. In the meantime I contend the only fair thing to do is to retain the bonus at last year's figures until a report on the revision of salaries can be brought down next session, and we can feel that we are not doing an injustice to thousands of our civil servants.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: A great many of the postal employees are very keenly interested in the bonus question, being particularly dependent upon the bonus. I think a very large number of postal employees, mostly married men, are in receipt of a maximum salary of $1,560. I should like an assurance from my right

hon. friend that under the amendment those receiving that maximum will be included.

Mr. BUREAU: They are included.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: The circumstances to which my hon. friend alludes largely influenced the Government in reaching that decision. I will read the bases of proposed distribution of civil service bonus allowance:

1. For members of the service having one or more dependents:
(a) On salaries of $1,560 and under—the bonus as existing in fiscal year 1921-22 to be continued.
(b) On salaries between $1,560 and $1,800 (inclusive)—two-thirds of the bonus as existing in fiscal year 1921-22, to be paid.
(c) On salaries between $1,800 and $2,400 (inclusive)—one-third of the bonus as existing in fiscal year 1921-22 to be paid.
II. For members of the Service without dependents—
On all salaries of $1,200 and under—one-half of the bonus as existing in fiscal year 1921-22 to be paid.
III. The bonus to be discontinued in other cases.

Mr. GARLAND (Carleton): Mr. Chairman, with respect to the statement made by the Prime Minister to-night and that contained on page 1560 of unrevised Hansard for May 8, I have this to say, that if the argument was good to raise the salaries in Class (a) from $1,200 up to $1,560, then when you come down to Class (b), salaries from $1,560 to $1,800, they, too, should be raised to $2,400, and the next class raised from $2,400 up to $2,760. I think the present bonus should remain in effect. I do not see why you can better the service in any way by taking a man at one desk, with dependents, and paying him more salary than the man at the next desk, without dependents, doing the same work. It seems to me that the salary paid should be according to the service rendered, and if any employees are not giving fair service they should be discharged. As has been said, in the United States and Great Britain the bonus has not been reduced, and certainly the cost of living has not come down here in proportion to the proposed bonus reduction. The lower grades should have a straight salary, because in some cases men with four or five children have difficulty to live on $50 a month, and among those men are returned soldiers.

Mr. CHEVRIER: May I be permitted to identify myself with the remarks made by my hon. colleague for Ottawa (Mr. McGivern)? It seems to me the two questions are: Do civil servants earn their salaries? Are they entitled to the bonus? Where you have, as in the civil service, over 60,000 employees distributed over the whole Dominion, it would be preposterous to contend that some individuals will not be found who are derelict in their duty. But in contrast to the few delinquents, I know that the great majority of civil servants will be found to be hard-working and conscientious in the performance of their duties. This question should be dealt with in a broad, generous manner as it affects the whole Dominion, not merely the city of Ottawa; it should therefore be taken out of the field of parochialism. I believe it will be found that 99 per cent of the service are earning more than the salaries the Government is now paying them.

But let us get down to the facts. Is this bonus justifiable? In 1918 the government decided to grant a bonus, following out the principle laid down by the classifiers of the civil service at page 24 of their report where this passage will be found:

Those with whom the final decision as to the adoption or amendment of these proposed schedules rests, knowing the basis upon which they were prepared, will be able to make intelligent adjustments if they disagree with the correctness of the principles and the wisdom of the policies.

So that when this classification was made and when salaries were set out there was no finality about it as the exact salary could not then be fixed, and the bonus was introduced in an attempt to meet the then still rising cost of living. Since its introduction the government has made certain reductions, and further reductions are now being made. With all due deference to those who have decided that the bonus should be cut this year, I contend that in the light of the figures given in the Labour Gazette there is not the slightest justification for this action. We are told that we should not make provision for one class and overlook another, and that throughout the country the wages have been reduced. That is true, but it must be borne in mind that people engaged in the various trades received increases in their wages very soon after the cost of living went up, but it was not until 1918 that the civil service bonus was granted, and it did not take effect until 1919; so that at no time did the bonus make up for the increased cost of living commencing in 1914.

I find in the Labour Gazette that the following increases in wages were granted:

Building trade employees, 91 per cent; metal trade employees, 90 per cent; printing trade, employees, 131 per cent; street railway employees, 116 per cent; steam railway employees, 91 per cent.

But what have civil servants received since 1918? Salaries were fixed in 1908. In 1918 the bonus was granted, and at its peak it represented but an increase of 44 per cent. The statutory increase was 5 per cent in 1908. So that, in 1918, the total increase of bonus and statutory increase was 49 per cent to meet an increased cost of living since 1900 of over 111 per cent.

Mr. McBRIDE: May I ask the hon. gentleman a question?

Mr. CHEVRIER: When I asked the hon. gentleman a few days ago to permit me to ask a question he told me that he had the floor; so have I on this occasion. Taking the figures given by the Labour Gazette, we find that in 1921 the cost of living owing to the abnormal war conditions jumped up to 165 per cent over the cost of living of 1904. There has been no decrease in that cost corresponding to the drastic reduction now being made in the bonus. If we compare the standard at 78 or 80 per cent to-day, as is made out in the various indexes with the decreased bonus that is now proposed, what results do we get? We find this: that since 1908 the civil servants have received an increase of 5 per cent in salary and 44 per cent in bonus, in all 49 per cent of which 44 per cent was granted in 1918. This increase of 45 per cent in 1918 was, in 1921, reduced by 25 per cent. This left a bonus increase of 35 per cent. If a further cut of 33 per cent is made this will be reduced to 24 per cent. If you add 5 per cent statutory increase you have 29 per cent as against 78 per cent or 80 per cent; if you deduct 66 per cent—as is proposed for the second category—from last year's bonus of 35 per cent this leaves 13 per cent; add to it 5 per cent statutory increase and you have 18 per cent as against 78 per cent or 80 per cent. In no industry has the cut been so radical and so drastic as it has been in this case. I submit that this cut should not be made; that the undertaking given when the classification was brought down should be carried out; and that the Government should have a subcommittee of the Cabinet to at once conduct an investigation into the conditions pertaining to the Civil Service, the rates of pay, and so on, and that that subcommittee report to this House on the opening of next session.

[Mr. Chevrier.]

No one would welcome an investigation of that kind more than the civil servants themselves. I have lived in this city all my life; for ten years I have been connected with the Civil Service in professional capacities, and I know that members of the service would, as a result of any impartial investigation such as I have suggested, be vindicated in the stand which they take in this matter.

With a view to refuting a charge which is sometimes made against the Civil Service, and to furnish also a further answer to the question whether this cut is justified, I quote the following from the Citizen:

For those who, somehow, have come to the mistaken belief that the civil servants at Ottawa, as a whole, are a collection of highly-paid holders of soft jobs, it is indeed a little difficult to realize the hardship that would follow even a 25 per cent cut in the cost of living bonus. There are some whom a reduced bonus might not seriously affect—among those in regularly classified positions and in receipt of salaries of $3,000 or more a year But the men with families or dependents who are receiving the average wage, will be called upon to undergo genuine hardship if any curtailment in their incomes, though comparatively small is decided upon.

One feels sure that no member of Parliament desires to see any privation endured by a single individual in the service of the Dominion of Canada.

I may point out that neither my colleague nor myself are pleading for the rights of the civil servants in Ottawa alone; we are pleading on behalf of every civil servant in every constituency represented by hon. members of this House. The article continues:

But perhaps there are some who through lack of knowledge or the misrepresentation of those who do not know the facts, are of the opinion that a cut in bonus can be made without injury to anyone. This is not true of the clerical service.

Let me now quote from The Ottawa Journal—

A member of Parliament has just made the statement that civil servants "are living on the fat of the land." He is a new member, and may be excused for speaking after a brief examination of the facts of the case and a necessarily superficial knowledge of the situation as a whole. Such testimony, is however, strikingly at variance with the declaration of the late Mr. J. M. Courtney that "Government is a niggardly paymaster." The difference between the two judgments is that the former was based on an observation covering a few days and the latter on nearly forty years of experience as Deputy Minister of Finance.

I repeat that I do not think this cut is justified under present conditions. Because there may be suffering in other classes is no reason why the service should be made

to suffer. I may point out that none were more generous than the civil servants throughout Canada in their contributions to the Patriotic Fund during the war, and if they felt that the amount by which their bonus is being reduced could be distributed throughout the country for the relief of poverty and distress, they would be satisfied to let that be done. But I do not think that the reduction will in any way result in the relief of that distress of which I speak. On the contrary, it will create hardship in a great many homes; this proposed saving will not in any way alleviate the conditions of distress which the country now faces, and will in no material manner alleviate the present financial condition.

Mr. McBRIDE: I may say in the first place that I have no fault whatever to find with the Civil Service. Since I have come down here they have treated me with every courtesy; no one could ask to be better treated than I have been. But I would like to put this question to my hon. friend (Mr. Chevrier): if the civil servants are treated as badly as he says they are, how is it that there are so many applications to fill vacancies?

Mr. WOODSWORTH: As one who has a very large number of civil servants in his constituency I feel that I ought to say something with regard to this question. I am glad that the Government has advanced from its first position on this question to the compromise now proposed, but I do feel that any reduction of the bonus figure for last year is short of what is due the civil servants. I should like to associate myself with the hon. member for Ottawa (Mr. Chevrier), who emphasized the need of a thorough revision of the salaries paid to the civil servants. I do not like this idea of a bonus; we ought not to regard the civil service in that way at all. The bonus was presumably granted on account of the cost of living, yet the figures already given show that the cost of living has not gone down, and that the amount that is being paid to civil servants is not sufficient to enable them to live as they should live. Another thing that I think ought to be considered by the committee is the position of the western men. Take the case of the railway mail clerks. In 1914 their maximum was $1,400 and there was a western provisional allowance of $180, making a total of $1,580. The maximum in 1922 is $1,560, and there is no bonus to single men; in other words, the single men of this class receive $20 less in 1922 than they did in 1914. In the case of the postal clerks, the maximum was $1,400 in 1914, which, with the western provisional allowance of $180, made a total of $1,580; the maximum salary in 1922 is $1,500. There is no bonus to the single men; their total salary is $1,500. In other words, in 1922 this class of employees received $80 less than they received in 1914. It seems to me that in discriminating against the single men we are introducing a new principle into the payment of persons for services. We say by the proposed arrangement that they ought to be paid in accordance with the number of dependents they have, their personal obligations, and so on. I do not know that I could object to that principle if it were universally applied. One of the old co-operative societies a good many years ago laid it down as a principle on which to proceed that we should expect from each according to his ability and give to each according to his need. If we go on that principle throughout, then I have no objection to a man with wife and family receiving a larger amount than a single man without dependents. If we go on that principle, there are members in this House who have no dependents and are unmarried, and we might very well begin with the Prime Minister and go down, and apply this principle all along the line. I know of no reason why this should not be done, if we are going on that principle at all. The underlying thought seems to be that these people receiving the lower salaries are more or less in the position of being on the verge of pauperism, and so we have to give just enough to keep them living.

Let me give one or two statements of the cost of living. The weekly budget for a family of five, as reported a month or two ago, including twenty-nine staple articles of food, wood, coal, light and rent, works out at $92.23 per month of thirty days. These figures allow absolutely nothing for extras, clothing, savings, recreation, insurance, etc. In this connection I quote from page 233 of the Labour Gazette as follows:

> For the average family of five the expenditure on these items of food, fuel, light and rent would be perhaps two-thirds or about 65 per cent of the total income.

There are many men with families greater than five in number employed in the Winnipeg office whose total remuneration is $96.25, less $3.50, or five per cent

of the salary which is deducted each month for retirement fund—not a pension scheme but an enforced savings scheme,—making the actual cash remuneration received for a full month's work of forty-four hours per week, $92.75, or 52 cents more per month than the actual cost of living for a family of five, estimated as being 65 per cent of the total income required according to Government statistics.

When we get down to that low rate, we can understand that a man can hardly maintain his self-respect and in some cases that he is actually tempted to resort to practices that are unjustifiable. I had a letter only a day or so ago from one of my constituents in Winnipeg, in which he says:

> Since April 1 of this year not dozens, but scores of married men in the Winnipeg post office with three, four and five children have been drawing the princely sum of $62 per month.

Now, Mr. Chairman, and hon. members, I suggest that no man can live and maintain a family on any such amount as that. Just let me make one or two comparisons.

At the time when the minimum salary for a married man, irrespective of the number of his family, stood at $101.50 per month, unemployed relief was being paid in my own city of Winnipeg to the extent of $112.60 per month in the case of a married man with three or four children, and $104.60 per month with two children. At that time there were no less than 242 employees in the Winnipeg office in receipt of a minimum salary. That is, in the city of Winnipeg we had the peculiar situation of government employees in the post office receiving less than was being paid by the relief agencies of the city of Winnipeg. That seems to me an intolerable situation. The figure fixed by the relief agency was considered the lowest sum on which people could live at all decently, and yet the government employees charged with responsible work were receiving less than the city dole.

Secondly, let me call attention to the fact that the maximum bonus paid at any time in Canada during or after the war was $420 per annum, while in Great Britain the maximum bonus was $2,500. The civil servant in Great Britain in the lower grades received a bonus greater than his salary or wage. One other comparison: During the time the minimum salary for a married man stood at $101.50 per month, its highest point, allowances to vocational students under the Department of Soldiers'

Civil Re-establishment were being paid according to the following schedules:

	Per month
Without dependents	$ 75
Married, without children	100
" wife and one child	115
" wife and two children	127
" wife and three children	137

Over three children add $10 per month for each child.

I am not suggesting at all that the amounts paid under the Soldiers' Civil Re-establishment were too high, but I would suggest if it were necessary to pay anything like $127 per month in the case of a returned man with a wife and three children, it is absolutely inadequate for the Government to pay only $101.50.

I should like to give, in closing, one or two actual cases which have been furnished me as to what this involves in actual family life. I have the names, but I shall not give them. They are residents of the city of Winnipeg:

(A) Porter with two years' service; not yet appointed to a permanent position. Has wife and seven children, last pay cheque was $35 for two weeks pay. Is buying house with monthly payments of $20, plus interest, taxes, insurance, etc.

(B) Clerk, with wife and one child. Passed Civil Service examination in May, 1919, and is not yet appointed. Last pay cheque $35. Is paying $55 per month on land and lumber used in building a home, also taxes of $65 per annum last year, this year will be more.

(C) Clerk, wife and one child. Buying house; payments not stated but understand it runs him $300 per annum, plus interest and taxes. Doctor's bill owing for one year and last winter's fuel not yet paid for. Two years in service, failed on general ability test at last examination.

(D) Porter with wife and five children, youngest six weeks old. Is buying own home. Suffers with asthma and is at present off duty through sickness believed to be brought on through worry about loss of bonus and fears ultimate loss of his home.

(E) Clerk with family of four children with addition expected within two months. Rent $30 per month with salary of $70 less 5 per cent deduction. This man is showing undoubted signs of breaking down under the load of worry and responsibility of trying to support his family and fears seizure of furniture by sheriff having been unable to pay his rent last month.

(F) Clerk, with wife and five children. Salary $70 per month less 5 per cent. Says he is just existing with aid from outside sources and is thankful that the winter is over.

It may seem to some to be beneath the dignity of this House to listen to some of these actual cases of need, yet I take it that, after all, we who are here charged with the responsibility of trying to administer the affairs of this country in such a way that we will at least make provision for the minimum requirements of food and clothing and shel-

ter and health and education; yet we find that even in the case of the government employees themselves the standards are distinctly below the standards of decent living. I recognize that it is next to impossible to do very much at this late stage of the session, but I do trust that the suggestion already made by one of the members from Ottawa that we should give this matter the most serious consideration may be followed, and that we provide for a complete revision of salaries, doing away with this bonus idea altogther, and paying such a salary as will enable all civil servants to live according to respectable standards. And there is one other thing—I think I have mentioned it before, but I should like to mention it again—it seems to me that we ought to make it a crime for any employer to pay a smaller salary to any man than will enable him to support himself in decency.

Mr. McBRIDE: It seems to me a rather peculiar thing that almost every member of Parliament who has spoken on this matter seems to feel himself compelled to speak on behalf of the Civil Service. As I remarked previously I have said nothing against the Civil Service; but I am sent down here to perform a duty and I am going to perform that duty to the best of my ability. I am going to express my views candidly on this question not only here but in any other quarter where I may have occasion to speak. When I go to the country and see what the people there are up against; observe the way in which their taxes are increasing, and notice how people are flocking to the city all the time—to be employed in the Civil Service or elsewhere—I do not think it is a proper condition to continue. During the last year or two a great deal has been said about those in the Civil Service going behind and not being able to make a living. Now, I invested in a ranch and went behind last year to the extent of over $4,000. Yet my hon. friend (Mr. Woodsworth) gets up and declares, "You have got to pay certain salary." Can I pay the salary upon which he seems to insist and still continue to run that ranch? I cannot do it. Not only are the facts as I have stated, but this year my taxes have been increased nearly forty per cent. How are people going to remain in the country under these conditions? Canada is naturally an agricultural country, and the people who dwell in the rural districts are entitled to consideration just as well as the members of the Civil Service and the dwellers in cities.

Mr. LOVIE: I would like to say, as regards the conditions in Winnipeg and the relief work that is carried on there, that I agree with my hon. friend from Centre Winnipeg (Mr. Woodsworth), that wages may not be high enough probably and that those men with large families may in consequence be suffering hardship. However, in respect to that, let me say this: During the Easter vacation, when I was West, I went to the employment agency to hire a man for one month during seeding time. The employment bureau was full of able-bodied men, and the sidewalk outside was lined with them. When I told the clerk inside of my requirement he said "Come back about five o'clock in the afternoon." This was in the forenoon. I said to him "Cannot you get me a man?" He said, "I cannot get a man at this time." I said to him, "Will they not come out for a month? Do they want to go out for the whole summer?" He replied, "They do not want to go out for the whole summer." I then inquired, "Do they not want to go for a month?" He replied, "No." Then I asked, "What do they want?" The clerk's answer to that was, "They want relief." Now, all these men were able-bodied individuals, and that was the situation in Winnipeg at Easter of this year. I wanted a man for a month, and there were others who wanted men, and yet these men would not go. As the employment clerk said, they were looking for relief.

Now as regards the high cost of living to which the hon. member for Centre Winnipeg has referred, the farmers are down to rock bottom. At Easter time I sold fat cattle for six cents a pound. Double that price and you get twelve cents a pound, but the butchers are selling meat at thirty cents a pound. That is profiteering. There you have the retail profiteer, and until his prices are cut down the cost of living in that respect is going to stay where it is.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: My hon. friend from Centre Winnipeg (Mr. Woodsworth) made some remark the purport of which I did not quite grasp. Was it to the effect that it might be considered beneath the dignity of Parliament to inquire into such matters as those pertaining to low-paid salaries?

Mr. WOODSWORTH: Yes, I said it might be considered beneath the Government's dignity to go into this detail in regard to the actual needy family cases.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: Well, I would like to assure my hon. friend that there is no member of the Civil Service so humble that the Government would not wish to see full justice done to him and his family, and it is from that point of view that we will continue to proceed in all our relations with the Service. I would also like to say that the representations of my hon. friend and others and in particular what has been said by the hon. members from Ottawa, deserve and will receive the most careful consideration of the Government. The Government will only too gladly continue to work on this problem, which is one of the most difficult and also most important of the problems with which the administration has to deal.

Item agreed to.

INDIAN AFFAIRS.

Indians. British Columbia. Legal expenses; further amount required $5,000.

Mr. McQUARRIE: The Indian agency at New Westminster has been vacant for some time; is it proposed to fill that vacancy, and if not why?

Mr. STEWART (Argenteuil): I cannot answer that question at the moment. There are two agencies which we are endeavouring to combine and one of them may not be filled. We hope to combine the work of the agencies and have one agent.

Mr. McQUARRIE: I think it would be a mistake to close the agency at New Westminster, as it is one of the most important agencies in British Columbia. I would ask the minister before taking action to look into the matter very carefully.

Item agreed to.

Indian education; further amount required—$211,000.

Mr. SHAW: Some time ago when the committee were considering the main estimates I dealt with the matter of educational facilities being provided for the Indians on the Stoney reserve at Morley in the province of Alberta. From facts in the possession of the department at that time it would appear that there are, if I remember correctly, 110 children of school age for whom no educational facility has been provided for the last two years—I think perhaps for the last three years.

I do not know of any place where there are 650 human beings without the advantage of a school at all except perhaps on this particular Indian reserve. I may say at the outset that I have a letter which was written by the ex-Chief of this particular Indian reserve, dated May 1st, 1922, directed to the Methodist missionary, and I will quote one portion of it. He says:

Why is it that we can get nothing done on this reserve such as school and other things. We have asked the Indian agent to ask the department for a school and I understand the request has not been made to the government.

The request for educational facilities on this particular reserve comes from the Indians themselves. They are anxious that their children should be educated yet they have no educational facilities at all. I know that there is under construction at the city of Edmonton, a distance of 250 miles away, some sort of an Indian educational institution, and I presume, although I do not know, that it is the intention of the department to transfer these Indians to this educational institution at Edmonton. That, undoubtedly will not meet with the approval of the Indians at this centre. They have a large number of children there. They want to accommodate them, and not only that, but they want the school to serve as a community centre, not only to benefit the children both intellectually and physically, but also because it is an advantage to the Indians themselves and a place, round which their community activities might centre. The Government of Canada is under treaty obligations with these Indians to provide them with educational facilities, and I think, unless we are prepared to treat these obligations as a mere scrap of paper, it is about time we should give heed to the demands of the Indians in this particular centre. I should like to know from the minister what educational policy has been determined on in connection with this Reserve?

Mr. NEILL: I would ask the minister if that item includes provision for the Indian school in Alberta?

Mr. STEWART (Argenteuil): Yes. I might say, in answer to the hon. gentleman from West Calgary (Mr. Shaw) that there is a vote of $75,000 for the school in the city of Edmonton, which is the Methodist school, which I presume the Indians of the Morley reserve know more favourably. The history of the Morley reserve is that they did not take kindly to day

schools. That proposition was abandoned some time ago. There is a considerable number of children in that particular reserve, and since my hon. friend brought this matter to the attention of the Government, they have been making a study not only of this reserve at Morley but of the Blood reserve at Macleod and the reserve at Gleishen. I expect within the next two or three weeks to visit this Reserve and to become personally acquainted with some of the difficulties which appear to exist there. As far as I can discover, Indian education from now on is going to be rather an expensive business for the people of Canada. My hon. friend points out that this is a duty that devolves upon the government of Canada. Formerly, apparently, the churches have been undertaking this responsibility to a very large degree, but they are beginning to find the load very much too heavy for them, and from time to time the Government will have to assume a larger share of the responsibility of educating the Indians, I can only say to my hon. friend that I will be prepared to give this the very greatest attention and will visit the institution. I have been across that reserve very frequently, but, of course, I was not specially interested at that time in the condition of the Indians on that particular reserve.

Mr. FORKE: I am almost afraid to ask my question, after what the minister has said, but, can he tell me, has anything definite been done about opening up the school at Elkhorn?

Mr. STEWART (Argenteuil): Yes, the Church of England has the matter under consideration with the department. I cannot promise my hon. friend that any definite conclusion has been arrived at, but in all probabilities that school will be opened.

Mr. MILLAR: Has the minister received any notice of damage done to the Round Lake Indian school at Broadview by the recent tornado?

Mr. STEWART (Argenteuil): Yes, we have received information. It has sustained some injury from the recent storm.

Mr. SHAW: Can the minister tell me what condition the building at Edmonton, is in, or if it is still in process of construction, and when it is proposed to open the institution?

Mr. STEWART (Argenteuil): I had intended to ask for the sum of $175,000 for the construction of that building. It is now almost July, and it will be too late to complete that building this season, undoubtedly, but I have included in this item an amount of $75,000 to begin construction upon that school, and we will rush the construction as fast as we possibly can.

Mr. SHAW: Can the minister tell me when the Indian children will be in a position to receive education in that school?

Mr. STEWART (Argenteuil): As with most building at this time, whether constructed by the Government or anyone else, there is no doubt a full year will elapse before the school will be opened so as to accommodate the children.

Item agreed to.

To provide for the purchase of British Columbia House, London, England, for the purposes of the Dominion Government, $175,000.

Mr. NEILL: Does this mean buying the whole house, or merely the backyard? I am speaking from memory now, but my recollection is that that house cost an enormous sum of money, and if the Government are buying it for $175,000 they are getting an awful good bargain. It is a case of poor old British Columbia being trodden upon once more.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: Hon. members know, I think, that the Canadian offices in London at the present time are scattered in different parts of the city, and for obvious reasons we thought desirable, if possible, to have them brought into one building to accommodate all. The Government ascertained that there was a possibility of purchasing the British Columbia house, a building splendidly adapted for our purposes, and well located in the central part of London, and we are conducting negotiations now with the British Columbia government with a view of purchasing the building outright, making it a Canada house instead of a British Columbia house. It is probable this purchase will go through. The amount asked for at the present time will be sufficient to enable us to get under way with the negotiations. It will not be sufficient to cover the entire price of the building, and if the deal should not go through the amount would not be required.

Mr. STEVENS: What negotiations have been entered into with the government of British Columbia in regard to the matter, and has any figure been fixed by the government of British Columbia.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: When the Premier of British Columbia was here the matter was discussed with him by the Minister of Public Works and myself, but he has to confer with his colleagues on his return to British Columbia. Both governments had to be supplied with particulars as to the price at which it was purchased originally by British Columbia, and this has necessarily been a matter of correspondence and the negotiations have not been completed by any means.

Mr. LADNER: Do the negotiations involve a reservation by lease or otherwise for the use of the province?

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: Yes. British Columbia would not consider the sale of the building without the reservation of a suitable accommodation for the British Columbia officials.

Item agreed to.

To provide additional salary for the Assistant Chief Electoral Officer from April 1, 1919, to June 30, 1920, $1,750.

Mr. BAXTER: I have no intention of opposing this estimate. The Chief Electoral Officer does good work from which we receive great benefit. But I have to take the opportunity to call the attention of the House to some statements made by the hon. gentleman from Victoria and Carleton (Mr. Caldwell) because justice demands that the other side should be stated.

I regret that the hon. member from that constituency was not in his seat when the motion to go into Committee of Supply was made, and that he is not in his seat now. I do not know that I can very well postpone my remarks, as otherwise I might fail to express something that I think ought to be put upon the record. The hon. member, on the 12th of June last, said that some two weeks before the election, he was astonished to find six new polls established in his constituency; that he inquired from the returning officer if those polls had been established; that he had no notice of the appointment of enumerator or registrars; and that the returning officer said that he did not propose to appoint any. He also stated that the returning officer informed him that he was subdividing one division into four, and that he intended to revise the whole as one list, and then afterwards to make a division, allocating the voters to different districts. In fact, I think he said that the returning officer would prepare a copy of the poll for the deputy returning officers on election day, but that no lists would be prepared for the candidates. My hon. friend stated also that he had to employ a lawyer and to threaten an injunction to stop the election in order to get those lists.

There comes a very distinct issue of veracity between the hon. member and the returning officer. I know nothing of the circumstances. I do not know anything personally of the circumstances now, except as I have heard the statement made in the House and as I have, in my possession, a statement differing very widely in practically all respects, of the returning officer. I did ask, when the hon. member made his reference, if he had complained to the Chief Electoral Officer as to the conduct of this election. There is a useful provision in the law for that purpose. I do not want to do the hon. member any injustice. He may not have been aware of the rule; but at all events he did not make any complaint to the Chief Electoral Officer. Apart from this, which may be a petty question between two men, I think the committee might well be impressed with the importance of communicating with the Chief Electoral Officer all instances or irregularities. They could then be investigated, and recommendations could be made by the Chief Electoral Officer for amendments to the law, because in many cases, all we can do is to prevent a recurrence of a matter where very often we are unable to do justice in cases where there have been irregularities.

I do not like to take up much time just now; but I wish to call attention to the statements that are made by the returning officer himself. He has read the remarks of the hon. member, and he says that he found that by following provincial subdivisions, he had a number of large and unwieldly divisions, both geographically and from the standpoint of number of voters on the lists; that after appointing the registrars who had acted in the preceding referendum election and who were familiar with their duties, he was requested by the voters in those divisions to establish separate polling places which would be more accessible and convenient. I do not suppose all the voters asked him, but no doubt he had requests from some reasonable number. He further says that he did not at that time want to appoint new registrars who would be unfamiliar with the duties, and that he proposed to allow the existing registrars to make up his list for

11 p.m.

the entire division in the usual way and then subdivide it geographically for the use of the deputy returning officers in the separate polling stations on election day. Before finally doing so, he submitted the whole matter in detail to the Chief Electoral Officer who fully approved of the suggestion, as the correspondence on file in his office will show.

As regards the conduct of this returning officer, while it is impossible for the House to decide between him and the hon. member who has made allegations against him, it will be easy, I suppose, to refer to the correspondence on file with the Chief Electoral Officer and to see whether he was justified in doing as he did. He then says that he went ahead strictly on the lines approved by the Chief Electoral Officer. He alleges that every step in regard to his acts was first submitted to and approved by the Chief Electoral Officer. He declares that he cannot understand the hon. member's statement that the hon. member only found out about the new polling stations by accident. The boundaries of the new polling stations were printed in the proclamation and distributed and furnished to the hon. member's agent in strict conformity with the election law. I cannot, of course, vouch for a single statement that I am reading. I am accepting it all as being true, because of the honourable record of the returning officer in that constituency. I think, however, it is a most remarkable thing that there should be such a wide divergence between the statement of the hon. member made in this House where the returning officer had no opportunity of being heard and no notice that charges of that kind would be levelled against him, and this answer which is made by the returning officer and which, fortunately, he has an opportunity of bringing before the House and the people just as widely as the allegations that were made against him.

He does not stop there in his statement. He goes further; he says that the hon. member's further statement that the hon. member threatened him with an injunction is quite surprising. At no time during the election did either candidate threaten him in any way, and so far as he was aware, the conduct of the election from the returning officer's standpoint was satisfactory to all parties concerned. He says that it was surprising to learn that the hon. member had to put an injunction on the election. He declares that he—

Mr. CALDWELL: I rise to a question of privilege. I never said that I had to put on an injunction; but I had to threaten to do so, and I can prove this by the attorney whom I employed.

The CHAIRMAN (Mr. Marcil, Bonaventure): I was wondering whether this discussion was in order on the item.

Mr. CALDWELL: I hope it is, and I hope you will let us thresh it out.

The CHAIRMAN (Mr. Marcil): I am in the hands of the committee. The item before the House is to provide an additional salary for the Assistant Chief Electoral Officer, $1,750.

Mr. BAXTER: If I may be permitted to give reasons, I may say that such a discussion is always in order on a motion to go into Committee of Supply. Had I been permitted to-day to finish my remarks which were entirely out of order, little time would have been taken up, and the incident would have passed. I am dealing with the duties which have to be performed by an officer in this department in direct contact with the particular matters which are the subject of the allegations made by the hon. member. Whether this is pertinent or not, I fancy this committee has too high a sense of justice to permit one of its members to make allegations against a man who is not at the bar of this House, who has no opportunity of being heard—without some one being permitted to make a statement in his defence.

Mr. POWER: I rise to a point of order. I do not think it is permissible—

Mr. BAXTER: I am discussing a point of order.

The CHAIRMAN (Mr. Marcil): the hon. gentleman is speaking to a point of order.

Mr. BAXTER: I am not making a political address at all. I am not attempting to apportion praise or blame to either party, but simply to give expression here on behalf of a man who has been charged with wrongdoing. If it is fair that he should be protected, then I think I am in order, and surely it is opposite to this item. If it is not fair that I should be heard now, if hon. members put the technicalities of order above human justice,

then I will stand upon my rights and I shall discuss items until I shall render it absolutely necessary to move again to go into Committee of Supply. Then I shall be absolutely within my rights and impervious to the wishes of those who may not wish justice to be done.

Mr. POWER: My point of order is that it is not permissible for an hon. member to read evidence to controvert the word of another hon. member.

The ACTING CHAIRMAN (Mr. Marcil): That point of order does not arise at the moment. The question is whether this discussion is relevant to the item before the committee. I am in the hands of the committee, but generally there is strict adherence to the rule as to relevancy, and I do not think this debate is relevant to the item under discussion. There are other means by which the hon. member for St. John can bring the matter up.

Mr. CALDWELL: The hon. member for St. John has seen fit to attack a statement I made, and he has also misquoted me. I did not hear the beginning of his address tonight, but I did hear his remarks at the opening of the House this afternoon, and he misquoted me on that occasion.

Mr. STEVENS: I rise to a point of order, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. CALDWELL: I think I have the floor, Mr. Chairman.

The ACTING CHAIRMAN (Mr. Marcil): The hon. member for Vancouver Centre (Mr. Stevens) rises to a point of order.

Mr. STEVENS: My point of order is this, Mr. Chairman: that if the hon. member for Victoria and Carleton (Mr. Caldwell) is going to undertake to discuss the speech of the hon. member for St. John, then the latter at least should be allowed to complete his remarks.

Mr. LAPOINTE: I think everyone is out of order.

The ACTING CHAIRMAN (Mr. Marcil): The discussion is out of order on this item.

Mr. CALDWELL: Of course, I bow to your ruling, Mr. Chairman, but the hon. member for St. John has been allowed to contradict a statement I made—

Some hon. MEMBERS: Order.

Mr. CALDWELL: —and I think I should be allowed to reply.

[Mr. Baxter.]

The ACTING CHAIRMAN (Mr. Marcil): There is another time when the hon. member may reply to the statement. The whole question is whether the discussion is relevant to this item or not. I consider it is not.

Item agreed to.

Grant to the Canadian National Institute for the Blind, $10,000.

Mr. COOTE: Where is this institution located, and is it open to our blind?

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: I am sorry that the hon. Minister of Finance (Mr. Fielding) who had charge of this item is not in the House at this moment. As I recollect, careful inquiry was made regarding the scope of the Institute's work, and it appeared to be on a national scale. It is for that reason that this assistance is being given by the Government. We felt that the object was eminently deserving of support and would be sympathetically received by hon. members.

Mr. COOTE: I have no objection whatever to the grant, but a few weeks ago there was a tag day in Ottawa for the support of the blind, and it seemed to me that if Canada could not look after her blind better than that it was rather a reflection on us as a nation. That is the reason I am trying to get some information under this item. I think the majority of hon. members would like to see an appropriation made for blind soldiers. One of the women who was collecting on the occasion to which I have referred stated that the money was to go to blind soldiers. I am wondering if this institution is of any use to them.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: Yes, particularly so. That was one of the factors which influenced the Government to take such a sympathetic view of the work.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: This is the institution looked after by Mr. Wood and Colonel Baker. It is a very excellent institution.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: A large part of the work is for blind soldiers.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: Practically entirely.

Mr. GRAHAM: We have schools for blind children, but none for blind adults. These gentlemen have undertaken the work, and the comparatively small amount the Government is giving is a mere drop in the bucket compared to the private con-

tributions which are away up in the hundreds of thousands of dollars. We countenance the work being done by giving a small subscription. I can assure my hon. friend that this institution is educating blind adults all over the Dominion, and is working in harmony with the schools for blind children as well.

Mr. COOTE: I would urge on the Government to increase the vote, in that case.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: Hear, hear.

Item agreed to.

Trade and Commerce—Advance for Canadian Wheat Board, 1922, $50,000.

Mr. JOHNSON (Moosejaw): What is the intention of the Government in regard to the $560,000 which was turned back by the Canadian Wheat Board with certain recommendations?

Mr. ROBB: I think I made an explanation on the main estimates. My recollection is it was recommended that the money be applied towards combatting the grasshopper plague and conducting an investigation into the prevention of rust. My hon. friend of course understands that these amounts are turned in to the Receiver General and are not specially earmarked.

Item agreed to.

Public Works—Chargeable to capital—Public buildings. Ottawa—New Departmental Buildings—Compensation to Architects for designs submitted, $18,000.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: What is this vote intended to cover?

Mr. KING (Kootenay): In 1914 the Government invited architects to compete in the preparation of plans for a new departmental building. The contest was Empire-wide and some sixty gentlemen competed. Under the terms of the arrangement a committee was appointed to select from among the plans submitted the six which they considered the best.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: Perhaps the hon. gentleman will tell us why this eight-year old baby has been resuscitated?

Mr. KING (Kootenay): There is no doubt that there was an undertaking on the part of the Government to pay the sum of $3,000 to each of the six selected by the committee.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: What is there to show the undertaking?

Mr. KING (Kootenay): It was one of the terms of the competition advertised by the department.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: It seems an extraordinary thing that this was not done before.

Mr. KING (Kootenay): The competition was not completed; in fact, it is not completed yet. There was a suit in the courts with regard to this matter in which one of the parties was successful, not in getting the amount asked for, but in having his claim to $3,000 established.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: Was he the successful contestant?

Mr. KING (Kootenay): No choice was made out of the six.

Item agreed to.

Harbours and Rivers	
Esquimalt, B.C.—Dry dock, under construction	$1,000,000
Port Arthur and Fort William—Harbour improvements—Further amount required	85,000
Toronto Harbour—Improvements—Further amount required	100,000
	1,185,000

Mr. COOTE: Will the minister explain the first item in this vote and state very definitely whether he does recommend the completion of that work?

Mr. KING (Kootenay): The late government entered into a contract in February, 1920, for the construction of a dry dock at Esquimalt. Ordinarily the item for the completion of the work would have been in the main estimates this year, but when the Government came into power there was a feeling that although further dry dock facilities were necessary on the Pacific coast, money conditions were such that it was doubtful whether the construction of two dry docks on the Pacific coast would be justifiable. The work has been held up at Esquimalt as well at Vancouver. We found on investigation, however, that some $1,200,000 had been expended at Esquimalt; that the contractors had a large plant and equipment on the ground, and that if the Government cancelled the contract it would be liable for the payment of claims arising out of the cancellation. After careful investigation, in view of the fact that further dry dock accomodation there was needed; that large expenditure had already been made, and that further large expenditure would be involved if the contracts were cancelled and the works

closed down, it was considered better business to go on and complete the work. So we are asking for $1,000,000 for the continuation of the work at Esquimalt.

Mr. CLARK: When the main estimates were before the committee the Minister of Public Works suggested to me that when the supplementary estimates were being considered I would have an opportunity to refer to the conditions with respect to a dry dock in Vancouver. The need for a dry dock there was recognized by three successive governments, that of the late Sir Wilfrid Laurier, that of Sir Robert Borden, and later that of the right hon. gentleman who at present leads the Opposition (Mr. Meighen). In February, 1920, a contract between the Coughlin Shipbuilding Company and the government was authorized under the Dry Dock Subsidies Act, and in October, 1920, a contract was entered into under which, on consideration of the company expending $2,500,000 in the construction of a dry dock, the Dominion would subsidize the company to the extent of $112,000 per annum over a period of thirty-five years in accordance with the provisions of the Dry Dock Subsidies Act. Unfortunately, the contract called for a graving dock. After careful investigation the Coughlin Company came to the conclusion that a graving dock was not a proper dock to construct; so they joined with the Wallace Shipbuilding Company and agreed upon the construction of a floating dock.

The CHAIRMAN (Mr. Marcil): I have no objection to the hon. member making reference to Vancouver, but the question before committee at present relates to the dry dock at Esquimalt, not at Vancouver.

Mr. KING (Kootenay): I would like the hon. member to have an opportunity of proceeding, because when the main estimates were being considered there was a suggestion that he would later have an opportunity to make some reference to this matter.

The CHAIRMAN: I am in the hands of the committee.

Mr. CLARK: I shall not be long, Mr. Chairman, but I would like to place certain facts before the committee. As I have said, these two companies consolidated their interests; the old contract was surrendered, a new contract with the Government of Canada entered into, and these two companies were given the subsidies which had previously been given to the Coughlin Shipbuilding Company: These companies have now at their disposal a plant practically completed for this enterprise. The only thing that remains to be done is the construction of a floating dock. The Minister of Public works (Mr. King) advises me that this contract is in order; that the only reason why any question has been raised by the Government has to do with finances.

The minister has suggested that the Dominion might not be justified in constructing two dry docks on the Pacific coast. I want to point out that the Dominion is not constructing a dry dock at Vancouver; it is a matter of private enterprise, But I think there are certain facts that members of the House, particularly those who live in the prairie provinces and in eastern Canada, did not quite appreciate.

The facts are these: The total tonnage passing in and out of the two ports of Vancouver and Victoria for the year 1921 was almost equal to the total tonnage passing through the ports of Montreal, Quebec, Halifax and St. John. It has often been pointed out in this House that Vancouver is a port open the year round, whereas Montreal is closed five months of the year. The total tonnage passing through the port of Vancouver is greater than that of Montreal. Halifax and St. John are the ports through which the business of Montreal is done in the winter, and the two Pacific ports of Vancouver and Victoria do an almost equal volume of business with the four eastern ports. That is a fact which I think this committee should consider. If I may be permitted to suggest it, I think that if this House came to the conclusion that during one session of each Parliament the members should take a trip to all parts of Canada and see what is doing in their own country, it would eliminate a great deal of the talk that goes on here and we should do more business because we would know what we were discussing. I think it is a truism that to have seen a thing once is better than to have heard of it a hundred times.

May I point out in this connection that we have a serious unemployment problem on the Pacific coast. Had this project been proceeded with last year after the contract was concluded it would have resulted in the employment of one thousand men in that enterprise who are and have been unemployed.

May I also point out that the port of Halifax and the port of St. John each have dry docks; Quebec has two dry docks, Montreal, two; Kingston, Toronto, Collingwood, Port Arthur, Prince Rupert, each has a dry dock; but the two great ports of Victoria and Vancouver have no dry dock except the one in Victoria, which is not capable of handling any of the business that is required to be handled at the present time. This dry dock which the Government proposes to proceed with and for which the estimate is proposed, will take at least five years to construct. The dry dock in Vancouver which would be constructed by private enterprise if this contract was honoured could be completed within one year, and its existence would be more than justified within one year, because if it only repairs five or six ships, it will mean a tremendous sum of money for the port.

The situation is this: All the ships now coming into the port of Vancouver are forced to go for repairs to the port of Seattle, which, by the way, has five dry docks. It is true they only make minor repairs there, because the vessels wait until the return trip and have any major repairs done at Hong Kong. I have been assured by such men as Mr. Melville Dollar, of the Robert Dollar Company, one of the biggest shipping companies in the world, that vessels can now have their repairs done in Vancouver, such as can be done without a dry dock, as cheaply and as efficiently as they can be done on the Clyde, and just as cheaply and more efficiently than they can be done in Hong Kong. Surely under these circumstances this Parliament is not going to shirk its responsibility under a solemn contract which is admitted to be in perfect order.

May I point out also, and I am sure the Minister of Public Works will agree with me, that if this contract is proceeded with, the total cost for the first year cannot exceed the sum of $40,000. I am just as strong for economy as any member of this House, but where in the name of common sense does economy come in when an expenditure of $40,000 will mean the expenditure of millions of dollars by shipping companies outside of Canada within our own ports. Furthermore, these two great shipbuilding companies, the Coughlin and Wallace companies in which millions of dollars of our own Canadian money is invested, are slowly being strangled, for it is out of the uestion for them to get contracts for new ships. We all recognize that shipbuilding in Canada cannot be a thriving industry for five years to come anyway. It may be a thriving industry eventually, and we hope it will be, but these two shipbuilding companies could carry on with the repairs that would be available from the great volume of shipping that is now passing through that port, and they could save to the people the millions of dollars of capital invested by carrying on a repair business for the next few years, if they are given the chance.

I have seen a newspaper report that the Minister of Public Works proposes to go to British Columbia and investigate this matter, but I can assure him and every member of this committee that there is no need for further investigation. Investigations have been carried on over a period of many years.

Just before I conclude, I should like to refer the Government, and particularly the Minister of Finance, with whom I thoroughly sympathize in his effort to economize, to the conclusions arrived at not only by every citizen of Vancouver, but by the leading Liberal newspaper in the province of British Columbia, the Vancouver Daily World. The editorial I refer to appears on the front page of its issue of May 29. I could refer to various other editorials in the same paper on the same subject, but I think this covers it pretty well. I shall just read a few sentences:

> In view of these facts repudiation is impossible and unthinkable. Every consideration of national policy, of national honour and of national necessity—as well as every commercial necessity of the port of Vancouver—requires the carrying out of the contract and the keeping of public faith. On the issue of public honour, there is no room for evasion, repudiation or compromise. On the fact of commercial necessity there is no room for argument—the need of docking and repair facility is a recognized need of every active port. There is no answer to the justice of this claim and right.

I sincerely hope that there will be no delay in making the investigation which the Minister of Public Works stated last December he proposed to make. I think there has been plenty of opportunity and plenty of time to make the investigation already, and I hope that the very moment the session is concluded he will give this matter his first consideration and see that justice is done. I can quite appreciate the fact that he is not as closely in touch with this situation as we from the city of Vancouver, and possibly from other coastal ports, are.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: With reference to this contract which my hon. friend says is being repudiated—

Mr. CLARK: I did not say it had been repudiated.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: —will he tell us the date at which the contract was entered into, and by whom?

Mr. CLARK: Yes. The first contract was entered into in October, 1920. That contract was with Coughlin. It was afterwards surrendered in consideration of a contract for the same subsidy. The Wallace Company being added to the consolidation. It was a contract under which two shipbuilding companies joined together, but a change was made in the kind of dock. It had been intended to build a graving dock but I think they came to the conclusion that that was impraticable because of the cost. The subsidy was for a second class dock and would not have enabled them to float their bonds and so on, and then the project would be financially impossible. These two companies were negotiating for a period of some six or eight months and finally consolidated their interests and surrendered the contract in consideration of the execution of a new contract. I canot give you the exact date. I think the contract was signed very shortly before the election, but the consolidation was completed and the surrender of the old contract was given only on the distinct understanding that the new contract would issue in consideration thereof.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: My hon. friend says the contract was signed very shortly before the general election. Is it not a fact it was signed about six days before the election?

Mr. CLARK: I do not think it matters at all. I said "very shortly" but I cannot give you the exact date. It does not matter whether it was before or after the election; it is a necessity—that is my point.

Mr. COOTE: Does the hon. member think this Parliament would be justified in authorizing the building of two dry docks as close together as Esquimalt and Vancouver?

Mr. CLARK: In the first place this Government is not building the dry dock. This is a matter of private enterprise, subsidized under a public statute. Any person can come along, make out a case, and get the subsidy. A case has been made out repeatedly, as I say, for over a period of ten years and now we have got private enterprise to complete the undertaking. These two ports are eighty miles apart, and a dry dock in Victoria will never be of any use to the shipping industry of Vancouver. For this reason: Vancouver is a terminal point. The ships will come into Vancouver and unload, and if they have to turn round and go eighty miles to have very extensive repairs made, unless such repairs are an absolute necessity. They will reload and go back to Hong Kong and have them made there or else go down to Seattle.

Mr. COOTE: In other words a dry dock at Esquimalt is in the wrong place.

Mr. CLARK: I do not admit that at all. I say that the shipping in and out of Victoria is absolutely sufficient and more than sufficient to justify a dry dock there. As I pointed out before, the ports of Montreal and Quebec have four dry docks between them. These two ports have none and yet the shipping tonnage through them is much greater than through the ports of Montreal and Quebec.

Item agreed to.

Public Buildings—Ontario, $122,580.

Mr. NEILL: I just wish to suggest to the Government that under the item of Dominion Public Buildings some amount of money might be spent, and some attention paid, to the matter of the acoustics of this Chamber. The conditions that prevail here are a travesty on common sense. The man who erected this building and left it as it is should be crucified. Can you conceive of a church in any of our big cities, or a theatre, with accommodation for nearly 250 people as to which one-third of those who attend might almost just as well be outside the building. It is of no use to say that an improvement cannot be made, because there can be an improvement. If you send a plumber to do the work he will not be able to do it; but if you send an expert—and there are experts in the business—the needed work can readily be done. Members from British Columbia will recall the former legislative chamber, only this is worse than that because in the provincial chamber there were only forty-two members. However, they could not hear in that chamber and they did some peculiar stunt in connection with the roof. I forget whether they tore out the former ceiling and put in a new one—but it does not matter, they did something

to the chamber and made it practically all right. A little care and a little study by an expert would surely convert this Chamber into something approximating the purpose for which it was intended.

Item agreed to.

Public Buildings—Alberta, $27,000.

Mr. KNOX: Do I understand that the vote for public buildings in Saskatchewan has been carried?

The CHAIRMAN (Mr. Marcil, Bonaventure): Yes.

Mr. KNOX: I did not think the item was read. Is it so small for Saskatchewan that it is not worth paying any attention to?

An hon. MEMBER: There are others.

Item agreed to.

Harbours and Rivers, Nova Scotia, $258,740.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: These look more like main estimates than supplementaries.

The CHAIRMAN: Is it the pleasure of the committee that I read the different items embodied in this vote?

Some hon. MEMBERS: Carried.

Mr. COOTE: I think they had better be read, you might overlook some.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: These items are all for necessary repairs and perhaps they had better be taken together. It is not likely that hon. members will take exception to any, so they might go through as they are. If any hon. gentleman desires to take exception to any item it is open to him to do so.

Item agreed to.

Harbours and Rivers, Quebec—$236,785.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: Just one question. I take it from what my right hon. friend has said that these are for essential repairs. You are not going on with new works?

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: There may be one or two very small exceptions, but the votes would be for work that has been long standing and should really have been undertaken before this.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: There are some extensions here—$32,000.

Mr. KING (Kootenay): Not extensions, but necessary additions. It is not new work.

Item agreed to.

Manitoba—Delta—Completion of protection work, $1,500; Winnipegosis wharf, $3,100.

Mr. KELLNER: In regard to this wharf at Winnipegosis, the deputy minister asked me to present a statement. He was very careful, and very wisely asked me not to over-estimate what I thought it would cost to build this wharf. I personally visited the ground and ascertained the cost of securing the land on which it was to be built, and the cost of building it, and the least possible I considered it could be built for, was $4,000. I would ask why it has been reduced to $3,100.

Mr. KING (Kootenay): This is the estimate made up by the district engineer as to cost.

Mr. LEADER: I wish to say a few words in connection with the recent floods in Manitoba. If the Government had acted upon my suggestion when I brought the matter up some weeks ago, it would not have been necessary to have said anything to-night. At that time I suggested that the Government should bring down, in the supplementary estimates, an item to take care of the damage. I see they have not made any provision for that. Therefore, it is up to me to say a few words on it to-night.

The CHAIRMAN: The hon. gentleman would not be in order under this item. This is for temporary wharf accommodation. He would have to take some other opportunity.

Mr. LEADER: I was given the assurance this afternoon that I would be allowed to bring it up.

The CHAIRMAN: I am in the hands of the committee.

Some hon. MEMBERS: Go ahead.

Mr. LEADER: A statement was made by the Minister of the Interior that no claims had been made with regard to this flood in Manitoba. It is only natural that I, as representing that constituency, should receive any claims that were made. I will not weary the House by quoting them all. Here is a letter from J. A. Hirtle, of Headingly, and I have a letter from Mr. G. H. Kelly. These gentlemen claim, on behalf of others in the district, that they should be compensated for any work they did in connection with the recent floods.

Mr. BUREAU: What is the matter with the province of Manitoba compensating them?

Mr. LEADER: I beg leave to present a resolution passed by the councillors of Cartier and St. Francois-Xavier, which reads as follows:

Whereas the settlers along the Assiniboine river east of Portage la Prairie since the earliest times have suffered great loss and damage through high water;

And whereas the water of said river have overflowed its bank in greater or less volume every year;

And whereas the high water of 1902, 1904 and 1916 have caused great damage in our municipalities and have driven many settlers out of the district;

And whereas the residents of said municipalities have worked, day and night, to dyke a large portion of said river and thus prevent thousands of acres from being flooded;

And whereas the flood 1922 will bankrupt many farmers if financial help is not forthcoming;

Be it therefore resolved, that the federal Government at Ottawa immediately investigate the damages caused by the flood of 1922, compensate those who suffered losses, indemnify the settlers for the work done and take adequate measures to prevent the recurrence of these floods in future, and further,

Be it also resolved, that a copy of the above resolution be mailed to the Honourable Prime Minister of Canada, the leader of the Opposition, Mr. T. A. Crerar and our member, Mr. Harry Leader.

It has been stated that it has driven many settlers off the land. We have spent millions to bring settlers into this country, and here is one place where, with a little financial help, we could retain the settlers already on the land. It has been stated in this House that a satisfied settler is the best immigration agent the country can have.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: Perhaps the hon. member would permit the Committee on Railway Rates to present their report. This committee could rise and ask leave to sit again, so that the chairman of that special committee dealing with transportation costs could present their report.

Progress reported.

COMMITTEE ON TRANSPORTATION COSTS

Hon. A. K. MACLEAN (Halifax) presented the third report of the Select Special Committee appointed to consider transportation costs, together with the minutes of proceedings and the evidence.

Mr. STEVENS: Will that report be printed immediately, so that members can have copies?

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: I will endeavour to have them sent down to-night.

[Mr. Bureau.]

Mr. MACLEAN (Halifax): I give notice that on Monday I will move concurrence on the motion.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: Is there another report, or is this the final report?

Mr. MACLEAN: (Halifax): It is not likely that there will be another report.

Mr. BUREAU: Call it the third and final report.

SUPPLY

PUBLIC WORKS

The House again in Committe of Supply, Mr. Marcil (Bonaventure) in the Chair.

Mr. LEADER: I have another resolution to present to the House from the local branch at Reaburn. The resolution reads:

Whereas the floods from the Assiniboine river have caused serious loss to several farmers in this district in the loss of their crops;

Be it resolved that we request our federal member, Mr. Harry Leader, to urge upon the Government that every possible assistance be given to those farmers who have lost their crops, and also that a dyke be constructed this summer to prevent any such serious situation arising in the future, and that the destitute farmers be given an opportunity of constructing this dyke.

I am not very well versed in the situation, but I believe this Government cannot escape the responsibility of, at least, paying for the damage done to the bank of the Assiniboine river. To support my contention, I have a letter from a gentleman out there. I do not know that I should give his name. He states that the dyke was built by the Hon. Robert Rogers in 1914. Previous to this contract the Government had done some work up there. Therefore, I think they are fairly convicted, and must assume responsibility for the damage to the banks of the Assiniboine river. I have only done my duty in bringing the matter before the Government, it is now up to the Government to do their part. The Minister of the Interior (Mr. Stewart) to-day informed the House that he had, I think, instructed the hon. member for Brandon (Mr. Forke) to communicate with his constituents and to have them notify the provincial government that this Government were willing to cooperate with them in a survey of the damage done there, and to see if they could arrive at some agreement as regards the damage done. I am pleased that the Government have gone that far, and I hope they will be able to go a little further and to do something for the settlers.

Mr. FORKE: I have to put myself right along this line too, because the last time

the hon. member for Portage la Prairie (Mr. Leader) brought this matter up, I got quite a calling down from the people of Brandon for neglecting my duty by not bringing it up. I am glad the hon. member for Portage la Prairie has brought the subject forward. He is just a little mistaken in the last statement. The Minister of the Interior took it into consideration that they might make a survey of the river through Manitoba and find if something could be done to prevent flooding in the years that are to come. The promise was made that if the provincial government would make this request, it would most likely be acceded to. Some time ago I took the matter, as regards the damage done by the flood, up with the Minister of Public Works (Mr. King) and the Minister of the Interior. There is a question just how far the Dominion government are responsible. If they are responsible in any way, no doubt a great deal of suffering has been occasioned by the flood. I can readily see that the provincial government would in some way be responsible, perhaps to a greater extent than the Dominion government; but I think some little help might come from the Dominion government in this case, as the people have lost property and have suffered a great deal on this account.

Mr. LAPOINTE: It was an act of Providence.

Mr. FORKE: No doubt, and the Assiniboine river. I have brought this matter to the attention of the Government, and I hope they will take it into consideration anyway.

Item agreed to.

Saskatchewan and Alberta—waterways—temporary wharfage accommodation, $1,000.

Mr. KNOX: This sum is not very large, seeing that the item covers two provinces. Where is this money being spent?

Mr. KING (Kootenay): This is to provide temporary warfage accommodation at waterways, Alberta, at an approximate cost of $600. There is just the one item.

Item agreed to.

Harbours and rivers—British Columbia, $174,455:

Mr. McBRIDE: I brought this matter about Shuswap lake to the attention of the minister when the main estimates were under discussion. I know the coast of British Columbia and I know the Fraser river I have steam boats working there at the present time, and I will say no place in British Columbia to-day, to my knowledge, needs a wharf and some work done as much as does Shuswap lake. I have spoken to the minister as regards getting a dredge there, and if something is not done to get a dredge built this year, it will mean that no work can be done next year. If the dredge is not put into repair or a new dredge built this year, and if we have to wait until the estimates come down next year, it will be the fall of next year before the dredge is completed, and it will be two years from now before the work can be done. I would ask the minister, at least, to have a dredge built this year if there is any possibility of that being done.

Mr. STEVENS: Can the minister not take this out of the general dredging appropriation?

Mr. KING (Kootenay): The matter will receive consideration. I do not know that we can do this.

Item agreed to.

Progress reported.

SUPPLY—CONCURRENCE

The House proceeded to consider certain resolutions reported from Committee of Supply.

Resolutions concurred in.

TREATIES WITH HUNGARY AND TURKEY

On motion of Right Hon. W. L. Mackenzie King (Prime Minister), Bill No. 203, for carrying into effect the Treaties of Peace between His Majesty and Hungary and Turkey, was read the second time, and the House went into Committee thereon.—Mr. Marcil, Bonaventure, in the Chair.

On section 1.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: Is this in the same form as the acts adopted for the purpose of carrying out previous treaties?

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: Yes.

Section agreed to.

Bill reported, read the third time and passed.

On motion of Mr. MacKenzie King, the House adjourned at 12 o'clock midnight.

Monday, June 26th, 1922

The House met at three o'clock.

RAILWAY TRANSPORTATION COSTS

Hon. A. K. MACLEAN (Halifax) moved:

That the third report of the Special Committee on Railway Transportation costs be concurred in.

He said: Mr. Speaker, in making this motion I wish to address to the House a few general observations regarding the work of the committee and its conclusions as found in the report now before the House. At this stage of the session, and in view of the general knowledge which, I assume, hon. gentlemen have of the subject matter, it is hardly necessary for me to deal with it at any great length. However, I feel it is but fair to hon. gentlemen that I should make a brief explanation of the report and the subjects with which it deals.

Several important matters were referred to in the order of reference to the committee. Some of these matters were not fully considered—in fact, were hardly considered at all. Time did not permit of it. It was doubtful, at least to me, whether some of the suggestions in the order of reference were after all capable of any intelligent or useful treatment by the committee. Some of them belonged to the realm of speculative economics, and I think hon. gentlemen will agree that a parliamentary committee was hardly qualified or competent to deal with some of them, in a very practical way during the short time of a parliamentary session.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: Hear, hear.

Mr. MACLEAN (Halifax): For instance, the committee were requested to inquire as to the effect of freight rates upon general industry and upon specific industries. That, of course, is a very difficult problem. Any one who reads current literature relating to freight rates and their effect upon trade will observe that two different views are generally expressed. Competent students of the question assert that freight rates are not a very considerable factor in trade matters; others hold to the view that they are the most important factor in the resuscitation of trade and commerce. I do not propose addressing myself at any length to this particular aspect of the order of reference. My hon. friend opposite, the member for West York (Sir Henry Drayton) has indicated his concurrence in my suggestion that in some degree at least this matter belongs to the realm of speculative economics. I suppose, however, we can all agree that high freight rates do not stimulate trade. That is true of all commodities; high prices curtail trading in the commodities affected. After all, railway service is a commodity just like anything else. It has its costs of production and its selling price. When we are dealing with this matter it would be well for us to realize at all times that there is no distinction in essence between the price of railway service and the price of any other commodity. The freight rates of this or any other country must largely depend on the cost of living of the railways, for railways have their cost of living to face just as people have. At the present time the railways are consumers of iron, steel, wood, clothing, fuel and a great many other commodities. They are consumers in a very, very large degree of these commodities, and it must therefore appear to all of us that their ability to produce their railway service at a given price very largely depends upon what the cost of living is to the railways. As I said, the committee did not attempt to go into this matter in any exhaustive or scientific way,—the report merely expresses a general opinion upon this phase of the matter. The order of reference refers to transportation costs, and again I think I am speaking the judgment of every member of the committee when I say that it did not consider itself quite competent or sufficiently instructed to express any well considered, valued opinion upon the very much vexed question, as to what constitutes a proper railway freight rate, on any commodity or commodities.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: Hear, hear.

Mr. MACLEAN (Halifax): Freight rates are much like the divine peace, passing all understanding. There are many anomalies, of course, in freight-rate making. There is no such thing as a scientific freight rate in the sense that payment is made according to the service rendered. The hon. member for Sherbrooke (Mr. McCrea) appeared before our committee on different occasions and persisted on an inquiry as to why wheat was carried at a lower rate per hundred pounds than lumber, but I think that on these several occa-

sions he left the committee no wiser than when he entered it. There are, indeed, so many anomalies in railway freight rates that one might consume the attention of the House for many hours in enumerating them. They are the result of long years of experience and railway practice, and I suppose in some way or other they may be justified by that experience.

It was, I think, the judgment of the committee, and I think it will be found expressed in the report, that the question of railway charges and railway freight costs must in the end be determined by some body specially constituted for that purpose, and that body in this country is the Board of Railway Commissioners. The important thing after all, Mr. Speaker, that was referred to the committee was involved in the question whether the Crowsnest rate agreement should be allowed to come into operation on July the sixth next, or be further suspended. That, after all, was the important question submitted to the committee, and it was to a consideration of that question the committee largely devoted itself.

I may say just a few words explanatory of this agreement, although I fancy most hon. gentlemen are fully acquainted with it. In 1897 the government of Canada entered into a subsidy contract with the Canadian Pacific Railway for the construction of a line of railway from Lethbridge to a point in eastern British Columbia. The Canadian Pacific Railway undertook the construction of that road on the promise of a subsidy of, I think, $11,000 per mile. Eventually the road was constructed under that contract and the Canadian Pacific Railway received a total subsidy of, in round figures, $3,400,000. Concurrently with the subsidy contract, the government and the Canadian Pacific Railway entered into an agreement concerning the freight rates that were to be charged by that railway on certain specified commodities. At that time we had not in Canada a railway board or any other constituted body authorized to regulate freight rates. Such power, if any existed, rested, I fancy, with the Governor in Council. Under the charter of the Canadian Pacific Railway it was free to charge such rates as would yield a dividend of 10 per cent; that is to say, nobody was authorized to intervene in the freight rate structure adopted by the Canadian Pacific Railway until it had earned a dividend of over 10 per cent. At that time the population of the prairie provinces was sparse. Hon. gentlemen may possibly remember the figures that I gave in this connection when I spoke upon the budget, and by reference to those figures one would find that the population of the three prairie provinces was, comparatively speaking, very small indeed. I think it is a fair presumption that when the Crowsnest pass rate agreement was entered into, and when it assumed to fix maximum rates for certain commodities or articles of merchandise, it had in mind the fact that the prairie provinces were then in the pioneering stage, and that the control of certain things, particularly things that were of vital interest to the people then settled in those provinces, was of importance to that section of Canada and perhaps of interest to the whole Dominion. At any rate, the agreement provided that the rates on certain commodities then prevailing on the Canadian Pacific Railway—and it was the only railway in the West at that time—should be reduced and that a maximum rate should be fixed. The articles mentioned and the percentage of reduction are as follows—I shall quote from the statute:

Upon all green and fresh fruits, 33⅓ per cent;
Coal oil, 20 per cent;
Cordage and binder twine, 10 per cent;
Agricultural implements of all kinds, set up in parts, 10 per cent;
Iron, including bar, band, Canada plates, 10 per cent;
All kinds of wire, 10 per cent;
Window glass, 10 per cent;
Paper for building and roofing purposes, 10 per cent;
Roofing felt, box and packing, 10 per cent;
Paints of all kinds and oils, 10 per cent;
Livestock, 10 per cent;
Woodenware, 10 per cent;
Household furniture, 10 per cent.

These reductions were applicable to the articles which I have just read in movements westbound from and including Fort William and all points east of Fort William on the company's railway, to all points west of Fort William on the company's main line of railway. It will therefore be seen that the purpose of the agreement, in respect of these articles of merchandise, was to afford the settlers of the prairie provinces of that day the lowest possible rate upon the articles of merchandise which they most required, and which were not obtainable in these provinces. It was urged by many in the committee that this section of the agreement is practically obsolete. There is much to say in support of that argument, in fact it is my own view,

absolutely. However, I do not propose to debate that at the moment. The other provisions of the agreement in connection with the control of freight rates, related to grain and flour. That, doubtless was of great importance to the people of the west of that day, and it is still regarded by them as a very essential factor in the great basic industry of these provinces. The section of the agreement relative to grain and flour is as follows:

That there shall be a reduction in the Company's present rates and tolls on grain and flour from all points on its main line, branches, or connections, west of Fort William to Fort William and Port Arthur and all points east, three cents per one hundred pounds, to take effect in the following manner—

I need not read the rest of the section, but I might condense it by saying that it provides that a reduction of one and a half cents per one hundred pounds shall be made in the first year and one and a half cents per one hundred pounds in the following year, constituting altogether a reduction of three cents per hundred pounds on grain and flour. That is the substance of the so-called Crowsnest rate agreement, at least, that part of it which had particular reference to the inquiry conducted by the committee, and which is the important thing before the House for consideration this afternoon. In 1899, I think it was, the effect of this agreement was reflected in the grain and flour rates which came into effect in the autumn of that year; I think it was in the autumn of 1899 that the full effect of the agreement was to be seen. In 1903, however, an agreement was made between the Government of Manitoba and the Canadian Northern Railway, or what afterwards became the Canadian Northern Railway, providing for a control of freight rates within the province of Manitoba. This had its effect upon the freight rates upon grain throughout the whole of the prairie country. In 1903 the grain rate in the west was considerably below the Crowsnest rate and that rate, that is the lower rate, prevailed until March, 1918. In that month the Board of Railway Commissioners ordered an increase of 15 per cent upon freight rates in Canada generally, and the application of this order to grain rates elevated the lower grain rates to the maximum of the Crowsnest rates—that is in the year 1918, and that increase—

Mr. MEIGHEN: Excepting in Manitoba.

[Mr. A. K. Maclean.]

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: That is right, not in Manitoba.

Mr. MACLEAN (Halifax): It would have little or no effect in the province of Manitoba.

Mr. MEIGHEN: Still a little lower than the Crowsnest.

Mr. MACLEAN (Halifax): Yes, it may be still a little lower, my right hon. friend is right. I might say that this increase was made by the Board of Railway Commissioners upon the application of the railways, and inasmuch as grain rates did not rise beyond the Crowsnest grain rates, they had full authority to make this increase. Then there followed certain wage awards in the United States applicable to American railways, known as the McAdoo schedule, which were followed by many supplementary awards. This increase in the railway wages in the United States brought forth from the employees of railways in this country a demand for similar increases in Canada, and accordingly they made an application to that end. I assume that that application eventually came before the government of that day, but just how I cannot recall. Possibly the request came to the Government through the Canadian Railway Board, an organization of Canadian railway executives which was created and acting during the war period. On July 27, 1918, the government of Canada, by Order in Council, authorized an increase in the wages of the employees of Canadian Government Railways equal to the increases made in the United States, to which I have already referred. That Order in Council recommended the adoption of this increase in wages in the case of the employees of the other railways of Canada. The recommendation was adopted, and the wages paid to all the employees of Canadian railways was increased. It will be clear, therefore, to hon. gentlemen, I hope, that if any further increase was to be made in railway wages at that time, it meant a further increase in railway rates in Canada. Accordingly, the government of that day, by Order in Council under the authority conferred by the War Measures Act, authorized the Board of Railway Commissioners to disregard rate controlling agreements, having in mind the Crowsnest rate of agreement, and which order, of course,

gave the Board of Railway Commissioners the power to disregard that agreement. On August 12 of that year the Board of Railway Commissioners authorized a freight rate increase of 25 per cent in the east and 25 per cent in the west, but it was less in the west, as I understand it, because the increase of 15 per cent made in the previous March was absorbed by this increase of 25 per cent under the order of August 12th. As I have already stated that increase in freight rates was made by the Board of Railway Commissioners under the authority given it by Order in Council, and which in turn was pursuant to the powers given to the Governor in Council under the War Measures Act. Then further wage increases were granted to employees of railways in the United States. The particular increase which I have in mind is known as the Chicago Award. That increase was made applicable to Canadian railways in due course, and the Canadian railways then urged they were entitled to a further increase in freight rates because they were obliged to meet the further increase in wages. Accordingly, on September 13th, 1920, a further increase was ordered by the Board of Railway Commissioners to the extent of 35 per cent in the west, and 40 per cent in the east. This represents the full series of increases of freight rates made in Canada during the period of years which I have covered.

The last order providing for the 35 and 40 per cent increase also provided for a 5 per cent decrease on January 1st, 1921. Another order was subsequently passed by the Board of Railway Commissioners, ordering a further decrease of 10 per cent effective on December 1st, 1921, on which date that order came into effect. The authority of the Board of Railway Commissioners to suspend the Crowsnest rate agreement, being founded on the War Measures Act, was not considered a desirable authority upon which to have its powers rest, particularly as the war was then over and the War Measures Act was about to be repealed. The government of that day then deemed it wise to ask parliament to put that authority into statutory form, and in 1919, section 325, subsection 5, of the Railway Act of Canada, was enacted so as to give to the Board of Railway Commissioners the power to disregard all rates controlling agreements that were then in effect. I think that as a matter of fact there was but one agreement which the Board of Railway Commissioners could not disregard without some legislative authority and that was the Crowsnest rate agreement. That section of the Railway Act was to be effective only until the 6th day of July next. The section provides that it was to be effective only for three years. Hon. members will, therefore, see that that power granted to the Board of Railway Commissioners expires within a few days, and the whole question is whether that power shall be further continued by legislation, or whether it shall automatically pass away, and the Crowsnest agreement again come into full force and effect. That, after all, was the substantial question referred to the committee, and it is the substantial issue before this House to-day for its determination. The representatives of the Canadian Railways appeared before the committee,—Mr. Beatty, the President of the Canadian Pacific Railway, Mr. Hanna, President of the Board of Management of the Canadian National Railways; and Mr. Watson, on behalf of the Grand Trunk. They all urged a further suspension of the agreement, or, in other words, that section 325 of the Railway Act be further continued in its present form. That was the view presented to the committee by the railways. I shall not trouble the House this afternoon by giving any extended report of the statements made to the committee by representatives of the railways or by other persons, but I shall endeavour to give the House briefly the view of the railways particularly, and in very general terms the views of witnesses who gave evidence against the proposals of the railways.

Mr. Beatty, the president of the Canadian Pacific Railway, stated that with the application of the Crowsnest rate agreement to the 1921 traffic, with the other now existing rates in effect, would mean a decrease in the net earnings of that road for 1922 of $14,000,000, of which $7,000,000 would be from grain. Mr. Hanna, on the occasion of his last appearance before the committee, stated that, with the Crowsnest agreement rates on grain in effect, with certain voluntary reductions on basic commodities—and such commodities I will refer to later—in effect, and all other rates effective as at present, the loss to the Canadian National Railway system would be roughly $10,000,000.

Mr. MACLEAN (York): Did Mr. Hanna represent the Grand Trunk?

Mr. MACLEAN (Halifax): No, he represented the Canadian National Railway system. The representative of the Grand Trunk Railway, Mr. Watson, informed the committee that the effect of the application of the Crowsnest pass rates to that road's traffic would be very inconsequential indeed. I think he estimated their decrease in revenue by the coming into effect of those rates at about only $100,000; so that that can be entirely disregarded.

Mr. MACLEAN (York): Mr. Hanna represented the Grand Trunk Pacific?

Mr. MACLEAN (Halifax): Yes, he represented all the Canadian National system, but not the Grand Trunk proper. These figures, of course, are merely estimates. They may be seriously questioned upon one ground or another. They were submitted to the House merely as estimates, and every hon. member in this House will concede that it is extremely difficult to visualize the future with sufficient precision to estimate railway earnings with any degree of accuracy. As I have stated, the railways were of the opinion that there should be a further suspension of the agreement, and they voluntarily offered to submit themselves to the order of the railway board in the making of specific reductions upon certain commodities; or in effect they said: "If Parliament will further suspend this agreement, we will voluntarily submit to the order of the Board of Railway Commissioners in the matter of reductions in the rates on specified commodities." Another suggested certain specific reductions. It will take only a moment to give to the House these commodities and the reductions which the railways proposed. They proposed a reduction of 20 per cent in the grain rates. That virtually meant bringing the grain rates in the West down from where they now are, two-thirds of the way to the Crowsnest pass rates upon grain, or it was a reduction of about 66 per cent. A further reduction of about 10 per cent would have brought the rates upon grain down to the Crowsnest pass rates. In fact, in the province of Manitoba the grain rates under this proposal would have been practically down to the Crowsnest agreement rates. In Alberta and Saskatchewan the difference would have been anywhere from one cent up to two cents.

They proposed a reduction in forest products of 16.66 per cent, and reductions on coal varying from ten to twenty cents per ton, or on an average of ten per cent; and reductions on building material, such as brick, cement, lumber and plaster; and on other basic commodities, such as potatoes, fertilizers, ores, pig-iron, billets, wire rods and scrap-iron, which average about 18.3 per cent. On the last-mentioned commodities the reduction proposed was 16.66 per cent; on building material in the West it was 16.66 per cent and in the East 20 per cent. That was the proposal of the railways, which was in effect this, they urged a further complete suspension of the agreement, voluntarily submitting to the order of the railway board in respect of these suggested reductions, and leaving all other rate matters to the judgment of the Board of Railway Commissioners.

Mr. MACLEAN (York): The hon. gentleman gave us in dollars and cents the figures which the railways said that they would lose. Then suddenly transfers the matter into percentages. In order that the House and the country can understand the situation, can he keep the comparison to dollars and cents, or if it must be percentages, then in that? The people would like to have an explanation of this sudden switching, inasmuch as the railways say: "We lose so many million dollars a year," and then they say: "We will make cuts of certain percentages."

Mr. MACLEAN (Halifax): I quite understand the point which my hon. friend urges upon me, and I will give him the figures later. I am quoting the reductions offered by the railways, precisely in the way they were given to the committee, and only for that reason.

Mr. MACLEAN (York): But they were given in dollars and cents.

Mr. MACLEAN (Halifax): That was all given to the committee, and I am simply submitting to the House what was given to the committee. Later on, I can give, very shortly, to my hon. friend the information that he wants and in the manner in which he wants it.

I think it was the judgment of the committee that the full terms of the Crowsnest pass agreement should not come into effect. I do not say there were not some members of the committee who would not have desired, on behalf of the interests which

they represented, that the full provisions of the agreement should come into effect at once; but at any rate, whether owing to a spirit of compromise or whatever the motive might be, it apparently in the end was the judgment and view of the committee as a whole, that it was not desirable or necessary that the agreement come fully into effect. The whole issue then resolved itself into two questions. One was, whether the agreement should be further suspended, on the understanding of an assured and definite reduction in rates upon certain general commodities, with 20 per cent reductions in grain freight rates, with the balance of rate adjustment to be left with the Railway Board to deal with. The other was, further to suspend that part of the agreement which related to the thirteen commodities which I, a little while ago, read to the House, allowing the Crowsnest rates upon grain to come into effect and leaving everything else to the Board of Railway Commissioners. Those in the end were the two questions concretely before the committee for decision. I think I am correct in pointing out to the House that the offer made by the railways for voluntary reductions was upon the understanding that the agreement was to be suspended in full. I might give the House a few further figures which will furnish the information which I think the hon. member for South York (Mr. Maclean) asked for, and which may be of some value to the House. Hon. gentlemen will see that the difference between the two proposals which the committee in the end had to consider was very narrow. For instance, the difference between the rates offered by the railways upon grain and the Crowsnest rates upon grain would constitute a loss of revenue to the railways for 1922 of $3,800,000, this being, of course, based upon the traffic of 1921.

Mr. MOTHERWELL: Both railways?

Mr. MACLEAN (Halifax): Yes. Of this, a loss of $2,000,000 in revenue would be the estimate of the Canadian National Railway System and $1,800,000 the estimated loss in revenue to the Canadian Pacific Railway by reason of the application of the Crowsnest pass grain rates as compared with the proposed grain rates suggested by the railways.

Mr. CALDWELL: Was that also based upon last year's rate of wages?

Mr. MACLEAN (Halifax): Yes, that would be based upon all conditions prevailing last year, subject, however, to a reduction of 10 per cent made in general freight rates on January 1, 1922.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: Will my hon. friend kindly explain what the question of wages has to do with a gross loss?

Mr. MACLEAN (Halifax): I do not know that it has anything to do with it. I am simply answering the question of my hon. friend opposite. The reduction offered by the Canadian Pacific Railway and the Canadian National Railways—and for all purposes generally one might eliminate the Grand Trunk Railway, particularly when speaking of grain freight movements—would amount, as regards grain, roughly to $10,000,000. The estimated reductions in revenue, by reason of the application of the offers of the railways to the other com modities, would amount roughly to $6,000,000, of which I think $3,000,000 would be applicable to the Canadian Pacific Railway, $2,000,000 to the Canadian National Railways, and $1,000,000 to the Grand Trunk Railway. This would make a total of $16,000,000. I need not again point out to the House that, after all, these are but estimates. Apparently, therefore, the railways declined to meet the further loss of $3,800,000 upon grain, and the extent of their offer was, as I say, roughly, $16,000,000 instead of $19,800,000, or nearly $20,000,000. Under the report of the committee, which recommends the adoption of the Crowsnest rates agreement upon grain, the railways will take an estimated loss—and that is their own estimate—of about $14,000,000 upon grain, and the general question of freight rate reduction upon all other commodities is to be left to the Board of Railway Commissioners. Hon. gentlemen will, therefore, see, as I have already stated, that the issue is narrowed down to comparatively small proportions, and the difference between the two views is not very great when one is considering the immediate effects at least.

As to the conclusions of the committee, the committee was divided at one stage. At a later stage, the attitude of the committee was quite different. The committee divided very largely, I should think—and I am giving merely my personal opinion—by reason of the fact that to some it appeared of importance to have positive assurance of immediate reductions upon certain basic commodities. No member of the committee, objected to the restoration of Crowsnest rates upon grain, but naturally some wished to be assured of positive reductions

on other commodities, and the offer of the railways to submit to certain reductions was of interest to certain parts of Canada. It was just there that the committee divided in opinion. There was a motion before the committee to which I might refer. I am sorry to say it is not on record, because possibly some of the members of the committee may desire, quite properly, to refer to it. It was a motion by one of the members to the effect that Crowsnest rates on grain be immediately restored and that the committee recommend the immediate application of the proposed reductions of the railways upon the commodities which I have mentioned. The view of the committee was so divided on that occasion that I was obliged to give the deciding vote against the motion. I did so for the reason, that there was no means of knowing whether the railways would submit to the reductions proposed by that motion, and I thought it was desirable that an opportunity be afforded of ascertaining from them their view of the matter. The motion appeared to me as an effort on the part of the committee to make definite and fixed reductions in railway freight rates. To this I objected; I object to it now; and I trust that so long as I am in Parliament I shall always object to Parliament or a Parliamentary Committee presuming to fix railway rates definitely.

Mr. MACLEAN (York): Does the hon. gentleman object to changing a solemn act of Parliament?

Mr. MACLEAN (Halifax): I do not see that there is any difficulty in changing a solemn act of Parliament. If Parliament passes an act it can surely change it if it likes. Now, I am confident that in voting against that motion I was only taking the proper position. The motion virtually stated what should be the actual reduction in percentages on grain and the reduction in percentage on building material and other commodities, and I do not think that was a reasonable position for the committee to assume; that is something which can be decided in this country by one body only, the Board of Railway Commissioners. Later on a conference took place between the Minister of Railways and the representatives of the railway systems, but no amicable conclusions were reached in the direction of an agreement, I was informed, either upon the grain rates and the basic commodities.

[Mr. A. K. Maclean.]

Mr. EULER: Both railways?

Mr. MACLEAN (Halifax): Both railways, but particularly the Canadian Pacific Railway. This was communicated to the committee by myself on Saturday last after a conference with the Minister of Railways (Mr. Kennedy). Later the committee met, and their conclusions will be found in the report. As I stated in opening my remarks, the report recommends the adoption of the Crowsnest rates upon grain and the suspension of the rest of the agreement in so far as it relates to the rates upon the thirteen commodities mentioned in the agreement, leaving all other matters to the Board of Railway Commissioners for determination later on. There was only one dissenting voice to those conclusions. Some hon. gentlemen absented themselves from the proceedings of the committee for reasons which I do not know and which I do not intend to criticise at all. At any rate, Mr. Speaker, the conclusions of the committee as contained in the report are now before Parliament for discussion. What reductions shall be made on other commodities depends, of course, on the action that shall be taken by the Board of Railway Commissioners; and what action they shall take will depend very largely upon the economic conditions that prevail from time to time. There are many doubtful factors in this connection which would make it difficult for one to predicate at the moment what the probable reductions will be. It is difficult to visualize the future with such accuracy as to anticipate with much assurance probable reductions or when they will take place. However, the committee generally are of the opinion that we have reached such a stage that there should be a general deflation in railway rates. And they were strongly of opinion that there should be a deflation in railway operating costs, and that was a declaration directed to the public as well as to the railways. The committee received many recommendations for reductions upon this and that commodity. Every producer and every shipper would doubtless like to see
4 p.m. freight rates lowered to suit his particular interest. But if the viewpoint of every shipper in Canada as to freight rates were adopted and made effective, I really do not know where the railway systems of the country would stand. The railways have their cost of living, if I may use that term, to meet, and

that can be done only if they secure an adequate return for the services rendered to the public. One of the dangers that faces us to-day in this country, especially now that we are owners of a large railway system, is the idea that prevails throughout the country that railways are fed by some superhuman agency and require nothing from the public in return for the services they render. While the committee are of the opinion that there should be a rapid and early deflation in railway rates, yet I am sure I am speaking the sense of the committee when I say that this view as well recognizes the fact that railways must be permitted a reasonable return for services.

Now, I am not going to detain the House at further length. I shall have an opportunity at the close of the discussion to deal with certain other matters which are present in my mind but to which I shall not now refer. I have endeavoured to place before the House as succinctly and briefly as I could the work generally of the committee, the view of the railways in respect of the particular rate agreement which was before the committee—and which, after all, was its important work—the financial effect of the proposal of the railways, and the effect which would come from the adoption of the report of the committee. These matters I have dealt with, of course, only in general terms. I have endeavoured to show the House that the difference, after all, between the two proposals is not very extensive; that the issue is narrowed down to very small proportions. In view of the fact that a large majority of the committee recommend the adoption of the report, and that the proposal is of special interest to the producers of grain in the West—and this they seem particularly to value—I think the House might well adopt the report. I hope that the future holds out to us a prospect of an early improvement in trade generally, of a return to normal economic conditions, and of a great crop during the coming harvesting season. If so, then the issue involved in connection with this rate agreement and the differences of opinion on the subject generally will soon pass away. I therefore recommend to the House the adoption of the report of the committee.

Mr. DENIS (Joliette): I understand that the Crowsnest pass agreement will apply now only to grain and grain products, not to other commodities. Before the hon. member resumes his seat I should like to know what is the proportion of grain being carried in that section of the country in which the agreement is effective as compared with the total amount of freight traffic handled.

Mr MACLEAN (Halifax): The report of the committee is to the effect that the portion of the agreement which refers to the thirteen articles of merchandise that I named, shall be further suspended. Mr. Beatty stated that if the Crowsnest pass agreement went into effect there would be a reduction of revenue to his railway of $14,000,000, based on the traffic of 1921, of which $7,000,000 would be in grain.

Hon. Sir HENRY DRAYTON (West York): In opening, Mr. Speaker, I would like to congratulate my friends to my left. I wish I could congratulate friends from other parts of the country. What has just been said by the hon. member for Halifax (Mr. Maclean) is perfectly correct: the one idea prevailing in the committee was to secure rate reductions. I wish I could congratulate not only the prairie grain growers, but also the prairie live stock raisers, the prairie dairying interests, and the farming communities in every other part of this country. I would like to congratulate them upon some recognition. I would like to be able to congratulate the workers in Manitoba, Alberta, Saskatchewan—yes, and all over Canada, that the necessary freight rate reductions on basic commodities forming the product of their labours were getting at least some consideration. Unfortunately, I have not that pleasure; still, I congratulate my hon. friends who represent the western grain growers.

In the inception of my remarks, having regard to one or two sentences in the report, it is necessary to say something generally on the subject of freight rates. It is, as the chairman of the committee has pointed out, a difficult and complex matter, and one which has to be adjusted from time to time having regard to the changing conditions and requirements of the different parts of the country. What is required in one part of the country may not be required in the other. Proper railroad administration and proper rate regulation must observe the real public interest in the profitable interchange or movement of freight in each instance. The question then is, what is the best to be done, having regard to the immediate interests of agriculture and of industry as represented in those provinces? So it comes that of neces-

sity you have different scales of rates in different parts of the country. In respect of certain commodities you find a lower rate in the prairie provinces than anywhere else, and in other cases—more numerous these because business is so much diverse; so many more things have to be looked after—you find lower rates in eastern territory. It is quite easy to take the tariff of rates and strike a percentage increase over one part as against the other or vice versa, but after all, that is not what the country is really interested in; that is not what commerce really turns on. There is only one yardstick by the use of which you can tell what is going on, and that is the question irrespective of your tariff schedules; what is your result?—what do you find when you get down to your net cost per ton per mile and to your net earnings per ton per mile? For example, take the figures of the Canadian Pacific; you will find that their western earnings are higher than their eastern earnings, and you will also find that their lines comprise a very much larger mileage in western Canada than in the East. You find the result you would expect to find when you have two men to do one man's work, that you have twice the result. If you get it down to a mileage basis, to your earnings per mile, you come to a different conclusion, and if you take the ultimate yardstick and ascertain how much money the system gets for its movement per ton per mile, you will find that by reason of the fact that you have more class rates business moving, though on a lower basis than it moves in western Canada, the railway companies' earnings in eastern Canada per ton mile are greater than in western Canada.

But all these things are really by the way. It is a great mistake to look upon railway rates in any one part of the country as being injurious to railway rates in other parts of the country, unless of course, the railway rate in one part is so low that railway rates have to be raised in other parts in order to make up the deficiency. That condition we have never had in Canada, and we have not got it now. We have never yet had to raise rates in one part of the country to make up for deficiencies existing in other parts of the country. It would be illegal, it would be improper, it would be unjust, and it never has been done. But, conversely, very often the very best thing that can happen in any one part of the country is to have a low basis of rate in another part of the country. The West cannot be helped, speaking generally, without helping the East, and the East, again speaking generally, cannot be helped without helping the West.

The lowest rates in Canada are the rates on grain. I do not think any one will challenge that statement. They are the lowest rates, and they ought to be the lowest rates. It is a commodity which moves in great volume, and one which can be economically handled. Although the rates are the lowest rates, they are profitable rates. To-day they are the lowest rates having regard to any other rates on our system, and they ought to be continued low rates. But in connection with that very question of grain rates, the lowest rates we have in eastern Canada are the grain furtherance rates, which benefit only western territory; and the fact that there is a very large traffic carried at low rates, namely grains and their by-products, through eastern Canada depresses to a marked degree the earnings in eastern Canada. I only refer to this because of certain statements made in the report which are not correct. They are not in here as a finding. It is simply the suggestion that has been alleged. I do not know exactly why they were put in, but I have an idea, Mr. Speaker, because if there is one thing that is evident it is this fact, that the hon. the senior member for Halifax (Mr. Maclean) was in the position of the lady who was very much convinced against her will and was of her original opinion still. Why, every one of his arguments is against his own report, if his arguments be dissected, and therefore in the absence of argument it was necessary that this little clause be slipped in on this old question of discrimination. The position and plight of the hon. member must be quite clear to every one. What was the thing to be found, according to his own idea, but the proper rates, and the rates, he said, depend on the railway cost of living. What is the railway cost of living? Transportation costs. What does he say about transportation costs? Why, that he knows nothing about it, that the committee could not handle it. There you have it, according to my hon. friend's own yardstick—that the committee could not attempt to deal with the railway cost of living; he frankly and honestly said the committee could not handle it. Then, on the other hand, there is the other question of the effect upon business of a high freight

rate. He tells us again with respect to this question that it was something the committee could not handle. I do not know what else you would have to consider except, on the one hand, railway rates and their effect upon business, and my hon. friend says he cannot tell us that; and on the other hand, railway costs, and my hon. friend tells us that he could not settle that. In the absence of anything else this is the reason why these statements are put in.

Coming back to the Crowsnest pass agreement, as my hon. friend has said when that agreement was adopted we had no railway rate regulation in Canada, and he is quite right. At that time, it is true, there was a statute which gave power to the Governor in Council and to the old Railway Committee to fix rates. But they found—and it was by reason of that fact that the Railway Commission was appointed—that they could not function, they could not use that power, and we had no railway rate regulation effective in Canada at the time that agreement was entered into. The government there took power for a specific rate regulation, limited as it was to grain grown in the three prairie provinces, and to only one movemnent of that grain, and to flour turned out from that grain, and some thirteen other commodities in eastern territory, again moving in only one direction—the reverse direction this time, into the western territory. So we have the very limited rate regulation imposed by this agreement in place of the broad and full regulation given under the Railway Act. If this question were up for determination in the United States, let us say before the Interstate Commerce Commission, the agreement would not be considered at all. The agreement here only has to be considered because under the scheme of the drafting of our general Railway Act, all the conditions of special acts are made to override the general provisions of the Railway Act and to that extent limit its provisions. The ordinary statement of law, I think, is fairly accurately stated in a judgment I hesitate to read from, the judgment of January 8, 1918, dealing with the advanced 15 per cent rates case:

> There is no doubt that there is authority for the proposition that the passage of an act giving a new commission, by it formed, full jurisdiction to fix just and reasonable freight and passenger rate and fares, automatically repealed previous maximum rate laws—the basis supporting such proposition, of course, being that the object of the legislature is plainly declared, namely, the fixing of just and reasonable freight and passenger rates, having proper regard, not only to the question of the reasonableness and fairness of the rate itself, but also to the principle of equality as between different districts and shippers, which would be defeated by the continuance of Special Act giving special rights to any particular district of the country, or creating rates, which by change of circumstances and conditions could not be described as just or reasonable.

That is what would happen if it were not for the peculiar manner in which our general law is stated. I might call to the attention of the House that at a later date, after the late Mr. Dalton McCarthy had introduced the railway commission idea and Parliament was considering it, we had the policy of the Liberal party declared on this very question. Then Parliament was considering the question of the creation of a rate regulating board, and the agreement between the Manitoba government and the Canadian Northern was brought down here for ratification. It was ratified; but, bearing in mind the absolute impossibility of giving anything like fair, reasonable and just treatment to an act which declares for general fairness, justice and a lack of discrimination—the absolute impossibility of doing it with special privilege and special rates —the government reserved, in their ratification of that particular pact, the operation of their law. And so it is to-day that that Manitoba agreement is without force or effect having regard to Dominion legislation. Let me make myself clear: When there is no board to regulate, a small concession is wrung from the Canadian Pacific Company, who are then attempting to maintain their rates absolutely until 10 per cent is earned from the railway—something which has never yet been done;—a small rate-regulating concession is obtained from them. To-day we have full rate-regulating powers. When the Canadian Northern was exactly in the same position as the Canadian Pacific in that it made a rate-regulating argreement with the province of Manitoba, owing to the fact that the creation of a proper rate regulating tribunal was then in sight, proper exception was made, and the whole agreement was made subject to what might be done by the board. That is exactly what happened under that agreement. The Crowsnest agreement, is an agreement made providing for certain regulations in connection with a comparatively small number of articles, and in connection with one very important branch of business. And

the question is as to what should be done with it in view of this later general legislation?

Now, let us see what is the effect of what we are doing? I have no doubt it is going to be pretended that this is done to look after the basic industry of agriculture—that is what the pretence will be. I think it would be fairer to say that it was done in the interest of a very obvious political exigency, and not the bona fide interest of agriculture. Let us see why I say so. Let us take the last returns from the statistical department wherein it deals with agriculture. Mr. Speaker, I find that the estimated agricultural revenue for the whole country for the year 1921 amounts to $1,396,233,000. Now the field crops. I am giving much more in favour of what is being done to-day than it is entitled to because I give credit for the whole of the field crops, and there are other field crops besides grain. The field crops of Manitoba are placed at $72,136,000; of Saskatchewan $215,635,000; of Alberta $82,780,000; all making a total on that very basis in favour of what is now proposed to be done of $370,000,000, out of a grand total, as I have already given, of approximately $1,396,000,000, thus discriminating directly, having regard to the activities of agriculture, against a production of $1,025,682,000. Now what is being done? It is not in the interest of agriculture, unless we are going to say that the rates on every other agricultural product are fair and just, or reasonable. Why, Mr. Speaker, it was shown—there is no doubt about the truth of it—that there is hay, for example, in Quebec that cannot be moved on account of the freight rates; it was shown that potatoes were allowed to rot in New Brunswick because it did not pay to move them owing to the freight rates. But, notwithstanding all this, the result is that we have covered by statutory rate, which discriminates against every other kind of agricultural activity in this country, the interests of our grain growers in three of our provinces. It is true that they are important provinces, very important provinces; they are referred to as important in the report of the committee. But I want to know when the other provinces ceased to be of any importance? Are they of no importance at all? Ontario, for example, produces $441,418,000 worth of agricultural products. Is that a matter of no importance Why, there are cases, multiplied cases, where Ontario farmers have been trying to get redress from freight rate oppression. Are they entitled to no consideration? British Columbia produced agriculturally $37,151,000; Prince Edward Island, $21,000,000; Nova Scotia, $44,000,000; New Brunswick, $48,000,000; Quebec, $325,000,000; Ontario, as I have already stated, produced $441,000,000.

Mr. CALDWELL: Are those figures of the farm produce transported on the railways, or do they represent the total amount produced in each case?

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: My hon. friend is quite right. I cannot tell what the total amount transported on the railways is. Who can? I am sure my hon. friend can not. I am simply giving the whole amount of agricultural production. Now there is no doubt about this: There is this point that can be perfectly well taken, and I want to give immediate emphasis to it, and I want to be fair. It is absolutely true that by reason of length of haulage, weight of tonnage, and the like, as I said before, it is most vitally important that the West should get a lower freight rate on their grain. And they always have had; they have a lower freight rate on their grain than the western American farmer has. They are entitled to it, and we should get it as much lower as possible. But what I am pointing out is that it ought not to be at the expense of agriculture everywhere else in this country. There is a pious wish expressed in the report that there should be a reduction in other freight rates. I say "pious wish"; it amounts to that absolutely and nothing else. Nobody else has any assurance as to what will happen to their applications for a reduction. There is only a certain amount of rope; reductions cannot all be made to apply in one direction. The senior member for Halifax (Mr. Maclean) gave us $14,000,000 as the figures that this agreement means to the western grain growers. Well, he also told us that they have already had the advantage of a 10 per cent reduction.

Let us see what will happen when this comes before the Board of Railway Commissioners. The board will be told by the railways something like this: "On the amount of grain we moved last year, assuming the amount is the same this year, if we apply the Crowsnest pass rates, there will be a difference in our earnings of $17,000,000." There is a difference to-day, as the hon. member from Halifax says, of $14,000,000, but I am

going back now to the traffic that is actually moved, because that is the way the railways present their case. They will say, "We are $17,000,000 short and we are going to be able to make so much economy at the expense of labour." I do not know whether they will be able to save much or little, but they probably will say they are going to make some saving, and the applicants will be able to show that they will be able to make considerable economy in connection with material—no question about that. But, Mr. Speaker, I am afraid that the potato shipper, and the rest of the farming interests, are going to find that their cupboard is just as bare as any cupboard of Mother Hubbard's. It will be cleaned up, I am very much afraid. We have a very serious responsibility in Canada at the present time. The hon. member for Halifax is perfectly right when he says the committee could not handle this question. They could not. It is true they have arrived at a result without a single argument in favour of it that is capable of any demonstration. He says, "We cannot deal with it," and then he assumes to deal with it. He says, "I cannot deal with the underlying principles at all," and yet he proceeds to deal with them and the result is given. There is a serious responsibility. Last year we spent on our national railways in hard cash $115,000,000. Last year we spent upon our railways more than we could raise through the income tax and the excess business profits tax. I am quite sure the hon. Minister of Finance (Mr. Fielding) is just a little bit interested in this question—more than a little bit interested—as to how much he will this year be called upon to pay. Why he does not balance this year upon his estimate, does not balance this year upon the estimated expenditure, if I remember correctly, the $46,000,000 in connection with the National Railways. No one can say that the freight rates in this country ought to be fixed upon the National Railway lines. They ought not to be, there is no question about that. But admitting that they cannot be used as a basis, and admitting that using them as a basis would create a tremendously high rate, so that business could not properly carry on, we are all very much interested in seeing that that railway deficit is not multiplied.

Some gentlemen have said that the barrenness of argument in this report is owing to a very specific cause. We get a conclusion without any economic reason bringing us to that conclusion. Some gentlemen have said—I do not know whether rightly or wrongly, it is something I do not know anything about—that one very good reason for it is that if this be done at the present time, if anything like proper consideration be also given to the demands of agriculture all through this country, and to the demands of the western stock farmer, as well as the western grain grower, the position will be such that the National Railways will be absolutely swamped and unable to carry on. I do not know if that is one of the reasons why we have such a lack of argument in connection with the presentation of this report. But, Mr. Speaker, we are all very vitally interested in this matter. It is not a question of cracking railways, of hurting people on the one hand, or of stifling commerce on the other; we are most vitally interested in getting a reduction of freight rates. We are interested in getting such a reduction of freight rates as will help business all over the country, help the people to trade all over the country to the fullest possible degree. If we get that, it well may be that we can afford considerably lower freight rates, without at the same time very greatly enlarging our railway deficits. Mr. Speaker, I desire to carry to their logical results the remarks of the senior member for Halifax, when he tells us that his committee of necessity is not in a position to deal with railway costs or the effect of railway rates upon business; and, carrying that argument to its logical conclusion, I now beg to move, seconded by Mr. Dickie:

That the report be not now concurred in but that this house express the views and make the recommendations which follow:—

1. That while the Board of Railway Commissioners remains as it is now a tribunal constituted by Parliament to fix railway rates without discrimination and in accordance with changing conditions and to meet the needs of the country as a whole, it should be left free to perform such duty without dictation from this House and subject only to review by the Governor in Council as in the Railway Act provided.

2. That large and general reductions of freight rates particularly on basic commodities are not only obviously demanded in the national interest but are admitted by all concerned to be possible and to have been possible for several months and action to that end by the railway commission has only awaited the decision of the Government and of Parliament as regards the Crowsnest pass agreement.

3. That to enable the railway commission to carry out its duty as defined above such board should be empowered to suspend the said agreement, such suspension to be followed immediately by submission to the Governor in

Council of a new schedule of rates as reduced by the commission, the suspension to be revocable if such schedule is not approved by the Governor in Council but otherwise to continue for one year with in which time the will of Parliament may be again expressed.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: What does my hon. friend mean by "dictation"? Is it the same as action by this House?

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: I do not know exactly what fault my right hon. friend finds with the word. I remember a little while ago, on our having asked a definition of a particular word, we were told by the hon. member for Quebec East (Mr. Lapointe) to consult a dictionary or, perhaps, a school book. I do not want to adopt that tone. By this report, we are telling the Railway Board that we are binding them by the Crowsnest pass agreement; that we are preventing them, as between man and man, shipper and shipper, province and province, from carrying out the act.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: My hon. friend has not answered the question. Just what does he mean by dictation by this Parliament? Does he mean any action by this Parliament?

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: Just exactly what you propose now.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: Does he mean that this Parliament binds the Railway Commission if it takes any action?

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: I am afraid my right hon. friend is displaying a density which is not common to him at all. I think he thoroughly understands what I mean. The position is simply this, that the effect of this report as regards grain rates and flour rates, maintaining and putting back into force an old artificial basis, prevents the Railway Board from carrying out the proper administration of the act and, indeed, from administering justice.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: I want to be perfectly clear, because as I understand the situation at the moment, there is on our statutes an act of Parliament which will continue in force after the 6th of July unless this Parliament takes action. Do I understand my hon. friend to say that this Parliament should not take any action with respect to that statute?

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: I think the amendment is perfectly clear. It speaks

[Sir Henry Drayton.]

for itself. Certainly, take action. Certainly, unshackle the board. Certainly, tell them to go ahead and administer the act fairly in all parts of the country.

Mr. FIELDING: Dictate to them.

Mr. LAPOINTE: And be dictated to.

Mr. T. L. CHURCH (North Toronto): Mr. Speaker, I cannot allow this motion or the amendment to pass without making some observations with regard to the matter on behalf of the city which I have the honour to represent. I was opposed to the appointment of this committee to go into the question of freight rates. The question of rates should never be a political question. It is a business question, a transportation question of a technical nature, an economic question, one which concerns the welfare, health and prosperity of every man, woman and child in the community; and, in my opinion, this House made a great mistake in appointing a parliamentary committee to go into this question. The Railway Commission have for years been studying this problem from all angles and in many phases—both before, during and after the war—and it is their province, not ours. Following the American rate increase, based upon the decision of the Interstate Commerce Commission, they granted a rate increase of 15 per cent, and later on, after what was called the Chicago labour award, another increase was granted of 35 per cent to the West and 40 per cent to the East. Those rate increases were opposed by the municipalities of this country, and the city which I represent spent thousands of dollars of the money of the taxpayers of Toronto to fight those increases in rates, freight, passenger, telephone and express. The Railway Commission, instead of listening to the evidence and experts of the municipalities, took the figures of the Canadian Pacific Railway Company's experts and granted them the rate increases they asked.

We took an appeal to the Governor General in Council from every one of those rate increases, but we did not succeed. As a representative of a large municipality in this Dominion, I protest against what has been done in this House. I protested against the appointment in May last of a parliamentary committee to investigate this question. I protest against the way in which the committee has conducted its business, because I contend that it has gone outside the scope of the inquiry. In my opinion the committee should not have been appointed, because its appointment was il-

legal owing to the fact that the Railway Act, as I read it, says that the Railway Commission as established in 1903, has sole inherent and exclusive jurisdiction, independently of this House or of the Senate, over all rates—passenger, freight, telephone and express. If we had a strong Railway Commission that was efficient, as we had some years ago, it would have brought the railway companies to time long ago, and we would have had a proper regulation of railways and of railway rates instead of chaos and disorder.

I contend, however, that there is no adequate or proper regulation of railways or railway rates in this country to-day under the present commission. There is not the regulation which the Railway Act demands or requires, and there is an utter lack of control by the commissioners who have lost utterly the confidence of the public and also of the consumers and the producers of the country in general. Their usefulness is gone. The municipalities had of their own volition to take up these rate cases, and they fought every one of those increases. The city of Toronto paid an amount running up to, I think, $50,000 in connection with these rate increase applications. Our several appeals were dismissed. Where was the Drury government? They were nowhere to be found to oppose these rate raids.

The present report is out of order because, as I read the Railway Act of 1903 and amendments, this matter is exclusively the function of the Railway Commission.

The then Minister of Railways who introduced the Railway Act constituting the Commission—in 1903—contended at that time that the powers of the Commission were plenary, exclusive, independent and paramount; that they could not be interfered with; that they had full power to regulate the whole question of rates and tolls, without legislative interference on the part of this Parliament. The constitution of the Board of Railway Commissioners is very largely based as to powers, on the constitution of the Interstate Commerce Commission. That commission did not wait for Congress or a committee of Congress or of the United States Senate to tell them what to do as regards rate reductions in that country—it acted of its own volition and got results. The Board of Railway Commissioners in Canada were willing to follow promptly the Interstate Commerce Commission as regards increasing rates all along the line. They do not, however, follow the Interstate Commerce Commission when it comes to decreasing freight rates, but do a lot of stalling and log rolling. Now, Mr. Speaker, it is the general feeling throughout the country that the present high freight rates are paralyzing Canadian business, and that the question has simply been dallied with. Business is stagnant in many parts of Canada, many industries have had to close down, and trade and commerce are greatly hindered because of these high rates.

I do not think that the business interests in Canada have received at the hands of Parliament that assistance to which they are entitled in the matter of transportation or fair dealing from the railways. If adequate facilities of water transportation on the St. Lawrence and Great Lakes were provided, shippers could take advantage of this means of moving their produce during five or six months of the year, and waterborne traffic would be a competitor and regulator of rates. The Crowsnest pass agreement should never have been entered into by the Liberal party, who are responsible for the bungle. This tangle has been responsible for an increase in rates of hundreds of thousands of dollars which the people of the West have had to shoulder in the past. It was the duty of the Government of to-day to have assumed its responsibility, as an administration that is supposed to have charge of all national utilities of this kind, and to have stated clearly and distinctly its attitude towards the question. Months ago we on this side of the House demanded of the Government what position they would take in regard to the agreement and hon. gentlemen who occupy the treasury benches, instead of taking a definite stand, evaded their responsibility by undertaking to appoint a committee to look into the subject—merely, as the military say, "passing the buck." I do not think that this matter should be regarded as in any way coming within the field of party politics; the Government should not try to evade their plain duty in the way they have done. In my opinion they have made a fatal mistake. I have looked over the list of the witnesses who gave evidence before the committee, and I find that they were very largely ex-parte railway experts. The municipalities, which are unalterably opposed to the present high rates, were apparently given no opportunity whatever of sending representatives to state their views before the committee. Evidently they were not invited to do so; and

one cannot help commenting on the strange fact that the Ontario government, so-called farmers' administration, did not have the farmers' interests sufficiently at heart to see that they were properly represented before the committee as the western and maritime provinces were. The so-called Farmers' government were asleep, or were serving the big interests as usual.

Mr. VIEN: Why did not my hon. friend advise them to come before the committee? He is one of the members from the province of Ontario.

Mr. CHURCH: It was not my place to send out invitations to various people to attend the meetings of the committee; nor would it occur to me to do so. Moreover, they would not even have been listened to. I naturally took it for granted that the fullest possible opportunity would be given all parties to be heard. And, furthermore, the municipalities could not afford to send representatives from Halifax and Vancouver, and from other distant points on such short notice to remain in the
5 p.m. capital for any length of time—and they would have had no time to properly prepare their case, or to get experts.

Now, the committee seems to have drawn up one report one day and another report the next; and it evidently deemed it desirable to hold secret and private meetings. This was obviously improper, as the Rules of the House prevail in committees and secret meetings, according to the manual, are illegal.

What transpired at those meetings held in camera no one has any means of knowing, because there is no record of their proceedings. I should like to know how hon. gentlemen of the Progressive party, holding the political sentiments they profess to hold, could countenance such secret meetings on such a great national and economic problem. The railways were pleased, no doubt. Did the Progressives enter any protest, on behalf of the people they represent, against the holding of secret meetings in connection with a subject that concerns the people at large, and in which the future prosperity and welfare of trade and commerce and the farming industry of the country are bound up? I am afraid they were only like their sham Progressive friends in the Ontario house. According to the British North America Act, the Rules of the House and Bourinot, no committee of this Parliament has any power to hold such secret and private meetings, and I contend that it was a violation of constitutional principle and of responsible government for the committee to meet in secret in this way. I think that the Crowsnest pass agreement should be carried out in its entirety here and now, that there should be no more delays and that we should tell Mr. Beatty of the Canadian Pacific Railway just where he gets off in regard to this question. We should make it plain to the Canadian Pacific and the other railways beyond any question of doubt that the agreement is a contract and not a "scrap of paper." Parliament should not attempt to deal with the question itself, but should compel the Railway Commission to act or get out at once. The committee recommends that the agreement be suspended for one year, and thereafter, if deemed advisable, for another year by the Governor General in Council.

Are the Progressives in this House willing to support such a proposal as that? Why did they support it? Conditions are continually changing. Are the Progressives willing to surrender their rights as representatives of the people, supinely vote for such a report as this and delegate their powers to the Governor in Council and the Railway Commission? As I said before, the Government should have announced its policy long ago, not only as regards the Crowsnest pass agreement, but in respect of giving to the people a proper equipped board that would properly regulate railway matters.

It is my opinion that the Board of Railway Commissioners at present is badly in need of complete root and branch reorganization, once and for all because we shall never secure a proper and fully efficient railway service unless this board is overhauled from top to bottom, so that shippers and consumers may be given fair railways rates, secure proper regulation of railways in Canada, as is the case in the United States under the control of the Interstate Commerce Commission. I am opposed to delegating to the Railway Commission any power to suspend the Crowsnest pass agreement. I have had several years' experience with that body and I have never known them to make any concession to the people in the way of decreasing rates; they have granted every rate increase asked for. I certainly do not think that we should hand over to them the power to suspend this agreement as proposed in the amendment. I have lost

confidence in them. The railways are in politics all the time especially the C.P.R. who have $492,000,000 of active and inactive assets. They are in politics, always will be in politics, and always will try to dominate Parliament and the people. The best sort of policy for the National Railways is to render equal service to all the people, East or West, and to find out what the C.P.R. want them to do and then **do** the opposite.

In connection with railway rates there should be no East and West; there should be one economic principle applicable throughout the country, equality of treatment, no sectional or other special agreements for any special locality not applicable to all sections and a uniform enforcement of the Railway Act for one and all. The Railway Commission cannot deal with this problem unless they have a free hand.

It is stated, in the report of the committee, that the case for the prairie provinces was presented, and that representations were made on behalf of the maritime provinces. In my opinion there should be no special treatment of localities; there should be one treatment, and equality of treatment, for all. A reference is made in the report to competition of the American railways and of water-borne traffic in the East. But there is no longer such competition; it is a myth. A merger which was effected a few years ago, authorized by this House, has resulted in doing away with any competition of water-borne traffic on the great lakes as a regulator of rail rates. There used to be a steamship line between Toronto and Belleville which operated six months of the year on the north shore, but that service has been frozen out by the great lakes merger, as well as all other competitive water-borne traffic services. The railways did this. Talk about American railway competition to help the east rates, it has increased rates, instead of decreasing them. The co-ordination of 228 separate railway systems by Mr. McAdoo under government operation and control was accomplished by the United States government in twenty-four hours in the month of December, 1917; we have been sitting here now for nearly four months and no proper coordination of our railway systems has been accomplished. I wish to protest against the way in which the committee dealt with this matter. I protest against the holding of a secret session and of unwarranted meddling by Parliament with these rate matters.

Mr. VIEN: What does the hon. member mean by "secret session"? Was the evidence not published, printed, circulated? Does he object to the committee sitting behind closed doors when they deliberated on their report?

Mr. CHURCH: If the hon. gentleman and those who composed the committee would leave these intricate questions of rates and so on to the Railway Commission, it would be better for the House and for the country. There were secret meetings with outside parties, and log rolling, and private meetings are illegal, as I see it.

Mr. VIEN: I am talking of the alleged secret sittings. I want to inform my hon. friend that there were no secret meetings of the committee except when they deliberated upon their report.

Mr. CHURCH: I do not care what the committee did; it does not make any difference to me. This meddling and fixing of rates by legislative enactment is vicious in principle and wrong in law. It is what the railways and the Canadian Pacific Railway wanted, exactly. It destroys any chance the people of Canada may have of giving the Railway Commission power to regulate rates. I say that the appointment of this committee has the effect of interfering with the powers and prerogatives, the rights and privileges, of the Railway Commission—a board which, with the voluminous information at their disposal, might have taken action of their own volition—in the matter and effected a reduction along the lines of the very drastic cuts granted by the Interstate Commerce Commission of the United States. We should have had reductions effected at least a year ago if the Railway Commission had done its duty—fulfilled its functions and powers for which it was appointed, instead of playing the East and West against each other. It has been asserted that the Canadian Pacific Railway Company plays no part in politics, but from what I have seen around these legislative halls during the last few weeks, it seems to me that the Canadian Pacific Railway Company is always in politics. In fact, until we have a railway board that will put the Canadian Pacific Railway in its place we will continue to have high rates. I protest against the manner in which this subject has been brought up and dealt with at this late hour in the session. Instead of compelling the commission to act, the mat-

ter is brought up under such circumstances that the question cannot be discussed as it should be. I am surprised at the Progressives calling themselves Progressives in view of the stand they are taking on this question. I repeat, Mr. Speaker, my protest as a humble member of this House against any further suspension for one hour of the Crowsnest pass agreement and I would call the bluff of the Canadian Pacific Railway to put increased rates on the East. A strong railway commission would get equitable and just rates for West and East alike. We are at the parting of the ways and getting nowhere with the log-rolling and legislative interference. Parliament should keep out of such things.

Mr. W. F. MACLEAN (South York): Mr. Speaker, I had been waiting for the hon. member who leads the Progressive party (Mr. Crerar) to state the attitude taken by that party on the question now before the House, but so far he has not seen fit to do so. Perhaps I may be able to induce activity on his part in that respect. As one who has studied this question of transportation I am against the proposal now made to interfere with the restoration of the Crowsnest pass agreement on the seventh of next month. Parliament has seen fit to suspend the agreement; that suspension is now about to expire, but the proposal is made on behalf of the Government and on behalf of the Progressive party that the agreement be still further suspended. I am against that, and I am not altogether in harmony with the amendment which has been offered here to-day. I want to discuss the question in a broad way and to give my reasons for the views which I hold. In doing so I shall not take up much of the time of the House.

Some hon. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

Mr. MACLEAN (York): But I will take up a little longer if hon. gentlemen are too insistent upon abbreviating the discussion. Now, why does the Progressive party ask that the agreement be further suspended and another proposal substituted for it? Because, as the ex-Minister of Finance (Sir Henry Drayton) has pointed out, they get an advantage for a certain portion of the community. But there may be others who would be benefited by the continuance of the Crowsnest pass agreement who ought to be heard—people in the east; perhaps people in portions of British Columbia would be benefited. But on the basis of the argument made here to-day and in the committee that the western provinces are to be benefited, it is recommended that there be further suspension. Now, my contention—and it did not receive much support when I offered it in connection with the statement of the Chairman of the committee—is that the agreement proposed to be interfered with is a sacred agreement. The franchise of the Canadian Pacific Railway Company is a parliamentary franchise, and there would be objection to any suggestion that it be changed. My hon. friend the senior member for Halifax (Mr. Maclean) said that they were entitled to a 10 per cent dividend. If they are, it is by parliamentary agreement. He would have one parliamentary agreement changed because it was to benefit the Canadian Pacific, but he would not have the other one changed. My hon. friend the Minister of Loaves and Fishes—

Some hon. MEMBERS: Oh, oh.

Mr. MACLEAN (York): My hon. friend the Minister of Marine and Fisheries (Mr. Lapointe) has had a great habit of getting up in this House and discussing constitutional questions and one of his favorite words is "pontifical". He says that the Constitution is pontifical and that acts of Parliament like the constitution are pontifical and must be enforced. Will he say that this agreement is pontifical? No, he is prepared to get away from that. My contention is that that is a sacred act of Parliament, that it granted concessions to certain people, and we gave certain sums of money in order that certain things should be done and certain services given to the people of the West; and I say that that agreement should be carried out whatever it is, because it is an agreement, and it has the sanction of Parliament behind it. When you enter into a new agreement and give a preference in it to a small portion of the community, and ignore the greater portion, ignore the farmers of the East to the benefit of the farmers of the West, I say you are doing wrong and making an act of Parliament subject to the whims of succeeding parliaments. I say that that was a sacred agreement sanctioned by all parties in this House. It was sanctioned too by the leader of the Progressives. He was in the Government that now proposes to change this agreement.

Mr. CRERAR: I did not quite catch the import of that last remark.

Mr. MACLEAN (York): I say that the hon. gentleman was a member of the late government which was a party to suspending the Crowsnest pass agreement, and now he proposes to change that agreement, and members of late government may now propose to change it. I want to point out that we have the Prime Minister of the late government and several members of that government sitting in this House, and they are all—I hope really not all, because we have an amendment here that is against it, but judging from the arguments before the Special Committee, they were largely—in favour of giving a benefit to the Canadian Pacific and letting that company get out of its solemn agreement. The Canadian Pacific should not be allowed to get out of its solemn agreement, or if this agreement is to be changed their whole agreement should be brought into Parliament and the whole thing revised. But they only want to get out at one point. What did the late government do in the last year of its existence? They made an agreement with the Canadian Pacific, and they committed themselves to it, and they should have carried it out. They should have done something more. I have spoken of this on other occasions. Before the late government went out of office, they should have brought into force the law that was then on the statute book in favour of the consolidation of the railways they had taken over into one system and they should have appointed a new and united board of directors for all these railways. Then they should have passed an act of redistribution and gone to the country on that railway question. But that was not done. The question was passed on to this Parliament, and the proposal is now to pass it still further on without even having an election on so vital a question.

I want to come to another feature. I have referred to the two oppositions on this side of the House, and I come now to the Government. They want this law changed. They propose to have this suspension still further continued, and later on something else is to be done. I do not agree with that at all. The Government must take the responsibility of dealing with this matter now and in this House. They cannot deal with it by suspension or by passing it along to a committee. They must deal with the transportation problem that is before Canada to-day, and there is a transportation problem before this country to-day, and it demands solution. This is merely a stand-off of the proposition. The Government are inclined to take the advice of the president of the Canadian Pacific Railway. Who is the president of the Canadian Pacific Railway as it stands before this country to-day? He has come into this question. He came before our committee, and through newspapers that are friendly to him and through his friends in this House, what did he propose? He proposes that, first of all, there should be only one railway in this country, although Canada has a system of national railways. He proposes that his road, which is the creature of this Parliament, shall be the only road in this country. That is the source of the advice which the Government would take. What more does the Canadian Pacific say? It not only says that you ought to have only one road, and if you have another of your own you should get rid of it—that we must give our national roads to it, and when we give it to that company, we must give also an immense bonus to make up the deficits on the road, but the Canadian Pacific says another thing. That corporation and certain portions of this country that are very much attached to that corporation say: There shall be no competition between the railways of this country; you must have only one railway and that must be the Canadian Pacific, and you must have only one means of transportation, and that is by railway. They do not even want to accept the invitation of the president of the United States and co-operate in the improvement of the waterways of this country and so reduce the cost of transportation. We all dodge the question, simply because we do not approach the transportation problem in the broad way in which it ought to be approached. Transportation in this country is a matter of railways; it is a matter of waterways; it is a matter of highways, and it may be a matter of airways later on. We have the railways and the highways, but these people are undertaking to say that there shall be no settlement of the transportation question except on the basis of a railway system of transport. The people of this country are not going to stand for that, no matter who suggests it That being the case, it is time we reviewed the whole question, and time that we consolidated the various interests, and found out how best we can relieve the transportation difficulties. There is a great transportation problem before this country, and it is very vital and pressing in the West. The solution may not be in the railways even, though we do own a great government sys-

tem. It may be in a combination of railways, waterways and highways, and the old King's highway is coming back as a system of transportation. Here we have the Canadian Pacific coming to this Parliament and telling us we must have only one railway, and that that is to be the Canadian Pacific, and that we must give our roads to them, and a bonus at the same time. They do not want us to co-operate with the president of the United States in having seaways made from the ocean up to the inland ports of Canada. It is a case, not of letting George do it, but "let Eddie do it." He is ready to do it all for you. I do not think the people of this country will stand for that for one moment; I do not think the Government side of the House are prepared to stand for that. I was waiting to see the Minister of Justice (Sir Lomer Gouin) so disapprove of this proposal that he would retire from the Government. It was a case of submit or resign, I almost thought, and I would like to hear from the minister whether he approves of this agreement. I want to hear from the Minister of Justice whether he approves of this agreement, and whether the railway situation is to be side-tracked so as to give the Canadian Pacific a good deal of leeway. I would think that the Minister of Justice would have something to say as to that. "Wait and see" is the great expression in politics in Great Britain to-day. I say to the Minister of Justice that he had better wait and see what is going to happen. I would not be a bit surprised if there would be a reconstruction of the Cabinet and a joining up of the Progressive party with the present Government if this proposition goes through now.

Some hon. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

Mr. MACLEAN (York): I do not know whether that would be acceptable to the Minister of Justice or not. He may have to put a little more wire in his fences because he was affected, so the story goes, not long ago in connection with the acceptance or rejection of invitations that were made to the leader of the Progressive party. Anyway I want to hear from the Minister of Justice.

Mr. GRAHAM: You had better get an Order of the House.

Mr. MACLEAN (York): I want to know whether this proposal meets with his endorsement. I was told to-day that the Canadian Pacific Railway Company was to be given "the greatest wallop" it ever got in its history. I want to wait and see whether the "wallop" has come or not; I want to wait and see how the Government reconstructs the board of directors who are to administer the National Railways; I want to wait and see what the Minister of Justice has to say to all this; and what the people will say when they come to vote on this question, because they will have a chance to vote on it in a very short time, especially after we have a redistribution of the seats in this House.

I trespassed upon the time of the House not long ago when I laid down what I call a "Bill of Rights" in connection with the transportation question in this country. I declared myself then in favour of a great national railway; I declared myself in favour of the national ownership of means of communication; I declared myself in favour of the government having a system of banking, such as they have in the United States, that would enable them to assist in marketing the crops of the farmers of this country; I declared myself in favour of a system of seaways. Now that is a real question, and it must go to the people. The people must have the opportunity of settling the transportation problem—the problem of the railway, the waterways, the seaways, aerial transportation, and the highways. It is through these avenues that the country will get relief. Apparently the proposition now is to keep the transportation system in the hands of the Canadian Pacific Railway Company, to have no competition, but to let them run the country. Is the Minister of Justice satisfied with this treatment of the Canadian Pacific; is he coming here to endorse this proposal? I am not so sure that he is. He may for the time being, but let him also "wait and see." And let the country wait and see what is going to happen in regard to the reconstruction of the Government, what is going to happen in connection with the appointment of the board of directors of the National Railways; and let the public have an opportunity of having this transportation question go to them in a big way for settlement. That is what the late government should have done. They should have taken up this question of transportation in a big way. Even if it had entailed their defeat it would have been good policy. It would have been a good policy to have consolidated the railways of this country a year ago. I know

of economies which, if carried out, would result in millions of dollars of saving to this country. The minute the Grand Trunk, the Grand Trunk Pacific, the Intercolonial, and the Canadian Northern are put together, all these unnecessary stations are wiped out; all unnecessary trackages are put out of business; and all unnecessary trains, all unnecessary officials, and all kinds of expensive things wiped out. We shall see an immense saving. We are talking about a petty thing to-day in the way of economy. That was a great expression of the chairman of the committee, "the economic view of the transportation question." We have all been talking about economy—economy in tariff matters and other directions; but the real economy to be wrought in this country is in regard to transportation. There is a Greek expression that "to play upon the harp we have got to play upon the harp"; and to secure economy in this country you have got to effect economy. What is the Government proposing to-day in the way of economy? Why did the late government fail to bring about these economies? It had a plan for that purpose, but it failed to put it into effect. If all these railroads had been consolidated a year ago there would not have been a doliar of deficit to-day. Just give them a chance to be consolidated, and you will see the deficits disappear. But when you find the discussion taking place to-day as to whether Parliament shall suspend a solemn agreement or treat it just as a thing to be passed over or to be used for preferential treatment, it is a different matter.

We used to hear a great deal about equal rights—equal rights for all. Why, I am told that this proposal is going through to-day because the Progressives must get something for the West. That is not equal rights. If it goes through for that reason there are going to be other consolidations later on, and the political situation in Canada will be very considerably altered. And so I am going to "wait and see" whether the Canadian Pacific Railway take this as a "wallop" or not. I will wait and see how the Minister of Justice will view it. He has been very busy. Undoubtedly he is a very able man. Sometimes when I think of him the name Machiavelli occurs to me. Then when I recall Benvenuto Cellini, the great craftsman I think of the Minister of Justice as the great craftsman of the Government. Does he see his way to bring about the wishes of the Canadian Pacific so that there will be only one railway and one means of transportation in this country, and that there will be no waterway competition My hon. friend may have to "wait and see". He has been disappointed in the past, and he may be disappointed in the future. Whether it is to be a wallop for the Canadian Pacific or not I do not know, but they deserve a wallop.

There is only one thing to be done to-day in order to bring about the real solution of the transportation question and that is to consolidate the railways of the country. The Government and Parliament have got to find a way to incorporate the Canadian Pacific with the national roads of the country. There can be only one system under public ownership, and we must give public ownership a reasonable trial, just as we are giving it a trial in Ontario, in the city of Toronto, and in a great many other places. I know, public ownership has been denounced all over the country. I see that in the American papers whenever public ownership is proposed they say "Look at what they are doing in Canada, and in Ontario." Well, we are doing some rather surprising things in Ontario in the way of public ownership. I invite the other provinces to come to Ontario and see how public ownership is being administered. You can see it to-day in the street railway system of Toronto, you can see it in the distribution of power, in Ontario; and you can see it in a variety of other applications. The movement is marching on because the people believe in public ownership. They believe in the public ownership of railways. If the Canadian Pacific is getting its wallop now is the time to proceed to put public ownership on a large scale into effect. This country is prepared to deal with the Canadian Pacific in a reasonable way, and when that is done there will be a way out of the present situation. The way to find the solution of the transportation problem is to get a real national system of railways. Let the people own the whole of the railways; and as a complement of that let us have transportation by water, and highways. What is bothering the railroads to-day is the competition of the waterways. That is what is troubling Mr. Beatty and Mr. Hanna more than anything else, if you ask me. The day of the railway may have departed, so far as any one can tell, at the present time. Certainly, the settlement of the transportation question is not by rail-

ways alone, but by the use of these things to which I have referred as public services.

This is the time we ought really to approach the settlement of these questions. We ought to make some reasonable proposition to the Canadian Pacific Railway so that they might be prepared to come in. I do not say that we will be able to give them 10 per cent, but I know of a way by which they can retire half their capital out of their assets in the treasury. They have enough assets in the treasury now to do it. There is a way out of these difficulties by dealing with these questions and not side-stepping them, as we are doing when we give additional power. We are contracting ourselves out of liability by shifting the responsibility to the Railway Commission. Let us make the law and place it on a proper basis. Let us say to the commission, "You are to be the judges, you are to be fair in the matter and decide these questions, but if you cannot decide them come back to Parliament and we will give you any assistance in our power". But where we have an agreement, as in the present case, let us respect it, and if there are to be changes or preferences given—and I do not think there should be any—let there be equality of treatment. I ask the hon. leader of the Progressives (Mr. Crerar) how he can justify this preferential treatment for his portion of the country. I am absolutely in favour of giving the farmers of the West some solution of their transportation difficulties. I have so expressed myself in the House, and I am not afraid to go to the West. I will go there the first opportunity I have and I will tell them that the settlement of their transportation problem is, first of all, consolidation of the railways, strict economy in their administration, and in the routings and the number of miles arranged. In the next place, we must make the waterways and highways complementary to the railways, and in other directions effect economies. Not a word has been said about that in the House to-day.

Is the Minister of Railways (Mr. Kennedy) in his place to-day? I hope he will announce in a few days that he is going to have a high-class Board of Directors.

Mr. PUTNAM: The hon. member has stated that he would leave the business of the railways largely to the Railway Commission.

Mr. MACLEAN (York): Yes.

[Mr. W. F. Maclean.]

Mr. PUTNAM: Will he please indicate how he would do that?

Mr. MACLEAN (York): Within the full meaning of the act.

An Hon. MEMBER: It does not go far enough.

Mr. MACLEAN (York): It goes a long way. First of all, let us put the act back as it was—the act and the whole act—not an emasculated act.

Mr. PUTNAM: Would the hon. minister indicate the line of cleavage as between what he would leave to the Railway Commission and what he would not?

Mr. MACLEAN (York): When I have charge of the government of the country I will answer that question.

Mr. PUTNAM: I am afraid I will have to wait a long time for an answer.

Mr. MACLEAN (York): The hon. member knows where he stands. He is going to vote to-day—to do what? To do in Parliament what the Railway Board ought to do, and what the Railway Board is better able to do than Parliament. All we have to do is to say "Hands off,—let the act go into operation". I am not surprised that the farmers do not ask that this be referred to the Railway Commission. What are they going to do? Are they going to talk it out and wait here till July 6th? Perhaps, then, you will see an improvement in the rates of the country. This report is simply tinkering with the railway question, and we are ignoring consolidation and economy, water competition and the competition that sea ways will give. We are ignoring the question of better storage capacity for all the grain production of the country. The Senate has very properly taken up the question of routing, because the great bulk of the grain production of our western prairies does not even go out by the St. Lawrence, but goes through the Erie canal. That is a question of transportation, but we are not doing anything with it. I have always had some hope that the Government would, as soon as Parliament prorogued, appoint a Board of Railway Directors. They could have appointed them once, and could have had a great board, but that question goes over. They say "wait and see". I am going to have to wait and see, and the House and the farmers will have to wait and see. It may be that the farmers are getting a temporary advantage, and I believe they are.

I do not know how I will vote. I will have to think over the amendment. I repeat, leave the act as it is and let the law go into operation, and then, if you like, take over the railway, or have a session of Parliament and take time to settle the transportation question. We are a new Parliament, and we have a new Government. The Government has been in office some months and has not settled the question. They should have some leadership in their party. They should not only take office but also take the responsibility of office. The party in power has not assumed the responsibility. The transportation question is before them, and all they have done is to continue the suspension of an act for another year, in the meantime applying some minor remedies, but that is not sufficient for me. I have indicated the course that should be taken, and I leave it with the House. Members talk about basic commodities. They are going to have some basic commodities coming through Ontario. There is a good argument in that view. The proposition before us is a clever piece of—what? Not humbug, perhaps, but misleading the public. The hon. member for Halifax (Mr. Maclean) told us about what the railways said they would lose in dollars and cents, and then he went on talking about percentages. Later on he brought the discussion back to dollars and cents, but did not tell us whether he had any experts verifying the statement as to what the railways would lose, or what they would gain in the percentages. That alone was sufficient to convince me that there was something queer in the proposal. He started to talk about the millions the railways were going to lose, but when he came to speak of what the farmers would gain he reverted to percentages. I hope the farmers have verified the percentages. They have their experts in the country. I never heard a case put in better shape than when Mr. Symington presented his argument. I suppose he has looked into the percentages and verified them. They are all subject to verification, and perhaps the railways have not overstated the case. They speak in dollars and cents in giving their losses, but when referring to what the public are going to get, they have recourse in percentages. The farmers may be getting a lot of percentages which look nice on paper, but do not look so well when put into dollars and cents.

Mr. McBRIDE: Would the hon. member be in favour of suspending Hansard here?

Mr. MACLEAN (York): I do not object to Hansard being suspended. My main objection is that they are not able to put in the cheers and applause that sometimes come to speakers in this House. I shall be pleased some day soon to discuss the railway question with the hon. member in his constituency, if he cares to make an appointment, and I should like him to make the issue in the discussion whether he thinks he is getting fair treatment for British Columbia as compared with the advantages which the provinces of Manitoba, Saskatchewan and Alberta can get. Let him go back to his constituency and discuss that, or let him discuss it here. It is fine for him to get up and make the remark which he has made, very clever; but there are plenty of men more clever than he is in the North of Ireland to-day, and in the South too, who would be a match for him, if that is all the argument that he can put up. Let him deal with the question of transportation. He has the floor now, and probably he may be satisfied with what has taken place; but I have heard hon. members from British Columbia say that they are not getting equality of treatment with the other provinces. Ontario is not getting equality of treatment, and I do not think the maritime provinces are. There is the issue and we are dodging it, as the ex-Minister of Finance (Sir Henry Drayton) says, perhaps for political effect. In any event, I am going to wait and see now what the Minister of Justice (Sir Lomer Gouin) and the Minister of Marine and Fisheries (Mr. Lapointe) have to say. I want to know whether that favourite word "pontifical" used by the latter in describing the sanctity of our constitution, applies to this law, and whether this law and its enforcement and maintenance is pontifical in the same sense.

I apologize for taking up so much of the time of the House. I should like to have made a second speech, but I have been cut out of that by the amendment, which might have been kept until a little later on in the discussion. In the meantime the question is before the House. I have stated my view; I know where my vote is going to be, and I know what I am going to say to my constituents when I go back, and to the people of Canada: namely, that we have not yet dealt with the transportation question; that we have only trifled with it.

The Government have not dealt with it; the Opposition have not dealt with it. The only people who seem to have dealt with it to advantage—and I congratulate them on their efficiency in that respect—are the Progressives of the western provinces, and they have dealt with it with advantage to themselves.

At six o'clock the House took recess.

After Recess

The House resumed at eight o'clock.

Mr. E. M. MACDONALD (Pictou): I am quite sure that every hon. gentleman who had the privilege of serving upon the committee whose report is under consideration will agree that the experience was one of the most interesting that has ever been afforded members of Parliament. Today, when the desire to return to normal conditions in this country is one that animates every good citizen of Canada, the part that railway transportation rates can play in bringing about that condition is most vital and is of the highest importance. How these rates may be changed and be once more established on their former basis is among the gravest questions for the consideration of Parliament. As has been frequently stated, the control of rates generally, by virtue of the Railway Act, rests with the Board of Railway Commissioners, subject to such limitations as may be provided in any special statute such as the Crowsnest pass agreement. Apart from those exceptions, absolute power in regard to rates is vested in the commission, with an appeal to the Governor in Council under certain conditions. In my opinion the Board of Railway Commissioners has played a very important part, and a satisfactory one, in its history in this country. Time has shown it to be an institution which was well considered; and while there have been criticisms of the board because of increases it has made in the rates, a close examination of the conditions that have prevailed whenever these increases have been made will show that the rise in rates in Canada has always followed a similar increase in the United States, very largely as a result of increase in wages brought about by various conditions referred to by the member for Halifax (Mr. Maclean) this afternoon.

In considering the many questions that came before the committee from different parts of the country, from the provincial governments interested and from the representatives of other bodies, it was naturally concluded that the final decision in most instances would devolve eventually upon the board. Hence, in the report now before the Parliament, some of the matters that are under consideration are referred to the Board of Railway Commissioners for final disposition. For example, take the case of British Columbia. The premier of that province, the Hon. Mr. Oliver, accompanied by Mr. McGeer, his counsel, presented his case with great ability. These gentlemen argued that the rates known as the mountain rates should be lowered, and brought to a level comparable to the rates in force on the prairies. They claimed that during the last fifteen years the conditions that have existed in that part of Canada, and which obtained at the time the original rate schedule was formed, had changed and that instead of many of the products from the East going to the prairies which were formerly shipped there, the province of British Columbia had developed as a manufacturing centre, its manufactures now finding a market in the western and other provinces. Their case was presented with great force and vigour, and I am sure it interested every member of the committee. But the conclusion we arrived at was the inevitable one, that their remedy lay with the Board of Railway Commissioners, who alone had power to deal with the schedules of which they complained.

This question of rail rates has to my mind been always an abstruse one. There are a large number of classifications. The standard classifications, I believe, number five, in each one of which are stated certain classes of material which are carried at certain fixed rates. Then there are special commodity rates and numerous other rates of various kinds; and the operation of the whole matter is naturally very complicated to one who is not an expert on railway rates.

Similar to the case of British Columbia was that presented on behalf of the prairie provinces, not merely as regards the Crowsnest agreement, but also in connection with what they alleged was a discrimination against these provinces by what are described as the western rates that are charged from Fort William west on the prairies. It was urged that the rates in that part of Canada were higher than in the East. The reply to this, on behalf of the railways, and from other viewpoints, was that there lay north of Lake Superior a large mileage of railway which was necessary for approach to western Canada, but

from the operation of which there was absolutely no remuneration. It was pointed out that the operation of this portion of the railways was unprofitable, but that it was necessary because it provided the only method of access to-day to the West by rail. Furthermore, it was stated that this great inland country had not the advantage of water competition such as existed on the Great Lakes in the territory which is to be found mainly in Ontario. There, again, the problem was one which was practically for the Board of Railway Commissioners to deal with. They alone can decide the question satisfactorily for the complainants; and as it was well understood that all these matters had been gone into very carefully by the commission, whose decision was awaiting the determination of this House of the question of the further suspension of the Crowsnest agreement, manifestly the proper disposition of them on the part of the committee was to refer them to the Railway Board.

Then, from the maritime provinces, there were representatives from each of the three governments, who, through their counsel, pointed out that these provinces were peculiarly situated in Confederation. They jut far out into the Atlantic and are to a great degree isolated from the central and western portions of Canada. Besides, through some unfortunate error of British diplomacy, by virtue of a treaty, the state of Maine obtrudes far north into the province of Quebec. So that those who live in the maritime provinces are isolated to a greater extent than the people of any other part of Canada. In two of the maritime provinces there is only one line of railway. Every other part of Canada has numerous railways connecting with adjacent provinces. But in Prince Edward Island and Nova Scotia there is no means of access by rail to any other part of the Dominion than by what was formerly known as the Intercolonial Railway, now under the management of the Board of Directors of the Canadian National Railways.

Now, connection which does exist was provided for by the absorption of the local railways which existed in 1867 and the construction to the St. Lawrence river of what has always been known as the Intercolonial railway to meet the special purpose of binding these provinces commercially to the rest of Canada. Its construction was specially provided for under the terms of the British North America Act. The railroad was finally completed in 1876 and was paid for out of the public treasury, just as the canals were paid for at the time of their construction; its cost was absorbed in the general debt of the country. In the days preceding the war the total net debt of this country did not exceed $350,000,000. That was the amount of the net debt remaining after the period in which the Transcontinental railway had been constructed, and various other great public works throughout the country. But this particular railway had been built some thirty years before that and its cost had long since been wiped out as I have stated. Now, the primary obligation involved in the construction of these railways was that they were to be the great factor in providing for interprovincial trade by overcoming the natural isolation of these provinces from Central Canada. The idea was, as the Fathers of Confederation said at the time, to give to this new nation of Canada a maritime front on the Atlantic. These provinces gave up the right to control their own tariff, the right to operate their railways and handle their own products as they saw fit, the object being the benefit of the whole Canadian people. These railways were to be operated in such a way that the original intent of the Fathers of Confederation should be carried out. But what has occurred? It was pointed out before the committee that in 1876, when construction was completed, a system of rates both local and general was put into effect which carried out that obligation. Indeed, the undertaking of the Fathers of Confederation was observed for forty years, from 1876 to 1916, and no matter what political party was in power, no matter what the political conditions were in other parts of Canada, that obligation was faithfully discharged. Differential rates were established in the different classifications by which freight was carried to and from these provinces at a figure varying according to the classification, which resulted in removing in some degree the disadvantage of their distance from central and western Canada. Local freight rates were also established in fulfilment of that obligation and as the result of all this there grew up in that part of Canada great coal, iron and steel industries. There grew up also the lumber industries, and numerous other developments took place on the faith of the carrying out of these transportation conditions and in the belief that they would be maintained.

But in later years an entirely different condition arose. In 1918, when the present Board of Management took over the control of the Intercolonial railway, the differentials were practically abolished; that is to say, they were increased 300 per cent. I am sure that hon. members can scarcely realize the extent to which these impositions were practised upon the maritime provinces. We heard complaints in the committee from hon. members from other parts of Canada respecting the great increase of rates put into effect through the operations of the Board of Railway Commissioners since 1918. We have heard of 15 per cent increases and of 40 per cent increases, and those who complained of them felt that the burden was a very onerous one. Let me give you some illustrations of the increases that were put into effect in the eastern part of Canada, as pointed out by the representatives of these provincial governments before the committee. The rate on lumber was increased 90 per cent. The rate on pulpwood was increased 95 per cent, and on fruit 65 per cent. The rate on potatoes was increased from 75 to 100 per cent, varying according to the distances which they were carried. Coal rates in those provinces were increased from 80 to 138 per cent.

Let me give you an illustration of the extent to which business has been paralyzed down there so far as our great natural coal product is concerned. There is in the constituency of my hon. friend who sits to my right (Mr. Logan) one of the most important coal mines in my province. It is in the town of Springhill, 188 miles distant from the prosperous town of Bathurst in the constituency of the hon. member for Gloucester (Mr. Turgeon). It would be supposed that the very large industries which operate in Bathurst would naturally obtain their supply of coal from Springhill mines, 188 miles away. But let me tell you that those industries find it possible to buy coal in Norfolk, West Virginia, and have it carried through the North Atlantic and the Gulf of St. Lawrence to Bathurst and discharged at less cost for transportation than would be the case if they obtained it from the Springhill mines, 188 miles away. That illustration was emphasized before the committee by the gentlemen connected with the industry in Bathurst. I could cite many other cases if the matter were to be discussed in detail-cases in which the local coal rates were increased 280 per cent. Then, the increase in the rates on wire nails was from 80 to 111 per cent. The rates on sugar, which the maritime provinces are specially qualified to handle on account of their proximity to the West Indies, were increased nearly 300 per cent. In the constituency of the hon. member for Yarmouth (Mr. Hatfield) the cotton duck industry has been carried on for many years; the increase in the freight rates on the products of that industry has been 280 per cent. The result is that it has been practically impossible to carry on their business in other parts of Canada. Mr. Finn, who very ably represented these provinces, pointed out the effects of the conditions which existed. Our industries cannot export their products; our workingmen are idle; our farmers are unable to dispose of their crops. If we are to play any part in this Confederation we must have the old transportation conditions restored, as speedily as possible. I do submit that the minister and the Board of Management operating and controlling that railway at the present time should take steps to see that substantial reductions are made in the local rates as recommended by the report of the committee before the House, and I trust that the Board of Railway Commissioners will be able to restore the differential rates as they existed before 1918.

These were some matters which engaged our attention, and I am sure hon. members will agree that they were important matters, entirely apart from the question of what has been called the Crowsnest pass agreement. Let us approach the consideration of that matter and see what is the position of the matter. The considerations that impressed me with regard to that act are these. A careful study of the subject, and whatever information I have been able to obtain from reading, leads me to the conclusion that the Crowsnest pass agreement should be understood and held to have been made, not for the West, but for all Canada. It was made in consideration, too, as is expressly stated in the act, of the fact that a railway commission would be instituted in this country for the purpose of dealing with rates. Primarily, so far as regards the construction of that railway whose name attaches to the agreement, it was intended for the development and exploitation of the coal mines of southern British Columbia and the tremendous development that has taken place in that part of the West has resulted in the coal supplies of the prairie provinces coming from south-

ern British Columbia, instead of from the East as they did in the olden days. It was intended also for the purpose of establishing and assisting in the maintenance of trade east and west, and I do submit that in considering its effect and what our attitude should be in regard to it, we should approach the agreement from the viewpoint of its having been made on behalf of Canada generally, rather than from the narrower viewpoint that it was made for western Canada only. It must be remembered that it was in effect only for three years of the twenty-five that have elapsed since 1897, and in normal times it has been shown to be of no importance by reason of the experience of these three years in which it was in operation. There is the further consideration that by reason of the agreement being in existence, the Canadian National Railway is bound practically as fully and completely as the Canadian Pacific because being the other competing line of railway, if conditions ensued under which the Canadian Pacific was compelled to carry products at the rates mentioned in the Crowsnest pass agreement, the Canadian National would naturally have to follow suit in order to obtain its share of the business. An interesting fact in that connection which I might recall is that of the products carried by the Canadian National last year, according to the statement made on behalf of the directors of that company, 25 per cent only of its business arose from grain and grain products. Before passing to another branch of the subject I venture to re-state the view which I expressed when this matter was before the House previous to the committee being formed, that the true interpretation of the Crowsnest pass statute permits the application of the agreement only to the lines in existence in the West at that date. I know it has been held by the Railway Commission that the effect of its operation was to extend to lines that subsequently came into existence and that are in existence to-day. I venture to differ from that view, and to re-state the position I took at the time this matter was under discussion previous to the committee's appointment.

Mr. MACLEAN (York): Is there any written instrument embodying the rights which the hon. member claims for the maritime provinces?

Mr. MACDONALD: There is no agreement similar to the Crowsnest pass agreement in regard to the maritime provinces, no federal statute at all. The argument that we make and that was made on behalf of the maritime provinces was that the construction of the Intercolonial was one of the obligations of Confederation, provided for under the British North America Act. There was an implied obligation which attached in regard to the operation of that railway that it should be operated on the same terms and conditions under which it has been operated for forty years since its construction.

With regard to the Crowsnest pass situation, I think I am stating the position correctly when I say that all parties are agreed that the Crowsnest pass agreement should be suspended, for the same reason in a modified degree which prompted its suspension in 1918 and its continued suspension in 1919. The agreement was suspended on account of the abnormal conditions that existed throughout the country, and hon. gentlemen from the West agreed at that time that it should be suspended. The suspension expires next week. I think all are agreed that there should be some suspension, and the only difference is as to whether that suspension should apply to all the articles mentioned in the agreement or to only a portion of them, and as to the length of time for which the agreement should be suspended. In other words the difference is as to whether the agreement should be suspended in whole or in part, and the determination of that question depends upon this other point, whether or not the returns to the railway will warrant a reduction in the rates on basic and other commodities. In dealing with this matter we must all realize that in the first place we have the Canadian National Railways on our hands with the enormous deficit of $72,000,000 a year. I am not going to digress to engage in a discussion of the virtues and the glories or the weaknesses of public ownership. Sufficient unto the day is the evil thereof. We have these railways on our hands at the present time with that enormous deficit. Then there is the Canadian Pacific. I know some people like to abuse that great corporation, but I want to say that the Canadian Pacific is a great national institution and if anything happened to imperil its position, it would be a grievous injury to the whole of Canada, just as much injury as if the finances of a province or this country itself were imperilled.

From the evidence before the committee at one stage of the proceedings it would

appear as if the proposition to suspend this agreement absolutely would be necessary in order to enable the whole of Canada to get some advantage by a reduction in the rates on basic commodities, in addition to the reduction on grain. That was the view that was presented by the railways but on the very last day we found through the evidence given by Mr. Hayes that the difference between the rates on grain that were offered by the railways and the rates under the Crowsnest pass agreement would be $3,824,476, of which $2,000,000 would apply to the Canadian National Railways, and $1,800,000 to the Canadian Pacific. In other words, that represented the difference between operating under the Crowsnest pass agreement and operating under the rates proposed by the railways for basic commodities. Hon. members of the committee were affected by that consideration, that so small a difference, relatively speaking, existed between these two positions. The report that has come to the House assumes, in suspending the operation of the Crowsnest pass agreement, with the exception of grain and flour that the Railway Commission will find ways and means for bringing about decreases on basic commodities.

When I see the amendment which has been moved by my hon. friend from York (Sir Henry Drayton) I find that it is peculiarly optimistic upon that point. It is a most peculiar amendment. First, there is a sort of qualified eulogy of the Board of Railway Commissioners who, it is asserted, should be left to perform their duty without dictation in any way whatever from this House. Well, everybody will agree with that proposition. I have heard of nobody in this House suggesting, nor is it suggested in any way in the report that has been submitted, that Parliament should undertake to dictate to the Railway Commission what they should do. It was not necessary for Sir Henry Drayton, if he will pardon me for mentioning him by name, undertaking to solemnly set down in a resolution that a principle of that sort required to be asserted. Then my hon. friend goes on and says that large and general reductions of freight rates on basic commodities, and otherwise, are demanded in the national interest. In other words, my hon. friend turns round and demands from the Railway Commission in the national interest something which, in the clause of the amendment immediately preceding, he asserted should not be said to them when he affirmed they should not be dictated to. He goes on to say that these reductions are admitted by all concerned to be possible, and to have been possible for several months, and action to that end by the Railway Commission has only awaited the decision of the Government as regards the Crowsnest pass agreement. There is a positive declaration in the amendment that so far as the rates on basic commodities are concerned the Railway Commission are waiting at this moment to put them into effect. Now, I apprehend that is a situation which we would all like to see. If our western friends, having regard to the vital importance to this country of the marketing of their grain crop can, with the difference which exists between what was offered by the railways and the Crowsnest pass agreement, be assured of conditions under which they would be able to satisfactorily market their crops without putting any onerous responsibilities upon other parts of the country, I think this House ought to be willing to come to the view that we should agree that that should be done.

Now the position of the Opposition is this: There is no doubt about it, the basic commodity reduction is coming into effect. It has been possible for a long time, it is possible now, and the board are only waiting to hear what we are going to do in order to put it into effect. I must confess I had grave doubts at one time in regard to this matter, previous to hearing Mr. Hayes on that question, as to whether or not it would be possible to arrange that we should have low rates on basic commodities in the East, and at the same time have the rates as provided for in the Crowsnest pass agreement on grain in the West. But I have no hesitation whatever, in view of what has occurred—in view of the statement of Mr. Hayes, and in view of the position of my hon. friends on the other side who moved this resolution—in saying that I think he might fairly have confidence in the future of this country and therefore let us settle the question along the lines suggested by the report of the committee. Then my hon. friend in his amendment says:

> That to enable the Railway Commission to carry out its duty as defined above such board should be empowered to suspend the said agreement, such suspension to be followed immediately by submission to the Governor in Council of a new schedule of rates as reduced by the commission, the suspension to be revocable if such schedule is not approved by the Governor in Council—"

—and so on. Well, that is a rather moveable suspension—it is a suspension in and a suspension out. It is the first time, in my experience, that I ever saw the proposal made that a solemn act of Parliament should be suspended one day and not suspended the next day; and that power should be given to the Board of Railway Commissioners, or any other board outside of Parliament, to move the act into effect one day, and to move it out of effect the next day. That is the real purpose of my hon. friend's amendment, and it also provides this: Instead of the Board of Railway Commissioners having power to fix the rates it proposes—after flattering the commissioners in the first clause—to put that power absolutely in the hands of the Governor in Council, because my hon. friend says: Let it go to the Board of Railway Commissioners, let the Board of Railway Commissioners suspend the Crowsnest pass agreement. Well, then, they are to make settled rates and they are to report those rates to the Government. If the Government do not like the rates then they send them back to the board, and the Crowsnest pass agreement is not suspended. How long they are going to keep on doing that before we get settled rates seems to be quite a conundrum. Really I do not think my hon. friend could seriously ask this House to make such a deliverance upon this question as is contained in the amendment which he has moved.

Now, Mr. Speaker, the report before the House recommends the suspension in part of the Crowsnest pass agreement. If it is passed into effect it ensures a rate upon grain guaranteed by the Crowsnest pass statute, and it in effect suspends that statute with regard to the westbound traffic. It is hoped and expected that this country may be able to so develop during the rest of this year that the returns from the railways will render it easy for them to provide for the reduction on basic commodities. It must be remembered that on the first of July there goes into effect in Canada a 10 per cent reduction on traffic to and from the international lines; and it must be remembered too that there have been some reductions made in the wages fixed by the Chicago award schedules according to the arrangements that have been made in the United States. There are other conditions noticeable. Signs of reviving business, of hopefulness in the future; of confidence in the fact that the crops of the West and the products of the East this year, under Providence, may be provided to a greater degree than we have had during the dark periods of the last year or two. We may well hope that it should be so; and I see no reason why, at this time, we should not be optimistic and look on the future with some degree of confidence and believe that this success can be brought about. A great deal in regard to these matters, particularly with reference to the Canadian National Railways depends upon the way in which the system is managed and operated. It is all very well for us to talk in this House about the success of a theoretical principle, but the problem of operating a great transportation system is a condition, not a theory; and the fate of the so-called public ownership depends entirely upon the success in operating by the men who happen to be in charge of that enterprise. Whether or not during this year it will be possible if reductions on basic commodities are made for them to be maintained depends entirely upon the wisdom of the men who are to constitute the new board who, I am glad to believe, the Minister of Railways will probably announce to the country before very much longer.

I submit to this House, not only from what appeared to us in the committee but from other matters which have transpired since the opening of this session, that as regards that great enterprise it is the bounden duty of the minister to see that the next board should at once proceed to have a full and complete accounting of the operations during the past three years in order that we may know in Canada where we stand, in order that we may know where we are going to be during the time that public ownership is to be given a fair trial. Certainly to hope for rate reductions being maintained in this country unless you have absolute, certain knowledge as to your financial position and as to the methods of operation is an impossibility. We are not able before the committee to obtain from the Canadian Northern Railway that statement of the results of the operations during the last three or four years that we obtained from the Canadian Pacific Company. It was evidenced that there was something lacking in regard to this condition which might well warrant the attention and demand the careful looking into of those who have to do with its management.

Take another matter: it should be the bounden duty of those to whom is entrusted

the operation of the Canadian Northern Railway to encourage the development of industries and traffic in the natural products that are to be found along the line of its operation both east and west. The discriminatory freight rates against us in eastern Nova Scotia, not fixed by the Railway Commission, but fixed by the board of management of the railway, absolutely prevented our export of coal to central Canada. With the great undeveloped resources that exist in the West and East, $80,000,000 went out in good Canadian money for the cost of coal alone, and in addition to that about $10,000,000 for carrying that coal over American transportation lines to this country. Do hon. members not think it would be a good thing to enhance the traffic of our railway enterprises if, in regard to all those supplies which it is possible to obtain, which may be produced in Canada, the greatest possible solicitude should be exhibited, in order that they be given the first opportunity to be used, instead of sending such a vast amount of money out of the country. Take the situation that existed in the year 1920. In that year there was purchased for the Canadian National Railway in the United States 1,312,872 tons of American coal. A very large portion of that coal was used in central Canada necessarily, but in addition to that, as disclosed in the Public Accounts Committee ten days ago, it was shown conclusively that there was purchased and taken to the eastern portion of the Canadian National Railway, a very large portion of that coal, and then was paid for it as high a price as $12 a ton, to which freight had to be added, and that on the 31st March, 1921, 250,000 tons of that American coal was stored on the eastern division of the Canadian National Railway. The result was that during the last year they purchased from the Nova Scotia Coal mines 238,000 tons less than the year before. I submit, Mr. Speaker, that if the Canadian National Railway is going to succeed, it must succeed because the industries that are to be found along its line both east and west are encouraged in their development. And for a similar reason we accede to the proposition in regard to the grain fields in the West, that these rates may be accorded to them so that their products may find an outlet to the sea and beyond. Similarly, there should be the same encouragement given to the other national industries of the country, because their prosperity is the prosperity of the railway, and if they do not succeed, then the railway cannot succeed.

I submit further that there should be some attention given to the idea of the development of trade to Canadian ports as a natural and necessary assistance to Canadian railways. We had the farcical proposition in this country of a Merchant Marine, constructed at great cost and at a great loss to the country. It consisted of tramp steamers, which did not expect to bring back any products. Trade was not the idea of originating that line, and the results indicated what might well have been expected under the circumstances.

Some study must be given to the consummation along proper lines of our maritime connections. A committee of the Senate not long ago was considering the matter of trade with Canadian ports, and an admirable report was made by that committee to the Senate, in which it undertook to point out how, in regard to questions of this kind, aid could be given by the railway. The citation from the report reads as follows:

> Since the first aim of the federal government must be to secure better freight return on the Transcontinental Railway in order to reduce its huge railway deficit, a more reasonable and inviting rate should be quoted from Winnipeg and other shipping points along the line, so as to have the largest possible quantity of grain sent through Quebec until the closing of that port in January, and then on to St. John and Halifax.
>
> In accordance with the evidence given before the committee by Mr. C. A. Hayes, a rate considerably lower than the present rate could be quoted and the Transcontinental railway would still be making money out of it.

It was shown conclusively by evidence submitted to that committee that during the last six years, out of 1,096,000,000 bushels of grain which came from the West, 518,000,000 bushels in that period went through Buffalo, N.Y., and other United States ports. If one-half of all the grain products of the West come down to Fort William, and if our transportation systems in this country are to have nothing to do with them after they reach that point, and they are diverted to the United States, to their canals and their railways, how can the Canadian National pay, and how can they have reduced rates on basic commodities? These are matters which seem to me to demand the most careful attention from the Minister of Railways (Mr. Kennedy), and those responsible for the management of this enterprise at this time. The quota-

tion from the report of the Senate Committee in regard to this matter reads:

> There seems to be no doubt that two-thirds and probably four-fifths of that trade takes that route, and that we are paying many millions annually to the United States railways lake carriers and elevators that would be earned by our own railways and trainmen, if it were possible to export this grain at Canadian seaports.

Why should not this country, if it is going to be a self contained country at all, consider carefully the idea of developing the trade through our own ports? We must cease to be sectional, as far as possible. While our country is so vast, of necessity we come to Parliament imbued with the interests of those who live near to us, yet we should never forget the idea that should animate us as Canadians. It is all very well to say that you may get cheaper rates through American ports, but what is to become of the Canadian future, if we are to send our goods by foreign ports? What is to become of Canada in the immediate future, with our tremendous financial obligations and railway responsibilities, unless we provide for the carriage of our imports and exports as far as possible over our own lines of communication, and through our own ports, east and west? The situation, it seems to me, Mr. Speaker, in regard to this matter, is that, having in view all the evidence that was obtained before that committee, while there is to a certain degree some uncertainty as to whether or not the basic commodity rates will be reduced by the commission—and my hon. friend's amendment expresses very strong confidence in regard to that and he does not seem to have very much doubt about it—yet I believe that under reasonable conditions we can look forward to that reduction, and if so we can go along through this year and other years, realizing in some degree our anticipations and desires that we shall get back to normal business conditions, and to a hopeful view in regard to our future. Let it be distinctly understood at this stage—my hon. friend from Marquette (Mr. Crerar) has acceded to the principle—that this agreement should be suspended in part. He stated so before the committee, and I understand hon. members opposite agree in that view, and the report submitted to the House expresses that view. The only question was whether it should be suspended in part or in whole, and that depends on the considerations which I have mentioned. I assent to the proposition and support the adoption of the report, not only on that ground, but also because of the recommendations of the committee in regard to the other matters that have come before use, to which references have been made. I desire to say to the Minister of Railways, speaking particularly of the part of Canada from which I come, that we look to him with expectancy to see that this report as regard our rates in the maritime provinces is implemented and carried into effect speedily, and we look with hopefulness and confidence to the result which will follow the naming of the new board which I trust will take charge of the Canadian National Railway in the near future.

Hon. J. B. M. BAXTER (St. John and Albert): I have been much interested, and I am sure the House has been much interested in so much as could be heard of the address of my hon. friend (Mr. Macdonald, Pictou) which, I regret, was not so much in this quarter of the House as we might have desired. I expected—and I think those of us who represent constituencies in the maritime provinces expected from him and his other colleagues from the province of Nova Scotia—a strong stand on behalf of what are generally termed the maritime interests. I trust the hon. member has discharged that function to the entire satisfaction of his constituents. I should be sorry to think that men with a sense of responsibility and charged with the duty of representing the maritime provinces, would accept this halfpenny worth of bread with this intolerable deal of sack which is given to us by the report. In fact, it is difficult to see even the half pennyworth of bread. I think only the crumbs appear.

I should like for a few moments—it may take even a little longer, but I will ask the House to bear with me—to give some analysis of this report which, I think, is one of the most remarkable documents that has been presented to Parliament during this session or, perhaps during many preceding sessions. The report proceeds as a well-written narrative down to a certain point, and then three or four sentences are interpolated between the historical narrative and the conclusion. But the remarkable thing is that the interpolated sentences seem almost like the work of a later author, some one—perhaps, at an early hour in the morning—to complete a document that the committee was not able to complete itself, and, perhaps, in a semi-somnolent condition the unknown author of those sentences has failed to appreciate the necessity of some logical connection between them and the conclusion. We have a conclusion that is

comparable only to Mohammed's coffin for its want of visible support. May I ask the consideration of the House for a moment to the genesis of this investigation? I find that on the 4th of May the Minister of Railways (Mr. Kennedy) moved this resolution, and even at the risk of being tedious, I should like to read it:

That notwithstanding that the regulation of railway rates is a matter within the jurisdiction of the Board of Railway Commissioners, it is advisable that a Select Special Committee be appointed—

For what purpose?

—to make inquiry into the question of railway transportation costs.

I will take this document which appears in the Votes and Proceedings of the House, and I will ask any hon. member, with the aid of his imagination and of the most powerful microscope that he can bring to bear upon it, to discern even one iota of result from this portion of the investigation. Where is the investigation of transportation costs reported upon in this report? I cannot find it and no other hon. member can find it either. The motion proceeds:

It having been disclosed by recent conferences held between the Government and the chief executives of the various railways with respect to the reduction of freight rates that the representatives of the railways deem it inadvisable immediately to reduce rates on basic commodities because of the expiration, on July 6, 1922, of the suspension of the Crowsnest pass agreement.

It really seems to be a matter of increasing doubt whether the Government is connected with this matter at all, because so far we have not been favoured with the slightest expression of opinion from any member occupying the treasury benches. We have had hon. gentlemen who are prominent in this House, but who have not yet attained to the dignity of a portfolio, put forward, one the Chairman of the Committee and another the hon. member who has just spoken (Mr. Macdonald, Pictou), as apparently the exponents of Government policy. Where did they get this information? It does not seem to have been disclosed to the committee. I was not a member of that committee; but so far as I can ascertain from reading the report of the daily proceedings of the committee, the Government preserved the same cautious abstention, during all the weeks the committee were sitting, from expressing any views upon this subject, as it had done from the time the matter was first mooted in the House. Even yet, we have not had a pronouncement from a member of the Government. Yet, the Minister of Railways, in introducing this subject—and he must have spoken for the Government—declared—and, I take it, with the approval, at least with the knowledge and without the reprobation of the Government—that the representatives of the railways deemed it inadvisable to reduce rates on basic commodities until they knew where the Crowsnest pass matter would stand. That is the position they took, and down to this moment I will challenge any hon. member to go through the evidence and through this report and find a clear statement of railway transportation costs. It could not be done, not in that time and not without a set of experts investigating the matter. But we have had the experts all along, sitting not a quarter of a mile from this chamber, and the Government has never called them in, has never given to Parliament the conclusions at 9 p.m. which the Railway Commission has, undoubtedly, arrived with regard to this matter. The public of Canada pays and rightly pays for the work of the Railway Commission. That work has been going on for months on this very subject. The Government could have the information for the asking, and yet why was that not produced in the court of the committee? The hon. member for Pictou is quite willing to rush in and take all risks without that information. So much of his address as I could hear impressed me with the idea that he was prepared to perform probably the most gigantic swallowing act of his entire career. He has swallowed the report, body and bones, and I hope it will sit easily upon his digestion. I wish he had given us a little more information, because I am curious to know at what moment the great light shone round about Saul of Nova Scotia, how long he remained blind, when his eyes were opened and he came in as the Paul of the Progressive party sitting on the other side of the House. The resolution proceeds:

That, in the circumstances, it is advisable to afford opportunity to all interested parties to submit their views upon the subject matter of the inquiry to the said committee with particular regard to the effect of the rates established by the Crowsnest pass agreement upon the Canadian National Railways and other lines, as well as upon agricultural development and Canadian industry generally.

Each one of those I take it is just as important to this House and to this country as any other. Representatives of the Canadian National Railways were brought before the committee; representatives of

the Canadian Pacific Railway Company were brought before the committee, and I have heard it intimated that some representative of the Grand Trunk was brought before the committee. Down to the very last sitting, what one might almost call the supernumerary sitting of the committee, the doubt was not resolved, and Mr. Hayes was called back, ostensibly, at least, to correct some possible error in the figures. I have read and re-read every word that has been transcribed as the report of the last meeting of that committee, and I say that no human being can draw any sure deduction from any of the figures that were given at that session. And this House does not know to-day how much the Canadian Northern Railway will lose, or what the anticipated loss will be in its revenue by the application of the Crowsnest schedules to its business for the coming year. Hon. members may say that there are figures in the report. There are almost oceans of figures, but there is no stability in those figures. There is no certainty about them, and no hon. gentleman sitting in this House, if it were a matter of his private business, would depend upon such a nebulous aggregation of statements as is to be found in the report of this committee, or in the evidence that was taken on the subject. The railways were represented and some of the provinces were represented; and the committee was charged with ascertaining the effect of the Crowsnest pass rates upon agriculture and also upon Canadian industry generally. I should like to know from the hon. member who has just taken his seat (Mr. Macdonald), or from any other gentleman in this House, what effect these rates would have upon the general industry of the maritime provinces—upon the coal and steel and fish in Nova Scotia, and upon the potatoes, the lumber and fish in New Brunswick.

Now, let us understand that this matter must be dealt with to a certain extent, and in a fair way, as a sectional matter. It is no use to stand upon some high plane and talk platitudes about it. Each part of the country is interested, and vitally interested, in knowing what the result of the proposed action of this House will be upon the fortunes of those industries that are indispensable to the success of that particular locality. It is not at all improper for our friends who come from the prairie provinces to say that they want to retain the Crowsnest pass rates because they obtain a special advantage thereby. Well, if that is not unfair, nor improper, it cannot be wrong for the people of the maritime provinces of Canada, in British Columbia as well as in the Atlantic provinces, to point out the effect which the failure to reduce freight rates will have upon their basic commodities, and upon their principal exports. Surely Canada is not for one part or section; surely the vision of this House must be broad enough and fair enough to cover all the provinces, and not merely one or two or three of them.

Does the idea appeal to our patriotic spirit or our business spirit, of a Canada which is prosperous in the centre or in some particular section, while some other part is drying, withering and shrivelling up? Does that idea appeal to us? I think not. I have heard from hon. gentlemen sitting to my left, and during this session, painful tales of the misery and distress which unfortunately, according to them, prevails in the provinces they represent. I should hope that the pictures are a little bit overdrawn. I should not like to think that Canada, or any part of it, was in quite so bad condition. But I fear there is a very substantial basis in fact for the statements these hon. gentlemen have made. Then, that calls for treatment and relief. But when I asked the House, as I did some weeks ago in support of my hon. friend from Cumberland (Mr. Logan), to consider a national policy for Canada, a policy that would restrict the British preference to goods entering directly by Canadian seaports, with what remark were my hon. friend and myself greeted? It came from the left of where I stand. One hon. gentleman expressed himself thus: "That old story is played out, of Canada for the Canadians." I hope he did not represent the group of which he is a member in giving expression to that sentiment; I hope he did not voice the feeling of the House.

We cannot fairly consider one part of Canada without the rest of Canada; and it is in the spirit of appeal to the House to consider what is fair, and just, and prudent, and right with regard to the maritime provinces that I am venturing to take as much time as I am taking to-night. The question was asked by my hon. friend from South York (Mr. Maclean)—I am sure he was not asking it in a spirit of the least hostility to the maritime provinces—whether the hon. member for Pictou could tell him if the agreement to which he re-

ferred was in writing or not. I know my hon. friend from South York did not ask that question with the same intent as prompted the question of Shylock, "Is it so nominated in the bond?" I think my hon. friend rather had in his mind that at least the Crowsnest pass agreement was in writing and its terms were clear; and taking the view that he takes of such subjects, I should fancy, though I prefer that he speak for himself, that he does not believe in the abrogation of agreements, especially where they confer a privilege upon some body of people. I may not be wholly in accord with him on that point, but I take it that that is the spirit in which he asked the question. But I say to the House that when the three loyal provinces of the East combined with the one great province of Canada to make Confederation possible, to make possible the growth and development of a great Dominion under the British flag in the northern part of this continent, it was never anticipated by any one that the result of that real sacrifice from the standpoint of the maritime provinces should be that those provinces would wither and shrivel up, and, from the commercial and industrial point of view, be blown away and dissipated over the face of the earth. We have industries in the maritime provinces; we have natural resources; but we are separated from the rest of Canada by distance. It is said there is no written agreement. We are not depending on "scraps of paper" that might be treated as such by the character of people who regard only the letter and miss the spirit of any obligation. We are not dealing here with other provinces populated by Huns; we are dealing with provinces populated almost entirely by the two great races that stood in this world for fair play and honest dealing, and it is in that spirit that the position of the maritime provinces shall be considered; because this House and the people of Canada will not fail ultimately to do their duty and play fair by that part of the Dominion.

Now, we are separated by some hundreds of miles. The distance that separates us from the rest of Canada is as real a barrier as the Rocky mountains are to British Columbia. Are we, in the interests of ourselves and in the interests of Canada, to be helped to cross that barrier? Shall we be told: "You are down by the sea; you did your work when you made Confederation possible, and now you can go?" I do not expect that to be the answer of the rest of Canada to the maritime provinces, and it will not be. But when we come to the consideration of a matter of this kind are we not a little prone to neglect the interests of the other fellow? I am not here to-night with the slightest desire to do the West an injustice, but before the subject is dealt with I want sufficient real knowledge, not guess-work, not imagination, not political by-play—I want sufficient real knowledge on which to found a real decision that will produce real results of value to all parts of Canada. That to-night we have not got. It is not in this report; it is not before the House.

Let me call attention again to the fact that four days after the introduction of the first resolution on this subject of the Minister of Railways it was ordered that certain members do compose a select special committee to make inquiry into the question of railway transportation costs and the effect upon the Canadian National Railways and other lines as well as upon agricultural development and Canadian industry generally of the expiration or suspension of the Crowsnest pass agreement on July 6 next. There was a reiteration of the first resolution expressed in more compendious language. The emphasis is still upon railway transportation costs, and again, as I have a right to do, I point out that this report gives the House no information as to railway transportation costs generally. It does not give us the effect upon agricultural development; it does not give us the effect upon Canadian industry generally of either the expiration or the suspension of that agreement. I have heard hon. members say that all the rest was out of it; that after all, this came down to the question whether the Crowsnest pass agreement should be abrogated, should be suspended, or should be allowed again to go into operation. Well, that brings us to another consideration. The report, as I have said, makes certain recommendations, but it does not give us the reason for any recommendation. It says:

> It was stated that the rates in the East, being controlled and limited by water and American rail competition resulted in deficiencies in revenue which prairie rates were designed to make up and it was urged that the Crowsnest pass agreement was the only controlling factor at the disposal of the people of the prairie provinces. Therefore, they objected strongly to its further suspension. It was their "sheet anchor," as one witness put it.

That is the language of the report. If it is just, if it is fair that the prairie provinces should have a "sheet anchor", is it not equally right and just and fair that

every other province affected should have its sheet anchor also? Who obtained the sheet anchor in the case of this Crowsnest pass agreement? Not the provinces affected, but the whole of Canada; the rights and privileges were bought by the money of all the people and all the people as represented here have the right to deal with this agreement exactly as they please. If it were burdensome upon those provinces, would anyone question the right of this House to get rid of it? If it is valuable to those provinces, then it becomes a question whether that value in certain circumstances is consistent with keeping alive and developing in other parts of Canada those commercial aspirations which they also have the right to entertain. In other words, if the Crowsnest pass agreement confers too great an advantage on one part of Canada and prevents other parts from coming to what I might call a normal condition, I fail to see that any but the most selfish mind could resist its abrogation. To take any other view would be to say: "Yes, your money bought it; I got it. It is only my own because it benefits me; it is really yours. It hurts my neighbour; yet selfishly I claim the right to retain it." Now I do not say that is the case to-day, but that is a possibility. The question requires investigation and analysis and expert knowledge that the committee does not and cannot be expected to possess, knowledge that is or ought to be in the possession of the Board of Railway Commissioners, knowledge that has been denied us in this House, either through lack of appreciation or because a bargain was being secretly driven and the committee was not to be allowed to have any information that would militate against it. It is one pan of the scales or the other; hon. members may draw their own conclusions.

Now this report further indicates that representations were made on behalf of the maritime provinces that their situation was of a special character because of the conditions under which the Intercolonial Railway had been constructed as the result of a Confederation agreement. I could catch here and there the figures that the hon. member for Pictou was giving, and I know that he laid before the House a statement of what I might characterize as the paralyzing increase of railway rates in the maritime provinces. It cannot be the wish of Canada that the coal mines of Nova Scotia should lie dormant, awaiting the enterprise of some future generation under happier auspices for their re-opening.

Mr. VIEN: Would my hon. friend allow me a question on this point?

Mr. BAXTER: Oh, yes.

Mr. VIEN: Does he assume that the reinstatement of the Crowsnest pass agreement rates on grain will prevent other reductions on other commodities? Did not the railways offer reductions—

Mr. BAXTER: Is this a speech now, or a question?

Mr. VIEN: It is only a question.

Mr. BAXTER: If it is a question, and my hon. friend will continue to give me the very careful attention he has given me down to the present point, I hope, whether he is able to agree with me or not, he will at least get the state of my mind before I conclude. I do not want to stop to answer his one question. The answer will be apparent from the tenor of my remarks.

Mr. VIEN: Too embarrassing.

Mr. BAXTER: It is not embarrassing at all. It is a thing I have to meet, and I am going to meet it, but I am going to meet it in my own way and in my own time. It is an idiosyncracy I have.

Mr. VIEN: I hope you will.

Mr. BAXTER: Let my hon. friend possess his soul in patience, and if he has not got a soul within him, let him possess anything else he can lay his hands on.

I have already spoken of the situation in one province with respect to mining. When I got a letter as I did the other day from the St. John Board of Trade, pointing out that to transport one car carrying 40,000 pounds of fish, from St. John to Vancouver cost nearly $1,000, and they wanted some special consideration upon fish, I wondered when I read this report how far the committee had gone into the question of general industry, how far they had made themselves aware of the real condition of the maritime provinces, or, in fact, how far they had made themselves aware of anything except the technical details of the Crowsnest pass agreement and possibly the amount of grain that is transported each year, and the change in the tariff of rates during the successive periods that they have very correctly outlined in the report. I cannot find that the coal from Nova Scotia, I cannot find that

the fish from Nova Scotia or New Brunswick, I cannot find that the lumber from New Brunswick, I cannot find that the potatoes from New Brunswick received the slightest bit of consideration—practically no attention given, no reasoning applied to these things. Where are we going to get by pursuing a course of that kind? Is that consideration all to be given to one class of people, and to one only? I do not mind if, after fair consideration and proper investigation, a competent tribunal says: Those people in the West need the continuation of such rates as they have enjoyed in the past, need it possibly for one or two or three years. If that is the real sense and judgment of a competent tribunal, I ought to accept it, and the people of the maritime provinces should accept it loyally. But we want that process gone through first. We do not want a committee which only hears from part of Canada, and only examines a part of the subject, and brings in conclusions unsupported by a single syllable of the preceding part of the report, and unsupported by one tittle of evidence given before the committee—we object to being thrown out in the cold by such a process as that.

If we have not, or if we do not try to form, a policy in these matters which will give so far as it is possible to do so, reasonably equal opportunities to each part of Canada to enjoy profitable commercial relations with the whole of Canada, then this system of Confederation of which we have so much boasted will be found to be a mere failure. I say again that I do not believe it is doomed to fail, but to prevent the danger of failing, yes, the danger of possible shipwreck, it is necessary in dealing with these matters to let everybody sit around the table and to deal with all on a fair and equal basis. It is necessary to avoid carrying on the work of a committee during some weeks as a spectacle and a parade, and resolving upon some other course of conduct outside of the pale of the committee, and at the last minute imposing that upon the committee as their report and their advice to this House. The proper course is for the Government, or whoever is responsible for the latest action of the committee, to take that responsibility here, to make it a part of the Government programme, to have the Government stand behind it, and not to bring it in as the lame and limping adjunct to a report that otherwise has no possible connection with it. Can any member look at this report and point out to me where the claims of more than one section have been considered or are reported on, or that the claims of more than one section have been even the object of consideration by that committee, or are presented for the consideration of this House? This House under the report that has been presented, is to be the tribunal for the provinces immediately interested in the Crowsnest pass agreement, and the rest of us are told to go to the Railway Commission—two absolutely separate tribunals in Canada, one for the gentlemen with whom it is desirous to continue a political alliance, the other for the people who are either absolutely in opposition or whose loyalty to party is so unquestioned and unquestionable that it is known in advance that they will swallow this or any other dose in the name of docile support to their leaders.

The committee does say that while they were impressed with the arguments put forward on behalf of the maritime provinces and British Columbia they are "possibly"—I know my friend the chairman of the committee would inject a word just like that, because he could not go the whole distance, his honesty of character would not permit him to do it—they are possibly without the scope of the reference. When he penned that, he must have smiled and thought: Well, of course, there are minds of many characters, and possibly I might find some semblance of mentality somewhere that might come to that conclusion. He would not come directly to that conclusion himself. I have read and re-read the two resolutions upon which this committee is founded, and I say it is impossible for a man willing to be fair, willing to be judicial, to read out of that reference, to exclude from it, the important interests of the maritime provinces with regard to which I have addressed this House to-night. They should have been considered.

The report proceeds: "and in any event are too intricate and involved and would require more time than is at the disposal of the committee to form a proper judgment regarding them." Then they point out that these matters have been before the Railway Commission during the past twelve months, and have been the subject of expert investigation. Are the matters affecting the lumber, the fish, the coal and the potatoes of the maritime provinces one whit more abstruse or more difficult to deal with than the matters

in connection with the Crowsnest pass agreement? There are thirteen articles in one of the schedules; there is one class of article in the other. Can it be said that these maritime matters are more difficult? In what respect is it more difficult to fix the rate on coal than it is to fix the rate on building materials, and so forth? You can go through the whole list, but I wish to take no more time to point them out in detail. It all tends to enforce my view that the one and only body that should have dealt with this matter and that could have given us expert information and advice was the Railway Commission of Canada. It is only a matter of proceeding step by step. Cut this matter off and next year for some other political purpose there will have to be some other fission somewhere; and by and by you will reduce the Railway Commission, by that process, to an absolute absurdity. I am not discussing the personnel of the Railway Commission. One hon. member to my right did, to some extent, make some reference to it. He was in favour, as I understood him, of dealing with these matters by the Railway Commission, but he did not like the present commission. Well, he might be matched. I am sure an hon. member could be found on the other side of the House, even in the ranks of the ministry, who could wax much more warm on the subject of the personnel of the Railway Commission than did my hon. friend from Toronto (Mr. Church).

Then the committee proceeds further. They admit that—

> Fixing rates by legislation is no doubt generally a bad principle, because it hampers the free action of the Board of Railway Commissioners and may create a discrimination in favour of the commodities covered by statutory rates.

They further say that the board—

> —is the only body in Canada equipped for the determination of the intricate matters relative to railway rate making—

And that

> The matter of the Crowsnest agreement becoming effective or being suspended is related to other concrete railway rate issues either pending or imminent.

They say:

> The one reacts upon the other, and both upon the whole freight rate structure which must, within a short period of time, undergo many substantial changes. The question would seem to be largely one that can best be treated by one body, the Board of Railway Commissioners.

Now, Mr. Speaker, that is not my language. That is the language of the gentlemen who sat for weeks listening to evidence and compiling this report, down to the time that the compilation was suddenly interrupted for the purpose of putting a new tail on the report. It really was unfortunate that the author of the report did not revise it in the light of his latest instructions, because he has created a most illogical document. The whole argument, the whole reasoning, the whole direction of the report is to the Railway Commission. Then it winds up with a cool proposition to throw the Railway Commission overboard and to plunge into this thing directly by legislation with reference to one part of the subject, and let the rest go to the Railway Commission.

When the agreement was established we find that it was divided in the matter of rates, and even the committee itself points out the division. One branch provides for a percentage reduction of the rates upon a class—you have ten or thirteen articles—from any point east of Fort William to any point west of Fort William. That is the first division. But the second division provides for specific reduction of rates upon grain and flour from all points west of Fort William to Fort William and Port Arthur. Parliament is now asked to continue number two; but it is to leave number one to the Railway Commission. Is it possible that it requires a different order of intelligence to deal with these two branches? Why, even as to the agreement itself the commission has become paralyzed and ceases to function. It can only do half of that job; it might just as well have a little rubber stamp marked "political agreement", and put that down on the paper. It would at least have been clear, intelligible, honest and direct.

I was asked by an hon. member, to say whether this would have any effect upon the business of Canada. I shall answer that question possibly in two ways. The first way—and I think the most effective way in appealing to the intelligence of the hon. member and his fairness—is to say that the answer is: That until he knows, as a member of the committee, with practical certainty, what loss will be involved, particularly to the Canadian National Railways, he is not in a position to recommend any legislation to this House. That information he has not got. I have seen it estimated, I think, all the way from about $8,000,000, roughly speaking, down to about $2,638,000—something of that kind. I do not profess to be able to follow the peculiar

calculations by which, in varying form, results have been obtained by different witnesses who appeared before the committee. But I say that this is obvious: If you take all the grain trade of Canada that is handled by the railways of Canada, and reduce that by a certain amount in the rate, the result distributed between the two systems of railways that handle it, must be borne by those railways together. One of the systems is the property of the people of Canada. For every dollar that that system loses the people of Canada—not of the prairie provinces only but the people of the Dominion as a whole—have to make up the difference by taxation, in many cases direct. Hon. members complain that all our income taxation is swallowed up by the railway burden. It is unfortunately true, even if we take the operating deficit alone it was said to be something over $31,000,000 on the Canadian National Railways, including the Grand Trunk. Now shall we add to that ten per cent, that being the very lowest calculation that has been made by anybody in this committee? I would suggest to my hon. friends to consider very carefully whether we should add to the operating deficit something more than ten per cent of that amount and ask all the people of Canada to bear it in order that a certain class of traffic may be hauled for possibly less than it costs. My hon. friend cannot say whether the amount is more or less than the cost of hauling it; I cannot say; but the Railway Commission can. Then, even if that class of traffic is profitable there must be classes of traffic less profitable, and other classes more profitable. It is a matter of adjusting the thing to its proper relative place in the scale. The committee cannot do it, this House cannot do it, but the Railway Commission ought to be able to do it.

Now that is one ground alone upon which this could be met. The other ground is that for every dollar by which you reduce the income of a railway company in respect of certain specific traffic, by so much less can you reduce the rates upon the other traffic that does not fall within that specific category. These other classes of traffic mean the business of every other part of Canada, except that which is included within the scope of the Crowsnest pass agreement. Before you shift the burden from one side to the other, you surely ought to know how much of a burden there is to shift, and what the effect upon other interests will be in making that shift. But the committee come to the House, and they do not know. It will be a brave man among the members of that committee, unfortified by facts, who will rise and say he does know. The document itself and the evidence taken before the committee will contradict him. No intelligent man reading his speech and reading the evidence will find the slightest justification for the assertions. No such man has yet arisen in the chamber. Still it is not beyond the bounds of probability or possibility that some hon. member may make assertions of that kind. They will be unjustified, but that will not matter. The vote is foreseen. It is a question of counting the votes. Nobody is going to be affected by any possible reasoning in regard to it, but it is advisable that a section of the country such as the maritime provinces should be placed fairly and squarely on record in regard to this matter.

I am going to vote for the amendment, but at the same time I am going to state my personal position, which is only personal, and which goes considerably beyond that of any hon. member who has spoken. My position is that the only proper way to deal with this matter is to absolutely abrogate the Crowsnest pass agreement and any other special agreement that exists anywhere in Canada in regard to railway rates and leave the whole subject open, including fair consideration for any interests which may exist in the Crowsnest territory or elsewhere that is dependent upon a condition of affairs created by the Crowsnest pass agreement, or by any other agreement which has been made. Instead of making an arbitrary rule, I would leave it to the commission in this way, that it should not be considered unjust discrimination to give some benefit to the people who have formerly had that benefit in the Crowsnest pass area, if it were shown to the commission that it was necessary for the preservation of their industrial or commercial life. I would say the same thing in regard to any special agreement that had been made anywhere, and I would apply the very same language to that unwritten but no less binding agreement by which the maritime provinces, at the risk of great sacrifice, became members of this Confederation.

I will go a step further. Someone will ask: Why should you abrogate an agreement assented to in good faith and with legislative sanction? I will try to answer

that. In the first place, as has already been stated, it was an agreement between the nation and the Canadian Pacific Railway—not between any particular provinces of Canada and the Dominion. It was the nation's money that bought the privilege. It is the nation's right to forego the privilege, if it seems right and just to forego it. But there is another element which enters into it. That agreement was entered into, I think, in 1897. In 1903, in regard to the question of railways generally, they developed the legislation, which I think had started in Great Britain and had spread to many cities of the American Union, and has since been adopted, I believe, by every province of Canada. I refer to legislation regulating public utilities. Now the moment that you adopt legislation of that character you place the public utility affected in a very different position from that which it occupied anterior to the passing of the legislation. Prior to the passage of the legislation the company had a right to make all the money it could out of its business, even if that business was selling to the people, water or gas, or light, or transport —things that are generally denominated as public utilities to-day. There was no limit to the measure of the return a man might take from his investment, but the moment you get public utility regulations, you say to the investor "We will control the rates which you may charge to the public." That is wise and beneficial legislation, but when you do that you enter into a moral compact with the investor that you will not force him to charge such rates as will result in the ruin of his enterprise and the destruction of his invested capital. It is that semi-Bolshevik spirit that is too much abroad in Canada to-day, that can never see an aggregation of capital or a useful enterprise without seeking to strike it, damn it, or pull it down. There is an idea that a shareholder is a monopolist, a man trying to take life blood out of somebody else. It is quite true that capital has its rights just as much as anything else, but it has no right to be unjust or dishonest. It has a right to be protected so long as it is legitimate, and, therefore, having passed the Railway Act, Canada is in a position where it ought to see no injustice is done to any private investor in any private railway company. I start with that as an absolute axiom. In the second place, the public utility regulation was assumed by the state. It was one of its principles that there should be no discrimination, or, as sometimes expressed, no unjust discrimination, and it has become one of the cardinal features of legislation of that class that all previously made private agreements inconsistent with the particular legislation should be abrogated. On that broad general principle, I say that this Parliament will not only be justified in removing, but will fail to do its duty unless it removes, this special legislation and all other special legislation with regard to rates from the statute books of the Dominion.

Mr. CHURCH: The hon. member says he is in favour of the suspension of the Crowsnest pass agreement. If so, is he in favour of demanding that the Canadian Pacific Railway should return the three and a half million subsidy which they receive from the Government of Canada in consideration of the agreement which the Canadian Pacific made that a reduction should be made in the freight rates?

Mr. BAXTER: That is another matter entirely. I read the report of the debate on the Crowsnest pass matter, and I judge from that that the subsidy was only a very ordinary subsidy for those times, and that the railway would have got that subsidy irrespective of the making of this agreement and that that was simply something imposed upon the railway to create a more immediate development of the area that would be opened up by the building of the Crowsnest pass railway. As to whether I would demand it or not, my hon. friend will have to put me in a position where I could be a negotiator. There are many things I have in my mind that I do not always express. The debate which I read impressed me, but entirely apart from the question of whether Canada is to get back the money or not, the fact remains that until you abrogate every special agreement, you cannot deal fairly with all parts of Canada and every interest in Canada.

Mr. MACLEAN (York): Will the hon. member move an amendment for the abrogation of the Crowsnest pass agreement? I cannot do so now, but I should be only too glad to second such an amendment.

Mr. BAXTER: Without having the slightest hope that we shall be able to command even a reasonable majority in the House, I am quite willing to oblige my hon. friend, because I am never afraid to put

my vote or name behind my declarations and my views. I, therefore,

10 p.m. move in amendment to the amendment, that in the opinion of this House, regardless of all other considerations, the Crowsnest pass agreement should be immediately abrogated.

Mr. MACLEAN (York): I will second that.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: I must inform the hon. member that, under rule 42 of this House, an amendment must be in writing before it can be presented to the House.

Mr. SPEAKER (having resumed the Chair): Mr. Baxter moves, seconded by Mr. Maclean (York):

That all the words after "that" in the amendment be struck out and the following substituted therefor:

In the opinion of this House the Crowsnest pass agreement should at once be abrogated.

The question is on the sub-amendment.

Mr. CHURCH: I should like to know if the amendment of the hon. member for St. John and Albert (Mr. Baxter) is in order, inasmuch as exclusive jurisdiction over rates is, by law, the function of the Railway Commission.

Mr. SPEAKER: Yes.

Mr. MACLEAN (York): The hon. member for North Toronto (Mr. Church) urged that something like this be done. Now that it is done, he says that it is out of order.

Sub-amendment (Mr. Baxter) negatived.

The House divided on the proposed amendment (Sir Henry Drayton) which was negatived on the following division:

YEAS

Messrs.

Anderson,
Arthurs,
Baxter,
Black (Yukon),
Bowen,
Boys,
Chaplin,
Charters,
Dickie,
Drayton (Sir Henry),
Duncan,
Garland (Carleton),
German,
Grimmer,
Guthrie,
Hanson,
Harris,
Hocken,
Hubbs,
Jones,
MacKelvie,
MacLaren,
McKillop,
McQuarrie,
Manion,
Maybee,
Meighen,
Mewburn,
Ross (Kingston),
Ryckman,
Senn,
Sheard,
Simpson,
Spence,
Stansell,
Stevens,
Stewart (Hamilton),
Stewart (Leeds),
Sutherland,
Thompson,
Tolmie,
White,
Wilson—43.

NAYS

Messrs.

Archambault,
Baldwin,
Bancroft,
Beaubien,
Béland,
Binette,
Bird,
Black (Huron),
Boivin,
Bouchard,
Boucher,
Bourassa,
Brethen,
Brown,
Bureau,
Cahill,
Caldwell,
Campbell,
Cannon,
Cardin,
Carmichael,
Casgrain,
Chevrier,
Chew,
Chisholm,
Church,
Clifford,
Coote,
Copp,
Crerar,
d'Anjou,
Davies,
Déchêne,
Delisle,
Demers,
Denis (Joliette),
Denis (St. Denis),
Desaulniers,
Deslauriers,
Drummond,
Duff,
Eliott (Dundas),
Elliott (Waterloo),
Ethier,
Euler,
Evans,
Fafard,
Fansher,
Fielding,
Findlay,
Fontaine,
Forke,
Forrester,
Fortier,
Fournier,
Gardiner,
Garland (Bow River),
Gauvreau,
Gendron,
Gervais,
Good,
Gordon,
Gouin (Sir Lomer),
Gould,
Graham,
Halbert,
Hammell,
Hatfield,
Hodgins,
Hoey,
Hudson,
Hughes,
Humphrey,
Hunt,
Irvine,
Jelliff,
Johnson (Moosejaw),
Johnston (Last Mountain),
Kay,
Kellner,
Kennedy (Edmonton),
Kennedy (Essex),
Kennedy (Glengarry and Stormont),
Kennedy (Port Arthur and Kenora),
King (Huron),
King (Kootenay),
King, Mackenzie (York),
Knox,
Kyte,
Lafortune,
Lanctôt,
Lapierre,
Lapointe,
Leader,
Léger,
Lewis,
Lovett,
Lovie,
Lucas,
Macdonald (Pictou),
Mackinnon,
Maclean (Halifax),
MacLean (Prince, P.E.I.),
Maclean (York),
Macphail,
McBride,
McConica,
McDonald (Timiskaming),
McGiverin,
McIsaac,
McKay,
McKenzie,
McMurray,
McTaggart,
Malcolm,
Marcil (Bonaventure),
Marcil (Bagot),
Marler,
Martell,
Mercier,
Michaud,
Millar,
Milne,
Mitchell,
Morrison,
Morrissy,
Motherwell,
Munro,
Murdock,
Neill,
Ouimet,
Pacaud,
Papineau,
Parent,
Pelletier,
Power,
Prevost,
Pritchard,
Putnam,
Raymond,
Reed,
Robb,
Robinson,
Robitaille,
Ross (Simcoe),
St. Père,
Sales,
Savard,
Séguin,

Sexsmith,	Thurston,
Shaw,	Tobin,
Sinclair (Oxford),	Trahan,
Sinclair (Queens, P.E.I.),	Turgeon,
Speakman,	Vien,
Spencer,	Wallace,
Steedsman,	Ward,
Stewart (Argenteuil),	Warner,
Stewart (Humboldt),	Woods,
Stork,	Woodsworth—169.

PAIRS

(The list of pairs as furnished by the Chief Whips is as follows:

Ministerial.	Opposition.
Blackadder,	LeSueur,
Jacobs,	Bristol,
McMaster,	Porter,
Low.	Stewart.

Mr. W. W. GERMAN (Welland): I did not take up the time of the House in speaking to the amendment, but before the main motion is put I desire to state my attitude in regard to both the motion and the amendment. I have had the honour of sitting in Parliament for a good many years. It is 31 years now since I first sat in the House of Commons of Canada, and I am free to say that in all that time I have not seen such a change of front on the part of a good many members as I have witnessed in the last three days. However, I am not the keeper of any man's conscience; I have enough to do with my own. I consider this matter from the standpoint of a business transaction. To my mind there are no politics whatever in connection with it; it is simply and solely a business transaction. As I understand the situation, even though the Government are solidly in favour of the report, if the amendment moved by the hon. member for West York (Sir Henry Drayton) had carried it would not have been a vote of censure on the administration. This is not a government proposition; it is a business proposition emanating from a committee appointed by this House to inquire into freight rates. I took a decided stand in that committee and although we may not, under the rules of the House, discuss what has taken place in special committees, I believe that when the proceedings of this committee are made generally known to the people there will be some surprise in a good many quarters. Now, it is my opinion that freight rates in this country must come down from what they have been and what they are to-day. The Crowsnest pass agreement will come into force on July 6th, unless it is further suspended by act of this Parliament. The result of that rate agreement is a discrimination throughout the country in the matter of freight rates. Indeed, the agreement not only creates a discrimination in the country as a whole, but there will be discrimination in the very part of Canada which it is claimed that the agreement was entered into to benefit, and that is the western provinces; because that agreement can be effective only on lines of railways that were in existence at the time it was entered into. So that the Canadian Pacific Railway, which at that time had only half its present mileage, will be seriously affected. It is obvious therefore that more than one-half of the particular part of Canada which is interested in this agreement will be discriminated against if the agreement goes into effect. There will be a discrimination in freight rates, even out there; and more particularly will that discrimination be felt in the eastern portions of Canada. The railway men who appeared before the committee submitted a proposition for reduction in rates, and the member for Halifax (Mr. Maclean) made a statement as to the percentages by which these rates were to be reduced, namely, sixteen and two-thirds per cent in the West, in existing rates, and twenty per cent in the East. Matters came to a point where the western members agreed to a suspension of the Crowsnest pass agreement on all commodities other than grain and flour. I asked the question—and in this particular I do not think I shall be out of order—whether the railway companies would stand by the proposition of a reduction in freight rates of sixteen and two-thirds per cent in the West and twenty per cent in the East if the Crowsnest pass agreement were suspended, except as to grain and flour. They would not agree to this.

Now what is the position? The whole freight rate question is in the air; and the proposition of the railway companies is naturally withdrawn. The gentlemen representing the railway companies presented their proposition, to be effective if and when the Crowsnest pass agreement was suspended. So that what we shall have is a fixed rate on grain and flour from the West to the East, but on all other commodities the rate is to be fixed by the Railway Board. According to the evidence and the report the loss to the Canadian Pacific Railway will be something over $7,000,000 on grain and flour, while the loss to the Canadian National lines will be over $8,000,000, or $15,000,000 in all; and that money must be made up by an in-

creased rate on products in the East. I say this on the strength of the statement of the Board of Railway Commissioners—and this is one of the things that influenced me in coming to the conclusion I arrived at—that as a sine qua non the Canadian Pacific Railway must have earnings sufficient to pay their dividends. The rates will be fixed according to the decision of the board on a basis which it is assumed will earn to the Canadian Pacific Railway Company the dividends they have hitherto paid. What does that mean? It means that this $15,000,000 must be paid by the manufacturers and farmers in the eastern portion of Canada. There is nothing else for it; I say that is a discrimination which should not exist. I believe the proper principle to have adopted, the proper report to have brought in, was a suspension of the Crowsnest pass agreement for two years, with power to the Governor in Council to suspend for another year if that was deemed advisable. That is the principle that I supported in the committee and that is the principle I support now.

Mr. MACLEAN (York): Has my hon. friend an amendment to offer?

Mr. GERMAN: I have not an amendment; that is why I supported the amendment of the hon. member for West York (Sir Henry Drayton), which is based on that principle. I did not altogether like the wording of the amendment of the hon. member for West York, but as I say, it emphasizes the principle that I believe in—the suspension of the Crowsnest pass agreement for at least a year with power to the Governor in Council to suspend it for another year if that should be deemed expedient. These rates could at the end of that time be fixed by the Board of Railway Commissioners. I believe that conditions will by that time have become such as to justify a further reduction of freight rates so as to bring them down to where they were before the war—that is to say, lower than the rates as fixed by the Crowsnest pass agreement. That will be the result eventually; in the meantime my position was as I have stated. We have come now to the original report, which must be adopted or the Crowsnest pass agreement will go into effect on the 6th of next month. On the basis of preferring half a loaf to no bread, I certainly would rather see this report adopted than see the original Crowsnest pass agreement go into force on the 6th day of July. That is why, the amendment having been voted down, I do not intend to vote against this report. To do that would be to place the whole matter in abeyance; the Crowsnest pass agreement would again come into effect and we would be in a far worse position than that which we are in at the present time.

Mr. SPEAKER: Is the House ready for the question?

Some hon. MEMBERS: Question.

Mr. SPEAKER: The question is on the main motion of Mr. Maclean (Halifax) that the report of the committee be adopted. Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt the motion? Shall I say "carried"?

Some hon. MEMBERS: Carried.

Mr. SPEAKER: I declare the motion carried.

RAILWAY ACT, 1919, AMENDMENT

Right Hon. W. L. MACKENZIE KING (Prime Minister) moved for leave to introduce Bill No. 206, to amend the Railway Act, 1919.

He said: Mr. Speaker, this bill is based upon the recommendation of the report of the committee which has just been adopted. Its purpose is to suspend the Crowsnest pass agreement, except as regards grain and flour, for a period of one year, and to give to the Governor in Council power to suspend for a further period of one year if in his judgment the then existing conditions justify that course.

Motion agreed to and bill read the first time.

Mr. SPEAKER: When shall the bill be read the second time?

Some hon. MEMBERS: Now.

Mr. SPEAKER: Moved by Mr. Mackenzie King, seconded by Mr. Fielding, that the said bill be now read the second time. Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt the motion?

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: I would like to recall to the attention of the House the statement I made on May 4 when the question of the Crowsnest pass agreement was, among other matters, referred by the House to the Special Committee on Railway Transportion Costs. On that day I spoke as follows:

In order that there may be no mistake as to the Government's position on this matter, I have reduced to writing the exact statement of the Government's position towards the expira-

tion of the Crowsnest pass agreement, and I hope my hon. friends opposite, after hearing it, will feel, as I think they ought to feel, that, as regards this particular resolution, there is no reason why it should not have their wholehearted support. In a word, the Government's policy is this:

Unless it can be shown that in the public interest there are good and sufficient reasons why, what is termed the Crowsnest pass agreement of 1897, should not again become operative in July next, the existing Statute will not be interfered with.

In other words, the suspension of the Crowsnest pass agreement will then have expired.

A little further on I said:

All that the Government is asking is that there shall be an opportunity, not alone to the Government itself, but to the members of Parliament and to the country, to understand all that is involved in the coming into effect of that agreement on July 6th of this year, or in the continued suspension of it after that date.

The committee, in the report which has just been adopted, has gone, Mr. Speaker, very fully into all that is implied in the partial suspension of the agreement as proposed in the bill. In its report the committee says:

Some of the reasons advanced in 1918 as justifying the suspension of the Crowsnest pass agreement have disappeared, and your committee has reached the conclusion that an immediate reduction of freight rates on grain and flour is in the national interest.

Your Committee, therefore, recommends a suspension of the Crowsnest pass agreement, except in respect of grain and flour, for one year from July 6, 1922, with power to the Governor in Council to suspend for a further period of one year, if in its judgment the then existing conditions justify the same.

There was only one dissenting voice, I am informed, to the acceptance of its report by the committee. The House has just adopted the report, I think, without any dissent, and it is on the recommendation of the report of the committee that this bill is based.

Right Hon. ARTHUR MEIGHEN (Leader of the Opposition): Mr. Speaker, the first remark I wish to make has to do with almost the last sentence that fell from the lips of the Prime Minister (Mr. Mackenzie King). In that sentence he stated that the House had just adopted a report without dissent. He said that in the face of a vote by which the House has just passed on an amendment moved by the Opposition, and in the face of a recorded vote on the main motion "carried on division." The House by no means adopts this report without dissent. The dissent of the Opposition is decided, and it is reinforced by the arguments advanced frankly by the hon. member for Welland (Mr. German); advanced just as strongly by the hon. member for Halifax (Mr. Maclean) and just as strongly by the hon. member for Pictou (Mr. Macdonald); arguments expressed tersely and forcefully in the report itself—all of which tell against the conclusion the report arrives at and which the Government in an attitude of helpless silence now seeks to implement by legislation.

The Crowsnest pass agreement is embodied in legislation of this House dating back to 1897. As stated by the hon. member for Halifax, it has virtually been without effect from that day to this. For some time, possibly, the rates under it were lower than they otherwise would have been—for the time that intervened between the passing of that legislation and the creation of the Railway Commission. I apprehend myself that the agreement was not ratified at the time by this Parliament in the belief that there was to be established thereby any discriminatory rates, any rates that would not have been enforced at that time by any efficient judicial tribunal which had charged upon it the duty of fixing rates fair to all classes of producers and to all portions of the country. At that time there was no such tribunal, and as part consideration for some subventions then made this reduction was agreed to by the Canadian Pacific Railway Company. It was not felt on any side to constitute anything in the way of discriminatory rates. After the creation of the Railway Commission, rates fell far below the Crowsnest pass schedule, and remained far below until the summer of 1918. Then the McAdoo awards forced a situation wholly abnormal in this country. Then it was seen that the Crowsnest pass agreement, were it kept in effect, would have resulted not only against the public advantage, but in such a disaster as would mean the paralysis of the whole railway traffic of Canada. Consequently, that agreement was then suspended. We are now at the expiration of the suspension, and Parliament is about to decide by legislation what shall be done as regards the continuance of the suspension so expiring.

A committee was appointed on the 4th day of May, such committee being asked to inquire into the general question of transportation costs and to hear witnesses as to the effect on the whole rate structure of this country of the Crowsnest pass agreement. At the time I expressed the view that a general inquiry of this sort by a committee of Parliament was a wholly

impracticable and worthless piece of procedure, that inquiry into transportation costs by a committee with a view to ascertaining the effect of the continuance of the Crowsnest pass agreement upon the rate structure of Canada could end in nothing, and could have no result save to delay a determination of policy by the Government, which determination had to be made before general reductions in Canada could take place. I wonder have I been vindicated by the event?

Som hon. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

Mr. MEIGHEN: I wonder is the view then expressed not expressed just as well, and possibly more forcefully, in the report of this committee? Is there any finding here on transportation costs? There is an acknowledgement by the committee that they have come back with hands empty, with nothing to report on the whole subject. Is there any verdict here, any information in this report to throw light to this Parliament on the question as to what effect the Crowsnest pass agreement would have now on transportation costs? There is an open confession that the committee can make no finding or even comment on that point at all, and the report abounds in the conclusion expressed over and over again that the whole subject of transportation costs, and the effect of the continuance of the agreement upon that subject, is one for the Railway Commission, and for the Railway Commission alone. If the members of that committee had come back to Parliament and said: "We find we were wrong in voting against the Opposition amendment,—the amendment should have carried," their language would have been no more explicit than the language of the report to-day. But it has had the effect of delay. For four months Parliament has been sitting, for two months since that motion was made, and the people of Canada have been paying excessive freight rates, because of the farce of that committee. Had the Government come to its conclusion at the opening of this session and brought it down, the people of this country in every part of Canada would have saved millions in transportation costs and there would have been that revival of business that such reduction brings about; there would have been acceleration in the recovery of this country from the after effects of war.

That is all we have got out of the committee. Well, not quite all. No, we have a piece of reasoning, we have something new in the realm of logic. We have a process of deduction which I think should be spread before the minds of all interested, for their delectation and amusement.

I have the report before me. It declares in explicit language:

> Fixing rates by legislation is no doubt generally a bad principle, because it hampers the free action of the Board of Railway Commissioners and may create a discrimination in favour of the commodities covered by statutory rates.

I hope the House notes the full effect of that sentence. I wonder does any one question the truth of that sentence? Is there any one who in his mind to-night has the slightest doubt as to its absolute fidelity to truth? And if it is true, how does this House now justify fixing rates on any commodity whatever? The next sentence reads:

> The Crowsnest pass agreement was enacted before the institution of the board. This board, created in 1903, have been charged by the Parliament of Canada with the duty of regulating railway rates and of establishing just and reasonable railway rates. It is the only body in Canada equipped for the determination of the intricate matters relative to railway rate making.

The only one. It goes on:

> The matter of the Crowsnest agreement becoming effective or being suspended is related to other concrete railway rate issues either pending or imminent. The one reacts upon the other, and both upon the whole freight rate structure which must, within a short period of time, undergo many substantial changes. The question would seem to be largely one that can best be treated by one body, the Board of Railway Commissioners.

Now, all the facts adduced,—not very many, all the premises laid down, all the reasoning advanced up to that point, are wholly consistent with the quotation I have just made. There is no want of harmony. There is no collision. All is consistent up to that point. What follows? Having declared that there is one body, and one only, constituted and equipped to decide the matter of rates, it then proceeds to say that as respects grain that body shall not be permitted to do so. I felt some sorrow for the hon. member for Halifax (Mr. Maclean). I was going to say that I knew his mind on this question. I once knew it, and I think I know it yet. The hon. member's mind, though it moves somewhat cautiously, moves true to reason if he gives it a chance. It is of sound and honest structure. When, from that point on he proceeded to explain to the House the conclusion of the report, the reluctance, the hesitation,

the mildness and the meekness of his sentences convinced me that they did not express his thought at all, convinced me that he knew he was enunciating not a conclusion from facts, not the result of the reasoning of his mind, but an irrational decision forced upon him by the Government after log-rolling for two months with hon. gentlemen to my left. Yes, the Railway Board is the only body in Canada equipped or fitted to give judgment on these matters; but he says, "we find that grain is very important to three provinces." It is a "basic industry of three provinces of Confederation," and furthermore "the prosperity of that basic industry is a factor vitally affecting the economic welfare of the nation." More than that, the grain grown in those prairie provinces is "mostly for export purposes," and the price of that commodity is settled "by competition in the world's markets." He puts that motley collection of words together as a reason for concluding that the Railway Commission should not be allowed to decide the freight rates on grain. It is true that grain is the main industry of these three provinces. Very well, is not something else the main industry of other provinces? Is not something else the main industry of British Columbia? Is not something else the main industry of Quebec? And if so, why not withdraw the subjects of those main industries from the Railway Commission too? The success of the grain industry, he says, is vital to the nation. Very well, is not the success of other industries vital too?

Mr. McMASTER: Were not those things covered by a special contract?

Mr. MEIGHEN: And is the contract sacred? If so, why is the hon. member himself voting to violate it? Contract of course. We are debating now whether the contract is to our national advantage be cause if it is not we shall not longer bind ourselves by it, provided the other party is ready to let us out. The other party is ready, and we are deciding whether it is in our interests or not. The next assertion is this: That the grain is mostly for export. So is our copper, so is our nickel, so is our cheese. The very same could be said of all these and a dozen more—pulpwood for example. Why should not those be withdrawn from the Railway Commission? Think, Mr. Speaker, of this piece of reasoning with which the Government has coincided. I do not know that I am surprised at the Government, but I am surprised at many hon. members behind the Government. The report says, "The rate on wheat and grain is very important. It is immensely important that such rate be decided rightly." In the paragraph preceding it is said that the only body that could decide the rate rightly is the Railway Commission. And this follows: "Because it is something important we will not let the Railway Commission, which is competent, decide it, but we will turn it into this Parliament, which is incompetent, and let Parliament decide it." Such is the report for which the hon. member for Brome voted.

Mr. McMASTER: As regards incompetency I trust the right hon. member is only speaking for his own group.

Mr. MEIGHEN: I am not speaking for my own group when I said we voted for this report; I was speaking for the hon. member for Brome. The hon. member for Brome voted that way and also other hon. members of the Government, but I am more surprised at him than at some of the others—

Mr. McMASTER: As a matter of fact I was paired, otherwise I would have voted for the report.

Mr. MEIGHEN: They say, "Because the grain trade of this country is an important industry, we will not let the decision on the freight rates on that subject go to the only body that is competent to fix the freight rates; we will hold fast to it and decide it here in a body that is not equipped, that does not know the facts." The committee, after two months' consideration, says: "We do not know the facts. We do not know what effect it is going to have, but we will let it be decided by this unequipped, incompetent body, and take the consequences." "Oh," it is whispered somewhere, "there are some who have not confidence in the Railway Commission." That was stated, I know, in evidence before the committee. Indeed I do not know what can be behind the motive of the Government in supporting this report unless it also has no confidence in the Railway Commission. I know that one hon. member of the Government used to declare very loudly that he had no confidence. I know that he has been astonishingly silent in this debate. His representations still lie under consideration on the desk of the administration, and the personnel of the board hangs between heaven and earth awaiting the verdict of the Government.

That is the condition of affairs they think proper for this country—the right position in which to suspend the Railway Board. Well, if this decision arises in any degree out of lack of full confidence in the board, is the result any more logical than it was? They say: "the board is the right body, and we have confidence in it, to fix the rates on coal, but we have not enough confidence in it to allow it to fix the rates on wheat. We take out of the original Crowsnest pass agreement all fruits, and we declare that we will let the Railway Commissioners fix the rates on fruits, but we will not let them fix the rates on flour; we have not confidence enough in them for that. We will take binder twine out, we will take farm implements out, we will take furniture out, and we will let the Railway Commissioners fix the rates on all these unimpeded; but for the life of us we cannot summon confidence enough in them to let them fix the rates on wheat." What a fine position to be in!

To-day the grain growers of the West come, and they say to the Government: "Grain is an important industry in our country. We ask you to make an exception, we ask you to take it away from the Railway Commission and fix the rates by log-rolling and agreement in Parliament because grain raising is an important industry." Next week the coal mine owners of Nova Scotia will come down to this Government and will say: "Here, the raising and the selling of coal is an important and vital industry to our country. We want you to take that out from the Railway Commission and fix a low rate by Parliament." What is going to be the answer of the Government to that appeal?

Mr. CARROLL. It is not out.

Mr. MEIGHEN: The hon. member says it is not out.

Mr. CARROLL: It never was out.

Mr. MEIGHEN: Does the hon. member want it out?

Mr. CARROLL: I certainly do.

Mr. MEIGHEN: I expected he would. And what answer is the Government to make to him?

Mr. CARROLL: General lower rates.

Mr. MEIGHEN: That would be a fine answer. The Government says it will not interfere except in grain. But if a delegation should come and ask this Parliament to take coal out of the jurisdiction of the Railway Commission and fix by statute the rate of freight to be charged thereon, we could give no answer at all.

Mr. CARROLL: We are not selfish.

Mr. MEIGHEN: I hope the compliment is understood by hon. gentlemen on my left. The following week the farmers of British Columbia come to the Government and they say that fruit is the mainstay of agriculture in British Columbia. They show this Government that fruit was in the Crowsnest pass agreement and they say: "We must have special rates on fruit. You gave it to wheat and flour for the prairie provinces and we want the same concessions for British Columbia. We want fruit taken out of the jurisdiction of the Railway Commission and we want it fixed by Parliament." What can be the answer of the Government. Can they make any answer to the fruit growers of British Columbia? Has the Minister of Public Works (Mr. King, Kootenay) an answer for his people? Has he even thought of the position which the Government have placed him in?

Mr. KING (Kootenay): Fruit coming from British Columbia is not in the Crowsnest pass agreement.

Mr. MEIGHEN: But fruit is out of the Crowsnest pass agreement for good, if my hon. friend's Government has his way tonight.

Mr. KING (Kootenay): Fruit from the west is not under the agreement.

Mr. MEIGHEN: Fruit going west is in, but not coming east. So the hon. member is satisfied. Has the Government not just as much right to deal with fruit because it is the basic industry of British Columbia, as on the appeal of the prairie provinces it has now to deal with grain? Can the hon. minister make any answer to the farmers of his province when they say to him "Our rights are just as strong as our brothers in the prairies? We have just as much right to have parliament enact a special rate for us as have our brothers in the prairie provinces?" What answer can the minister make to that?

What answer can be made to the stock growers of the prairie provinces themselves? They had at least certain rights under the Crowsnest pass agreement. They have none whatever now. They can say "Stock raising is our only industry. We want a special rate. We had a special

rate when we were under the old agreement, and you have taken it from us, and you give the man beside us who is raising grain a special rate by act of parliament". What is going to be the answer of the Government? They have no answer to these demands. No, they have only one answer, and it is this: "We had to stay in power, and to do so we had to have the Progressive vote." That is the position. That is the position on every issue that has come before this Government. It has not been able to arrive at a conclusion on anything until it went through the necessary manœuvres to find out where just each member stood and just about how strongly he stood on his pins in that position. The whole process of deciding the right legislation and the right time to enact legislation is just a process of estimating the stiffness and the obstinacy of members of this House, of the members that stood in one quarter as against those that stood in another quarter. This matter should have been decided from the standpoint of the whole country. When you decide it by a method of concession to a district in order to get the votes of the representatives of that district, you only make the trouble greater for the other district and pile upon one class something you are taking off another class, to get a political result.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: In regard to what the right hon. member has just stated, does he think the Government should pay no attention to the views entertained by members of this Parliament?

Mr. MEIGHEN: Certainly, but they should also pay attention to the arguments advanced in support of propositions to the realities of the case, more than to the arithmetic of the vote. One of two things is going to result. By the statutory rates on wheat and flour, discrimination because of a lower than just rate is going to be given or it is not—one or the other. If it is, by what right does the Government of Canada levy the difference or the loss upon the other class of the community? If it does not, then is the Railway Commission not competent to find that out, and, under its general unhampered jurisdiction, fix the rates at the level they are fixed there?

Mr. CRERAR: Does the hon. member favour the complete abrogation of this agreement?

Mr. MEIGHEN: I do not, and I will explain why in a moment. I favour the amendment and the amendment sets out clearly, the course which should be pursued. There has been a statutory agreement Under the terms of the Railway Act creating the Railway Commission a certain review by way of appeal was retained over the actions of that commission by the Governor in Council, and for what purpose? In order to find out, first, whether, through any inadvertence or favour, there had been omission to hear all the evidence that might be advanced before a decision was reached, and, secondly, in order that in arriving at a decision and in enforcing that decision, the Government could see that no principle of public policy had been violated. Those two reasons have been held up all through these years as the reasons that constituted the ground of the appeal, and the reasons that actuated the government in deciding what course it should take when an appeal came before it. Now in this special case there has been a statutory restraint, and certainly the right of appeal should still be sustained, but inasmuch as there has been a statutory restraint all these years, and it was not permitted for the Railway Commission to evade that restraint, therefore I say parliament would be justified in keeping jealously its hand upon the agreement until convinced that the new conditions effected as the result of its removal are satisfactory to the representatives of the people. We do so by this amendment. Let the Railway Commissioners who have the data and the equipment and machinery to act, lay before the Governor in Council—they cannot lay them before parliament now before prorogation —the new schedules they propose. Give the Governor General in Council power to revoke the suspension if he feels there is in these new rates any failure to observe any sound principle of public policy, and if there has been any failure to hear all sides of the case—

Mr. CRERAR: Would the Government in that case be a better judge than the railway commission?

Mr. MEIGHEN: On principles of public policy, yes, but not in initiating and fixing rates.

Mr. CRERAR: Is it not a question of fixing rates?

Mr. MEIGHEN: Certainly the Railway Commission fixes the rates, but in fixing

the rates there are principles of public policy that must be observed. For instance, there must be such rates as will enable trading to function between the maritime provinces and the West, and such rates as enable trading to function over the stretch of barren territory to the north of the great lakes. There must as well be an absence of discrimination. This country has proceeded on the hypothesis that, though it may be at the expense of the whole of Canada, we must bridge the chasm that lies between the maritime provinces and our central provinces, and as well bridge the chasm between the prairies and the mountain provinces of the West and the eastern provinces. We must do those things and it is the business of the Government and Parliament always to see that they are done and that no rates are enforced which prevent those two great objects being reached. It is our business I repeat, to see, even though the cost fall on the whole Dominion as a Dominion, that such rates are maintained over special stretches of territory as make possible the continuance of interprovincial traffic, without which Confederation is more of a name than a reality. If hon. member will look back over the records of the Privy Council in deciding appeals that came before it from decisions of the Railway Commission, he will find it has invariably had regard just to the considerations I have named. And in this case. where the statutory restraint is being removed, I think it only right that the hand of the Privy Council, and back of the Privy Council the hand of Parliament, should be upon the agreement which contains the restraint until we are satisfied that in such new schedules that will be given effect to when the agreement is removed, justice has been done every part of our Dominion, and, that no principle of public policy has been violated. With those things satisfactorily accomplished I would be prepared to let the agreement stand suspended, that is to say, as soon as the representatives of the people are content that there have been established on a permanent basis such schedules of rates as are fair to the various provinces of Canada, and as to make possible the great objects of confederation. But how can any hon. member who wants his future conduct to be consistent, take hold of the Railway Commission and say " We have every confidence in you to fix rates for all the basic commodities of the country, but we cannot let you fix rates on wheat and flour coming from the prairie provinces to Fort William. We must fix those ourselves by statutory enactment even though there results an unfair and indefensible discrimination. We now fix that rate. We do not know whether it is discriminatory or not, we do not know the possibility of necessary reductions elsewhere. We do not know what effect it is going to have on problems that are before us, now pending or imminent", to use the language of the report. We do not know what is to be the result from our action, but we are going to act anyway. Such is the report which we are asked to concur in to-night. I dissent from the report, because it is not based on reason or on fact. It does not pretend even to follow the facts contained in the report itself. It does not pretend even to embody the conclusion reasoned out from those facts in the language of the report itself.

[Mr. Meighen.]

The ex-Minister of Finance has proposed a thoroughly sensible and simple plan by his amendment. If, next session, in the judgment of this House, the Railway Commission has failed to discharge its duty, if the Railway Commission has failed to function as Parliament intended it to function, then it is the business of the Government to come to Parliament and to propose a remedy. Parliament has power to effect a remedy. While the Railway Commission remains as it is unmolested, it is presumably there with the confidence of this House. Presumably reposed in it is the confidence of the country; and if such be the case, surely it is the duty of Parliament to leave to the commission the exercise of its functions as they should be exercised. Its powers should be exercised subject only to review by the Government as expressed in the original act and to those special precautions outlined in the amendment which it seems proper to take on this particular occasion.

Mr. T. L. CHURCH (North Toronto): Mr. Speaker, I contend that we should not delegate to an outside authority, the Governor General in Council, power to suspend the Crowsnest pass agreement for one more year, because to do so would be class legislation of the worst kind. By clause 1 of this bill there is a provision to frame rates by legislation. This is vicious in principle; it is against the principle of the Railway Act, which provides for equality of treatment as regard rates for all localities. The general act gives the commissioners power to fix rates for all classes of the country on the principle of equal rights to all and special

privileges to none. No cry of East or West should be raised in regard to this rate question. It is an economic question and not a sectional one. There is no East and no West in fixing rates on the American railways. In the United States the rates are fixed on an economic and business basis, and in this country there should be no question of East and West in fixing rates. The late chairman, Mr. Justice Mabee, when chairman of the Board of Railway Commissioners, had no such principle or sectional way of fixing rates, and it is unjust and inequitable. It is all very well for us to have the benefit of the Crowsnest pass agreement for some products and classes in the country; but what about other classes in the West and in other parts of Canada? What about the other class of products covered by that agreement? The bogey is set up that people in the East will have to pay for the abrogation of the Crowsnest pass agreement. That is not the case. The Railway Commission should protect the East. The East paid the biggest part of the cost of constructing western lines, and it should not be discriminated against by such a class cry. The Railway Commission should do its part or be removed; it should see that any order it issues does not rob Peter to pay Paul. For that reason I beg to move, seconded by Mr. Maclean (York) that the bill be not now read the second time, but that it be read the second time this day six months hence.

Amendment (Mr. Church) negatived.

Motion agreed to, bill read the second time and the House went into committee on the bill, Mr. Gordon in the Chair.

On section 1.

Mr. W. F. MACLEAN (South York): Mr. Speaker, the question now comes back to this Parliament and it goes from them to the people. It will never be settled aright until it is settled on some public principles such as those laid down by the previous speaker (Mr. Meighen). This question has not been settled here tonight; it is widened out. Every industry that feels aggrieved now must come to Parliament for relief just as the western farmers have come for relief. Therefore, the responsibility is on the Government to frame a policy and to remedy grievances that exist, and the question will go back to the people. What has happened in this House to-night throws the question open in the election that is coming on in Manitoba next month. The people there are not satisfied with what is going on to-day. Just wait and see—that is all I have to say. Watch the developments that take place.

Mr. ARTHURS: I have no desire to delay the passing of this bill; but I should like to speak on behalf of the people in some parts of Ontario and, indeed, of Canada generally, who will be prejudicially affected by this legislation. There is no question at all that, according to the evidence given before the committee, the railways will suffer a severe loss by the adoption of the provisions contained in this bill. I represent a constituency in which many men, in fact, probably most men, are engaged, in some degree at least, in lumbering and in the pulp industry. We have had an abnormal condition throughout northern Ontario in that regard. I have in mind cases where the prospective farmer clearing a farm has been offered $3 a cord for pulpwood while the freight rate was $10 to the nearest pulp mill. These men have suffered more proportionately than the men who are raising grain; and while I have every desire to see the men raising grain have every satisfaction and every possible reduction in rates, nothing should be done to prejudice the interests of those men who are engaged in lumbering or mining or any other industry in Canada. I feel that Parliament, in passing a measure of this kind which provides that one interest shall benefit at the expense of all others, is not doing the right thing at the present time.

Mr. CRERAR: I wish to say a word in respect of the argument advanced by my hon. friend from Parry Sound (Mr. Arthurs). I think he has spoken without a full knowledge of the facts in connection with this matter. It certainly is not the desire of the farmers of western Canada to do any injustice to any other portion of the Dominion.

Mr. ARTHURS: I did not say it was the desire of the farmers of western Canada to do this. I said that the effect of this resolution would be that similar reductions could not be made on basic commodities in other parts of the country.

Mr. CRERAR: I very much question, indeed, the deduction that my hon. friend has drawn from his reading of the reports.

Mr. MEIGHEN: The report says that they do not know anything about it.

Mr. CRERAR: I was referring to the reports of the committee, to which the hon. member for Parry Sound also had refer-

rence. I was not speaking about the report submitted to Parliament to-day.

Mr. ARTHURS: I did not refer to the report of the committee. What I referred to was the evidence given before the committee by the persons who represented the various railway companies. I never referred to the report of the committee.

Mr. CRERAR: Let me make myself clear, if it is possible for me to do so. I understood that my hon. friend referred to the daily evidence given before the committee, which I was describing as reports. He deduced from that evidence that if these Crowsnest rates on grain were put into effect his lumber and pulp could not get reduced rates; and in that he has not correctly interpreted the evidence given to the committee. What was the proposal that we have heard quite a bit about during the discussion this afternoon and to-night, and which was submitted to the committee by the railways? It was a proposal for a reduction on basic commodities generally. The basic commodities were set out and it is quite true that lumber and pulp were among those specified. But in the proposal of the railways to give a reduction on basic commodities there was also the suggestion that a reduction of 20 per cent would be given on the existing grain rates. In other words, that would bring the existing grain rates down about two-thirds between where they are at present and the Crowsnest scale. All that the report recommends is that these rates be put into full effect on grain, and if this is done it will take from the railways only $3,800,000 of revenue. There is no evidence, other than the statement of the railways to the effect, to show that if the full reduction were made to the Crowsnest level on grain, reductions could not be made on basic commodities. The railways themselves, in the evidence given before the committee, state that the loss to their systems outside of grain altogether would amount to $6,163,000. If they do bring the rates down from what they have proposed to the exact level of the Crowsnest pass agreement it only means $3,800,000 of a loss. So that they still have $2,500,000 to go upon, on their own word, in making reductions on basic commodities before they would lose a cent; and I am convinced that they can make reductions on basic commodities and give the Crowsnest rates on grain without suffering in any hardship.

Mr. ARTHURS: Is it or is it not true that a question was asked in the committee whether, if the grain rates were lowered to the level of the Crowsnest agreement, the railways would then agree to reductions on other basic commodities to which they had already referred?—to which they replied, no.

Mr. CRERAR: It is quite true that the railways stated that they could not give reductions on basic commodities. But I, as one member of the committee, do not take the words of the railways in that matter. I have already pointed out that they could give almost 50 per cent of a reduction on the basic commodities they suggest without losing a single cent.

Mr. STANSELL: I was not a member of the committee and have not followed the reports very closely. But it is apparent to me that there could not have been any Ontario dairy farmers present at least judging from a perusal of the report. An exception is made in the case of rates on grain and flour, and it should certainly apply also to bran and shorts or the by-products of wheat. Most of us in Ontario who use the by-products know very well that in many cases we have to buy in mixed car lots, and under such an arrangement as this, a low rate being granted on flour, it is possible that the railways will charge correspondingly high rates on bran and shorts, which will work a hardship against the Ontario farmer who needs these by-products. I submit in all fairness that if wheat and flour moving from the West to the East are given special rates, then by-products such as bran and shorts should be put on the same basis. I firmly believe that the country demands that there shall be a substantial reduction in rates, and I believe also that the people are quite willing that a preferential treatment should be accorded certain basic commodities. Unquestionably wheat is one of those commodities to which this should apply; and I would also extend the same concession to the coal produced in the maritime provinces and possibly the fruit in the far West. It must be apparent to all of us that if we are to justify Confederation, if we are not going to tear down what has already been built up, a certain preference in the matter of rates should be given on many of the basic commodities that move East and West, so that the various provinces may be bound more closely together. Granting that, what is the fault in the present bill based on the report of the committee? Merely this: It is wrong in principle; in introducing the report the

chairman of the committee (Mr. Maclean, Halifax) said, and the same thing is stated in the report itself, that the principle is unsound of a government fixing rates. If that is correct, then it is clearly wrong for the Government or Parliament to fix rates on any special commodities. If the report had recommended that the Railway Commission fix the lowest possible rates with a special preference to certain basic commodities, then I could agree with it. In a word, when the Government says: We believe the proper principle is by legislation of our own to fix a special rate for a few provinces where we are most anxious to get some support and to let all other interests of this country depends upon pious hopes and prayers, I say that principle is wrong. If I have learned anything this session from hon. members to my left it is that they believed in certain definite principles; that in the consideration of any question those principles should first be applied; that there should be equal rights to all and special privileges to none. They have insisted on that principle all through, in the consideration of every important question, but here is one question which, on the admission of the Government itself, involves a wrong principle; yet because the loaves and fishes are extended to hon. members to my left they are willing to accept the bait, and are ready to swallow all that they previously said in that respect. I say that to proceed in this way is entirely wrong, and I cannot see how Progressive members can consistently support the bill.

Section agreed to.

Bill reported, read the third time and passed.

SOLDIERS' CIVIL RE-ESTABLISHMENT

Hon. H. S. BELAND (Minister of Soldiers' Civil Re-establishment): Mr. Speaker, before we leave the order "introduction of bills" I would ask leave to introduce a bill respecting the Department of Soldiers' Civil Re-establishment.

Mr. SPEAKER: By leave of the House.

Mr. BELAND moved for leave to introduce Bill No. 207, respecting the Department of Soldiers' Civil Re-establishment.

He said: The other day the right hon. leader of the Opposition (Mr. Meighen) asked me if we intended to introduce any legislation in connection with the report of the Re-establishment Committee that was laid on the Table at that time, and I said that outside of the resolutions themselves already printed in the Order Paper, I did not think any other legislation was required; that Orders in Council or regulations would be sufficient. It appears after consultation with the Justice Department that a bill such as this is necessary to enable the department to carry out the various recommendations of the committee. I will read the bill; it has only one clause:

> The recommendations contained in the second and final report of the Special Committee appointed at the present session of Parliament by the House of Commons to consider questions relating to pensions, insurance and re-establishment of returned soldiers, and any amendment in the existing law in relation thereto are hereby approved and put into full force and effect, subject to such regulations and limitations as the Governor in Council may prescribe.

I may say that this bill was prepared by the Parliamentary Counsel.

Mr. MEIGHEN: Mr. Speaker, this is not only contrary to the statement of the Government as to what legislation they propose but it is the most astonishing legislative proposal I think I have ever seen. I do not know whether hon. members got the purport of it as it was read by the minister. It is not that I object to the recommendations; I am not discussing that at all—generally I agree with them. But to legislate in this form would seem to me to be—well, the best way in the world to sow a plentiful crop of lawsuits. This bill may have been submitted to the Parliamentary Counsel, but I really have such profound respect for the Minister of Justice (Sir Lomer Gouin) that I venture the assertion now that it was never submitted to him.

Sir LOMER GOUIN: I may say that I was not consulted in the matter by the Parliamentary Counsel, who, I understand, prepared the bill.

Mr. BELAND: This bill was prepared by the Parliamentary Counsel and sent by him to me. I am not a lawyer, but I am willing to couch the bill in any terms that would conform to parliamentary usage. The object of the bill is to carry out the provisions of the report.

Mr. MEIGHEN: I think the bill is past redemption in its present form. There might be a bill enabling the Government to carry out the recommendations, but a bill enacting the whole body of those regulations, comprising a report that is almost

the size of a book, and to say that they shall be law—really, I do not think it does justice even to the Government.

Mr. BELAND: I may say to my right hon. friend that though I am not a lawyer I think I concur in his view. If the House will give me leave to introduce the bill, the second reading may be postponed till to-morrow and I shall have the form of it prepared by the Justice Department—which, I understand, is infallible.

Motion agreed to and bill read the first time.

SENATE BILLS

FIRST READING

Bill No. 205, respecting matches.—Mr. Fielding.

QUESTIONS

(Questions answered orally are indicated by an asterisk.)

CIVIL SERVICE BONUS

Mr. GARLAND (Carleton):

1. Why does the Government propose to cut off the bonus from all civil servants receiving $2,400 or over, and from many single persons under that amount?

2. Does the Government intend to grant higher salaries to the Civil Service?

Hon. Mr. MACKENZIE KING: The Government stated its views on this question during the discussion of the supplementary estimates on Saturday night. I do not know that the question is quite in order; I think it might be dropped, in view of what already has been stated.

Mr. SPEAKER: Dropped.

Mr. MEIGHEN: The hon. member (Mr. Garland) is not here.

Mr. SPEAKER: Stand.

CANADIAN MERCHANT MARINE—EMPLOYEES

Mr. WOODSWORTH:

What are the wages paid to engineers, stewards and other such employees of the Canadian Merchant Marine, (a) in the Pacific service and (b) in the Atlantic?

Hon. Mr. KENNEDY: In the Pacific service, engineers, including chief engineers, are paid from $120 to $230 per month; stewards, from $88 to $100 per month, and assistant stewards when employed, $48 per month. In the Atlantic service, engineers, including chief engineers, are paid from $80 per month to $200; stewards from $73 to $95 per month, and assistant stewards when employed, $48 per month.

[M. Meighen.]

CHARTERED BANKS

Mr. SPENCER:

1. What were the total profits of chartered banks between 1901-1911 and 1911-1921 inclusive?

2. What percentage do the profits of chartered banks bear to the capital between the years 1901-1921 inclusive?

3. What was the amount of Dominion Government notes in circulation 1901, 1911, 1921?

4. What is the amount of interest paid to the Dominion Government by the banks for the use of Dominion notes?

5. Where is this amount recorded in the public accounts?

6. What amount of excess circulation was issued by the chartered banks for moving the crop during the years 1911-1921 inclusive?

7. What rate of interest was paid by the chartered banks to the treasury for the use of this excess circulation?

8. What did this interest amount to?

9. Where is this amount recorded in the public accounts?

Hon. Mr. FIELDING:

1 and 2. These statistics not compiled.

3. As at April 1:

1901	$ 28,498,519 52
1911	89,994,270 25
1921	277,882,884 92

4. Answered on page 3262 of Unrevised Hansard of this Session.

5. Under miscellaneous revenue items in the revenue schedules.

6, 7 and 8. Answered on pages 3262 and 3264 of Unrevised Hansard of this Session.

9. Included in the item "Casual Revenue, Finance," in the revenue schedules.

GOVERNMENT CUTTER HUDSON

Mr. BAXTER:

1. Do Captain P. A. Sandall, engineer Charles Johnson, cook Thomas Oulton, and deckhand Alfie Lougere, constitute crew of Government cutter "Hudson"?

2. If so, when were they appointed?

3. Were they appointed on the recommendation of a local patronage committee?

4. If not, what are the names of the persons who recommended their appointment?

5. Was Captain Sandall formerly appointed in 1912 to command this cutter?

6. When was he dismissed and for what cause?

7. When the new crew took charge was the cutter not in good condition?

8. What has happened to the cutter, particularly to the machinery, since that time?

9. Was not the engineer accustomed to a stationary engine?

10. What experience had he with a marine gasoline engine?

11. Has this crew been discharged in consequence of an accident?

12. If not, for what cause and when was it discharged?

13. What, if any, correspondence on the subject has been received by the Department of

Marine and Fisheries, or any other Department of Minister, including the Secretary of State, from Captain Sandall, or any member of the crew, or any member of the Provincial Government of New Brunswick or other person?

Hon. Mr. LAPOINTE:

1. There is no government cutter Hudson. The persons named were employed on the Fisheries Patrol Boat Mildred McColl.

2. Began duty May 8th.

3 and 4. They were appointed by the Minister of Marine and Fisheries.

5. No.

6. Answered by No. 5.

7. The engine needed two new cylinders.

8. After the new cylinders were installed by the Inspecting Engineer one of them bursted when he was testing the engine, as it was defective.

9 and 10. His continued employment was contingent on the Inspecting Engineer being satisfied that he possessed the requisite qualifications. Before entering on his duties the Inspecting Engineer became convinced that he did not possess the needed qualifications and consequently his employment was not continued.

11 and 12. The crew were not discharged but their pay was discontinued until the boat was replaced.

13. This question should stand as a Notice of Motion for a return of the correspondence.

POSTAL REGULATIONS

Mr. GARLAND (Bow River):

1. Did the Post Office Department recently establish a ruling defining a bona fide subscriber to a newspaper or magazine?

2. If so, on what date?

Hon. Mr. MURPHY:

1. No.

2. Answered by No. 1.

LUSITANIA REPARATIONS CLAIMS

Mr. JACOBS:

1. Has the Government received claims of Canadian citizens for reparation for loss arising out of the sinking of the Lusitania by a German submarine in May, 1916?

2. If so, how many claims have been so received and what is the aggregate amount of such claims?

3. What steps, if any, have been taken to collect from the German Government for losses suffered as above?

4. If no steps have been taken, does the Government purpose taking any action in the premises?

Hon. Mr. COPP:

1. Yes, for loss arising out of the sinking of the Lusitania in May 1915.

2. There are 162 claims. 8 claims of no stated amount. 154 claims totalling $1,627,937.83.

3. The Treaty of Peace with Germany makes no provision for payment to the individual claimants for loss occasioned by the sinking of the Lusitania. Claims for such losses were asked for, for the purpose of computing under Article 232 and Annex to Section I of Part VIII of the Treaty, the amount payable by Germany for reparation. Any amount paid by Germany for reparation to Great Britain will be paid to Canada to the extent of Canada's allotted share. What amounts may be paid to claimants for losses sustained by the sinking of the Lusitania will then be considered.

4. Answered by 3.

CUSTOMS DUTIES—CANADIAN FORD COMPANY

Mr. STEWART (Leeds):

1. What amount of customs duty has been paid by the Canadian Ford Company in each year since 1904?

2. What amount has been paid by this company in each year by way of taxes under The Business Profits War Tax Act?

3. What amount has been paid by this company in each year by way of taxes under The Income War Tax Act?

Hon. Mr. FIELDING: For reasons set forth on April 19 in answer to a question concerning the income tax, the Minister of Finance is of opinion that the transactions of particular individuals or corporations with the Government as respects payment of taxes should not be regarded as ordinarily open to disclosure in answer to questions in the House.

MR. L. J. GABOURY

Mr. SEGUIN:

1. What are the duties of Mr. L. J. Gaboury of the Post Office Department, Montreal, Quebec?

2. Was he recently promoted, and to what position?

3. What is his salary?

4. How long has he been in the service?

5. What was his salary when first appointed?

6. At what dates did he receive increases in salary, and what amount in each case?

Hon. Mr. MURPHY:

1. Under the direction of the General Superintendent of Postal Service, to act as travelling representative of the Post Office Department in an assigned division; to supervise and co-ordinate the administration of postal service districts; to supervise the work and staffs of postal districts and instruct district superintendents and their staffs in their duties; to advise district

superintendents and other supervisory officials in matters or organization, methods of administration, and problems of discipline; to examine into the management and efficiency of district offices, post offices, railway post offices, and steamboat, rural and stage routes; on occasion, to assist the General Superintendent of Postal Service in the peformance of his duties and, when designated to act for him in his absence; and to perform other related work as required.

2. 1st March, 1921, promoted to position of Division Superintendent of Postal Service.

3. $5,400.

4. 21½ years.

5. $400.

6. 5th September, 1900, $200 on permanent appointment, $600 being minimum of junior second class; 1st October, 1901, $50, annual increase; 1st October, 1902, $50, annual increase; 1st October, 1903, $50, annual increase; 24th October, 1903, $50, (Act to amend Civil Service Act); annual increase; 1st October, 1904, $50, annual increase; 1st October, 1905, $50, annual increase; 1st October, 1906, $300, promoted to first class; 1st January, 1907, $300, maximum first class; 1st January, 1908, $500, appointed assistant postmaster at Montreal at minimum for position; 1st April, 1910, $800, salary based on revenue of office; 1st April, 1912, $400, section 2, act to amend C. S. Act, 1912; 1st January, 1913, $300, appointed superintendent city and semi-staff offices in Quebec and maritime provinces; 1st January, 1918, $500, supplementary estimates; 1st April, 1919, $800, minimum on classification; 1st April, 1920, $300, annual increase; 1st April, 1921, $300, annual increase.

WELLAND SHIP CANAL

Mr. SPENCER:

1. Has contract for sections number three and four of Welland Ship Canal been let?

2. If so, to whom and what was the total price?

3. What are the names of persons who tendered and what was the amount of their respective tenders?

4. What were the estimates of the departmental engineers for this work?

5. What security did each contracting firm submit with tenders?

Hon. Mr. KENNEDY:

1. Yes.

2. P. Lyall & Sons Construction Company, Limited, Montreal.

[Hon. Mr. Murphy.]

3. A. W. Robertson, Limited, $20,750,-762.50; P. Lyall & Sons Construction Company, Ltd., $15,497,777.10; Royal Construction Co., Toronto, $15,342,385.50.

4. $16,343,517.50.

5. As to the Robertson tender, a certificate of the Bank of Toronto, Montreal, that $850,000 in Canadian war loan bonds is held subject to the order of the Minister of Railways and Canals. As to the Lyall tender, an accepted cheque on the Molsons Bank, Montreal, for $850,000. As to the Royal Construction Company, an unaccepted cheque for $850,000.

PROVINCIAL GOVERNMENT COMMISSIONS

Mr. CHURCH:

1. How many provincial government commissions during the years 1920, 1921 and 1922 did the Hon. Justice Riddell and the Hon. Justice Latchford serve on, and how many days were they absent from their judicial duties?

2. Is it the intention of the Government to fill the vacancy in the High Court Bench of Ontario caused by the death of the late Hon. Justice Sutherland.

Sir LOMER GOUIN:

1. The Government has not been informed.

2. Yes.

UNOPPOSED MOTIONS FOR PAPERS

Mr. BAXTER:

For a copy of all correspondence from and to any member of the Government, any government department or official thereof, or other persons, with reference to the appointment and dismissal in the year 1921 and 1922 of the crew of the Government cutter Hudson.

Mr. SEGUIN:

For a copy of the Report number three, dated the seventeenth September, 1920, re Administration and Organization of the Post Office Department addressed to Council Sub-Committee on re-organization and efficiency.

AUTOMOBILE TAXES

On the Orders of the Day:

Mr. J. L. BROWN (Lisgar): May I ask what consideration has been given by the Government to the request of the automobile dealers in regard to the remission of taxes which they claim to have paid, and which they thought were to be refunded?

Hon. W. S. FIELDING (Minister of Finance): Is my hon. friend referring to the proposals in the budget of this year?

Mr. BROWN: No.

Mr. FIELDING: Referring to the budget of a year ago? Application was made to

the late government to refund the taxes in certain cases, which they did not seem able to grant, and we have not been able to change their decision.

CRIMINAL CODE AMENDMENT

On the Orders of the Day:

Mr. D. M. KENNEDY (West Edmonton): May I ask whether the Minister of the Interior (Mr. Stewart) has received a telegram from Mr. Calhoun, of Edmonton, with regard to Bill No. 54, which recently passed through this House, and if so, whether it could be read to the House?

Hon. CHARLES STEWART (Minister of the Interior): I did receive a telegram to-day.

Mr. D. M. KENNEDY: Could it be read to the House?

INTERNATIONAL LABOUR CONFERENCE

On the Orders of the Day:

Mr. J. S. WOODSWORTH (Centre Winnipeg): I believe that last Saturday the report of the International Labour Conference at Genoa was tabled. Is this report to be printed and made available for the use of the public? It would be of very great advantage to have it.

Right Hon W. L. MACKENZIE KING (Prime Minister): I think the report has already been printed in the Labour Gazette, which I thought my hon. friend read.

ARMORIAL BEARINGS OF CANADA

On the Orders of the Day:

Mr. JOHN EVANS (Saskatoon): May I at this late stage of the session be permitted to put a question which might more properly have been brought up in Committee of Supply on Saturday, when a vote of $2,000 was passed in connection with the armorial bearings of Canada. In these armorial bearings appear the arms and emblems of the English, the Irish the Scotch and the French, but I regret to say, sir, the emblem of that small nation which gives a title to the heir to the British throne, and which has given to the United Kingdom one of its greatest prime ministers—

Mr. SPEAKER: Order. Will the hon. member put his question? Argument is not permissible on the Orders of the Day.

Mr. EVANS: I desire to ask if the Government will take early steps to see that the leek of my native Wales is enshrined in our armorial bearings with the thistle, the shamrock, the lily and the rose?

Mr. MACKENZIE KING (Prime Minister): The Government will be pleased to take into consideration the suggestion of my hon. friend.

CUSTODY OF ALIEN PROPERTY

On the Orders of the Day:

Mr. J. R. CLARK (Burrard): On the 15th of May the Secretary of State (Mr. Copp) answered certain questions which I had put on the Order Paper regarding the law firms of Fisher and Oughton and of Williams and Manson. I asked whether the custody of alien property had been transferred from the firm of Fisher and Oughton to that of Williams and Manson, and the reply was in the affirmative. I asked the reason for the change and the answer was that it was made for the purpose of improving the efficiency of the administration of enemy property. I should like to know whether the Secretary of State suggests that there was any inefficiency in the administration of this property by the firm of Fisher and Oughton, and if so, whether any complaints were made by him to that firm at any time.

Hon. A. B. COPP (Secretary of State): I have nothing to add to the answers that appear in Hansard.

Mr. CLARK: May I ask whether the minister suggests that there was any inefficiency on the part of Messrs Fisher and Oughton? Is he making the charge that there was inefficiency on the part of that firm? I would call attention to—

Mr. SPEAKER: Order. The hon. member has put his question, and the minister has given his answer, and the matter must stand there. Otherwise, a debate might arise.

BANK INTEREST

On the Orders of the Day:

Mr. JOHN MILLAR (Qu'Appelle): I should like to draw the attention of the Prime Minister to a matter of considerable importance. I have two letters here received from my constituency, which I shall not take time to read to the House, but they both complain that the banks, now that money is very scarce and farmers are

very much in need of ready money, have raised their rate in many cases to as high as nine per cent. I would ask if the Government is prepared to make any representations to the banks in regard to this matter. I suppose there is no thought of revising the Bank Act before next session, but perhaps the Government would make some representations to the banks and look into this matter.

Hon. W. S. FIELDING (Minister of Finance): I am afraid there is nothing the Government could do at present. The whole question of the revision of the Bank Act will have to be taken up at another session. For the present, I do not know that anything can be done to remedy a difficulty of that kind if there is one.

DEPARTMENT OF SOLDIERS' CIVIL RE-ESTABLISHMENT

On the Orders of the Day:

Mr. W. J. WARD (Dauphin): Following some remarks I made in the House in the early part of the session regarding the Department of Soldiers' Civil Re-establishment, I have received several letters from civil servants employed in he B.P.C. at Ottawa. Probably all the members of the House are not aware that some time ago the D.S.C.R. absorbed the B.P.C. I may explain that D.S.C.R. stands for Department of Soldiers' Civil Re-establishment and B.P.C. for Board of Pension Commissioners. Can the Government inform me if permanent civil servants employed on the staff of the D.S.C.R. are being dismissed for inefficiency, and if not for inefficiency why have the provisions of Order in Council, P.C. 2722, dated August 17, 1921, been ignored? Have the D.S.C.R. the prerogative of vetoing any legislation passed by Order in Council? My reason for asking this question is that certain permanent civil servants employed by the Department of Soldiers' Civil Re-establishment—

Mr. SPEAKER: Order. The hon. gentleman's question is not arguable.

Mr. BELAND: If my hon. friend will come over to-morrow to my office and ask me this question I will be in a position to answer him. I may say offhand that I am under the impression that owing to the necessity of reducing the staff in the department a certain number of permanent employees have had to be retired. As they had been blanketed in, as it is termed, by a certain Order in Council, therefore an Order in Council had to be passed to retire them, but it was not on account of any inefficiency but only by reason of the necessity for contracting the service.

PRIVILEGE—Mr. CALDWELL

On the Orders of the Day:

Mr. CALDWELL: Mr. Speaker, before proceeding to the Orders of the Day I wish to refer to some remarks made by the hon. member for St. John and Albert (Mr. Baxter) on Saturday in which he misquoted what I said in the House on June 12—

Some hon. MEMBERS: Order.

Mr. CALDWELL: —and then proceeded to read a document—

Some hon. MEMBERS: Order.

Mr. CALDWELL: —and then proceeded to read a document in which doubt was cast upon my veracity.

Mr. SPEAKER: Order. The hon. gentleman is entitled to put a question and make a personal explanation before the Orders of the Day are called, but he must avoid attacking any other hon. member. He may state the facts which perturb his mind and then let the House judge of the matter; but he must not attack any other hon. gentleman. I understand the hon. member wishes to make a personal explanation. He may proceed to that explanation without, however, attacking another hon member.

Mr. CALDWELL: I had no intention of attacking anybody. I simply wanted to clear up a statement made by the hon. member for St. John on Saturday as a question of privilege. In that connection I want to read the statement the hon. member attributed to me and then read what I actually said, leaving the House to judge as to whether the hon. member quoted me correctly. He was speaking of a statement I made in the House on June 12; it was with regard to an amendment I moved to the Dominion Elections Act on that day. The hon. member was referring to a statement I made about a returning officer in my riding during the recent elections, and this is what he said:

He was charged—

That is the returning officer, he meant—

He was charged with having made electoral subdivisions which were not warranted by law.

Now, I wish to quote what I actually did say:

Last fall, I learned quite accidentally one evening, just two weeks prior to the election, that five new polls had been established in my riding.

That is the only reference I made to the establishing of the new polls. I did not say they were established illegally because I knew better. While I am not a lawyer possibly I know the Elections Act quite as well as my hon. friend from St. John, due to the fact that I was in this House when it was passed. I opposed some of the provisions of that act very strenuously and was convinced last fall that I was justified in doing so.

Mr. SPEAKER: I think the hon. gentleman has stated his case fully.

Mr. CALDWELL: Mr. Speaker, I—

Mr. SPEAKER: Order. Bourinot says in speaking of personal questions brought up when Orders of the Day are called, that it is the usage in both Houses of the Canadian Parliament to make personal explanations and ask questions of the Government. They make them in reference to an inaccurate report of their speeches in the official report, or in the newspapers, but they must not engage in discussion or further explanation. The hon. gentleman has stated that he has been misquoted. He has read what he said in the House and what the hon. member for St. John had said. Now the House must judge of the incident, which is closed and no further argument can be allowed.

Mr. CALDWELL: May I be allowed to quote further from the hon. gentleman's speech to show that he made a misstatement later on in his remarks.

Mr. SPEAKER: Order. Orders of the Day.

Mr. CALDWELL: Have I not a right, Mr. Speaker, to quote further from the hon. gentleman's speech to correct another misstatement?

Mr. SPEAKER: I do not think it is really necessary. The hon. member has presented his case from his point of view. He has given a quotation of his own statement, and has also quoted a statement by the hon. member from St. John. Now the incident is closed.

Mr. CALDWELL: But I am rising to a question of privilege.

Mr. SPEAKER: Order.

Mr. CALDWELL: I have only explained one incident. The hon. member for St. John also charged that I had stated a falsehood in the House.

Mr. STEVENS: I rise to a point of order.

Mr. SPEAKER: Is the hon. member speaking to a point of order?

Mr. STEVENS: My point of order is this: I bring to your attention the fact that when the hon. member for St. John first attempted to make his statement he was ruled out of order by you, Sir, and I think quite properly. On the second occasion that he made his statement he was again ruled out of order, after proceeding for some short space, by the Chairman of the Committee of the Whole. Consequently he had not the opportunity of finishing his statement. Therefore, I submit to you, Sir, that it would be highly unfair to have another hon. gentleman debate further the hon. member's statement which was not completed.

Mr. CALDWELL: May I speak to the point of order? I submit that it is quite a different thing to rule an hon. member out of order when he is replying to an attack by another hon. member and seeking to establish the fact that he was misquoted, and falsely accused of making a false statement in this House.

Some hon. MEMBERS: Order.

Mr. CALDWELL: I will leave the House to judge if I am not taking the right course.

Mr. BAXTER: The hon. gentleman has already misquoted me. I was careful to say that I was quoting from a letter signed by the gentlemen he had attacked in the House. I made no statement about the hon. member himself because I have no personal knowledge of the circumstances.

Mr. SPEAKER: No hon. member can use the expression "false" or "falsely" in speaking of another hon. member. It is not parliamentary language and I would therefore ask the hon. member from Carleton, N.B., to withdraw the expression.

Mr. CALDWELL: Mr. Speaker, I gladly withdraw the expression if it is misconstrued in any way. I desire to state, however, that I did not accuse the hon. member himself of making a false statement; I said he read a document "which falsely accused me of making a false statement in this House.

Mr. SPEAKER: I have given my ruling and I am now in the hands of the House. I rule that the incident is now closed. It has been fully explained by all parties.

On the Orders of the Day:

ENTRY OF CHINESE INTO CANADA

Mr. McBRIDE: I would like to know from the Minister of the Interior if he has any further information in connection with the entry of 360 Chinamen into Canada.

Mr. STEWART (Argenteuil): There are 144 Chinese on the Empress of Canada. There are 33 still to be examined and reported upon; 85 were returning to Canada, and 176 passing through Canada in bond.

MERCHANTS BANK ENQUIRY

On the Orders of the Day:

Mr. CHURCH: As the session is drawing to a close I would be glad if the Government would inform the House whether they will order a thorough government enquiry either by a committee of this House to sit in the recess of Parliament or by a royal commission into the whole Merchants Bank case in the public interest in addition to the very limited enquiry now being held at Montreal. The Country expects it and also an inquiry into the whole Banks Act. Something should be done in the matter.

Mr. FIELDING: I am not aware of any action being taken or contemplated than that at present proceeding in the courts in Montreal.

WAYS AND MEANS

DOMINION ELECTIONS ACT

On motion of Mr. Fielding for Committee of Ways and Means.

Mr. CALDWELL: Before you leave the Chair, Mr. Speaker, I would like to continue the discussion which was proceeding when I was ruled out of order recently. I had stated that the hon. member from St. John and Albert (Mr. Baxter) quoted a statement I made on the 12th June. I read what he said and I read what I said myself, and I am willing to leave the House to judge of the matter. In regard to the making of the list, I want to quote what the hon. member said. During the reading of this document he interjected this remark:

> There comes a very distinct issue of veracity between the hon. member and the returning officer. I know nothing of the circumstances. I do not know anything personally of the circumstances now, except as I have heard the statement made in the House and as I have in my possession, a statement differing very widely in practically all respects, of the returning officer.

He has qualified that again by saying—

> I cannot of course vouch for a single statement I am reading.

I am not in the same position as the hon. member for St. John. I am not going to make a statement I cannot vouch for in this case. I did not make a statement on the 12th June that I could not vouch for and could not prove in any court of the land and I do not propose to make a statement now which I cannot vouch for. I was quoting what I did say on that occasion with regard to preparing the list and will leave the House to judge whether the returning officer's statement differed from mine. I was speaking of the necessity for the polls created in my riding. I said:

> I went to the returning officer to inquire if it was a fact that those new polls had been established, because I had no notice of the enumerators, and he said that it was. I asked him if he had his enumerators or registrars appointed for the polls and who they were: He said: "No and I do not propose to appoint any." I asked him how he proposed to get a list of those polls and to furnish it to the candidate on nomination day. He said that he did not propose to have a list for each polling division. He was subdividing one polling division into four. He said that he was going to have them all prepared as one list and revised as that. He said: "We will provide a copy of each poll for the deputy returning officer on election day, but no separate lists will be prepared for the candidate."

I want to quote from the document the hon. member read on Saturday night and I will leave the House to judge. The hon. member for St. John read from the document prepared by the returning officer as follows:

> He further says that he did not at that time want to appoint new registrars who would be unfamiliar with the duties, and that
> 11 p.m.
> he proposed to allow the existing registrars to make up his list for the entire division in the usual way and then subdivide it geographically for the use of the deputy returning officers in the separate polling stations on election day.

That is identical with the statement I made on the 12th June. I wish to deal very briefly with this, because I do not wish to impose on the good nature of the House at this hour of the night and at this stage of the session, but I think it is due to myself that I should clear up this matter. This is also from the statement as read by the hon. member from what is supposed to be a document sent to him by the returning officer for my riding.

He says that the hon. member's further statement that the hon. member threatened him with an injunction is quite surprising. At no time during the election did either candidate threaten him in any way, and so far as he was aware, the conduct of the election from the returning officer's standpoint was satisfactory to all parties concerned. He says that it was surprising to learn that the hon. member had to put an injunction on the election.

At this point I rose to a point of order and I said—

Mr. Caldwell: I rise to a question of privilege. I never said that I had to put on an injunction; but I had to threaten to do so, and I can prove this by the attorney whom I employed.

I wish to read a telegram from an attorney whom I employed on that occasion. I wired him on Saturday night to verify the threatened injunction and this is the telegram which I received from my attorney. This gentleman is well known to the members of the House from the maritime provinces and his veracity would not be impugned. His name is W. P. Jones, barrister, of Woodstock, N.B.:

WOODSTOCK, N.B. June 25th, 1922.

THOMAS W. CALDWELL, M.P.,

House of Commons, Ottawa, Ont.

Last Dominion election you instructed me to apply for injunction against returning officer unless lists of new polls established by him were furnished without further delay. I telephoned returning officer that I would take legal action if lists not supplied. He referred me to Hayward his solicitor who undertook to furnish same.

W. P. JONES.

Now, in that statement read by the hon. member Saturday night and in his comments he stated that the returning officer had submitted all these things to the Chief Electoral Officer and had his sanction to do this. The returning officer also showed me these letters from the Chief Electoral Officer in his office, which showed that he had spent more time in corresponding with the Chief Electoral Officer to get authority to evade the Election Act than it would have taken him to have made the lists because he had had several interchanges of letters with the Chief Electoral Officer, and he read them to me in his office. I said, "I do not care what the Chief Electoral Officer told you to do about the list. He has authority to instruct you to establish a new polling division. You must make the list according to law, and I want to quote what the law says about appointing officers and making lists." I was not finding much fault because he did not appoint new registrars. It might have caused some inconvenience, but I was particular that we should have the lists and have them according to law. I want to read what the law says about appointing registrars and making lists. Page 93 of the Dominion Elections Act, section 32, rule 1, reads:

Rule (1) Immediately after the receipt of the writ the returning officer shall appoint by writing in Form No. 5 one person only to be registrar of voters for each rural polling division. Whenever a competent person can be secured who is a resident within the limits of the polling division such person shall be appointed and only in case of necessity shall a registrar be selected from an outside polling division.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I hardly think that either the member for St. John or the returning officer in my riding would like to stand within the bounds of that riding and say there were not men fit to be registrars in any of those new polling subdivisions. I know the people in those subdivisions very well, and I do not think I know a crook in one of those new subdivisions. It is just possible that was the reason there was no registrar appointed in that division. I wish to read rule (3) with regard to preparing lists and furnishing them to the candidates. Rule (3) of section 32 provides:

Each registrar shall complete, date at his place of residence and certify as in form No. 18 to this act such copies of the voters' lists on the 15th day before the polling day and not other- It appears to be all right looking at it from two of the most public and conspicuous places within such polling division and another he shall retain for revision. He shall on the day fixed for the nomination of candidates deliver or send by registered mail to each of the candidates a copy of such lists.

Although the law says that they must be made fifteen days prior to an election and not otherwise, the returning officer, according to the statement as read in the House by the hon. member for St. John and Albert, admitted that he did not propose to make these separate lists before election day or that he did not intend to have any for the candidates, but that he proposed to have one for the deputy returning officers on election day. There is a good deal more that I would like to have said, had it been earlier in the day or earlier in the session; but I want to repeat what I said at the beginning. I have not made a statement in connection with this that I cannot prove either in this House or outside of it. In fact, I think I am safe in saying that since I have been a member I have never made in this House a statement that I could not prove. Should it occur to the hon. member for St. John and Albert to wish me to prove the truth of some of the statements

that I have made during this session, I shall be only too pleased to accommodate him.

Hon. J. B. M. BAXTER (St. John City and Counties of St. John and Albert): Mr. Speaker, I am sorry to detain the House at any length on such an unimportant matter. Had I been permitted to read in full, as I endeavoured to do, the letter which I received from the man who had been attacked by my hon. friend (Mr. Caldwell), that would probably have ended the incident. As I read the whole letter with the exception of the last paragraph, I am not going to bother the House with the rest of it. The hon. member challenges me to a number of things, and all I wish to remark is simply this. I will not discuss the case further. I assured the House already that I interfered only because I was applied to by a man who claimed that he had been unjustly referred to by the hon. member and who wanted to have his case put before the House. The hon. member has admitted that he had read the correspondence with the Chief Electoral Officer. He was not, however, frank enough to tell the House that he had read it, and it is clear now that whatever this returning officer did, whether it may seem to be irregular as regards the law or not, was sanctioned by the Chief Electoral Officer. I will not go into the matter further. The only other observation that I wish to make is that the hon. member has given us his measure to-night. He has absolutely accused me, in plain and direct terms, of having falsely represented him. When he attempted to prove that, he read, not from my own statement, but from my quotation from the letter from the returning officer, language that I made it clear I was not responsible for except as the vehicle to convey it to the House. When the hon. member used that language with regard to me, that I had spoken falsely—

Mr. CALDWELL: I rise to a question of privilege. I did not state that the hon. member had made a false statement. I stated that he read a document which falsely accused me. I reiterate that.

Mr. BAXTER: I adhere to my original statement of the matter, and my final comment on it is that the hon. member has shown respect neither for the amenities of personal contact, nor for the dignity of this House, in not withdrawing the statement that he made in regard to the matter. There is no question—the ears of hon. members are sharp enough to hear it—it was said, and it would have been resented in a much more violent way by myself had it been made outside the walls of this Chamber.

Mr. CALDWELL: With regard to the statement that the returning officer was instructed to do certain things and that he was justified in doing what he did, I want to say that he did not do what the Chief Electoral Officer instructed him to do, but proceeded to furnish me with the lists after I had threatened to get an injunction.

With regard to the last statement of the hon. member for St. John and Albert I can take up his offer outside whenever he wants to.

Mr. SPEAKER: I will ask the Sergeant-at-arms to see that no disorder takes place in the lobby.

WAYS AND MEANS

CUSTODY OF ALIEN PROPERTY

On the Motion of Mr. Fielding for Committee of Ways and Means:

Mr. J. R. CLARK (Burrard): As regards the answer given by me a few moments ago by the Secretary of State (Mr. Copp) to what I think was a perfectly proper question regarding the law firms of Fisher and Oughton and of Williams and Manson, I wish to place before the House certain facts. As I stated before, on the 15th of May, the Secretary of State answered certain questions regarding the firm of Fisher & Oughton acting on behalf of the custodian of enemy property and effecting a sale of certain properties. I think a reflection has been cast upon that firm. I am credibly informed that, throughout the period of the administration of this property by that firm, no complaint was made by the department regarding the conduct of the firm in regard to matters committed to their care. I think, in justice to that firm, the Secretary of State should now furnish the House with the true reasons for transferring the business from the firm of Fisher and Oughton to that of Williams and Manson. It appears to me that the real reason was a political one. I can see no other reason, and my opinion is confirmed by the answer which was given a few moments ago, when I asked what I consider was a perfectly legitimate, proper question.

Hon. A. B. COPP (Secretary of State): Mr. Speaker, in reply to my hon. friend regarding the change of solicitors to which he refers—I do not know whether they are

in his constituency, or what constituency they are in, but they are in British Columbia—I may say to him, what I have already said by correspondence with the gentlemen for whom he speaks. My hon. friend himself took the responsibility of placing the question upon the Order Paper. I, as head of the department for the time being, thought that it was in the interest of the department to change solicitors at that time. I took the responsibility for doing so, and I gave my hon. friend the answer as I have given him the reply now.

Mr. MEIGHEN: There appears no good reason for the action of the minister. His answer is this: We did it; and we have no reason other than that we wanted increased efficiency. Thus he reflected on the efficiency of a reputable firm. Now, the minister has no right to do that unless he can state his reasons. He does an injury to that firm in Parliament and he does an injustice to his office. He knows he has no reasons to give, but purely the reason that what he did was for patronage purposes. But he has not the courage to say so. The minister is called upon to give reasons for his action, and if he fails to give them he fails in his duty as a member of the Government. He does not get rid of his responsibility by evading the questions that are asked on the Order Paper, and now that he is questioned across the floor of the House he does an injury to a firm which he does not care to repair and to which he professes a cynical indifference. He at least could do credit to himself if he frankly admitted that what he did was for the purpose of party political advantage and none other.

Mr. COPP: I do not regard my right hon. friend as a proper judge of what a minister should do in such cases. I can only repeat that in carrying on the work of the department I found it necessary to make some changes, among which was the one I have already spoken of.

WAYS AND MEANS

SUPPLY BILL

Mr. FIELDING 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, 1923, the sum of $175,766,646.71 be granted out of the consolidated revenue fund of Canada.

Motion agreed to.

Resolutions reported and concurred in.

Mr. FIELDING moved for leave to introduce Bill No. 202, for granting to His Majesty certain sums of money for the public service for the year ending 31st March, 1923.

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

THE TRUST COMPANIES ACT, 1914, AMENDMENT

CONCURRENCE IN SENATE AMENDMENTS

On motion of Hon. W. S. FIELDING (Minister of Finance) amendments made by the Senate to Bill No. 60 to amend the Trust Companies Act, 1914, were read the second time and concurred in.

THE INSURANCE ACT, 1917, AMENDMENT

CONCURRENCE IN SENATE AMENDMENTS

On motion of Hon. W. S. FIELDING (Minister of Finance) amendments made by the Senate to Bill No. 58 to amend the Insurance Act, 1917, were read the second time and concurred in.

CRIMINAL CODE AMENDMENT

On motion of Sir Lomer Gouin (Minister of Justice) the amendments made by the Senate to Bill No. 93, to amend the Criminal Code, were read the second time and concurred in.

LOAN COMPANIES ACT, 1914, AMENDMENT

On motion of Hon. W. S. Fielding (Minister of Finance), the amendments made by the Senate to Bill No. 59, to amend The Loan Companies Act, 1914, were read the second time and concurred in.

AGRICULTURAL FERTILIZERS

On motion of Hon. W. R. Motherwell (Minister of Agriculture), the amendment made by the Senate to Bill No. 149, to regulate the sale of agricultural fertilizers, was read the second time and concurred in.

OPIUM AND NARCOTIC DRUG ACT

On motion of Hon. H. S. Béland (Minister of Health), the amendments made by the Senate to Bill No. 137, to amend The Opium and Narcotic Drug Act, were read the second time and concurred in.

CANADA TEMPERANCE ACT AMENDMENT

Hon. D. D. McKENZIE (Solicitor General) moved:

That this House do not agree to the amendment made by the Senate to Bill No. 132, to amend The Canada Temperance Act, for the following reason: That the said amendment destroys the effect of the whole bill and should not, therefore, be concurred in.

Mr. LADNER: I would just like to say a word in favour of the motion. The amendments made by the Senate do have the effect stated. I am of the opinion that it is in the interests of the province of British Columbia that the control of liquors be vested in the provincial government, and for that reason, without delaying the House any further, I express my approval of the motion.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: Do I understand the minister to say that the bill is dropped?

Mr. McKENZIE: No.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: The Saskatchewan sections are not affected at all.

Motion agreed to.

Hon. D. D. McKENZIE (Solicitor General) moved:

That a message be sent to the Senate acquainting Their Honours with the non-concurrence of this House in the amendments made by the Senate to Bill No. 132.

On the motion of Mr. Mackenzie King, the House adjourned at 12:45 a.m. Tuesday.

Tuesday, June 27, 1922

The House met at three o'clock.

HOUSE OF COMMONS

CHIEF OF STATIONERY DIVISION

Mr. SPEAKER: I have the honour to inform the House that I have directed the Clerk of the House to lay upon the Table the report of the Civil Service Commission amending the salary rates for the class of Chief of the Stationery Division, House of Commons.

Right Hon. W. L. MACKENZIE KING (Prime Minister): I beg to move:

That the recommendation of His Honour the Speaker laid on the Table of the House this day respecting the compensation of Mr. Eugene Naubert, Chief of Stationery Division, House of Commons, be concurred in.

[Mr. Beland.]

PRIVILEGE—MR. W. F. MACLEAN

On the Orders of the Day:

Mr. W. F. MACLEAN (South York): I should like to make an explanation in connection with an incident in the debate yesterday on the Crowsnest pass agreement. When I challenged my hon. friend from St. John and Albert (Mr. Baxter) to make a motion for abrogation, I understood his motion to be for the abrogation of the suspension, but apparently he had in view the abrogation of the agreement, and I was rather surprised the way it came out. It was my mistake, and, particularly as an old member, I am to blame. I am sure the vote would have been altogether different if my hon. friends in other portions of the House had understood it to be a motion for the abrogation of the suspension. I wanted to see the end, not of the agreement, but of the suspension of the agreement, and I am sure it will be only a short time before we do get an entire abrogation of the suspension.

REDISTRIBUTION

On the Orders of the Day:

Mr. JOSEPH T. SHAW (Calgary): I should like to ask the Prime Minister if we can now have the assurance of the Government that redistribution will precede a general election.

Right Hon. W. L. MACKENZIE KING (Prime Minister): I think I can assure my hon. friend that there will be no general election before the next meeting of Parliament, and as soon as the next meeting of Parliament takes place, it is the intention of the Government to introduce a redistribution measure.

REASSEMBLING OF PARLIAMENT

On the Orders of the Day:

Mr. E. J. GARLAND (Bow River): I should like to ask whether, in view of the sentiment in the House in favour of a fall session, it is the intention of the Government to summon Parliament in the fall.

Right Hon. W. L. MACKENZIE KING (Prime Minister): As my hon. friend and other members of the House will recall, earlier in the year I stated that the Government rather hoped it might be possible to open our next session in the month of November, but in this matter, as in all others, the Government wishes to consult the convenience of hon. members so far as it can, and so far as it may be in the public inter-

est. I gather from what the Whips of the different groups have told me that it would probably suit the convenience of the great majority of the members if for the next session we met early in January, rather than in November. We might have to ratify some treaty with the Balkan States or something of that kind in the fall, and if necessary we could call a session for that purpose.

Right Hon. ARTHUR MEIGHEN (Leader of the Opposition): I am very glad, Mr. Speaker, to observe that the Government has receded from its last impossible position, not with very good grace, but with just as much good grace as we have been accustomed to.

Mr. BUREAU: The Government canvassed the opinion of hon. members first.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: I think I should answer my hon. friend's remark by saying that he has accepted the decision with his usual good grace.

Mr. MEIGHEN: Because it was the position I have always taken, and the practice I observed, but the fall session was one of the great reforms promised, which has turned out not to be a reform at all, but merely a farce.

SOLDIERS' CIVIL RE-ESTABLISHMENT

On the motion of Hon. H. S. Béland (Minister of Soldiers' Civil Re-establishment) Bill No. 207, respecting the Department of Soldiers' Civil Re-establishment, was read the second time and the House went into committee thereon, Mr. Gordon in the Chair.

On section 1—recommendations in committee report approved:

Mr. MEIGHEN: To submit typewritten copies of a bill and ask us to proceed, before any one has had a chance to look at it, is really asking too much from a long-suffering Parliament. No one has yet had time to study its provisions. We are told that printed copies of the bill are on the way to the House, and we are asked to legislate before those copies arrive. I enter my protest against such a proceeding.

Mr. BELAND: The reason is that we are anxious to send this bill over to the Senate so that it may be considered there and agreed to. Its provisions simply give effect to certain recommendations contained in the report laid before the House by the Committee on Pensions, Soldiers' Insurance and Re-establishment. There is absolutely nothing in the present measure that is not contained in that report. There are a few things in the report, however, which are not mentioned in the bill. For instance the recommendations of the committee dealing with pensions, insurance and land settlement have already been provided for by special acts. With respect to other matters, it is not absolutely certain that the department could not, under existing legislation, provide measures to carry out the recommendations of the committee. As my right hon. friend will see when I read from the act of 1919, there is this provision:

Section 5 (2) Subject to the approval of the Governor in Council the minister may make such regulations from time to time as he may deem necessary and advisable: for the purpose of carrying out the provisions of this act with respect to any matter placed under the control and management of the minister.

In order to remove all doubt, however, it is deemed necessary to have the present bill. I have already read subsection 2 of section 5 of the Act of 1919. It is now proposed that the subjects as to which the minister shall have power to make regulations shall be the following:

(g1) For the constitution of medical boards including appeal boards with such powers as may be deemed expedient;—

That is provided for in the report of the committee.

The sheltered employment of ex-members of the forces including after-care of the tuberculous.

That is also a recommendation contained in the report:

The granting of free transportation in Canada to any ex-member of the forces who has been pensioned for total blindness or for a disability which necessitates an escort when travelling:—

That is a special recommendation of the report:

For providing burial expenses for ex-members of the forces who die in destitute circumstances.

That is another recommendation of the report:

For the administration and disposal of canteen funds;—

That is also provided for in the report:

For the repatriation of ex-members of the forces discharged in England and their dependents and relief for distressed ex-members of the forces in the United Kingdom;—

That is also a recommendation of the report:

For the treatment of former members of the forces classified as wholly incurable or chronically recurrent cases needing institutional care:—

That is recommended in the report:

For the provision of measures of unemployment relief to ex-members of the forces and their dependents;—

That is also a recommendation of the report:

And for the payment of compensation in respect of industrial accidents and the return of premiums paid by employers of ex-members of the forces to Workmen's Compensation Boards;—

And then the final provision:

The whole subject to such appropriations as Parliament may provide.

I am sure that my right hon. friend will admit that there is nothing objectionable in these provisions. It is to be regretted that the bill in its present form was not distributed earlier. That, however, is not due to any fault of mine. It was thought by the officers of the department, after consultation with the officials of the Justice Department, that it would be more regular if a special enactment of the House were made in regard to these subjects. The bill was introduced at the time it was in order to expedite matters, so that the measure might be sent over to the Senate for examination there as soon as possible.

Mr. MEIGHEN: The bill is a vast improvement on the one introduced yesterday. In fact what the Government introduced yesterday was not a bill at all—it was simply an attempt to legislate a book into law. This, I think, is the right way to attack the subject and in the few seconds that I have had to examine it I do not observe anything very substantial that is objectionable. I do though urge upon the Government that this be the last offence in the way of throwing into the House in the very last two or three days all the important legislation of the session. This session has been one long procrastination and at the end one last desperate gulp. I know that it has been the reference of important subjects to committee that has been the means adopted to reach this result, but it should not be done.

In view of the subject with which it deals this legislation certainly should not fail to pass this session. I would think, however, if the Government had any other work we might take it up now and in the meantime a little more detailed study could be given to this bill. I frankly say at once that the method adopted by the present bill, as a result of last nights protest, seems to be the right one, and in reading over its clauses I have not observed anything which seems to me from a cursory glance to be wrong.

Section agreed to.

Bill reported, read the third time and passed.

PRIVATE BILLS

CONSIDERED IN COMMITTEE—THIRD READINGS

Bill No. 177 (from the Senate), respecting a Patent of Simon W. Farber.—Mr. Chevrier.

Bill No. 178 (from the Senate), respecting a Patent of Daniel Herbert Schweyer.—Mr. Maclean (Halifax).

Bill No. 179 (from the Senate), respecting certain patents of Holophane Glass Company.—Mr. McMaster.

Bill No. 180 (from the Senate), for the relief of Margaret Maud Evelyn Clark Leith.—Mr. Euler.

Bill No. 181 (from the Senate), for the relief of Mary Ann Phair.—Mr. Church.

Bill No. 182 (from the Senate), for the relief of William Park Jefferson.—Mr. Church.

Bill No. 183 (from the Senate), for the relief of Eva Maud Ginn.—Mr. Church.

Bill No. 184 (from the Senate), for the relief of Louise Janet Maud Bigford.—Mr. Ross (Kingston).

Bill No. 185 (from the Senate), for the relief of James Dickson Couch.—Mr. Boys.

Bill No. 186 (from the Senate), for the relief of Cecil Grenville Bell.—Mr. Maclean (York).

Bill No. 189 (from the Senate), for the relief of Nykola Pirozyk.—Mr. Kay.

Bill No. 190 (from the Senate), for the relief of Margaret Mary Ivor Horning.—Mr. Bristol.

Bill No. 196 (from the Senate), respecting a Patent of the Dominion Chain Company.—Mr. Jacobs.

PROROGATION OF PARLIAMENT

Mr. SPEAKER read a communication from the Acting Governor General's Secretary, announcing that the Right Hon. Sir Louis Davies, K.C.M.G., acting as Deputy of the Governor General, would proceed to the Senate Chamber this evening at 9.30 o'clock, for the purpose of proroguing the present session of Parliament.

On motion of Mr. Mackenzie King the House returned to Government Orders.

BANKRUPTCY ACT AMENDMENT

NON-CONCURRENCE IN SENATE AMENDMENTS

Consideration of amendments made by the Senate to Bill No. 107, to amend the Bankruptcy Act.

Sir LOMER GOUIN (Minister of Justice): Mr. Speaker, I do not think we should concur in all the amendments proposed by the Senate. I refer especially to clause 12, as we find it in the bill reprinted by the Senate. In the case of corporations which cannot meet their obligations, where arrangements are made between creditors and shareholders for a rearrangement of the shares—for instance, by the cancellation of preferred shares, or the reduction of them to the rank of common shares—clause 12, as we find it in the bill now before us, that is the Senate reprint, provides that a majority of the different classes of shares, first preferred, second preferred or common, may decide, and that the minority shall be governed by the majority. That is to say, if 51 per cent of any of these classes were to accept any scheme, the minority would be bound by such a decision. We think we should give more protection to minorities, and that is why I now propose that we should not concur in the amendment which we have before us, and that instead of leaving the decision to a majority of 51 per cent, we should say that the minority will not be bound by a decision come to by less than 67 per cent of the stock of the different classes. We thus give more protection to the minority.

I would ask the House not to concur in section 14. This amendment offered by the Senate provides that the sale by a trustee of property comprised in any security shall have the same effect as the sale by trustees of property under mortgage. The amendment may be desirable, but I have not had time enough to consider it, and I do not like approving of it without knowing exactly its full effect.

Mr. GUTHRIE: Is the last section the only one my hon. friend does not approve of?

Sir LOMER GOUIN: The Senate have made some amendments to section 2 striking out certain words. They take the view that we should retain the law as we have had it up to now, and while I should have preferred that the amendment which this House made to the act should have been accepted by the Senate, at the same time I understand that if we reject too many of their amendments we may expose the life of the bill. For that reason I would accept their amendment to section 2 rather than lose the bill. I move:

That, as a consequential amendment, section 12 be amended by striking out the word "majority" in line 39 on page 5 of the bill as printed, and substituting therefor the words "two-thirds". And that this House do not agree to section 14 as inserted in the bill by the Senate, because it destroys the effect of the bill.

Motion agreed to.

Sir LOMER GOUIN (Minister of Justice) moved:

That a message be sent to the Senate acquainting their Honours with the non-concurrence of this House in the amendments made by the Senate to Bill No. 107.

Motion agreed to.

ORDER IN COUNCIL PRESENTED

Order in Council P. C. 1245, dated 14th June, 1922, authorizing the transfer of radio telegraph service, hydrographic survey, tidal and current survey, the fisheries protection service, from the jurisdiction of the Minister of Naval Affairs to the Minister of Marine and Fisheries.—Hon. Mr. Lapointe.

Right Hon. W. L. MACKENZIE KING (Prime Minister): I move, Mr. Speaker, that the House now take recess to resume at eight o'clock to-night.

Mr. MEIGHEN: Is there no business ready from the Senate?

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: No; there are one or two conferences taking place, but there is no legislation ready from the Senate.

Mr. MEIGHEN: It is amazing that the hon. member for West Calgary (Mr. Shaw) does not take advantage of the opportunity afforded him of moving that a redistribution bill be passed this session.

Mr. SHAW: I fear my right hon. friend was not in the Chamber when we received assurances from the Prime Minister on this matter.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: A good many members are anxious to know what arrangements have been made for them to be paid off.

Mr. SPEAKER: After conferring with the Prime Minister (Mr. Mackenzie King) I have issued instructions that all accounts shall be settled.

Motion agreed to, and the House took recess at 4 p.m.

After Recess

The House resumed at eight o'clock.

PENSION ACT AMENDMENT

SENATE AMENDMENTS

On motion of Hon. H. S. Beland (Minister of Soldiers' Civil Re-establishment) the amendments made by the Senate to Bill No. 192 to amend the Pension Act were read the second time and concurred in.

ACOUSTICS OF THE CHAMBER

Mr. HANCE J. LOGAN (Cumberland): I desire to take advantage of this opportunity to bring to the attention of the Government, and particularly the Minister of Public Works, the poor acoustic properties of this chamber.

Some hon. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

Mr. LOGAN: I believe that is about the most popular remark I have made this session. I think it would be popular even in the press gallery, where I am not always popular.

Some hon. MEMBERS: Louder.

Mr. LOGAN: Thank you. We meet here as the representatives of the great Canadian people, to transact important public business, but the real facts of the matter are that two-thirds of the time we do not know what is going on in this House. I desire to say to the Government, because perhaps they do not realize how inadequate this chamber is in that regard, that when any hon. member is courteous to you, Mr. Speaker, and addresses the Chair he is not heard by the rest of the House, even if he is speaking from the middle of the chamber.

Mr. MANION: You ought to congratulate yourself.

Mr. LOGAN: Thank you. I am told by distinguished visitors who have sat in the distinguished visitors' gallery that they can hear very little of what is said from this side of the House, and nothing at all that is said from that side, which latter, perhaps, is no great loss. However, that is where we have the advantage, because we can hear hon. gentlemen opposite. Joking aside, this has just about reached the limit. As I said a moment ago, we come here as the representatives of the people, to do important business and to hear what is being said in this House. We desire also that the press gallery shall hear, so that the people of this country will know what is going on in Parliament, but as a matter of fact very few of us can hear half of what is being said, and I am told that in the press gallery they also have difficulty in hearing the speakers. What I rose to do was to call the serious attention of the Government, and particularly of the Minister of Public Works, to this condition of affairs. Think of it! We have built a twelve million dollar building in which we cannot be heard. It is ridiculous. It is not fair. It is neither just to us nor to the people we represent.

Mr. BUREAU: Perhaps it was done on purpose.

Mr. LOGAN: I am by no means an architect, but there is one suggestion I desire to make. Before doing so, let me state, Mr. Speaker, that the main reason why we cannot hear down at the end of the chamber, or even in the middle here, is because out of courtesy, and properly so, every hon. member is supposed to address Your Honour, but if we do so, the voice is lost to the rest of the House, and particularly to those behind us. My suggestion is that your Chair, Mr. Speaker, be moved to the middle of the chamber, either on one side or the other, under the clock and that the seats be arranged in a semicircle, or in the form of an ampitheatre, so that when any hon. member is addressing you, Sir, he will be at least half facing the other side of the circle.

Mr. BUREAU: And have a ring in the centre.

Mr. LOGAN: That, Mr. Speaker, is the seating arrangement adopted, I think, by the leading Parliaments of the world, outside of the Mother Parliament, and we all know that the acoustic properties at Westminster have been a source of grievance for many years. If you go into the Chamber of Deputies at Paris, or into Congress at Washington, or into the legislature of Quebec, or Ontario, or Nova Scotia, and nearly every other legislature, you will find this semicircular seating arrangement. I think if that arrangement were followed here, the bad acoustics would be partly overcome. I am calling this matter to the attention of the Government because I feel it is necessary that the Minister of Public Works between now and next session should make some change. If we had the Speaker's Chair over there under the clock, and the press gallery where the present Speaker's gallery is, hon. members would be able to hear much better, and the press gallery would also be able to hear. Perhaps that

would not always be to their advantage, but they would at least hear what we are trying to say in this House.

If the chamber were circular in form you could have more galleries—there could be a gallery in each of the four corners of the existing chamber. At the present time the accommodation in the public galleries is not at all adequate to the importance of Parliament. I would like other hon. members to express their views upon this matter. Undoubtedly it is a very serious one, and improvements should be made if we are to conduct the proceedings of Parliament as they should be carried on.

Mr. C. A. GAUVREAU (Temiscouata): I hope that next session when the hon. member for Cumberland talks about reducing the indemnity nobody will hear him.

Mr. LOGAN: Mr. Speaker, after what has been said by myself and others about the desirability of reducing the indemnity there has certainly been a very eloquent silence.

Mr. KING (Kootenay): The matter brought up by the hon. member for Cumberland is of very considerable importance to members generally, and though I am not in a position to state whether anything can be done to improve the acoustics of the chamber, still I will make it a point to have inquiries made during the coming recess with a view to seeing if it is possible to bring about the desired improvement.

CANADA TEMPERANCE ACT

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

That a message be sent to the Senate respectfully requesting a free conference with Their Honours to consider certain amendments made by the Senate to Bill No. 132, An Act to Amend the Canada Temperance Act, to which amendments this House does not agree and upon which the Senate insists, and any amendment which at such conference may be considered desirable to make to the said Bill or amendments thereto.

Motion agreed to.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: I move that a message be sent to the Senate acquainting Their Honours with the motion which has just been passed.

Motion agreed to.

CANCELLATION OF LEASES

Mr. MACKENZIE KING moved:

That a message be sent to the Senate requesting a free conference with Their Honours to consider the reasons advanced by this House for insisting upon its amendments to the Bill No. 153 (Letter Y2 of the Senate) Intituled an Act Respecting Notice of Cancellation of Leases of Dominion Lands and any amendments which at such Conference it may be considered desirable to make to the said Bill or amendment thereto.

Motion agreed to.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: I move that a message be sent to the Senate acquainting Their Honours with the motion which has just been passed.

CANCELLATION OF LEASES OF DOMINION LANDS

CONFERENCE WITH THE SENATE ON SENATE AMENDMENTS TO BILL No. 153

Mr. SPEAKER: I have the honour to inform the House that a message has been received from the Senate informing this House that the Senate accedes to their request for a free conference to consider (Bill No. 153) intituled an Act respecting Notices of Cancellation of Leases of Dominion Lands, and any amendments which at such conference it may be desirable to make thereto, and have appointed the Honourable Sir James Lougheed and the Honourable Messieurs Raoul Dandurand, Watson, Barnard and Bradbury, as managers on their part of the said free conference.

Right Hon. W. L. MACKENZIE KING (Prime Minister): I beg to move, seconded by Mr. Fielding:

That Messrs. Guthrie, Baxter, Shaw, Brown, Stewart (Argenteuil), Fielding, Gouin, and Mackenzie King be appointed managers on behalf of this House of the free conference with the Senate with respect to amendments to Bill No. 153, and that a message be sent to the Senate to acquaint Their Honours therewith.

Motion agreed to.

CANADA TEMPERANCE ACT AMENDMENT

CONFERENCE WITH THE SENATE ON SENATE AMENDMENTS TO BILL No. 132

Mr. SPEAKER: I have the honour to inform the House that a message has been received from the Senate informing this House that the Senate accedes to their request for a free conference to consider Bill No. 132, intituled An Act to amend the Canada Temperance Act and any amendments which at such conference it may be desirable to make thereto, and have appointed the Hon. Sir James Lougheed, and the Honourable Messieurs Raoul Dandurand, Watson, Barnard and Bradbury, as managers on their part of the said conference.

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

That Messrs. Ross (Kingston), Clark, Neill, McConica, D. D. McKenzie, Gouin, Fielding and Mackenzie King be appointed managers on behalf of this House of the free conference with the Senate with respect to amendments made to Bill No. 132, and that a message be sent to the Senate to acquaint Their Honours therewith.

Motion agreed to.

On the motion of Mr. Mackenzie King, the sitting was suspended at 9.15 p.m. pending the conference with the Senate.

The House resumed at twelve o'clock midnight.

Right Hon. W. L. MACKENZIE KING (Prime Minister): Mr. Speaker, the point at issue in this matter is whether a province, that has enacted legislation whereby it takes control of the liquor traffic and the sale of liquor should not also have the right to prevent the importation of liquor into such province. In our legislation we proposed that that right should be given. The Senate were unwilling to accept that part of the proposed legislation, and we were unable after a very lengthy conference to come to any agreement with its honourable members. We proposed that the bill as it stands at the present time should be amended by a clause to the effect that such control over importation should not be exercised by the province concerned until the legislature of the province had passed a resolution to that effect. We thought that possibly that step might prove a satisfactory means of getting over the point of difference between us, but the gentlemen of the Senate with whom we conferred were unable to see their way to accept our original legislation though modified in that way. As a result we were unable to reach any conclusion.

The first part of the legislation respecting the exportation of liquor from provinces that have enacted prohibitory laws remains as it was originally passed by this House except that the Senate have proposed as an amendment that the restriction respecting exportation is not to go into effect until after notice of three months. That amendment is now before this House, and we are ready to accept it. Rather than lose the benefit of that much of the legislation by dropping the bill, I beg to move that the Senate amendments be now read the second time and concurred in.

Right Hon. ARTHUR MEIGHEN (Leader of the Opposition): Would it not be better

[Mr. Speaker.]

to have the amendments read, the number of the bill given and the amendments that are now accepted read?

The amendments were then read by the Clerk Assistant as follows:

Amendments made by the Senate to Bill No. 132, to amend the Canada Temperance Act:

1. Page 1, line 25.—After "order" insert: "Provided that such day shall not be prior to the first day of October, 1922."

2. Page 3, line 15.—Leave out the whole of clause 3.

Amendments read the second time and concurred in.

CANCELLATION OF LEASES OF DOMINION LANDS

CONFERENCE WITH THE SENATE ON SENATE AMENDMENTS TO BILL No. 153

Right Hon. W. L. MACKENZIE KING (Prime Minister): Mr. Speaker, as regards this bill we were unable in our conference to reach any agreement as to the amendments proposed by the Senate and to preserve the bill as originally introduced we shall be obliged to drop our amendment to section 5 which read:—

This Act shall not affect any rights under any judgment rendered before the date of the passing of this Act, or under any action, suit or other proceeding instituted before the first day of May, 1922.

Our amendment changed the date from May to July. If we drop the bill, we lose entirely the much needed protection which it affords in other directions, and rather than lose the whole bill as we would be obliged to do, if we do not accept the Senate's amendment, we are agreeable to dropping section 5.

Mr. MEIGHEN: I am not clear as to just what the decision of the Government is. The first part of the Prime Minister's remarks indicates that the Government have decided to drop the bill; the latter part indicates a decision to drop only section 5.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: Rather than drop the entire bill we are prepared to let section 5 go.

Mr. MEIGHEN: That would leave the bill in the form in which it was first introduced in the House.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: Yes.

Mr. MEIGHEN: That is to say, the cancellations will now be confirmed as valid.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: Yes.

Mr. MEIGHEN: I think that in this case, as well, in order that we may be certain that what the Prime Minister states is exactly the effect of the amendments, they might be read.

Mr. STEWART (Argenteuil): The original bill consisted of two sections and the Senate added sections 3, 4 and 5. It will be recalled that when the bill came back to the House I asked that there be stricken out section 3, placing under the control of Parliament an area in the Smoky river district in Alberta. That left sections 4 and 5. Section 5 was subsequently amended on motion of the hon. member for Brome (Mr. McMaster) and the bill went to the Senate in that condition. What is proposed now is that sections 1 and 2 of the bill shall remain. I am not clear as to section 4, but it deals only with the question of the annual reporting of all leases granted by the Department of the Interior, and is not very material. I am not sure whether section 4 is to remain or not, but the Senate's objection is to section 5 as amended, and our proposal is to strike out that section.

Mr. MEIGHEN: We must be clear whether section 4 remains or not. If it remains, it stands as section 3. Personally, I do not see that section 4 is very essential, but I am prepared to have it either dropped or retained. The House, however, should understand whether there are two or three sections.

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

Mr. MEIGHEN: We must know what the motion is. Are sections 4 and 5 to be struck out? Section 3 was struck out in this House.

Mr. STEWART (Argenteuil): There is no dispute about section 4. Frankly, I agree with the leader of the Opposition that this section is not material to the bill, because any hon. member can ask for the return annually. The section merely provides for the annual return of all leases granted by the department. But so far as the utility of the bill is concerned, sections 1 and 2 were originally submitted by the department, and with those I am content to have the bill passed.

Mr. MEIGHEN: We must now agree or disagree with the Senate. If we strike out section 4 the bill will have to go back. I suggest that we simply assent to the Senate amendments.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: That is right.

Mr. VIEN: Before the amendment is concurred in I would inquire of the minister whether section 5 as amended by this House is stricken out by the Senate amendment. If that is the case, I do not think that this House should concur in the amendment offered by the Senate, because it simply does away with the recourse of those who have filed with the department any petition of right for action against the Government in this matter. I do not believe that it is customary for Parliament to enact legislation with retroactive effect. Section 5 as we amended it in this House was to the effect that the legislation passed by Parliament would not affect the proceedings in court, whether by suit, petition of right, or other action. If you anul the amendments made by this House to section 5 it simply means that this legislation will affect vested rights and pending litigation. I do not think it would be fair or equitable for this House to give effect, by legislation, to cancellations that are already before the courts in pending litigation, and so far as that is concerned I would ask the House not to concur in the amendment of the Senate.

Mr. CANNON: I have only this to say, that the Senate is attempting in these last few days to increase their privileges and rights. I think that the Senate should realize that the House of Commons, being the elective House, is more responsible to the people than the other Chamber, which is not elected, and which is irresponsible, and this being the last day of the session, I would recommend to the Government in view of what has taken place that the sooner we have Senate reform the better.

Sir LOMER GOUIN (Minister of Justice): The amendment that we make by this bill is to the effect that the notices of cancellation of leases which have been given during the last ten or fifteen years by the Department of the Interior, in the form in which they were given, are to be accepted as legal.

There was a case which was instituted by the Crown against a gentleman named Paulson who had a lease, which lease was cancelled by the department after giving notice in a certain form. It was decided by the Privy Council that such notice was not exactly in the terms in which it should have been given. We find that in many cases similar notices of cancellation were given, and the minister has brought in this

bill to have it declared by this Parliament that no such irregularity which might be found in the form of such notice should be considered as rendering the notice illegal. This does not affect in any way the rights of the interested parties in such leases as to preserving all such rights as they had from the leases granted to them by the Crown. An amendment was made by the Senate to clause 5, in which it was stated that the bill would not affect the rights acquired by judgment, or by action or suit instituted before the 1st of May, 1922. That section 5 was amended by this House, adding to the exceptions any petition of right which might be pending or had been presented to the Department of Justice. Our amendment is refused by the Senate. The Senate says we should not give any more rights than are given by section 2, that is to say, that all actions or rights of action as to the forms of notice should be proscribed after one year.

As the Prime Minister has said, we met the delegates of the Senate and we tried to convince them that they should accept the amendment that was moved and passed by this House, but we did not succeed in convincing them. It is important for the administration of the affairs of this country that we should have the legislation which is to be found in the first two clauses of this bill. No one is deprived of any right that he may have under any lease which was signed in his favour for any other reason or on any other ground. It is only a question of form in the notice, and that is why we say that this legislation is acceptable.

We would have preferred to have clause 5 as amended by this House, but after the refusal of the Senate to consent to it, we think we should ask the House to accept the three first clauses of the bill.

Mr. MEIGHEN: The view taken by the Senate of the matter is the view I expressed in this House, but I do not wish to argue now either in support of one side or the other of that question. The bill as it stood when it left this House provided that all cancellations should stand as valid save only those in respect of which litigation had been entered or a petition of right applied for. That proviso has been struck out by the Senate. The bill, as the Government advises us to accept it now, will make all cancellations valid. My experience of the department convinces me that no man whose lease has been cancelled has anything better than the flimsiest technicality on which to base a claim against the Crown. The utmost leniency was shown throughout the entire term of my office, through all the period before, and I am equally satisfied that it has been shown since.

In the Paulson case the judgment undoubtedly centered around a very doubtful technicality, one which it would not bother my conscience in the least to sweep away by legislation. I do believe it only just in the interests of the country that any action arising from such a case as that should be removed once and for all. As to saving cases that are in litigation, I have some sympathy with the desire of the Government to avoid any international question, any question arising from the rights of an American citizen or the citizen of any other country, but we must remember we are treating everybody alike in this legislation. It is not designed against any special citizen, against any one at all in particular. Our own people have to abide by it just the same as the citizens of the United States or of any country in Europe. All are treated precisely the same.

If it should turn out later that there are special rights of a substantial character appertaining to the citizens of any country, that might be treated of separately. I do not believe there are. Consequently, I think the Government is well advised under the circumstances in abandoning the amendment which the Senate has removed, and in accepting the bill in its original form with clause 4 made clause 3. I support it in that action, and if it is of any value, I pledge it any support in my power in any difficulty that may arise.

Amendments read the second time and concurred in.

PROROGATION OF PARLIAMENT

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

Mr. SPEAKER: The Right Honourable the Deputy of His Excellency the Governor General desires the immediate attendance of this Honourable House in the Chamber of the Honourable the Senate.

Accordingly, Mr. Speaker, with the House, went up to the Senate Chamber.

In the Senate Chamber, the Right Honourable the Deputy of His Excellency the Governor General was pleased to give, in His Majesty's name, the Royal Assent to the following bills:

BILLS ASSENTED TO

An Act for the relief of Joseph Robert Lloyd Beamish.

An Act for the relief of Clarence Robinson Miners.

An Act for the relief of Mary Eleanor Menton.

An Act for the relief of Harvey Easton Jenner.

An Act for the relief of Alexander Lawrie.

An Act for the relief of Alexander Frederick Naylor.

An Act for the relief of Margaret Yallowley Jones Conalty.

An Act for the relief of Daisy Mary Nicholson.

An Act for the relief of Edwin Dixon Weir.

An Act for the relief of Henry James Bristol.

An Act for the relief of Floran: Brys.

An Act for the relief of Catherine Rudd.

An Act for the relief of Norman Edward Harris.

An Act for the relief of Maria Amy Drury.

An Act for the relief of George Daly.

An Act for the relief of Wrae Elizabeth Snider.

An Act for the relief of Oliver Kelly.

An Act for the relief of Vera Hamlin.

An Act for the relief of George Drewery.

An Act for the relief of Kate Holmes.

An Act for the relief of Ernest Hull.

An Act for the relief of Leslie George Dewsbury.

An Act for the relief of John Douglas Stewart.

An Act for the relief of Helen Garrett.

An Act for the relief of Arthur Leslie Smith.

An Act for the relief of d'Eyncourt Marshall Ostrom.

An Act for the relief of George Herbert Stanley Campbell.

An Act for the relief of Deliah Jane Mills.

An Act for the relief of Robert James Owen.

An Act for the relief of Gibson Mackie Tod.

An Act for the relief of Agnes Mary Flynn Donoghue.

An Act for the relief of Margaret Thompson.

An Act for the relief of Daniel Calvin Bell.

An Act for the relief of Stanley Davidson Morning.

An Act for the relief of Johnston Nixon.

An Act for the relief of William Andrew Hawkins.

An Act for the relief of James Malone.

An Act for the relief of Marjorie Elizabeth Wickson.

An Act for the relief of Charles William Murtagh.

An Act for the relief of Marie Louise Dagenais.

An Act for the relief of Telesphore Joseph Morin.

An Act respecting The Esquimalt and Nanaimo Railway Company.

An Act respecting The Canadian Transit Company.

An Act respecting Itabira Corporation, Limited, and to change its name to "Itabira Corporation."

An Act respecting Niagara River Bridge Company.

An Act to incorporate Frontier College.

An Act to incorporate The General Missionary Society of the German Baptist Churches of North America.

An Act respecting the Department of National Defence.

An Act to amend the Judges Act.

An Act respecting the Canadian Pacific Railway Company.

An Act for the relief of James Hosie.

An Act for the relief of Mary Ila Cameron.

An Act for the relief of Frank Hamilton Bawden.

An Act for the relief of Harry Alexander Smith.

An Act for the relief of Allen Richard Morgan.

An Act for the relief of Mildred Emma Blachford.

An Act for the relief of James Henry Boyd.

An Act for the relief of Georgina Gibbings.

An Act to incorporate The Sisters of Saint Mary of Namur.

An Act to amend the Animal Contagious Diseases Act.

An Act to amend the Admiralty Act.

An Act to amend The Air Board Act.

An Act to amend The Salaries Act and the Senate and House of Commons Act.

An Act to amend the Consolidated Revenue and Audit Act.

An Act to amend The Fisheries Act, 1914.

An Act to amend The Currency Act, 1910.

An Act to amend The Public Service Retirement Act.

An Act to amend The Vancouver Harbour Commissioners Act.

An Act to amend the Supreme Court Act.

An Act to amend the Canada Shipping Act (Public Harbours and Harbour Masters).

An Act to amend The Fisheries Act, 1914.

An Act to amend The Meat and Canned Foods Act.

An Act to amend the Penny Bank Act.

An Act for the relief of Roy Wilbert Shaver.

An Act for the relief of Frank Clifford Gennery.

An Act for the relief of Sarah Brackinreid.

An Act for the relief of Mildred Catherine Touchbourne.

An Act for the relief of Frederick McClelland Aiken.

An Act for the relief of Arthur Percival Allen.

An Act for the relief of Eva Florence Heavens.

An Act for the relief of Dorothy Lillian Jewitt.

An Act for the relief of Gladys Mae Larivey.

An Act for the relief of Gladys Caroline Hilton.

An Act for the relief of Eva McRae.

An Act for the relief of Warren Garfield Young.

An Act for the relief of Benjamin Charles Bowman.

An Act for the relief of Ivy Elsie Miron-Smith.

An Act for the relief of Lillian May Maybee.

An Act for the relief of Phoebe Levina Simpson.

An Act for the relief of Thomas Preece.

An Act for the relief of Frederick Greenhill.

An Act for the relief of Hazel May Dillon.

An Act for the relief of William Arthur Parish.

An Act for the relief of James Hayden.

An Act for the relief of Bertha Plant.

An Act for the relief of James Murray Johnston.

An Act for the relief of Thomas Leonard Armstrong.

An Act for the relief of Henry Hardy Leigh.

An Act to amend the Canada Shipping Act (Pilotage).

An Act to amend The Escheats Act.

An Act to amend the Dominion Elections Act.
An Act to incorporate National Casualty Company.
An Act respecting The Edmonton, Dunvegan and British Columbia Railway Company.
An Act to provide for further advances to the Harbour Commissioners of Montreal.
An Act to amend the Indian Act.
An Act to regulate the Sale and Inspection of Root Vegetables.
An Act to provide for the constitution and powers of The Canadian Wheat Board.
An Act to amend The Income War Tax Act, 1917.
An Act respecting The Canadian Patriotic Fund.
An Act to amend The Returned Soldiers' Insurance Act.
An Act to amend The Soldier Settlement Act, 1919.
An Act to amend The Oleomargarine Act, 1919.
An Act to authorize the raising by way of loan, certain sums of money for the public service.
An Act to amend The Inland Revenue Act.
An Act to amend The Insurance Act, 1917.
An Act to amend The Loan Companies Act, 1914.
An Act to amend The Trust Companies Act, 1914.
An Act to amend The Criminal Code.
An Act to amend The Opium and Narcotic Drug Act.
An Act to regulate the Sale of Agricultural Fertilizers.
An Act to amend The Special War Revenue Act, 1915.
An Act to amend The Customs Act and The Department of Customs and Excise Act.
An Act for the relief of Margaret Maud Evelyn Clark Leith.
An Act for the relief of Mary Ann Phair.
An Act for the relief of William Park Jefferson.
An Act for the relief of Eva Maud Ginn.
An Act for the relief of Louise Janet Maude Bigford.
An Act for the relief of James Dickson Couch.
An Act for the relief of Cecil Grenville Bell.
An Act for the relief of Nykola Pirozyk.
An Act for the relief of Margaret Mary Ivor Horning.
An Act respecting a Patent of Simon W. Farber.
An Act respecting a Patent of Daniel Herbert Schweyer.
An Act respecting certain Patents of the Holophane Glass Company.
An Act respecting a Patent of the Dominion Chain Company.
An Act to amend The Customs Tariff, 1907.
An Act to provide for further advances to the Quebec Harbour Commissioners.
An Act to amend The Railway Act, 1919.
An Act respecting The Canadian Red Cross Society.
An Act to amend The Department of Soldiers' Civil Re-establishment Act.
An Act to amend The Bankruptcy Act.
An Act respecting the Harbour of Trenton in the Province of Ontario.
An Act for carrying into effect the Treaties of Peace between His Majesty and Hungary and Turkey.
An Act to amend The Canada Temperance Act.
An Act respecting Notices of Cancellation of Leases of Dominion Lands.
An Act to amend The Pension Act.

To these bills the Royal Assent was pronounced by the Clerk of the Senate in the following words:

In His Majesty's name, the Right Honourable, the Deputy of His Excellency the Governor General doth assent to these Bills.

Then the Honourable the Speaker of the House of Commons addressed the Right Honourable the Deputy of His Excellency the Governor General as follows:

MAY IT PLEASE YOUR HONOUR.

The Commons of Canada have voted Supplies required to enable the Government to defray certain expenses of the public service.

In the name of the Commons I present to Your Honour the following Bill:

An Act for granting to His Majesty certain sums of money for the public service of the financial year ending the 31st March, 1922.

To which Bill I humbly request Your Honour's assent.

To this Bill the Clerk of the Senate, by command of the Right Honourable the Deputy of His Excellency the Governor General, did thereupon say:

In His Majesty's name, The Right Honourable, the Deputy of His Excellency the Governor General thanks his loyal subjects, accepts their benevolence, and assents to these Bills.

After which the Right Honourable the Deputy of His Excellency the Governor General was pleased to close the First Session of the Fourteenth Parliament of the Dominion of Canada, with the following speech:

Honourable Members of the Senate:
Members of the House of Commons:

In relieving you of the duty of further attendance in Parliament, I desire to express my pleasure and satisfaction at the extent to which, in addition to other matters of public interest, you have found it possible to deal with the many important subjects to which your consideration was invited at the opening of the session.

The readjustment of the Customs Tariff, to the consideration of which much time has been given, will, it is hoped, meet in a considerable degree the desire for tariff revision, while not creating any serious disturbance of industrial conditions.

The attention given to the question of transportation costs, the recommendations of the special committee of the House of Commons which has so fully investigated the whole problem, and the resultant legislation, will effect immediate substantial reductions of freight rates in a manner which cannot fail to be of far-reaching benefit to all parts of the Dominion.

The measures passed to aid or control the marketing of certain farm products, and the manufacture, marking, and sale of fertilizers;

for the expansion of cold storage facilities, and for further experimental and research work in the control of fruit diseases and the eradication of bovine tuberculosis, should prove of substantial service in the development of the grain, live stock, dairying, and fruit production industries of the country, and in further protection against their natural foes.

Pursuant to representations made on behalf of the prairie provinces, legislation has been adopted for the re-establishment of a Wheat Board, which it is hoped will meet the desire for a more equitable method of marketing Canadian wheat.

The special committee of the House of Commons appointed to examine into the questions and problems related to the welfare of soldiers and their dependents has submitted many useful and important recommendations on pensions, insurance, land settlement, sheltered employment, and other aspects of re-establishment, which, together with the legislation based thereon, should do much to ensure the fulfilment of the just and patriotic purposes these measures are intended to serve.

The co-ordination, under one ministerial head, of the defence forces of Canada in a single department of National Defence, is certain to increase efficiency, and at the same time effect a much-needed economy in these branches of the national service.

By amendment to the election laws, full freedom of the franchise has been secured for additional thousands of Canadian women. Important temperance legislation has also been placed upon the statutes.

Substantial progress has been made in the negotiations which have taken place with respect to granting the control of the natural resources of the three western provinces to their respective provincial governments.

It is gratifying to observe that the depression of business is gradually becoming relieved, and that unemployment throughout the Dominion has correspondingly decreased. The conference being arranged between the federal and provincial authorities will, it is hoped, disclose means of more effectively dealing with problems incidental to unemployment, whenever and wherever they may arise.

The success of the recent loan operations of the Dominion is gratifying to all. The measures adopted to provide needed additional revenue give assurance of a determination to make reasonable provision for the public service and to maintain the high credit of Canada in the money markets of the world.

Members of the House of Commons:

I thank you for the supplies granted for the carrying on of the public services of the Dominion. The sums appropriated will be expended with due regard to economy and efficiency.

Honourable Members of the Senate:
Members of the House of Commons:

In view of the approval you have given to the treaties concluded at the Washington Conference on the Limitation of Armaments, the Government will be in a position immediately to sanction on behalf of Canada the ratification of these agreements, the effect of which, it may confidently be anticipated, will be of far-reaching significance in promoting international good-will and co-operation.

I humbly thank Divine Providence for the promise of a bountiful harvest, and devoutly pray that when Parliament reassembles, the prospects, at present so bright, will have been realized in all parts of the Dominion.

This concluded the First Session of the Fourteenth Parliament.

INDEX

FIRST SESSION—FOURTEENTH PARLIAMENT, 1922

Abbreviations:—1r., 2r., 3r.,=first, second, third reading. Admn.=Administration. Amdt.=Amendment. Com.=Committee. Dept.=Department. Div.=Division. Govt.=Government. M.=Motion. Neg.=Negative. Qu.=Question. Ref.=Reference. Rep.=Report. Res.=Resolution. Sec.=Section.

Abattoirs. *See also* Cold Storage; Health of Animals; Meat and Canned Foods
Maritime provinces in, M. 992, 1023

Accountants. *See* House of Commons; Senate

Accounts. *See* Consolidated Revenue and Audit Act; Finance; Public Accounts

Accredited Herds. *See* Health of Animals

Acme Grain Company, default of, 2834

Acoustics. *See* House of Commons

Actions. *See* Escheats Act Amdt.

Active Militia. *See* Militia; National Defence

Adamson, Mr. Justice, appointment of, 1670

Address in reply to Governor General's Speech, 10, 15, 50, 98, 122, 173, 211, 260, 303, 326
Mover (Mr. McMurray) 10; Seconder (Mr. Mercier) 15
Speakers, Messrs: Baldwin, 60; Baxter, 98; Beaubien, 280; Brown, 332; Campbell, 356; Carmichael, 155; Church, 116; Crerar, 50; d'Anjou, 306; Denis (St. Denis), 348; Dickie, 341; Drayton, 195; Evans, 300; Forke, 76; Gouin, 140; Harris, 307; Hughes, 224; Irvine, 211; Johnson (Moosejaw), 112; Kennedy (Edmonton), 142; King (Mackenzie), 38; Ladner, 321, 326; Lewis, 149; Logan, 105; Macdonald (Pictou), 186; MacKelvie, 159; MacLaren, 353; MacLean (Prince), 335; Maclean (York), 63; McBride, 316; Manion, 263; Marler, 243; Meighen, 19; Neill, 169; Pritchard, 250; Putnam, 309; Raymond, 253; Robitaille, 320; Ross, 95; Ryckman, 284; St. Père, 281; Sexsmith, 293; Sheard, 294; Speakman, 80; Stansell, 359; Stevens, 230; Stork, 330; Turgeon; 273; Warner, 349; Woods, 92; Woodsworth, 84
Motion agreed to, 362; acknowledgment of address by Governor General, 746-7

Adjournments. *See* House of Commons

Adjustment of War Claims. *See* War Claims

Administration of Justice. *See* Justice

Administration of Oaths of Office bill, 1r., 6

Admiralty Act Amdt. bill (Deputy Registrar and Deputy Judge) 1r., 245-6; 2r., com., 2822; 3r., 2823

Admiralty Court vacancy at Quebec, 1275

Adulteration of Food. *See* Food; Health

Advertising. *See* American Magazines

Aerial Patrol. *See* Air Service

Aeronautics, control of. *See* Air Board Act

Aeroplanes. *See* Air Service

Age of consent. *See* Criminal Code Amdt.

Agents Provacateur. *See* National Defence; Royal Canadian Mounted Police

Ages, Population by. *See* Population

Agricultural bloc in United States, 69, 210, 988. *See also* Budget; Customs; United States

Agricultural Commodities. *See* Farm Products

Agricultural Fairs. *See* Exhibitions

Agricultural Fertilizers. *See also* Fertilizers
Inquiry as to legislation, 3041
Speaker's ruling, 1282

Agricultural Fertilizers, Regulation and Sale of, bill. Res. 3043; 1r., 3044; 2r., 3044; ref. to Com. on Agriculture, 3044; com., 3194; 3r., 3195. Senate amdts., 3607

Agricultural Implements, 2185, 2217, 2360, 2464, 2564, 2620
Brantford factories, closing of, 2375
Duties on, reduction, 2115, 2175, 2206, 2217, 2230, 2360, 2375, 2381, 2484, 2534, 2592, 2731, 3118-3120, 3141. *See also* speeches on Address; Budget; Customs Tariff
Drawbacks and refunds, 2175, 3122
Ploughs, 3121, 3229
M. (Mr. Johnston — Last Mountain) to reduce, 3121, 3229
Imported from United States, 2413-14, 2486
By United Grain Growers, 3118-19
International Harvester Company, 2382
Massey-Harris Company, 2175
Price of, 1476, 2188. *See also* Address; Budget
At home and abroad, 2452, 2620
Protection, 2697
Manufacturers, and, 2575
Raw Materials for, 302, 309, 766. *See also* Customs Tariff
Raymond, Mr., and, 254, 255, 2705. *See also* speeches on Budget
Repair parts, 1901
Standardization of parts, 2406
Tariff, and, *See* Address; Budget; Customs Tariff

Agricultural Institute, 657, 969

Agricultural Instruction Act, 651-2, 994, 1012
Marshall, Mr. Duncan, 1032

Agricultural Labourers. *See* Immigration; Labour; Unemployment

Agriculture. *See also* speeches on Address; Budget
Accredited herds, 995, 2556, 2734-43
Diseases, 968. *See also under this title,* Health of Animals
Valuation, 1000
Animal diseases. *See* Animal Contagious Diseases; Health of Animals
Bacon, production and marketing, 1025
Bounty to, 1698
Bovine Tuberculosis. *See under this title.* Health of Animals
Butter. *See also* Oleomargarine
Accumulation in England, 997
Colouring of, 1778
Imported, qu. 613, 803
New Zealand, from, qu. 614
Protection against oleomargarine, 177. *See also* Oleomargarine
Vitamines in, 1781

Agriculture — *Con.*
Cattle. *See also* Live Stock
Embargo on. *See* Cattle Embargo
Free carriage of, 1029
Cold storage, 818, 992, 998, 2557
Abattoirs, maritime provinces, 992-3, 1023
Quebec, 1471
Warehouses, 3521
Commissioner of, qu. 609, 645, 3501. *See also* Marshall, Mr. Duncan
Committee on. *See* Agriculture and Colonization
Competition, 2698
Conditions and prospects, 16, 53, 78, 81, 85, 113, 150, 231, 252, 300, 2147, 2149, 2153, 2156, 2163, 2216, 2403, 2885. *See also* speeches on Address; Agriculture Estimates; Budget
Statement by Manitoba Agricultural College, 2332
Contributions to railway tonnage, 1927. *See also* Freight Rates; Wheat Board
Dairying. *See that title*
Depression in, 1475, 2147. *See also* Address; Budget
Department
Calgary live stock branch, qu. 607
Comparison of average salaries, 750
Dominion Apiarist, 592
Estimates, 1018, 1718, 3520
Marshall, Mr. Duncan, appointment of, 3501. *See also that title*
Salaries and contingencies, 588, 644, 3504
Destructive Insect and Pest Act, 590, 3520. *See also under this title,* Entomology
Diseases of Animals. *See under this title,* Accredited Herds; Health of Animals
Entomology, 813
Exhibitions, 993, 1026, 3521. *See also that title*
Experimental and illustration Farms, 795, 2557, 3521
Buildings, expenditure on, 1264
M. (Mr. Sutherland) to reduce item, 812
Mont Laurier, 994
Saunders, Dr. C. E., Dominion Cerealist, gratuity to, 590, 3522
Export figures, 2446, 2638
Farm labourers, 79, 87, 251, 1153
Harvest excursions to West, 337
Immigration of. *See* Immigration
Unemployment. *See* Unemployment
Fertilizers. *See* Agricultural Fertilizers; Fertilizers
Fruit Industry. *See that title*
Importance of, 2386. *See* Address; Budget
International Institute of, 657, 969

Agriculture — *Con.*
Health of Animals, 967. *See also under this title,* Accredited Herds
Bovine tuberculosis, 2556
Hog cholera, 1007, 1028
Alderson claim, 1004
Tuberculosis, 3521. *See also* Animal contagious Diseases
Japanese engaged in, 345-6. *See also* Oriental Aliens
Lecturers, 1023
Live Stock. *See that title*
Manitoba Agricultural College, statements on, 2332
Markets, 251, 2149. *See also* Address; Budget; Cattle Embargo; Wheat Board
Military and agricultural expenditures, comparison, 1137
Mixed farming, 2592
Potatoes. *See that title*
Root Vegetables. *See that title*
Saunders, Dr. C. E., Dominion Cerealist, gratuity to, 590, 3522
Seed, Feed, and Fertilizer Control, 1011
Seed Grain, 3522
Stock-grazing and feeding, 1718. *See also* Live Stock.
Unemployment, and, 2158, 2331. *See also* Labour; Unemployment
Wheat Board. *See that title*

Agriculture and Colonization, Committee on
Bouchard, Mr., substituted for Mr. Stein, 2035
Canadian Council of Agriculture Memorandum ref. to, 377
Constitutionality of Wheat Board, Law Officers' opinion, 940
McCoig, Senator, attendance of, 1900, 2406
Reports
Inquiry as to, 1929
Second and third, 657
M. to concur in, 703, 726, 776
Amdt. (Mr. Meighen) to refer back, 779
M. as amended, agreed to, 786
Third, concurred in, 786
Fourth, concurred in, 865
Fifth, M. to concur in, 2915
Amdt. (Mr. Sutherland), 2951; neg. 2969
See Wheat Board, for further proceedings
Standardization of parts of agricultural machinery, 2406

Air Board, qu. 366. *See also* Militia and Defence; National Defence

Air Board — *Con.*
Aeronautical research, 3499
Biggar, Col. O. M., resignation of, 1726
Civil aviation, 1722. *See also* Air Force
Estimates, salaries, etc., 1722
Expenditure, details of, 1728

Air Board Act, 1919, Amdt. bill (Compensation for death or injury)
Res. 2357, 2820; 1r., 2821, 2r., com., 3r., 2826

Aircraft Limitation. *See* Limitation of Armaments

Air Force. *See also* Air Board; Militia, National Defence
Aeroplanes, danger of attack from, 2085-98
Civil Aviation, and, 1047, 1722
Aerial patrol, High River, Alta., 1048; qu. 1066, 1723
Camp Borden, 1728
Co-operation with provinces, 1722
Customs patrol, Vancouver, B.C., 1730
Forest patrol, 1047
High River station, 1048; qu. 1066, 1723
Railway Belt, B.C., 1730
Gasoline for aeroplanes. *See* Gasoline
Pensions, Widowed mothers, 1305

Air Service. *See* Air Force

Aird, Sir John, 1128

Alberta
Dry areas, 1042
Harbours and rivers, 2004
Indian schools. *See* Indians
Meeting of defeated candidates, 2858
Public buildings, 1254
Second homesteads, 1042
Soldier's Civil Re-establishment hospitals, 1344

Alcohol. *See also* Customs Tariff; Opium and Narcotic Drugs; Prohibition; Special War Revenue Act
Country doctors and, 2177
Retail druggists, for, ques. 1213, 1400; 2114, 2176-7, 2191

Alderson Claim. *See* Agriculture, Health of Animals

Aldred, Mr. J. E., 1128

Ale. *See* Liquor; Special War Revenue Act; Taxation

Algoma Steel Corporation, rails, 1689

Aliens. *See also* Immigration; Labour; Unemployment
Deportation of. *See* Immigration Act Amdt.; Opium and Narcotic Drugs
Enemy property, custodians of 1672, qu. 1904
C.P.R. shares held by, 1672
Mulvey, Mr. Thomas, qu. 3363
Prince Rupert, 3606, 3601
Fisher & Oughton, qu. 1773, 3601, 3606
Thorsch, Mr., qu. 1772
Williams & Manson, qu. 1772, 3601, 3606
Lord Kitchener, news of his death, and, 2155
Oriental Immigration. *See* Oriental Aliens
Taxation of, 2155
Women of Alien Birth. *See* Dominion Franchise Act, M. (Mr. Euler)

Allan, Sir Montagu, 872. *See also* Banks, Merchants Bank

Alliances, Political, 2095, 2097. *See also* Nationalists; Progressive Party
"Morganatic alliance", 2095, 2344

Alpine Club, grant to, 1053, 1387

Alternative Vote. *See* Proportional Representation

Aluminum Company of America, 71, qu. 728
Cedar Rapids power, qu. 1375

Amalgamation of Departments. *See* National Defence Bill

Ambassador, Canadian, at Washington. *See* Canadian Representation

American Bankers' Association, 2189

American Magazines, importation and competition, 3109

Amherst, N.S.
Car repair contracts, 1702
Drill hall, 1238

Ammunition. *See* Militia and Defence

Anaesthetics, use of. *See* Criminal Code Amdt.

Anderson, Mr. R. K. (Halton)
Budget, 2364. Tribute to Finance Minister; taxation and the cost of living, 2364; tariff; import and excise duties; free trade; origin of protective policy in United States; population, increase

Anderson, Mr. R. K. — *Con.*
Budget — *Con.*
of; tariff reductions; a two and a half per cent budget; sales tax increase, 2365; party without definite fiscal policy; 2366; revenue and protective tariffs in England and United States; Fordney tariff, 2367; reciprocity with United States; British and American investment in Canadian industries, 2368; home manufacture; trade with Great Britain and United States, 2369; home market; difficulties due to war; debt and deficits, 2370; economy and expenditure; civil service; militia and naval service, 2371; taxation; railways; emigration; dumping clause, 2372; beet sugar; the amendment, 2373
Burlington channel bridge, 2007
Daylight Saving, M. (Mr. Kay) 954
Halifax and St. John quarantine stations, 1241
Halton county
Highways — Dundas Street, qu. 1065
Post offices, 1247
Immigration, medical inspection, 2021-2
Opium and Narcotic Drug Act, 3014
Orders in Council, qu. 935
Overseas service — categories, 3317
Penitentiary Act Amdt, 790
Pensions, commutation of, 1281
Public buildings
Rentals, 1259
Water, 1266
Soldiers' Civil Re-establishment, care and medical examination of patients, 1281
Steel rods, refund of duties, 1774

Andrews, Mr. A. J., K.C.
Winnipeg Strike correspondence, 2042

Anglo-French Relations. *See* Genoa Conference; Limitation of Armaments

Anglo-Japanese Treaty, 168. *See also* Japan; Limitation of Armaments

Animal Contagious Diseases Act
Administration, 967, qu. 3362

Animal Contagious Diseases Act Amdt. bill (Compensation for slaughtered animals), 1r., 1283; 2r., com., 2102; com., 2734; 3r., 2806

Animals, Cruelty to. *See* Criminal Code Amdt.

Annexation, 2550
"Annexationists of the prairie provinces", 1020

Annual Drill. *See* Militia

Annuities Branch, Salaries, etc., 776

Anti-Conscription, 22. *See also* Military Service Act Amdt.

Anti-Dumping. *See* Budget; Customs; Fruit; Trade

Appeal Cases. *See* Judges' Act Amdt.

Appeal Judges, Saskatchewan. *See* Judges Act Amdt.

Appeals from Provincial Courts. *See* Supreme Court Act Amdt.

Apples. *See* Fruit

Appropriation Acts
1. Bill No. 26 (Interim Supply — for $53,-901,669.17 for 1922-23). Res., 362, 598; 1r., 2r., com., 3r., 599
2. Bill No. 85 (for 1921-22, for $9,623,-792.61 and 1922-23 for $88,517,204.53). Res., 1r., 2r., com., 3r., 1842-3
3. Bill No. 202 (for 1922-23 for $175,766,-646.71). Res. 1r., 2r., com., 3r., 3607

Appropriations not required. *See* Estimates

Archambault, Mr. Joseph (Chambly and Verchères)
Bankruptcy Act, trustees for Montreal district, 1183
Canadian Govt. Merchant Marine ships in Montreal harbour, qu. 2637
Criminal Code Amdt. (Mr. Woodsworth). *See under this title,* Immigration-Criminal Code
Health Dept. correspondence relating to drugs, 1289, 1377
Immigration-Criminal Code bills (Mr. Woodsworth)
Special Com. Reports, 1988, 2519, 3156, 3280
Isle Perrot bridge, qu. 1377
Military Service Act Amdt., 642
Montreal Harbour Commission, employees, 1289
Naturalization Act, 1914, Amdt. bill (Residence), 1062
Newspaper censors, 1069
Opium and Narcotic Drugs
Correspondence with wholesale druggists, 1289, 1377
Point of order — relevancy, 1890
Pratt vs. Delphine, 302
Railway Commission, Chief Traffic Officer, ques., 1377, 2215, 2457

Archambault, Mr. Joseph — *Con.*
St. John harbour, qu., 1401
Trent canal, total expenditure, qu. 1376
Victoria bridge tolls, qu. 1377
War claims, details of estimates, qu. 1288
Welland canal, total expenditure, qu. 1376

Architect. *See* Parliament Buildings

Archives. *See* Public Archives

Arctic Ocean, patrol. *See* Naval Service

Arctic Regions, Mounted Police in, 3497

Arichat, port physician, qu. 1773

Armaments. *See* Limitation of Armaments

Armorial Bearings of Canada, Welsh emblem, 3601

Armouries. *See also* Militia and Defence
Fittings and alterations, 1261, 1288
Quebec, in, qu. 1287

Army and Navy Veterans, Oriental immigration, 1514

Arsenals. *See* Militia

Arthur Young & Company, 1490. *See also* Civil Service, Classification

Arthurs, Mr. James (Parry Sound)
Canadian Transit Company Bill, 1771
Cash Bonus to Soldiers, 403; M., 429
Empire and Ascension days, 1769
Fishing schooner race, 3514
Geodetic survey, 1986
Labour Dept.
Nova Scotia strike, 584
Salaries, 575
Temporary clerks, 567
Naval Service, cruisers, qu. 2039
Pension Act Amdt. bill, 3440-53
Postal receipts, qu. 938
Railway Act Amdt. (Crowsnest pass) 3959
Reading of documents, 560
Returned soldier hikers, qu. 3153
Rural mail routes, qu. 3152
Soldiers' settlement, building loans, 3475
Transcontinental railway, 919

Articles. *See* League of Nations

Artillery. *See* Militia; Royal Canadian Artillery

Artisans, Immigration of. *See* Immigration; Labour

Ascension Day Adjournment. *See* House of Commons

Asiatic Exclusion League of Canada, Oriental Immigration, 1514

Asiatics. *See also* Immigration; Oriental Aliens
British Columbia in, 171, 183

Assiniboine River Floods, 1842, 2003, 3545
Relief measures, inquiry, 3491

Assistant Chief Electoral Officer. *See* Chief Electoral Officer

Athletics. *See* Cadet Camps

Atlanta, Ga., Penitentiary, 1278

Atlantic-Pacific, Canadian ports. *See* British Preference; Steamship Services

Atlantic Sugar Refineries, drawback, 2850

Audibility of Debates. *See* House of Commons

Audit, Supreme Court pre-audit, 1275

Audit Act. *See* Consolidated Revenue and Audit Act Amdt.

Auditor General
Contingencies, 3504
Salaries, 793

Auditor General's Report, 380, 424
Public Works, expenditure of previous year, 1270
Ref. to Public Accounts Committee, 1462

Aurora, warship. *See* Naval Service

Australia
Immigration policy, 1536
Preservation of Industries Act, 2411, 2648
Reciprocal trade with, 33, 174, 2110, 2802
Correspondence tabled, 9
Steamship services. *See* Steamship Services
Trade relations with, 2592

Automobiles. *See also* Taxation
Duty on, 2116, 2186, 2206, 2232, 2574
Drawbacks, refunds, 2850
Excise sales tax, 2116, 2177, 2186, 2206, 2230, 2260, 2346-7, 2388, 3272-3, 3276
Amended, 2857
Ford car, cost in Detroit and Canada, 2186
Ford Motor Company, 3273
Duty paid by, qu. 3599
Output, 3273
Protection and profits, 2232, 2696
Imports, qu. 1633

Automobiles — *Con.*
Industry, protection of, 2696, 2730, 3132
Number of, by provinces, 2566
Refund of taxes, 3600
Results of protection of industry, 2696
Theft, penalty, 2831
Value, $1,000, to be admitted free for settlers, 2116

Aviation. *See* Air Board; Air Force

Bachelor Tax. *See* Taxation

Backus, Mr. E. W. *See also* Lake of the Woods Repeal Bill
Lease of timber areas, 2805; qu. 2992

Bacon, production. *See* Agriculture; Live Stock
Conference on, 1025

Baddeck, N.S.
Public Buildings, 1238
Wharf, 1269, 1765

Baie des Chaleurs railway service. *See* Gaspé Railways

Baker, the late Colonel G. H., M.P.
Memorial to, 1929
Appointment of Special Com., 2101
Second report, 3490

Baldwin, Mr. W. K. (Stanstead)
Address in reply, 60; congratulations to mover and seconder; Miss Macphail, income tax collections, 60; attitude of leader of Opposition, 60-61; conscription, 61; leader of Opposition, 62
Armouries, 1288
Budget, 2250. Public debt; sugar control; railways; economy, 2250; naval service; development of natural resources, 2251; geographical difference; party promises; water power development; St. Lawrence river waterway, 2252; tariff; Progressive party; Hon. Alexander Mackenzie; Sir John Macdonald and protection, 2253; wartime wages and prices; immigration, national spirit; inequalities of taxation, 2255
Oleomargarine, Manufacture and importation, M. (Mr. Neill) 1832

Balkan States, credit to. *See* Loans; Roumania

Ballantyne, Hon. C. C. *See* Banks; Ministers and Directorships

Bancroft, Mr. L. P. (Selkirk)
Icelandic river improvements, 2004
Pension Act Amdt. bill, 3463
Pensions for lightkeepers, 1496
Selkirk wharf, 2004

Banff, Windermere road, 1051, 1682

Banking and Commerce, Committee on
Bouchard, Mr., substituted for Mr. Stein, 2035
Insurance Act, 1917, Amdt. bill, ref. to, 1210
Loan Companies Act Amdt. bill, ref to, 1210
Trust Companies Act Amdt. bill, ref. to, 1210

Bankruptcy Act, qu., 703

Bankruptcy Act Amdt. bills
1. Bill No. 45 (Mr. Jacobs — additional grounds for petition in bankruptcy) 1r., 821; ref. to Com. on Banking and Commerce, 1395
2. Bill No. 56 (Mr. Ethier — court to which petition shall be presented) 1r., 1132; 2r., ref. to Banking and Commerce Com., 1662
3. Bill No. 107 (Sir Lomer Gouin) 1r., 2035; 2r., com., 3025; 3r., 3026
Sections and Subjects discussed:
Avoidance of general assignment of book debts, 3025
Court of bankruptcy, 3026
Judges to be assigned by chief Justice, 3026
Senate amendments, concurrence in, 3611
Suspension of payment, notice of, 3025
Winding up Act, 3026

Banks and Banking. *See also* Finance; Loans; Taxation
American Bankers' Association, 2189
Bank Act, revision. *See* Address; Budget
Bank balances and real wealth, 2497
Chartered banks, returns, 865
Cheque tax, 2117, 2177, 2329, 2852, 2856, 3258
Circulation, deposits, loans, etc., qu. 1901
Circulation, tax on, 2117, 2626
Commerce, 1085-7
Credit system, 1290. *See also* Financial Credits
Credits, 1071, 2729. *See also* Loans
Currency, issue of, 2501
Deposits, ratio to capital, 2728
Gold in Canadian banks, qu. 2971
Grain trade, financing of, 2246

Banks and Banking — *Con.*
Income tax payments by, qu. 1400
Interest, 1291, 3601
Alleged violation of Bank Act, 2627
Interlocking directorates, 2503
Loans to directors, 1093
Merchants', 1085, 1092, 1121, 3604
Allan, Sir Montagu, 872
Amalgamation, 2727
Ballantyne, Hon. C. C., 1085
Independent inquiry by Parliament, 2396
Macarow, Mr. D. C., case against, qu. 2305
Merger, 158, 237, qu. 367, 872, 1085, 2727
Montreal Bank and, 1085
Royal Trust Company, and, 1085
Montreal Bank, 1071-85, 1129
Canadian Pacific, and, 64-66
Unemployed and, 87
Montreal City & District Savings Bank, 1087
Municipalities, withholding credit from, 2627
Nationalization of, 2325-8
New banks, starting, 2501
Number, reserves, deposits, loans, property, qu. 1182
Penny Bank Act Amdt. bill. *See that title*
Penny Banks, depositories for money received, 1132
Profits, circulation, interest, etc., qu. 3598
Refusal to advance money to school board, 2627
Royal Bank, 1087
Special War Revenue taxation. *See that title*
Note circulation, payments on, qu., 1400
System, revision of, 138, 158, 223, 237, 352, 2501, 2506. *See also* Budget; Irvine

Barclay, Mr. A. J., qu., 963-4

Barkhouse, Captain, 1748

Barnet, Major. *See* Soldier Settlement Board

Barnjum, Mr. Frank J., Forest Protection, 1049

Battlefields Commission, 119, 771. *See also* War Graves

Battlefields Memorials. *See also* War Memorials
Estimates, 2098, 2975

Baxter, Mr. Charles W., Appointment of successor, qu., 2457

Baxter, Hon. J. B. M. (St. John City and Counties of St. John and Albert)
Address in reply, 98. Congratulations to Mr. Speaker, 98; Conservative party, campaign literature, 99; natural resources of western provinces, 100; maritime provinces, 101; tariff and reciprocity, 102; railway situation; Canadian ports, 104; economy in expenditure; industrial depression, 105
Audibility of debates, 708
British Preference and Canadian seaports, M. (Mr. Logan) 493, 712
Budget, 2340. Congratulations to Finance Minister; tariff; per capita taxation; expenditure, 2341; Progressives and Government; duties on coal, boots and shoes; platform of 1919; failure of Government to implement pledges, 2343; reciprocity with United States; morganatic alliance, 2344; platform of Canadian Council of Agriculture; the amendment, 2345; Wheat Board; Crowsnest pass agreement; redistribution; taxation of luxuries; automobile tax, 2346; tariff proposals as they affect farmer and labourer; trade with Germany, 2347
Canada Shipping Act Amdt. bill, 2820
Canada Temperance Act Amdt bill, 3007
Date of coming into force, 3008
Canadian National railways
Government ownership and operation, 1965
Immigration, and, 2165
Intercolonial, 1967
Menus, cost of printing, qu., 1931
Carleton, N.B., returning officer, 3538, 3603, 3606
Civil Service — Mr. Martell, 3101
Criminal Code Amdt. bills
Fines, payment to municipalities, 2832
Half-breed scrip, 3217, 3221
Pool-selling and book-making, point of order, 2973
Customs tariff operation, 769
Dauphinee, Mr. Charles, Lunenburg, qu., 1902, 2458, 2584
Daylight Saving, M. (Mr. Kay) 956
Dominion Elections Act Amdt. bill, 2810
Dominion Lands, Cancellation of Leases bill, 3468-74
Dredging, maritimes provinces, 2006
Enfranchisement of foreign-born wives, M. (Mr. Euler) 492
Escheats Act Amdt. bill, 2826

Baxter, Hon. J. B. M. — *Con.*
Fisheries
Deputy Minister of, 2166
Markets, 2166
Fisheries Act Amdt. bill, 2817
Freight Rates
Special Com. on third report, 3577
Sub-amdt., 3586
Harbours and Rivers, New Brunswick, 1991
St. John harbour improvements, 2013
Hudson bay railway, 1970
Hudson, Government cutter, qu., 3598
Immigration, maritime provinces and, 2165
Interior Dept., salaries, 454
Judges' Act Amdt. bill, 426, 546
Labour Dept., 494, 495
Mildred McColl, patrol boat, qu., 3598
Military expenditure and policy, 1149, 2094
Militia and Defence
Arsenal, Quebec, 2094
Expenditure and policy, 1149, 2094
Ministers and Directorships, M. (Mr. McMaster) 1117
Monopolies and excess profits, 3276
Monuments, historic sites, qu., 469
National Defence bill, 2809
Negro Point breakwater, 2013
Opium and Narcotic Drugs Act Amdt.
Appeal, restriction of right, 3021
Deportation, 3024
Parliament buildings, architects' fees, 2016
Penitentiary Act Amdt. bill, 789
Pensions Act Amdt. bill, 3441
Railway policy, 1965
Rideau Hall, coal supply, 1757
Royal Canadian Mounted Police
M. (Mr. Woodsworth) 840
St. John, in, 736
St. John terminal facilities, 848-9
St. John Valley railway, 3039
Savoy, J. Clovis, qu., 3363
Soldier Settlement Act Amdt. bill, 3408
Special War Revenue Act Amdt. — Insurance, 3253
Spruce bud worm, 815
Wharves in New Brunswick, transfer of, qu., 2305

Beatty, Mr. E. W., President of C.P.R., 126, 127, 1128
Labour costs, 2317

Beaubien, Mr. A. L. (Provencher)
Address in reply, 280; congratulations to mover and seconder, aims of Progressive party, 280
Boy Scouts, 773

Beaubien, Mr. A. L. — *Con.*
Canadian National railways — wrecks caused by defective cars from United States, 1708
Immigration — Ukrainians, 3061

Beck, Sir Adam, 63, 71, 92, 123, 124, 134, 633, 1327, 1937. *See also* Hydro Electric; Maclean, Mr., (York); St. Lawrence Waterway

Beef, Imports of, qu., 610

Beer. *See* Liquor; Taxation

Beet Sugar. *See* Budget; Inland Revenue Act Amdt.; Special War Revenue

Behring Sea Patrol, 1736. *See also* Naval Service

Béland, Hon. H. S. (Minister of Soldiers' Civil Re-establishment and Minister in charge of the Department of Health)
Canadian Patriotic Fund bill, 3479-84
Canadian Red Cross Society bill, 3151, 3386
Canteen funds, disposal, 3329, 3308
Cash grants to soldiers, 394
M. (Mr. Arthurs) 441
Chaudière Valley floods, 3492
Conservation Commission, 456-7
Election promises, 402
Health, department of
Correspondence with wholesale druggists, 1289, 1377
Estimates, 2017
Immigration, medical inspection, 2021
Quarantine, 2021
Salaries, 775
Venereal diseases, 2022
Insurance claim of heirs of deceased soldiers, 1349. *See also under this title* Returned Soldiers Iusurance
Opium and Narcotic Drugs
Correspondence with wholesale druggists, M. (Mr. Archambault) 1289, 1377
Enforcement of Act, 2017
Prohibition and, 2018
Opium and Narcotic Drugs Act Amdt. bill, 775, 1841, 2823, 3013
Appeal, 3020
Deportation, 3024
Pension Act Amdt. bill, 3402, 3439-64
Pension Commissioners, Board of, 1339, 1349-50, 3336
Appeals, 3341
Charges against, 3041

Béland, Hon. H. S. — *Con.*
Pension Commissioners. — *Con.*
Discretion, 392
Memorandum of Chairman, 2994
Representation of Quebec, 1350
Pensions
Commutation, 392
European War and active militia, 1353, 1361
Expenditure under report of Special Com., 3523
Widowed mothers, M. (Mr. Power) 1307
Pensions, Insurance, etc., Special Com.
Appointed, 496
Final report, 3355
Shaw, Mr., 3326
Returned Soldiers, alleged ill-treatment of children of, 2639
Returned Soldiers' Insurance Act Amdt. bill, 3319, 3358, 3388, 3398, 3437
Soldiers' Civil Re-establishment dept.
Amalgamation or abolition of, 1341
Employers' Liability compensation, 1348
Estimates, 1279, 1339
Hospitals, 1348
Nurses' salaries, 1342
Operating expenses and working capital, 1347
Patients, care and medical examination of, 1280
Pensions, 1349, 1353, 1361. *See also under this title,* Pensions
Royal Commission on Pensions, 388. *See also under this title,* Pension Commissioners
Staff, 405, 1343
Reduction of, 3602
Salary increases, 385, 388, 401, 405, 551
Waddington, Mr., 385, 398
Unemployment relief, 1352, 3528
Vocational loans, 1346
Vocational training, 1281
War service gratuity, interest on, 1347
Soldiers' Civil Re-establishment Dept. bill, 3597, 3609
Soldiers' homes, establishment of, 1348
Unemployment relief, 1352, 3528

Belgium, free trade and, 2525

Bell Telephone Company, rates increase, 132

Belley, Mr. Alfred, salary, 3504

Belley, Hon. Mr., and conscription. *See* Military Service Act Amdt.

Benefit Societies. *See* Insurance Act Amdt. bill

Bertrand, Mr. T., qu., 937

Betting. *See* Criminal Code Amdt.

Beverages, Tax on, 2594, 2857. *See also* Budget; Taxation

Bienfait, Briquetting plant at, qu. 6$4, 1233, qu. 1632, 2712-15
Expenditure and results, 2712-15

Big Bay Point, Lake Simcoe, removal of sunken vessel, 2005

Big Bras d'Or wharf, 1765

Big Interests and Liberal party, 242, 2431, 2678, 2682. *See also* speeches on Budget

Biggar, Colonel O. M.
Resignation from Air Board, 1726. *See also* Chief Electoral Officer

Biggar, Mr., W. H., K.C., qu. 728

Biggs, Hon. F. C., 63

Bills. *See* Deputy Speaker; House of Commons; Speaker
For Public Bills *See* their individual titles;
For private Bills, *See* Private Bills Discussed

Binder Twine, 257, 265, 2405 2575
Brantford factory, 2375. *See also* Budget

Binders. *See* Agricultural Implements

Binette, Mr. Joseph (Prescott)
Campaign funds, qu. 1508
L'Orignal wharf, qu. 1212
Quebec riots, compensation for damage, qu. 1508
St. Lawrence river waterway, communication with Imperial Govt., qu. 1508

Biological Board. *See* Marine

Bird, Mr. T. W. (Nelson)
Budget, 2704. Political expediency; difficult to modify protective system, 2704; divergence of views of Mr. McMaster and Mr. Raymond; historic Liberalism represented by Progressive party, 2705; revival of Liberal spirit; attitude of Opposition towards Progressives; alleged inaccuracies, 2706; statement as to direct and indirect taxation; tariff a secondary revenue producer; sales tax; free trade and revenue, 2707; inheritance tax; protection and farmers, 2708; labouring man; competition under free trade;

Bird, Mr. T. W. — *Con.*
Budget — *Con.*
Canadian wheat in England; workingman and protection, 2709; small industries and trusts, 2710; Wheat Board; protection and flagwaving; obstacles to united nationhood, 2711
Civil Service salaries, 554
Hudson Bay railway, completion, 2786
Nova Scotia miners, M. (Mr. Irvine) 526
Royal Canadian Mounted Police, M. (Mr. Woodsworth) 838

Birnie, Mr. Alexander, and others, petition of, 1929

Black, Mr. George (Yukon)
Alien enemy property, qu. 1904
Canada Temperance Act Amdt. bill, 3004
Canadian Patriotic Fund bill, 3483
Civil Service list, qu. 727
House of Commons
Law Branch, qu. 2304
Senate, and,
Chief Accountants, qu. 2583, 2803
Expenditure, qu. 2583
McPherson, Mr. Duncan, superannuation, qu. 2805
Migratory Birds, 1686
Oriental Aliens, M. (Mr. McQuarrie) for exclusion, 1520
Pension Act Amdt. bill, 3464
Pensions Committee, final report, 3334
Royal Canadian Mounted Police, M. (Mr. Woodsworth) 838
Senate and House of Commons
Chief Accountants' salaries, ques. 2583, 2803
Yukon Territory
Administration of justice, 1275
Suggested union with British Columbia, 1275
Mining and mineral discoveries, 1276
Parcel post, 2802
Radio-telegraph service, 1749
Silver discovery, 1276

Black, Mr. William (South Huron)
Budget, 2448. Disappointment at proposals of Finance Minister; the tariff; jokers in budget; protection with an excise tax; boots and shoes; building materials and agricultural implements; exorbitant prices charged; manufacturers' rebate on raw materials; loss of population, 2449; immigration; railway situation; national railways; change of management necessary; merchant marine; civil service; mem-

Black, Mr. William — *Con.*
Budget — *Con.*
bers taking up too much time with speeches; trade relations with United States; export of cattle, 2450; immigration, 2450
Goderich harbour improvements, 2000
Harbours and rivers, Ontario, 2000

Black, Mr. W. J., Deputy Minister of Immigration
Appointment of, 3500. *See also* Immigration

Blackfoot Reserve. *See* Indians

Blake, Late Hon. Edward
Letter to West Durham electors, 2677
Malvern speech, 2655, 2677
Withdrawal from leadership of Liberal party, 2655, 2657, 2677

Bland, Mr. C. H., Civil Service Commission, qu. 1773

Blankets. *See* Customs Tariff

Blind
Canadian National Institute for, grant, 3540
Soldiers. *See* Pensions Committee

Blood Indian Reserve. *See* Indians

Board of Commerce, 1118
Constitutionality of. *See* Wheat Board
Cost, report, qu. 2583
Salary of secretary, 1715

Board of Pension Commissioners. *See* Pension Commissioners

Board of Railway Commissioners. *See* Railway Commission

Boivin, Mr. George H. (Shefford)
Business of the House
Questions requiring tabulated answers, 1132
Canadian National railways
Board of management, 1698
Rail and car repair contracts, 1698
St. Malo shops, 1699
Cheque tax, 3261
Criminal Code, revision, 1717
Debates Committee, first report concurred in, 1258
Debates, Official, Unrevised Index, 3359
Health of Animals
Hog cholera, 1007
Inspection of dairy herds, 1007
Rail and car repair contracts, 1698
Unemployment, rail and car repair contracts, 1699

Bolshevism, 1290. *See also* Labour; Nova Scotia Miners

Bona fide Contractors. *See* Wheat Board bill

Bonds. *See also* Finance; Loans
Five year maturities, qu. 2993
Non-taxable Victory bonds, qu. 2971
Sale by public tender, 1468
Tax-exempt, 2567, 2725

Bonus. *See* Civil Service; Soldiers

Bookmaking. *See* Criminal Code Amdt.

Bootlegging. *See* Liquor

Boots and Shoes, 3238. *See also* speeches on Address; Budget; Customs
Felt shoe industry, 3239
Price and labour costs, 2350
Protection of industry, 207-208
Tariff on, 102-103, 152-3, 159, 2341-2, 2465, 2488-9, 2632, 2685, 3236, 3237
M. (Mr. Shaw) to reduce duty, neg. 3238

Borden, Camp
Air force and civil aviation, 1728

Borden, Right Hon. Sir Robert
Appointment to Limitation of Armaments Conference
M. (Mr. Casgrain) for papers, 373
Imperial Conference of 1918, 1864
Naval defence, on, 1864, 1876
Quebec Harbour, 1475
Report on reduction of naval armaments, 9, 42, 1737, 1743
Withdrawal from directorships, 1089

Bouchard, Mr. George J. (Kamouraska)
Introduction, 1929

Boucher, Mr. Aimé (Yamaska)
Naval policy, 2078
Sorel shipyard, men employed May 1921, qu. 1062

Bounties
Linen yarn, 3128
Steel, 304-5, qu. 3360
Sugar beet industry. *See* Inland Revenue

Bourassa, Mr. J. B. (Levis)
Levis lightkeepers, qu. 2583

Bovine Tuberculosis. *See* Animal Contagious Diseases

Bowen, Mr. Fred W. (Durham)
Campbell, Mr. W. E., qu. 937

Boy Scouts Association, 772

Boys, Mr. W. A. (South Simcoe)
Big Bay point, Lake Simcoe, wreck, 2005
Business of the House
Budget debate, conclusion of, 2639
Paired members inadvertently voting, 1462
Canada Gazette, expenditure Public Works, 1268
Coal, importation for public buildings, 1763
Dredging, 2005
External Affairs, salaries, 412
Harbours and rivers, Ontario, 2002
Militia-Naval Service, officers, 421
National Defence bill, Air Force, 677
Naval Service
Militia, and, deputy ministers, 421
Niobe, sale of, 2068
Patronage — rural postmasters, 3083
Penitentiary Act Amdt. bill, 790
Pensions Board, appeal, 390
Pensions, disability cases, 389
Public Buildings
Coal importations for, 1763
Ottawa
Elevator attendants, 1267
Expenditure on, 1268
Public works
Appropriations and expenditures, 2002
Estimates, 695, 698
M. to reduce, 695
Expenditure, monthly statement of, 1268, 1271
Riley's army, qu. 3364
Soldiers' land settlement, 2132

Brantford
Agricultural implement industries, 255, 2375. *See also* Budget; Raymond
Meighen, Hon. Mr., speech at, 256

Breadner, Mr. R. W., Commissioner of taxation, salary, 2024

Brethen, Mr. G. A. (East Peterborough)
Accredited herds, 1000
Agriculture — Deputy Minister, 653
Automobile tax, 3276-7
Budget, 2693. United Grain Growers and agricultural implement business; income tax — who pays? 2693; economy; reduction in cost of government; national debt; domestic loans; reciprocity, 2694; sales tax; excess profits, 2695; luxury tax; unimproved land values; automobile tax; protective tariff and automobile industry, 2696; Ford car; protection of agricultural implements, 2697; home market; prices

Brethen, Mr. G. A. — *Con.*
Budget — *Con.*
fixed in markets of world; ability of agriculture and live stock industries to meet world competition, 2698
Customs Dept., estimates, 763
Grants to live stock associations, 1027
Live stock trade with South America, 647
Manufacturers, protection of, 2696, 3232
Oleomargarine, 3430
Woollen clothing and blankets, 3135

Brewing. *See* Inland Revenue

Bridges. *See also* Public Works
Burlington Channel, 2007
Edmonton, 2007
Edmundston, 1239-53
False Creek, 3516
Grand river, York, Ont., qu. 1287
Isle Perrot, federal contribution, qu. 1377
Ottawa, lighting, 1267
Quebec, 1068
Red Deer river, 1964
Victoria, tolls, qu. 1377

Bridgetown, post office accommodation, 1245

Briquetting. *See* Bienfait; Lignite

Bristol, Hon. Edmund (Centre Toronto)
Budget, 2407. Congratulation to Finance Minister; nothing for trade or agriculture, a "stand pat" budget; protection against competitors; wages and production costs in Germany, 2407; German exports to Canada, 2408; protection of industries in Great Britain; Safeguarding of Industries Act; United States tariff, 2409; protection against German competition; equalization of conditions; duty valuation based on Canadian selling price; safeguarding of French industries, 2410; Australian Industries Preservation Act; Tom Moore on German labour conditions; protection of Canadian industries, 2411; industrial development and tariff legislation in United States; iron and steel, comparison of English and American prices; steel rails; Germany underselling United States; nails; protection of Nova Scotia coal and steel industry, 2412; tariff revision long overdue, 2413; western farmer and tariff and freight rates; United States farmer opposed to free trade; tariff against Canadian agricultural products; protection against United States commodities;

Bristol, Hon. Edmund — *Con.*
Budget — *Con.*
free trade; agricultural implements, importation from United States; effect of tariff reduction on implement factories; American factories in Canada; trusts and combines; woolens, 2415; free trade means destruction of Canadian industries and home markets; harmony between eastern and western Canada, 2416; deflation; building costs, coal; railway wages and freights; the amendment, 2417
Canadian ships damaged during war, 1183
Welland canal, 2748
Co-operation with the United States, 2751
Grain transportation, 2750

British Admiralty, war claims, 1752

British Board of Trade, relief of distressed seamen, 1676

British-Born
Disabilities under Immigration and Naturalization Acts, 1389-91

British Columbia
Aerial patrol of forests, 1724, 1730
Asiatics in. *See under this title,* Oriental Aliens
Banff-Windermere road, 1051, 1682
Burrard Dry Dock Company, 2008
Canada Temperance Act, 1017
Canada Temperance Act Amdt. bill, 2733, 2997. *See also that title*
Canadian National branch lines, 331
Coal mines in, 178
Coastal services, qu. 3152
Dairymen's Association, 1794
D'Arcy Island, lazaretto, 2021
Esquimalt and Nanaimo Railway Company bill, 1156-63, 1353
United Farmers, and, 1354
Fisheries. *See also* Quebec Fisheries
Cost and revenue, 2306
Gasoline for fishing boats, 2313, 3116
M. (Mr. McQuarrie) 851, 863
Transfer to, 2042
Freight rates. *See* Crowsnest Pass Agreement
Fruit industry, 162, 225, 3417-3424
Tariff and. *See* Budget; Customs
Fuel Oil, 178, 344, qu. 728
Competition with coal, 2312
Liquor traffic, 2018. *See also under this title,* Canada Temperance Act

British Columbia — *Con.*
Natural resources, 328. *See also* Natural Resources
Old age and mothers' pensions, 1375
Oliver, Hon. John, 322
Criticism by Vancouver Sun, 2236-7
Opium and Narcotic Drugs, 2017. *See also that title*
Oriental Aliens. *See also that title*
Competition with, 171, 173, 183, 316-19, 332, 344
Immigration, 167, 872, 967, 2310, 3104
Res. by Legislature, 1511, 1513
M. (Mr. McQuarrie) for exclusion, 1509
Population, 1512
Voting, 172
Post offices, revenue from, qu. 824
Potlach Indian Institution, qu. 1377. *See also* Indians
Public buildings, improvements, etc., 1255
Railway Belt
Forestry, 1046
Survey, 1043
Railway mail service, 2797
Union for judicial purposes with Yukon, 1275

British Columbia House, London, purchase of, 3537

British Empire Steel Corporation, 200, 1106, 1130. *See also* Nova Scotia Miners
Business profits tax, qu. 1067
Compensation for loss, 1082

British Goods, Importation. *See* British Preference; Customs; Trade

British-Japanese Treaty *See* Limitation of Armaments

British Market. *See* British Preference; Cattle Embargo; Trade

British Ministry of Shipping
Account, 2975
Hospital ship, claim for loss of, 2976

British North America Act, powers under. *See* Quebec Fisheries

British Preference, 2111, 2201, 2529, 2624-5. *See also* Budget; Customs; Trade
Canadian Seaports, and, 2688
M. (Mr. Logan) 493, 707
Amdt. (Mr. Lewis) 772; withdrawn, 726
Further reduction of duties, 2113
Goods imported via United States, qu. 375
Sugar, 2116

British Shipping Board, credit, 2975

British Subjects, Wives of alien birth. *See* Dominion Elections Act

British Valuation. *See* Customs, Valuation

Brockville and Westport Railway, qu. 704

Brown, Hon. George, on political pledges, 2482

Brown, Mr. J. L. (Lisgar)
Address in reply, 332; reciprocity, live stock industry, 333; cattle embargo, 334
Animal Contagious Diseases Act Amdt. 2735
Automobiles, refund of taxes, 3600
British Preference and Canadian seaports, M. (Mr. Logan) 721
Canadian Patriotic Fund bill, 3484
Canals, traffic through, qu. 705
Canned foods, marking, 3050
Civil Service, economy in, 423
Criminal Code, cruelty to animals, 2833
Experimental farms, 808
Fishing schooner race, 3512
Inaudibility of debates, 1751
Labour Dept. — economy, 568
Militia and Defence
Estimates, 587
Quebec arsenal, 2095
Naval policy, 2069
O'Connor, Mr. James, dismissal of, 1674
Oleomargarine, manufacture and importation, M. (Mr. Neill) 1803
Opium and Narcotic Drug Act Amdt. bill, 3018
Pensions Committee — final report, 3342
Political alliances, 2095
Prince Rupert Dry Dock Co., claim, 3516
Public Works estimates, 696
Rideau canal, 2765, 2767
Royal Canadian Mounted Police, M. (Mr. Woodsworth) 840
St. Lawrence river waterway, 1207
St. Peter's Indian reserve, qu. 472
Soldier land settlement, 2134
Soldiers' bonus, M. (Mr. Arthurs) 449
Soldiers' Civil Re-establishment, staff, 1345
Statistics, accumulation of, 580
Wheat Board bill, 3180
Wheat Board — point of order, 2949
Woollen goods, duty on, 3232

Brussels Financial Conference, 1138, 1292

Bryce, Dr. Peter, H., pamphlet, 1224

Bud Moth. *See* Forestry

Budget. *See also* Ways and Means
Date of
Announcement, 1721
Inquiry, 1018, 1463, 1503
Debate, on, 2104, 2171, 2216, 2256, 2307, 2358, 2407, 2459, 2519, 2523, 2585, 2640, 2692, 2842, 2859
Amendments
Crerar, Mr., 2473-4; Speaker's ruling 2520-23
Drayton, Sir Henry, 2179, neg. 2912
Divisions
Amdt. (Sir Henry Drayton) neg. 2912
Corrected division list, 2972
Motion (Mr. Fielding) for Ways and Means Com., 2104; agreed to, 2913
Ruling of Mr. Speaker on Amdt. to Amdt. (Mr. Crerar) 2520-23
Probable time for conclusion of, 2639
Speeches of Finance Minister, 2104, 2842
Speakers, Messrs: Anderson, 2364, Baldwin, 2250; Baxter, 2340; Bird, 2704; Black (Huron) 2448; Brethen, 2693; Bristol, 2407; Caldwell, 2660; Campbell, 2729; Cannon, 2909; Chaplin, 2616; Charters, 2561; Church, 2392; Coote, 2724; Crerar, 2459; 2522; Denis (Joliette) 2887; Drayton, 2127; Drummond, 2272; Elliott (Waterloo) 2348; Fansher, 2229; Fielding, 2104, 2842; Findlay, 2893; Fortier, 2274; Gardiner, 2624; Garland (Carleton) 2300; Good, 2429; Gouin, 2654; Gould, 2711; Guthrie, 2874; Hocken, 2675; Hoey, 2331; Hughes, 2225; Irvine, 2495; Jacobs, 2513; Johnston (Last Mountain) 2220; Kellner, 2280; King (Huron) 2301; King (Mackenzie) 2537; Kyte, 2358; Ladner, 2276; Laflamme, 2895; Lanctôt, 2567; Lapierre, 2628; Lapointe, 2585; Lavigueur, 2398; Leader, 2510; Lewis, 2256; Logan, 2684; Lovett, 2270; Lovie, 2451; Low, 2445; MacKelvie, 2196; Maclean (Halifax) 2859; Maclean (York) 2321; Macphail, Miss, 2384; McBride, 2635; McConica, 2898; McCrea, 2314; McKenzie, 2604; McMaster, 2417; McMurray, 2474; McQuarrie, 2233; McTaggart, 2545; Malcolm, 2387; Manion, 2261; Marcil, 2905; Meighen, 2523; Millar, 2294; Milne, 2239; Morrison, 2699; Motherwell, 2548; Neill, 2307; Prevost, 2577; Putnam, 2282; Raymond, 2373; Robb, 2179; Sales, 2574; Speakman, 2881; Spencer, 2629; Stansell, 2290; Steedsman, 2721; Stevens, 2646; Stewart (Argenteuil) 2216; Stewart

Budget — *Con.*
Debate on — *Con.*
(Humboldt) 2597; Sutherland, 2481; Tolmie, 2591; Turgeon, 2188; Ward, 2400; Warner, 2204; White, 2352; Woods, 2183; Woodsworth, 2242
To continue from day to day, 2101
Resolutions, 2218
Amended, 2854

Building
Costs, 2416. *See also* Housing Trades
Conference, 582-3
Freight rates affecting, 133

Buildings. *See* Public Buildings

Bukowinians. *See* Immigration

Bull Durham Tobacco, comparative prices, 2546

Bureau, Hon. Jacques (Minister of Customs and Excise)
Agriculture Committee Report, Wheat Board, 726
Civil Servants, appeal, 3079
Customs dept.
Drawbacks, 766
Estimates, 762, 1674
Officials, 764
Valuation of imports, 3413
Dominion Elections Act Amdt., 2810
Empire and Ascension days, 1769
Estimates, accounts chargeable to current and past year, 1675
Export liquor warehouses, 768
Fishing schooner race, 3511
Military Service Act Amdt. bill, 641
National Defence Bill, Senate amdts., 2807
O'Connor, Mr. James, dismissal, 1674
Parliament, fall session, 3609
Public ownership, 1331
Quebec Harbour — Park St. Charles, 1470
St. Lawrence river waterway, 1332
Total trade, statement of, 1376

Bureau of Standards, 235, 1372

Bureau of Statistics. *See* Statistics

Burlington Channel, Bridge, 2007

Burrard Dry Dock Company, 2008

Burstall, Major General Sir Henry, retirement, 742-3, 1145, qu. 1211. *See also* National Defence Bill

Business Profits War Tax. *See* Taxation

Butter. *See* Agriculture; Dairying Industry; Oleomargarine

By-Elections. *See* House of Commons

Bylot Island, Mounted Police, 3497

Byng, Lord, Governor General. *See* References in Address

Cabinet. *See* Ministers and Directorships
Personnel of, 241

Cables, Submarine, ques. 3151-2, 3360

Cadets. *See* Militia and Defence

Cahill, Mr. Frank S. (Pontiac)
Canadian Pacific railway bill, 1860
Crowsnest pass agreement, M. (Mr. Kennedy, Essex) for Special Com., 1449
Montreal, Joliette and Transcontinental railway, 1577
Royal Canadian Navy, 1893
St. Lawrence river waterway, M. (Mr. Church) 1208
Vancouver and Fraser Valley railway, 798

Calder Act. *See* Civil Service; Public Service Retirement Act

Calder, Hon. Senator J. A., 1393

Calder, Senator, United States
St. Lawrence river waterway 1206

Caldwell, Mr. Thomas W. (Victoria and Carleton, N.B.)
Abbatoir and cold storage plants in maritime provinces, 992
Agriculture
Cold storage facilities, 992-3
Department — salaries, 750
Exhibitions, 993
Fertilizer inspectors, 592
Lecturers, 1023
Saunders, Dr., resignation of, 591
Spruce bud moth, 595, 2668
Air Board Act Amdt. bill, 2821
Animal Contagious Diseases Act Amdt. bill, 2734-8
Blankets, duty on, 3131
British Columbia fisheries, M. (Mr. McQuarrie) 856
Budget, 2660. Congratulations to Finance Minister; Minister of Justice applauded by Opposition; fallacy of the home market argument; wheat and potatoes; reciprocity with United States; Mr. Chaplin; taxation; inconsistency of

Caldwell, Mr. Thomas W. — *Con.*
Budget — *Con.*
Prime Minister; sales tax burdensome to people least able to bear it, 2661; duty on clothing and silk goods; failure of budget to carry out Prime Minister's ideas; drawbacks and untaxed exports, 2262; a protectionist budget; tools of production; agricultural implements, prices in Canada and United States; fertilizers and the tariff, 2663; Maine and New Brunswick prices, 2664; cost of growing potatoes; reductions of duty on farm machinery; prospect of Liberals implementing tariff planks, 2665; Finance Minister's disavowal of tariff planks of Liberal platform, 2666; free trade; export duty on pulpwood and round logs; Canadian resources used to develop American industries, 2667; spruce bud moth; import and export duties, payment of, 2668; amendment; tariff revision; recent additions to Conservative party, 2669
Business of the House — concurrence, 1842
Canada Shipping Act Amdt. (Pilotage) 2820
Canada Temperance Act Amdt. bill, 2733
Canadian National railways
Directors, 2791
Public ownership, 1939
Carleton, N.B., returning officer, 3539, 3602, 3604
Privilege, question of, 3602
Civil Service Commission, salaries, 3509
Commissioner of Taxation, salary, 2024
Cotton fabrics, 3127
Damage by floods in New Brunswick, 3492
Dominion Elections Act Amdt. bill, 2813
New polls to be established, two months prior to election day, amdt., 2815
Dominion Iron and Steel Company, qu. 704
Edmundston public building, 1240
Farm machinery, cost of, 769
Fertilizer Act Amdt., 775, 3041, 3194
Fertilizers
Duty on, 3140-3141
Inspectors, 592
Tariff and, 2664
Transportation rates on, 1022
Fisheries
Fish culture, 2169
Fishways in salmon rivers, 2167
Pollution of streams, 2168
Fisheries Act, 1914, Amdt. bill, 2818
Fishing Schooner race, 3510

Caldwell, Mr. Thomas W. — *Con.*
Forests
Destruction by spruce moth, 1049, 2668
Protection by fire towers, 1048
Gasoline tractors, 2123
Grading machines, 3126
Harness, duty on, 3137
Home brewing, 3141
Hudson Bay railway, completion of, 2791
Indians
Devon Band, proposed removal, 1216
Expenditure, 1225
Tobique reserve, illegal cutting of timber, 1233
Insurance returns, 3254
Manufacturers — free traders, 3140
Militia and defence — annual drill, concurrence, 1842
Municipal taxation, payment by Government, 1257
National Defence bill, 745
Naval Service, sale of Niobe, 2065
Penitentiary Act Amdt. 789
Pension Act Amdt. bill, 3445-56
Pension Board, staff, 1351
Pensions
Committee on, report, 2996, 3310-24
Commutation of, 1281
Disabilities, 390
Widowed mothers, 1312, 3324
Potatoes, 2661, 2666
Inspection and sale of, 2744. *See also under this title* Root Vegetables
Shipment to Cuba, 2028
Privilege, Carleton, N.B., returning officer, 3602
Purchasing Commission, 2025
Quebec Harbour Commission — Parc St. Charles, 1469, 3197
Root Vegetables, inspection and sale, 2744, 3486
Potato grades, 3370
St. John and Quebec railway, 1293-6
St. John, N.B., terminal facilities, M. 639. 844, 850
Saw-mill machinery, 3127
Senate indemnity, 3509
Silk fabrics, duty, 2662, 3137
Soldiers
Disabilities of, 392
Insurance, 3321
Soldiers' Civil Re-establishment
Hospitals, 1342-8
Patients, care and medical examination of, 1280
Salaries, 1342
Vocational loans, 1346
Vocational training, 1281

Caldwell, Mr. Thomas W. — *Con.*
Soldier land settlement, 2133, 3408
Land purchase, irregularities charged, 2142
Payment of municipal taxation by Govt., 1257
Taxes, collection of, 2134
Steamship service, St. John and Cuba, 2028
Steel plates, delivery of, 3508
Sydney pilotage district, 3508
Widowed mothers, pensions, 1312, 3324
Woollen goods, duty on, 3129

Calgary
Buildings, rental of, 1254
Free freight outlay, qu. 704
Live stock branch, qu. 607
Milk inquiry, cost of, qu. 823
Post office building, 1254
Trades and Labour Council, unemployment, 1082

Calydor, sanitarium, 1279

Cameras, prices in Canada and United States, 2547, 2624

Cameron, Mr. Alex., qu. 606

Campaign Funds and Literature. *See* Elections

Campbell, Mr. J. A., claim for flax shipment, 2834

Campbell, Mr. Milton N. (Mackenzie)
Address in reply, 356. Financial position of western farmer, 356; railway and freight problems, 357; maritime provinces and Confederation; financial condition of country, 358
Automobiles, protection of industry, 2730
Blankets, duty on, 3132
Budget, 2729. Liberal pledges and promises; platform of 1919, 2729; statements of Prime Minister at Yorkton, Sask.; the budget a repudiation; the tariff, automobile industry, 2730; Sir John Macdonald's view of protection; guiding principle of national policy; Mr. Meighen and agricultural implement duties, 2731; tractors and farm machinery: cotton and woollen clothing; protection and the farmer; protected interests and campaign funds; betrayal of the people, 2732
Cadet services, expenditure, 1137
Crowsnest pass agreement, M. (Mr. Kennedy — Essex) for Special Com. 1426
Dominion lands, surveys, 1037
Experimental farm, Canora, 805

Campbell, Mr. Milton N. — *Con.*
Housing credits, 3524
Immigration
Highland family, alleged unjust treatment, 2145
Holland, from, 2145
Medical inspection, 759
Indians
Bryce, Dr. Peter H., pamphlet, 1224
Saskatchewan reserves, qu. 608
Linen yarn from Canadian flax, bounty, 1361
Naturalization expenses, 1671
Public Works Dept.
Filing clerks, 693
Officials, 692
Saskatchewan Indian reserves, qu. 608

Campbell, Mr. W. E., qu., 397

Camp Borden, Air Force and Civil aviation, 1728

Camps, Militia. *See* Militia and Defence, Annual Drill

Canada Status of, 1337, 2324. *See also* Speeches on Address; Budget; Limitation of Armaments; Naval Service

Canada-Australia-New Zealand steamship service, 3034

Canada Car and Foundry Company, 1696
Car repair contracts, 1696
Amherst shops, 1702
Port Arthur, 1696

Canada Cement Company, 200, 2297, 2300

Canada Gazette
Expenditure, Public Works Dept., 1268

Canada Grain Act. *See also* Grain and Grain Trade
Administration of, 2834
Constitutionality of, 2837
King v. Manitoba Grain Company, decision, 1132, 1841, 1932
Inquiry (Mr. Meighen) 1770

Canada-Mexico trade, qu. 606, 699, 700, 2989

Canada-Newfoundland Steamship service, 2027

Canada Shipping Act Amdt. Bills
1. (Exemption from Pilotage Dues) — Res. 1335, 1487; 1r., 1489; 2r., com., 2819; 3r., 2820; Senate amdts. 3437
2. (Appointment of Harbour Masters) — Res. 1578, 3009; 1r., 2r., com., 3r., 3010

Canada Steamship Company
Life-saving equipment, qu. 1284

Canada Temperance Act
Expenses under, 3499
Plebiscite, 2024

Canada Temperance Act Amdt. Bills
1. (Provincial legislation) 1r., 1017; withdrawn, 2733
2. (Provincial government control of liquor importation) 1r., 2733; 2r., com., 2997; 3r., 3009
Senate amendments
Concurrence, 3614
Non-concurrence in, 3608
Conference, 3613
Subjects and items discussed:
Amdt. (Mr. Jacobs) 3000, neg. 3006
Carriage or transportation, Amdt. (Mr. Mitchell) 3008
Date of coming into effect, Amdt. (Mr. Shaw 3007; withdrawn, 3008

Canada-West Indies-British Guiana service, qu. 2356

Canada-West Indies, South America service, 2027, 3026

Canada's Contribution. *See* League of Nations; Naval Service

Canadian Air Board. *See* Air Board

Canadian Council of Agriculture. *See also* Progressive Party; Wheat Board
Agricultural figures, 2649
Fiscal policy and proposals, 2508-9
Memorandum on Wheat Board referred to Agriculture Com., 377. *See* Agriculture and Colonisation Com.
Platform, 2345
Tariff criticisms and proposals, 2509, 2552. *See also* speeches on Budget

Canadian Deep Waterway and Power Association, 1320. *See also* St. Lawrence River Waterway

Canadian Expeditionary Force. *See also* Pensions; Soldiers Civil Re-establishment
Canteen Funds. *See that title*
First contingent, qu. 1376
Medical inspection, 3317. *See also* Pensions
Repatriation of dependents, 1711
Royal Canadian Mounted Police, and, qu. 2038

Canadian Ford Company. *See* Automobiles

Canadian Forestry Association. *See* Forestry

Canadian Freighter. For names of Canadian Government Merchant Marine vessels. *See* Vessels

Canadian Government Merchant Marine, 882, 2888. *See also* Canadian National Railways; Naval Service; Shipbuilding; Steamship Services
Canada-Newfoundland service, 2027
Coal from Japan, 2312, 2406
Cost of, 245, 247, qu. 469. *See also* speeches on Address; Budget
Dominion Steel Corporation, contract for steel plates, 1677
Employees at Montreal, qu. 2992
Employees' wages, qu. 3598
Inquiry as to sale of, 3104
Insurance, qu. 605
Lake marine, qu. 3362
Loans to, 3035
Lumber cargoes for Orient, 2311
Ocean and river service, 3507. *See also* Marine
Ocean freights. *See* British Preference
Outstanding claims, qu. 606
Ownership and operation of, 3037
Passenger traffic, qu. 939
Potatoes, shipment to Cuba, 2028
Prince Rupert Drydock and Engineering Co. claim, 3514
Shipments by. *See* St. John terminal; Steamship Services
Ships in Montreal harbour, qu. 2637
Subsidized steamship services, 3027, 3506
Welland canal, 2756-9
Vessels. *See also that title*
Britisher, steamer, 3514
Canadian Exporter, wreck, qu. 1210
Canadian Freighter, qu, 963
Number of, qu. 469
Scottish, steamer, 3514

Canadian Government Railways, 873. *See also* Canadian National Railways
Deficits, qu. 607
Dining car service, qu. 2040

Canadian High Commissioner. *See* High Commissioner

Canadian Institute of Mining and Metallurgy, 1237

Canadian Manufacturers' Association, 170. *See also* Budget; Manufacturers
Canadian exhibition in France, 2032
Tariff, and, 2546

Canadian Mission, Colonel Delphine, 303

Canadian National Institute for the Blind
Grant, 3540

Canadian National Parks. *See* Dominion Lands and Parks

Canadian National Railways. *See also* Address; Budget; Freight Rates; Railways; Transportation
Accounting, 1908-18
Advances
$7,000,000, — 2779
$42,800,000, — 1905-33-69
Amalgamation of system, delay, 2585
Amount required for, 381
Annual report, 1928
Annual statement by Minister of Railways, 873; Canadian Government railways; 873; Grand Trunk system, 877; estimates, 879; freight rates, 879; reorganization, 880; Canadian Government Merchant Marine, 882; summaries, 882
Board of Directors. *See under this title,* Directors
Bond sale in New York, 58
Branch lines, 1472, 1476, 1956
Bengough extension, 2770
British Columbia, 331
Eastern Maine railway, 1293
Hanna-Medicine Hat, 1965
Kamloops-Kelowna, qu. 937, 1134, 2797
Policy of Government, 1135
Business methods, 1692
Canadian Government Merchant Marine, and, 3036
Canadian Northern railway, 123
Acquisition of, 2614
Advances to, qu, 471
$42,800,000, — 1905-33-69
Agriculture, contribution to freight tonnage, 1927
Arbitration, 204
Bonded indebtedness, 190, qu. 368
Assumption by Dominion Govt., 2458
Co-ordination, 1907
Deficit, 191, 1907
Electrification of, 1317. *See also* Electrification
Federal subsidies, qu. 1504
Guarantee bill, 1914, legal expenses, 1667
Indebtedness of western provinces, 229
Insurance, qu. 471
Invasion of Ontario by, 202
Liabilities, qu. 368
Loans and subsidies to, 189-90, 204, qu. 1504, 1921
Mackenzie-Mann
Amounts paid to, qu. 935
Subsidy, qu. 607

Canadian National Railways — *Con.*
Canadian Northern Railway — *Con.*
Mileage, qu. 368
Operating deficit, 1905
Responsibility for loans, 204. *See also under this sub-title,* Loans
Rorketon branch line, 2139
Subsidiary lines, 202
Taking over of, 190, 1907
Canadian Pacific railway, competition with, 65. *See also* Address; Budget; Railways
Car and locomotive contracts
Canadian Locomotive Company, 2794
Eastern Car Company, 2794
Car repairs. *See under this title,* Rail and Car Repair Contracts
Carey, Mr., 2858
Coal
Importations, qu. 926, qu. 2213
Purchases, qu. 2306
Consolidation, 6. 11, 28, 72, 73, 89. *See also* speeches *on* Address; Budget
Dams impeding ascent of fish, 2168
Deficits, 1905-69, 1920
Corrected statement, 1919
Dining car and restaurant service, qu. 2040
Menus, cost of printing, qu. 1931
Rivers and Melville, Sask., restaurants, qu. 2038
Directors, Board of, 1924, 2194, 2791
Appointment of, 1936
Connection with supply companies, 2792
Hanna, Mr. D. B., 1924, 1959, 1962
Labour costs, and, 2317
Interested in other companies, 1129
Mitchell, Mr. A. J., 1924
Public ownership, sympathy with, 2852
Representation of employees, 2798
Statement of Prime Minister, 2792
Drayton-Acworth report, 45-46
Edith Cavell road, Jasper Park, 1052
Electrical operation, 1206, 1323. *See also* Electrification; St. Lawrence river waterway; *and under this title,* Public Ownership
Electrification, M. (Mr. Deslauriers) 627
Estimates, 1905
Fraser, Mr., right-of-way agent, 1134
Freight
Careless handling of, 1965
Rates. *See also* Crowsnest Pass Agreement; Freight Rates
Advertising campaign, qu. 1375
Coal from maritime provinces, 1763
Quebec and, 1472-5
Special Committee, M. (Mr. Kennedy, Essex) 1213

Canadian National Railways — *Con.*
Grain leakages, qu. 1401, qu. 1930
Grain shipments, 2194. *See also* Grain and Grain Trade
Grand Trunk Pacific railway, 189, 196, 203, 342, 1921
Advances, qu, 471, qu. 2037, 3520
$15,900,000, 1969
Branch lines, 3520
British Columbia in, 331
Cost of to the country, 196
Estimated, 205
Subsidiary lines, 203
Grand Trunk railway, 29. *See also* speeches on Address; Budget
Acquisition, 190, 235, 1922, 2612, 2616
Administration of, 64
Advances to, qu. 471, qu. 2037
$25,750,000, 1969
American mileage, 191, 204
Amount required, 381
Annual statement of Minister of Railways, 877
Arbitration, 128, 205, 2779
Comments of English newspapers, 374, 821
MacInnes, Mr. Hector, K.C., payments to, 2772
Bonded security, advances, qu. 935
Coal, qu. 606
Deficit, 191. *See also* Annual Statement *under this title*
Employees
Pension rights and status, M. (Mr. Boys) 863, 1382, 2041, 3437
English stock-holders, 64, 123
Financial statement, 1933
Government ownership, 125. *See also* speeches on Address; Budget
Kelley, Mr. H. B., 205
Mortgage trust deed, legal expenses, 1667
Officials, salaries, qu. 728
Portland terminal, 353, 920. *See also* British Preference and Canadian Seaports
Rail and car repair contracts, 1688
Hotels, 2806
Immigration, 1927, 2147, 2165. *See also that title*
Industrial councils, 1061
Insurance, qu. 471, qu. 610
Intercolonial railway, 106-111, 274, 312, 1967, 2688. *See also* Logan; Macdonald (Pictou)
Administration, 275
Domination by Canadian Northern railway, 193-194
Employees, enlistment of, 3518
Freight rates, 275, 355. *See also that title*

Canadian National Railways — *Con.*
Intercolonial railway — *Con.*
Gaspé and Bonaventure counties, in, 623
Gulf shore and Caraquet railway, qu. 1504
Local management, 313-314, 192
Management, inquiry, 407-8
Moncton headquarters, 313, 355, 2289
Operation of, 107, 192
Passes on, 315
Patronage system, 106
Pension fund, qu. 938
Provident fund for employees, 2769
Repairs to cars, qu. 1212
Snow-cleaning, 313
Investigation proposed, 1908-17
Labour conditions, 2315
Mail contracts, qu. 2038, qu. 2213
Mail service, qu. 2799
Montreal, employees, 1288
National Transcontinental. *See under this title* Transcontinental
Overbuilding, 2569
Passenger traffic, qu. 927
Pension fund, qu. 938
Prince Edward Island railway, 1249
Public confidence, 1928
Public ownership and operation, 1907, 1933, 2193. *See also* speeches on Address; Budget
Purchases in anticipation of requirements, 1912
Quebec Oriental and Quebec Western railways, 623
Quebec terminals, 1475
Rail and car repair contracts, 1912, 1925, 1958, 2399
Board of management and, 1688-1710
Defective American cars, 1708
Steel cars, 1702-6, 1709
Rates. *See* Freight Rates; Railways
Regional control, 1923, 2196
Representation at meeting of steamship companies, qu. 2584
Revaluation, 1925
Right-of-way and lease agent, qu. 1633
Rolling stock repairs, 1212. *See also under this title* Rail and Car Repairs
St. John and Quebec Railway, qu. 1774
M. (Mr. Caldwell) 1293, neg. 1296
Securities, qu. 3154
Shops
Moncton, 1709
Rivière du Loup, 1690
St. Malo, 1699
Transcona, 1705, 1708
Steel cars, qu. 2213
Repairs, 1702-1709

Canadian National Railways — *Con.*
Telegraphs, qu. 3360
Ties, ques. 934, 2209
Purchases of in Quebec, qu. 1659
Toronto Globe editorial, 1134
Toronto railway viaduct, qu. 1660
Transcontinental railway, 111, 125, 278, 919, 1921, 2493
Cost, 2193
Enlisted men, allowance to, 3518
Freight rates, Quebec and, 1472-5
Grain shipments by, 2194
Lease of Eastern division, legal expenses, 1667
Opposition of Canadian Pacific to, 545, 2194
St. John valley, 3039
Unification, 1907, 1923-5, 2585. *See also under this title* Consolidation; Public Ownership
Water supply, Ste. Anne-St. Pierre, qu. 2213
Working expenditures, 2779

Canadian Navy. *See* Naval Service

Canadian Northern Railway. *See that title under* Canadian National Railways

Canadian Pacific Railway, 146, 191. *See also* Address; Canadian National Railways; Esquimalt and Nanaimo Railway; Freight Rates
Advance in price of stock, 129
Beatty, Mr. E. W., 126, 127, 1128
Labour costs, 2317
Canadian Pacific Railway Company bill, 1606, 1856
Coal lands, transfer of, qu. 2214
Competition with Grand Trunk, 64. *See also that title*
Cost, 2193
Dams impeding ascent of fish, 2167
Directors, voting trust, 1936
Electrical operation, 71, 1206. *See also* St. Lawrence River Waterway
Esquimalt and Nanaimo Railway Company bill. *See that title*
False creek bridge, removal, 3516
Freight Rates. *See that title*
Immigration and, 351
Indian Department, payment to, 3518
Labour conditions, 2315
Mail contracts, ques. 2040, 2213
New England states, connection with, 1294
Palais station, Quebec, 1068
Public ownership, 1937, 2329
Rail and car repair contracts, 1688-1710
Rates, *See* Freight Rates

Canadian Pacific Railway — *Con.*
Shares held by custodians of alien enemy property, 1672
Success of, 123
Transcontinental railway, opposition to, 2194

Canadian Patriotic Fund bill
Res. 3156, 3366; 1r., 3366; 2r., com., 3477; 3r., 3484

Canadian Press, Limited, 772

Canadian Red Cross Society bill
1r., 3151; 2r., com., 3387; 3r., 3388

Canadian Representation in the United States, 1383, 2026, 2864, 2990
International Labour Conference, qu. 824, 1060, 1070, 3437, 3490
Printing of report, 3601
Limitation of Armaments Conference. *See that title*

Canadian Seaports, trade through, 104. *See also* British Preference; Steamship Services; Trade

Canadian Towing and Wrecking Co., 1677

Canadian Transit Company. *See* Private Bills Discussed

Canadian Vickers. *See* Vickers

Canadian Wheat Board. *See* Grain and Grain Trade; Wheat Board

Canadian Wheat Board Bill. *See also* Grain and Grain Trade; Wheat Board
Res. 3174; 1r., 2r., com., 3179; com., 3379; 3r., 3387
Amdts:
(Mr. Johnson, Moosejaw) 3178
(Mr. Maclean, Halifax) 3180
(Mr. Johnson-Mr. Robb) agreed to, 3383

Canadians
Distressed, relief for, 2027
Emigrating. *See* Immigration

Canalization. *See* St. Lawrence River Waterway; Welland canal

Canals. *See also* Railways and Canals; St. Lawrence River Waterway
Chambly, improvements, 3518
Frankfurt, 1189
Georgian Bay, 1184, 1199, 1200-1209, 1319, 1397-8

Canals — *Con.*
Lachine
Widow of late James Innes, allowance, 2779
Manchester, 1189
Ontario-St. Lawrence, 2779
Quebec, 2779
Rideau, 2764
Construction of storehouse at Ottawa, 2764
Expenditure on, 2860
Improvements, 2769
St. Lawrence river waterway, M. (Mr. Church) 1183. *See also that title*
St. Lawrence ship canal, 2767
Soulanges
Improvements, 2768
Roadway, 2768
Traffic through, qu. 705
Panama, Suez and Soo canals, 1203
Trent
Estimates, 2764
Nassau dam, qu. 2457
Total expenditure on, qu. 1376
Welland, qu. 827, 1184, 1205, 1207, 2747
Contracts for sections 3 and 4, qu. 3600
Co-operation with United States, 2749-51
Estimates, 2747
Amdt. (Mr. Millar) to reduce vote by $4,000,000, 2758
Port Colborne elevator, claim of Mr. J. A. Jamieson, 1687
St. Lawrence river waterway, 1321. *See also that title*
Tonnage, qu. 936
Total expenditure on, qu. 1376
Water power rights, 2747. *See also* St. Lawrence River Waterway

Cancellation of Leases. *See* Dominion Lands

Canned Fish. *See* Fisheries Act Amdt.; Meat and Canned Food

Canned Goods, Marking of. *See* Meat and Canned Foods

Canneries, Inspection. *See* Meat and Canned Foods

Cannes Conference, 1716. *See also* Genoa Conference
Submarines, 1845

Canning Licenses. *See* British Columbia Fisheries; Fish and Fisheries

Cannon, Mr. Lucien (Dorchester)
Budget, 2909. Defeat of Tory party; administration facing serious situation; Progressive party; reasons for

Cannon, Mr. Lucien — *Con.*
Budget — *Con.*
Liberal victory; tribute to Prime Minister; platform of 1919; restoration of constitutional liberty; responsibility for conduct of public officials; responsible government and commission control, 2910; Canadian National Railways; a word to the West; Quebec the friend of the West; provincial autonomy, 2911; railways; Liberalism, hope of the West; division amongst Progressive forces, 2912
Canadian National Railways, public ownership, 1936-42
Dominion Lands, Cancellation of Leases bill, Senate admts., 3615
Limitation of Armaments, 3166
MacInnes, Mr. Hector, payments to, 2772
Militia, arsenals
Lindsay, 2088
Quebec, 2092
Naval policy, 2085
Point of order, parliamentary committee, 3354
Public Works estimates, preparation of, 1270
Royal Canadian Navy, 1887-90,

Canteen Funds, undistributed, disposal of, qu. 2215, 3290, 3308, 3328, 3331, 3334, 3346, 3350

Capital Ships. *See* Limitation of Armaments

Caraquet and Gulf Shore Railway, 1183, qu. 1504

Carey, Mr., and Canadian National Railways, 2858

Caribou. *See* Hudson Bay Railway

Carleton, N.B., returning officer, 3538, 3603, 3606

Carmichael, Mr. A. M. (Kindersley)
Address in reply, 155. French language; western opinions, 156; financial and economic outlook in the West, tariff question, 157; freight rates; grain speculation, banking conditions, 158
Campbell, Mr. J. A., claim for flax shipment, 2834
Canada Grain Act, administration of, 2834
Canadian Pacific Railway Company bill, amdt. 1606
Deputy Minister of Finance, 753
Experimental farms, 800

Carmichael, Mr. A. M. — *Con.*
Income War Tax Act, 1917, Amdt. 3486
Justice Dept. — Private secretary, 1669
Kindersley post office building, 1254
Militia, annual drill, 1177
Public buildings, Saskatchewan, 1253
Telephone lines, Saskatchewan, 2012
Wheat Board, 3181

Carroll, Mr. William F. (Cape Breton South and Richmond)
Burstall, Sir Henry, 743
Canadian Transit Company, bill, 1771
Cold storage, 819
Daylight saving, M. (Mr. Kay) 957
Dominion Elections Act. Amdt. 2812
Fuel oil, 178
Harbours and rivers, Prince Edward Island, 1991
Indians, Sydney reserve, 1215
Judges' Act Amdt. bill, 426
Labour dept. increases, 568
Labour men and unions, 228
National Defence bill, 743
Nova Scotia Miners, M. (Mr. Irvine) 499, 532
Oleomargarine, M. (Mr. Neill) 1800
Opium and Narcotic Drug Act Amdt., appeal, 3024
Pension Act Amdt. bill, 3442
Pensions Committee, final report, 3316
Pensions — Royal Commission, 3327
Unemployment situation, 1076
Steel rails contracts, 1076
Sydney steel workers, 1076

Carruthers, Mr. John (East Algoma)
Civil Service — patronage, 3086
Little Current harbour improvements, 2002

Cars. *See also* Railways
Governor General's, 1688
Repairs. *See* Canadian National Railways
Shortage of. *See* Freight Rates

Cartier Square militia stores shed, qu. 2038

Carty, Captain, qu. 1062

Carvell, Hon. F. B. *See* Railway Commission

Casgrain, Mr. Pierre F. (Charlevoix-Montmorency)
Budget, 2670. Congratulations to Prime Minister upon title of Imperial Privy Councillor; Congratulations to Mr. Speaker; budget proposals; abnormal conditions, 2670; principles of the Liberal party; platform of 1919; Opposition amdt. not to be taken seriously; theories and arguments of the official Opposition and Progressive party; the golden mean; moderate protection, 2671; sales tax; inequality of income tax; burden borne by small wage-earners; proposed exemption of heads of large families; tax on cigarettes and cigars; exemptions from sales tax, 2672; cheque tax; leaf tobacco; tariff reductions; automobile tax, 2673; Borden and Meighen Governments responsible for present conditions; Canadian National Railways, management, board of directors, deficits; Canadian Govt. Merchant Marine; public debt; economy; Purchasing Commission; Civil Service Commission, 2674; reduction in civil service; public works in Charlevoix-Montmorency; Canada's future, 2675

Casgrain, Mr. Pierre F. — *Con.*
Belley, Mr. Alfred, salary, 3504
Daylight saving, M. (Mr. Kay) 956
Esquimalt and Nanaimo Railway bill, 1356
Military Service Act Amdt. bill, 642
Steamship service, Murray Bay-Tadoussac, 3035
Superintendent of Lighthouses, Quebec, qu. 2584

Cash Grants to Soldiers. *See* Soldiers' Bonus

Cassels, Professor Gustavus, 1292

Cattle. *See also* Agriculture, Accredited herds, Health of Animals; Live stock industry
British embargo on. *See* Cattle Embargo
Decline in prices of, 77. *See* speeches on Address; Budget
Diseases of. *See* Animal Contagious Diseases Bill
Exported to United States, 2450, 2695
Fordney tariff and. *See* United States, Fordney
Markets for, 977

Cattle Embargo, 93, 334, 361, 970, 973, 979, 985, 989, 992, 1002, 1031, 1283, 2182, 2571, 2597. *See also* Live Stock Industry
Alleged statement of Hon. Mr. Larkin, High Commissioner, 1020, 1463, 1502
Doherty, Hon. Manning, visit to England, 1283
Removal of, 2597

Cedar Rapids power, 71, qu. 728, qu. 1375. *See also* St. Lawrence River Waterway

Census of 1921, 20, 56. *See also* Immigration; Population; Redistribution; Statistics
Agricultural assets and liabilites, 2159
Completion of, 1363
Cost, 1363
Enumerators, 1366
Appointment of, 1368
Payment of, 1367-9
Irregularities, 1363, 1365, 1367
Population, by ages, qu. 1632
Redistribution, and, 1363-71
Registration of Canadians, 1363
Report of Commissioner, 1366
Verification of figures, 1366

Central Vermont Railway. *See* Grand Trunk Railway

Chair rulings of. *See* Deputy Speaker; Speaker

Chairman of Committees. *See* Deputy Speaker

Chamberlin, Mr. R. G., grant to, 3497

Chambly Canal. *See* Canals

Champlain, steamship, qu. 1400

Chaplin, Mr. James D. (Lincoln)
Agriculture Dept.—salary increases, 657
Boots and shoes, duty on, 3237
Budget, 2616. Ross rifle, war wagons and equipment; acquisition of Grand Trunk; congratulations to Finance Minister; reciprocity treaty, 2616; tariff proposals; automobile tax; tax on soft drinks, grape juice, 2617; consumption of farm produce in Canada; discrepancy as to agricultural exports; padded figures; non-agricultural commodities included in statement of exports, 2618; value of home market; agricultural implements, 2619; home and foreign trade in; prices in Canada and abroad, 2620; trend of tariff legislation in United States; Mr. Crerar's prophecy, 2621; farmers' platform; alleged effect of protective tariff; statement that consumer pays $4 for every dollar of revenue collected, 2622; export freight rates, 2623; cost of collecting customs duties; prices of kodaks in Canada and United States; political pledges; speech of late Hon. J. Israel Tarte, 2624
Canadian Transit Company bill, 1771

Chaplin, Mr. James D.—*Con.*
Cash bonus to soldiers, 402
Cheque tax, 3260
Dominion lands, temporary employees, 1036
Experimental farm employees, 652
Ford automobiles, 3274
Government printing, 1972
Hamilton-Queenston highway, qu. 471
Harbours and Rivers
Manitoba, 2004
New Brunswick, 1993, 1997
Imperial Mining Resources Bureau, 1238
Interior Dept., salary increases, 457
Migratory birds, 1685
Militia and Defence
Arsenals, 1979
Lindsay, 2086
Quebec, 2091
Military property in Lincoln county, 1980
Pay of staff, 1982
Permanent force, 1983
Staff reduction, 420
Junior clerks, 416, 419
Transport and freight, 1986
Mutual insurance, 3255
Orders in Council, qu. 934
Printing and stationery supplies, 454
Privy Council officials, 410
Public buildings
Maritime provinces, 1244
St. Catharines post office, 1246-50
Rail and car repair contracts, 1709
St. Thomas-Niagara Falls highway, qu. 936
Soldiers' Civil Re-establishment
Salaries and officials, 398-9
Salary increases, 386
Welland canal, construction, 2753

Charges of Management. *See* Finance

Charlevoix-Montmorency public works, 2675

Charlottetown, quarantine station, 2021

Chartered Banks. *See* Banks and Banking

Charters, Mr. Samuel (Peel)
Budget, 2561. Speech of the Minister of Agriculture; Wheat Board; Liberal pledges; introduction of national policy; the amendment; Government's failure to implement promises, 2561; Mr. Murphy at Milton; Government by Order in Council; business and luxury taxes; profiteers; inaction of Minister of Labour, 2562; sales tax; Civil Service Commission; patronage; the tariff; protection and free trade, 2563; statement of Finance Minister;

Charters, Mr. Samuel — *Con.*
Budget — *Con.*
manifesto of Progressive party; tariff changes; agricultural implements; fruit industry, 2564; pessimistic view of present day conditions; reciprocity; rural population; rural school attendance; value of farm lands; farm production, 2565; automobiles; Ontario Government immigration literature, 2566; future of Canada, 2567
Long Branch rifle range, qu. 372

Cheques. *See* Special War Revenue; Taxation

Chevrier, Mr. E. R. E. (Ottawa)
Civil Service
Absence through sickness, 3509
Bonus, 3531
Commission, 3064
Pensions Com., final report, 3337
Senate indemnity, 3509

Chief Architect's Branch. *See* Public Works

Chief Electoral Officer
Assistant, salary of, 3538
Carleton, N.B., returning officer, 3539, 3603, 3606
Report of Fourteenth General Election, of 1921, 1258
Report, printing of, 871
Residential qualification, 1297

Children
Dependent. *See* Income War Tax Act
Health of. *See* Daylight saving; Health
Immigration. *See that title*
Infant mortality in cities, 2634
Miners of, in Nova Scotia, 529
Oleomargarine, effect on health, 178. *See also that title*
Pensions to. *See* Pensions Com. report
Save the Children fund, 3516
School attendance, 2565. *See also* Education
Soldiers of
Alleged ill-treatment, 2638
Education. *See* Pensions Com.
Provision for, 3315-16

China
Commissioner of Immigration in, ques. 2026, 2214
Dr. Tsur, Chinese Consul General, 1776
Eggs, importation from, 177
Treaties with. *See* Chinese Customs Tariff Treaty; Far Eastern Treaty

Chinese Customs Tariff Treaty, 3161

Chinese Immigration. *See* Oriental Aliens

Chippewa electrical development, 72, 1327. *See also* St. Lawrence River Waterway

Chisholm, Mr. A. W. (Inverness)
Civil Service, officials receiving more than deputy ministers, 1508
Inverness pier, 1766
Margaree breakwaters, 1767

Church, Mr. Thomas L. (North Toronto)
Address in reply, 116. Congratulations to Speaker; standing of different parties, 116; race and religious differences, 118; Speech of Hon. Ernest Lapointe; Battlefields Commission, 119; taxation methods, 120; unemployment and housing, 121; Good roads; public ownership, 122; Hydro-electric, 123, 131; public ownership of railways, 133; work of Sir Adam Beck, 134; radial railways, 134; St. Lawrence river waterway, 135; German trade; Senate reform; Civil service reform, 138; Conservative and Liberal gains and losses, 138-139; combines; ties with mother land; High Commissioner, 139
Alienation of natural resources, qu. 2992
Backus, Mr. E. W., lease of timber area, 2805
Blind soldiers, pensions, 3310, 3358, 3404
Bonds, sale of by public tender, 1468
Budget, 2392. Tariff not a political question; Tories and Radicals; Conservatives and protection; national policy; home market, 2392; the Progressives; United Farmers' platform; Liberals and free trade; protection and the growth of cities and towns ;tariff increase world wide; protectionist budgets of Liberal governments; tariff reduction and sales tax increase; Progressives and big interests, 2393; farmers and other producers highly organized; time for consumers to get together; tax burden on urban population; cigarette and tobacco taxes; railway problem; Canadian Pacific and Crowsnest pass agreement; trade with Germany, 2394; trusts, combines and war profiteers; tax evaders; taxation in Ontario; war time amusement tax; cheque tax; protest of Toronto and other municipalities, 2395; posterity should pay; Wheat Board; cost of living; Bank Act; Merchants Bank, 2396; judges serving on political com-

Church, Mr. Thomas L. — *Con.*
Budget — *Con.*
missions; prison reform; civil service, 2397; St. Lawrence river waterway, 2398
Business of the House, Mondays and Wednesdays, 1462
Cadet corps, 1147, 1973
Canadian battlefields, 119, 771
Canadian Exporter, wreck, qu. 1210
Canadian Govt. Merchant Marine, 3038
Canadian National Railways, 68
Carey, Mr., 2858
Directors' sympathy with public ownership, 2858
Canadian representation in the United States, 2990
Civil Service retirement fund, income tax, qu. 937
Coal, price of, qu. 2039
Combines Investigation Act, qu. 1902
Committee speeches, relevancy, 555-6
Criminal Code — poolselling, bookmaking, etc., 2973
Cruisers, armed, on Detroit river, qu. 2214
Customs receipts, qu. 470
Daylight saving, qu, 372
M. (Mr. Kay) 946
Disability soldier cases, 3318
Elevators
Ontario, in, 2978
Terminal, qu. 3152
Enfranchisement of foreign-born women, M. (Mr. Euler) 489
Federal subsidies to Ontario, qu. 2214
France, trade relations with, 2990
Freight Rates
Crowsnest pass agreement, 2563-94
Railway Act Amdt. bill (suspension of agreement) 3594; amdt. 3595
Special Com. on, third report, 3560-4
Fuel, price of, qu. 1774
"General" Macdonald's army, reception of, 2256
Government office building in Ottawa, 1252
Haney, Mr. M. J., contracts, 1375
Hueston, Captain, inquiry into death of, qu. 2993
Imperial Mining Resources Bureau, 1238
Judges' Act Amdt. 546
Judges and commissions, qu, 366, 2397
Labour dept., policy, 464-5, 559
Lake of the Woods control, 2805
Joint board, qu. 2970
Lambton, steamer, loss of, 3365
Life-saving stations, qu. 367
Merchant lake marine, qu. 3362
Merchants Bank case, qu. 367, 2396, 3604
Case against D. C. Macarow, qu. 2305

Church, Mr. Thomas L. — *Con.*
Military expenditure and policy, 1177
Militia and Defence
Annual drill, 1177, qu. 1285
Arsenals, Quebec, 2093
Cadet services, 1147, 1973
Expenditure and policy
1890-1913, qu. 1285
Annual drill, proposed reduction, 1613
First Canadian contingent, qu. 1376
Ministers and directorships, 1125
National Defence bill, 742
Naval policy, 2043
Naval Service
Navy men, travelling expenses, qu. 3156
Royal Canadian Navy, 1894, 2043
Patronage, appointments to penitentiary, 1277
Penitentiary inmates, qu. 3362
Pension Act Amdt. bill, 3442-62
Amdt. (Blind soldiers) 3358, 3404
Pensions
Evidence, 3357
Mothers, qu. 1375
Old age, qu. 1375
Pensions Committee final report, 3309
Postal affairs, qu. 368
Post Office, drop letter rate, 1250
Prince of Wales Leinster regiment (Royal Canadians) qu. 1065
Prison reform, 1277, 2397
Inspection by Grand juries, qu. 1773
Jail farms, qu. 1773
Youthful offenders, qu. 1773
Provincial commissions, Hon. Mr. Justice Riddell and Mr. Justice Latchford, qu. 3600
Public buildings
Flags, 1260
Maritime provinces, 1244
Ontario, 1246-51
Rental and purchase of, 1262
Quebec Harbour Commission bill, 1467, 1482
Railway Act Amdt. bill (special passenger rates) 1460
Rental and purchase of buildings, 1252
Returned Soldiers' Insurance bill, 3391
Ritchie, Mr. Hugh, qu. 3361
St. Lawrence river waterway, 135, 2398
Correspondence with United States, 2357
International Joint Commission report, 2357
M. (Mr. Church) 1183
Toronto
Customs house, qu. 470
Harbour improvements, 1467

Church, Mr. Thomas L. — *Con.*
Toronto — *Con.*
Public buildings, 1246-7
Railway viaduct, qu. 1660
Steam railway freight, qu. 936
Trade commissioners and commercial agents, 2990
Welland canal, qu. 827
Construction, 1687
Tonnage, qu. 936

Cigars and Cigarettes, tax on. *See* Budget; Inland Revenue; Taxation; Tobacco

Civil Aviation. *See* Air Force

Civil Pensions. *See* Pensions

Civil Service. *See also* Supply. For individual departments, *See their titles.* For references generally, *see* speeches on Address; Budget
Absence through sickness, 3509
Amalgamation of departments. *See* National Defence bill
Appointments, 337, 2559, 3065, 3098
Members, and, 3074-3077
Recommendations of. *See under this title,* Patronage
Outside service, post offices, 3073-4
Procedure, 573
Soldiers, 3330, qu. 3361. *See also* Soldiers
Bonus, qu. 472, qu. 606, 733, 1258, 2397-8, 2513, 2801, 2805, qu. 3364, 3531
Announcement by Prime Minister, 1503
Appropriation, 3528
Inquiry as to payment of, 2996
Soldiers' Civil Re-establishment, nurses, 1342
Withdrawal of from certain civil servants, qu. 3598
Calder Bill. *See* Public Service Retirement Act
Classification, 455, 466, 494, 693, 3067, 3089
Appeals against, qu. 1508
Arthur Young Company, 1490
Bland, Mr. C. H., qu. 1773, qu. 1904
Board of Hearing, 1491
Examination of masters and mates, 1490
Foran, Mr. J. J., qu. 2214
Militia dept., 416
Post Office, money order branch, qu. 1285
Printed copies of, qu. 1930
Responsibility for, 1491
Commission
Abolition of, recommended, 2563, 2674-5
Appointments agriculture dept., 2599
Appraisers, Paris and London, 1068
Bland, Mr. C. H., qu. 1773, qu. 1904

Civil Service — *Con.*
Commission — *Con.*
Census enumerators, appointment, 1368
Commissioners
Annual salary and travelling expenses, qu. 364-5
Appointment of, 2659
Cost of, qu. 364-5
Employees
Number of, qu. 364
Salaries, 3093
Estimates, 3102
Exemptions, 3078-9
History of and legislation creating, 3065
Jurisdiction, 736-7
Salaries over, 2801
Militia dismissals, 423
Officials and employes, qu. 364-5, 3093
Organization branch, qu. 935
Putnam, Mr., C.V., qu. 935, 3090
Powers of, 553, 554
Report, qu. 826
Salaries and contingencies, etc., qu. 364-5, 386, 3091, 3509
Secretary, qu. 826
Soldiers' Civil Re-establishment, and. *See that title*
Deputy ministers, qu. 3364
Increase in salaries, 2805
Militia and Naval Service. *See* National Defence
Dismissals, 3083-3090
Economy in, 401, 423, 2057-61, 2371. *See also* Address; Budget
Examination, 871
Hours, 2321, 2371,
Income tax department, 1663
Industrial councils, 1061
List, qu. 727
Married women employed in, qu. 1658
Memorandum of Hon. Mr. Robertson, 555
Militia services amalgamation, 418-19. *See also* National Defence
Overmanning of, 2371, 2450, 3099. *See also* speeches on Address; Budget
Patronage and, 199, 2563, 3073, 3080, 3094, 3096
Promotions, 576, 3066
Public Service Retirement Act. *See that title*
Qualifications, 3070
Reduction of, 2674-5
Reform, 138, 3075
Reorganization, 2061. *See also under this title,* Classification
Griffenhagen and Associates, 1490
Sherbrooke post office inspector, 1507

Civil Service — *Con.*
Responsibility, 3076
Retirement. *See also* Public Service Retirement Act
Fund, qu. 826
Income tax, qu. 937
Lightkeepers, 1496
Rural postmasters, 3079, 3095-6
Salaries and remuneration, 552, 2243, 2321, 2397, 2513, 2805, 3075, 3081, qu. 3364
Employees receiving less than $600, qu. 1067
Hours and, 2321, 2371
Officials receiving more than deputy ministers, 1508
Paying of. *See* Interim Supply
Recommendations, 550
Reductions, 2690-1
Salaries of $960 and less, qu. 1660, 1775
Statement of Hon. Mr. Robertson, 555
Tariff Commission, appointment of, 1663
Temporary employees, 1036. *See also* individual departments
Vacancies, filling of, 792. *See also under this title* Appointments

Clark, Mr. J. A. (Burrard)
Alien enemy property, custodians of, 3601
Messrs. Fisher & Oughton, Prince Rupert, qu. 1772, 3606
Ammunition, shipment from Great Britain, 1337
Income tax collections, 1919-20-21, qu. 1063
Militia and Defence, expenditure and policy, 1335
National Defence bill, 678
Naval Service — Royal Canadian Navy, 1878, 2061
Northwest Rebellion, pensions of Mounted Police, 3523
Oriental Aliens, M. (Mr. McQuarrie) for exclusion, 1523
Quebec Harbour, appropriations for, 1486
Pension Act Amdt. bill, 3443-55
Pensions Com., 391
Final report, 3327
Returned Soldiers' Insurance Act, 3400
Revenues from imports, qu. 827
Royal Canadian Mounted Police
Doctors Lovering and Taylor, qu. 1211
Industrial disputes, 679
Northwest Rebellion, pensions and claims, 3523
Royal Canadian Navy, 1878, 2061
Vancouver
Drydock, 3542
Harbour work, 1485
Terminal railway, 1485
War, preparation for, 1335

Clark, Dr. Michael, 295

Clarke Trading Co., transport of supplies, 1681

Classification. *See* Civil Service

Clay Products, 1234

Closure, application of. *See* Interim Supply

Clothing, duty on, 2186, 2465, 2662. *See also* Budget; Taxation

Coal. *See also* Fuel; Mines; Natural Resources; Railways
Anthracite importations, qu. 2356, 2686
Bituminous, 2686
British Columbia, mines in, 178
By products of, 3525
Canadian, 2687
Use of in public buildings, 1759
Canadian National Railways
Imported for, qu. 926, qu. 2213
Purchases, qu. 2306
Canadian Pacific lands, transfer of, qu. 2214
Competition
Fuel oil, 2312
United States Mines, with, 2612
Conservation of supply by power development, 1188. *See also* St. Lawrence River Waterway
Drumheller mines, 85
Duty on, 2342
Investigation of low grade, 3525
Freight rates. *See also that title*
Manitoba from, 1763
Japan from, qu. 963, 2312, 3406
Labour. *See also that title*
Canmore employers and miners dispute, 1058
District No. 18 Board, 1058
Drumheller mines, 86
Employers and miners' dispute, 1058
Industrial Disputes Investigation Act, 1058
Nova Scotia Miners' strike, 1054. *See also that title*
Oriental aliens, 2312. *See also that title*
Cumberland mines, in, 2407
Wages in Nova Scotia, 1078. *See also* Nova Scotia Miners
Lands
Transfer by Canadian Pacific, qu. 2214
United States in, purchase of, 2611
Lignite
Bienfait briquetting plant, qu. 604, 1233, qu. 1632, 2712-15
Utilization Board, 1233, 3524

Coal — *Con.*
Lightboats, for, qu. 606
Mineral development, 686
Mining industry, protection, 2312
Montreal requirements, 630
Nova Scotia, 2412
Freight charges on, 193, 194
Miners. *See that title*
Powdered, 2713-5
Price of, 465, 1758, 1774, qu. 2037, qu. 2039
Effect of freight rates on, 132-133
Reduction in, 1490, 1494
Public buildings, heating, 1758
Importation for, 1763
Railways
Canadian National Railways, qu. 926, 2213
Purchases for, qu. 2306
Grand Trunk Railway, qu. 606
Royalties, qu. 375
St. Lawrence river waterway, 1316
Smoky river, lease of coal lands, 3465
Supply, control, 71
Transportation. *See* Freight rates
Waterpowers and, 2182

Coats, Mr. R. H. *See* Statistics, Bureau of

Cocaine. *See* Opium

Cocoa and Chocolate. *See* Customs Tariff

Cockshutt, Lieut. Governor, 1128

Cockshutt Plough Company, Minister of Justice and, 242

Codling Moth. *See* Entomology

Coinage. *See also* Currency Act Amdt. bill
Nickel coin blanks, qu. 3152
Nickel, five cent piece, 1132
Silver, millesimal fineness, 1132

Cold Storage. *See* Agriculture

Collective Bargaining, 2322

Colonial Status. *See* Naval Service; Prime Minister's Conference

Combines, 139. *See also* Address; Budget; Trusts

Combines Investigation Act, qu. 1902

Commerce. *See* Board of Commerce; Trade

Commercial Travellers. *See* Budget; Income War Tax Act Amdt.

Commissioner of Agriculture. *See* Agriculture; Marshall

Commissions
Judges serving on, qu. 366, 546, 2397

Committee of Supply. *See* Supply

Committees. *See* House of Commons

Commodity Rates. *See* Freight Rates; Railways; Transportation

Commodity Tax. *See* Taxation

Companies Act, Privy Council appeal, legal expenses, 1671

Compensation. *See* Animal Contagious Diseases amdt.

Compensation for Injuries. *See* Air Board Act Amdt.

Compulsory Enfranchisement. *See* Indian Act Amdt.

Compulsory Legislation. *See* Wheat Board

Compulsory Military Service. *See* Military Service Act 1917 Amdt. bill

Con Rein, sinking of, M. (Mr. Macdonald, Pictou) 1382, agreed to, 1384

Concurrence. *See* Supply

Condensed Milk tax on, 2492, 3264-71, 3409

Confectionery, tax on, 2177, 2641, 2676, 2852, 2857

Confederation, basis of, 154
Maritime provinces and, 228. *See also* Intercolonial Railway

Conferences
Brussels Financial, 1138, 1292
Building trades, 582-3
Cannes, 823, 1716, 1845
Genoa, 7, 58, 156, 212, 582, 1292, 1463, 1675, 1715-6, 1845, 2035, 2337
Expenses, 1715
Europe, in, 1336
Imperial, 1864. *See also under this title* Prime Ministers'
International Labour, qu. 824, 1060, 1070, 3437, 3490
Printing of report, 3601
Limitation of Armaments, 7, 1283, 1731, 1737, 1844-95
Borden, Rt. Hon. Sir Robert, report M. (Mr. Casgrain) for papers, 373
National Industrial, qu. 1375
Postal, 7, 15
Potato growers, 3367
Prime Ministers', 1624, 1864, 1883, 2042, 2082
Trades Union, Rome, 1060

Conferences — *Con.*
Washington. *See under this title,* International Labour; Limitation of Armaments

Connaught rifle range, qu. 3153

Connor, James, dismissal of, 1674

Conscription, 22, 61, 90-91, 2570, 2685. *See also* Military Service Act, 1917, Amdt.

Conservation Commission, transfer of employees, 3495. *See also* Interior Dept.; White, Mr. James

Consolidated Revenue and Audit Act Amdt. bill, 1r., 1210; 2r., com., 3r., 3042

Consortium to re-establish Russian trade, 1463

Constitutional Development. *See* Address; Conferences; League of Nations; Naval Service

Constitutionality of Wheat Board. *See* Wheat Board

Consular Agents. *See* Trade and Commerce

Consular Certificates. *See* Customs; Trade and Commerce

Contagious Diseases. *See* Animal Contagious Diseases; Health; Immigration; Penitentiary Act Amdt.

Contingency Vote. *See* Departments; Estimates; Supply

Coolie Labour. *See* Oriental Aliens

Co-operative Pooling. *See* Wheat Board

Co-ordination. *See* Militia and Defence; National Defence

Coote, Mr. G. G. (Macleod)
Agriculture dept., travelling expenses, 657
Automobiles and parts, imports, qu. 1633
Automobile tax, 3276
Banks
Circulation, deposits, loans, etc., qu. 1901
Number, reserves, deposits, loans, etc. qu. 1182
Board of Commerce, cost, report, qu. 2583
Budget, 2724. The amendment; party politics a curse, 2724; the budget a disappointment; national debt; tax exempt bonds; conscription of wealth during war time, 2725; taxation of implements of production; oil and well-drilling machinery; western problems; grasshoppers, 2726; cattle industry; amalgamation of Merchants' Bank and Bank of Montreal, 2727; banking system, ratio of deposits to capital; credit; distribution of products; Wheat Board; tariff a geographical question; treatment of western Canada, 2729
Canadian National Institute for the Blind, 3540
Canadian National railways, freight rates advertising campaign, qu. 1375
Criminal Code, cruelty to animals, 2833
Customs, dumping clause, 3419, 3423
Dominion notes, qu. 3153
Esquimalt dry dock, 3541
Felt shoe industry, 3239
Forestry, aerial patrol at High River, 1050
Grasshoppers, 2726, 3520
Immigration
Child, 2161
Farmers, 3064
Italian, 2171
Policy, 2161
Indians
Blood reserve, 1219, 1224
Land leased, qu. 2969
Education, schools in Alberta, 1237
Insurance premiums, tax, 3258
Lambton, loss of, 3508
Live stock industry, 991, 2727
Macleod post office, qu. 2804
Penitentiaries, inmates, foreign and native, 1279
Ploughs, duty on, 3123
Prince Rupert Drydock Co., claim, 3514
Railway Commission
Carvell, Hon. F. B., Chairman, 2773-5
Langley, Hon. George, statement, 2773
Redistribution, 1370
Royal Canadian Mounted Police, Macleod, 2584
Steel bounties, qu. 3360
Tariff inquiry, 1920-21, cost, report, publication, qu. 2215
Threshing machines, 3125
Total trade, 1900-1921, qu. 1633
Tree-planting on prairies, 1051
Unemployment figures, qu. 3362
Vancouver dry dock, 3544
Wheat Board, 2729, 3182, 3189

Copp, Hon. A. B. (Secretary of State)
Alien enemy property, custodians of, 1672, 3601
Prince Rupert, 3606
Alleged election promises in Charlotte County, N.B., 1994
Archives Branch, Dr. Doughty, 702
Canada Temperance Act, 2024
Civil Service
Commission, 3102
Examinations, 872
Harbour and Rivers, New Brunswick, 1992
Lusitania reparation claims, 3599
Moncton car shops, 1709
Naturalization Act, Amdt. bill, 3104, 3436
Naturalization expenses, 1671
Provincial wharves, New Brunswick, 1992
Public Service Retirement Act Amdt. bill, 1661, 3025, 3148
Rail and car repair contracts, 1708
Secretary of State dept.
Estimates, 701, 1671, 2977, 3499
War claims, adjustment of, 1672, 2977
Privilege, correction of report in Montreal Gazette, 1721

Corporation Control. *See* Railways

Corporation-Owned Railroads in United States, 67-70. *See also* Railways, Public ownership

Correction of Division List. *See* House of Commons Divisions

Correspondence, quoting from. *See* Speaker's Rulings

Cost of Living, 2349, 2359, 2396, 2578. *See also* Address; Budget; Civil Service Bonus; Labour; Nova Scotia Miners; Unemployment
Labour Gazette and, 1057
Prices, deflation of, 1216-18
Purchasing power of money, 1151-3, 1175, 1177, 1292, 2331, 2603
Sales tax, and, 2676. *See also that title*
Tariff and, 2882. *See also* speeches on Budget
Taxation on, 2364. *See also* Speeches on Budget
Wages based on, 1303

Cotton Industries
Duties, 2469, 3127. *See also* Customs Tariff
Wages, hours, etc., qu. 1903

Coughlin Shipbuilding Company, 3542

County Courts, establishment in Quebec, 3496

County Fairs. *See* Agriculture, Exhibitions

Courtenay Bay, qu. 365. *See also* St. John Harbour

Courtney, B.C., post office building, 1258

Cow Bay wharf, 1766

Cream Separators. *See* Agricultural Implements

Credits. *See* Banking; Finance; Financial Credits; Housing; Loans; Roumania and Greece; Unemployment

Crerar, Hon. Thomas A. (Marquette, Leader of the Progressive party)
Address in reply, 50. Congratulations to Speaker, Miss Macphail, mover and seconder of Address; speeches of Prime Minister and leader of Opposition, 50-51; election campaign, 51; negotiations between Government and Progressives, 51; attitude of Progressive party, 52; condition of agriculture; wheat marketing, 53; production costs; transportation costs; freight rates; tariff revision, 54; Sir Lomer Gouin; railways, public ownership, 55-56; immigration, burden of taxation, 56-57; soldiers' re-establishment, 57; Limitation of Armaments; Genoa Conference; economy, need for; burden of taxation, 58; redistribution; proportional representation, 59
Adjustment of war claims, 1672
Agricultural exports, figures used in budget debate, 2638
Agriculture
Condition and prospects, 53, 2156, 2471
Dept., salary increases, 588
Agriculture and Colonization Com.
McCoig, Senator, attendance before, 1901
Wheat Board report, 780. *See also under this title,* Wheat Board
Alien enemy property, 1672
American magazines, 3113
Animal Contagious Diseases Act Amdt. bill, 2102
Audibility of debates, 708
Board of Commerce, 1715
British Columbia, and, 2234-9
British Preference and Canadian seaports, M. (Mr. Logan) 716
Budget, 2459. Congratulations to Prime Minister; tribute to Finance Minister; difficult and perplexing problems; unsatisfactory financial position; debt and taxation, 2459; railway expenditures; revenue and expenditure; discrepancy between income and outgo, 2460; limit of taxation about reached; economy; new taxation; reorganization of departments and elimination

Crerar, Hon. Thomas A. — *Con.*
Budget — *Con.*
of duplication; new administration buildings; overlapping of Dominion and provincial expenditures, 2461; sales tax, inequitable and unsound; cheque tax; tax on foreign insurance companies, 2462; co-ordination of financial policy; overlapping of taxation; reciprocity with United States; valuation and marking goods; valuation of currency, 2463; trade with Germany; a protectionist budget; no statement of government policy; agricultural implements, 2464; inconsistencies in agricultural machinery schedule; government failure to implement pledges; clothing; boots and shoes; household equipment, 2465; tariff reductions counterbalanced by sales tax increase; tariff platform of 1919; Liberal resolution of 1921; tariff proposals not what country requires; discrimination against United States, 2466; tariff legislation before Congress; American factories in Canada; opposition to protection in United States, 2467; Progressive party unalterably opposed to protection; development of natural resources; home market fallacy; manufacture of rubber goods; cotton; raw material and finished product; protection sectional and selfish; movement of population; exodus of Canadian workmen; maritime provinces under protective policy, 2469; rural depopulation in Ontario; prairie provinces; Vancouver and free port proposal, 2470; agriculture prospers in spite of protection; development of west; prosperity from 1900 to 1912 not due to tariff; export of natural products, 2471; tendency of economic thought in Europe; trade begets friendship; the amendment, 2472; no constructive proposal; amdt. to amdt. proposed, 2473
Business of the House
Budget (amdt. to amdt., Sir Henry Drayton) 2473, 2507, 2522
Budget debate, conclusion of, 2640
Easter adjournment, 820
Empire and Ascension Days, adjournment, 1905
Government orders, Monday and Wednesday, 1461, 1720
Privilege on Orders of Day, right to raise, 2638

Crerar, Hon. Thomas A. — *Con.*
Canadian Govt. Merchant Marine, loan to, 3036
Canadian National Railways
Deficits, 1920
Canadian Northern, 1907
Immigration, 1927
Public ownership and operation, 1920
Rail and car repair contracts, 1689, 1707, 1925
Revaluation of, 1925
Canadian Transit Company bill, 1772
Civil Service
Commission, 3078
Patronage, 3080, 3096
Cold storage warehouse, Montreal, 819
Crowsnest pass agreement, 3595
M. (Mr. Kennedy, Essex) for Special Com., 1414-20-29, 1433, 1454
Telegram from Minister of Agriculture to Calgary Board of Trade, 2358
Customs
Drawbacks, 766
Dumping clause, 3423
Estimates, 762
Officials, 764
Debates, Official Report of, insertion of documents not read, 1540
Dominion Iron and Steel Co. contract for steel plates, 1678
Elevators, terminal, administration, 2980. *See also under this title,* Grain Inquiry Commission
Emigration, record of, 2158
Estimates, accounts chargeable to current or past year, 1675
Freight Rates
Crowsnest pass agreement. *See under this title* Crowsnest
Immigration and, 2157
Genoa Conference, 1715
Cannes Conference, 823
Reported subscription of Canada to consortium, 1463
Governor General's cars, 1688
Grain and grain trade. *See also under this title* Wheat Board
Manitoba Court of Appeal, decision, 1933
Russia, competition in wheat market, 2157
Grain Inquiry Commission, 49, 2982, 2895
Secret session at Fort William, 2983
Hyndman Commission, 2982
Immigration
Central European, 2157
Policy, 2156
Railways, and, 1929, 2157

Crerar, Hon. Thomas A. — *Con.*
Immigration Act Amdt. bill (Mr. Woodsworth) 1394
Intercolonial Railway, maritime management, 193
Interior Dept., economy, 455
Judges' Act Amdt. bill, 426
Justice Dept., contingencies, 1668
Labour
Estimates, 579180
Technical education, 459
Liberal party, negotiations with, 34-35, 51
Limitation of Armaments Conference, 9, 3167
Militia and Defence
Co-ordination of services, 417
Expenditure and policy, 1593
National Defence bill, 739-40
Naturalization expenses, 1671
Naval Service
Empire defence contribution, 2081-2
Fleet 420
Policy, 2081
Nova Scotia miners, 508
M. (Mr. Irvine) 542
Oleomargarine Act Amdt. bill, 3429
Oleomargarine, manufacture and importation of M. (Mr. Neill) 1821
Ploughs, duty on, 3121-3122
Political inquesting, 404
Population, need of increased, 2158
Privilege, questions of
Agricultural figures used in budget debate, 2637
Member's right to raise on Orders of day, 2638
Proportional representation, M. (Mr. Good) 1652
Public ownership, 1920, 1923
Rail and car repair contracts, 1684, 1707, 1925
Railway Act Amdt. bill (Crowsnest pass) 3595
Railway policy 1920, 1923
Responsibility as leader of Opposition, 73
Royal Canadian Mounted Police, M. (Mr. Woodsworth) 835
Soldiers' bonus, M. (Mr. Arthurs) 444
Soldiers' Civil Re-establishment
Salary increases, 398, 404
Discussion out of order, 398, 404
Speaker, election of, 4
Speaker, Mr., death of father, 496
Steamship services
Canada-Australia-New Zealand, 3034
Canadian Govt. Merchant marine, subsidies, 3032
Revision of, 3034
West Indies, 3032

Crerar, Hon. Thomas A. — *Con.*
Steel industry, subsidies to, 1692
Supreme Court Act Amdt. bill, 2974
Tariff, immigration and, 2157
Tractors, duty on, 3124
Treaties of peace with Hungary and Turkey, bill, 3490
Union Government, resignation from, 2490
United Grain Growers, Limited, 2489
Terminal elevator, 2983
Welland ship canal, grain transportation, 2750
Wheat Board, 377, 2922
Fixation of prices, 2588
Proceedings in Committee, 2934
Wheat Board bill, 3186, 3191, 3384, 3386

Crime. *See also* Criminal Code; Penitentiaries
Foreign immigration and, 1392-4

Criminal Code
Reprinting and revision, 1278, 1717

Criminal Code Amendment Bills
1. Criminal conspiracy and sedition (Mr. Woodsworth) 1r., 364; 2r., 493, 865; com,. 865, 1388; ref. to Special Com., 1395, 1503; report, 1988. *For further stages, see* Immigration Act Amdt. (Mr. Woodsworth)
2. Newspaper ownership (Mr. Jacobs) 1r., 821
3. Scrip Frauds (Mr. Kennedy, Edmonton) 1r., 1062; 2r., 3211-3217; com., 3217; 3r., 3221
4. Age of consent; automobile theft; bribing police commissioners; carrying animals by railways; carnal knowledge; clerk of peace, Quebec; indecent assault; protection of English hall marks; recovery of penalties from corporations by civil process; retention of fines by municipalities in Ontario (Sir Lomer Gouin) 1r., 1841; 2r., com., 2830, 2973; 3r., 2974; Senate amdts., 3607

Subjects and sections discussed:
Age of consent, 2830-1
Calhoun, Mr., telegram from, 3601
Conveyance of cattle, 2831-34
Feeble-minded person, carnal knowledge of, 2973
Game of chance, 2973
Pool-selling, bookmaking, 2973

Criminal Conspiracies. *See* Criminal Code Amdt.

Cronyn, Mr. Hume, reference to. *See* Pensions Committee, final report

Crowsnest Pass Agreement. *See* Freight Rates

Crude Oil. *See* Fuel Oil

Cruelty to Animals. *See* Criminal Code Amdt.
Society for prevention of, 2831

Cruisers, armed, on Detroit river, qu. 2214

Cuba
Shipment of potatoes to, 2028
Steamship service to. *See that title*

Cultivators. *See* Agricultural Implements

Cumberland, B.C.
Mines, 2407
Voting in, 180

Currency. *See also* Banks and Banking; Finance; Money
Gold standard, 1291
Valuation for customs, 2113, 2173, 2389, 2420, 2463, 2599, 2641, 2859, 2875, 2884, 2897, 3223-4. *See also* Customs Act Amdt.

Currency Act, 1910, Amdt. bill, Res. 1132, 3042; 1r., 3043; 2r., com., 3r., 3043

Currie, General Sir Arthur, 1986

Customs Act and the Department of Customs and Excise Act Amdt. bill (Dumping clause; consular certificates; valuation for duty; currency) 1r., 2r., com., 3222; 3r., 3477

Customs and Excise. *See also* Budget; Customs Act; Customs Tariff; Imports and Exports; Taxation; Trade
Automobiles, tax on. *See* Automobiles
British goods imported, qu. 966
Via United States, qu. 375
Collections, New Brunswick, qu. 607
Consular certificates, 2114, 3477, 3522. *See also* Customs Act Amdt.
Department
Connor, Mr. James, gratuity, 1674
L'Assomption and Montcalm excise officers, qu. 1774
Montreal employees, 1288
Organization, 1674, 2808
Printing, 1674
Salaries, 762
Veit, Mr. A. E., J. M., qu. 1773
Drawbacks, qu. 764, 828, 1067, 2175, 2186, 2662-3, 2840-50, 2895, 3141. *See also* Budget Speeches; Customs Tariff
Ford Motor Co., 2850
Payments of, 1922, qu. 2356, 2849-50

Customs and Excise — *Con.*
Drawbacks — *Con.*
Sugar on, 2850, 3251, 3476-7
Steel rods, refund, qu. 1774
Dumping clause, 304, 2184, 2197, 2275, 2494, 2641, 2879, 3188, 3410-13, 3477. *See also* Address; Budget; Customs Tariff
Duties
Cost of collecting, 239, 240, 2623-4
Fruit, 164. *See also under this title,* Dumping clause
Fuel oil on, 178
Militia dept., 1978
Per capita payment, 2691
Rebates of, 2175. *See also under this title,* Drawbacks
Valuation for, 2172. *See also* Currency
Excise tax
Alcohol for retail druggists, qu. 1400, 2114. *See also* Alcohol; Special War Revenue
Ale, beer, porter and stout, 2852
Beer brewed for private use, 2856
Beet sugar, 2117, 2855. *See also* Budget; Special War Revenue
Tobacco, 2115
Canadian raw leaf, 2853
Cigarettes, 2852
German goods, valuation. *See* Currency; Customs Act; Germany; Imports
Imports and exports
By countries, 2109
Marking and valuation of, 2113, 2174, 2410, 2463, 2879, 2897, 3413. *See also* Currency; Customs Act; Customs Tariff
Amended regulation, 2854, 3413
Revenue, qu. 827. *See also* Imports and exports
1911 to 1922, qu. 1661
International Customs Tariff Bureau, 1373
Liquor export warehouses, qu. 1211
Liquor imported, excise duties, qu. 828
Marking Act, 2641, 2877-80
Prohibited goods, 3476-7
Receipts, qu. 470
Revenue, qu. 614, qu. 827
Tariff bill, 3476-7. *See also* Customs Tariff
Tariff resolutions, 2118
Amended, 2854
Toronto customs house, qu. 470
Valuation for Duty. *See* Currency, Customs Act
Wines and spirits
Exportation of, 2854
In bond, 3229

Customs Tariff, 1907, Act Amdt. bill (Marking of imported goods; duties; amended rates; drawbacks; prohibited goods) Res. 1r., 2r., com., 3476; 3r., 3477

Customs Tariff Items
Adzes, cleavers, etc., 3127
Agate ware, 3118
Anti-dumping clause. *See under this title,* Dumping
Blankets, 3128, 3132, 3231
M. (Mr. Spencer), 3234, neg. 3235
Book and coated papers, 3108
Boots and shoes, 3236
M. (Mr. Shaw) to reduce, neg. 3238
Changes in. *See also* Tariff revision
Chinese. *See that title*
Cigarettes, 3107
Cigars, 3107
Clothes wringers, etc., 3140
Coated papers, 3108
Cocoa, 2116, 3106
Cotton fabrics, 3127
Cultivators, harrows, etc., 3120
Dairy tinware, 3118
Drugs, 3114
Dumping clause, 304, 2184, 2197, 2275, 2494, 2641, 2879, 3188, 3411-13, 3477. *See also* Customs Tariff Act Amdt.
Fishing hooks, etc., 3140
Flannels, 3137
Fruit and vegetable grading machines, 3126
Gasoline, 3115
Glass bottles, etc., 3117
Harness and saddlery, 3137
Hatters' bands, 3139
Hatters' plush, 3141
Incubators, etc., 3126
Iron and steel tubing, 3118
Linen yarn, 3128
Magazines, 3108
Marking Act, repeal, 3104
Milking machines, 3126
Mowers and harvesters, 3118
Paper invalid cups, 3115
Paper milk bottle caps, 3113-14
Ploughs, etc., 3121, 3229
M. (Mr. Johnston) to reduce, 3121, 3229
Portable and traction engines, 3231
Pump parts, 3127
Sawmill machinery, 3126
Settlers' effects, 3140
Silk cloth, 3137
Street rollers, 3126
Sugar, 3107
Threshing machines, parts, 3124
Tools, 3127
Tractors, 3123

Customs Tariff Items — *Con.*
White cotton fabrics, 3128
Window shades, etc., 3127
Wool and cotton yarns, 3127
Wool and woollen goods, 3233
Woollen clothing, 3235

Dairy Cattle. *See* Agriculture, Accredited Herds; Live Stock

Dairying Industry. *See also* Address; Budget; Oleomargarine
British Columbia Dairymen's Association, 1794
Butter. *See that title under* Agriculture
Competition with other countries, 178
Duties on utensils, reduction in, 2115, 2205, 3118
Exports and imports, 209
Grading of products, 655-6
Implements, reduction of duties on, 2115, 2205, 3118
Milk supply, inspection of herds, 2740. *See also* Agriculture, Accredited Herds, Health of Animals
National Dairy Council and oleomargarine, 1791
Oleomargarine, 1791, 2205. *See also that title*

Dalrymple, Mr. J. E., qu. 728

Dandurand, Hon. Senator, 1128

d'Anjou, Mr. Emmanuel (Rimouski)
Address in reply, 306; parliamentary rights of French language, 306; economy in Government expenditure, 307
Military expenditure and policy, 1593

D'Arcy Island lazaretto, 2021

Dartmouth, N.S. air station, 1724

Dauphinee, Mr. Charles, dimissal of, 1902, 2458, 2584

Davies, Mr. C. C. (North Battleford)
Wheat Board, participation certificates, funds, qu. 2304

Davies, Right Hon. Sir Louis, K.C.M.G., Deputy of the Governor General, 3610

Daylight Saving, 227, qu. 372
House of Commons, and, 1282
M. (Mr. Kay) for legislation to prohibit, 942, 943
Amdt. (Mr. Duff) 959; Neg. 1314

Deathbed Cases. *See* Returned Soldiers Insurance Act Amdt.

Debates. *See* House of Commons

Debeaux, Mr. Robert, claim of, 2306

Debt, Public. *See* Address; Budget; Finance; Loans; Public Debt

Deceased Soldiers. *See* Soldiers
Insurance claims of heirs, 1349. *See also* Returned Soldiers' Insurance Act
Widowed Mothers. *See* Pensions

Dechene, Mr. A. M. (Montmagny)
Oleomargarine, M. (Mr. Neill) 1801

Deep Sea Racing. *See* International Deep Sea Racing

Deep Waterway and Power Association. *See* St. Lawrence River Waterway

Defence. *See* Militia and Defence; National Defence; Naval Service

Deficits. *See* Canadian National Railways

Deflation of Credit. *See* Finance

Deflation and Inflation of prices. *See* speeches on Address and Budget

Delinquents. *See* Juvenile delinquents

Delphine, Colonel, 303

Delta, Manitoba, protective works, 3545

Demers, Captain, 1492

Demers, Mr. M. J. (St. Johns and Iberville)
Income tax, Montreal office, qu. 607

Demobilization. *See also* Militia, Annual Drill; War Claims
Estimates, 1171
Expenditure, 1155, 1163, 1171

Denis, Mr. J. Arthur (St. Denis)
Address in reply, 348. Congratulations to Mr. Speaker; immigration; Laurier-Fielding tariff, 348
Lamontagne, Mr. Ernest, qu. 824

Denis, Mr. Jean J. (Joliette)
Budget, 2887. Tribute to Finance Minister; budget proposals generally satisfactory; extravagance of Union Government; acquisition of Railways; Canadian Govt. Merchant Marine; credits to Balkan states; revenue and expenditure, 2888; Progressive party; compromise and co-operation Canada a hard country to govern; Wheat Board; freight rates, 2889; railway

Denis, Mr. Jean J. — *Con.*
Budget — *Con.*
deficits made good by East; free trade, 2890; tobacco industry, protection of, 2891
Milk supply, inspection of herds, 2740
Ministers and Directorships, 1113
Solders' insurance, 3321

Denmark, Expedition to Ellesmere Island, 1751

Dennis Building, Halifax, qu. 3360

Department of National Defence bill. *See* National Defence

Departmental Expenditure. *See* Supply

Departmental Law officers, 683, 2572

Dependency. *See* Pensions, Widowed Mothers

Deportation. *See* Immigration; Opium and Narcotic Drug Act Amdt.; Oriental Aliens

Depreciated Currency. *See* Currency; Customs

Deputy Ministers. *See* Militia Estimates; National Defence Bill; Naval Service
Salaries of, 752

Deputy Registrar. *See* Admiralty Act Amdt. bill

Deputy Sergeant-at-Arms, appointment, 5

Deputy Speaker and Chairman of Committees (Mr. George N. Gordon)
Election of, 363
Rulings and statements of. *See also* House of Commons; Marcil; Speaker
Amendments
Already covered, 3147-8
Anticipatory, 2973
Increasing charge on revenue, 3404
Member having already spoken, cannot move, 3558
Moved separately, 3401
Previous, 3148
Bills
Casting vote of Chairman, 3473
New sections proposed, 3445
Private
Com. may not refer back, 1747
Relevancy, 1858
Public
Amdt. dealt with by another amdt. on order paper, 2973

Deputy Speaker and Chairman of Committees — *Con.*
Rnlings and Statements of — *Con.*
Chair
Decision given, final, 3354
Member may not criticise ruling, 555, 2974
Ruling of non-debatable, 1898
Debate
Inaudibility of, 1755
Member speaking given opportunity to answer questions, 1889
Rule 18, tedious repetition, 1361
Debates, Official Report of
Insertion of documents not read, 1539, 3526
Decorum, courtesy to member speaking, 2090
Language, "Breach of duty", 3354
Members
Desiring to speak, must rise, 1985
May ask question but not make statement, 2489
May not criticise ruling of Chair, 555, 2974
Must put question without argument, 2340
Not in order in discussing ruling of Chair, 555, 2974
Speaking, need not answer questions unless willing, 2318, 2619, 2710
Opportunity to answer, 1889
To rise if vote desired, 3456
Ministers
Not required to answer questions, 2777
On item, may discuss general policy, 555
Motions
Amdt. to Amdt. in supply, 1579
Involving charge on revenue, must be made by minister, 3404
Non-debatable
That committee rise, 1181
Supply, in, 1579
Two, amending same item, 1982
Questions to be put without argument, 2340, 2489
Railway Commission, salaries not included in vote, 2776-8
Reference to judges and high officials, 2778
Relevancy, 404, 406, 671, 736, 1470, 1476, 1898, 3141
Cash bonus to soldiers, discussion, 404
Esquimalt and Nanaimo Railway, bill, 1603
Grain Inquiry commission, 2988
Hudson Bay railway, 2780

Deputy Speaker and Chairman of Committees — *Con.*
Rulings and Statements of — *Con.*
Senate, indemnity, 3509
Supply
General policy of department, 560
No question before com. on which to base discussion, 1900
Relevancy, 1135, 2089, 3527, 3545
Lindsay arsenal, 2089
Militia and Defence items to be discussed separately, 1139-40-42
Penitentiaries, 1279
Quebec arsenal, 2095
Quebec riots, 2090
Rails and car repair contracts, 1698
Railway commission, estimates, 2776-8
Railways and Canals, 1135
Two motions, amending same item, 1982
Vote
Casting of, by Chairman, 3473
Desire for in com. to be indicated by members rising, 3456

Derelicts. *See* Marine and Fisheries

Desbarats, Mr. J. B. *See* National Defence

Deserted Wives. *See* Pensions

Deslauriers, Mr. Hermas (St. Mary)
Aluminum Electric Co., qu. 728, qu. 1375
Bland, Mr. C. H., qu. 1773
Boon, Mr. W. R., qu. 728
Canada-West Indies steamship service, qu. 2356
Canadian Govt. Merchant Marine, employees at Montreal, qu. 2992
Canadian National Railways
Electrification, M. 627
Champlain steamer, sale of, qu. 1400
Civil Service
Classification, printed copies of, qu. 1930
Commission, Mr. Putman, 3090
Imperial council, qu. 2803
Marconi Wireless Telegraph Co., qu. 1065
Militia and Defence, permanent force, qu. 2637
Montreal Harbour Commission
Paint purchases, qu. 602
Policemen, qu. 2992
Tugs, qu. 600
Occupational diseases, protection against, M., 1378
Personal explanation, Civil Service estimates, 3365
St. Vincent de Paul penitentiary, qu. 2804
Veit, Mr. A. E. J. M., qu. 1773

Destructive Insect and Pest Act, qu. 472, 3520. *See also* Entomology

Detective Firms, American, 670

Detroit River
Armed cruisers on, qu. 2214
Regulation of navigation, 1498. *See also* St. Lawrence River Waterway

Deville, Dr. E. C., 1044, 1048

Dickie, Mr. C. H. (Nanaimo)
Address in reply, 341. Women and the franchise, 341; Pacific and Great Eastern railway; Grand Trunk Pacific and railway problem, 342; coal and fuel oil; Japanese and the fisheries, 344: returned soldiers, problems, 345; depletion of British Columbia fisheries, 346; dry dock at Esquimalt; British Columbia tariff views, 347
Esquimalt and Nanaimo Railway bill, 1603
Oleomargarine, M. (Mr. Neill) 1828
Oriental Aliens, M. (Mr. McQuarrie) 1523

Digby, N.S., pier, 1760

Digby-St. John Steamship Service, 3035

Dinosaurs, purchase of specimens, 1237

Directors, Board of. *See* Canadian National Railways

Directorships. *See* Ministers and directorships

Disability Soldier cases. *See* Pensions Committee

Disallowance of Ontario legislation, qu. 2805, qu. 2992

Disarmament. *See* Militia and Defence; National Defence; Naval Service
Conference on. *See* Limitation of Armaments

Diseases
Infectious. *See* Penitentiary Act Amdt.
Occupational, of workmen. *See that title*

Disfranchisement. *See* Dominion Elections Act

Distressed Canadians, relief of, 2027

Divisions. *See* House of Commons

Dockyards. *See also* Naval Service
Halifax and Esquimalt, 1752

Doctors. *See* Soldiers' Civil Re-establishment

Doherty, Right Hon. C. J.
Payments to, 2572
Reported engaged on Newfoundland-Labrador boundary case, qu. 704, 2572

Doherty, Hon. Manning, 334, 974, 987. *See also* Cattle Embargo
Visit to England, papers, 1283, 1334

Domestic Loans. *See* Loans

Domestic Servants, Immigration of. *See* Immigration

Domicile of Voter. *See* Dominion Elections Act Amdt.

Dominion Bureau of Statistics. *See* Statistics

Dominion Coal Company. *See* Nova Scotia Miners

Dominion Elections. *See* Elections of 1921; Proportional Representation

Dominion Elections Act
Abuses under, 184-5
Amendments, qu. 470
Campaign funds, qu. 1508
Enfranchisement of women of alien birth M. (Mr. Euler) 473, agreed to, 493
Removal from statute books, 184
Residential qualification, M. (Mr. Rinfret) 1296, agreed to, 1301

Dominion Elections Act Amdt. (Alien women; Domicile of voter)
1r., 1796; 2r., com., 2809; 3r., 3817
Subjects and sections discussed:
Election day, public holiday Amdt. (Mr. Neill) 2812
Elector's residence, change of, 2809
New polls, establishment of Amdt. (Mr. Caldwell) 2815
Senate amdts. concurred in, 3486

Dominion Iron and Steel Corporation, 2419-20. *See also* Nova Scotia Miners
Contract for steel plates, claim for damages, 417, qu. 704, 1677-80, 1689, 2170
Legal expenses, 3497
Delivery of seel plates, 3508

Dominion Lands
Contingencies, 1037
Estimates, 1035
Forest reserves. *See* Forestry
Homestead entry, 1041
Reclamation by drainage, 1051
Salaries, 1035
Sale of, qu. 376

Dominion Lands — *Con.*
Sub-agencies closed, qu. 1181
Surveys, 1037
Dr. Deville, 1044
M. to reduce, vote, 1039
Reduction of vote by $30,000, 1044-6

Dominion Lands, Notices of Cancellation of Leases bill
1r., 3151; 2r., com., 3465; 3r., 3475
Senate amdts., non-concurrence; free conference 3613; concurrence, 3616

Dominion Lands and Parks
Canadian National parks, 168, 1051
Visitors to, 1052
Migratory birds, 1684
Wolves, destruction of live stock by, 990, 998

Dominion Notes. *See* Finance

Dominion Observatory, Ottawa Building, 1265

Dominion Police. *See* National Defence; Royal Canadian Mounted Police

Dominion Public Buildings. *See* Public Buildings

Dominion Statistician. *See* Statistics

Dominion Textile Company, 200, 583, 1106, 1130

Dorchester Penitentiary. *See* Penitentiaries

Doughty, Dr. A. B., 702

Douglas Credit System. *See* Finance; Irvine

Doukhobors. *See* Immigration

Drainage. *See* Dominion lands

Drawbacks. *See* Customs

Drayton, Hon. Sir Henry L. (West York)
Address in reply, 195. Provincial prejudices; Mr. Macdonald of Pictou; Minister of Finance and railways, 196; financial outlook; election, popular support of parties, 197; redistribution, campaign literature, 198; public works and unemployment; Halifax patronage committee, 199; Minister of Labour and trusts and combines; Sir Charles Gordon; Canada Cement and Dominion Textile Companies, 200; British Empire Steel Corporation, 200-1; position of Prime Minister and Mr. Crerar; railway policy, 201; Canadian Northern in Ontario, 202; railway

Drayton. Hon. Sir Henry — *Con.*
Address in reply — *Con.*
lines in United States, 204; national ownership, 205; Sir Lomer Gouin and the big interests, 206; proposed King-Crerar alliance; leader of Opposition and insult to Quebec; 207; tariff present and former, 208; reciprocity; Fordney tariff, 209; imports and exports of agricultural commodities, 209; reciprocity, 208-211
Adjournment, item stands, 596
Admiralty Act Amdt. bill, 2822
Agricultural implements, drawback, 3122
Air Board, 1728, 1735
Air Board Act Amdt. bill, 2821
Alcohol tax, 1213
American magazines, 3110
Auditor General's office, 793
Budget, date of, inquiry, 1018, 1463, 1503
Budget, 2127. Loans; congratulations to Minister of Finance; financial situation; revenue, 2171; optimism and work; taxes, estimated revenue from; trade agreements; customs and currency valuations, 2172; German competition, 2173; marking of goods; income tax; tariff changes, 2174; agricultural implements, drawbacks, 2175; alcohol for druggists, 2176; beet sugar industry; new taxation, 2177; trade with United States; unemployment, 2178; political honesty; amdt. proposed, 2179
Business of the House
Members, payment of, 3611
Canada Grain Act, administration, 2834
Canada Shipping Act Amdt. bill, 3010
Pilotage, 2820
Canada Temperance Act Amdt. bill, 2733
Senate amendments, 3608
Canadian Institute for the Blind, 3540
Canadian Patriotic Fund bill, 3477-86
Census
Completion of, 1363
Cost, 1363
Civil service bonus, 3530
Coal for public buildings, 1759
Criminal Code Amdt. bill, 2831
Fines to municipalities, 2832
Crowsnest pass agreement, M. (Mr. Kennedy, Essex) for Special Com. 1442
Amdt. 1444. *See also under this title* Freight Rates
Customs Act and Dept. of Customs bill, 3477
Customs and Excise Dept., employees, 765

Drayton. Hon. Sir Henry — *Con.*
Customs tariff
Book and coated papers, 3108
Cigars, 3107
Cocoa, 3106
Drugs, 3114
Gasoline, 3116
Marking Act, 3105
Pump parts, 3127
Wool and Woollen goods, 3129, 3130, 3233
Customs Tariff Act Amdt. bill, 3476
Daylight saving, M. (Mr. Kay) 957
Anonymous letters, 944
Drayton-Acworth report, 126
Elevators, terminal, 2978
Estimates
Accounts chargeable, current or past year, 1675
Discussion of general policy, 767
Exchequer Court, estimates, 1274
Finance Dept.
Charges of management, 770
Salaries, 753
Fisheries Act Amdt. bill, 3011
Fishing tackle, 3140
Freight rates, Special Com., third report, 3555
Amdt. 3559. *See also under this title* Crowsnest pass
French trade treaty, 3224
German goods, valuation, 2172, 3227
Grain
Inquiry Commission, 2984-6
Shipment of via Quebec, 1466
Grand Trunk arbitration, newspaper comments, 821
Harbours and rivers, estimates, 1765
Health dept. estimates, 775
Housing, 774
Immigration facilities at Quebec, 1466
Income War Tax Act Amdt. bill, 3485
Inland Revenue
Alcohol for druggists, 3242
Sugar beet, tax on, 3242
Inland Revenue Act Amdt. bill, 3477
Insurance Dept. 792
Interim Supply, 373, 378, 383, 598
Interior dept.
Economy, 456
Salaries, 452
Typewriters, 455
Justice dept.
Appropriations exceeded, 1279
Contingencies, 1669
Labour dept.
Appointments, 462
Salaries, 548

Drayton. Hon. Sir Henry — *Con.*
League of Nations, 3174
Secretariat, Canada's contribution, 3990
Loans, 2127
New Canadian, 1133
Special Loans bill, 3476
Meat and Canned Foods bill, 3149
Militia and Defence
Amalgamation of services, 419
Naval Service, 422
War claims, adjustment, 2974
Montreal Harbour Commission bill, 3199
Naval service, 1737
New departmental buildings, Ottawa, 3541
Non-productive assets, 1467
Nova Scotia miners, 509, 512
M. (Mr. Irvine 540)
Oleomargarine Act Amdt. bill, 3489
Opium and Narcotic Drug Act Amdt. bill, 2824
Penitentiaries, inmates, increase in number, 1279
Penny Bank Act Amdt. bill, 3043
Pension Act Amdt. bill, 3404, 3439-64
Pensions
Commutation of, 390
Widowed mothers, M. (Mr. Power) 1308
Prime Minister, secretaries, 411
Printing plants, tax, 3410
Public Accounts, delay in closing, 1264
Public buildings
Coal for, 1759
Expenditure, 1260
Public Service Retirement bill, 3148
Quebec Harbour Commission bill, 1465-86, 3195
Quebec harbour, Parc St. Charles Co., 1470
Railway Commission, statement of Mr. Carvell, 2774
Redistribution
Census and, 1363, 1369
M. (Mr. Shaw), 1769
Returned Soldiers' Insurance Act Amdt. bill, 3389, 3397, 3438
Revenue and Audit Act, 3042
St. Lawrence river waterway, correspondence, 2207
Sales tax collections, 1921-22, qu. 1212
Saskatchewan, export of liquor, 3000, 3002
Soldiers' Civil Re-establishment
Capital expenditure, 1279
Patients, care and medical examination of, 1280
Soulanges canal, 2768
Special War Revenue Act Amdt. bill, 3477
Cheque tax, 3258
Supreme Court Act Amdt. bill, 2974
Supreme Court, pre-audit, 1274

Drayton. Hon. Sir Henry — *Con.*
Tariff Commissioner, appointment, 1664
Transcontinental railway, 917
Transportation Costs, Special Com. *See under this title,* Crowsnest pass; Freight Rates
Treaties of Peace with Hungary and Turkey, bill, 3547
United States, operation of railways in Canada, 192
Vancouver Harbour Commission bill, 2822
Vickers, Limited, 2975-7
War claims
Adjustment of, 2974, 2977
Exchange, 1758
War Graves Commission, 774
Weston post office building, 1259

Drayton-Acworth report, 46, 125, 130

Dredges and Dredging. *See also* Marine; Public Works
Estimates, 2005
Plamonder, 2006
Port Nelson, 2006
Quebec harbour, 1483
Red river channel, 2007
St. Lawrence river ship channel
De Beaujeu bank, 1495
New elevator dredge, 1495
St. Marys river, 2006
Shuswap lake, 2006

Druggists, alcohol for, 2114. *See also* Alcohol

Drumheller mines, 85, 1058

Drummond, Mr. J. D. F. (West Middlesex)
Beet sugar industry, 2273, 3251
Budget, 2272. Progressives, attitude towards; public debt; duty on beet sugar, 2272; tariff, duty on agricultural implements; farmers not asking special privileges, 2274
Goderich harbour, improvement, 2002

Drury, Hon. E.C., and Drury Government, 63, 125, 127, 134, 334
Lake of the Woods, control. 2991. *See that title*
Land tax, and, 2491

Dry Docks
Burrard Dry Dock Company, 2008
Esquimalt, 347
Appropriation, 3541
Pacific Coast on, 2401
Subsidies to, 2008
Vancouver, 2005, 2008, 3542

Drysdale, Mr. Justice, retirement of, 1275

Duff, Mr. William (Lunenburg)
Air Board, qu. 366
Air Force and civil aviation, 1724
Banff-Windermere road, 1683
British Columbia fisheries, M. (Mr. McQuarrie) 857
Canada Shipping Act Amdt. (Pilotage) bill, 2819
Canadian Govt. Merchant Marine
Cost, etc., qu. 469
Subsidized steamship services, 3031
Canadian national parks, expenditure, 1681
Canned fish, marking of tins, 3048
Civil Service
Commission, qu. 364
Overmanning, 3099
Patronage, 3094
Rural postmasters, 3095-6
Con Rein, sinking of, 1384
Courtenay Bay works, qu. 365
Daylight saving, M. (Mr. Kay) amdt. 959
Distressed seamen, relief of, 1676
Dominion Iron and Steel Corporation contract, 1677
Fishing schooner race, 1384, 3513
Flags, cost of, qu. 599, 1264, 1268
Halifax terminals, qu. 364
Harbours and rivers
Expenditure, details of, 1272
Ontario, 2000
International deep sea racing
M. for encouragement, 1384, 3513
Marine and Fisheries
Capt. O'Hara, 1490
Examination of masters and mates, 1490
Migratory birds, 1685
Military and naval expenditures, reduction, 1139
National Defence bill, 740
Naval policy, 2052
Naval Service
Aurora, cruiser, 2053
Royal Canadian navy, qu. 366, 1848, 1871, 2052
Navigation off Newfoundland coast, aids to, 1498
Nova Scotia pensioners, qu. 615
Public buildings, flags, qu. 599, 1264, 1269
Toronto harbour works, qu. 365
Tourist traffic, 1683
Unemployment, 1683
War service badge, 1754
Wooden ships, qu. 364

Dumping Clause. *See* Customs and Excise

Duties. *See* Customs and Excise; Customs Tariff

Dynevor Hospital, 1218

Easter Adjournment. *See* House of Commons

Eastern Car Company, car repairs, 1706

Eastern La Have Transportation Company. *See* Con Rein

Eastern Maine Railway, 1293

Economic Depression, 6, 10, 85, 157, 237-8, 3299. *See* also speeches on Address; Budget

Economy in Administration, necessity for, 7, 52, 97, 122, 455-6. *See also* speeches on Address; Budget; Civil Service; Supply

Eddie, Captain, 1493

Edison, Mr. T. A., credit system, 2505

Editorial Committee, 1235-6

Edmonton
Indian school, proposed, 1227-9. *See also* Indians
Post office building, alteration, 1254

Edmundston
Post office, qu. 608
Public building, 1239, 1242

Education
Indians. *See that title*
Orientals in British Columbia, 317. *See also* Oriental Aliens, M. (Mr. McQuarrie)
Rural schools in Ontario, 2385, 2565
School boards, refusal of bank to advance money to, 2627
School lands, 339
School system, 2385
Taxes in school districts, 2714

Eggs
Chinese, importation of, 177
Cold storage in, 2562
Exportation, 813
Imported into Canada, qu. 612
Inspection and standardizing, 177, qu. 727, 811-812

Eight-Hour Day. *See* Daylight Saving; Labour

Election Day. *See* Dominion Elections Act Amdt. bill

Election of Speaker. *See* Speaker

Election of 1921
Campaign, 21, 40-41, 51, 61, 99, 140, 198, 265, 288. *See also* Address; Budget; Proportional Representation

Election of 1921 — *Con.*
Campaign — *Con.*
Brantford at, 255, 256
Charlotte, N.B., county in, 1997
Funds, and protected interests, 2437, 2732
Literature, 99
Statements by Sir Lomer Gouin, 140
Chief Electoral Officer, report, 1258
Deposits refunded, qu. 1067
Liberal pledges, cash grants to soldiers, 102, 400. *See also* Liberal Convention; Soldiers' Bonus
Maritime provinces in, 315-316
Minority government, 197. *See also* speeches on Address; Budget
Number of votes cast, 197
Pledges and promises, 243. *See also* Liberal Convention; Soldiers' Bonus
Rail and car repair contracts, prior to, 1688
Results, 61, 142, 186, 197, 2282, 2654, 2851, 2909-2910,
By provinces, 46
Returning officer, Carleton, 3538, 3602, 3604
Unit of representation, 198
Voters, failure to vote, 1112
Women, 1113

Electoral System. *See* Proportional Representation

Electric Power. *See also* Aluminum Company; Hydro Electric; Lake of the Woods; St. Lawrence River Waterway; Water Powers
Campbell river, 1355
Railways and, 1940

Electrical storm in the West, 3493

Electrification of Railways, 133, 630. *See also* Canadian National Railways; Railways; St. Lawrence River Waterway
M. (Mr. Deslauriers) withdrawn, 639

Elevators. *See* Grain and Grain Trade; Wheat Board

Elk Island Park, fencing, 1051

Ellesmere Island
Danish expedition to, 1751
Royal Canadian Mounted Police at, 3497

Elliott, Mr. William (South Waterloo)
Budget, 2348. Tribute to Minister of Finance; tariff proposals a step in the right direction; national debt; revenue and expenditure; civil service; United States tariff; development of natural

Elliott, Mr. William — *Con.*
Budget — *Con.*
resources, 2348; markets, building up of industry at expense of agriculture; high cost of living, unemployment; labour conditions; boots and shoes; labour cost; woollen cloth, labour cost, 2350; woollen clothing, price and labour cost, 2350; permanent tariff commission; claims for tariff protection, 2351
Galt post office building, 1247

Embargo
Cattle. *See* Cattle Embargo
Manure, exportation of, 1021

Emigration. *See* Immigration

Empire, British
Foreign policy and defence, 1629. *See also* Limitation of Armaments; National Defence bill; Naval Service

Empire Day adjournment. *See* House of Commons

Employment Offices Co-ordination Act, 1058

Employment Service. *See* Labour

Enemy Debts. *See* Treaties with Hungary and Turkey

Enemy Property. *See* Aliens, Enemy Property

Enfranchisement
Indians of. *See* Indian Act Amdt. bill
Women of alien birth. *See* Dominion Elections Act

English River water powers. *See* Lake of the woods

Entomology, 813. *See also* Destructive Insects
Spruce bud moth, 1049

Escheats Act Amdt. bill (Time in which action must be brought)
1r., 2456; 2r., com., 2826; 3r., 3026; Senate amdts. 3486

Espionage. *See* Labour; Royal Canadian Mounted Police

Esquimalt. *See also* Naval Service
Dry dock; 347, 596-7
Appropriation, 3541
Royal naval college at 2047, 2203, 2450

Esquimalt and Nanaimo Railway Company bill. *See* Private Bills Discussed

Essence de l'Erable, qu. 1774

Estimates. *See also* Deputy Speaker; House of Commons; Interim Supply; Speaker; Supplementary Estimates; Supply. For departments, *See their titles*
Accounts chargeable to current or past year, 1675
"Appropriations not required", 1263
Classification and preparation, 569
Comparison with last year, 384
Consideration of, 3526
Details of, 1347
Government economy in, 381-382
Information not up to date, 1267
Items, reading of, 3545
Main
Comparison with last year, 381
Tabled, 363
One-fourth vote. *See* Interim Supply
Supplementary, tabled, 1258, 3463
War claims, details of, qu. 1288

Ethier, Mr. J. A. C. (Laval-Two Mountains)
Bankruptcy Act Amdt bill, 1132, 1662
Indians, Oka agent, 1217

Euler, Mr. William D. (North Waterloo)
Agriculture Com. report, Wheat Board, 781
Alien Birth, women of, enfranchisement, M., 473, 480
Canadian National Railways
Canadian Northern deficit, 1906
Public ownership operation, 1948
Re-valuation, 1926
Civil Service, promotions, 576
Daylight saving, M. (Mr. Kay) 950
Oleomargarine, M. (Mr. Neill) 1788
Quebec public utilities, 1912
Railway policy, 1948

European Credits. *See* Loans

European War. *See* War

Evans, Mr. John (Saskatoon)
Address, 300. Agriculture in a deplorable state; rates on grain; railway consolidation, 300; tariff and trade prevention, 301; national policy a failure, 302: freer trade relations, 303; protected combines; railway question, 304; tariff views of different parties; returned soldier farmers, 305
Agricultural implements
Dumping clause, 2360
Importation by United Grain Growers, 3118, 3119
Agriculture dept., professional men, 588
American magazines, 3113

Evans, Mr. John — *Con.*
Apple industry, 3417
Armorial bearings of Canada, Welsh emblem, 3601
Beef hides, 3138
Blankets, duty on, 3130
British preference and Canadian ports, M. (Mr. Logan) 711
Canadian National railways, public ownership, 1963
Canadian Pacific Railway bill, 1608
Canadian Press, Limited, 772
Crowsnest pass agreement
Telegram of Mr. Motherwell to Calgary Board of Trade, 2358
Customs
Drawbacks, 765, qu. 828, 1067
Dumping clause, 2360, 3417
Fruit-growers, protection, 3417, 3425
Hudson Bay railway, completion, 2795
Humboldt-Fort Pitt telegraph line, 2007
Immigration
Medical inspection, 759
Money qualification, 3058
Unrestricted, 3062
Live stock industry, 989
Mowers and harvesters, 3118
Naval policy, 2072
Post office salaries, 2801
Railway policy, 1963
Saskatoon post office building, 1253
Soldiers' land settlement, 305, 2132
Steamship subsidies, qu. 614
Welland ship canal, 2758

Excess Profits tax. *See* Taxation

Exchange. *See also* Finance
Claim by British Admiralty for refund, 1752
Foreign, 2264
Rate of, 286
Soldiers' money on, 3339, 3348

Exchequer Court of Canada
Admiralty, vacancies, 1275. *See also* Admiralty Act
Estimates, 1274

Excise Taxes. *See* Customs and Excise; Inland Revenue Act Amdt.; Special War Revenue Act

Exemptions. *See* Income Tax Act; Special War Revenue Act
Pilotage dues, from. *See* Canada Shipping Act Amdt.

Exhibitions, 2582. *See also* Agriculture; Live Stock; Trade and Commerce

Exhibitions — *Con.*
Agricultural. *See that title*
Canadian National, 2990
Estimates, 2026
France, in, 2031, 2990
Grants to, 649, 977, 3521
London, 2027
Tampa, Florida, 2026

Expenditure. *See* Finance; Public Expenditure

Experimental and Illustration Farms. *See* Agriculture

Explosives Act, 1234

Export Liquor warehouses. *See* Liquor

Exports. *See that title under* Imports and Exports; Trade

Ex-service Men, representative. *See* Pensions Committee

External Affairs, Department of
Con Rein, sinking of, 1382
Doherty, Hon. Manning, 1283
Papers and memorandum, 1334
Salaries and contingencies, 411, 3509
War claims, adjustment of. *See* War claims

Fafard, Mr. J. Fernand (L'Islet)
Butter imports, qu. 614
Canadian National railways, water supply, qu. 2213

Fair Wage Clause. *See* Labour

False Creek, removal of bridge, 3516

Fansher, Mr. B. W. (East Lambton)
Beet Sugar industry, 2232, 3246, 3251
M. to reduce duty, 3248
Budget, 2229. Fiscal policy; tariff revision; encouragement of native industries; agricultural implements; sales tax; business profits tax; protected industries, 2230-1; automobiles, duty and tax; beet sugar industry, 2232
Customs drawbacks, qu. 2356

Far Eastern Treaty, 3160. *See also* Limitation of Armaments

Farm Implements. *See* Agricultural Implements

Farm Lands, value of, 2565

Farm Products
Consumption in Canada, 2650. *See also* Budget
Decline in prices, 6, 11, 77, 93, 95, 113, 150, 225, 231. *See also* Address; Agriculture; Budget; Live stock
Fordney tariff, effect of, 209. *See also* United States, Fordney tariff
Exchange value of, 2576
Importation, 209
Trade in, 226. *See also* Trade

Farmers
Block in United States, 69, 210, 988. *See also* Address; Budget; Trade; United States
Eight-hour day and, 227. *See also* Daylight Saving
Geographical advantages, 297-9
Immigration of, 145, 225. *See also that title*
Income tax returns, 226, qu. 1063, 2241, 2631. *See also* Income Tax
Labour, 79, 87, 251, 337, 1153. *See also* Address; Budget; Immigration; Labour; Unemployment
Loyalty of, 526
Need of encouragement, 252
Profits, comparison of, 2333
Protection and. *See* Agricultural Implements; Budget
Remedial legislation, 157
Representation in Parliament. *See* Progressives
Sons, exemption from military service, 440, 448-9, 2685. *See also,* Military Service Act Amdt.
Transportation problems. *See* Freight rates
Want of confidence in future, 143
Western, 146-7, 357
And wheat marketing. *See* Wheat Board
Grievances, 2652

Farmers' Movement and Party. *See* Progressive Party

Federal Civilian Force. *See* National Defence bill; Royal Canadian Mounted Police

Federal Elections Act. *See* Dominion Elections Act

Federal Representation by provinces, in 1877, qu. 1183

Federal Subsidies. *See* Subsidies

Feed Control Act, 1011

Female Suffrage. *See also* Dominion Elections Act
Failure of women to vote, 1113

Fertilizers. *See also* Agricultural Fertilizers bill
Cost of, 770
Duty on, 3140-3141
Freight rates on, 1022
Ground limestone, 1024
Inspectors, 592
Natural, exportation of, 1019
Tariff and, 2664

Fiduciary Interest. *See* Ministers and Directorships

Fielding, Hon. W. S. (Minister of Finance)
Agricultural implements, duty on, 3120, 3141. *See also under this title,* Customs Tariff
Alcohol for druggists, duty on, 2114, 3241
Alleged election promises, Charlotte, N.B. 1997
American magazines, 3108-3111
Appropriation Acts, 363, 598-9, 1842-3, 3607
Auditor General's office, 793
Auditor General's report
Public Works, expenditure of previous year, 1270
Referred to public Accounts Com., 1462
Automobiles, 2850, 2853, 3275. *See also under this title,* Special War Revenue Act
Refund of taxes, 3600
Value up to $1,000 for settlers, 2116
Banks
Circulation, tax on, 2117
Interest rates, 3602
Beet Sugar. *See under this title,* Sugar
Board of Commerce, 1715
Boy Scouts, 772-773
British Columbia government, criticism, 2237
Budget, inquiries as to date of, 1018, 1463, 1503
Budget Speech, 2104; Financial position of Dominion, 2104-17; economy, income and expenditure, 2104; public debt, 2106; loans, 2107; trade, 2108; trade agreements and negotiations; tariff revision, 2110-14; British preference; trade with United States, 2111; Marking and valuation; currency, 2113; certificate of trade or consular agent; tariff reductions, 2114; new taxation, 2116; financial situation; tariff resolutions, 2118

Fielding, Hon. W. S. — *Con.*
Budget — *Con.*
Supplementary statement, 2842. Acknowledgement of tributes and congratulations, 2842; attitude of Progressives towards Budget, 2842; step in right direction; Liberal policy as declared in 1921, supported by Progressive members; a policy of moderation; tariff and sales tax, 2843; land and inheritance taxes; tariff proposals; tariff revision of 1897; predictions of bankers and manufacturers; trade revival; reduction in duties, 2844; change in policy of Sir John Macdonald; British preference; Sir Charles Tupper; reciprocity; "no truck or trade with Yankees"; opposition of Conservative party to trade arrangement; Liberal party ready to discuss question; value of United States market; Windsor Hall speech, 2846; industrial condition of Germany, 2847; depreciated currency; value of mark and commodity prices; trade with Germany; treaty of Versailles; valuation of currency, 2848; increased taxation effect of currency valuation on Italian trade; a protectionist budget; downward revision; Progressives would not have been able to do more; direction in which Liberal party is looking, 2849; drawbacks and refunds; Ford motor company; Atlantic Sugar refineries; goods in transit; manufacture for export, 2850; Opposition amdt.; Liberal platform of 1919; verdict of electors; proposed changes in budget proposals; amended resolutions, 2851; tax on confectionery; soft drinks; ale, beer, porter and stout; cigarettes; fertilizers and dried beet pulp; cheque tax, 2852; bond and stock transfers, 2853; beet root sugar; raw leaf tobacco; receipts; cigars; automobiles; depreciated currency, 2853
Business of the House. *See also under this title,* Estimates; Supply
Amdt. to amdt. (Mr. Crerar) 2473-74, 2522
Civil government items, 374
Daylight saving, 1282
Member interrupting, must ask permission, 255-6
Privilege, right to raise on Orders of the day, 2638
Questions standing as orders for returns, 1660

Fielding, Hon. W. S. — *Con.*
Business of the House — *Con*
Special loan bill, 3151
Supplementary estimates, 3365
Supply, concurrence, 1842
Business profits war tax, 1658, 2024
Canadian battlefields, 772
Canadian Patriotic Fund bill, 3156, 3366, 3477-86
Canadian Press, Limited, 772
Canadian Transit Company bill, 1747, 1771
Cattle embargo, reported statement of Mr Larkin, 1023
Chartered banks, returns, 865
Cheque tax, 2117, 2852, 3258
Cigars and cigarettes, tax on, 2852, 3239, 3240
Commissioner of Taxation, salary, 2024
Confectionery, tax on, 2852
Congratulations to on fortieth year of public life, 3279
Consolidated Revenue and Audit Act Amdt. bill, 1210, 3042
Currency Act, 1910, Amdt. bill, 1132, 3042
Currency, depreciated, valuation for customs, 2113, 2849, 2853
Customs Act and Dept of Customs and Excise Act Amdt. bill, 3222, 3476, 3477
Depreciated currency, 3223, 3224, 3410
Dumping clause, 3225, 3411
German goods, valuation, 3229
Invoices certificates, 3221
Wines and spirits in bond, 3229
Customs drawbacks, 2850, 3141
Customs Tariff
Blankets, 3128, 3131, 3136, 3234
Book and coated papers, 3108
Boots and shoes, 3238
Cigars, 3107
Cocoa, 3106
Cotton, fabrics, 3128
Gasoline, 3106, 3115, 3116
Glass bottles, 3117
Grading machines, 3126
Hatters' bands, 3140
Invalids' wheel chairs, 3115
Marking Act, 3105
Mowers and harvesters, 3118
Paper invalid cups, 3115
Paper milk bottle caps, 3114
Ploughs, 3121, 3229
Pumping machinery, 3127
Reductions, 3239
Saw-mill machinery, 3126
Silk, 3127
Tools, 3127
Tractors, 3123

Fielding, Hon. W. S. — *Con.*
Dominion Iron and Steel Corporation, claim, 2170
Dumping clause, 3225, 3411.
Estimates. *See also under this title*; Supply
Accounts chargeable to current year, 1675
"Appropriations not required", 1269
Items, urgent, 409
Procedure, 409
Tabled
Main, 363
Supplementary, 1258, 2465
Fabre, Madame, pension, 2024
Fertilizers, duty on, 2852, 3141
Finance Dept.
Charges of management, 770
Deputy minister, 753
Estimates, 751, 1663, 3495
Legal expenses, railways, 1667
Loans, 771. *See also under this title*, Loans,
Unforeseen expenses, 771
Fire prevention, 794
Fiscal year, ending of, 1210. *See also under this title*, Consolidated Revenue and Audit Act
Fisheries, reduction in duties on, 2116
Fishing schooner race, 3512
France-Belgium trade treaties, 3223
Girl guides, 774
Governor General's Secretary's office, 751
Harbours and rivers
New Brunswick, 1998
Nova Scotia, expenditure in 1921-22, 1269
Prince Edward island, 1989-90
Housing, 774
Immigration Act Amdt. bill (Mr. Woodsworth) 865
Imperial Convention of Teachers, 1673
Imports, marking and valuation of, 2113, 2849, 2853, 3229
Income tax
Cost of collection, 2025
Legislation, 3104
Income War Tax Act Amdt. bill, 3278-9, 3359, 3484
Inland Revenue Act Amdt. bill, 3477
Alcohol for druggists, 2114, 3241
Cigars and cigarettes, 3239, 3240
Home brewing, 3141
Sugar beets, 2117, 2853, 3242, 3248
Insurance Act Amdt. bill, 1210, 1464, 3143, 3607
Insurance officials, 791
Insurance premiums, tax, 3253, 3255, 3477
Interim Supply, 373, 378, 383, 598
Bill, 362, 598-9

Fielding, Hon. W. S. — *Con.*
Labour and capital, 2117
Liberal platform of 1919, tariff plank, 2529, 2851
Loan Companies Act Amdt. bill, 1210, 1464, 3142, 3607
Loans, 771, 2107
New Canadian, 1131, 1133
Special loans bill, 3476
Merchants' Bank, inquiry, 3604
Nova Scotia miners, 497
M. (Mr. Irvine) 543
Nova Scotia Supreme Court, vacancy, 3437
Oleomargarine, M. (Mr. Neill) 1814
Penny Bank Act Amdt., bill, 1132, 3043, 3148
Pensions to Imperial forces, 864
Personal statement, correction, 681
Private Bills Com., substitution of names, 2355
Public Accounts, closing of, 1210, 1264-66
Public buildings
Flags, 1265
Generally, expenditure, accounts not closed, 1263-66
New, 1256
Public Works estimates, 696, 697, 750
Rail and car repair contracts, 1697
Railways, annual statement, 926
Reciprocity with United States, 2111, 2845-6
Returned Soldiers' Insurance Act Amdt. bill, 3320, 3392, 3395
Revenue and Audit Act Amdt. bill, 1210, 3042
Root vegetables, inspection and sale of, 2744
St. Lawrence river waterway, 786
Co-operation with the United States, 2755
Sales tax, 2116, 2843, 2851. *See also under this title*, Special War Revenue Act
Save the Children fund, 3516
Senate indemnity, 3509
Soldiers' Bonus, M. (Mr. Arthurs) 442
Special loans bill, 3476
Special War Revenue Act Amdt. bill, 3477
Automobiles, 3275
Ford company, 3276
Cheque tax, 3258
Insurance premiums, tax, 3253, 3255, 3477
Matches, 3263
Mineral waters, 3278
Receipts, 3262
Sales tax, 2116, 3264, 3269
Amdt. (Mr. Speakman) 3271
Condensed milk, 3268, 3409
Job printing, 3409
Steamship services, 2029

Fielding, Hon. W. S. — *Con.*
Sugar
British preference increased, 2116
Excise duty on beet sugar, 2117, 2853, 3242, 3248
Supply bills, 362, 598-9, 1842-3, 3607
Supply, concurrence, 1769, 1842
Tariff Commission, 1663
Tariff reductions, 2114, 2844, 2851, 3123
Tariff revision, 2110-14, 2844, 2849
Taxation, increases in, 2116, 2843, 2848, 2851-3
Tobacco, duties on, 2115, 2852-3, 3107, 3239
Trust Companies Act Amdt. bill, 1210, 1464, 3142, 3607
United States
Reciprocity with, 2111, 2845-6
Visit to Washington, 2112
War claims, exchange, 1754
War Graves Commission, 774
Wrangel island, 1750

Filled Milk and cream, qu. 963. *See also* Milk; Oleomargarine

Films, Educational. *See* Trade and Commerce

Finance. *See also* Banks; Budget; Financial Credit; Loans
Additional currency issue, qu. 3155
Bank deposits, qu. 3155
Bank notes in circulation, qu. 3155
Banking conditions, 158
Bonds
And stock, transfers, tax, 2853
Tax-free, maturing, qu. 826
Canada's financial position, soundness of, 2497
Commitments, 208
Credit Systems. *See* Financial Credit
Department
Charges of management, 770, 1663
Deputy Minister, 751
Estimates, 1662
Expenditure, economy in, 1475
Dominion Notes, qu. 705, qu. 935, qu. 3153, qu. 3154
Expenditure, monthly statement of, 1271
Legal expenses, 1667
Paper Control inqury, 1673
Salaries, 751, 3504
Unforeseen expenses, 771
Estimate of wealth and production, 2497
Excise profits and watered stock, 2714
Financial position of country, annual statement of Minister, 2104-2118
Gold reserve, qu. 3154, qu. 3155
Gold standard and credit system, 219

Finance — *Con.*
Grain trade, 2246
Loan department, 220
National wealth, 222. *See also* Natural Resources
Per capita wealth, 2630
Sinking funds, 1663

Financial Conference, Brussels, 1138, 1292

Financial Credit, 208, 219, 221, 2497-8. *See also* Banks; Finance; Loans; Money
Banks and, 1290, 2501, 2714
Brussels Conference, 1138, 1292
Community power, use of for private interest, 1291, 2501
Control of, 222, 1292, 2445, 2500
Germany in, 2500
Credit systems, 2634
Attempts to inaugurate
Guernsey Island, 2505
St. Louis Municipal currency, 2506
Definition of Credits, 2503
Douglas system, 220, 222, 2502
Financial organizations, consolidation, 2245-6
Gold standard and, 219, 1291, 2506
Greece and Roumania, qu. 1400
Industrial stagnation and unemployment, 1291. *See also* Industrial depression
Inflation and deflation, 2502
Loans, 1292. *See also that title*
M. (Mr. Irvine) for Parliamentary Com., 1289, 1396
National credit power, 1291, 2499
Private monopoly of, 2501
Purchasing power, 1292
Restricted, 2629-30
Scientific inquiry and experimentation, 1289
Sociological laboratory, 1290
Systems, 2282

Financial Depression and Outlook. *See* speeches on Address; Budget

Findlay, Mr. J. W. (South Bruce)
Budget, 2893. Protection and blind party-ism; reciprocity, 2893; Ontario farmer not a protectionist; Progressives in Ontario; Laurier naval policy; tariff reductions; public morality and political honour; pledges and promises; Senate reform, 2894; debt and increased taxation; expenditure; reduction of sessional indemnity; drawbacks; protective budget, 2895
Potlach, Indian institution, 1578
Indians serving gaol sentences, 1721

Fines, payable to municipalities, 2832. *See also* Criminal Code Amdt. bill

Finney, Colonel John, 1189

Fire
Insurance. *See* Insurance
Losses, railways from, 628
Prevention, 794. *See also* Air Service; Forestry; Insurance

First Contingent, training, qu. 1376

Fiscal Changes. *See* Budget; Tariff resolutions; Taxation

Fiscal Year. *See* Consolidated Revenue Act Amdt. bill

Fish and Fisheries. *See also* Marine and Fisheries
Boats admitted as settlers' effects, 2116
British Columbia. *See also that title*
Depletion of, 346
Orientals engaged in, 167, 171, 344. *See also* Oriental Aliens
M. (Mr. McQuarrie) 851, 863
Salmon traps, 346
Transfer, 2042. *See also* Quebec Fisheries
Canning. *See* Meat and Canned Foods Act
Canning and curing licenses, 3010
Deep sea, conservation and development, 2169
Department of Fisheries, 2166
Dry salting, 3010
Estimates, 2166
Fish culture, 2169
Fishermen's supplies, 2690
Fishing schooner race. *See* International Deep Sea Racing
Fishing vessels, pilotage, 2819
Fishways in rivers, 2166
Gasoline for fishing boats, 2313, 3116
Guardians, salaries, 2166
Hatcheries, 2169
Herring, dry salting, 3010
Herring, in Alaska, 70
Improved methods, Gulf and Gaspesian coasts, qu. 1401
International deep sea racing. *See that title*
Licenses. *See* Quebec fisheries
Lobster, 1399, 2817, 2996
Market, 2166
Mildred McColl, patrol boat, qu. 3598
Officers and guardians, salaries, 2166
Orientals. *See* Oriental Aliens, M. (Mr. McQuarrie)
Patrol service, 2166
Boats, qu. 1503, qu. 3598
"Phalarope", qu., 1503

Fish and Fisheries — *Con.*
Pollution of streams, 2168
Prince county, illegal fishing, qu. 371
Protection service. *See* Marine; National Defence; Naval service
Publicity and marketing, 2169
Quebec, transfer of, 142. *See also* Quebec Fisheries
Range lights for fishermen, 1498
Rope, twine, etc., duty on, 2359
Salmon, 1399, 2817, 2996
Dry salting, 3010
Sardines, export, qu. 1182
Supplies, reduction in duties, 2116, 2359
Tariff reductions on implements of, 2191
Transportation, 2166
Vocational loans to fishermen, 1346

Fisher and Oughton, Messrs. *See* Aliens

Fisheries Act, 1914, Amdt. bills
1. Protection of Salmon and Lobster Fisheries. 1r., 1399; 2r., com., 2817; com., 2996; 3r., 2997
2. Salmon Curing and Herring Drying. Res. 2306, 3010; 1r., 2r., com., 3r., 3013

Fisheries Protection Service. *See* Marine; National Defence bill; Naval Service

Fishing Schooner Race. *See* International

Flag-Waving, 1265, 1386, 2711

Flags
Cost of, qu, 599
For public buildings, 1260, 1264, 1268

Flavelle, Sir Joseph, 634. *See also* Canadian National Railways, Directors

Flax
Campbell, Mr. J. A., claim of, 2834
Canadian bounty on linen yarn from, 1361

Flour
Exports to United States, 209
Insurance on mills, 3255

Flynn, Mr. Harry, and soldiers' bonus, 394, 402

Fontaine, Mr. J. E. (Hull)
Gatineau Point-Rockliffe ferry, qu. 1399, qu. 1661
Old age pensions, M., 1303
Post Office
Classification, 3089
Employees receiving $600, qu. 1067
Married women, qu. 1658
Money Order branch, qu. 1285

Food and Drug Act, administration, 2017

Food and Drugs. *See* Health; Meat and Canned Foods

Food Inspection, 820

Foot and mouth Disease. *See* Cattle Embargo

Foran, Mr. J. J., qu. 2214

Foran, Mr. W., *See* Civil Service Commission

Ford Car. *See* Automobiles

Ford, Mr. Henry, credit scheme, 2505

Fordney Tariff. *See* Budget Speeches; United States

Foreign-Born wives of British subjects. *See* Dominion Election Act Amdt.

Foreign Currency. *See* Customs, Marking; Currency
Inflation. *See* Customs and Excise Dept. bill

Foreign Fraternal Societies. *See* Insurance Act Amdt.

Foreign Loans. *See* Loans

Foreign Markets. *See* Trade

Foreign Monetary Standards. *See* Customs; Currency

Foreign Warships. *See* Canada Shipping Act Amdt. bill

Foreigners. *See also* Aliens
Crime and, 1392, 2517
Foreign-born wives and children of British subjects. *See* Dominion Elections Act Amdt.
Immigration. *See that title*
Immigration Act Amdt. bill (Mr. Woodsworth) 1388-94
Textile industries, engaged in, 2518

Forest, Mr. Médard, qu. 2355

Forestry. *See also* Natural Resources; Research; Timber
Aerial patrol, 1047, 1722
Gaspe, 1733
High River, Alta., qu. 1066, 1048, 1723
Railway belt, B.C., 1730
Fire losses, 628
Fire towers, 1048
Forest area under federal control, 1048
Protection of timber in West, 1046
Pulpwood and round logs, duty, 2667

Forestry — *Con.*
Spruce bud moth, 1049, 2668
Tree culture in West, 1046
Turtle Mountain reserve, qu. 615

Forke, Mr. Robert (Brandon)
Address in reply, 76. Congratulations to Mr. Speaker, mover and seconder, 76-77; reciprocity with United States; marketing of farm products, 77; tariff revision; railway problems, 78; taxation burdens; immigration, 79
Agriculture, condition and prospects, 2149
Assiniboine river floods, 2004, 3546
Boy Scouts, 773
Cigarettes, tax on, 3241
Crowsnest pass agreement, M. (Mr. Kennedy, Essex) for Special com., 1424
Distribution of labour and goods, 2149
Fishways, 2168
Freight rates, 1424
Harbours and rivers, Manitoba, 2004
Immigration policy, 2148
Indians
Education, Elkhorn school, 3537
Oak lake and Pipestone, 1223
Militia and defence, Lindsay arsenal, 2086
Naval policy, 2079
Progressives, patriotism, 720
Rideau canal, 2765
Soldier land settlement, taxes, 2134
Soldier Settlement Board, qu. 469
Transportation, 2149
Woollen goods and blankets, 3234

Fort Churchill. *See* Hudson Bay Railway

Fort George, 119

Fort Mississauga, 119

Fort Qu'Appelle Sanitarium, 1345

Fort William
Car repair contracts, 1696-1705
Grain overages, qu. 1210
Terminal elevators. *See* Grain and Grain Trade

Fortier, Mr. H. A. (Labelle)
Agricultural exhibitions, 993
Budget, 2274. Congratulations to Minister of Finance; Government policy; amendment; revenue requirements and taxation, 2274; income tax; suggested concession to heads of families; population, suggested methods of increasing; railways and public ownership, 2275; economy in public expenditure, 2276
Daylight saving, M. (Mr. Kay) 961

Fortier, Mr. H. A. — *Con.*
Demonstration farm at Mont Laurier, 994
Military Service Act, 1917, Amdt. bill, 643
Ministers and directorships, 1123
Oleomargarine, manufacture and importation, M. (Mr. Neill) 1798

Fournier, Mr. C. A. (Bellechasse)
Carty, Captain, qu. 1062
Chief Architect's branch, Public Works, qu. 963
Civil Service Commission, qu. 826
Bland, Mr. C. H., qu. 1904

Four-Power Treaty. *See* Limitation of Armaments

France
Canadian exhibition in, 2031
Exhibition train from, 2990
Industries, protection of, 2410
Post war conditions, 2643
Trade relations with. 2990. *See also* Trade
Trade treaty with, 2110

Franchise. *See also* Dominion Elections Act Amdt.
Extension of, 2242
Public ownership, and, 1944

Fraser River Fisheries. *See* British Columbia, Fisheries

Fraser Valley Railway. *See* Vancouver and Fraser Valley

Fraternal Benefit Insurance. *See* Insurance Act Amdt.

Frauds, Scrip, prosecution for. *See* Criminal Code Amdt.

Fredericton
Military property, 1980
Officers' square, 1980

Free Freight outlay, qu. 704

Free Trade. *See* Address; Budget

Freight, careless handling of, 1965

Freight Rates. *See also* Address; Budget; Canals; Railway Commission; Railways; St. Lawrence River Waterway; Transportation
Advertising campaign, qu. 1375
Calgary, free outlay, qu. 704
Coal from maritime provinces, 1763
Comparison between freight and duty, 2175

Freight Rates — *Con.*
Crowsnest pass agreement, 146, 176, 350, 1412. *See also under this title,* Excessive. *See* Speeches on Address; Budget
Special Com. to inquire into effect upon Railway Rates
M. (Mr. Kennedy, Essex) for, 1213, 1402
Amdt. (Sir Henry Drayton) 1444; neg. 1457
M. agreed to, 1458
Named, 1502
Reports
First, 1657
Second, 1719
Third, 3546
M. (Mr. Maclean, Halifax) for adoption of, 3548
Amdt. (Sir Henry Drayton, 3559; neg. 3586
Amdt. (Mr. Baxter) 3586; neg. 3586
M. agreed to, 3588
Position of Ministers of Agriculture and Interior on, 242
Railway Act Amdt. bill, 1r., 3588; 2r., com., 3595; 3r., 3597
Rule 11, suspension of, 1502
Telegram from Minister of Agriculture to Calgary Board of Trade, 2358
Excessive, 33, 47, 54, 78, 83, 131-132, 275, 350, 2219, 2314, 2453. *See also under this title,* Crowsnest Pass Agreement, *and* Speeches on Address; Budget
Export, 2633
Fertilizers, on, 1022
Immigration and, 2157
Lumber industry, 234, 2311
Norris, Premier, reported statement of, 1213
Quebec, and, 1472, 1473
Railway labour, and, 2315
Regulation by water carriage competition, 1688
St. Lawrence river waterway, 1204. *See also that title*
Subsidized steamships, 2028
Wheat on, 235. *See also* Wheat Board

French, early pioneers in West, 2912

French-English Canadians, unity between, 168-9. *See also* Address

French Language, 155
Civil Service classification, qu. 1930
Parliament in, 155, 244, 306, 356
Pension Commissioners, Board of, 1351
Soldier Settlement Board, Sherbrooke, qu. 1658

Fruit Industry, 220, 2564
Apple-growing, 171, 967
Importations, qu. 612
Protection of, 225, 2197
Baxter, Mr. Charles W., appointment of successor, 2457
British Columbia in, 2593. *See also that title*
Competition with United States, 2903
Dumping clause, 2280, 2310, 2372, 2593, 2641, 2879 2903. *See also* speeches on Address; Budget
Freight rates. *See* Crowsnest pass agreement
Fruit Commissioner, qu. 2457
Grape juice, tax on, 2594, 2617
Okanagan Valley, 162. *See also* British Columbia
Oriental Aliens engaged in, 1535. *See also that title*
Protection. *See* Budget; Customs, Dumping clause
Tariff, 2197
Transportation. *See* Freight Rates
Trees, protection from insects. *See* Entomology

Fuel. *See also* Coal; Mines; Natural Resources
Oil, 344, qu. 728
Competition with coal, 2312
Importation, 178
Tank at Louise Basin, 1484
Tariff against, 1761
Peat, 1235
Price, 1490, qu. 1774. *See also* Coal

Further Legislation. *See* House of Commons

Futures, trading in. *See* Wheat Board

Gaboury, Mr. L. J., salary and duties, qu. 3599

Galicians. *See* Immigration

Galt post office building, 1247

Gambling. *See* Criminal Code Amdt.

Game. *See* Migratory Birds; Dominion Lands and Parks

Games of Chance. *See* Criminal Code Amdt.

Gaols. *See* Prisons; Penitentiaries

Garbage Feeding. *See* Hog Cholera

Gardiner, Mr. Robert (Medicine Hat)
Budget, 2624. New national policy, 2624; fiscal plank; substantial reduction of customs tariff; British Preference; free food stuffs; machinery for conversion of natural resources and raw materials; time to be allowed for industrial readjustment; claims for protection to heard in public; parliamentary committee on tariff; tariff commission, 2625; effects of tariff; exploitation of the people; tariff increases prices but not values; tariff reductions; revenue; land tax; inheritance tax; excise tax on manufactured goods; sales tax, 2626; circulation tax; bank interest violation of Bank Act; withholding of credit from municipality; unemployment; an inequitable budge 2627
Canadian National Railways
Branch lines, 1964
Bridge over Red Deer river, 1964
Canadian Pacific Railway bill, 1859
Cheque tax, 3260
Civil Service bonus, 1258
Dominion lands, oil leases, 1046
Fishing tackle, 3140
Income War Tax Act, 1917, Amdt. bill, 3486
Port Nelson dredging, 2006
Returned Soldiers' Insurance Act Amdt. bill, 3438
Rural mail delivery contracts, 2800
Seed Grain Commission, 1011
Steamship services, 2027
Tar Sands, 1236
Timber wolves, 1001
Venereal diseases, 2022
Wheat Board, 785

Garland, Mr. E. J. (Bow River)
Additional currency issue, qu. 3155
Aerial forest patrol, High River, Alta., 1048, qu. 1066, 1723
Agriculture Com. report — Wheat Board, 783
Agriculture dept. — Mr. Duncan Marshall, 651, 652
Bank notes in circulation, qu. 3155
Boy Scouts, 773
Business of the House — eleven o'clock adjournment, 2033
Canadian exhibition in France, 2032
Canadian Govt. Merchant Marine
West Indian trade, 3928; amdt. 3031
Canadian National railway, securities, qu. 3154
Criminal Code Amdt. (Half breed scrip) 3216
Dominion lands, surveys, 1038, 1044
M. to reduce vote, 1039

Garland, Mr. E. J. — *Con.*
Dominion notes, qu. 3154
Dredging, 2006
Fish culture, 2169
Forest aerial patrol, High River, Alta., qu. 1066, 1048, 1723
Gold reserve, qu. 3154, qu. 3155
Immigration of children, 2148, 3063
Indians
Blackfoot reserve, pasture lands, qu. 2215
Greater production, 1224, 1288
International boundaries, 1033
Mixed farming, 983
National gallery, 2011
Naval Service
Niobe, sale of, 2043, 2067
Royal Canadian Navy, 2043
Nova Scotia miners, M. (Mr. Irvine) 522
Parliament, fall session, 2608
Pensions Com., report, 3349
Post office, ruling respecting newspaper or magazine subscriber, qu. 3599
Redistribution, meeting of defeated candidates in Alberta, 2858
Royal Canadian Mounted Police, 3497
Enlistment in Canadian Expeditionary Force, qu. 2038
Soldiers' land settlement, homestead rights, 2135
Steamship services, 2027, 3028, 3506
Amdt., 3031
Tax-free bonds, qu. 826
Telegraph and telephone lines, Alberta, 2012

Garland, Mr. W. F. (Carleton)
Budget, 2300. Congratulations to Finance Minister; war expenditure; Canada Cement Company; income tax; tariff on agricultural implements; British preference; Mr. Fielding's trip to Washington; trade with United States; civil service dismissals; bonus; superannuation, councils, 2300; sales tax, 2301
Canada-Great Britain postal rate, qu. 3364
Civil Service
Bonus, qu. 472, qu. 606, 2300, 3531
Withdrawal from certain civil servants, qu. 3598
Commission, salaries, 407
Councils, 2300
Increase to deputy ministers, bonus, salaries, qu. 2805
Remuneration, qu. 3364
Retirement fund, qu. 826
Superannuation, 2300
Connaught rifle range, qu. 3153
Egg inspection, 811

Garland, Mr. W. F. — *Con.*
Exhibitions, prizes, 654
Experimental farms, 811
Grand Trunk, salaries of officials, qu. 728
Highways
Ottawa-Kingston, qu. 1904, 2794
Ottawa-Pembrooke, qu. 1661, 2794
Ottawa-Prescott, tree planting, qu. 2039
Mail contracts
Gascons-Quebec, qu. 2213
Lachenaie, qu. 2805
Militia dept. shed, Cartier square, Ottawa, qu. 2038
Poultry inspection, 656, 807
Rideau canal, 2766

Gas and electricity, inspection, 1373

Gascons-Quebec mail contract, qu. 2213

Gasoline, price of, 2106, 2296, 2313, 3115

Gaspé Peninsula
Aerial forest patrol, 1733
Fisheries, qu. 1401
Railways, M. (Mr. Marcil) for papers, 623

Gatineau-Point-Rockliffe ferry privilege, qu. 1399, qu. 1661

Gauvreau, Mr. C. A. (Témiscouata)
Acoustics of the Chamber, 3613
Canadian National Railways
Intercolonial
Pension fund, qu. 938
Repairs to cars, qu. 1212
Rivière du Loup shops, qu. 1181, 1690
Indemnity of members, 3613
Juvenile delinquents, qu. 469
Lighthouse boats, fuel for, qu, 606, qu. 1183
Lighthouses and wireless telegraphy, qu. 370
Prison reform, 1279
Privilege — alleged statement of Miss Macphail, 3221
Rail and car repair contracts, 1690
Rivière du Loup arsenal, qu. 1181, 1690

Gendron, Mr. R. M. (Wright)
Dennis building, Halifax, qu. 3360

General Election. *See* Election of 1921

"General" Macdonald's Army. *See also* Riley's Army; Unemployment
Government action in regard to, 2458
Reception of, 2256

Genoa Conference, 7, 58, 156, 212, 582, 2337. *See also* Address; Budget; Conferences
Canadian delegation to, expenses, 1715, 2864

Genoa Conference — *Con.*
Cannes conference, documents, 823
Tabled, 865
Correspondence with Govt. of Italy, 1905, 2035
Gordon, Sir Charles, 58, 582
Dominion Textile Company, and, 583-4
Money vote for, 1675
Montpetit, Professor, 582
Reported subscription of Canada to consortium, 1463
Submarines, 1845

Geodetic Survey
Estimates, 1033
Ottawa building, 1265

Geological Survey. *See also* Mines and Minerals
Anthropological division
Potlach institution, qu. 1377. *See also* Indians
Camsell, Mr. Charles, 1262
Co-ordination of survey work, 1236
Estimates, 1233, 1236
Maps, 1237
Publications, 1237
Reduction of vote, 1237-62
Specimens, purchase of, 1237

George, Right Hon. Lloyd, 2203, 2337
Empire defence, responsibility of dominions for, 1630

Georgian Bay Canal. *See* Canals

German, Mr. W. M. (Welland)
Freight rates, Special Com., third report, 3587-8
Pension Act Amdt. bill, 3441
St. Lawrence river waterway, M. (Mr. Church) 1319
Trenton Harbour bill, 3494

German Goods, valuation of. *See* Budget; Customs Act Amdt.

German Mark, decline in value of. *See* Budget; Currency, depreciated

Germany. *See also* Budget; Customs Tariff; Imports; Trade
Agents of manufacturers in Canada, 2647
Commercial development, 2643
Competition with, 2114, 2140, 2173-4, 2203, 2412, 2420, 2487, 2878
Credit control, 2500
Exports to Canada, 2408, 2421, 2863
Pocket-Knives, valuation of, 2876
Financial situation, 2499, 2642
Indemnity, payment in goods, 2500

Germany — *Con.*
Industrial condition, 2499, 2847
Labour conditions in, 3227. *See also* Labour
Mark, value of, 2417, 2644, 2848. *See also* Budget; Currency, depreciated
Paper money, 2499
Proposed loan, 2500
Reparations paid to Allies, qu. 375
Tariff wall against goods, 174
Trade relations with, 138, 2183, 2263, 2287, 2347, 2394, 2421-22, 2464, 2487, 2848, 2876
Foreign, 2644
Wages and production costs, 2407, 2499, 2884
War debts, 174
Working hours, 2499

Gervais, Mr. Théodore (Berthier)
Inglis boiler works, qu. 732

Gillen Board. *See* Labour; Nova Scotia Miners

Girl Guides, grant, 774

Glanders. *See* Health of Animals

Glass
Customs duties on, 3117
Industry, occupational diseases. *See* Labour

Globe, Toronto, imaginary speeches of Mr. Meighen, 207

Goderich Harbour improvement, 2000

Gold
Central reserves and gold held in Canadian banks, qu. 2971
English hall marks, protection of. *See* Criminal Code
Refining. *See* Charges of Management
Reserve. *See* Finance
Standard, 1291

Gold and Silver Marking Act, administration of, 1372

Good, Mr. W. C. (Brant)
Agate and granite ware, 3118
American magazines, 3108, 3113
Automobiles, tax on, 3273, 3277
Beet sugar industry, 3250
Blankets, duty on, 3234-5
British preference and Canadian seaports, M. (Mr. Logan) 722
Budget, 2429. Tariff record of Liberal party; repudiation of tariff plank of 1919 platform; history of fiscal legislation, 2429; inception of protective

Good, Mr. W. C. — *Con.*
Budget — *Con.*
policy; position of Liberal party on tariff question in seventies; Liberal convention of 1893; condemnation of protection system; campaign of 1911, 2430; reciprocity agreement; Liberal protectionists; the "great apostacy"; the "interests"; possible explanation of Liberal attitude, 2431; expediency of compromise; geographical considerations; examination of protective system without reference to locality or occupation; social versus individual advantage, 2432; trade a form of co-operation, not competition; protectionist philosophy; political boundaries and tariff walls, 2433; tariffs for revenue and protection; "plucking the goose with the least squawking"; direct and indirect taxes; protection by boundary dather than by tariff; encouragement of infant industries; protection of all industries impossible; favourable trade balance; international trade; cheap foreign labour; real and nominal wages; retaliatory tariffs, 2435; diversified industry; decadence of agriculture; effect on manufacturing industries; free raw material and lower labour costs; free trade and advantage to manufacturers; competition against old established industries, 2436; protective tariffs and monopoly; price-fixing combinations; has protection assisted Canadian manufacturers?; the system corrupting, demoralizing and indefensible; contributions to campaign funds; national existence and integrity, 2437; economic self-sufficiency; sentiment in favour of protection; public opinion distorted; quotation from Mr. J. A. Hobson, 2438; consumers not organized to protect themselves; Canadian Manufacturers' Association propaganda; objects of protection; how has the policy worked out?, 2439; loss of population; indictment of system by United Farmers of Ontario; war profiteering; revenue raising expedients, 2440; excess profits tax; no promise of relief in budget; taxes on consumption; sales tax, 2441; income and inheritance taxes; ability to pay, 2442; property tax; taxation of land value; 2443; increased production; booms and depressions; public works; credit control, 2445

Good, Mr. W. C. — *Con.*
Business of the House
Estimates, consideration of, 3527
Mondays and Wednesdays, 1720
Business profits war tax, qu. 1657
Canadian National railways, public ownership, 1961
Cattle embargo, 991-992
Chamberlin, Mr. R. S., grant to, 3498
Civil Service Commission, salaries, 3509
Coated papers, duty on, 3108
Condensed milk, tax, 3269
Contingencies, expenditures for, 415
Cotton fabrics, duty on, 3128
Debates, inaudibility of, 1755, 1996
Ford motor company, 3273
German importations, value of, 3228
Governor General's cars, 1688
Harbours and rivers, Ontario, 2001
Hydrographic survey, 1746
Immigration
Passports, 3064
Salaries, 3499
Income war tax act, 3278
Indians
Medical attention, 1220
Six Nation reserve, 1222
Lambton, loss of, 3507
Live stock industry, 992
Military expenditures and policy, 1144
Naturalization expenses, 1671
Naval defence, obligation of Canada, 1745
Oleomargarine, manufacture, etc., M. (Mr. Neill) 1836
Opium and Narcotic Drug Act Amdt. bill, 3019
Pool selling, bookmaking, etc., 2973
Prince Rupert Drydock Co. claim, 3515
Proportional Representation, M. for adoption, 1633
Public buildings, Ottawa
Elevator attendants, 1267
Expenditure, 1268
Quebec Harbour Commission bill, 1485
Quebec harbour, parc St. Charles, 1470
Rail and car repair contracts, 1705
Railway policy, 1961
Root vegetables bill, potato grades, 3376
Royal Canadian Mounted Police, M. (Mr. Woodsworth) 843
Senate indemnity, 3509
Soldiers' bonus, M. (Mr. Arthurs) 436
Steamship subsidies, contracts, 3034, 3506
Supply, discussion, method of, 1142
Tariff amendments, 3238-9
Telegraph and Telephone lines, 2012
Tools, tax on, 3127

Good, Mr. W. C. — *Con.*
Unemployment
Causes of, 3526
Military expenditures, 1144
Relief, 3526
Wheat Board bill, 3187
Woollen goods, duty on, 3130

Good Roads. *See* Highways

Gordon, Sir Charles, 58, 200, 239, 1128
Genoa conference, 1715

Gordon, Mr. George N. (West Peterborough.)
See also Deputy Speaker
O'Connor, Mr. W. F., K.C., payments, qu. 2037

Gouin, Hon. Sir Lomer (Minister of Justice and Attorney General)
Adamson, Mr. Justice, appointment of, 1670
Address in reply, 140. Congratulations to Mr. Speaker; statements made in last general election, 140; Order in Council government, 141; Quebec fisheries; results of general election, 142
Allan, Sir Montagu, 872
Bankruptcy Act Amdt. bill, 3025
Senate amdts. 3611
Budget, 2654. Fiscal policy, protection and free trade; issue of the election campaign; Liberals not free traders; history of tariff legislation; Hon. Alex. Mackenzie; Mr. Blake's Malvern speech, 2655; principles which have inspired Liberal party; fiscal policy of Government found in speeches of Prime Minister and Finance Minister, 2656; budget proposals in consonance with declarations of leaders, 2657; expenditure and debt; revenue necessities; manufacturing important factor in developing Canada, 2657; late Sir Wilfrid Laurier on encouragement of Canadian industries; progress of manufacturers since 1870; exodus during last ten years; investment in industrial establishments, 2658; grievances of the West; proposals for tariff reduction; strict economy needed; immigration policy; the amendment; no deception of electors, 2659; budget proposals consistent with Liberal promises
Canada Grain Act
Decision of Manitoba Court of Appeal, 1133, 1841, 1932
Chamberlain, Mr. R. S., grant to, 3497
Criminal Code Amdt. bills, 1841, 2830, 2973, 3607

Gouin, Hon. Sir Lomer — *Con.*
Criminal Code Amdt. bills — *Con.*
Half-breed scrip, 3219
Mr. Woodsworth
M. for reference to Special Com., 1503
Dominion lands, Cancellation of leases bill, 3468-75
Senate amdts. 3615
Exchequer court
Admiralty vacancies, 1275
Estimates, 1274
Immigration Act Amdt. bill (Mr. Woodsworth)
M. for ref. to Special Com., 1502
Judges Act Amdt. bill, 424, 2830
Judges, Quebec, 3497
Justice department of,
Estimates, 1274, 1668
Litigated matters, 1276
Salaries, 451, 4395
Yukon territory, 1275
King v, Manitoba Grain Company, decision, 1133, 1841, 1932
Newfoundland-Labrador boundary, 1276
Nova Scotia Supreme Sourt, vacancy, 3437
Pecuniary Claims Convention with United States, 1276
Penitentiaries
Estimates, 1276
Inmates, foreign and native, 1279
Penitentiary Act Amdt. bill, 545, 787
References to, 21, 26, 55, 206, 207, 239, 242, 243, 1128, 2679, 2682, 2718. *See also* Budget; Ministers and Directorships
Revenue and Audit Act Amdt. bill, 3042
Royal Canadian Mounted Police
Estimates, 2129
Pensions, 2131
Soldiers' civil re-establishment bill, 3597
Supreme Court Act Amdt. bill, 2456, 2974
Supreme court estimates, 1274
Trial of Indian murderer, Lebeaux expenses, 1669
White, Mr. James, employment of, 3496
Yukon territory, 1275

Gould, Mr. O. R. (Assiniboia)
Agriculture department
Officers, 650
Professionnal men, 589
Air force and civil aviation, Saskatchewan, 1724
Allan, Sir Montagu, 872
Bank, loans to directors, 1093
Bee-keeping, 592
Bienfait briquetting plant. *See under this title,* Lignite
Blankets, duty on, 3129

Gould, Mr. O. R. — *Con.*
Budget, 2711. Congratulation to Finance Minister; grievance of the West and its solution; briquetting plant at Bienfait, 2712-15; farmers and the income tax; excessive profits and watered stock; banks and credit, 2714; liquor exportation from Saskatchewan; banking system, 2716; cheque tax; national debt, 2717; taxation; Sir Lomer Gouin and protection; tariff on implements of production, 2718; inconsistent attitude of Conservatives towards tariff; a disappointing budget; failure of Government to carry out platform of 1919; similarity of Liberal and Progressive platforms, 2720; Liberals will not implement pledges, 2721
Civil service economy, 793
Clothes wringers, 3140
Criminal Code, carriage of calves, 2831
Daylight saving, M. (Mr. Kay) 952
Defence branches, amalgamation, 423
Departments, economy in, 458, 793
Dominion Elections Act Amdt. bill, 2814
Dominion lands, surveys, 1041
Electrical storm in the West, 3493
Elevators, complaint of unfair dealing, 2987
Entomology, qu. 472, 590, 817
Export liquor warehouses, 768, 2716
Fishing schooner race, 3511
Grain Growers' Grain Company, 2489
Grasshopper plague, qu. 472, 590, 817
Harbours and rivers, expenditure, 1272
Harness, hides, prices, 3139
Immigration, medical inspection, 2022
Insurance Act Amdt. bill, 3143
Judges Act Amdt. bill, 546
Lignite
Bienfait briquetting plant, qu. 604, 1233, qu. 1632, 2712-15
Utilization board, 3524
Live stock, diseases, 650
Military district No. 12, 1176, 1602, 1987
Military expenditure and policy, 1148, 1175, 1610
Militia and Defence
Annual training, 1175, 1600-10
Customs duties, 1978
Permanent force, 1982
Saving in, 418
Temporary clerks, 587
Transport and freight, 1987
Ministers and directorships, 1091
Ministers, salary increases, 1093
Ocean and river service, 3508
Opium and Narcotic Drug Act Amdt. bill, 3017

Gould, Mr. O. R. — *Con.*
Public Works, average salary, 750
Quarantine, 2021
Raw materials, duty on, 3131
Royal Canadian Mounted Police, M. (Mr. Woodsworth) 839
Steamship subsidies, 3506
Woodmen of the World, 1905
Woollen goods, 3137

Government Departments
Co-ordination of, 180-181. *See also* National Defence
Payment to each other for services rendered, 1724

Government, Federal, responsibility for unemployment, 1069-94. *See also* Address; Budget; Unemployment

Government, group system of. *See* Proportional Representation

Government-Owned Railways. *See* Canadian National Railways

Government Printing. *See* Printing; Publications

Governor General
Cars, 1688
Deputy of the Governor General, 3610
Secretary's office, 751
Speech on opening of Parliament; new appointment as Governor General; world-wide economic disturbances and industrial depression; unemployment; decline in prices of farm products; Customs tariff revision; co-ordination of government railway systems, 6; immigration, 6-7; re-establishment and medical treatment of soldiers; natural resources of western provinces; co-ordination of defence forces; limitation of armaments; Genoa conference; Postal conference; need for economy, 7
Address in reply. *See that title*
Warrants, 1990
Canadian Expeditionary Force, repatriation of dependents, 1711
Dominion Iron and Steel Corporation, contract for steel plates, 1677
Dominion lands and parks, 1681
Expenditure by, 1353
Genoa Conference, 1716
Penitentiaries, 1670
Unemployment relief, 1719
Welland canal construction, 1687
Yukon territory, 1681

Grading of Vegetables. *See* Root Vegetables

Graham, Hon. George P. (Minister of Militia and Defence and Minister of the Naval Service)
Air Board
Aeronautical research, 3499
Biggar, Colonel O. M., resignation, 1727
Estimates, 1722
Expenditure, details of, 1731
Air Board Act, 1917, Amdt. bill, 2357, 2820
Air Force and civil aviation, 1722
Customs patrol, Vancouver, 1730
Forest patrol, British Columbia, 1730
Barkhouse, Captain, 1748
Battlefields memorials, 2098
Behring sea patrol, 1736
Business of the House
Debate on naval service estimates, 1742-5, 1900
Canadian institute for the blind, 3541
Canadian Northern, Sir Richard McBride, 202
Civil service salaries, 553
Crowsnest pass agreement, M. (Mr. Kennedy, Essex) for Special Com., 1411-14
Fisheries protection service, 678, 1747
Ford Motor Company, 3277
Government departments, payment to each other for services rendered, 1724
Gwatkin, General, 422. *See also under this title,* National Defence
Hydrographic survey, 1746
Insurance Act Amdt., 3147
Insurance premiums, tax, 3257
Militia and Defence
Adjustment of war claims, 2974
Air force 1722
Allowances, active militia, 1135
Amalgamation, saving, 417-18
Ammunition, reserve of, 2086
Annual drill, 1151, 1179, 1578
Arsenals
Lindsay, 1979, 2085
Quebec, 1979, 2091
Cadet services, 1972, 1978
Classification, 416
Civil Service Commission, and, 423
Defence forces, 1135
Director of assigned pay, 586
Engineer services and works, 1980
Estimates, 1711, 2974, 3498
Expenditure and policy, 1339
Reductions proposed by Minister, 1578
MacBrien, General, reported utterances of, 1662
Ordnance building, Quebec, repairs, 1711
Permanent force, 1136-52, 1982
Royal military college, 1985
Schools of instruction, 1985

Graham, Hon. Geo. P. — *Con.*
Militia and Defence — *Con.*
Temporary employees, 417
Topographic survey, 1985
Transport and freight, 1987
War claims, adjustment, 2098
Ministers and directorships, 1109
Money, purchasing power of, 1151-3
Municipal taxation, payment of by government, 1257
National Defence bill, 363, 417, 547
National Defence bill (No. 27) 644, 657, 668, 733, 746
Air Force, 678
Concurrence in Senate Amdts. 2806
Militia estimates, 421
Services, transfer to, 1747
Naval policy, 2043-72
Naval service
Estimates, 418, 420, 1735, 1843
Fisheries protection service, 678, 1747
Niobe, sale of, 2043-65
Radiotelegraph service, 1749
Royal Canadian navy, 1735, 1843, 2043, 2058, 3365
Postponement of debate, 1972
Reduction of naval armaments, 1737
Ships to be taken out of commission, 1740
Trawlers, 1844
War claims, adjustment, 1752
War medals, 1754
Niagara River Bridge Company bill, 1486
Patrol of northern waters, 1750
Parents, support of by children, 1308
Pelagic sealing treaty, 1844
Pension Act Amdt. bill, 3358
Pensions
Northwest Rebellion, 3523
Widowed mothers', M. (Mr. Power) 1308
Radiotelegraph service, 1736, 1749
Railway Commission
Carvell, Hon. F. B., criticism of, 2778
Rideau canal, 2766
Royal Canadian Mounted Police, M. (Mr. Woodsworth) 831
Salaries, 775
Royal Canadian navy. *See under this title,* Naval Service
Royal naval college, Esquimalt, 2048
Salaries Act Amdt. bill, 363, 746
Soldier Settlement Act Amdt. bill, 3358
Special Loans bill, 3358
Supply, discussion, method of, 1142
Survey and map work, co-ordination of, 1986
War claims, exchange on, 1752
War memorials, 2098, 2100

Graham Miss Nora, qu. 599

Graham, Mr., agent at Regina, 682

Grain and Grain Trade. *See also* Address; Agriculture; Budget; United Grain Growers; Wheat Board
Acme Grain Company, default of, 2834
Banks and, 2246. *See also that title*
Campbell, Mr. J. A., claim for flax shipment, 2834
Canada Grain Act
Administration of, 2834
Constitutionality of, 2837
Decision of Manitoba Court of Appeal, 1132, 1841, 1932
Inquiry, 1770
Canadian National railways, grain leakages, 1401, 1930
Canadian Wheat Board, advance, 3541. *See also* Wheat Board
Car demurrage, 2981
Elevators
Private, 2981
Licenses to, 2838
System of, 114, 233
Terminal, 2980
Excess overages, qu. 609, qu. 1401, 2837
Fort William
Inspector, 2983
Port Arthur, and, overages, qu. 1210
Government, 233, qu. 3152
Grain Commission, and, 2980
Maintenance and equipment of, 2978
Quebec, 1466, 1471, 1474, 1483
United Grain Growers, 2983
Freight rates on grain, 146. *See also* Freight Rates
Grades, mixing of, 2839, 2981
Grain Board. *See* Wheat Board
Grain Growers and oleomargarine. *See* Oleomargarine
Grain Inquiry Commission, 49, qu. 705, 777, qu. 1181, 2839, 2842, 2982
Hyndman Commission, 2982
Secret session at Fort William, 2983
Terminal elevators, 2980
Grain leakages on Canadian National railways, 1401, 1930
Handling of. *See under this title,* Elevators; Transportation
Long hauls to market, 146-7
Manitoba Court of Appeal, decision. *See under this title,* Canada Grain Act
Mixing grades, 2839, 2981
In transit, 2838
Montreal harbour, shipment of grain through, 1489
Oats, price of, 225

Grain and Grain Trade — *Con.*
Overages, qu. 609, qu. 1401, 2837, 2838, 2980
Per capita production, 2159
Price fixed in Liverpool, 1203-08
Production and shipment, 1203
Quebec, shipment of grain through, 1466, 1471, 1472
Russia, competition of, 2157
St. Lawrence river waterway, 269, 1183, 1317, 1325. *See also that title*
Sample market, 2838
Saskatchewan Co-operative Elevator Co., 2989
Screenings, recleaned, 2490
Selling without growers' permission, 2989
Shipment. *See under this title,* Montreal; Quebec; St. Lawrence River Waterway
Shrinkage and leakage in transit, 232. *See also under this title,* Elevators
Speculation in, 158. *See also* Wheat Board Bill
Transcontinental railway, 2194
Transportation, 235, 300. *See also* Freight Rates; Railways; St. Lawrence River Waterway; Welland Canal
Water by, 69-70. *See also* St. Lawrence River Waterway
United Grain Growers, terminal elevator, 2983
Wheat
Marketing, 2915, 2951, 2969. *See also* Wheat Board
Production and cost, 2333

Grain Growers Grain Company, alleged contribution to political organization, 2488

Grand Anse, C.B., mail service, qu. 938

Grand Manan, wharves and breakwaters, 1993

Grand River bridge, qu. 1287

Grand Trunk Pacific Railway. *See that title under* Canadian National Railways

Grand Trunk Railway. *See that title under* Canadian National Railways

Grape Juice, tax on, 2117, 2594, 2617

Grasshopper Plague, qu. 472, 2726, 3520

Gravel, Mr., Quebec Harbour Commission, 1477

Great Britain
British Preference. *See that title*
Free trade and, 2526. *See also* speeches on Budget

Great Britain — *Con.*
Imports from, qu. 966. *See also* Imports and Exports; Trade
Income tax reductions, 2860
Investment in Canadian industries, 2368
Merchant Marine, 2379
Protection of industries, 2408-9
Tariff legislation, 2267
Trade with. *See* British Preference; Trade

Great Lakes, life-saving service, qu. 367

Great Lakes-St. Lawrence waterway. *See* St. Lawrence River Waterway

Great Lakes Tidewater Association, 1319. *See also* St. Lawrence River Waterway

Great War Veterans' Association. *See also* Canadian Patriotic Fund Bill; Returned Soldiers
Cash grants to soldiers, policy on, 394. *See also* Soldiers Bonus
Charges against Pensions Board, 3041. *See also* Pensions
Housing credits, 3524
Immigration, 2155
Oleomargarine, 1798
Oriental immigration, 1514

Greece
Commission on credit to, 303
Loan, qu. 1400

Grey, Lord, letter to Governor General on military protection, 1136

Griffenhagen and Associates, 1490. *See also* Civil Service, Classification
Montreal post office, 1633
Post office inspectors, 1507

Grimmer, Mr. R. W. (Charlotte)
Charlotte County, Mr. Todd's election promises, 1997
Grand Manan, Campobello and Deer islands, wharves and breakwaters, 1993-7
Harbours and rivers, New Brunswick, 1993
Patrol boat Phalarope, qu. 1503
St. George public building, 1240
Sardines, price for export, qu. 1182

Grosse Isle quarantine station, 2021

Guernsey Island of, credit system, 2505

Gulf of St. Lawrence Shipping and Trading Company, qu. 1400

Gutelius, Mr. F. P., 192

Guthrie, Hon. Hugh (South Wellington)
Air Board
Biggar, Col. O. M., resignation of, 1726
Expenditure, 1725
Details of, 1730
Air Service, forest patrol, 1047
Ammunition, shipment from Great Britain, 1154-68-73
Animal Contagious Diseases bill, 2735
Bankruptcy Act Amdt. bill, 3025
British Ministry of Shipping, claim, 1752
Budget, 2874. Amended resolutions, 2874; depreciated currency, valuation of, 2875; trade with Germany; pocket knives; effect of Minister's proposal, 2876; marking of goods, effect of repeal; German aluminum goods; German agents seeking orders in Canada; Canadian valuation of German goods; favourable position of German manufacturers; anti-dumping clause; fruit industry, 2879; marking of goods; government by Order in Council, 2880
Burstall, Sir Henry, 742-3
Business of the House
Point of order, bill ref. to Com., 1395
Saturday sittings, 2032
Canada Temperance Act Amdt. bill, 2997
Canadian exhibition in France, 2032
Canadian National Railways, enlisted men, allowance, 3519
Census, completion of, 1364
Chamberlin, Mr. R. G., grant to, 3497
Criminal Code Amdt. bills
Carriage of calves, 2831
Scrip frauds, 1396
(Mr. Woodsworth) 1395
Criminal Code, revision, 1717
Criminal Code and Statutes, reprinting of, 1717
Demobilization, 1155
Expenditure for, 1163
Vote, 1171
Departmental solicitors, 683
Dominion Elections Act Amdt. bill, 2810
Residential qualification, M. (Mr. Rinfret) 1299
Women of foreign birth, enfranchisement, 476
Dominion lands and surveys, 1035, 1038
Topographic survey, 1043, 1986
Dominion observatory building, 1266
Enfranchisement of foreign-born women M. (Mr. Euler) 476
Escheats Act. Amdt. bill, 2829, 3026
Finance, loans, 771
Govt. departments, payments to each other, 1726

Guthrie, Hon. Hugh — *Con.*
Govt. publications, demand, 1374
Gwatkin, Major-General, 742
Harbours and rivers
New Brunswick, 1997
Amdt. to reduce item by $20,000, 1998
Nova Scotia, expenditure, 1269
Ontario, Goderich, 2000
Prince Edward Island, 1988
Quebec, 1999
Hospital ship, claim for loss of, 2976
Immigration Act Amdt. bill, (Mr. Woodsworth) 1393
Immigration of farm workers, 3052
Indian Affairs, officials, 683
Judges Act Amdt. bill, 2830
Labour dept., salary increases, 564
Linen yarn bounty, 1362
Military expenditures, 1138
Militia and Defence
Ammunition,
Reserve of, 2086
Shipment from Great Britain, 1154-73
Annual drill, 1154, 1155
Artillery ammunition from Great Britain, 1154-73
Liberal attitude in 1920, 1921, and 1922, 1154
Arsenals, Lindsay, 2085
Cadet services, 1972, 1977
Expenditure and policy, 1594
Permanent force, 1983
Reduction of staff, 586
Topograpric survey, 1043, 1986
War claims, adjustment of, 2976
Ministers and directorships, 1094
Montreal Harbour Commission bill, 1488
Municipal taxation, payment by Government, 1256
Munitions, shipment from Great Britain, 1154-73
National Defence, Department of, bill, 659, 738, 1747
Bill should be preceded by resolution, 547
Naturalization Act, 2024
Naval policy, 2051
Naval service
Fisheries protection service, 1747
Gift of ships to Canada, 2050
Royal Canadian navy, 1846, 1972
Royal naval college, 2049
Opium and Narcotic drugs, 2020
Parliament buildings, 2014
Penitentiary Act Amdt. bill, 787
Pilotage, administration of, 1499
Preston, Mr. W. T. R., claim of, 3503
Progressive party, attitude towards redistribution, 1364

Guthrie, Hon. Hugh—Con.
Public buildings
Expenditure, 1261
Improvements, repairs, etc., 1238
Ontario, 1251, 1259
Public Service Retirement Act, 3025
Public Works estimates, 964, 747
Contingency vote, 748
Reductions, 698
Quebec harbour advances, 1473
Redistribution and the census, 1364
Soldiers' Civil Re-establishment Dept.
Amalgamation or abolition of, 1340
Statutes
Printing of, 1972
Revision of, 1717
Steamship services, 2020, 3505
Survey and map work, proposed co-ordination, 1033, 1986
Toronto harbour improvement, 1474
War claims, adjustment
Naval service, 1752
Vickers, 2976
War medals, 2977
War memorials, Vimy, 2100
Warlike stores, sale of, 1171
Wheat Board, 2968
Wrangel island, 1751
Yukon territory, 1034
Radiotelegraph service, 1750

Gwatkin, Major-General, 421, 422, 742, qu. 1211. *See also* National Defence bill

Halbert, Mr. Robert H. (North Ontario)
Campbell, Mr. Alex., qu. 606
Cattle embargo, Mr. Doherty, 989
Customs tariff, ploughs, 3231
Doherty, Right Hon. C. J., qu. 704
Hatters' plush, duty on, 3141
Labour dept., employees, 566
Lake of the Woods bill, 2309
Lindsay arsenal, 1979
Military expenditure and policy, 1179
Militia and defence
Annual drill, 1179
Expenditure and policy, 1597, 1617, 1984
Permanent force, 1984
Plough parts, duty on, 3123, 3231
Riordon Company, taxes, qu. 607, qu. 927
Root Vegetables bill, potato grades, 3373-4

Half Breed Scrip, Frauds, 148-9. *See also* Criminal Code Amdt. bill

Halifax. *See also* Naval Service
Dennis building, qu. 3360
Fortifications, 1581
Ocean terminals, qu. 364
Ocean tonnage, 2008

Halifax — *Con.*
Patronage committee, 199
Port of. *See* British Preference, M. (Mr. Logan)
Public buildings, expenditures, 1244
Quarantine station, repairs, 1238, 2021

Halkett, Mr. Andrew, 3051

Hamilton
Post office building, 1246-51, 1258
Queenston-Hamilton highway, qu. 471

Hammell, Mr. W. J. (Muskoka)
Parry Sound lighthouse inspector, qu. 827

Haney, Mr. M. J., contracts, 1375

Hanna, Mr. D. B., 192-3, qu. 471. *See also* Canadian National Railways, Directors

Hanna-Medicine Hat line, 1965

Hansard. *See* House of Commons, Debates

Hanson, Mr. Richard B. (York-Sunbury)
Alcohol for druggists, 3242
Business of the House, Saturday sittings, 2033
Canada Temperance Act, 2024
Caraquet and Gulf Shore Railway Co., 1183, qu. 1504
Coal
Anthracite, importations, qu. 2356
Public buildings, for, 1763
Defence, deputy ministers, 419
Dominion Elections Act Amdt. bill, 2810
Edmundston public building, 1239, 1251
Election promises in Charlotte County, N.B., 1994
Experimental farms, 795
External Affairs, contingencies, 3509
Graham, Miss Nora, qu. 699
Harbours and rivers
New Brunswick, 1991
Nova Scotia, 1765
Expenditure, 1269
High Commissioner, 414
Indians, Devon band, removal, 1215
Insurance premiums, tax, 3256
International operation of railways, 192
Joggins breakwater, 1767
Justice department, contingencies, 1669
Labour investigators, 462
Marshall, Mr. Duncan, 647
Matches, tax on, 3262
Migratory birds, 1685
Militia and defence
Military property at Fredericton, 1980
Transport and freight, M. to reduce item by $50,000, 1987

Hanson, Mr. Richard B. — *Con.*
Municipal taxation, payment by Government, 1256
Naturalization Act, 2024
Nickel coin blanks, qu. 3152
Nova Scotia
Coal strike, 461
Supreme court vacancy, 3436
Pension Act Amdt. bill, 3451
Pension Board, appeals, 391
Post Office Dept.
Printing and stationery, 691
Reorganization, 2800
Rural delivery, 2800
Provincial wharves, New Brunswick, 1991
Public buildings, Maritime provinces, 1243
Public Works estimates, 693
Purchasing Commission, 2025
Reid Newfoundland railway, 2027
Root Vegetable bill, 3369
Royal Canadian Mounted Police, 735
St. John and Quebec railway, 1295
Acquisition by Canadian National railways, qu. 1774
St. John terminal facilities, M. (Mr. Caldwell) 847
St. Lawrence river waterway, survey, 2768
Senate indemnity, 3509
Soldiers' Civil Re-establishment dept.
Salary increases, 391
Vocational loans, 1346
Soldiers' homes, establishment of, 1348
Sorel shipyard, qu. 605
Statistics, Dominion Bureau of, 1363
Steamship services, 2029, 3506
War trophies, director, 702
Wharves in tidal waters, qu. 2209
White slave traffic, suppression of, 3497

Harbour Masters. *See* Canada Shipping Act Amdt.

Harbours. *See* St. Lawrence River Waterway. For individual Harbours, *see their titles*
Advances to. *See* Montreal, Quebec and Harbour Commission bills

Harbours and Rivers
Alberta, 2004, 3547
British Columbia, 2005, 3547
Esquimalt, 3541
Estimates, 1269, 1765, 1988, 3541
Expenditures on, 1465
Lake Huron, harbour of refuge, 2002
Little Current, 2002
Manitoba, 2003, 3545

Harbours and Rivers — *Con.*
Montreal Harbour Commission, employees, 1289. *See also* Montreal Harbour Commission bill
New Brunswick, 1991
Amdt. (Mr. Guthrie) to reduce item by $20,000, 1998
Provincial wharves, 1991
Nova Scotia, 1765, 3545
Expenditure, 1921-22, 1269
Ontario, 1999
Port Arthur and Fort William, 3541
Prince Edward Island, 1270, 1988
Quebec, 1998, 3545
Quebec Harbour Commission, 1283. *See also* Quebec Harbour Commission bill
St. John
Expenditure, qu. 1401
Improvement, 2013
Saskatchewan and Alberta, 2004, 3547
Shuswap lake, wharf, 3547
Toronto, 3541

Harding, President, 69
St. Lawrence River Waterway, 133, 1184

Hardy, Hon. Senator, A. C., 2695

Harris, Mr. Joseph H. (East York)
Address in reply, 307. Liberals and Progressives, 307; immigration; railway policy; 308; manufacturers and raw material, 309
Aliens, taxation of transient, 2155
Customs department, secretaries, 764
Foreigners, 2155
Hog cholera, garbage feeding, 1007-9, 1028
Immigration
Policy, 2154
Undesirable, 2154
Insurance premiums, tax, 3258
Lord Kitchener's death, foreigners and, 2155
Militia and defence, Lindsay arsenal, 2085
Pension Act Amdt. bill, 3464
Pensions Com., final report, 3350
Public buildings, Ontario, repairs, 1250

Harvest Excursions, 337

Hatfield, Mr. Paul L. (Yarmouth and Clare)
Canned goods, marking, 3050
Fishing schooner race, 3511
Rural postmasters, 3080

Hatters' Bands, Plush, and bindings, 2855, 3139, 3141

Hawaian Islands, Japanese immigration, 1515

Health. *See also* Immigration; Indians; Tuberculosis
Department
Estimates, 2017
Salaries, etc., 775
Diseases, infectious of prisoners. *See* Penitentiary Act Amdt. bill
Honey, 2017
Housing, and, 121. *See also* Housing
Immigration, medical inspection, 2021. *See also* Immigration
Narcotic drugs, 2017. *See also* Opium and Narcotic Drugs Act Amdt. bill
Correspondence with wholesale druggists, 1289
Occupational diseases. *See* Labour
Quarantine, 2021
Unemployment, 86-87
Venereal diseases, qu. 935, 2022

Health of Animals. *See* Agriculture; Animal Contagious Diseases

Hearst Publications, 3111

Herring,. Dry-salting. *See* Fisheries Act Amdt. bill

Hides, price of, 2623, 3138

High Commissioner in London, 58
British Columbia house, purchase of, 3537
Cattle embargo, and. *See also that title*
Alleged statement on, 1020, 1463
Income and taxation, 139
Salaries, etc., 413

High Cost of Living. *See* Cost of Living

High River, Alta.
Aerial Forest patrol, 1050, qu. 1066, 1723

Highways, 63, 75, 122
Banff-Windermere, 1051, 1681
Biggs, Hon. F. C., 63
Dundas Street, Halton county, qu. 1065
Edith Cavell, 1051
Grand Circle tour, 1683
Hamilton-Queenston, qu. 471
Indian reserves, 1216
Isle Perrot bridge, qu. 1377
Ontario, qu. 372
Ottawa-Kingston, qu. 1904, 2794
Ottawa-Pembroke, qu. 1661, 2794
Ottawa-Prescott, treeplanting, qu. 2039
Road materials, investigation, 1234
Road projects, submitted, qu. 2040
St. Thomas-Niagara Falls, qu. 936
Soulanges canal road, 2768
Tourist traffic and, 1682
Transcontinental, 319, 2636

Highways — *Con.*
Transportation, 1939
Unemployment relief, 1082
Windermere road, 1051, 1681

Hikers. *See* Macdonald's Army; Riley's Army

Historic Sites, 119. *See also* Battlefields Monuments, qu. 469

Hocken, Mr. H. C. (West Toronto)
Agriculture Com. report, Wheat Board, 785
American magazines, importation of, 3108-09, 3112
Budget, 2675. Expected modifications in budget proposals, 2675; taxes on cheques, confectionery and cigars; sales tax and cost of living; dissatisfaction of Agrarian party with budget; tariff record of Liberal party; pledges and promises broken, 2676; reduction in agricultural implement duties; protection and the maintenance of industries; record of Conservative party; inconsistencies of Liberals; Mr. Blake's Malvern speech; his letter to West Durham electors, 2677; unrestricted reciprocity; commercial union; Mr. Fielding's disavowal of tariff items of Liberal platform; concealment of views on public questions; reciprocity; government created by big interests, 2678; big business behind Sir Lomer Gouin, 2679; Proposed coalition of Agrarians and Liberals; national railways; responsibility for railway building, 2680; effort to form Liberal-Progressive government; progressives and reactionary factions in government; Minister of Marine and Fisheries; conflicting opinions in Liberal ranks; national railways; speech of Minister of Justice; full value for support of big interests; protection; diversified industries, 2682; relief from burdens not to be had through tariff reduction; feeling between East and West; rural depopulation of Ontario; agricultural conditions; manufacturers in unsatisfactory position, 2683; amenities of rural life, 2684
Canada's credit, 1919
Canadian National railways, deficits, 1919
Dominion Elections Act Amdt. bill, 2811
Residential qualification, M. (Mr. Rinfret) 1298
Empire-Ascension Days, adjournment, 1905
Finance, deputy minister's salary, 752

Hocken, Mr. H. C. — *Con.*
Fishing schooner race, 3513
Income taxes, qu. 705
Labour dept.
Mr. Harrison, 575-6
Promotions, 576
McDonald, Mr. John N., qu. 3361
Military expenditure, 1137
Military hospitals, expenditure, 1261
Public buildings
Expenditure, 1261
Flags, 1265
Water, 1266
Public works estimates, 747, 748, 1261
Reciprocity, Mr. Putnam, 2286
Royal Canadian Mounted Police, M. (Mr. Woodsworth) 833
St. Lawrence river waterway
M. (Mr. Church) 1314
Welland canal, and, 2754
Soldiers' Civil Re-establishment, salary increases, 388, 398
Toronto Suburban railway, qu. 2456
Welland ship canal, 2754

Hodgins, Mr. A. L. (East Middlesex)
Animal contagious diseases, 2103
Telegraph and telephone lines, 2013
Water powers, surveys, 1051

Hoey, Mr. R. A. (Springfield)
Budget, 2331. Financial obligations; precarious position of agriculture; Canadian workman, purchasing power; unemployment, 2331; Western Canada; statements prepared by Manitoba Agricultural College staff; wheat production and cost, 2332; farmers' profits compared with those of other businesses, 2333; probable permanency of conditions; rural discontent; the solution, 2334; drastic tariff reductions; lower freight rates, wider markets; tendency to lean on government, 2335; protection and the agricultural industry; Fordney tariff; opportunity for reductions in Canadian tariff; Genoa Conference; Mr. Lloyd George and spirit of nationalism; source of revenue; development of basic industries, 2337; the amendment, 2338; broken promises; tariff commission; redistribution; party system of government, 2339
Census, completion of, 1365
Cost of living, 1175, 2331
Gordon, Sir Charles, 584
Immigration statistics, 756-7
Labour dept., salaries, 551

Hoey, Mr. R. A. — *Con.*
Military expenditure and policy, 1175
Militia and defence
Annual drill, 1175
Quebec arsenal, 2097
Ministers and directorships, 1111
Rail and car repair contracts, 1705
Redistribution and the census, 1365
Winnipeg river, bridge, 2011

Hogs
Cholera. *See also* Agriculture; Animal Contagious Diseases bill; Health of Animals
Compensation, 1028
Extermination of, 2594
Grading, 2594

Holiday on Election Day. *See* Dominion Elections Act Amdt. bill

Holland, immigration from, 2144

Holland, Lee, order for deportation of, 1283

Holland, Major, death of, 2821

Holstein Cattle trade with United States in, 2695

Holt, Sir Henry, 1128

Home Brewing. *See* Inland Revenue

Home . Markets. *See* Budget; Markets; speeches on Address

Homesteads. *See* Dominion Lands; Immigration; Soldiers' Land Settlement
Re-entry, 1041

Honey, 2017

Honorary Advisory Council of Industrial and Scientific Research. *See* Industrial and Scientific Research

Horse Power. *See* Electric Power; Water Power

Horse Racing, Federal control of, 2596

Horses. *See* Live Stock

Hose, Captain. *See* Naval Service

Hosmer, Mr. Charles R., 1128

Hospital Ships
Claim by British Ministry of Shipping for loss, 2975
Exemption from pilotage dues. *See* Canada Shipping Act

House of Commons. *See also* Deputy Speaker; Speaker
Acoustics, 1053, 1751, 3544, 3612. *See also under this title,* Audibility of Debates
Adjournments
Easter, 546, 820, 823
Empire day and Ascension day, 1760, 1769, 1905
To discuss matter of urgent public importance
M. (Mr. Irvine) Nova Scotia miners, 497; withdrawn, 545
Audibility of debates, 385, 411, 658, 708, 1053, 1578, 1721, 1751, 1755, 1996, 2831, 3544, 3613
Bills, money, to be preceded by res, 547
Business of the House
Budget debate, probable date of conclusion, 2639
Daylight saving, 1282
Further legislation, 2996, 3041, 3103, 3151, 3364-5
Government orders, Mondays and Wednesdays, 1460, 1719
Private members', 1719
Public accounts, closing of, 1210
By-elections. *See under this title* Vacancies
Chamber, acoustics. *See under this title,* Acoustics; Audibility of Debates
Committees, Select Standing, 8, 323. For proceedings and reports, *See* titles of the several Committees
Changes in, 497, 545, 596, 871, 1398
Powers of, 326
Criminal Code, reprinting of, 1717
Debates
Audibility of. *See under this title* Acoustics; Audibility of Debates
Official Report of
Committee
Appointed, 325
First report, 1132, 1258
Second report, 3359
Incorporation of documents not read, 1539, 3526
Tabulated statements in answer to questions, 1132, 1660
Decorum
Conversation, 1755, 2640
Courteous bearing to member speaking, 2090
Deputy Speaker, election of, 363. *See also that title*
Deputy Sergeant-at-Arms, 5
Divisions
Budget
Amdt. to Amdt. (Mr. Crerar), ruling of Mr. Speaker on, 2523

House of Commons — *Con.*
Divisions — *Con.*
Budget — *Con.*
Amdt. (Sir Henry Drayton), neg. 2912
Correction of division list, 2971; Corrected list, 2972
M. (Mr. Fielding) for Com. of Ways and Means, agreed to, 2913
Crowsnest Pass Agreement
M. (Mr. Kennedy, Essex) and amdt. (Sir Henry Drayton) 1457-8
Esquimalt and Nanaimo Railway Company bill, amdt. (Mr. Neill) neg. 1163
Freight Rates, amdt. (Sir Henry Drayton) to M. (Mr. Maclean, Halifax) for adoption of third report of Special Com. on Transportation Costs, 3586
Lake of the Woods Regulation bill, 3435
Ministers and Directorships, M. (Mr. McMaster) neg. 1131
Oleomargarine, Manufacture and Importation, discontinuance of, M. (Mr. Neill) neg. 1840
Oriental Aliens, M. (Mr. McQuarrie) and amdt. (Mr. Stewart, Argenteuil) 1577
Paired members inadvertently voting, 1462
Royal Canadian Mounted Police, M. (Mr. Woodsworth) neg. 843
Soldiers' Bonus, M. (Mr. Arthurs) neg. 450
Estimates, 2026. *See also that title*
Discussion of particular item on M. to go into Com. of Supply, 1337
Expenditure, qu. 2583
Expense of sittings and cost per hour, 1476, 2170, 2635
Hansard. *See under this title,* Debates, Official Report of
House of Commons and Senate Act, 1088. *See also* Ministers and Directorships
Indemnity
Payment of, 361
Proposed reduction, 2513, 2690, 2895, 3613
Internal Economy Commission, 8
Members
Attendance of, 2513
Deceased
Baker, the late Colonel G. H., memorial to, 1929
McGibbon, Mr. Peter (Argenteuil) 39
New
Election and introduction of
Bouchard, Mr. Georges (Joseph) 1929
King, Hon. J. H., 496
Ouimet, Joseph Rodolphe, 323
Private, business of, 1719

House of Commons — *Con.*
Members — *Con.*
Speeches, length of, 2450, 2635
Ministers and directorships. *See that title*
Motions
Amdt. to amdt. (Mr. Crerar) 2473, 2507
Speaker's ruling, 2519
Non-debatable
That Com. rise, 1181
Oleomargarine (Mr. Neill) time fixed for discussion, 1719
Redistribution, M. (Mr. Shaw) opportunity for discussion, 1719
Supply in, 1579
Orders for returns. *See under this title,* Returns
Orders of the Day
Right of member to raise qu. of privilege, 2638
Pairs. *See under this title,* Divisions
Petitions, Birnie, Mr. Alex. and others, 1929
Privilege
Baxter, Hon. Mr. — Carleton, N.B., returning officer, 3492
Caldwell, Mr. — Carleton, N.B., returning officer, 3602
Copp, Hon. Mr. — Correction of report respecting War claims, 1721
Crerar, Hon. Mr. — Budget debate, agricultural figures quoted in, 2637
Deslauriers, Mr. — Correction of speech, 3365-6
Fielding, Hon. Mr. — Clerk Assistant, 687
Gauvreau, Mr. — Statement of Miss Macphail, 3221
Hoey, Mr.—Denial of newspaper reports. 2458
Johnston, Mr. (Last Mountain) — Charge that Progressives are delaying budget debate, 2692
Kay, Mr. — Wheat Board, 872
Maclean, Mr. (York) — Crowsnest pass agreement, 3608
Right of member to raise qu. on orders of the day, 2638
Questions
Lengthy answers to, 1660
Tabulated statements in official report of debates, 1132
Returns
Inquiry for, 1283, 1988, 2042
Questions requiring tabulated answers, 1132
Rules, suspension of Rule 11, 1502
Senate, and, expenditure, qu. 2583
Sergeant-at-Arms
Parliamentary messengers, qu. 1376, 1335

House of Commons — *Con.*
Sittings
Eleven o'clock adjournment, 2033
Empire and Ascension days, 1769
Saturday, 1905, 2032, 2458
Suspended, 3611-14
Wednesday at 3 p.m., 49
Wednesday evenings, 1905, 2033, 2170
Speaker. *See that title*
Speeches, length, 2450, 2635
Staff
Chief accountant, salary, qu. 2583, qu. 2803
Chief of stationery division, 3608
Law branch, 2304
Organization, 3221
Amended, 1335
Reading room, assistant curators, 1335
Stenographers and messengers, pay, qu. 1376
Statutes, reprinting of, 1717
Supply
Amendment to amendment, 1579
Discussion of particular item of estimates on M. to go into Supply, 1337
Motion, movers of, 1579
Motion for, latitude in discussion, 2238
Vacancies
Kamouraska, 1459

House of Commons and Senate Act Amdt. bill. *See* Ministers and Directorships; Salaries Act Amdt.

Housing, 121, 219, 774, 3524. *See also* Labour; Returned Soldiers; Unemployment
Building costs, 2417
Returned soldiers, for, 271, 3304, 3314, 3321-22, 3329, 3332. *See also that title*
Shortage of, 1072
Unemployment, and, 3524

Howe, Hon. Joseph, 1387

Hubbs, Mr. John (Prince Edward)
Alcohol tax, retail druggists, 1213

Hudson, Mr. A. B. (South Winnipeg)
Crowsnest pass agreement, M. (Mr. Kennedy, Essex) for Special Com., 1444
Immigration-Criminal Code bills, 3283
Lake of the Woods repeal bill, 3199, 3210

Hudson's Bay Company
Northwest country and, 148
Supplies to northern Indians, 1712

Hudson Bay Railway, 2602
Completion of, 2779

Hudson Bay Railway — *Con.*
Hudson Bay
Navigability and fishery resources of, 2781, 2779-99
Port Nelson, 1970
St. Lawrence river waterway, 1208, 1325
Senate committee, report, 2781

Hueston, Captain, inquiry into death of, qu. 2993, 3314

Hughes, Mr. J. J. (King's P.E.I.)
Address in reply, 224. Reciprocity and class legislation, 224; immigration and unemployment, 225; Prince Edward island markets and government inspection; income tax, administration of Act, 226; sales tax; daylight saving; eight-hour day and farmers, 227; labour unions; railways and the maritime provinces, 228
Administration, economy in, 3077-8
Budget, 2225. Financial situation, debt, expenditure, economy; borrowings, 2225; the amendment, 2226; income tax, comparison with systems in other countries, 2227; sales tax; extravagant war expenditures, 2228; Wartime Elections Act, 2229
Canadian National railways, public ownership, 1925, 1956
Canned goods, inspection of, 3049
Civil Service Commission, 3076
Civil Service, economy, 2060
Daylight saving, M. (Mr. Kay) 955
Dominion Elections Act Amdt. bill
Residential qualification, M. (Mr. Rinfret) 1299
Harbours and rivers, Prince Edward island, 1989
Income tax, comparison with systems in other countries, 2227
Military expenditures and policy, 1143
Militia, annual drill, 1144
Montague, P.E.I., post office building, 1264
Railway policy, 1956

Humane Society, Criminal Code Amdt., 2831

Humphrey, Mr. L. W. (West Kootenay)
Oriental aliens, M. (Mr. McQuarrie) 1526
Pension Board, charges against, 2994
Postal revenue, qu. 2040
Remuneration of railway employees — Mr. McCrea, 2316

Hungary, Treaty with, 3359, 3490, 3547. For Bill, *See* Peace Treaties

Hutterites. *See* Immigration

Hydro Electric, 632, 1326, 1937, 2327, 2747. *See also* Electrification; Maclean, Mr. (York); St. Lawrence River Waterway; Water Powers
Commission, 1937
Difference with Ontario Government, 1080
Power development in Ontario, 63, 71, 131, 1950
St. Lawrence river waterway, 136, 1188-9. *See also that title*

Hydrographic Survey, 1736, 1746. *See also* Naval Service

Hyndman Commission. *See* Grain Inquiry Commission

Ice-breakers
Claim of Canadian Towing & Wrecking Co., 1677
Repurchase of, 1490
Thunder Bay, at, 1677
Vickers company contract, 320

Iceland, immigration from, 2144

Immigration, 6-7, 56, 79, 80, 82, 88, 145, 164, 182, 236, 282, 297, 311, 336, 348, 2243, 2254. *See also* Address; Budget; Census; Labour; Oriental Aliens; Unemployment
Advantages, 2516
Agents,
Bonus to, 3062
Promises by, 3058, 3063
Agricultural labourers, 297, 2143, 2161, 2193, 2514, 3053-5
Agriculture, condition and prospects, 2147
Alien enemies, 2146
Asiatic. *See under this title,* Oriental Aliens
Attitude towards the immigrant, 2151, 2157, 2160
British, 2144, 2150, 2515
Artisans, 2258, 2516
Ex-service men, qu. 3152
Buildings, repairs, etc., 1757
Bukowinians, 2159
Canadian National railways, and, 1927
Canadians emigrating, qu. 1182. *See also under this title,* Emigration
Central European, 2154-8, 2166, 2477
Child, 2144, 2148, 2153, 2161, 2163, 3063
Chinese, 2026. *See also* Oriental Aliens, M. (Mr. McQuarrie)
Commissioner at Canton, qu. 1901, qu. 2214

Immigration — *Con.*
Classes prohibited after May 9, 2514
Crime, and, 1392-4, 2517
Deportation. *See* Immigration-Criminal Code Bills (Mr. Woodsworth)
Aliens trafficking in drugs, 2019
Desirable, 3057
Domestic servants, 2143, 2514, 3053-4
Doukhobors, 167, 2160
Eastern Canada, 2165
Eastern Europe, 80
Emigration from Canada, 2260, 2372, 2516, 2865. *See also* Population
Canadians, qu. 1182
Exodus from Canada, 2478, 2516
Losses through, 2516
Record of, 2158
Europe, from, 308. *See also under this title,* Central European
Follow up policy, 2160
Foreign-born and crime, 1392-4, 2517
Galicians, 2159
Great Britain, from, 2480
Growth of wealth under, 13
Highland family, alleged unjust treatment of, 2145
Holland, 2144
Holland, Lee, deportation of, 872, 1282
Household workers, 2143, 2514, 3053-4
Hutterites and Mennonites, qu. 723, 2160, 3060
Icelandic, 2144
Industrial centres, from, 236
Inspection, 2148
Investigation of conditions in Europe, 1711
Italian, 2171
Japanese. *See under this title,* Oriental Aliens
Land, speculation in, 2152-9
Language qualification, 2515
Literature, Ontario Government, 2566
"Man with the sheepskin coat", 2151, 2153, 2518
Manitoba Liberal Convention, res. 2478
Maritime provinces, and, 2165
Meals for immigrants, qu. 2971
Medical inspection, 2021, 2143
Mennonites, qu. 723, 2160, 3060
Emigration to Mexico, qu. 732, 2160
Mentally unfit, 2145
Minister's statement, 2143
Money qualification, 2148, 2208, 3058
Montreal Board of Trade res. 2517
"Nomination system", 3056
Oriental, 319, 2143. *See also* Oriental Aliens, M. (Mr. McQuarrie)
Asiatic, 173, qu. 732
British Columbia in, 167

Immigration — *Con.*
Oriental — *Con.*
Chinese, restriction of
M. (Mr. Stevens) for papers, 1776
Japanese, restriction of, qu. 1289, qu. 1399
M. (Mr. Stevens) for papers, 1776
Oriental Aliens, 319. *See that title*
Poland, 2145
Policy
Criticisms, 2579
Minister's statement, 17, 2143, 2476, 2481
Physically fit, 3055-6
Printers, 3055
Problems of, 350
Qualifications, 2479
Quebec, facilities at, 1465
Racial groups, 236
Assimilation, of, 2517
Rate of, 269
Reception of the immigrant, 2151, 2157, 2160
Regulations, 249-250, 2148, 2215, 2513-14
Res. of Manitoba Liberal Convention, 2478
Restricted, 167, 2513-14, 3056
St. John immigration buildings, 2027
Scandinavian, 2144
Shandro's plan, 2153
Sifton, Sir Clifford, and, 268
Undesirable, 1389, 2154
Ukrainians, 3061
Unemployment, and, 151, 182, 225, 1071. *See also that title*
Union of Canadian municipalities resolution, 236, 2155
United States, from, 658, 2147, 2150, 2162, 2477. *See also that title*
Work, lack of, 251. *See also under this title*, Unemployment

Immigration Act
Disqualification of British-born under, 1389-91

Immigration Act Amdt. bills
1. Trial by jury, deportation, (Mr. Woodsworth) 1r., 364; 2r., 493, 864
Ref. to Special Com., 1388-94, 1502
Additions to Special Com., 1719
Special Com. reports, 1988, 2519, 3104, 3156. *See also* Criminal Code bill (Mr. Woodsworth)
Final report, 3280
M. (Mr. Woodsworth) to refer back, 3282-83
Amdt. neg. 3286
M. (Mr. Archambault) to concur
M. agreed to, 3286
(Subjects and sections discussed)

Immigration Act Amdt. bills — *Con.*
Trial by jury — *Con.*
Arrest without warrant, 1390
Assumption of powers of government, 1391
British subject, naturalization of, 1391
Decision of immigration authorities, 1389
Deportation of British subject without trial, 1390
Domicile, 1389
Enemy aliens, 1389
Foreigners, 1392
Organized Government, disbelief in, 1389
Overt acts and thoughts, 1390
Prohibited or undesirable classes, 1389
Repeal of provisions of 1919 Act, 1392
Retroactive legislation, 1391
Trial by jury, 1388
2. Intending Immigrants to make written application. (Mr. Neil) 1r., 2207

Immigration and Colonization
Department
Civil government estimates, 3499
Contingencies, 3051
Deputy Minister, qu. 2970
Estimates, 1711, 2026 2143, 3499
Representative at Canton, China, qu. 1901, qu. 2214
Salaries, etc., 754, 3502

Imperial Conference. *See also* Conferences; Prime Minister Conference
Naval defence, 1864

Imperial Convention of Teachers, grant, 1673

Imperial Council, qu. 2803

Imperial Defence. *See* National Defence bills

Imperial Forces, pensions. *See* Pensions

Imperial Mining Resources Bureau, 1237

Imperial Order of Daughters of the Empire, 2517

Implements. *See* Agricultural Implements

Imported Goods, marking of. *See* Budget; Customs; Imports

Imports and Exports. *See also* Budget; Customs; Germany; Trade
Agricultural figures, 209, 2618-19
Automobiles and parts, qu. 1633. *See also that title*
British goods, qu. 966
Via United States, qu. 375
By countries, 2109
Coal for public buildings, 1759
Duties, 2668. *See also* Customs

Imports and Exports — *Con.*
Exports
Decrease, 2579
Fiscal years, 1876-77 and 1921-22, qu. 1376
Restriction of exports, 2883
United States, to, 209. *See also* United States
1911-1922, qu. 1661
Germany, from, 2421, 2644. *See* Germany
Marking, 2113, 3476-7. *See also* Customs
Meat, of, qu. 610
Quantity, and, value of, 2182
Revenue from, qu. 827
Statement for last three years, 2109
Structural steel, qu, 1931
Valuation, 2113, 3413
For duty, amended regulation, 2854

Income Tax. 2174, 2220, 2691, 2693. *See also* Address; Budget; Taxation; Ways and Means
Administration of, 226, 2024
Aliens, non-residents, 1301
Amount collected, qu. 366
Average, by classes, 2298
Banks, payments by, 1400
Branch, appointments to, 1663
By provinces, qu. 705, qu. 1340
Civil Service retirement fund, qu. 937
Classification of taxpayers, 1063
Collections, 60
In 1919-20-21, qu. 1063
Manufacturers, from, 60
Commercial travellers, 2174, 3484. *See also* Income War Tax Act Amdt.
Comparison with systems of other countries, 2227
Exemptions, 2275
Farmers, and, 352, 2714
Great Britain, reductions in, 2860
Inequalities, 2672
Inquiry for legislation, 3103
Montreal office employees, qu. 607, 1288
Payments by grades, qu. 3362
Revenue and classification of taxpayers, 1063, qu. 1399
By provinces, qu. 705, qu. 1340
Winnipeg, qu. 1340
Riordon Paper Company, qu. 927
St. John, N.B., office, qu. 826
Systems in other countries, 2227
Widows and widowers, 2174

Income War Tax Act, 1917, Amdt. bill
Res. 3478; 1r., 3359-3360; 2r., com., 3484; 3r., 3486
Sections and subjects discussed:
Banks not entitled to deductions, 3485

Income War Tax Act, 1917, Amdt. bill — *Con.*
Sections and Subjects discussed — *Con.*
Exemptions, 3359
Children, 3484
Forms, 3486
Non-resident aliens
M. (Mr. German) 1301, agreed to, 1303
Taxation of American citizens, 3485
Travelling expenses of trainmen and commercial travellers, 3485

Indecent Assault. *See* Criminal Code

Indebtedness. *See* Budget; Finance; Loans; Public Debt

Indemnity of Members. *See* House of Commons

Index, Unrevised Edition. *See* House of Commons, Debates

Indian Act Amdt. bill (Enfranchisement of Indians; Ownership of land)
1r., 2991; 2r., com., 3191; 3r., 3194

Indian Affairs, Department of
Estimates, 1214, 1712, 3536
Salaries, etc., 681

Indians
Agents. *See also under this title,* Reserves
Oka, 1217
Sturgeon Falls, qu. 1285
Agitation and unrest, 1223
British Columbia, 1713
Lands, 330
Legal expenses, 3536
Bryce, Dr. Peter H., pamphlet, 1220, 1224
Complaints, 1223
Destitute, relief for, 1712-14
Edmonton school, proposed, 1227-9, 3536
Education, 1227, 1715, 3536
Edmonton school, 1227-9, 3536
Elkhorn school, 3537
Morley school, 1218, 3536
Red Deer school, 1229
Round Lake school, 3537
Stony reserve, qu. 965, 1218, 1227, 3536
Enfranchisement. *See* Indian Act Amdt.
Expenditure, 1216, 1225
Field and garden seeds, 1712
Food allowance, 1220
General expenses, 1226, 1712
Greater production campaign, 1216-20, 1224, 1288
Half-breed scrip frauds, 148-9. *See also* Criminal Code
Health, 1220, 1230
Hospitals and medical attention, 1218-24, 1713

Indians — *Con.*
Janse brothers, land in Ermineskins reserve, 1713
Lafferty, Dr. J. D., 1225
Manitoba, Saskatchewan, Alberta and northwest, 1218
New Brunswick, 1215
Nova Scotia, 1214
Number in Canada, 685
Ontario and Quebec, 1216
Potlach Institution, qu. 1377, 3191
Indians serving gaol sentences for, 1578, 1721
Reserves
Blackfoot, 1224
Greater production, 1288
Pasture land, qu. 2215
Blood, 1219
Land leased, qu. 2969
Devon band, proposed removal, 1215
Ermineskins, 1712
Keeseekoose-Saskatchewan, qu. 608
Oak lake and Pipestone, 1223
Oka, Indian agent, 1217
St. Peters, qu. 472
Saskatchewan, qu. 608
Six Nation, 1220-1
Stony, 1218
Education, qu. 965, 1227, 3536
Sydney
Medical attendance, qu. 2216
Proposed transfer, 1215
Tobique, illegal cutting of timber, 1233
Settlers. *See* Indian Act Amdt. bill
Smallpox and other diseases, 1714. *See also under this title,* Health
Treaty No. 11, 1219, 1227
Tuberculosis, 1714
Yukon, 1226

Industrial and Scientific Research, 1372

Industrial Conference. *See* National Industrial Conference

Industrial Depression, 6. 10, 52, 85, 105, 210, 212, 218, 219, 223, 235. *See also* Address; Budget; Trade

Industrial Disputes. *See* Labour
Investigation Act, 1054, 1058. *See also* Nova Scotia Miners

Industrial Re-establishment. *See* Labour; Returned Soldiers; Unemployment

Industrial Warfare. *See* Nova Scotia Miners

Industries. *See also* Address; Budget; Trade
Basic and secondary, 2384
Boot and shoes, cost of labour, 2350

Industries — *Con.*
Canadian, encouragement, 2658. *See also* Budget
Exhibitions of industrial products in France, 2031
Financial credit, M. (Mr. Irvine) 1289, 1396
Home, 2149, 2229. *See also* Budget
Key, 2379
Infant, encouragement, 2434
Manufacturing, 2377
Occupational diseases. *See* Labour
Protection and maintenance of, 144, 2677, 2409-11
St. Lawrence river waterway, 1318
Subsidizing, 2402
United States, branches in Canada, 2389, 2546
Woollen, cost of labour, 2350

"Industry and Humanity", reference to, 253, 534

Infant Mortality, 1380, 2634

Infectious Diseases. *See* Penitentiary Act Amdt. bill

Inglis Boiler Works, qu. 732

Inheritance Tax. *See this title under* Taxation

Inland Revenue Act Amdt. bill (Excise duties changed). Res. 3239; 1r., 2r., com., 3r., 3477
Sections and subjects discussed:
Alcohol for druggists, 3241
Beet sugar, 3246
Amdt. (Mr. Fansher) negatived, 3252
Cigars and cigarettes, 3239
Home brewing, 3141, 3142, 3252
Molasses, 3242
Raw leaf tobacco, 3241
Sugar, 3242

Inquiry for Returns. *See* House of Commons, Returns

Insect Pests. *See* Agriculture; Destructive Insect and Pest Act; Grasshoppers

Inside Service. *See* Civil Service

Inspection and Sale of Root Vegetables. *See* Root Vegetables

Insular Dominions. *See* Limitation of Armaments

Insurance
Canadian Govt. Merchant Marine, qu. 605
Canadian National railway, qu. 471, qu. 610

Insurance — *Con.*
Claims of heirs of deceased soldiers, 1349. *See also* Returned Soldiers' Insurance
Fire prevention, 794
Foreign companies, tax, 2462
Fraternal benefit societies, 3143
Mutual companies, 3477. *See also* Special War Revenue
Premiums, tax on, 2117
Returned Soldiers, 3306, 3313. *See* Pensions; Returned Soldiers Insurance bill
Beneficiaries, 3328
Returns. *See* Special War Revenue bill
Soldiers, etc., 791
The People's Insurance Act, Great Britain, 1304
Unemployment, 1069-84
Sickness, and old age, qu. 1375
Woodmen of the World, 1905

Insurance Act, 1917, Amdt. bill
1r., 1210; 2r., ref. to Banking and Commerce Com., 1464; com., 3143; 3r., 3148; Senate admts. 3607

Inter-Allied Permanent Committee on Disabled Soldiers, 3403

Intercolonial Railway. *See that title under* Canadian National Railways

Interest, 1921. *See also* Banks; Finance; Loans; Money

Interim Supply. *See also* Estimates; Supply
Committee, 378, 598
One-fourth vote suggested, 373
Position of Opposition last year, 378-385

Interim Supply Bill. *See also* Appropriation Acts
Res. 378; 598; 1r., 2r., com., 3r., 599

Interior Department
Canadian National parks, 1681
Conservation Commission employees, transfer to, 452-3
Dominion lands and parks, 1681
Estimates, 452, 1033, 1270, 1680, 3517
Forbes, Mrs. E. S., compassionate allowance, 3517
Migratory Birds, 1684
Nelson, Mr. Frank, salary, 3517
Printing and stationery, 1680
Statistics, 1366
Topographical maps, qu. 1632
Yukon territory
Administration of, 1681
Expenditure, 1275

Interlocking Directorates, 2503. *See also* Ministers and Directorships

Internal Economy Commission. *See* House of Commons

International Boundary Commission, 1033

International Customs Tariff Bureau, 1373

International Deep Sea Racing, M. (Mr. Duff) 1384, 3510

International Disarmament Conference. *See* Limitation of Armaments

International Harvester Company, 2382

International Institute of Agriculture, 969

International Joint Commission, 70. *See also* Electrification; Lake of the Woods; St. Lawrence River Waterway
Report on St. Lawrence river waterway, 136, 1185, 1191, 1193, 1197, 1199, 1206, 1315, 1396, 1469
Welland canal, 1688

International Labour Conference, qu. 824, 1060, 1070

International Operation of Railways. *See under* Canadian National Railways, Grand Trunk lines in United States

International Opium Convention, qu. 1066

International Waters. *See* Lake of the Woods; St. Lawrence

Intoxicating Liquor. *See* Canada Temperance Act; Liquor

Inverness Pier, 1766

Invoice Certificates. *See* Customs Act Amdt.

Ireland-Halifax cable, qu. 3360

Iron and Steel Industry. *See also* Steel
Structural steel importations, qu. 1931

Irrigation
Preservation of forests and, 1723
Southern Alberta, 761

Irvine, Mr. William (East Calgary)
Address in reply, 211; death of Prime Minister's brother; congratulations to Mr. Speaker, important matters contained in Speech from Throne, 211; industrial problems; social evolution, 212; complicated political system, 213; Labour party, 214; party system of government, 215; origin of parties, 216;

Irvine, Mr. William — *Con.*
Address — *Con.*
official Opposition; speeches of Prime Minister and leader of Opposition, 217; co-operation in government; production, consumption and unemployment, 218; unemployment insurance; industrial disturbance, 218; housing; gold standard and credit system; 219; protection and wages; home markets, 221; credit systems, 222; trade competition, 223; industrial problems — British labour party, 224
Agriculture and unemployment, 3058
British Empire Steel Corporation, 1082
Budget, 2495. Congratulations to Minister of Finance; taxation; public debt; chasing the financial blue-bird; colossal lie upon which budget is based; credit proposal to meet expenditures and debt; panic of national leaders, 2496; soundness of Canada's financial position; bank balances and real wealth; estimate of wealth and production, 2497; difference between production and consumption; average income of Canadian bread-winner; purchasing power, 2498; credit question at centre of national problems; Germany's industrial and financial position, wages, working hours; paper money, 2499; payment of indemnity in goods; proposed German loan; control of credit, 2500; the banking system; starting a new bank; issues of new money; issue of currency by Govt.; interest; private monopoly of social credit; indebtedness of Canada, 2501; inflation and deflation; under consumption; shut off interest taps of financiers; the Douglas system, 2502; definition of credit; ability to produce and deliver goods; a social asset; banking and interlocking directorates, 2503; regulation of prices, 2504; schemes proposed by Mr. Henry Ford and Mr. T. A. Edison, 2505; practical attempts to inaugurate credit system; island of Guernsey, 2505; St. Louis municipal currency; the gold basis; collapse of financial system; investigation of banking system, 2506; taxation of consumer; the amendment; attitude of Opposition; amendment to the amendment, 2507; attitude of Progressives; Farmers' platform; fiscal policy of Canadian Council of Agriculture; speech of leader of Progressive party; tariff proposals of Canadian Council of Agriculture, 2509; tax on unimproved land values; inheritance tax, 2510
Debate, M. for adjournment, 2448, 2451, 2455
Business profits war tax, 2024
Calgary live stock branch, qu. 607
Canadian exhibition in France, 2032
Canadian Government railways, deficits, qu. 607
Canadian National railways, public ownership, 1953
Canadian Patriotic Fund Act, 3478-84
Customs department, estimates, 769
Ex-service men, qu. 3152
Financial credit, M. 1290
Free freight outlay, qu. 704
Gold in central reserves and chartered banks, qu. 2971
Immigration-Criminal Code bills (Mr. Woodsworth) 1393, 3285
Immigration, medical inspection, 2022, 3060
Labour department
Employment specialist, 461
Statisticians, 462
Wage investigators, 463
Labour and unemployment, 3060
Loans, five year maturities, qu. 2993
Mackenzie-Mann subsidies, qu. 607
Military expenditure and policy, 1150, 1617
Ministers and directorships, 1120
Non-taxable bonds, qu. 2971
Nova Scotia miners
M. to adjourn House to discuss, 497, 539; withdrawn, 545
Quarantine. immigrant refusing vaccination, 2022
Pension Act Amdt. bill, 3456
Pensions Com., final report, 3345
Prime Ministers' Conference, naval defence, 1745
Rail and car repair contracts, 1705
Royal Canadian Mounted Police, M. (Mr. Woodsworth) 836
Shoe industry, protection, 3238
Soldiers' bonus, M. (Mr. Arthurs) 436
Soldiers' Civil Re-establishment, 1617
Tariff against France, 2032
Unemployment
Insurance, 1081
National Conference, 1082
Public works and highways, 1082
Relief, 2023
Situation, 1080
Standing committee, 1082
War, causes and effects of, 1618

Isle Perrot bridge, *See* Bridges

Italy
Genoa Conference, correspondence, 1905, 2035
Immigrants from, 2171
Trade, effect of currency valuation, 2849

Jacobs, Mr. S. W. (George Etienne Cartier)
Air Board, 1722
Animal Contagious Diseases bill, 2734
Archives branch, 703
Bankruptcy Act Amdt. bill (petition in bankruptcy) 1395
Budget, 2513. Immigration, restrictive regulations; certain classes of immigration prohibited after May 9; agriculturists; farm labourers and domestic servants, 2514; discrimination in favour of British immigrants; language qualification; attempt to secure farmers bound to fail, 2515; artisan class should be admitted; immigration of the last ten years; exodus; loss of a million people; advantages of immigration; immigration into the United States, 2516; resolution of Montreal Board of Trade; curious notions in regard to immigration; Imperial Order of Daughters of the Empire; assimilation of races; foreign-born and crime, 2517; Miss Macphail's objection to sheepskin coats; foreigners engaged in textile and other trades; government by Order in Council, 2518
Canada Temperance Act Amdt. bill, amdt., 3000, neg. 3006
Canadian Govt. Merchant Marine, 3104
Census
Cost, 1363
Enumerators, appointment of, 1368
Chamberlin, Mr. R. G., grant to, 3498
Cigars and cigarettes, tax, 3240
Criminal Code Amdt. bill, (Mr. Jacobs) 1395
Criminal Code revision, 1717
Dominion Chain Company, Limited, 3490
Enfranchisement of foreign-born women, M. (Mr. Euler) 477
"Foreigners and crime" propaganda, 1392, 2517
Grecian and Roumanian loans, qu. 1400
Immigration, 2513-2517
Department of, 3500
Deputy Minister, Mr. W. J. Black, qu. 2970, 3500
Dutch, 2144

Jacobs, Mr. S. W. — *Con.*
Immigration — *Con.*
Lord Kitchener's death, foreigners and, 2155
Meals for immigrants, 2971
Immigration Act Amdt. bill, (Mr. Woodsworth) 1391, 1392
Insurance premiums, taxation, 3254-5
Linen yarn bounty, 1362
Lusitania reparation claims, qu. 3599
Oleomargarine Act Amdt. bill, 3425
Palestine, mandate over, 1716
Redistribution and the census, 1365
Saskatchewan liquor export, 3000
Steamship subsidies, qu, 614
Supreme Court Act Amdt. bill, 2974

Jamieson, Mr. J. A., claim of, 1687

Japan
Army reduction, 1610
Coal, importation from, 2406. *See also* Coal
Immigration from. *See* Oriental Aliens
Lemieux agreement, 1459
Rights and disabilities of Canadians in, qu. 1289, 1511, 2208
Treaty with, 1510. *See also,* Limitation of Armaments

Jasper Park, Edith Cavell road, 1051

Jelliff, Mr. L. H. (Lethbridge)
Air force and civil aviation, High River, 1734
Customs tariff, woollen clothing, 3235
Irrigation, Southern Alberta, 761
Lighthouses and lightkeepers, 1497
Live stock, loss through wolves, 990, 1001
Rotary rod weeders, duty on, 3121
Sales tax, 3272
Soldiers' civil re-establishment, salary increases, 406

Job Printing. *See* Special War Revenue, Sales Tax

Joggins, breakwater, 1767

Johnson, Mr. R. M. (Moosejaw)
Address in reply, 112. Congratulations to Mr. Speaker; position of Progressive party, 112; agricultural conditions, 113; marketing of grain, 114; tariff; natural resources of western provinces; public ownership of railways, 116
Agriculture, retirement of Dr. Saunders, 590, 3522
Animal Contagious Diseases Act Amdt. bill, 2103, 2737

Johnson, Mr. R. M. — *Con.*
Canada Grain Act
Constitutionality of, 2837
Overages, 2838
Canada Temperance Act Amdt. bill, 3009
Canadian National railways. Bengough extension, 2770
Canadian Wheat Board, qu. 472, 2951. *See also under this title,* Wheat Board bill
Advance to, 3541
Customs, dumping clause, 3419
Dominion Elections Act Amdt. bill, 2810
Dominion lands, cancellation of leases bill, 3469
Fishing schooner race, 3510
Freight rates, Quebec and, 1472
Goderich harbour, grain shipment through, 2002
Government publications, 1374
Grain companies, default of, 2837
Judges' Act Amdt. bill, 427
Justice dept, estimates, 1668
Labour dept.
Temporary clerks, 567
Wage investigators, 462-3
Lignite Utilization Board, 3526
National Defence bill, 2808
Portable and traction engines, 3231
Public buildings
Heating, 1759
Western provinces, discrimination against, 1254
Quebec harbour advances, 1471
St. Lawrence river waterway, 2762
Saunders, Dr. C. E., gratuity, 590, 3522
Soldiers' civil re-establishment, Fort Qu'Appelle sanitarium, 1345
Threshing machines, 3124-25
Welland ship canal, grain transportation, 2762
Wheat Board bill, 3177, 3180, 3182, 3188, 3384
Amdt. 3178

Johnston, Mr. J. Fred (Last Mountain)
Accredited herds, diseases, 968
Air force and civil aviation, 1724
Bacon, production and marketing, 1025
Budget, 2220. Congratulations to Finance Minister; reciprocity; financial situation, 2220; revenue and expenditure; debt; war obligations; profiteering; failure to tax wealth; tariff reductions; sales tax, 2221; income tax; immigration; increased production, 2222; markets; trade with United States; Wheat Board; amendment, 2223; failure of Government to propose progressive policy, 2224

Johnston, Mr. J. Fred — *Con.*
Canadian Govt. Merchant Marine, qu. 469
Cultivators, etc., duty on, 3120
Customs Act, valuation, 3415
Dominion lands, sale of, qu. 376
Hudson bay railway, 1970
Immigration
Deputy Minister, 757
Officials, 760
Implement parts, duty, 3120
Lighthouses and lightkeepers, 1497
Militia and Defence, pay of staff, 1982
Ministers and Directorships, 1120
Ottawa public buildings, 1252
Ploughs, etc., duty on, 3121
M. to reduce, 3121
Printing Bureau, plant and publications, 1971
Privilege, Progressives and delay in budget debate, 2692
Redistribution and the census, 1370
Rural and urban population, qu. 376
War memorials, 2101

Joint Industrial Councils. *See* Labour

Jones, Mr. George B. (Royal)
Canadian National railways, coal importations, qu. 2213
Grand Anse, C.B., mail service, qu. 938
Le Blanc, Dr. B. A., Arichat, qu. 1773
St. John terminal facilities, 848

Judges. *See also* Bankruptcy Act Amdt.; Exchequer Court; Justice; Supreme Court
Adamson, Mr. Justice, appointment of, 1670
Admiralty, local judge in, 1274
Gravelbourg, Sask., appointment at, 3496
Judges Act, Ministers and Directorships, 1088
Nova Scotia Supreme Court vacancy, 3436
Political commissions, on, 2397
Provincial commissions, on, qu. 366
Latchford, Hon. Mr. Justice, qu. 3600
Riddell, Hon. Mr. Justice, qu. 3600
Salaries, 2512, 3496
Yukon territory, 1275

Judges Act Amdt. bill (Saskatchewan Court of Appeal
Res. 424; 1r., 429; 2r., com., 546; 3r., 547
Senate amdts., 2830

Judicial Districts. *See* Bankruptcy Act Amdt. bill

Justice
Administration of
Exchequer Court, 1274

Justice — *Con.*
Administration of — *Con.*
Litigated matters, 1276
Pecuniary Claims, 1276
Penitentiaries, 1276
Supreme Court, 1274
Yukon territory, 1275
Civil Government, 1668
Estimates, 1274, 1668, 3495
Minister of, directorships and, 242-3. *See also* Ministers and Directorships
Pecuniary claims convention with United States, 1276
Prisons and penitentiaries, inspection of by Grand Juries, 1279
Salaries and contingencies, 451
Trial of Indian murderer, Lebeaux, expenses, 1669

Juvenile Delinquents
Prison farms for, qu. 1773
Special schools for, qu. 469
16, 17, and 18 years old, qu. 1773

Kamloops
Model city, 318
Post office building, 1255

Kamloops-Kelowna Railway. *See* Canadian National Railways

Kamouraska, vacancy, 1459

Kay, Mr. W. Fred (Missisquoi)
Agricultural implements
Standardization of parts, 2406
Appearance of Senator McCoig before Com. on Agriculture, 2406
Agriculture and Colonization Com. reports
McCoig, Senator, attendance of, 1900
M. for concurrence in fifth report, 2915
Wheat Board, 657, 703, 726, 776, 865, 1929
Baker, the late Col. G. H., M.P., memorial to, 2101
Daylight saving, M., 942-3
Privilege, Wheat Board, 872
Reference to, 1282

Kelley, Mr. Howard G., qu. 729

Kellner, Mr. Donald F. (East Edmonton)
Air force and civil aviation, 1723
Animal contagious diseases, compensation, 2806
Budget, 2280. Congratulations to Minister of Finance, 2280; attitude of Progressives to old parties; little change in policy indicated by budget proposals; new taxes; principle of taxation; depression throughout the country, 2281; position

Kellner, Mr. Donald F. — *Con.*
Budget — *Con.*
of the farmer; workingman and business man; labour and capital; public debt; credit system, 2282
Canteen funds, undistributed, qu. 2215
Criminal Code Amdt. (Scrip frauds) 3216
Immigration regulations, compliance with, qu. 2215
Soldier land settlement, 2141
Soldiers' pay, exchange on, qu. 826
Winnipegosis wharf, 3545

Kemp, Sir Edward, ammunition shipment from Great Britain, 1169

Kennedy, Mr. Donald M. (West Edmonton)
Address in reply, 142. Constituency of West Edmonton, 141-142; conditions in western Canada; tariff question, 143; protection of industries, 144; immigration, 145; Wheat Board; freight rates on grain; Crowsnest pass agreement, 146; soldier settlers, 147; railways, western provinces, natural resources, 147-8; half-breed scrip, 148
Air force and civil aviation, 1724
Banks, income and note circulation taxes, qu. 1400
Criminal Code Amdt. bill (Scrip frauds) 1062, 1395, 3213, 3220
Calhoun, Mr., telegram from, 3601
Dominion Iron and Steel Company, contract for steel plates, 1680
Edmonton bridge, 2007
Harbours and rivers, Alberta and Saskatchewan, 2005
Indians, 1232
Nova Scotia miners, M. (Mr. Irvine) 499
Prince Rupert Drydock Co. claim, 3515
Public buildings, furniture, etc., 1758
Public Works dept., average salary, 749
Rural mail contracts, subletting, 2801
Steamship subsidies, fair wage clause, 3506
Steel industry, 769

Kennedy, Mr. J. Wilfred (Glengarry and Stormont)
Animal Contagious Diseases Act Amdt. bill, 2737
Canada Temperance Act Amdt. bill, 3005
Liquor, export of, 3005
Canadian Government Merchant Marine, wheat carriage, 3039
Customs
Drawbacks, 769
Officials, 765
Valuations, 3416

Kennedy, Mr. J. Wilfred — *Con.*
Dairy Grading Act, 652
Director of Commercial Intelligence, 700
Immigration figures, 758
Oleomargarine Act Amdt. bill, 3425
Railway finances, qu. 471
Sugar beet industry, 3245

Kennedy, Hon. William C. (Minister of Railways and Canals)
Canadian Govt. Merchant Marine, loan to, 3035
Canadian National railways
Annual statement, 873
Branch lines, Bengough extension, 2771
Canadian Northern, advance to, 1905
Consolidation, 1963
Deficits, 875-86
Corrected statement, 1919
Directors, 2791
Appointment of new board, 2772, 2794
Representative of employees, 2794
Freight, careless handling of, 1965
Grand Trunk Pacific
Advances to, 3520
Branch lines, 3520
Intercolonial, employees' provident fund, 2769
Kamloops-Kelowna railway, 1135
New board of directors, appointment, 2772, 2794
Rolling stock, repairs, 1212
St. John and Quebec railway, 1295
Toronto Globe editorial, 1134
Transcontinental, allowance to enlisted men, 3518
Canadian Transit Co. bill, 1772
Canals. *See also under this title,* St. Lawrence
Rideau, 2769
Soulanges, 2768
Trent, 2764
Welland, 2747
Construction, 1687
Port Colborne elevator, Jameson claim, 1687
Crowsnest Pass Agreement. *See under this title,* Freight Rates
Electrification of railways, M. (Mr. Deslauriers) 638
Freight Rates, M. for Special Com., 1213, 1402-3, 1502
Gaspe railways, 627
Governor General's cars, 1688
Hudson Bay railway, completion of, 1970, 2798
Ottawa-Kingston highway, 2794
Rail and car repair contracts, 1689

Kennedy, Hon. William C. — *Con.*
Railway Commission
Carvell, Hon. F. B., alleged statement at Calgary, 2775
Motherwell, Hon. Mr., alleged statement, 2774
Representation of labour, 2776
Railway estimates, 407-8, 1133, 1905, 1933, 2747
St. John valley railway, 3039
St. Lawrence river waterway, surveys, 2768
St. Lawrence ship canal, 2768
Shipbuilding, cost of, 3508

Key Industries Act, 2424

Kindersley, post office building, 1254

King, Hon. J. H. (Minister of Public Works)
Big Bay point, sunken vessel, removal of, 2006
British Columbia govt., reply to criticism of, 2237
Courtenay Bay, 2014
Customs dumping clause, 3418
Introduction, 496
National gallery, 2011
Oriental aliens, M. (Mr. McQuarrie) for exclusion, 1547
Public buildings
Appropriations and expenditures, 1921-22, 1259
Calgary, 1254
Coal for, 1758
Edmundston, 1240
Flags, 1264
Furniture purchases, 1757
Galt, 1247
Generally, expenditure, 1260
Halifax expenditures, 1244
Hamilton, 1246-51, 1258
Heating, 1758
Kamloops, 1255
Maritime provinces, 1243
Montagu, P.E.I., 1264
Ontario, 1245
Ottawa, 1252
Dominion observatory, Geodetic survey, 1266
Elevator attendants, 1266
Lighting, 1267
New departmental, architects' designs, 3541
Water, 1266
Parliament buildings, 2014
Architects' fees, 2014-16
Furniture, purchase of, 1757
Tower, 2016
Quebec, 1245

King, Hon. J. H. — *Con.*
Public Buildings — *Con.*
Rentals, 1259
Rideau hall, fuel and light, 1756
St. Catherines, 1258
St. John quarantine station, 1240-1
St. George public building, 1240
Saskatoon, 1253
Swift Current, 1253
Toronto, 1246-7
Victoria, 1255
Weston, 1260
Public Works
Dredging, 2005
St. Marys river, 2006
Drydocks,
Esquimalt, 3541-2
Vancouver, 1255, 2005, 2010
Harbours and rivers, 1988
British Columbia, 2005
Icelandic river improvements, 2004
Manitoba, 2004
New Brunswick, 1991
Provincial wharves, 1992
St. John, 2014
Nova Scotia, 1765
Expenditure, 1269
Inverness pier, 1760
Joggins breakwater, 1767
Ontario, 1999
Goderich, 2000
Prince Edward Island, 1270
Quebec, 1998
Saskatchewan and Alberta, 2005
Selkirk, wharf, 2004
Shuswap lake wharf, 3547
Winnepegosis wharf, 3545
Public Works dept.
Employees transferred, 696
Estimates, 692, 747, 749, 1238, 1270, 1755, 1988, 3541
River guaging and metering, 2011
Roads and bridges, 2007
Edmonton, bridge, 2007
St. John, N.B.
Harbour improvement, 2014
Terminal facilities, 849-50, 851
Telegraphs and telephones, 2012
Humbolt-Fort Pitt telegraph line, 2007
Yukon radio-telegraph service, 1750

King, Mr. J. W. (North Huron)
Budget, 2301. Congratulations to Minister of Finance; Progressives from Ontario; fiscal policy; small percentage of land under cultivation; drift towards the cities; infant industries; reciprocity with the United States; tariff proposals, 2302; friendly relations between Canada and United States, 2303
Grand Trunk railway, employees pension rights and status, 2041

King, Mr. J. W. — *Con.*
Budget — *Con.*

King, Right Hon. W. L. Mackenzie (Prime Minister; Secretary of State for External Affairs; President of the Privy Council
Acoustics of the Chamber, 3613
Address in reply, 38. Congratulations to Mr. Speaker, mover and seconder, 38; welcome to Lord Byng; late Mr. Peter McGibbon; Miss Macphail, 39; remarks of the leader of the Opposition; followers of Mr. Meighen in present Parliament, 40; campaign literature and election results, 40-41; natural resources of western provinces, 41; treaties; Imperial Conference, Limitation of Armaments, 42; customs tariff revision, 43-44; position at Liberal Convention, 44; railway situation; government ownership, 45-46; marketing of wheat, 46-47; railway freight rates; party formation and names, 47; negotiations with Progressive party, 48; Liberal administration, 48-49; Mr. Stewart (Argenteuil) and Mr. Motherwell, 49
Ammunition, artillery, shipment from Britain, 1154, 1156, 1163, 1165, 1172
Annual drill, 1155, 1165
Demobilization expenditure for, 1155-65
Annuities, 776
Armorial bearings of Canada, Welsh emblem, 3601
Assiniboine river floods, 1842
Auditor General's report, 424
Australia, reciprocity with, 9, 2803
Banff-Windermere road, 1681
Bankruptcy Act Amdt. bill, (Mr. Ethier) 1662
Bankruptcy Act Amdt. bill (Mr. Jacobs) 1395
Board of Commerce, 1715
Borden, Right Hon. Sir Robert
International disarmament conference, papers, 1283. *See also under this title,* Limitation of Armaments
British Columbia house, London, purchase, 3537
Budget, 2537. Conflicting amendments evidence of wisdom of budget proposals, 2537; taxation, re-adjustment of; speeches of Progressive and Op-

King, Right Hon. W. L. Mackenzie — *Con.*
Budget — *Con.*
position leaders; extreme points of view; amendment to amendment; a protectionist budget; repeal of protectionist legislation; reduction of duties; effort to carry out Liberal policy; protection versus free trade not the issue, 2538; tariff revision; amendment; no constructive suggestions; Sir Henry Drayton's tariff proposals of 1920, 2539; platform of National Liberal Conservative party; trade with the mother country; disregard of political honour; promised revision of tariff, 2540; pledges of Liberal party; Liberal Convention of 1919; chart, 2541; statement of policy last session; budget consistent with campaign utterances; no deception of electorate, 2542; Mr. Meighen's London speech; Liberal handbook, 2543; tariff revision on basis of revenue; duties on instruments of production and necessaries of life; pledges fulfilled; tribute to Finance Minister; stability and confidence, 2544
Business of the House
Budget debate, conclusion of, 2639
Customary procedure, 7
Debates on naval service estimates, 1899
Easter adjournment, 546, 821, 823
Eleven o'clock adjournment, 2033
Empire and Ascension days, adjournments, 1769, 1905
Estimates, 569, 2167, 3527
Govt. orders on Monday and Wednesday, 1460
Legislation to be introduced, 2996, 3041, 3102, 3103, 3365
Mines and Minerals Com., 1398
Mondays and Wednesdays, 49, 1719, 2169
Order of, 374
Private members', 1719
Prorogation, 3365
Questions standing as orders for returns, 1660
Quotations from anonymous letter, 1480
Saturday sittings, 2033, 2458
Wednesday sittings, 49
Evening, 2169
Canada Grain Act, Manitoba Court of Appeal decision, 1770
Canada Temperance Act Amdt. bill, Senate amdts. 3613-4
Canadian Expeditionary Force, repatriation of dependents, 1711

King, Right Hon. W. L. Mackenzie — *Con.*
Canadian Govt. Merchant Marine, 3104
Coal importations, from Japan, 2406
Canadian National Institute for the Blind, 3540
Canadian National parks, 1681
Canadian National railways
Amalgamation of system, 2585
Co-ordination, 73
Directors, sympathy with public ownership, 2858
Canadian offices in England, co-ordination, 414
Canadian representation in the United States, 1384
Canadian Wheat Board bill. *See under this title,* Wheat Board
Cattle embargo, alleged statement of High Commissioner, 1463
Chamberlin, Mr. R. G., claim of, 3498
Chief Electoral Officer, report, 871
Civil Service
Appointments, 573-4
Bonus, 733, 1258
Appropriation, 3528-36
Inquiry as to payment, 2996
Economy, 424
Salaries, 552
$960 and less, 1660
Civil Service Commission, salaries, 3509
Coal
Importation from Japan, 2406
Mined by Orientals, 2407
Con Rein sinking, 1384
Contingencies, vote for, 415
Criminal Code Amdt. (Half-breed scrip) 3220
Criminal Code Amdt. (Mr. Woodsworth) 865, 1719
Criminal Code and statutes, reprinting, 1717
Crowsnest pass agreement. *See also under this title,* Freight Rates
Telegram from Minister of Agriculture to Calgary Board of Trade, 2358
Dauphinee, Mr. Charles, dismissal of, 2458
Death of brother, Dr. MacDougall King, 211, 224, 230, 276
Debates, Official Report, insertion of documents not read, 1540
Debeau, Mr. Robert, claim of, 2306
Deputy Speaker, election, 363
Doherty, Hon. Manning, visit to England, 1334
Dominion Elections Act Amdt. bill, 2814
Dominion Lands, cancellation of leases bills, Senate amdts., 3614
Editorial Committee, 1236

King, Right Hon. W. L. Mackenzie — *Con.*
Enfranchisement of foreign-born women, M. (Mr. Euler) 487
Esquimalt dry dock, 597
Estimates, classification of, 569, 2167, 3527
External Affairs
Salaries, 412, 3509
Secretaries, 411
Fielding, Hon. Mr., congratulations to, 3279
Financial credit, M. (Mr. Irvine) 1293
Freight Rates (Crowsnest pass agreement)
Special Com., ref to
M. (Mr. Kennedy), Essex) 1213, 1432-8, 1453-4
Railway Act Amdt. bill, 3588
Reports, 3546, 3560
"General" Macdonald's army, 2256
Genoa Conference, 582, 823, 1715
Cannes documents tabled, 865
Correspondence tabled, 865
With Italy, 2035
Reported subscription to consortium, 1463
Grand Trunk Arbitration
British newspaper article, 374, 822
Grand Trunk railway, pension rights and status of employees
M. (Mr. Boys) 863, 1382, 2041, 3437
High Commissioner
Alleged statement re cattle embargo, 1463, 1502
Office of, 414
House of Commons. *See also under this title,* Business of the House
Organization, amendment of, 1335
Sittings suspended, 3611-14
Staff, 3221
Immigration
Chinese, 3437
Investigation of conditions in Europe, 1711
Oriental. *See under this title,* Oriental Aliens
Immigration Act Amdt. bill (Mr. Woodsworth) 864, 1388, 1394, 1719
Imperial Convention of Teachers, 1673
Indians
Estimates, 1712
Potlach institution, 1578
Number serving gaol sentences, 1721
Interim Supply bill, 379
Interior dept., printing and stationery, 1680
International Disarmament. *See under this title,* Limitation of Armaments
International Labour conference, 3437, 3490
Report and printing of, 3601
Japan
Lemieux agreement, 1459
Rights of Canadians in, 1289, 2208

King, Right Hon. W. L. Mackenzie — *Con.*
Labour dept. estimates, 564, 569, 577
Lake Huron marine allowance, 1930
Lake of the Woods repeal bill, 3206, 3211, 3435
League of Nations
Permanent secretariat
Canada's contribution, 2990
Expenses, 3173
Protocols of proposed amdt. to covenant, 2583, 2692, 3171
Limitation of Armaments, 786
Papers, 1283
Report tabled and ordered printed, 596
Res., 3157
Treaty tabled, 9
Liquor importation, 733. *See also under this title,* Canada Temperance Act
Military Service Act Amdt. bill, 639
Ministers and directorships, 1098
Ministers' secretaries, 413
Munitions, shipment from Britain, 1154-65-72
National Defence bill, 547, 662, 680
Natural resources transfer to western provinces, 1017
M. (Mr. Meighen) for correspondence 1509
Provincial governments, correspondence with, tabled, 1769
Naturalization Act, 2024
Naval defence, 1873-1899
Naval service
Gift of ships to Canada, 2051
Royal Canadian navy, 1873-1899
Newmarket, speech at, 35
Norris, Premier, statement on freight rates and natural resources, 1213
Nova Scotia miners, M. (Mr. Irvine) 536, 597
Occupational diseases, M. (Mr. Deslauriers) 1381
Oleomargarine Act Amdt. bill, 3427-35
Oleomargarine, M. (Mr. Neill), time for discussion, 1719
Oriental aliens, 872, 967, 3104
Immigration
Chinese, restriction of
M. (Mr. Stevens) for papers, 1776
M. (Mr. McQuarrie) for exclusion of, 1554, 1573-6
Japanese, restriction of
M. (Mr. Stevens) for papers, 1776
Parliament, fall session, 3608
Pensions, Insurance, etc.
Special Com., appointed, 496-7
Widowed mothers, M. (Mr. Power) 1308
Preston, Mr. W. T. R., rent of house in London, 3504

King, Right Hon. W. L. Mackenzie — *Con.*
Prime Ministers' Conference, 5
Correspondence, 1068
Naval defence, reported statement of Lord Lee, 1742
Opportunity for discussion of, 2042
Proceedings tabled, 8
Prime Ministers' secretaries, 411
Privy Council
Estimates, 410
Private secretaries, 410
Proportional representation, M. (Mr. Good) 1655
Public buildings appropriations, 1259
Purchasing Commission, 2025
Quebec fisheries, 8
Railway Act Amdt. bill, 3588
Railway Commission, Hon. Mr. Motherwell, 2774, 3491
Redistribution, 733
Bill to be introduced next session, 3608
Meeting of defeated candidates in Alberta, 2858
M. (Mr. Shaw), opportunity for discussion, 1719, 1769
References to, (Sir Henry Drayton, "jilting Quebec") 206, 1365, 1754, 2969. *See also* Address; Budget
Regional Bureau of the International Catalogue of Scientific literature, 3528
Returned soldiers. *See also under this title,* Pensions; Soldiers
Announcement of Govt.'s policy, 2637
Unemployment of, 2458. *See also under this title,* Unemployment
Returns, inquiry for, 1283
Royal Canadian Mounted Police
Industrial disputes, and, 666
M. (Mr. Woodsworth), 834
Macleod detachment, reported removal of, 2585
Russian relief, 3516
St. Lawrence river waterway
Co-operation with United States, 2760
Correspondence with United States Govt., 2357, 2583, 2760, 2767
Tabled, 2256
International Joint Commission, report, 2357
Treaty with United States Govt., 2207, 2760
Save the Children Fund, 3516
Soldiers' bonus, 396
M. (Mr. Arthurs) 431, 437
Speaker, Mr.
Bereavement of, 496
Congratulations to, 3489
Election of, 1

King, Right Hon. W. L. Mackenzie — *Con.*
Steamship services, 2027
Tariff commissioner, appointment of, 1666
Tourist traffic, 1682
Treaties of Peace with Hungary and Turkey, 3490, 3547
Unemployment. *See also under this title,* Returned Soldiers
Banff-Windermere highway, 1682
Federal, provincial and municipal obligations, 1073-9
Insurance, 1073
Relief, 1719
Returned soldiers, 2458
Situation, 1073-9
Unemployment Service Council, recommendations, 2803
Vancouver dry dock, 3544
War memorials, 2099
Washington conference papers, 1283. *See also under this title,* Limitation of Armaments
Wheat Board, 378, 783, 2921, 3179
Concurrence in report of Special Com., delay, 2306
Constitutionality of, opinion of Law Officers, 940
Wheat Board bill, 3190, 3383
Wrangel island, 1751
Russian claim to, 2208
Yukon territory, administration of, 1681

King-Crerar Alliance, negotiations, 48, 206. *See also* references in Address

King v. Manitoba Grain Company, decision. *See* Canada Grain Act

Kingston
Election petition, 2692
Penitentiary. *See* Penitentiaries

Klim, competition with milk, 981

Knives, German production of. *See* Budget; Customs Act; Currency; Guthrie; Stevens

Knox, Mr. Andrew (Prince Albert)
Canadian Patriotic Fund bill, 3484
Coal royalties, qu. 375
Customs tariff, ploughs 3230
Easter adjournment, 546
Experimental farms, 800
Hudson bay railway, 2750, 2779
Mines dept., field work, 690
Natural resources of western provinces, 457-8
Northwest rebellion, pensions for Mounted Police, 3523

Knox, Mr. Andrew — *Con.*
Port Nelson, examination of masters and mates, 1491
Rideau canal, 2769
Riordan Company, taxation, qu., 372
Royal Canadian Mounted Police pensions
Inadequate, 2131
Northwest rebellion, 3523
St. Lawrence ship channel, 1495
Welland ship canal, 2750

Kodaks, prices in Canada and United States, 2547, 2624

Kootenay, Burlington channel bridge, 2007

Kyte, Mr. George W. (Cape Breton South and Richmond)
American magazines, 3109
Budget, 2358. Congratulations to Finance Minister; testimony of opposition to wisdom of Minister's proposals, 2358; tariff an issue no longer, burden of taxation; revenue tariff; sales tax; the workingman; cost of living; articles which do not pay the tax; interpretation of customs law; fishermen's rope; lumber; technical ruling of officials; agricultural implements, 2360; revenue tariff; England's tariff policy; protective duty counterbalanced by excise tax; origin of protective tariff in United States, 2361; manufacturers and war profits; propaganda of Canadian manufacturers; alleged reconstruction committee, 2362; election campaigns of 1896 and 1911; reciprocity with United States; increase of population under Liberal and Conservative rule; immigration, 2363
Migratory birds, 1685
Militia, civil pensions, 3499
Paired members inadvertently voting, 1462
Rail and car contracts, 1693, 1694
Unemployment at Sydney, rail orders in advance, 1691

Labour. *See also* Civil Service; Housing; Immigration; Industrial Disputes; Oriental Aliens; Returned Soldiers; Shipbuilding; Unemployment
Administration, 1058
British labour party, 224
Bureaux, 3314
Canadian Government Merchant Marine
Wages, qu. 3598
Canadian National railways
Representation on Board of directors. *See* Canadian National Railways, Directors

Labour — *Con.*
Canadian Pacific, conditions on, 2315
Capital and, 2117, 2191, 2250, 2282. *See also* Speeches on Budget
Coal. *See also* N. S. Miners
Canmore and Drumheller, miners' dispute, 1058
Competition with foreigners, 2154, 2435
Orientals, with, 317, 345. *See also* Oriental Aliens
Conciliation and Labour Act, 1053
Conditions, 2350
Cost of living, 1175, 1303, 2331. *See also that title*
Costs, 2317, 2349-50
Cotton industry, wages, hours, etc., qu. 1903
Lower, 2436
Department
Annuities branch, 776
Bertrand, Mr. T., qu. 937
Classification, 494
Director of Technical Education, 578
Estimates, 1053, 1719, 1970
Officials and economy, 464-5
Printing bureau, 1970
Salaries and contingencies, 458, 493, 548
M. (Mr. Stevens) to reduce item, 562, 579, agreed to, 581
Statistical branch, 1366
Technical education, 459, 460, 578
Temporary clerks, 548
Wage investigators, 462
Departments employing organized and unorganized labour, qu. 2303
Distribution of, 2149
District No. 18, board, 1058
Economic injustice to, 2323
Eight-hour day, 184, 2311. *See also* Daylight Saving
Employment Offices Co-ordination Act, 1058
Espionage, 670-9
Exodus of workmen, 2469
Fair wage clause, 1469, 1486, 3506
Farms, on, 79, 87, 251, 337, 1153. *See also* Address; Budget; Immigration
Genoa Conference. *See that title*
Germany, conditions in, 2411. *See also* Germany
Hours, 2317. *See also under this title,* Eight Hour Day
Housing, 219. *See also that title*
Immigration of farm workers and domestics, 2480, 3053-4. *See also* Immigration
Industrial centres, 236
Industrial Disputes Investigation Act, 1054, 1058

Labour — *Con.*
Industrial disputes, Mounted Police and, 667, 679. *See also* Royal Canadian Mounted Police
M. (Mr. Woodsworth)
International Labour Conference, qu. 824, 1060, 1070, 3437, 3490
Report, printing of, 3601
Joint industrial councils, 1060
Labour Gazette, 1053, 1057
Leaders, 2118
McAdoo award, 1707
Mounted Police and, 670. *See* Royal Canadian Mounted Police, M. (Mr. Woodsworth): National Defence bill
Nova Scotia miners. *See that title*
Occupational diseases, protection against M. (Mr. Deslauriers) 829, 1378, withdrawn, 1382
O'Dell, Mr., on cost of labour in boot and shoe industry, 2350
Old age pensions, 1303. *See also that title*
Organized, 2321, 2324
Oriental, 2330. *See also* Oriental Aliens
Party, composition of, 214
Public ownership and, 130
Quebec harbour commission, wages of employees, 1465, 1469, 1486
Railway, 2315
Canadian National, 2315
Representation on board of directors. *See* Canadian National Railways, Directors
Canadian Pacific, 2315
Costs, 2317
Wages, 357, 1707, 2315, 2417. *See also* Crowsnest Pass Agreement
Railway Commission, representation on, 2776
Skilled, protection of, 2379
Specialization of, 2149
Strike-on-the-job, 1054
Strikes, 2320, 2322
District No. 18, miners' strike, 1058
Nova Scotia miners. *See also that title*
Gillen board, 1054
Railway employees, 2324
Winnipeg, 841, 1068
Cost of trials, qu. 1182
Literature, 837
Trades Union Conference, Rome, 1060
Unemployment. *See also that title*
Agriculture and, 2158, 2331
Calgary Trades and Labour Council, 1082
Rail and car repair contracts, 1688
Relief, 1719, 1970, 2022, 3526
Situation, 1069
Steel workers, Sydney, 1076
Trades and Labour Congress, and, 1081

Labour — *Con.*
Unions, 228, 2295, 2317-8, 3059
International, 2317
Unorganized, 2628
Unrest, 14, 17, 90. *See also* Address; Budget
Wages
Average income, 2498
Canadian Government Merchant Marine, qu. 3598
Fair wage clause, 1469, 1486, 3506
Germany, in, 2407
Investigators, 462
Protection, and, 2298
Quebec Harbour Commission, employees, 1465, 1469, 1486
Railway, 357, 1707, 2315, 2417
Shops, 1707
Real and nominal, 2435

Labour Gazette, 1053-7
Cotton industries, wages and hours, qu. 1903

Labrador Boundary, qu. 704, 2572

Lachenaie, Que., mail service, qu. 2805

Ladner, Mr. L. J. (Vancouver South)
Address in reply, 321, 326; four parties in politics, 321; Liberal party in British Columbia; Hon. John Oliver, 322; national railway, 326; returned soldier problems, 327; natural resources of prairie provinces, 328; British Columbia claims, 329
Belgium, trade with, 3223
British Columbia house, London, purchase of, 3538
British Preference and Canadian seaports, M. (Mr. Logan) 720
Budget, 2276. Tribute to Minister of Finance; Budget of sixteen years ago; promises and policy of Liberal party, 2277; the amendment; tariff changes; British Columbia industries and protection, 2298; danger of Japanese competition; results of protective policy; weakness of budget; trade with Germany, 2279; sales tax; dumping clause and fruit industry, 2280
Canada Temperance Act Amdt. bill, 3608
Canneries, inspection of, 3048
Crowsnest pass agreement, M. (Mr. Kennedy, Essex) 1448
Fisheries Act Amdt. bill, 2818
Indian Act Amdt. bill, 3191
Labour estimates, increase, 495
Oleomargarine
Further legislation, inquiry, 3041
Importation, 654

Ladner, Mr. L. J. — *Con.*
Oleomargarine — *Con.*
Manufacture and importation of, 1797
Regulations under Act, qu. 1902
Opium and Narcotic Drug Act Amdt. bill, 2824, 3014
Appeal, 3023
Penalty, whipping, amdt., 3015, 3020
Oriental Aliens, M. (Mr. McQuarrie) for exclusion, 1528
Pension Act Amdt. bill, 3444-56
Pensions Com., final report, 3339
Potlach Indian institution, qu. 1377, 3191
Proportional representation, M. (Mr. Good) 1650
Vancouver dry dock, 1255, 1484, 2010
Vancouver Harbour Commission bill, 2822

Lafferty, Dr. J. D., 1225

Laflamme, Mr. J. N. K. (Drummond-Arthabaska)
Budget, 2895. World war and its consequences; motion and amendment; opposition arguments; Liberal platform of 1919; pledges and promises, 2896; Agrarian party; amendment to the amendment; standard of public life; currency valuation; dumping clause; marking of goods, 2897; insufficient reasons given for vote to defeat Government, 2898
Canadian National railways, public ownership, 1944
Military Service Act Amdt. bill, 643
Oriental aliens, M. (Mr. McQuarrie) for exclusion, 1566

Lafortune, Mr. D. A. (Jacques-Cartier)
Daylight saving, M. (Mr. Kay) 959

Lake Marine. *See* Canadian Govt. Merchant Marine; Grain; St. Lawrence river Waterway

Lake of the Woods
Control board, 2025
Joint board, 2805, qu. 2970

Lake of the Woods Regulation Act, 1921, Repeal bill
1r., 2991; 2r., com., 3199; 3r., 3435

Lambton, steamer, wreck of, 1497, 3365, 3507

Lamontagne, Mr. Ernest, qu. 824

Lanctôt, Mr. Roch (Laprairie-Napierville)
Annual drill, 1154
Budget, 2567. Beer tax; war and taxation; tax free bonds, 2567; commercial patriotism; national railways, 2568;

Lanctôt, Mr. Roch — *Con.*
Budget — *Con.*
responsibility for overbuilding of railways; proposal to sell system to Canadian Pacific; freight rates, 2569; public ownership will lead to ruin; war and conscription, 2570; preparation for war; naval service; militarism; cattle embargo; public debt, 2571; parliamentary counsel; Hon. C. J. Doherty, reported engagement in Labrador - Newfoundland boundary case; payments to, 2572; departmental lawyers; co-ordination of law branches, economy, 2573
Civil Service classification, appeals, 1508
Dominion Iron and Steel Co., contract, 1678
Farm labour, cost of, 1163
Foran, Mr. J. J., qu. 2214
Lawyers, employment of by department of Justice, 1678
Manure, exportation of, 1018
Military expenditure and policy, 1153
Militia and defence
Military districts, 1775
Officers and men at headquarters, 1775
Militia council, qu. 2039
Naval council and officers, qu. 1774

Lands. *See also* Dominion Lands; Natural Resources
Accessible for homesteads, 87
Location of. *See* Criminal Code, Scrip frauds
Percentage under cultivation, 2302
Private ownership of, 1927
Public. *See* Natural Resources
Right of Canadians to hold in Japan, 2209
Settlement, 182-3. *See also* Soldier Land Settlement
Speculation in, 2404. *See also* Immigration
Undeveloped, settlement of, 236
Unimproved values, tax on, 2191. *See also* Budget; Taxation
Unoccupied, 2603
Western, cost to the immigrant, 2157

Langley, Hon. George, statement respecting Railway Commission, 2773

Lapierre, Mr. E. A. (Nipissing)
Budget, 2628. Congratulations to Finance Minister; the great unorganized body of wage-earners; clerks, book-keepers, commercial travellers and office assistants; cheerful acceptance of burden of citizenship; union government; day of reckoning; debt; curtailment of expenditure, 2628; restoration of pur-

Lapierre, Mr. E. A. — *Con.*
Budget — *Con.*
chasing power; adjustment of tariff to financial exigencies; retail trade and prices, 2629
Georgian Bay canal, 1199
St. Lawrence river waterway, 1199
Sturgeon Falls
Indian agent, qu. 1285
Postmaster, qu. 1285
Sudbury mail contract, qu. 1285

Lapointe, Hon. Ernest (Minister of Marine and Fisheries)
British Columbia fisheries, M. (Mr. McQuarrie) 857
Budget, 2585. Congratulations to Finance Minister, 2585; leader of Opposition; amendment; no violation of Liberal platform; political pledges and honour, 2586; a Liberal budget; no political party in favour of free trade; campaign bogeys; an academic question; protection an economic heresy; national as opposed to individual interest; geographical considerations, 2587; United States farmers and protection; Wheat Board, fixation of prices; financial and economic consequences of war; tariffs of Switzerland, Belgium, Holland and Spain, 2588; Government tariff proposals, 2589; Liberal platform of 1893; reciprocity; not free trade but freer trade; revenue tariff; protection and revenue features of tariff legislation; exaggerated statements as to Canada's condition, 2590; hatred and class war; the future; fair play for the government, 2591
Business of the House, questions, 1660
Canada Shipping Act Amdt. bills
Harbours and harbour masters, 1578
Pilotage dues, 1487, 2819, 3009
Coolie labour on British ships, 2043
Criminal Code Amdt. bill (Mr. Woodsworth) 865
Distressed seamen, relief of, 1676
Dominion Iron and Steel Co.
Contracts, steel plates, 1677
Damage action against Govt., settlement of, 2170
False Creek bridge, 3516
Fisheries. *See also under this title,* Marine and Fisheries
Department of, 2166
Fish culture, 2169
Fishways, 2167
Marketing, 2109
Protection service, 678

Lapointe, Hon. Ernest — *Con.*
Fisheries Act, 1914, Amdt. bill, 2306, 2817, 2996, 3010
Fishing schooner race, 1387, 3510
Genoa Conference, expenses, 1715
Immigration Act Amdt. bill (Mr. Woodsworth) 864
International deep sea racing, 1387, 3510
Judges Act Amdt. bill, 428
Lambton steamer, loss of, 1497, 3365, 3507
Limitation of Armaments, 3169
Marine and Fisheries. *See also under this title,* Fisheries
Biological board, 3051
Capt. Demers, 1492
Department, estimates, 1489, 1676, 2166
Examination of masters and mates, 1490
Icebreaking, 1677
Life saving service, 1494
Lighthouse and coast service, 1496
Lambton, steamer, wreck of, 1497, 3365, 3507
Marine agencies, 1496
Marine signal service, 1499
Navigation, aids to, 1498
Navigation schools, Capt. Eddie, 1493
Ocean and river service, 1494, 3507
Pilotage, administration of, 1496
Removal of obstructions in navigable waters, 1493
Port Dalhousie, 1493
St. Lawrence ship channel, 1494
Dredges, 1494
Steamboat inspection, 2169
Wrecks, investigation, 1492
Meat and Canned Foods Act, 3045, 3149
Military Service Act Amdt. bill, 640
Militia and Defence
Annual drill, amdt. to amdt. to reduce vote by $400,000, 1579; agreed to, 1631
Quebec arsenal, amdt. to reduce vote by $50,000, 2091
Montpetit, Prof., 582
Montreal Harbour Commission
Employees, 1289
Revenue, 1465
Montreal Harbour Commission bill, 1488, 3199
Naval Service
Niobe, sale of, 2067
Transfer of services to Marine and Fisheries, 3611
Navigation, Rainy river lights, 1499
Pilots and pilotage, administration, 1499
Fees, regulation of, 1500
Prince Rupert Dry dock and Engineering Co., claim, 3514

Lapointe, Hon. Ernest — *Con.*
Quebec fisheries, 377
M. (Mr. Marcil) 619, 622
Quebec harbour
Parc St. Charles Co., Limited, 1470
Revenue and expenditures, 1471
Quebec Harbour Commission
Papers, 1584
Political patronage, 1477
Quebec Harbour Commission bill, 1464-86, 3195
Fair wage clause, 1469
Returned Soldiers' Insurance bill, 3399
Steel plates
Contracts, 1677
Delivery, 3508
Trenton harbour bill, 3493
Vancouver
Ballantyne pier, 1485
Drydock, 1485
Vancouver Harbour Commission bill, 1929, 2821, 2996

Larkin, Hon. P.C. *See* High Commissioner

L'Assomption and Montcalm
Excise officers, qu. 2355
Lightkeepers, qu. 1904, qu. 2215

Latchford, Hon. Mr. Justice, qu, 366, qu. 3600

Laurier, Sir Wilfrid. *See also* speeches on Address; Budget
Canadian military responsibilities, 1629
Canadian Northern loan, 1957
Canadian ports and German submarines, 2089
Conscription and. *See* Military Service Act Amdt. bill
Grand Trunk lines in United States, 191
Monument, qu, 936
Naval policy, 1849
Old age pensions, 1305
Railway administration, 202
St. Lawrence river waterway, 1333, 1398

Laurier-Fielding Tariff, 141, 144, 208, 290. *See also* Address; Budget

Lavigueur, Mr. Henri E. (Quebec County)
Budget, 2398. Tribute to Finance Minister; extravagance and mismanagement of former government; public debt; unfair treatment of province of Quebec, 2398; no confidence in public ownership of railways; transcontinental railway; Champlain market station; St. Malo repair shops; car repairs, 2399; St. Charles river improvements; wharf at Ste. Pétronille;

Lavigueur, Mr. Henri E. — *Con.*
Budget — *Con.*
wharf at St. Grégoire de Montmorency; expenditure and economy, 2400
Canadian National railways, public ownership, 1938
Military Service Act Amdt. bill, 643
Quebec Harbour Commission bill, 1474

Law, Bowman B., M.P., the late, memorial tablet, 2835

Law Officers
Departmental, 1678, 2573
Opinion of. *See* Canada Grain Act, constitutionality

Leader, Mr. Harry (Portage la Prairie)
Accredited herd system, 2739-41
Animal Contagious Diseases Act, qu. 2739, 3362
Assiniboine river floods, 1842, 2003, 3545
Budget, 2510. Finance Minister's proposals disappointing; tariff reductions counterbalanced by sales tax increase; better trade relations with United States; apology for having voted against reciprocity; rejection of treaty a disaster; live stock industry; little difference between two old parties; origin of Progressive party; promises and performance of Liberals; the amendment; broken promises of Conservatives; Mr. Meighen's declarations on tariff policy; salaries of Ministers and judges, 2512; proposed reduction in indemnities of Senators and Members; Civil Service bonus; shortening of session; absence of members from House, 2513
Harbours and rivers, Manitoba, 2003
Health of animals, tuberculosis, 3522
Immigration, Hutterites, 3060

League of Nations. *See also* Limitation of Armaments
Article X of the Covenant, 3170
International Labour Conference, 1060
Permanent secretariat, 2026
Canada's contribution, 2990
Protocols of proposed amendments to covenant, 2583, 2692, 3171

Leases, Cancellation of. *See* Dominion Lands

Leblanc, Dr. B. A., Arichat, qu. 1773

Lee, Lord, of Fareham, 1852. *See also* Limitation of Armaments

Legal Expenses, 1668. *See also* Justice; Law Officers
Companies Act, appeal, 1671
Departmental counsel, 1678, 2572-3
Dominion Iron and Steel Co., damage claim, 1677
Employment of outside lawyers, 1678
Trial of Indian murderer, Lebeaux, 1669

Legal Officers, concentration of, 683, 2572-3

Léger, Mr. A. T. (Kent, N.B.)
Canadian National railways, purchase of ties, qu. 2209
Experimental farms, 806, 808
Harbours and rivers, New Brunswick, 1991
Lighthouse and coast service, 1495
Migratory birds, 1685
Oleomargarine, manufacture, etc., M. (Mr. Neill) 1792
Richibucto repair works, qu. 375
St. John income tax office, qu., 826

Legislation. *See also* House of Commons; Senate
House of Commons, 2026
Printing, 1972
Senate, 2026

Lemieux, Hon. Rodolphe. *See* Speaker

Lemieux Agreement with Japan, 1459

Lepers, Number of, 2021

Lesueur, Mr. R. V. (West Lambton)
Sugar beet industry, 3243-4

Letter Carriers. *See* Post Office

Letters, Anonymous, quoting from, 943-944

L'Evénement, Quebec, 1480

Levis
Gravel, Mr., resignation from Quebec Harbour Commission, 1477
Lightkeepers, qu., 2583

Lewis, Mr. Arthur J. (Swift Current)
Address in reply, 149. Congratulations to Mr. Speaker; common platform in politics, 149-50; real conditions in the West; Great War burdens, 150-151; unemployment; wider markets, agricultural and economic conditions, 151-152; tariff and protection; natural resources of western provinces, 153-154; consolidation of railways, 155
Blankets, duty on, 3233
British preference and Canadian seaports, M. (Mr. Logan) Amdt. 722

Lewis, Mr. Arthur J. — *Con.*
Budget, 2256. Congratulations to Minister of Finance; Progressive party and government; fiscal policy; free trade; similarity of Liberal and National policies, 2257; forty-four years of protection; tariff for revenue; reductions in tariff and increases in sales tax, 2258; economy; Welland canal; St. Lawrence river waterway; emigration and race suicide; cigar and cigarette duties; automobiles; luxury tax, 2260; British preference; reciprocity with United States, 2261
Canadian National railway, public ownership, 1954
Canadian Patriotic Fund bill, 3484
Canned fish, marketing, 3049
Cattle embargo, 1020
Cigars and cigarettes, duty, 3239
Dominion Bureau of Statistics, 1368
Dominion Election Act, residential qualification, 1301
Dominion lands, 1036
Experimental farm, Swift Current, 796, 3521
Grand Trunk Pacific branch lines, 3520
Gravelbourg, Sask., appointment of Judge, 3496
Indians, education of, 1230
Mines dept., field work, 690
Mixed farming, dairying, 996
Naval service, 1737
Royal Canadian navy, 1852, 2065
O'Connor, Mr. James, dismissal of, 1676
Paper cups, 3115
Pilotage dues, 1500
Post Office estimates, 692
Proportional representation
M. (Mr. Good) 1645
Public Works estimates, 692
Rail and car repair contracts, 1689
Railway policy, 1954
Railways, branch lines, 1688, 3520
Residential qualification, 1301
Royal Canadian navy, 1852, 2065
Saskatchewan liquor export, 3000
Soldier Settlement Act Amdt. bill, 3406
Soldier settlement, land purchase, 2140
Swift Current
Experimental farm, 796, 3521
Post office building, 1253
Tractors, duty on, 3123
Welland canal construction, 1688, 2260, 2749

Liberal Convention of 1919. *See also* Address; Budget
Cash grants to soldiers, 393, 397, 429

Liberal Convention of 1919 — *Con.*
Old age pensions, 1305
Platform, 25, 2529, 2541, 2896, 2910
Tariff, 2466, 3235
Mr. Fielding's disavowal, 2666
Res. of 1921, 2466
Position of Mr. King, 44-45

Liberal Party
Administration of railways before 1911, 189
Appointments, 138
Big interests and, 242. *See also* Big interests; Ministers and Directorships
Caucus, 1338
Fiscal attitude, 2430. *See also* Address; Budget
Gains and losses, 138-9. *See also* Elections of 1921
Government, 188
History of, 2430, 2548-9. *See also* Speeches on Budget
Interpretation of Liberalism, 26
Opposition in, and Estimates, 378-385

Library of Parliament
Joint Committee on, 211, 326
Salaries, 3517
Staff, 3091-2

Life-Saving Service. *See* Marine and Fisheries

Lights and Light-Keepers. *See also* Marine and Fisheries
Fuel for lightboats, qu. 1183
L'Assomption and Montcalm, qu. 1904, qu. 2215
Lévis, qu. 2583
Lighthouse and coast service, 1495, 1677, 3508
Maintenance and repairs to lighthouses, 1498
Parry Sound inspector, qu., 827
Pensions of lightkeepers, 1496
Salaries and allowances, 1497
Superintendent, Quebec district, qu. 2584
Wireless telegraphy, qu., 370

Lignite. *See* Coal

Limitation of Armaments, 7, 10, 20, 42, 58, 1143, 1174, 1179. *See also* Military Policy; Militia and Defence; National Defence
Air service, 1731
Approval of treaties signed at Washington, 786, 3157
Borden, Right Hon. Sir Robert, 1283
Report of, 1737, 1743
Canada's representation, 43

Limitation of Armaments — *Con.*
General Smuts, 1283
Naval armament, reduction of, 1737, 1844-5. *See also* National Defence; Naval Service
Naval holiday, 1737
Report tabled and ordered printed, 596
Sherman, General William T., 1336
Submarines, 1845
Treaty tabled, 9

Lindsay Arsenal. *See* Militia and Defence

Linen Yarn
Bounty, 1361
Dominion Linens, Limited, 1362
Duty, 3128

Ling, Mayor. *See* Nova Scotia Miners

Liquor. *See also* Alcohol; Canada Temperance Act; Inland Revenue; Special War Revenue
Ale, beer, porter and stout, tax on, 2117, 2852, 2857
Beverages, containing 2½ per cent proof spirit, 2857
Bootlegging, cost to country, 2282
Confiscation of, 2997
Export, 2716
Warehouses in Saskatchewan, 767-8, qu., 1211, qu. 1660, 2997
Government, sale of, 1017
Importation, 733. *See also* Canada Temperance Act
British Columbia into, 1017
Excise duty on, qu. 828
Saskatchewan into, qu. 2037, 2303
Quebec government, and, 71
Sales tax on ale, beer, etc., 2117, 2852, 2857

Little Current
Harbour improvement, 2002
Tugboat, 3086-7

Live Stock, 333, 971, 2511. *See also* Accredited herds; Address; Agriculture; Animal Contagious Diseases Act; Budget; Cattle Embargo; Health of Animals
Animals, cruelty, to. *See* Criminal Code Amdt.
Associations, grants to, 1027
Bacon, 1025
Bovine tuberculosis. *See* Animal Contagious Diseases bill
Carload and free freight policy, 1029
Commission men, 1031
Competition, 2695, 2698
Destruction by wolves, 990, 998

Live Stock — *Con.*
Estimates, 1018
Exhibitions, 3521. *See also* Agriculture
Feed shortage in western Canada, 1030
Fordney tariff, effect on, 2453-4. *See also that title*
Garbage feed, 1029
Grants to exhibitions, 3521
Hog cholera, compensation, 1028
Hogs, grading, 1025
Industry, 334. *See also* Cattle Embargo
Marketing in United States, 94
Milk supply, inspection of herds, 2740
National live stock records, 1026
Pure bred sires, 1032
Sheep-raising, 2592
Stallion clubs, 1031
Stockgrazing and feeding, 3522
Stockyards, 1030
Trade with South America, 647
Tuberculosis, 2595

Lloyd George. *See* George, Lloyd

Lloyds, steel plates, delivery, 3508

"Loafing-on-the-Job". *See* Industrial Disputes; Labour; Nova Scotia Miners

Loan Companies, 2299
Proposed taxation of, 2299
Renewal of loans, 1476

Loan Companies Act Amdt. bill
1r., 1210; 2r., ref. to Banking and Commerce Com., 1464; Com., 3142; 3r., 3142; Senate amdts., 3607

Loans. *See also* Finance; Special Loans bill, 2107, 2171
Domestic, 2694
Five-year maturities, qu. 2993
German, proposed, 2500
Grecian, qu. 1400
Morgan, Messrs, J. P., & Co., 1131
New Canadian, $100,000,000, announcement of, 1131, 1133
New York, 2107-27
Roumanian, qu. 1400
Soldiers, to. *See* Soldier Settlement
Special Bill. *See* Special Loans bill
$100,000,000, 1292, 1131

Lobster Canning. *See* Meat and Canned Foods

Lobster Fisheries. *See* Fisheries Act Amdt. bill

Local Council of Women, Hamilton, Oleomargarine, 1835

Logan, Mr. Hance J. (Cumberland)
Acoustics of Chamber, 708, 3612
Address in reply, 105. Congratulations to Mr. Speaker, 105. Intercolonial railway, management and operation, 106; history of the Intercolonial; 107; separate operation necessary, 111
British preference
And Canadian seaports, M. 493, 707, 725
Goods imported through United States, qu., 375
Budget, 2684. Mr. Hocken's flirtation with Progressives; official Opposition; Bourbons; decline of Conservative party; optimism should give place to despair; the amendment; platform of 1919; changed conditions, 2684; public promises; conscription of farmers by Union Government; tariff; not sufficient time for investigation; boot and shoe industry; problem of unemployment, 2685; leader of Progressive party; revenue necessities; transportation; income, inheritance and land taxes; no question of free trade or protection; revenue tariff; incidental protection; not a protectionist budget; anthracite and bituminous coal; suggested duty on anthracite; bituminous coal duty, 2686; distinction between revenue and protective tariffs; importance of Canadian coal industry; imports; valuation of imports for duty purposes, 2687; British preference and Canadian seaports; direct shipments; transportation question as it affects the maritime provinces; South African railways, 2688; Intercolonial railway; sales tax; exemptions, 2689; fishermen's supplies; economy; civil service salary reductions; indemnity of members; equality of sacrifice; Opposition and budget; compromise on tariff issue; reciprocity; a united Canada, 2691
Canadian National railways
Intercolonial, 106-111, 2688, 2689
Employees, enlistment, 3519
Rail and car repair contracts, 1702, 1925
Revaluation, 1926
Transcontinental, enlisted men, allowance, 3518
Canadian Patriotic Fund bill, 3478
Coal
Anthracite and bituminous, suggested duty on, 2686
Investigation of low grade, 3525
Public buildings for, 1759

Logan, Mr. Hance J. — *Con.*
Fishing schooner race, 3512
Joggins breakwater, 1767
Lignite Unitilization board, 3525
National defence, 422
Nova Scotia miners, M. (Mr. Irvine) 523
Penitentiary Act Amdt. bill, 790
Pensions, widowed mothers, 1310
Prison reform, 1278
Rail and car repairs, 1702, 1708, 1925
Unemployment
Canadian coal miners, 1759
Rail and car repair contracts, 1702

Logan, Mr. R. S., 728

Long Branch rifle range, qu., 372

Long Sault. *See* St. Lawrence River Waterway

L'Orignal wharf, 1212

Louisburg quarantine station, 2021

Lovering, Dr., qu. 1211

Lovett, Mr. L. J. (Digby-Annapolis)
Bridgetown post office accommodation, 1245
Budget, 2270. Waste of time in useless discussion; slow progress of Nova Scotia, 2270; freight rates and trade restrictions; reciprocity; emigration; sectional interests, 2271; public debt; financial chaos; taxation; tariff reductions, 2272
Civil Service patronage, 3084
Rural postmasters, 3080

Lovie, Mr. W. J. (Macdonald)
Bovine tuberculosis, Carman, Man., deputation, 2743
Budget, 2451. Congratulations to Finance Minister; tariff reductions not sufficient; handicap upon agriculture, 2451; farmer cannot pass on taxation; manufacturer beneficiary of protection; agriculture the basic industry; implements sold cheaper in foreign countries than in Canada; agricultural depression, 2452; injustice of protective tariff to farmers; freight rates reduction; marketing of wheat; export markets; reciprocity with United States; effect of Fordney tariff on live stock industry; potatoes and poultry products; garden truck; Kubanka wheat; freight rates; statement of Mr. Sandford Evans; wheat and commodity prices, 2454; war profiteering;

Lovie, Mr. W. J. — *Con.*
Budget — *Con.*
income tax; religious institutions penalized, 2455
Civil Service bonus, 3535

Low, Hon. Thomas A. (South Renfrew)
Budget, 2445. Congratulations to Finance Minister; tariff views of Mr. Good; serious problems confronting government; effort to reduce expenditure, 2445; the tariff; the home market; agricultural production; ratio of exports to domestic consumption; agricultural implements; reciprocity agreement; railways, 2446; freight rates; history repeating itself; cheap transportation for the West; national ills and financial burdens; progressive immigration policy, 2447; settlers from the United States, England and northern Europe and countries

Lucas, Mr. W. T. (Victoria, Alta.)
Canada Grain Act, car demurrage, 2981
Canadian Pacific Railway bill, 1861
Elevator overages, qu. 609
Immigration, Mr. Shandro's proposed colony, 2159
Oriental Aliens, M. (Mr. McQuarrie) 1519

Lumber. *See also* Tariff resolutions; Timber
Cargoes for the Orient, 2311
Dressed on one side only, duty, 2360
Freight rates on, 175, 234, 2311. *See also that title*
Japanese, acquisition of timber in British Columbia, 2310
Machinery and tools, reduction in duties, 2116
Orientals in industry. *See* Oriental Aliens, M. (Mr. McQuarrie)

Lusitania reparation claims, qu. 3599

Macarow, Mr. D. C. *See* Merchants' Bank

Macbrien, General, 1151, 1169, 1179, 1617
Reported utterances, 1662
Topographic survey, 1986

Macdonald, Mr. E. M. (Pictou)
Address in reply, 186. Congratulations to Mr. Speaker and previous speakers, 186; results of election, 186-7; Mr. Meighen's political campaign, 186-8; responsible government once more restored; public ownership of railways, 188; Canadian Northern and government railways 190; Grand Trunk lines

Macdonald, Mr. E. M. — *Con.*
Address — *Con.*
in United States, 191; Intercolonial railway management, 192; deficits on railways, 194; financial burdens, 195
Agriculture Com. report, Wheat Board, 783
Canada Shipping Act Amdt. bill (pilotage) 1487
Canadian National railways, 190
Coal
Importations, qu., 926
Purchases of, qu., 2306
Insurance, qu., 471, qu., 610
Operation, 66
Public ownership, 1924
Canadian Patriotic Fund bill, 3480
Civil Service classification, 494-5
Con Rein, sinking of, 1382
Crowsnest pass agreement, M. (Mr. Kennedy, Essex) for Special Com., 1440-2
Dominion Elections Act Amdt. bill, 2814
Dominion notes and gold reserve, qu., 705
Freight Rates, Special Com., on, third report, 3570
Grand Trunk, coal for, qu., 606
Judges Act Amdt. bill, 427, 429
Labour dept., temporary employees, 566
Naval defence, 1743
Naval service
Reduction in, 1743
Royal Canadian navy, 1870, 2062
Rail and car repair contracts, 1706
Redistribution of 1914, 1369
Reference to, 2536
Royal Canadian navy, 1870, 2062
War claims, loss of hospital ship, 1753
Washington disarmement conference, 1743
Yukon territory
Administration, cost of, 1681
Population, and expenditure, qu., 2456

Macdonald, "General", army of, 3315
Reception of, 2256

MacInnes, Mr. Hector, K.C., payments to, 2772

MacInnes, Mr. W. W. B., Immigration Commissioner in China, qu. 1901, qu. 2214

MacKelvie, Mr. John A. (Yale)
Address in reply 159. Congratulations to Mr. Speaker; boots and shoes, tariff on, 159-160; statements of Mr. Meighen and Sir Lomer Gouin, 160; Tory party, 161; tariff revision, 162; fruit-growing in British Columbia; protective tariff and fruit; railway situation, 166; immigration; Orientals in British

Mackelvie, Mr. John A. — *Con.*
Address — *Con.*
Columbia, 167; natural resources; soldiers' re-establishment; attitude of Sir Lomer Gouin, 168; unity between French and English-speaking Canada, 168-9
Budget, 2196. Congratulations to Finance Minister; tariff; fruit-growing industry; Liberal platform of 1919, 2197; promises and performances; British preference, 2198; reciprocity; dumping clause, 2199; fruit growing industry, 2200; taxation; retrenchment; militia expenditure; cadet training, 2202; naval service; German trade and competition, 2203; the amendment, 2204
Cadet training, 2202
Canadian National railways, Kamloops-Kelowna line, 1134
Customs, dumping clause, 2199, 3422
Dominion lands, sub-agencies closed, qu., 1181
Entomology, codling moth, 814, 816
Fruit growers, protection, 2197, 2200, 3422
George, Rt. Hon. Lloyd, 2203
Interior dept., publicity agent, 454
Militia, expenditure and policy, 2202
Naval college, Esquimalt, 2047, 2203
Naval service, 2203
Royal Canadian navy, 2047
Oriental Aliens, M., (Mr. McQuarrie) 1534
Telegraphs and telephones, Okanagan district, 2008

Mackenzie and Mann, 189. *See also* Canadian National Railways
Loans to, 189-190
Subsidy, qu. 607, qu., 935

MacLaren, Mr. Murray (St. John City and Counties of St. John and Albert)
Address in reply, 353; national railway system; Grand Trunk railway and Portland terminus, 353; Intercolonial railway, 354; natural resources of Prairie Provinces, 355; returned soldiers, 356
American magazines, 3110
Biological Board, 3051
British preference and Canadian seaports, M. (Mr. Logan) 721
Canadian Govt. Merchant Marine, steamship services, and, 3033
Canadian National railways, Intercolonial employees, 3519
Canadian Red Cross Society, 3387
Canadian Transit Company bill, 1771

MacLaren, Mr. Murray — *Con.*
Canned goods, marking, 3048
Cold storage, 3521
Edmundston public building, 1240
Harbours and rivers, New Brunswick, 1273
Immigration
Medical inspection, 3052
Officials, 756
Imports of British goods, qu., 966
Inter-allied permanent commission, 3403
Military expenditure and policy, 1149
Militia estimates, 588
Naval policy, 2053
Negro point, breakwater, 2013
Pension Act Amdt. bill, 3403, 3442
St. John Ambulance Association, 3387
St. John harbour, 2013
Submarine cables, qu., 3151, qu., 3360
Tracadie lazaretto, 2021
West Indies subsidies steamship services, 3033

MacLean, Mr. A. E. (Prince, P.E.I.)
Address in reply, 335. The Prime Minister and Prince Edward Island, 335; Progressive and Liberals; potato trade, 336; harvest excursions; civil service; railway situation in Prince Edward Island, 337; Intercolonial railway; tariff; natural resources and Prince Edward Island, 338-9
Census enumerators, 1366
Civil Service Commission, 364
Hog cholera, 1029
Illegal fishing, Prince county, qu., 371
Migratory birds, 1684
Rail and car repair contracts, 1710
Range lights for fishermen, 1498
Theshing machines, 3125
Tormentine reef, buoy, 1490
Unemployment, Canadian National railways, 1710

Maclean, Hon. A. K. (Halifax)
Budget, 2859. Amended resolutions; effect of taxation on trade; depreciated currency; Germany, trade with; debt and revenue necessities, 2859; income tax expenditure, reduction of, 2860; economic problems and proposed remedies; Progressive party not an occupational group; class organization; restriction of output; consequences of the war; European recovery; interdependence of nations; international trade; international politics, 2862; German rehabilitation; reparation payments; restriction of German exports, 2863; Canadian representation at Genoa Conference; reciprocity with the United States; tariff legislation of Congress; Canadian representation at Washington; business conditions, 2864; emigration; reconciliation of adverse interests; Maritime Provinces commercial relation with rest of Canada, 2865; Ontario and Quebec, industrial development; Prairie Provinces, 2866; British Columbia; depression of trade; exchange value of commodities; primary products low in price; manufactured products abnormally high, 2868; wages, labour conditions and production; deflation of manufactured products; effect of taxation on prices; amendment, 2869; Liberal platform of 1919; tariff revision vertically and horizontally; chart and compass; Prime Minister's utterances at convention and in campaign, 2870; protection and free trade, 2871; United States competition; compromise on fiscal policy; tendency in United States towards reduction of tariff, 2872; imports and interests, 2873

Maclean, Hon. A. K. — *Con.*
Budget — *Con.*
Canadian Government Merchant Marine
Ownership and operation of, 3036
Subsidized steamship services, 3029
Crowsnest pass agreement, M. (Mr. Kennedy, Essex) for Special Com., 1420-6.
See also under this title, Freight Rates
Dominion lands, Cancellation of leases bill, 3469
Freight Rates, Transportation costs, Special Com., Third report, 3456
M. for adoption of, 3548-55
Insurance Act Amdt. bill, 3143, 3145
Loan Companies Act Amdt. bill, 3142
Naval policy, 2055
Naval service
Royal Canadian navy, 2055
Royal Naval college, 2055
Public buildings, alleged discrimination against western provinces, 1254
Quebec Harbour Commission bill, 1464
Rideau canal, 2764
Welland ship canal, 2763
Wheat Board powers, 781
Wheat Board bill, 3175, 3180, 3380, 3385
M. Com. rise, neg., 3383

Maclean, Mr. William F. (South York)
Address in reply, 63. Public ownership of utilities; hydro-electric developments, 63; public ownership of railways, 64;

Maclean, Mr. William F. — *Con.*
Address — *Con.*
competition of C.P.R. with government-owned railways, 64-66; corporation-owned railways in United States, 67; water transportation, 69-70; electrical developments, 71; transportation and marketing of wheat, 72; co-ordination of government railways, 73; railway grades and duplication; community centres, 75; goods roads, 75-76
Alien enemy property, 1672
Blake, Hon. Edward, 2655
British Preference and Canadian seaports, M. (Mr. Logan) 723
Budget, 2321. Mr. McCrea and organized labour, 2321; war profiteering; pulp and paper industry; speculation in paper stocks; collective bargaining, 2322; farmers and strikes; the farmers' bloc in United States Congress; economic injustice to labouring population; railways, public ownership; consolidation of national railways, 2323; strikes of railway employees; organization of capital, labour and industry; Canada's status; federation of dominions with written constitution; court of last resort; the war and defence, 2324; scientific methods of destruction; race aggression; transportation; bill of rights of Canadian public services; nationalization of transportation communications, banking, marketing, waterways, finance, 2325; post office, express, telegraph and telephone services, cables; community centres, 2326; St. Lawrence river waterway; water-borne competition with railways, 2327; national banking system of United States; watered stock; co-ordination of railways, 2328; opposition to public ownership from Canadian Pacific Railway; new taxation; soft drinks; cheque tax; immigration, 2329; Oriental labour; redistribution, 2330
Budget debate, conclusion of, 2639
Canada Temperance Act Amdt. bill, 2733
Canadian National railways
New board, appointment of, 2722
Shares held as alien property, 1672
Census
Completion of, 1365
Enumerators, 1366
Cheque tax, 3259

Maclean, Mr. William F. — *Con.*
Crowsnest pass agreement, 175-6. *See also under this title,* Freight Rates
Daylight saving, M. (Mr. Kay) 953
Electrification of railways, M. (Mr. Deslauriers) 632
Enfranchisement of foreign-born women, M. (Mr. Euler) 491
Freight Rates, Special Com., on, third report, 3564
Grand Trunk lines in United States, 191
Hydro-electric Commission and Ontario Govt., 1080
Hydro-electric power developments in Ontario, 1937
Manufacturers and profiteering, 3275
National Defence bill, 680
Prison reform, 1278
Privilege — Crowsnest pass agreement, 3608
Public ownership, 1933
Quebec fisheries, 622
Railway Act Amdt. bill (Crowsnest pass agreement) 3595
Railway policy, 1933
Redistribution and the census, 1365
Returned Soldiers'
Bonus, 3290
Early announcement of government's policy, 2637
Returned Soldiers' Insurance Act Amdt. bill, 3319, 3392
Royal Canadian Mounted Police, M. (Mr. Woodsworth) 831
St. Lawrence river waterway
M. (Mr. Church) 1326
United States, co-operation with, 2752-55
Sugar beet industry, 3249
Toronto and York county, representation, 1365
Traffic charges on boat services, 182
Unemployment situation, 1080
Water-power rentals, 2747
Welland canal, 2747
Co-operation with United States, 2752-55
Wheat Board, 2967

MacLennan, Mr. Justice, Admiralty Court at Quebec, 1275

Macleod, Alberta
Post Office, revenue, building, qu., 2804
Royal Canadian Mounted Police, detachment at, 2584

MacPhail, Miss Agnes C. (Southeast Grey)
Alleged statement, denial of, qu. 3221
Annual drill, 1174

MacPhail, Miss Agnes C. — *Con.*
Budget 2384. Liberal party and protection; no material gain in budget proposals; argument of Mr. Raymond; basic and secondary industries; effect of protection, rural depopulation, 2384; protection of industries at expense of agriculture; rural schools; United States farmers demanding protection; unsatisfactory school system; farmers' credits; high transportation costs; taxation of all for the benefit of the few, 2385; proof that farming does not pay; importance of agriculture in development of Canada; trade and national greatness; high protection and revenue; the manufacturer the principal beneficiary, 2386; infant industries; cotton and woollen goods; discrimination against goods used by common people in favour of luxuries; direct and indirect taxation; national expenditure, 2386
Immigration
Child, 2153
"Man with the sheepskin coat", 2153
Policy, 2153
Military expenditure and policy, 1174
Nova Scotia miners, M. (Mr. Irvine) 533
References to. *See* Address; Budget
Rural population, movement towards cities, 2153, 2384
Soldiers' Civil Re-establishment, Supervisor of expenditure, 405

McAdoo Award, 2315, 2317. *See also* Canadian National Railways

McBride, Mr. T. G. (Caribou)
Address in reply, 316. Oriental question in British Columbia, 316-17, 319; soldier settlement, 318; unemployment; transcontinental highway, 319; Oriental immigration, 319
Budget, 2635. Length of speeches; free trade; tariff on farm implements and mining machinery; dumping clause, 2635; transcontinental highway, 2636
British Columbia and Progressive party leader, 2239
Canadian Govt. Merchant Marine, 3039
Loan to, 3036
Canadian Patriotic Fund bill, 3482
Canadian Transit Company bill, 1746, 1770
Chinese, arrival of at Vancouver, 3437, 3604
Civil Service
Bonus, 3533-5
Commission, 3072

McBride, Mr. T. G. — *Con.*
Criminal Code Amdt., branding of cattle, 2833
Customs, dumping clause, 2635, 3419
Debates, inaudibility of, 1053
Dominion lands, Cancellation of leases, bill, 3465
Dredging, Shuswap lake, 2006
Elevators at Vancouver, 2980
Experimental farms, 804-5
Fuel oil, tariff against, 1761
Grain Inquiry Commission, 2984
Housing, 774
Hudson bay railway, completion, 2797
Immigration, Chinese, 3437, 3604
Income War Tax Act Amdt. bill, 3485
Kamloops-Kelowna railway, qu., 937, 3797
Kamloops post office building, 1255
Lambton, steamer, loss of, 3507
Militia and Defence
Cadet services, 1978
Lindsay arsenal, 2088
Quebec arsenal, amdt. to reduce item by $110,000, 2091
Milking machines, 3270
Naval Service, Royal Canadian navy, 1854
Oriental aliens, M. (Mr. McQuarrie) 1531
Pensions Com., report, 3351
Quebec Harbour Commission bill, 3196
St. Lawrence river waterway, 2762
Shuswap lake
Dredging, 2006
Wharf, 3547
Soldier land settlement, 2142
Steamship services, 2027
Telegraphs and telephone lines, 2008
Woollen blankets and clothing, 3135

McCoig, Senator, leave to attend Agriculture Com., 1900, 2406

McConica, Mr. T. H. (Battleford)
Agricultural exhibitions, 984
Agriculture Com., report, Wheat Board, 748. *See also under this title,* Wheat Board
Budget, 2898. Amendment; political promises; tariff revision, 2898; tribute to Finance Minister; old and new taxes; reciprocity, 2899; Sir George Foster's trip to Australia and China; treaty of 1854; abrogation; efforts at renewal; trade routes; acquisition of railways in United States, 2900; trade complications; wheat market; manufacturers of Eastern Canada, 2901; purchasing power of West; position of the farmer; changed conditions, 2902; self-

McConica, Mr. T. H. — *Con.*
Budget — *Con.*
contained country or world power; production costs in United States; hothouse industries; competition with United States; fruit industry; debt; financial problem of the United States after Civil War; work; opportunities multiplying; high protection, 2964; substantial reduction of tariff; congratulations to Prime Minister, 2905
Campbell, Mr. J. A., claim for flax shipment, 2836
Canadian Pacific Railway Company bill, 1856
Amdt. (Mr. Carmichael) 1609
Canadian Transit Company bill, 1772
Dominion Iron and Steel Co. contract, 1678
Judges' Act Amdt. bill, 428
Live stock industry, 985
Mixed farming, 985
Nova Scotia miners, M. (Mr. Irvine) 525
St. Lawrence river waterway, 2753
Soulanges canal, 2769
Welland ship canal, 2743, 2753
Wheat Board, 3183
Point of order, 2935
Wheat Board bill, 3381

McCrea, Mr. Francis N. (Sherbrooke)
Budget, 2314. The railway situation; high freight rates; deficits, 2314; Government ownership; international labour unions; McAdoo award; eight hour day; labour costs in general, 2317; remuneration of railway employees; specialization of work; strikes; thrift and industry, 2316; reduction of labour costs necessary; incorporation of labour unions; formation of labour board; walkouts and lockouts should be made illegal; arbitration for settlement of labour disputes, 2319; civil service, 2320
Canadian Pacific Railway bill, 1857
Organized labour, 2321-2

McDonald, Mr. Angus (Timiskaming)
Multigraph machines in departments, 1508
Population by ages, qu., 1632
Quebec Harbour Commission, wages of employees, 1465
Unemployment, 2318

McDonald, Mr. John N., qu., 3361

McGiverin, Mr. Harold B. (Ottawa)
Civil Service
Bonus, 1503, 3529

McGiverin, Mr. Harold B. — *Con.*
Civil Service — *Con.*
Commission, 3071
Ottawa, Gas Company bill, 1657
Pensions Com., final report, 3331

McKenzie, Hon. D. D. (Solicitor General)
Admiralty Act Amdt. bill, 2456, 2822
Animal Contagious Diseases bill, 2735
Baddeck wharf, repair to, 1765
Big Bras d'Or wharf, 1765
Budget, 2604. Group representation in Parliament; Progressives; duties of citizenship, 2604; public men; tribute to Finance Minister, 2605; Liberalism in Nova Scotia; one change of government in fifty years; Hon. George Murray, 2606; Right Hon. Sir John Thompson; opposition criticisms; responsibility of former government for public debt, 2607; methods of collecting revenue; new taxes; war debt; extravagance; unfit men mobilized; patronage, 2608; Ross rifle; purchase of military equipment; amendment; no suggestion to offer; Liberal platform of 1919; trade with United States, 2610; reciprocity; transportation facilities; purchases of railways in United States; seaports at New London and Portland; purchase of coal lands in United States, 2611; competition with Canadian mines; taking over of Grand Trunk, 2612; Liberal opposition to proposal, 2613; Canadian Northern railway; Grand Trunk Pacific; verdict of the people, 2614; campaign promises made good; record of Liberal party; administration of Sir Wilfrid Laurier, 2615; time to restore prosperity, 2616
Campbell, Mr. J. A., claim of, 2837
Canada Temperance Act Amdt. bill
First reading, 1017
Withdrawn, 2733
Canada Temperance Act Amdt. bill, (No. 132) 2733, 2997
Date of coming into effect, 3007
Senate amendments, 3608
Canadian National railways
Amalgamation, 916
Public ownership, 1939
Criminal Code Amdt. bill., 2831
Dominion Elections Act Amdt. bill, 2809
Concurrence in amdts., 3486
Residential qualification, M. (Mr. Rinfret) 1299
Dominion franchise, 1300

McKenzie, Hon. D. D. — *Con.*
Dominion lands, cancellation of leases, 3473
Escheats Act Amdt. bill, 2456, 2826, 3026
Senate amdts. concurred in, 3486
Grain trade, alleged abuses of, 2840
Harbours and rivers, Nova Scotia, 1765
Interruptions, point of order, 558
Lake of the Woods regulation bill, 2991, 3202
Opium and Narcotic drugs, prosecutions, 2017, 3019
Public buildings, Ontario, 1248-51
Statutes, arrangement with Mr. W. J. O'Connor for revision, 1718
Sydney-Whycocomagh steamship service, 2031
Transcontinental railway, 917
Wheat Board, point of order, 2933

McKillop, Mr. Hugh C. (West Elgin)
Mulvey, Mr. Thomas, qu., 3362

McLachlan, Mr. J. B. *See* Nova Scotia Miners

McMaster, Mr. A. R. (Brome)
Animal Contagious Diseases bill, 2734
Audibility of debates, 411
Bankruptcy Act Amdt. (Mr. Jacobs) 821
Boy Scouts, 773
Budget, 2417. The Tariff a tax; German competition; purchasing power of the mark in Germany; working hours and conditions; production costs; Mr. Bristol's speech "made in Toronto"; prosperity of the United States; tendency towards free trade, 2418; Nova Scotia coal and steel industries; Dominion Iron and Steel Co.; watered stock; free trade in Australia; western farmers and protection; congratulations to finance Minister; inflation and depreciated currency; German competition, 2420; German imports and exports; cheap labour; international hatred and bitterness; treatment of French Canada after siege of Quebec, 2421; spirit of international peace and comity; trade with Germany; German rehabilitation necessary for stabilization of world conditions; fiscal policies of Switzerland, Holland, Belgium, 2422; free trade Great Britain; the big industries; the Safeguarding of Industries Act; history of free trade movement in England; the carrying trade of Great Britain and the United States, 2424; budget proposals; sales tax, 2425; cumulative payment by consumer; tariff reductions; Liberal

McMaster, Mr. A. R. — *Con.*
Budget — *Con.*
party and tariff; revisions of 1904 and 1907, 2426; reciprocity agreement of 1911; Liberal platforms of 1893-1919, 2427; abuses of protection; price-fixing by manufacturers; tyranny of the trusts; collars and silk stockings; the new feudalism; the amendment, 2428; Liberal party stands for progress and freedom, 2429
Criminal Code Amdt. (Mr. Jacobs) 821
Customs dumping clause, 3418
Depreciated currency, 2420, 3411
Dominion lands, cancellation of leases, 3467-75
Empire defence, Canada's responsibility, 1629
Enfranchisement of foreign-born women, M. (Mr. Euler) 483
Essence de L'Erable, qu. 1774
German valuation of goods, 3227
Girl guides, 774
Immigration figures, 758
Insurance premiums, tax, 3257
MacBrien, General, utterances of, 1662
Militia and defence, expenditure and policy, 1628
Ministers and Directorships, M., 1084, 1128
Paired members inadvertently voting, 1462
Point of order, reading of documents, 560
Proportional representation, M. (Mr. Good) 1648
Public Accounts Com., first report, 1460
Railway Act, 1919, Amdt. (Mr. Jacobs) 821
Root Vegetables bill, 3376
Sales tax, 3265
Special War Revenue, flour, 3265
Voting when paired, explanation, 1462
Wheat Board, 2957, 3185
Wheat Board bill, 3189, 3380
Amdt, 3384; agreed to, 3385

McMurray, Mr. E. J. (North Winnipeg)
Address in reply to Governor General's Speech moved, 10. Congratulations to Mr. Speaker; Miss Macphail; Lord Byng, 10; abnormal conditions at home and abroad; financial burdens; state-owned railways; agriculture unprofitable; tariff revision, 11; natural resources of western provinces, 11-12; seat for Hon. Mr. Stewart; unemployment; returned soldier problems; forest and mineral wealth, 12; immigration; wider markets, 13; War-time Elections Act; labour troubles; harmony between races, 14

McMurray, Mr. E. J. — *Con.*
Andrews, Mr. Alfred J., 1068, qu., 1182
Budget, 2474. Serious financial conditions, 2474; national debt; railroad deficits; legacy of the war; no constructive proposals; shifting the burden; production of wealth; Canada's future, 2475; immigration policy of former Liberal government; development of the West; prosperity interrupted by war; aggressive immigration policy needed, 2476; immigrants from central Europe; settlers from United States, 2477; exodus from Canada; statement of Lord Shaughnessy; declaration of Manitoba liberal convention; qualifications of the immigrant; criticisms of immigration policy answered; conditions in West improving, 2479; immigrants from the British Isles; foreigners and Canadian national life; the labour argument; policy of the United States; Canada's problems less than those of other countries, 2480; probable results of active immigration policy, 2481
Crowsnest pass agreement, M. (Mr. Kennedy, Essex) for Special Com., 1439
Lake of the Woods Repeal bill, 3205
Natural resources, prairie provinces, 1017
Oriental Aliens, M. (Mr. McQuarrie) 1527
Winnipeg strike, cost of trials, qu., 1182

McPherson, Mr. Duncan, superannuation of, 2805

McQuarrie, Mr. William G. (New Westminster)
Asiatic immigration, qu., 732. *See also under this title,* Oriental Aliens
British Columbia fisheries, M., 851
Budget, 2233. Progressive party' attitude towards Government; tariff reductions, 2233; reciprocity; British Columbia, protection of farms, mines and fisheries, 2234; free trade; immigration; unemployment; the amendment; pledges and moral code of the Liberal party; "political trickery"; Hon. John Oliver, Premier of British Columbia, criticism of by Vancouver Sun; alleged purchase by provincial government of warehouse site from President of Liberal Association; Vancouver World; resignation of provincial Attorney General, 2237; Minister of Public Works; national debt, 2238

McQuarrie, Mr. William G. — *Con.*
Canadian Govt. Merchant Marine, coal mined by Orientals, 2407
Carriage of mails, qu., 825
Census enumerators, payment of, 1367
Civil Service bonus, 733
Patronage, 3084
Salaries $960 and less, qu., 1660, qu., 1775
Condensed milk tax, 3269
Exhibitions, grants to, 1026
Indians, New Westminster agency, 3536
Oliver, Hon. John, criticism by Vancouver Sun, 2026, 2236-37
Opium and Narcotic Drug Act Amdt. bill, 3018, 3016
Oriental aliens, 872, 967, 3104
M. for exclusion or, 1509
Pensions Act Amdt. bill, 3445
Quebec fisheries, M. (Mr. Marcil) 169, 622. *See also under this title,* British Columbia Fisheries
Small manufacturers, 2710
Vancouver and Fraser Valley railway, 798
Widowed mothers, pensions, 3293

McTaggart, Mr. Neil H. (Maple Creek)
Budget, 2545. Congratulation to Finance Minister; budget proposals disappointing; speeches of leaders; debt, taxation, idle factories; unemployment; abandonned farms; readjustments in economic structure; downward revision of the tariff; failure of protection, 2545; sales tax; suggestion from Canadian Manufacturers Association; protectionist budget; revenue; investment of American capital in Canadian industries; abuse of Customs tariff by United States companies, 2546; duty on cigarettes, cameras; comparative prices in Canada and United States, 2547; tariff reduction; ability to compete with outside industries; Progressive party, 2548
Canada Temperance Act Amdt. bill, 3006
Customs revenue, 770
Dominion lands, surveys, 1041
Saskatchewan, liquor export, 3006

Machinery. *See* Agricultural Implements

Madawaska customs collections, qu., 607

Magazines, American, imports of, 3109

Magna Charta, 1388

Mail Carriers. *See* Post Office

Mail Contracts. *See* Post Office

Mail Services. *See* Post Office; Railways; Steamship Services

Malcolm, Mr. James (North Bruce)
British Preference and Canadian seaports, M. (Mr. Logan) 719
Budget, 2387. Tariff and taxation proposals of Minister of Finance, 2387; consideration given to all sections of country; sales tax; stamp and stock transfer taxes; automobiles tax; the tariff, 2388; United States tariff; reciprocity; British preference; American branch industries and export trade; marking and depreciated currency acts, 2389; income tax; effect on capital; confiscation; enterprise should not be discouraged; immigration, 2390; emigration; the farmer and industrialism; problems of prairie provinces; markets; transportation costs; fiscal policy, 2391
Goderich harbour improvement, 2001
Harbours and rivers, Ontario, 2002
Lake Huron, harbour of refuge, 2002
Soldier Settlement Act, 1919, Amdt., 2035

Management, Charges of. *See* Finance

Manion, Hon. Robert J. (Fort William and Rainy River)
Address in reply, 263. Congratulations to Mr. Speaker; speech of Mr. Raymond, 263; different tariff policies of Liberals, 264; election campaign, 265; record of Union Government, 266; defeat of Union Government, 267; immigration; national debt and railway problem, 268; natural resources; St. Lawrence river waterway, 269; race and creed bigotry, 270; soldiers' reestablishment and pensions, 271; housing; tariff and protection, 272; railway rates, 273
Agriculture, subsidies to, 1698
Budget, 2261. Congratulations to Finance Minister; loans; Liberal and Progressive platforms, 2261; resolution moved by Minister of Finance while in opposition; the tariff, 2262; farmers and the budget; trade with Germany, 2263; foreign exchange; protective legislation in the United States; tariff for revenue; free trade not possible, 2265; sectional demands; Wheat Board; Crowsnest pass agreement; St. Lawrence river waterway; the home market; sales tax, 2266; Great Britain and tariff legislation; 2267; free trade

Manion, Hon. Robert J. — *Con.*
Budget — *Con.*
and protection, 2268; advisory tariff board or commission; cheque tax, 2269; receipt tax; the amendment, 2270
Burstall, Sir Henry, 743
Canadian Govt. Merchant Marine, claims qu., 606
Canadian National railways
Grain leakages, qu., 1401, 1930
Orders in anticipation of requirements 1698
Canadian Patriotic Fund bill, 3481
Canadians emigrating, qu., 1182
Census, remarks by Mr. Johnston (Last Mountain) 1370
Civil Service Commission, 3087
Cost of living, 1057
Daylight saving, 948-9, 961
Dominion Bureau of Statistics, 1366
Dominion lands and surveys, 1037, 1039
Election pledges, cash bonus to soldiers, 403
Empire and Ascension days, 1760
Employment offices, 1058
Fisheries estimates, discussion, 2166
Forest protection, 1048
Harbours and rivers, Ontario, 1999
Health, department of, 2017
High Commissioner's office, 414
Immigration
Estimates, opportunity for consideration, 2162-4
Physically fit, 3055-6
Policy, 756
Immigration dept., labourers, 3054
International Labour Conference, 106C
Labour Gazette, 1057
Labour, technical education, 460
Militia and defence
Arsenals, Quebec, 2093
Expenditure and policy, 2092
Officials, 586
Staff reduction, 422
Naval service staff, 418, 422
Navigation lights in Rainy River, 1499
Opium and Narcotic drugs, 2017, 3016
Prohibition, and, 2017
Parliament buildings, tower, 2016
Patronage, rural postmasters, 3083
Penitentiary Act Amdt. bill, 788
Pension Board, 392, 1350
Regulations, change, 2995
Pensions
European war and active militia, 1361
Widowed mothers, 1311
Pensions Committee, final report, 3302-3

Manion, Hon. Robert J. — *Con.*
Point of order, general policy, 556
Public building, location of services in, 1757
Rail and car repair contracts, 1696, 1698
Returned soldiers, alleged treatment of children of, 2638
Returned Soldiers' Insurance Act Amdt. bill, 3394, 3400
Revenue and protective tariffs, 719, 2265
St. Lawrence river waterway, 1200
Co-operation with United States, 2760
Grain transportation, 2758
Soldiers' bonus, M. (Mr. Arthurs) 445
Soldiers' Civil Re-establishment
Estimates, details of, 1347
Expenditure, 1340
Hospital staff, 1345
Salary increases, 387
Soldiers' disabilities, 392
Unemployment relief, 1352
Vocational loans, 1346
Soldiers, land settlement, 2023
Statistics, co-ordination of work in, 1366
Steel industry, subsidies to, 1697
Tariff, permanent advisory board or commission, 2269
"Tories and militarists", 1598
Unemployment
Rail and car repair contracts, 1696
Situation, 1074
Vancouver and Fraser Valley bill, 798
Welland ship canal, grain transportation, 2758
Wheel chairs for invalids, 3115
Wrangel island, 2208

Manitoba
Agricultural College, western agricultural conditions, 2332
Court of appeal decision on Canada Grain Act, 1770, 1841, 1932-3. *See also* Wheat Board
Flags on public schools, 1265
Forestry in, 1046
Harbours and rivers, 2003
Liberal Convention, res. on immigration, 2478
Natural resources, control of, 24, 1018. *See also* Western Provinces
Norris, Premier, on freight rates and natural resources, 1017, 1213
Unemployment conference, 1069
University of, percentage of students of foreign extraction, 2151, 2157
White Mud river fishway, 2167

Manufactured Goods, tax on. *See* Customs Tariff

Manufacturers. *See also* Canadian Manufacturers' Association
Eastern Canada in, 2901
Income tax paid by, qu., 1063-4
Production of wealth by, 2378
Progress since 1870, 2658
Propaganda, 2362
Protection of, 55, 102-3, 144, 153, 303, 343, 2435-2440. *See also* Speeches on Address; Budget
Sales tax. *See* Special War Revenue

Manure, exportation of, 1018. *See also* Fertilizers

Maple Products. *See also* Health

Maple Products Act, administration of, 2017

Maps, Topographical. *See* Dominion Lands and Surveys

Marcil, Hon. Charles (Bonaventure)
Air force and civil aviation, 1733
Budget, 2905. Twenty-two years of parliamentary life; interest in the West; 2905; Liberal party and western development; a united Canada; hardships of pioneers, 2906; conditions and advantages of the western railways; market for the farmers; employment for the workingman; reciprocity; opposition of manufacturers; 2907; trade relations with United States; tariff reductions; British preference; development of St. Lawrence waterway; better understanding between East and West; the amdt., 2908
Business of the House
Budget debate, conclusion of, 2639
Sub-amendment (Mr. Crerar), 2473
Canadian National railways, public ownership, 1938
Canadian representation in the United States, 1383
Canned goods, marking, 3050
Census enumerators
Appointment of, 1371
Payment of, 1368
Census figures, verification, 1366
Civil Service
Commission, 3072
Patronage, 3074
Daylight saving, M. (Mr. Kay) 952
Debates, official report of insertion of documents not read, 1540
Dominion Elections Act Amdt. bill, 2813
Fisheries, Gulf and Gaspesian coasts, qu. 1401
French-Belgian treaty, 3223

Marcil, Hon. Charles. — *Con.*
Gaspe railways, M. for papers, 623
House of Commons staff, stenographers and messengers, qu., 1376
Immigration Act Amdt. bill (Mr. Woodsworth) 1393
Insurance claims of heirs of deceased soldiers, 1349
Meat and canned foods, 3047
Montreal Harbour Commission, Capt. Landry, 1481
Oleomargarine, M. (Mr. Neill) 1800
Opium and Narcotic drugs, 3019
Pension Act Amdt. bill, 3444
Pension Commissioners, Quebec representation, 1350-1
Pensions, widowed mothers, 3293
Proportional representation, M. (Mr. Good) 1656
Quebec fisheries, 377, M., 493, 616
Receipt tax, 3262
References to, 1298
Returned Soldiers' Insurance Act, 3395
Root Vegetables, potato bags, 3377
Rulings as Acting Speaker:
Member moving res. has right to close debate, 540
Member withdrawing motion, 545
Relevancy, 3539-40, 3542
Res. involving charge on revenue, 3476
Supply, point of order, 1337
Vocational loans to fishermen, 1346

Marcile, Mr. J. E. (Bagot)
Bankruptcy Act, qu., 703
Dominion Elections Act, qu., 470
Royal Canadian Mounted Police, qu., 377

Marconi Company, 1736, 1749

Margaree breakwater, 1767

Marine and Fisheries. *See also* Canada Shipping Act Amdts.; Canadian Govt. Merchant Marine; Fish and Fisheries; Naval Service. For vessels, *see that title*
Barkhouse, Captain, 1748
Biological Board, 3051
Demers, Captain, 1492
Deputy Minister of Fisheries, 2166
Derelicts, removal, Windsor, N.S., 1493
Distressed seamen, relief of, 1676
Estimates, 1489, 1676, 2166, 3507
Examination of masters and mates, 1490

Marine and Fisheries — *Con.*
Life-saving
Equipment, qu., 1284
Services, 1494
Stations, qu., 367
Lighthouse and coast service. *See that title*
Little Current tug boat, 3086
Marine agencies, 1495
Marine signal service, 1499
Meteorological service, 1501
Navigation, aids to, 1498
Newfoundland coast, 1498
Rainy river lights, 1499
Navigation schools, 1492
Ocean and river service, 1676, 3507
Expenditure, 1494
Murphy, Capt. Frank, compensation, 3508
Relief of distressed seamen, 1676
Steel plates, 3508
O'Hara, Captain, 1490
Pilotage
Administration of, 1499
Exemption from dues. *See* Canada Shipping Act Amdt.
Prince Rupert Drydock Co., claim, 3514
Publicity and marketing division, 2169
Range lights for fishermen, 1498
Removal of obstructions from navigable waters, 1493
St. Lawrence ship channel, maintenance, 1494
Select Standing Com. on, changes, 1398
Steamers and icebreakers, 1489
Steamboat inspection, 2169
Sorel shipyard
Maintenance, 1494
Men employed, 1062
War claims, adjustment of, 1677
Wrecking plants, subsidies, etc., 1493
Wrecks, investigation, 1492
Lambton, 1497

Maritime Provinces
Coal fields, 108, 2611. *See also* Coal
Condition prior to Confederation, 107
Intercolonial and, 107, 192. *See also that title* under Canadian National Railways
Natural resources, 340. *See that title*
Public buildings, 1243
Railways, 131
St. Lawrence river waterway, 1316

Mark, value of. *See* Currency, depreciated; Germany

Marketing of Wheat. *See* Wheat Board

Markets, Foreign, 221. *See also* Trade
Necessity for, 2149. *See* Speeches on Address; Budget
Reciprocity and. *See that title*
Restricted, 343

Marking Act. *See* Customs

Marking of Goods. *See* Budget; Customs Tariff

Marler, Mr. Herbert (St. Lawrence-St. George)
Address in reply, 243; congratulations to Mr. Speaker; unity of purpose in government; elections and the province of Quebec, 244; government by co-operation; railway situation, 246; merchant marine, 247; tariff revision, 248; Liberal tariff views; immigration, 249, 250
Canadian Govt. Merchant Marine, 246-247
Insurance, qu., 605
Enfranchisement of foreign-born women, M. (Mr. Euler) 486
Mines and Minerals, Com., on, 1398
Pension Act Amdt. bill, 3444-55
Pensions Committee
First report, 726
Final report, 3286, 3348
Adoption of, 2253
Meetings, 3335
Returned Soldiers' Insurance Act, 3393
Soldiers' Settlement Act Amdt. bill, 3408
Speech on tariff before election, 240
Vickers, dry dock, qu. 936

Marshall, Mr. Duncan, 647, 754, 1012, 1032. *See also* Agriculture
Cattle embargo and, 1032

Martell, Mr. L. H. (Hants)
Agricultural exhibitions, 995-6
Barkhouse, Capt., 1748
Biological Board, Mr. Halkett, 3051
British Empire Steel Corporation, taxation, qu., 1067
British Preference and Canadian seaports, 719
Canadian Govt. Merchant Marine, passenger traffic, qu. 939
Canadian Pacific Railway bill, 1859
Canadian Transit Company bill, 1771
Canned lobsters, inspection, 3048
Civil Service
Inside service, 580-1
Overmanning, 3081, 3100
Patronage, 3087

Martell, Mr. L. H. — *Con.*
Coal transportation on national railways, 1763
Cold storage, 818, 996
Daylight saving, M. (Mr. Kay) 951
Departmental law officers, 683-4
Esquimalt and Nanaimo railway bill, 1163
Fisheries Act Amdt. bill, 2818
Fisheries Protection service, 678, 1747
Fishing schooner race, 3510
Food inspection, 820
Income tax, qu., 366
Indians Sydney reserve, medical attendance, qu., 2216
Labour department salaries, 549
Legal costs, 2772
MacInnes, Mr. Hector, K.C. Halifax, payments to, 2772
Marine and Fisheries
Capt. O'Hara, 1491
Lighthouse and coast service, 1496
Ocean and river service, 3507
Select Standing Com., on, 1398
Wrecks, investigation, Capt. Demers, 1492
Meighen, "the King-maker", 35
Military expenditure, 1137, 1141
Militia dept., officials, 741
Motion transferred, 942
National Defence bill, 665, 737
Nova Scotia miners, 524
Oleomargarine Act Amdt. bill, 3489
Opium and Narcotic Drugs bill, 3022
Parents, support of by children, 1310
Parliament buildings, architects' fees, 2015
Pelagic Sealing treaty, 1844
Pensions
Limitation of time for application, 2995
Widowed mothers, M. (Mr. Power) 1309
Pensions Act Amdt. bill, 3445-62
Preston, Mr. W. T. R., claim, 3504
Removal of derelict in channel at Windsor, N.S., 1493
Royal Canadian navy, 1855, 1890
St. John terminal facilities, 849
Soldiers' Civil Re-establishment, staff, 1343
Steamship services, freight rates, 2028, 3032
Welland ship canal, 2749
West Indies steamship services, 3032
Wheat Board, 3182
Windsor, N.S.,
Lease of wharves to C.P.C., 2749
Wreck at, 1493
Women and the franchise, 483

Massey-Harris Company, 1106, 2175. *See also* Agricultural Implements

Masters and Mates. *See* Marine and Fisheries

Matapedia Valley. *See* Quebec Oriental Railway

Match Industry, Occupational diseases. *See* Labour

Matches
Bill respecting, 1r., 3598
Tax on, 3262

Maybee, Mr. M. E. (Northumberland, Ont.)
Baxter, Mr. Charles, successor to, qu., 2457

Meat and Canned Foods Act, administration of, 967

Meat and Canned Foods Act Amdt. bill
Res. 3044; 1r., 2r., 3050; com., 3050, 3149; 3r., 3150

Meat Inspection, 226. *See also* Animal Contagious Diseases; Cattle Embargo

Meat Products. *See also* Live stock

Meats, Cold storage. *See* Agriculture

Medical Advisory Board. *See* Pensions Committee

Medical care. *See* Indians

Medical Examinations. *See* Returned Soldiers Insurance Act

Medical Inspection. *See* Immigration

Medicines. *See also* Opium and Narcotics
Duties, reductions in, 2116

Mediterranean of America, 1202. *See also* St. Lawrence River Waterway

Meighen, Right Hon. Arthur (Leader of the Opposition)
Abattoir inspectors, 969
Adamson, Mr. Justice, appointment of, 1670
Address in reply, 19. Congratulations to mover and seconder; Miss Macphail; New Prime Minister; Limitation of Armaments conference, 19-20; census returns; expansion of trade, 20; Liberal speeches and campaign literature; Sir Lomer Gouin and Mr. Mitchell, 21; natural resources of western provinces, 22; tariff revision, 24; Liberal platform; speeches of Sir Lomer Gouin, 26; Hon. Walter Mitchell; the Prime Minister on the tariff, 26-27; Mr. Raymond, 27; Mr. Marler, 28; public ownership; 30; wider markets; Minister of Agriculture, 32; reciprocity pact; reduction of freight rates, 33; Liberal administration; negotiations with Progressives, 34; Mr. Crerar, 34-35; Newmarket speech; Union Government negotiations, 35; Mr. Gardiner's statement, 36; responsible government, 37; Orders in Council, 37-38
Agricultural implements, duty, 3119
Agriculture Com. report, 726, 776, 1929. *See also under this title,* Wheat Board
Agriculture dept., Mr. Duncan Marshall, 645
Air Board, 1722
Details of expenditure, 1728
Estimates, 1722-35
Alien property, custody at Prince Rupert, 3606
Alpine Club, 794, 1053
Archives, 702
Assiniboine river floods, relief measures, 3491
Australia, reciprocity with, 9, 10, 2802
Banff-Windermere highway, 1682
Birthday, congratulations on, 3102
Borden, Sir Robert, correspondence, 373
International disarmament conference, 1283
Budget, 2523; Tribute to Finance Minister; financial position; debt; taxation and fiscal policy; moderate protection, 2524; free trade principles; the Netherlands, Belgium, 2525; Great Britain; abandonment of protection would mean disaster to Canada; ability to compete abroad; reciprocal trade; peculiar situation of Canada; United States an intermediary between us and the outside world, 2526; east and west routes of trade; reciprocal arrangement with United States; rejection of Reciprocity treaty; Fordney tariff, 2527; American farmers and competition in home market, 2527; free trade in wheat; results seen in United States tariff legislation; amendment, 2528; Liberal pledges broken; brazen apostacy; British preference; microscopic reduction in duties; Liberal platform of 1919, 2529; Finance Minister should have declared his position; tariff; general reduction and detailed adjustment, 2530; voters betrayed; contract broken; revised policy of Liberal

Meighen, Right Hon. Arthur — *Con.*
Budget — *Con.*
party; declaration of Prime Minister; promised reductions in duties on food, 2531; clothing, building materials; failure to implement pledges, 2532; responsibility of Progressive party; invitation to Government to abandon pledges; grant to returned soldiers; Mr. Crerar's position, 2533; amendment to amendment; failure of Progressives to achieve their desire; responsible government; agricultural implement duties; 2534; Opposition votes for government; freight rates; faults of the budget; German and Austrian trade; exchange; inflation of currency; marking of imports, 2535; Government by Order in Council; dumping clause; possible tariff reductions; sales tax; Mr. Raymond and agricultural implement duties; Hr. Macdonald (Pictou) and steel and coal duties, 2536; special platforms for individual constituencies; Government's difficulties of their own creation, 2537
Budget amendment, 2338
Building trades, 583
Business of the House, 373
Amdt. to amdt., (Mr. Crerar) 2522
Budget debate, conclusion of, 2639
Daylight saving, 1282
Debate on naval service estimates, 1742, 1900
Debates, Official, insertion of documents not read, 1540
Decorum, 2090
Delay in proceeding with, 7
Further legislation, inquiry, 2996, 3102, 3365
Government orders on Mondays and Wednesdays, 1461, 1720
Privilege, right of member to raise on orders of the day, 2638
Questions standing as orders for returns, 1660
Supplementary estimates, 3364
Wednesday, hour of sitting, 49
Canada Shipping Act Amdt. bill (Pilotage) 1487
Canada Temperance Act Amdt. bill, Senate amdts., 3614
Canadian National parks, 1053
Canadian National railways
Accounting, 1918
Amalgamation of system, delay, 2585
Canadian Northern, 1907
Deficits, 1918

Meighen, Right Hon. Arthur — *Con.*
Canadian National railways — *Con.*
Estimates, 1907-54
Minister's annual statement, 912
Canadian offices in England, co-ordination, 414
Canadian Transit Company bill, 1747
Cash grants to soldiers, 393, 394, 2533
Liberal pledge, 400
Relevancy, 404
Cattle embargo, 985
Alleged statement of High Commissioner, 1022, 1463
Census enumerators, appointment, 1368, 1372
Chamberlin, Mr. R. G., grant to, 3497
Chinese customs tariff, 3168
Civil aviation, 1722
Civil Service Act, 1368
Civil Service
Classification, Arthur Young Co., 1491
Economy, 2057
Marine and Fisheries department, 1491
Militia services, organization of, 423
Reorganisation of, 2061
Griffenhagen and Associates, 1491
Russell, Mr. T. A., superannuation of, 1667
Coal for public buildings, 1758
Committees, changes, 497
Criminal Code Amdt. bills
Half-breed scrip, 3103, 3211, 3219
Mr. Woodsworth Special Com., second report, 1988
Crowsnest pass agreement, M. (Mr. Kennedy, Essex) for Special Com., 104-11-21-24-49-53. *See also under this title,* Freight Rates
Customs
Drawbacks, 766
Dumping clause, 2535-6, 3119, 3413, 3421
Estimates, 763
Valuation for duty, 3225, 3414
Daylight saving, M. (Mr. Kay) 948
Debates, Official Report of, insertion of documents not read, 1540
Defence, preparation for, 1621. *See also under this title,* National Defence
Demobilization, military hospitals, 1262
Deville, Dr., 1044, 1048
Dinosaurs, museum specimens, 1237
Director of commercial intelligence, 700
Distressed seamen, relief of, 1676
Doherty, Hon. Manning, visit to England, 1283, 1334
Dominion Elections Act, 470
Dominion Iron & Steel Company
Contract for steel plates, 1677
Damage action against Govt., 2170

Meighen, Right Hon. Arthur — *Con.*
Dominion lands
And surveys, 1044
Homestead re-entry, 1042
Dominion lands, cancellation of leases, bill, 3466-75
Senate amdts., 3614
Editorial Committee, 1235-6
Election campaign, 21, 187
Election of Speaker, 2
Election promises, 21
Liberal handbook, 400
Ellesmere Island, 1751
Enfranchisement of foreign-born women, M. (Mr. Euler) 479
Estimates
"Appropriations not required," 1269
Information not up-to-date, 1267
This year's accounts charged to previous years, 1715
Exemption of farmers' sons, 440
Experimental farms, expenditure, 1264
Extra-territorial rights, 1068
False creek bridge, 3516
Finance, deputy minister, 751
Fire prevention, 794
Fisheries protection service, 1747
Fishing schooner race, 3511
Freight rates. *See also under this title* Crowsnest Pass Agreement
Crowsnest pass agreement, 3589
Railway Act Amdt. bill, 3589
Special Com., ref. to, M. (Mr. Kennedy, Essex) 1213
Third report, 3589
Gasoline tax, 3116
Gaspé railways, 627
Genoa conference, expenses, 1715
Geological survey, co-ordination of survey work, 1236
German goods, valuation, 3225
Government departments, payments to each other, 1724
Grain Inquiry Commission, 50
Grand Trunk Railway
Arbitration, British newspaper article, 375
Financial statement, 1933
Harbours and rivers
Expenditure for 1921-22, 1269
Prince Edward Island, 1270
High Commissioner
Alleged statement of, 1022, 1463
Office, 414
Hydrographic survey, 1746
Immigration Act Amdt. bill (Mr. Woodsworth) 1503, 1988
Immigration — Criminal Code bills, 3284

Meighen, Right Hon. Arthur — *Con.*
Immigration dept., 3051
Black Mr., appointment, 3500
Marshall, Mr. Duncan, 755
Work of, 760
Immigration of Hutterites, 2160
Imperial Convention of Teachers, 1673
Imperial Mining Resources Bureau, 1238
Income tax
Comparison with systems in other countries, 2228
Naturalization, and, inquiry as to legislation, 3103
Non-resident aliens, M. (Mr. German) 1303
Income War Tax Act. Amdt., 3359
Indian Act Amdt. bill, 3192
Indian Affairs
Estimates, 681, 684, 1712
Indians
Agitation and unrest, 1223
Complaints, 1223
Expenditure, 1216
Hospital grants, 1218
Medical attention, 1218
Six Nation reserve, 1222
Soldiers Settlement Board, 1222
Stony reserve school, 1229
Insurance department, 792
Interim Supply bill, 380
Interior Department
Conservation Commission employees, transfer, 457
Estimates, 3517
Printing and stationery, 1680
International Labour Conference, 3437
Judges' Act Amdt. bill, 424, 428
Justice dept. salaries, 452
Labour department
Duplications, 577
Salaries 550
Lake of the Woods Repeal bill, 2991, 3200, 3207, 3435
Lawyers, employment in Justice dept., 1679
League of Nations, 3162, 3171, 3174
Limitation of Armaments, 43
Loyalty of western Canada, 1023
McCoig, Senator, attendance before Com. on Agriculture, 1900
Marine and Fisheries
Life-saving service, 1494
Removal of obstructions in navigable waters, 1493
St. Lawrence ship channel, 1494
Steamers and icebreakers, 1490
Marler, Mr., and railway situation, 28, 247
Marshall, Mr. Duncan, appointment, 3501
Meat and canned foods, 3045, 3050

Meighen, Right Hon. Arthur — *Con.*
Military Service Act Amdt. bill, 640
Militia and Defence
Annual drill, proposed reduction of vote, 1620-9
Arsenals
Lindsay, 2088
Quebec, 2091, 2096
War claims, adjustment of, 417
Mines department
Additional officials, 689
Estimates, 686
Ethnologist and ornithologist, 687
Ministers and directorships, 1104
Montreal Harbour Commission, 1489
National Defence bill, 663, 674, 734, 738, Senate amdts., 2807
Natural resources, transfer to western provinces, 41-42
M. for correspondence, 1509
Naturalization Act Amdt. bill, 3436
Naval defence, 1862-1900
Naval policy, 2056-81
Naval service, 1738
Empire defence, contribution to, 2081
Niobe, sale of, 2065
Royal Canadian navy, 1741, 1862-1900, 2056
Empire defence, needs of, 1741
Minister's proposals, criticism of, 1741
Staff, 418
Nelson, Mr. Frank, 3517
Norris, Premier, reported statement, 1213
Nova Scotia miners, M. (Mr. Irvine) 503, 524-539, 544, 597, 1054
Nova Scotia Supreme Court, vacancy, 3437
Ocean and river service, expenditure, 1494
Oleomargarine Act Amdt. bill, 3426-32
Orders in Council, government by, 663, 2535-6
Ore-dressing plant, 1235
Oriental aliens, M. (Mr. McQuarrie) 1561, 1567, 1575
Paper milk bottle caps, 3114
Parliament buildings, lighting, 1755
Parliament, fall session, 3609
Peace and war, 1621
Penitentiary Act Amdt. bill, 789
Pension Commissioners, Board of, 1350, 1351
Charges against, 3041
Representation of Quebec, 1351
Pensions
European war and active militia, 1353
Expenditure under report of Special Com., 3522

Meighen, Right Hon. Arthur — *Con.*
Ploughs, duty on, 3123, 3125
Amdt. (Mr. Johnston, Last Mountain, 3230
Political alliances, 2097
Political promises — Mr. Hoey, 2338
Portage la Prairie exhibition, qu., 1391
Post Office estimates, 691
Preston, Mr. W. T. R., rent of house in London, 3504
Prices, deflation of, 1216
Prime Minister, private secretaries, 410, 412
Prime Ministers' Conference, 1629
Correspondence, 1068
Naval defence, 1742
Lord Lee, reported statement of, 1742
Report, reference to, 5
Prince Rupert Dry Dock & Engineering Co., 3514
Privy Council, increases, 410
Promises of Union Government, 2339
Public buildings
Coal for, 1758
Flags, 1264, 1268
Generally, expenditure, 1262
Heating, 1758
Maritime provinces, 1243
Ontario
Alleged neglect by former government, 1249
Appropriation and expenditure, 1245-59-60
Ottawa
Elevator attendants, 1266
Lighting, 1267
Water, 1266
Public expenditures, 1249
Public Works
Classification, 693
Estimates, 692, 697, 699, 747
Public buildings, 1755. *See also under this title,* Public Buildings
Salaries, 749
Quebec fisheries, M. (Mr. Marcil) 377, 493 622
Quebec Harbour Commission
Inquiry for papers, 1283
Political patronage, 1477
Resignation of former commissioners, 1477-8
Quebec Harbour Commission bill, 1477
Radiotelegraph service, 1749
Railway Commission
Chairman, alleged statement of Mr. Motherwell, 3491
Freight rates, 193

Meighen, Right Hon. Arthur — *Con.*
Railway estimates, 409
Railway policy of Government, inquiry, 407
Railways, annual statement of minister, 921
Raymond, Mr., and the tariff, 255, 2536-7
Reciprocal trade with Australia, 10, 2802
Inquiry for correspondence, 9
Reciprocity with the United States, 2845
Redistribution, 733, 3611
Census, and, 1364, 1367, 1371
Resolution should embody bills, 3179
Returns, inquiry for, 1283
Rideau hall, fuel and light, 1756
Royal Canadian Mounted Police, 734
Amalgamation with Dominion Police, 673
Estimates, 2129
Ruling of Chair, 3354
St. John quarantine station, 1241
St. John terminal facilities, M. (Mr. Caldwell) 844
Saunders, Dr. C. E., gratuity to, 3522
Secretary of State, estimates, 701
Seed grain advances, 1053
Seed grain commission, 1011
Soldier land settlement, 3294, 3296
Estimates, 2135
Homestead rights, 2135
Land purchase, irregularities charged, 2139
Taxes, collection of, 2135
Soldiers' bonus, 393, 394, 400, 404, 436, 2533
Soldiers' Civil Re-establishment
Hospitals, 1262
Medical treatment, 392
Parliamentary Com., 393
Salary increases, 385
Unemployment relief, 1352
Soldiers' Civil Re-establishment bill, 3597, 3609
Sorel shipyards, dismissal of employees, 1283
Speaker, Mr., bereavement of, 496
Speaker's election, 2
Statistics, co-ordination of work, 580, 1366
Statutes, revision of, 1718
Steamship subsidies, 3505
Steel, structural, importation, qu., 1931
Stefansson expedition, 1750
Supply. *See also under this title,* Estimates
Concurrence, 1769
Method of discussion, 1142
Motions in, 1579
Latitude in discussion, 2238
Supreme Court estimates, 1274
Tariff Commissioner, appointment of, 1663
Tariff revision, 2540
Tourist traffic, 1682

Meighen, Right Hon Arthur — *Con.*
Tractors, duty on, 3124
Trade and Commerce officials, 700-01
Treaties of Peace with Hungary and Turkey, 3490
Trial of Indian Lebeaux, expenses, 1669
Unemployment
Banff-Windermere highway, 1682
Canadian coal, use of by railways, 1759
Insurance, 1080
Policy of government as to, 3491
Relief, 1719
Situation, 1079
Welland canal, 2750
United Grain Growers, agricultural implements, 3120
United States, discriminatory legislation 1303, 2527-8
Washington conference. *See also under this title,* Naval Service
Empire naval defence, 1744
Papers, 1283
Welland canal, 2750
Western provinces, natural resources. *See* Natural Resources
Wheat Board, 2915, 2924, 2953, 3175, 3184. 3190, 3381, 3386. *See also under this title,* Agriculture Committee
Concurrence in report of special Com., delay, 2306
White, Mr. James, employment of, 3495
Winnipeg strike, Mr. Alfred J. Andrews, 1069
Wrangel island, 1750
Yukon territory
Administration of, 1681
Expenditure, 1275
Radiotelegraph service, 1749

Melchior, Dr., on value of German mark, 2645

Mellish, Mr. Justice, 1275

Melville, Sask., railway restaurant, qu., 2038

Members. *See* House of Commons

Memorials, War. *See* Baker, Lieut. Col.; Battlefields; Historic Sites; War Graves Commission; War Memorials

Mennonites. *See* Immigration

Merchant Marine. *See* Canadian Government Merchant Marine

Merchants' Bank. *See that title under* Banks and Banking

Mercier, Mr. Paul (Westmount-St. Henri)
Address in reply to Governor General's Speech, seconder, 15. Change of government; Baron Byng of Vimy, 16; congratulations to Mr. Speaker; encouragement of agriculture, commerce and industry, 16-17; immigration; labour, 17; financial burdens; political parties, 18
Electrification of railways, M. (Mr. Deslauriers) 638
St. Lawrence river waterway, 786, 1333
M. (Mr. Church) 1396

Meredith, Sir Vincent, 1128

Messengers and Stenographers, qu., 1376

Metal File Cabinets, 1252

Metals. *See* Mines and Minerals

Meteorological Service, magnetic observatory, 1501

Mexico
Postal rate to, qu., 3364
Trade with, 699, 700, 2989

Mewburn, Hon. S. C. (East Hamilton)
Ammunition shipment from Great Britain, 1169
Battlefields memorials, 2098
Hamilton post office building, 1246
Military expenditure and policy, 1152, 1579
Militia and defence
Annual drill, 1152, 1579
Expenditure and policy, proposed reduction, 1579
Services co-ordination, 416
National Defence bill, 665, 666, 737, 744, 745
Royal Canadian Mounted Police, industrial disputes, 667
Royal commission on pensions, 386

Michaud, Mr. Pius (Restigouche and Madawaska)
Audibility of debate, 385
Criminal Code Amdt., fines, payment, 2832
Customs revenue, qu., 607
Damage by floods in New Brunswick, 3492
Edmundston
Post office, qu., 608
Public building, 1242
German reparations, qu., 375
Lighthouse and coast service, 1496
St. John terminal facilities, 847
St. Lawrence river waterway, 2753
Welland ship canal, 2753

Migratory Birds, 1684

Military Forces, preparedness. *See* Militia and Defence; National Defence; Naval Servicee

Military Hospitals, 1261, 1341, 1344, 3287-9, 3345. *See also* Pensions Com. report; Soldiers' Civil Re-establishment
Soldiers' Civil Re-establishment, 1339-48

Military Service. *See also* Pensions Com.
Medical inspection, 3317

Military Service Act, powers under, 780

Military Service Act, 1917, Repeal bill (Mr. Woodsworth
1r., 424; order for 2r., stands, 493; M. for 2r., 639; Mr. Speaker rules bill out of order, 644

Militia and Defence. *See also* National Defence bill
Adjustment of War claims, 1155, 2098, 2974
Air force, 1722
Allowances, active militia, 1135
Ammunition, 2085
Shipment from Great Britain, 1156-63, 1337
Small arms, 1979
Annual drill, 1137, 1139, 1144, 1146, 1151, qu., 1285, 1335, 1578, 1610, 2835
Amdt. (Mr. Power) to reduce vote by $1,100,000, 1174, 1578
Amdt. to amdt. (Mr. Lapointe) to reduce vote by $400,000, 1579; agreed to, 1631
Expenditure for 1911-21, qu., 1287
Armouries
Fittings and alterations, 1261
Quebec, qu., 1287
Arsenals
Danger of attack by aeroplanes, 2085-98
High explosive shells, 1170
Lindsay, 1165, 1171, 1979
Site, purchase of, 2087-8
Quebec, 1165, 1171, 1978-9, 2085
Amdt. (Mr. Lapointe) to reduce vote by $50,000, 2091; agreed to, 2098
Amdt. (Mr. McBride) to reduce vote by $110,000, 2091; neg., 2098
Customs duties, 1978
Rivière du Loup, qu., 1181
Burstall, General Sir Henry, retirement of, qu., 1211. *See also* National Defence
Cadet camps, 1147, 1973, 2202
Militarism, 1974
Cadet services
M. (Mr. Murdock) to reduce vote by $100,000, 1972; agreed to, 1978

Militia and Defence — *Con.*
Civil pensions, 1711, 3499
Clothing and necessaries, M. (Mr. Murdock) to reduce item by, $21,000, 1978
Defensive forces, 1135
Demobilization expenditure, 1155, 1163
Department
Estimates, 415, 586, 1578, 1610, 1972, 2974, 3498
Reductions, 1174, 1578, 1631, 1972-87, 2091-98
Salaries and contingencies, 415, 586, 1985
District auditors, 1145
Engineer services and works
M. Mr. Murdock) to reduce item by $50,000, 1980
Expenditure
Policy and, 1174, 1335, 1578, 1610, 2202. *See also under this title,* Arsenals, Naval Service
Reductions proposed by minister, 1578
Reduction of, 1135
1890-1913, qu., 1285
1911-22, qu., 1287
First Canadian Contingent, qu., 1376
General staff, 1145
Generals, 1145
Gwatkin, General, retirement of, qu., 1211. *See also* National Defence
Lindsay arsenal. *See under this title,* Arsenals
Long Branch rifle range, qu., 372
Lord Grey on military protection, 1136
MacBrien, General, 1151
Reported utterances of, 1662
Maintenance of military properties, 1980
Military districts, 1580, 1775
District No. 12, 1602
London, 1983
Toronto, 1983
Military holiday, 1146, 1338
Military hospitals, 1341. *See also that title*
Militia council, qu., 2039
Montreal ordnance stores building, 1245
Munitions. *See also under this title* Ammunition
Shipment from Great Britain, 1154-63
Officers and men at headquarters, 1775
Ordnance arms and lands
M. (Mr. Murdock) to reduce item by $9,000, 1982
Ordnance building, Quebec, repairs, 1711
Pensions. *See also that title*
European war and active militia, 1349, 1353, 1361
Permanent force, 1136, 1147, 1152, 1580, 1982
Estimates, 1982

Militia and Defence — *Con.*
Permanent force — *Con.*
Expenditure, 1140
Royal Canadian Artillery, 1982
Strength of, 1136
Ten years' service or more, qu., 2637
Prince of Wales Leinster regiment, qu., 1065
Quebec arsenal. *See under this title,* Arsenals
Rental of buildings, 1764
Royal Military College, 1985
Schools of instruction
M. (Mr. Murdock) to reduce item by $50,000, 1985
Service overseas, 1140-80
Shed on Cartier square, Ottawa, qu., 2038
Staff, 661
Pay of, amdt., (Mr. Murdock) to reduce item by $10,000, agreed to, 1982; amdt (Mr. Sutherland) to reduce item by $25,000, neg., 1982
Tobin, Lieut. Col., and 29th Battalion, 1975
Topographical maps, qu., 1632
Topographic survey, 1985
Training areas, 1986
Training camps, qu., 2584
Transport and freight, 1986
Amdts. (Mr. Hanson) to reduce by $60,000 and (Mr. Spencer to reduce by $10,000, 1987
War claims, adjustment of, 1155, 2098, 2974
Warlike stores, 1137, 1154-63
Sale of, 1171-3

Milk. *See also* Dairying Industry
Competition with Klim, 981
Condensed, tax, 2492, 3264-5, 3271, 3409
Filled milk and cream, qu., 963
Herds supplying. *See* Accredited herds
Paper caps for bottles, 3114
Products, taxation, 3263-4

Milking Machines, 3270

Mill Feeds, adutleration of, 1012, 2490. *See also* Grain and Grain Trade

Millar, Mr. John (Qu'Appelle)
Agricultural implements, price of, 1476
Agriculture
Condition and prospects of, 1475, 2163
Plant pathologist, 593-4
Animal Contagious Diseases bill, 2736
Banks, interest rates, 3601
Beet sugar industry, 3251
Budget, 2294. Congratulations to Finance Minister; war indebtedness; failure

Millar, Mr. John — *Con.*
Budget — *Con.*
to meet larger proportion of cost during the war; public debt; revenue and expenditure; encouragement of basic industries; agriculture bled white, 2294; monopolies and political contributions; labour unions; extracting profits from the consumer, 2295; insufficient tariff reductions; agriculture languishing; price of gasoline; Sir Richard Cartwright and Mr. Meighen on the tariff, 2296; the tariff and mergers; increased prices of textiles; white lead, protective duty added to price; sales tax, the poor man hit, 2297; free food, boots and shoes; protection and wages; average income tax by classes; cost of fostering home industries, 2298; income tax, introduction of; loan companies, 2299
Canadian National railways
Branch lines, 1476, 2772
Freight, careless handling of, 1965
Census
Completion of, 1363
Registration of Canadians, 1363
Civil Service, overmanning, 401
Dairy industry, 980
Enfranchisement of foreign-born women, M. (Mr. Euler) 485
Estimates, 401
Expenditure, necessity for economy in, 401, 1475
Export liquor warehouses, Saskatchewan, 767, qu., 1211
Legality of, qu., 1660
Fish culture, 2169
Fishing schooner race, 3513
Fort William-Port Arthur terminal elevators, qu., 1210
Hudson bay railway, completion of, 2784
Immigration
Foreigners, loyalty of, 2163
German, 3052
Policy, 2163
Indians
Education and health, 1228
Round lake school, 3537
Liquor
Export warehouses, 767, qu., 1211, qu., 1660, 3001
Importation into Saskatchewan, qu., 2037, qu., 2303
Loan Companies Act Amdt. bill, 3142
Loan companies, renewal of loans, 1476
Parsons, W. Reuben, qu., 3362

Millar, Mr. John — *Con.*
Quebec harbour advances, 1475
St. Lawrence river waterway, 1198
Grain transportation, 2756
Saskatchewan liquor export. *See under this title,* Liquor
Soldier land settlement, land purchases, 2139
Terminal elevators, overages, qu., 1210, 2837
Welland canal
Estimates, amdt. to reduce vote by $4,000,000, 2758; neg., 2764
Grain transportation, 2756
Wheat Board bill, 3385, 3181
Woollen goods, duty on, 3136

Milling Combines, 304, 2633. *See also* Wheat Board

Milne, Mr. Robert (Neepawa)
Agriculture dept., officials, 654
Budget, 2239. A six country; new fiscal policy needed; amendment; no solution; loss of faith in political parties, 2239; economy; tariff inconsistencies; unfairness as between manufacturer and farmer; free raw materials and protected product; sales tax, 2240; farmers and the income tax; agriculture the mainstay of the country, 2241
Fishways in White Mud river, 2167

Milton, speech of Hon. Mr. Murphy, at, 2562

Mineral Resources Bureau. *See* Imperial Mineral Resources

Mineral Waters, tax on. *See* Taxation

Mines and Minerals. *See also* Coal; Geological Survey; Natural Resources
Assay office, Vancouver, 1236
Canadian Institute of Mining and Metallurgy, 1237
Clay products, 1234
Imperial Mining Resources Bureau, 1237
Lignite Utilization Board, 3524
Machinery and tools, reduction in duties, 2116
Mineral rights. *See* Soldiers' Settlement Act Amdt.
Miners' strike, district No. 12, 1058
Mines dept.,
Estimates,, 685, 1233
Salaries, 685
Statistical branch, 1366
Topographical maps, qu., 1632
Ore dressing plant, 1236

Mines and Minerals — *Con.*
Publications, 1234-6
Resources, 12
Investigation of, 1234
Reduction in vote, 1236-62
Road and materials, 1234
Select Standing Com., 1398
Tar sands, 1236
Yukon, mineral discoveries, 1276

Ministers and Directorships, 241-243
M. (Mr. McMaster), 1084; neg., 1131
Bank directors, 1091
Bank of Montreal, 1129
Board of Railway Commissioners Act, 1088, 1101
Borden, Sir Robert, 1089
Directors of large corporations, names, 1128
Government's attitude, 1095-1117, 1124
Great Britain, practice in, 1089-99, 1107-1128
House of Commons and Senate Act, 1088, 1100, 1111, 1113, 1129
Interlocking directorates, 1086, 1100, 1115, 1129
Judges' Act, 1088
Merchants' Bank, 1085, 1096, 1121
Practice in other countries, 1090, 1096, 1101, 1114
Tariff beneficiaries, 1088
White, Sir Tomas, 1089, 1102

Ministers of the Crown
Salaries, 1093, 2895
Trips to Europe, 14

Minority Candidates. *See* Elections

Minority Government. *See* Elections

Minors, sale of drugs to. *See* Opium and Narcotics

Miscou-Shippegan Islands, service, 2029

Mitchell, Mr. A. J., 46, qu., 471

Mitchell, Mr. Walter (St. Antoine)
Canada Temperance Act Amdt. bill, 3002
Carriage or transportation, amdt., 3008
Canadian National railways
Deficits, 1910
Investigation proposed, 1908-17
Public ownership and operation, 1907
Rails and car repair contracts, 1694, 1709, 1961
Reference to by Mr. Meighen, 21, 207

Monckton Papers, purchase of, 1673

Moncton
Intercolonial headquarters, 313, 355, 2289
Railway shops, 1709

Money. *See also* Banks and Banking; Currency; Finance
Gold standard, 1291
Purchasing power of, 1151-3, 1175, 1177, 1292, 2331, 2603, 2629. *See also* Address; Budget
Mark, German. *See* Germany

Money Bills. *See* Appropriation; Supply

Montpetit, Professor. *See* Genoa Conference

Montreal (city)
Bank of. *See* Banks
Canadian National railways' employees, 1288
Census figures, 1366
Clerks of the peace. *See* Criminal Code Amdt.
Cold storage warehouse, 819
Customs and excise employees, 1288
Foreigners, immigration of, 1392-4
Income tax office, qu., 607, 1288
Merchants' Association, 1392
Ordnance stores building, repairs, 1245
Post office employees, 1288
Post offices, business done, qu., 1065
Soldiers' civil re-establishment, staff, 1342
Suburban steam service, 135
Wages of workmen, 1465

Montreal (port). *See also* British Preference, M. (Mr. Logan)
Canadian Govt. Merchant Marine, qu., 263
Employees, qu., 2992
Expenditure to date, 1488
Facilities, 1472, 1473
Grain shipments through, 1489
Ocean tonnage, 2008
Revenue, 1465
St. Lawrence river waterway, 1183-1209, 1315-34

Montreal Gazette
Canadian National railways, 1923
King-Crerar alliance, 206
Montreal Harbour Commission, resignation, 1481

Montreal Harbour Commission, 1289, 1335. *See also* Quebec Harbour Commission
Employees, 1289
Harbour master, Capt. Landry, 1481
Paint purchased, qu., 602
Policemen, qu., 2992
Resignation of commissioners, 1478-81
Tugboats, qu., 600

Montreal Harbour Commission Advances bill
Res., 1335, 1488; 1r., 1489; 2r., com., 3r., 3199

Monty, Hon. Mr., and conscription. *See* Military Service Act Amdt. bill

Monuments. *See also* Battlefields; War Memorials
Historic sites, 119, qu., 469
New Brunswick, historic sites, qu., 469
Parliament hill, qu., 936

Moore, Mr. Tom, and immigration, 3053

Moosejaw public building improvements,

Morgan, J. P., & Company, 1131, 1133

Morganatic Alliances. *See* Alliances

Morin, Mr. L. S. René (St. Hyacinthe-Rouville)
Canadian Northern railway, qu., 368
Wheat Board, 2926

Morphine. *See* Opium and Narcotic Drugs

Morrison, Mr. John (Weyburn)
Budget, 2699. Comparative prices of wheat and farm implements in Saskatchewan and North Dakota; shifting burden of taxation, 2699; exports of farm implements; competition in foreign markets; protection of industries; customs tariff inadequate to raise revenue, 2700; excise duty on manufactured goods; expense of running the Government; to much overhead, 2701; comparative development of Canada and the United states; freight rates and Crowsnest pass agreement, 2702; export rates on manufactured goods and agricultural products; prices of hides, wool, boots and shoes and clothing; exchange value of wheat and commodities, 2703
Campbell, Mr. J. A., claim for flax shipment, 2836
Canada Temperance Act Amdt. bill, 3005
Crowsnest pass agreement, 2702
M. (Mr. Kennedy, Essex) for Special Com., 1425-6
Royal Canadian Mounted Police, M. (Mr. Woodsworth) 836
Sales tax collections, qu., 375
Saskatchewan liquor exports, 3005
Soldiers' bonus, M. (Mr. Arthurs) 435

Morrissy, Mr. John (Northumberland, N.B.)
Harbours and rivers, New Brunswick, 1992
Provincial wharves, 1992

Mothers, Widowed, pensions to. *See* Pensions

Motherwell, Hon. W. R. (Minister of Agriculture)
Abattoir inspectors, 969
Accredited herds, 649, 999
Diseases, 969
Valuation, 1003
Adulteration of mill feeds, 1012
Agricultural Fertilizers bill, 1282, 3041, 3043, 3195
Agricultural Instruction Act, 1013
Agricultural lecturers, 1024
Agriculture department
Deputy Minister's salary, 653
Employees, 651
Estimates, 644, 1718, 3504, 3520
Lynton, Mr. T. J., 588
Marshall, Mr. Duncan, 645, 651, 1013
Officials, 654-5
Professional men, 589
Salary increases, 588, 657
Saunders, Dr., 590
Alderson claim, hog cholera, 1004
Animal Contagious Diseases Act Amdt. bill, 2102, 2734-43, 2806
Bacon, production and marketing, 1025
Budget, 2548. Fulfilment of election pledges; Liberal platform of 1893, 2548; tariff pledge; British preference; reciprocity, defeat of, 1911; free trade, 2549; unrestricted reciprocity; cry of annexation; opposition of manufacturers to proposal, 2550; Canada's tragic mistake; protection; infant industries; protection for the farmer, 2551; not a protectionist budget; a substantial step in right direction; Liberal platform of 1919; revision of Progressive platform, 2552; excise duty on manufactured articles; revenue, 2553; free trade and revenue duties; motor cars; Mr. Crerar's pre-election statements; gradual reduction of tariff, 2554; elimination of protective feature; Regina speech; time inopportune for drastic action, 2555; Department of Agriculture; accredited herds; tuberculosis in cattle, 2556; cold storage; experimental farm system, 2557; staff; Civil Service Commission, 2559; patronage, 2560
Canada Temperance Act Amdt bill, 2998
Carvell, Hon. F. B., 2773, 2774, 2778-9
Cattle embargo, 970, 979, 1021
Cattle, free carriage of, 1029
Cold storage, 818, 998, 1024, 2557, 3521

Motherwell, Hon. W. R. — *Con*
Criminal Code, cruelty to animals, 2834
Dairies, inspection of, 1006
Dairy produce, grading, 652, 656
Dairying industry, 982
Destructive Insect and Pest Act, 3520
Entomology
Botanical section, 816
Insect pests, 815
Exhibition grants, 649, 979
Experimental farms, 795, 799, 804, 812, 1014, 2557
Illustration farms, 3521
Fertilizers
Inspectors, 692
Manure, exportation of, 1021
Grasshoppers, 3520
Health of animals. *See also under this title,* Accredited Herds
Contagious diseases, 967
Hog cholera, 1008
Compensation, 1028
Tuberculosis, 2556, 3521
Hogs, grading of, 1025
Hudson Bay railway, completion, 2784
International Institute of Agriculture, 969
Klim, competition with milk, 981
Liquor, export of, 2998
Live stock industry, 978
Feed shortage in western Canada, 1030
Grazing and feeding, 1719, 3522
National live stock records, 1027
Provincial governments, overlapping, 997
Stockyards, 1030
Wolves, destruction by, 998-999
Milk supply, inspection of herds, 2740
Mixed farming, 998
Oleomargarine, 654
Manufacture and importation, M. (Mr. Neill) 1804
Oleomargarine Act Amdt. bill, 3358, 3425-32, 3487
Pure bred sires, 1032
Railway Commission
Carvell, Hon. F. B., alleged statement in regard to, 2773, 2774, 2778-9
Root Vegetables, sale and inspection of, 1282, 2724, 3142, 3194, 3369, 3486
Rust investigations, 594
Saskatchewan liquor export, 2998
Saunders, Dr. C. E., gratuity to, 3522
Seed Grain Commission, 1011
Spruce bud moth, 595
Wheat Board, 377, 2940
Wheat Board bill, 3382
Wool industry, 997

Motor Cars, Theft of. *See* Criminal Code Amdt.

Motor Trucks for transportation, 134

Mounted Police. *See* Royal Canadian Mounted Police

Moving Pictures. *See* Trade and Commerce

Mowing Machines. *See* Agricultural Implements

Mulvey, Mr. Thomas, qu., 3363

Municipal Prison Farms, 1277. *See also* Prison Reform

Municipal Taxation, payment of by Government, 1256

Municipalities
Unemployment relief, 1069

Munitions. *See* Guthrie; King, Mackenzie, Militia and Defence; War

Munro, Mr. E. A. (Fraser Valley)
Oleomargarine, manufacture, etc., M. (Mr. Neill) 1793
Oriental aliens, M. (Mr. McQuarrie) for exclusion, 1537

Murdock, Hon. James (Minister of Labour)
Building trades, 583
Canmore and Drumheller coal miners' dispute, 1058
Civil Service, report of Hon. Mr. Robertson, 554
Conciliation and Labour Act, 1054
Cost of living, 1058
Employment offices, 1058
Gordon, Sir Charles, 584
Industrial Disputes Investigation Act, 1058
International Labour Conference, 1060
Joint industrial councils, 1060
Labour department
Classification of employees, 494, 575
Director of technical education, 578
Economy and work, 465
Estimates, 1970, 3526
Outside employees, 493, 494
Permanent and temporary employees, 460-1
Staff and salaries, 458-9, 562, 575
Statistical work, 580
Wage investigators, 462
Labour Gazette, 1058
Militia and Defence
Cadet services, M. to reduce item by $100,000, 1972

Murdock, Hon. James — *Con*
Militia and Defence — *Con.*
Clothing and necessaries, M. to reduce item by $21,000, 1978
Engineer services and work, M. to reduce item by $50,000, 1980
Ordnance arms, lands, etc., M. to reduce item by $9,000, 1982
Pay of staff, M. to reduce item by $10,000, 1982
Nova Scotia miners, 46, 1054
Labour department officer, 585
M. (Mr. Irvine) 505
Printing Bureau, 1970
Rail and car repair contracts, 1696, 1701
Unemployment relief, 1074, 1719, 2022, 3526
Policy of government, inquiry, 3491
Rail and car repair contracts, 1696
Whitley councils, 1061
Winnipeg strike, correspondence with Mr. Andrews, 2042

Murphy, Hon. Charles (Postmaster General)
Belley, Mr. Alfred, salary, 3504
Militia expenditure and policy, 1582
National Defence bill, 677
Post Office department
Employees
Bonus, 2801
Salaries, 691, 2801, 3504
Estimates, 1711, 2799
Inspectorates, reorganization, 1507
Outside service, 2799
Railway mail service, 2800
Reorganization, 2800
Rural mail delivery contracts, 2800, 2801
Subletting, 2802
Yukon, parcel post, 2802

Murray Bay-Tadoussac service, 3035

Musk Ox in northern Canada, 2785

Mutton, imported, qu., 610

Mutual Insurance. *See* Insurance

Nanaimo, B.C Post office revenue, qu., 2040

Nanton, Sir Augustus, 1128

Narcotic Drugs. *See also* Opium and Narcotic Drugs
Correspondence with wholesale druggists, 1289

Nassau Dam, qu., 2457

National Battlefields Commission. *See* Battlefields Commission

National Debt. *See* Public Debt

National Defence. *See also* National Defence bills
Department of
Ashton, Major General, 661
Burstall, Major General Sir Henry, 661, 742
Canadian air force and civil aviation, 1722
Currie, Sir Arthur, 659, 743
Elmsley, Major General, 661
Gwatkin, Major General, 742
MacBrien, Major General, 661, 742
Morrison, Sir Edward, 661
Naval students in armories, physical drill, 1741
Services, co-ordination, 91, 97, 1747

National Defence, Department of, bills respecting
1. No. 15. 1r., 363-4; order for 2r., discharged, 547-8
2. No. 27. Res., 644, 657; 1r., 2r., com., 681; com., 732; 3r., 787; Senate amdts., 2806
Sections and subjects discussed:
Air Service, 658, 677
Amalgamation of services, 658
Appointment of officer to exercise powers of deputy, 737
Controller, 741
Defence Council, 746
Deputy Minister, 737
Desbarats, Mr. J. B., 737
Federal laws, enforcement of, 680
Holder of position abolished may be appointed to another, 741
Militia, 658
Naval Service, 658
Officers, retirement of, 661, 742
Officials, 736
Orders in Council, 661
Powers of Minister and deputy, 746
Regulations, 746
Royal Canadian Mounted Police, 658
Secret service, 670-9
Services included, 733

National Gallery, 2011

National Industrial Conference, unemployment insurance, qu., 1375

National Livestock Records, 1026

National Parks. *See* Dominion Lands and Parks

National Railways. *See* Canadian National Railways

National Status. *See* Canada

National Transcontinental Railway. *See* Canadian National Railways

Nationalists, 187
Conservative alliance with, 2095. *See also* Naval Service
Naval policy and, 1849, 1877

Natural Resources. *See also* Forestry; Mines and Minerals
Alienation of, 2245, 2992
Coal lands, 3465, *See also* Coal
Development, 269
Foreign ownership of, 2243. *See also* United States
Investigation of mineral resources, 1234
Northern Canada, in, 2779-99
Water powers, 1051. *See also that title*
Western provinces of, 88, 89, 100, 116, 154, 168, 223, 229, 339
Aerial patrol, 1722
Agreement with Government of Manitoba, 1018
Claims of prairie provinces, 1017
Conference with premiers, 1017
Tabled, 1769
Norris, Premier, reported statement, 1213
Transfer of, M. (Mr. Meighen) for correspondence, 1509

Naturalization. *See also* Dominion Elections Act

Naturalization Act, 1388, 1390
Disabilities of British-born under, 1389-91
Expenses, 1671, 2024
Further legislation, inquiry, 3103

Naturalization Act, 1914, Amdt. bills
1. Residence (Mr. Archambault) 1r., 1062
2. Method of application (Mr. Copp) 1r., 3436

Naval Armaments. *See* Limitation of Armaments

Naval College. *See under* Naval Service, Royal Naval College

Naval Defence. *See* Naval Service

Naval Fortifications. *See* Limitation of Armaments

Naval Service. *See also* Marine; National Defence
Aurora, qu., 827, 1736, 2051
Canadian Government Merchant Marine, 1898. *See also that title*

Naval Service — *Con.*
Canadian navy, members stranded, 3365
Cruisers and destroyers, expenditure, qu., 2039
Department
Deputy Minister. *See* National Defence
Estimates, 1843, 1862, 2043
Reduction in, 2371
Naval council and officers, qu., 1774
Salaries, 418, 1735, 1745
Dockyards, Halifax and Esquimalt, officers, 1752
Fisheries protection service, 665, 678, 1736, 1740, 1747
Gift of ships to Canada, 2050
Hydrographic service, 1736, 1746
Naval college, 2047, 2203, 2458
Naval defence
Contribution of dominions, 1742
"Five trawler policy", 1741-5
Naval policy, 2043-84
Naval volunteers, 2058
Patrol of northern waters, 1750
Pensions, widowed mothers, 1305
Protection of fur seals, 1844
Radiotelegraph service, 1736, 1749
Royal Canadian navy, qu., 366, 1843, 1862
Aurora, cruiser, qu., 827, 1736, 2051
Debate postponed, 1742-5, 1900, 1072
Dreadnoughts, contribution of, 1876
Esquimalt naval station, 1740
Estimates, 2043
Gift of ships to Canada, 1880-7, 2050
Halifax, protection and service at, 1740
Naval reserve force, 1739
Naval volunteer force, 1740
Niobe and Rainbow, 1736
Patricia, 1736, 2051
Patriot, 1736, 2051
Policy adopted, in 1913, 1876
Resolution of 1909, 1873
Ships to be taken out of commission, 1740
Submarines, 1845
Training, 1740
Travelling expenses, qu., 3156
Trawlers, 1740
Units, cost, etc., qu., 965
Warships and torpedo boats, qu., 827
Royal Naval college, Esquimalt, 2044
Closing of, 2047, 2203, 2458
Tidal surveys, 1736
Transfer of services to Minister of Marine and Fisheries, 3611
War claims, adjustment of, 1752
War service badge, 1754

Navigation. *See also* Marine
Aids to, 1498
Detroit river, 1498
Life-saving equipment, qu., 1284
Rainy river lights, 1499
St. Lawrence river waterway, M. (Mr. Church) 1183
Schools of, 1492

Navy. *See* Canadian Government Merchant Marine; National Defence; Naval Service; Royal Canadian Navy

Neill, Mr. Alan W. (Comox-Alberni)
Address in reply, 169. Congratulations to preceding speakers; Miss Macphail, 169; comparison of parties; British Columbia and protection, 170; Mr. Crerar, 170-171; Orientals in British Columbia, 171; personal position and platform, 172-3; unemployment; wider markets, 174; railway rates, 175; the tariff; free trade and protection, 176; Chinese eggs, 177; butter and oleomargarine, 177-8; coal mines in Vancouver Island; fuel oil importations, 178; Hon. Mr. Stevens and Mr. Clements; vote in Cumberland district, 179; railways and government ownership, 180; necessaries and luxuries, 182; immigration, 182-3; Asiatics, competition with; soldier settlement, 183; inheritance tax; eight hour day; old age pensions; removal of Dominion Elections Act from statutes, 184
British Columbia
Coastal services, qu., 3152
Fisheries, cost and revenue, 2306
Fisheries, M. (Mr. McQuarrie) 860
Post offices, qu., 824
Public buildings, 1258
British Columbia house, London, purchase of, 3537
Budget, 2307. Free trade and protection: a question of geography, 2307; the tariff, a compromise; economic position of British Columbia; support of government during session; expenditures in Vancouver and Victoria; rural constituencies neglected, 2309; political arguments for Conservative members; fruit industry and dumping clause; Oriental aliens; exclusion of, 2310; acquisition of British Columbia timber areas by Japanese; immediate action demanded; the workingman and the

Neill, Mr. Alan W. — *Con.*
Budget — *Con.*
eight hour day; lumber industry and freight rates, 2311; protection of coal mining industry against fuel oil; importation of coal from Japan; fishing industry; reduction in gasoline practically no benefit to fishermen; dairy industry; fruit industry; dumping clause; industries of Comox-Alberni, 2313; country districts suffering injustice; views of constituents, 2314
Canadian Freighter, Japanese coal imports, qu., 963
Civil Service reform, 3100
Courtney post office building, 1258
Criminal Code, carriage of calves under three weeks' old, 2831
Crowsnest pass agreement, M. (Mr. Kennedy, Essex) for Special Com., 1438
Debates, official report, insertion of documents not read, 1540
Debeaux, Mr. Robert, claim of, 2306
Dominion Elections Act Amdt. bill, 2811
Election day a public holiday, 2812
Enfranchisement of foreign-born women M. (Mr. Euler) 485
Esquimalt and Nanaimo Railway Company bill, 1354, 1439, 1602-6
Amdt. 1156, neg., 1163
Fisheries Act, 1914, Amdt. bill, 3012
Fuel oil, British Columbia, qu., 728, 2312
Gasoline for fishing boats, 2313, 3116
House of Commons, accoustics, 3544
Immigration
Methods, 3057
South-eastern Europe, from, 3057
Immigration Act Amdt. bill (Intending immigrants to make application) 2207
Indians, medical attention, 1219
International Labour Conference, qu., 824
Japanese in British Columbia, 2310. *See also under this title,* Oriental Aliens
Nova Scotia miners, M. (Mr. Irvine) 521
Oleomargarine, Manufacture and importation, M., 1777, 1836
Opium and Narcotic Drug Act Amdt. bill, 3016
Oriental Aliens
Japanese, acquisition of timber areas in British Columbia, 3210
M. (Mr. McQuarrie) for exclusion of, 1539
Paper mills, 3113
Pensions Com., final report, 3332
Point of order
Rule 18, tedious repetition, 1360
Rule 19, offensive words, 1361

Neill, Mr. Alan W. — *Con.*
Quebec Harbour Commission bill, fair wage clause, 1469
Soldier Settlement Act Amdt., 3407
Special War Revenue Act
Sales tax, 3269
Stumping powder, 3268
Statistics, co-ordination of, 581

Neill, Mr. C. E., 1128

Nelson post office revenue, qu., 2040

Neutrals and Non-Combatants. *See* Limitation of Armaments

New Brunswick
Floods, 3492
Harbours and rivers, 1991
Amdt. (Mr. Guthrie) to reduce vote, 1998
Immigration and, 2165
Public buildings, 1239
St. John and Quebec railway, 1293, qu., 1774
Salmon rivers, fishways, 2167
Soldiers' Civil Re-establishment staff, 1344
Wharves
Provincial, 1991
Tidal waters in, qu., 2209
Transfer of, qu., 2305

New London, Conn., seaport, 2611

New York Central Railway, 128

New Zealand
Butter. *See* Oleomargarine
Government ownership of railways, 181

Newfoundland
Canada-Newfoundland steamship service, 2027
Navigation, aids to, 1498
Reid-Newfoundland railway, 2027
Trade between Prince Edward Island and, 226

Newfoundland-Labrador Boundary
Reference to Privy Council, 1276
Doherty, Hon. C. J. reported engagement of, 2572
White, Mr. James, technical adviser, 3495

Newmarket, speech of Prime Minister at, 34-35

Newspapers
Censors, 1069
English, comment on Grand Trunk arbitration, 374, 821
Extracts. *See* Speaker, Rulings

Niagara Power Development, 134. *See also* Electrification; St. Lawrence river waterway

Nickel. *See also* Coinage

Nickel Coin Blanks, qu., 3152

Nickel Currency. *See* Currency Act Amdt.

Niobe and Rainbow, 1736. *See also* Naval Service

Non-Taxable Bonds. *See* Bonds; Finance

Norman Dam. *See* Lake of the Woods

Normand, Hon. Dr., references to. *See* Military Service Act Amdt.

Norris, Hon. T. C., Premier of Manitoba
Natural resources, 1017
And freight rates, reported statement on, 1213

North Sydney quarantine station, 1238, 2021

Northern Islands and Waters
Patrol. *See* Naval Service
Policy respecting, 1750

Northwest Rebellion
Royal Canadian Mounted Police, pensions. *See* Pensions
Smith, Mr. Leo, pension to, 3523

Notices of Cancellation. *See* Dominion Lands

Nova Scotia
Admiralty, local judge in, 1275
Air station at Dartmouth, 1724
Coal industry, protection of, 2412
Coal strike, 461. *See also* Nova Scotia Miners
Harbours and rivers, estimates, 1269, 1765
International deep sea racing. *See that title*
Liberal party in, 2606
Migratory birds, resolution of legislature, 1684
Pensioners in, qu., 615
Public buildings, 1238
Shipbuilding, 1387
Supreme Court, vacancy, 3436
Unemployment, 1075-6

Nova Scotia Miners, qu., 605, 1054. *See also* Labour
Inquiry, 597
McLachlan correspondence, qu., 704
M. (Mr. Irvine) 497, 539, 545

Noxious Gases and Chemicals, use of. *See* Limitation of Armaments

Observatory. *See* Dominion Observatory

Occupational Diseases. *See* Labour

Ocean
Ports, 1464-86
Tonnage, 2008
Vessels
Quebec, 1471
St. Lawrence river waterway, 1183-95, 1205

Ocean and River Service. *See* Marine

O'Connor, Mr. James, Snowflake, Man., dismissal, 1674

O'Connor, Mr. W. F., K.C.
Payments to, qu., 2037
Revision of statutes, 1718

Official Report of Debates. *See* House of Commons

O'Hara, Captain, 1490

Oil. *See also* Natural Resources
Duty on oil drilling machinery, 2726
Fuel Oil, 344, qu., 728
Competition with coal mining industry, 2312
Importations, 178
Tank at Louise basin, 1484
Tariff against, 1761
Leases, speculation in, 1046
Mackenzie and Peace river, cost of surveys, 1044

Okanagan Valley, fruit growing, 163. *See also* Budget; Customs, Dumping clause; Fruit

Old Age Pensions, 184, 1070, qu., 1375. *See also* Pensions
And mothers' pensions, qu., 1375
M. (Mr. Fontaine) 1303-5

Oleomargarine, 2205. *See also* Agriculture; Butter; Dairying
British Columbia Dairymen's Association, res., 1794
Children fed on, 178
Competition with butter, 177
Further legislation, inquiry, 3041
Great War Veterans' Association, 1798
Importation and Manufacture, qu., 613, qu., 1506
Discontinuance of, M. (Mr. Neill) 1720, 1776, neg., 1840

Oleomargarine — *Con.*
Local Council of Women, Hamilton, 1835
Materials, importation of, qu., 704, qu., 727, 3270
National Dairy Council, and, 1791
Regulations under Act, qu., 1702
Retail Merchants' Association and, 1797

Oleomargarine Act, 1919, Amdt. bill (Extension for one year)
Res., 3358, 3425; 1r., 3435; 2r., 3487; com., 3489; 3r., 3489

Oliver, Hon. John, Premier of British Columbia, criticism of by Vancouver Sun, 2236, 2237

One-Fourth Vote. *See* Interim Supply

Onion Grades, 2744. *See also* Root Vegetables

Ontario
Alienation of natural resources, qu., 2992
Canals, 2779. ***See also that title***
Flags on public schools, 1265
Harbours and rivers, 1999
Historic battle sites, 119-120
Hydro Electric Power Commission. *See that title*
Public buildings, 1245
Appropriations not required, 1259
Improvements, repairs, etc., 1258
Rural population, loss of, 301. *See also* Budget; Population
Taxation of, 131
Water powers. *See* Lake of the Woods

Ontario Athletic Commission, cadet camps, 1973

Ontario Temperance Act. *See* Canada Temperance Act

Opium and Narcotic Drugs. *See also* Health
Chinese, 2018
Cocaine, 2019
Correspondence with wholesale druggists, 1377
Enforcement of Act
Prosecutions, 2017
Japanese, 2017
International Opium Convention, qu., 1066
Morphine, 2019
Oriental traffic in, 1529, 2017. *See also* Oriental Aliens
Production and export of, 2019
Prohibition and, 2017
Smuggling, 2020

Opium and Narcotic Drug Act Amdt. bill
Res., 1841, 2823; 1r., 2826; 2r., com., 3013; 3r., 3025; Senate amdts., 3607

Opium and Narcotic Drug Act Amdt. — *Con.*.
Sections and subjects discussed:
Appeal, restriction of right, 3020
Dealing in drugs, 3013
Deportation, 3013, 3024
Penalties, 3013, 3014, 3020
Whipping, 3015

Opposition. *See also* Progressive Party
Attitude of, 60-61. *See also* Speeches on Budget
Position of. *See* Interim Supply
Representation in Parliament, 40
Status of leader of, 73

Orchards, protection of. *See* Entomology; Fruit Industry

Orders in Council, qu., 935
Canadian National railways, management, 192
Government by, 38, 141, 660, 662, 2518, 2536, 2562, 2880
Intercolonial railway operation, 107
Number passed, qu., 934, qu., 935

Ordnance Lands, local improvements fronting, 1681

Orient, trade with, 85. *See also* Trade

Oriental Aliens, 967
Australian legislation, 1536
Birth rate, 317
British Columbia in, 167, 171, 316, 332, 855
Resolution of legislature, 1513
Restrictive legislation, 1510
Canadians, disabilities in Japan, 1511, 2208
Chinese, 1510, 2026 3437
Arrival of at Vancouver, 3604
Opium and Narcotic drugs, 2020
Coal mined by, 2407
Coolie labour on British ships, 2042
Demands for exclusion of, 1513
Education, cost of, 317
Fisheries, engaged in, 345, 855
Franchise and, 483, 485
Fruit growing and, 1535. *See also* Fruit Industry
Gentlemen's agreement, 1511
Immigration, 319, 2161. *See also that title*
Chinese. *See also under this title,* Chinese Restriction of, M. (Mr. Stevens) 1776
Inquiry for opportunity to discuss, 967, **1461, 3104**
Japanese
Restriction of, M. (Mr. Stevens) 1776

Oriental Aliens — *Con.*
Rights of Canadians in Japan, 1511, 2208
Minister's statement, 2143
Money qualification, 2148
Written application by intending immigrants, 2207
Japan, treaty with, 1511
Japanese, qu., 1399, qu., 1459, 1510
Acquisition of timber limits in British Columbia, 2310
Competition in British Columbia, 2279
Lemieux agreement, 1459
Opium and Narcotic drugs, 2017. *See also that title*
Labour, competition with, 317
Land occupation by, 1534
Number in Canada, 1512
Motion (Mr. McQuarrie) for exclusion of, 1509
Amdt. (Mr. Stewart, Argenteuil) for "effective restriction", 1567; agreed to, 1577
Canada's right to legislate, 1550
"Effective restriction", 1567
Opium and Narcotic drug traffic, 1529, 2017

Osler, Sir Edmund, 1128

Ottawa
Cartier square Militia dept., shed, qu., 2038
Daly building, purchase of, 1252
Daylight saving, 1282
Dominion observatory and geodetic survey building, 1265
Local improvements fronting ordnance lands, 1681
New departmental buildings, 3541
Noon gun, 1756
Ottawa Gas Company bill. *See* Private Bills Discussed
Ottawa-Kingston highway, qu., 1904
Parliament buildings, 2014. *See also that title*
Proposed donation of Rideau canal to, 2764
Public buildings, 1245, 1252, 1265, 1755
Char service, 1756
Elevator attendants, 1266
Lighting, including roads and bridges, 1267
Rental of buildings in, 1252, 1764
Rideau hall, maintenance, 1756
Telephone service, 1757
Water, 1266

Ouimet, Mr. Joseph Rodolphe (Vaudreuil-Soulanges)
Introduction of, 323

Outside Service. *See* Civil Service

Overages. *See* Grain and Grain Trade; Elevators

Pacific and Great Eastern Railway, 342

Pacific Naval Powers. *See* Limitation of Armaments

Pairs. *See* House of Commons, Divisions

Palais Station, Quebec, 1068

Palestine, mandate over, 1716

Panama Canal, 191, 1326-9. *See also* St. Lawrence River Waterway

Panet, Mr. L. C., appointment as Deputy Sergeant-at-Arms, 5

Paper Control Inquiry, 1673

Paper for magazines, taxation, 3108

Parc St. Charles, 1469, 3197. *See also* Quebec Harbour Commission

Parent, Mr. George (Quebec West)
Appraisers, Paris and London, 1068
Civil Service examinations, 871
Insurance premiums, 3253
Labour dept., organized and unorganized labour, qu., 2303
Military Service Act Amdt. bill, 641
Naturalization expenses, 1671
Quebec bridge, 1068
Quebec riots, qu., 1508
Royal Canadian Artillery, qu., 370

Parents, support of by children, 1310. *See also* Pensions; Widowed Mothers

Paris Agency, 2025

Parks. *See* Dominion Lands and Parks

Parliament
Fall session, 3608
Opening of, 1
Prorogation of, 3616
Representation of provinces in 1877, qu., 1183

Parliament Buildings
Architects' fees, 2014
Cost to date, 2014
Estimates, 2014
Furniture, purchase of, 1757
House of Commons Chamber, accoustics, 1751, 1755, 1996, 3613. *See also that title*
Lighting, 1755
Tower, 2016

Parliament Hill monuments, qu., 936

Parliamentary Counsel, 2572

Parliamentary Guide, 2024

Parliamentary Procedure. *See* Deputy Speaker; House of Commons; Speaker

Parliamentary Restaurant
Com. appointed, 326
Loss in, 184

Parry Sound
Lighthouse inspector, qu., 827
Postal receipts, qu., 938

Parsons, Mr. W. Reuben, qu., 3362

Party Representation, 214

Party System of Government, 2339. *See also* Address; Budget

Party System of Politics, 117-118, 214, 215. *See also* Address; Budget

Passenger Rates. *See* Railway Act Amdt. bills

Passport Office, 2066

Patent Record, 2026

Paternalism. *See* Pensions Committee

Patricia, warship, qu., 827. *See also* Naval Service

Patriot, warship, qu., 827. *See also* Naval Service

Patriotic Fund. *See* Canadian Patriotic Fund

Patronage, 2608. *See also* Budget; Civil Service; Speeches on Address
Appointments to penitentiary, 1277
Census enumerators, appointment of, 1368, 1372
Civil service, 1663
Civil Service Commission, 2559, 2563
Intercolonial railway and, 106
Quebec Harbour Commission, 1477

Peace River block, 330

Peace Treaties. *See* Limitation of Armaments; Treaties

Pears, Vice Admiral Sir Edmund, 2061

Pearson, Mr. John A., Architect. *See* Parliament Buildings

Pearson Institute, Toronto, 3457

Pease, Mr. E. L., 1128

Peat. *See also* Fuel; Natural Resources
Committee, 1505
Deposits, experiments and production, qu., 1505
Investigational work, 1235

Pecuniary Claims Convention with United States, 1276

Pelagic Sealing Treaty, 1844

Penitentiaries. *See also* Justice; Prisons
Appointments, 1277
Death of inmates, qu., 3362
Dorchester, prison reform, 1278
Estimates, 1276
Supplementary, 1670
Infectious diseases. *See* Penitentiary Act Amdt. bill
Inmates
Foreign and native, 1279
Increase in number, 1277, 1279, 1670
Inspection by grand juries, 1743. *See also* Prison Reform
Kingston, overcrowding, qu., 3362
Patronage, appointments, 1277
Population, increased, 1277, 1279, 1670
Prison reform. *See that title*
St. Vincent de Paul, employees and number of convicts, qu., 2804

Penitentiary Act Amdt. bill, (Infectious diseases) 1r., 545; 2r., 787; com., 787; 3r., 967

Penny Bank Act Amdt. bill
Res., 1132, 3043; 1r., 3043; 2r., com., 3r., 3148

Penny Banks, depositaries for money received, 1132

Pension Act Amdt. bill
Res. 3358, 3402; 1r., 3405; 2r., com., 3439; com., 3459; 3r., 3463; Senate amdts., 3612
Sections and subjects discussed:
Application for pension, 3445
Blinded men, 3456
Bonus payments continued, 3451
Deserted mothers, 3439
Disability at or prior to discharge, 3452
Disability attributable to, incurred or aggravated during military service, 3453
Pension to widow, 3447
Power to cancel pension of prostitute, 3451

Pension Act Amdt. — *Con.*
Sections and subjects discussed — *Con.*
Residents in Canada, 3446
Time within which application must be made, 3445
Total and helpless disability, 3446
Widowed mother, 3439

Pension Commissioners, Board of
Amalgamation with Soldiers' Civil Re-establishment dept., 1339-40
Charges by G.W.V.A. against, 2994, 3041. *See also* Speeches on Address
Memorandum of Chairman in reply, 2994
Royal Commission to investigate, 3156, 3304, 3312, 3327, 3336, 3345, 3352, 3355-6
Expenditure, 1349
Imperial pensions, 1347-51
Medical examinations, 1343
Salaries and contingent expenses, 1339, 1349
Secondary boards, 1350
Staff, 1351

Pensions. *See also* National Defence bill; Railways
Civil, 1711
Commutation of, 390, 1281, 1349
Crimean war, 3315
Disabilities, 390
European war and active militia, 1349, 1353, 1361
Fabre, Madame, 2024
Fenian raid, 3315
Grand Trunk railway employees, 2041. *See also that title* under Canadian National Railways
Imperial Forces, M. (Mr. Ladner) 864, 1347-51
Increased, 184
Investigation. *See under this title,* Roya Commission
Lightkeepers, 1496
Maternity benefits, 1070
Mothers, qu., 1375
Deceased soldiers, of, M. (Mr. Power) 1313
Northwest rebellion, 3523
Nova Scotia, payment in, qu., 615
Old age, 184, 1070, qu., 1375
M. (Mr. Fontaine) 1303, agreed to, 1305
Returned soldiers, 320, 327. *See also* Returned Soldiers
Royal Commission on, suggested, 386. *See also* Pensions Board
Sickness, 1070
South African war, 3315
Total expenditure on, 1349

Pensions — *Con.*
Widowed mothers, 1312, 3324
M. (Mr. Power) 1305, 1313
Widows, 1070
Wrenick, Mrs., 3457

Pensions, Insurance and Re-establishment of Returned Soldiers
Special Committee appointed, 496-7
Change in names, 596
First report, 726
Final report, 3286
M. (Mr. Marler) for adoption, 3286
Amdt. (Mr. Shaw) to refer back, 3308; Withdrawn, 3349
Recommendations, expenditure under, 3522

Pilotage
Administration of, 1499
Dues, exemption from, 1500. *See also* Canada Shipping Act Amdt. bill
Fees to pilots and regulation of, 1499

Pleuro-Pneumonia. *See* Cattle Embargo; Health of Animals

Ploughs, duty on. *See* Agricultural Implements

Pocket-Knives, Competition, 2646, 2876. *See* Budget; Currency, depreciated; Customs Act; Germany

Police Commissioners, bribing of. *See* Criminal Code

Political Alliances, "Morganatic", 2095. *See also* Nationalists; Progressive Party

Political Contributions, by Monopolies, 2295. *See also* Election of 1921

Political Patronage. *See* Patronage

Polls. *See* Dominion Elections Act Amdt.

Pollution of Streams, 2168

Pool Selling. *See* Criminal Code Amdt. bill

Population. *See also* Budget; Census; Immigration
By ages, qu., 1632
Drift towards the cities, 2153, 2302
Increase under Liberal and Conservative govts., 2362, 2365
Loss of, 2439-40, 2449
Rural. *See under this title,* Rural
Ten years, in, 2516
Need of increased, 2148-58, 2275

Population — *Con.*
Oriental in Canada, 1512. *See also* Oriental Aliens
Rural, 2564-5
Decline in, 2153, 2156, 2158, 2384, 2439-40, 2449, 2683
Loss in Ontario, 2369, 2683
Movement to cities and towns, 2153, 2302, 2403
Urban, and, qu., 376
Infant mortality and, 2634
Slow growth of, 2158
Yukon territory, 1681

Pork Imports, qu., 611

Port Arthur
Canadian Towing and Wrecking Co. claim, 1677

Port Dalhousie, 1493

Port Hood breakwater, 1768

Port Nelson, dredging, 2006

Portage La Prairie
Assiniboine river floods, 1842, 2004
Exhibition grant, qu., 1931
Post office revenue, qu., 2040

Porter, Mr. E. G. (East Hastings)
Pension Act Amdt. bill, 3457
Trenton harbour bill, 3494
Wrenick, Mrs., pension, 3457

Portland Terminus, 2611
Competition with Canadian ports, 104, 2611. *See also* Grand Trunk Railway; British Preference, M. (Mr. Logan)

Ports, United States in preference to Canadian, 353-4

Postal Conference, 7, 15

Postmasters. *See* Civil Service; Post Office

Post Office
Department
Appointments, 3073
Belley, Mr. Alfred, salary, 3504
Classification, 3089
Employees receiving salary of $600, qu., 1067
Estimates, 1711
Gaboury, Mr. L. J., salary and duties, qu., 3599
General superintendent of postal service, 1711
Married women employees, qu., 1658

Post Office — *Con.*
Department — *Con.*
Money Order branch, qu., 1285
Outside service, estimates, 2799
Postal employees, 3075
Printing and stationery, 1741
Salaries and contingencies, 69, 3504
Drop letter rate, 1250
Letter rate, Canada-Great Britain, qu., 3364
Mail, carriage of, qu., 825
Mail contracts
Canadian National railways, qu., 2038
Canadian Pacific railway, and, qu., 2040, qu., 2213
Gascons-Quebec, qu., 2213
Grand Anse, qu., 938
Lachenaie, qu., 2805
Richmond and Wolfe, qu., 1505
Rigaud-St. Rédempteur, 1776
Sudbury, qu., 1285
Money orders tax, 2857
Montreal
Employees, 1288
Gaboury, Mr. L. J., salary, qu., 3599
Post offices and business done, qu., 1065
Postal receipts, qu., 938
Postmasters
L'Assomption-Montcalm, 1775
Sturgeon falls, qu., 1285
Post offices in British Columbia, qu., 824
Railway mail service, 2797
Reorganization, 2799
Revenue, qu., 2040
Richmond and Wolfe post offices, qu., 1507
Ruling respecting newspaper or magazine subscription, qu., 3599
Rural mail routes, qu., 3152
Savings banks, reduction in interest rate, qu., 1932
Sherbrooke inspectorate, qu., 1507
Subsidized steamships and carriage of mails, 2028
Toronto, revenue, qu., 368, 1250

Potatoes
Conference of growers, 3367
Cost of growing, 2665
Duty on, 239, 2601
Grading machines, 3126
Market for, 225
Marking and grading. *See* Root Vegetables
Prices of, 94
Shipment to Cuba, 2028
Shipping cost. *See* St. John Terminal Facilities
Trade with United States, 336. *See also* Budget

Potlatch Institution. *See* Indians

Poultry Industry, 226, 807

Power, Mr. C. G. (Quebec South)
Admiralty Court, vacancy at Quebec, 1275
Cash grants to soldiers, 394
Fishing schooner race, 3510
MacInnes, Mr. Hector, K.C. (Halifax) payments to, 2772
Militia
Annual drill, amdt. to reduce vote by $1,100,000, 1173, 1174, neg., 1631
Engineer services and works, 1980
Expenditure and policy, annual training, 1611
Pension Act Amdt. bill, 3402, 3443
Pensions
Mothers of deceased soldiers, M., 1313
Widowed mothers, M., 1305, 1312
Point of order — not permissible to read evidence to controvert member, 3540
References to, 1339
Returned Soldiers' Insurance bill, 3396
Soldiers' Civil Re-establishment, salary increases, 398

Power Development. *See* Electrification; Hydro Electric; St. Lawrence River Waterway

Prairie Provinces
"Annexation of", 1020
Forestry in, 1046
Natural resources. *See* Western Provinces

Pratt vs. Delphine, 302

Preference, trade. *See* British Preference; Trade; United States

Premiums, Insurance tax on. *See* Special War Revenue

Prescriptions, refilled. *See* Opium and Narcotics

Preservation of Industries Act, 2648

President Harding, St. Lawrence river waterway, 1326

Press. *See also* Canadian Press; Newspapers
Censors, 1068

Preston, Mr. W. T. R., rent of house in London, 3503

Prevost, Mr. Jules E. (Terrebonne)
Bertrand, Mr. T., qu., 937
Budget, 2577. Tribute to Finance Minister, his difficulties and responsibilities; the

Prevost, Mr. Jules E. — *Con.*
Budget — *Con.*
tariff, 2577; proposals in harmony with Liberal policy; new taxes; inheritance of debts from former governments; effort to lower cost of living; economy, 2578; national debt; militia or naval expenditure; expansion of external trade; decrease in exports; restoration of normal conditions, 2579; Canadian market insufficient for natural products and manufactured goods; trade with Great Britain and the United States; Fordney tariff; transportation; interior systems of communication, 2580; direct intercourse with foreign countries; duty of the department of Trade and Commerce; consuls and trade agents; information; trade commissioners; qualifications, 2581, fairs and exhibitions; serious problems; the future; new political groups; development of Canadian national spirit, 2582
Civil Service Commission report, qu., 826
Dominion Elections Act, residential qualification, 1298
Imports and exports, 1911-1922, qu., 1661
Militia and Defence
Annual drill
Expenditure 1911-21, qu., 1287
Armouries in Quebec, qu., 1287
Expenditure 1911-22, qu., 1287
Stationery, purchase of by Government, 1288

Pribyloff Islands, protection of fur seals, 1844

Prices. *See also* Budget; Cost of Living; Finance; Trade
Price-fixing combinations, 2428, 2437
Regulations of, 2504

Prime Minister's Bereavement, reference to death of brother. *See* King

Prime Ministers' Conference, 42. *See also* Naval Service
Anglo-Japanese Treaty, 168
Correspondence, 1068
Empire naval defence, 1629, 1883, 2082
Canada's contribution, 1742
Resolution respecting, 1742
Opportunity for discussion of, 2042
Report, 5
Tabled, 8
Royal Canadian Navy. *See* Naval Service

Prince County, illegal fishing, qu., 371

Prince Edward Island
Harbours and rivers, 1270, 1988
Migratory birds, resolution of legislature, 1684
Natural resources, 339
Potato-growing, 225, 337
Public lands, 229
Railway, 229, 337, 1249. *See also* Canadian National Railways

Prince of Wales Leinster regiment, qu., 1065

Prince Rupert
Alien property, custodians of, 3601
Post office building, 1257
Post office revenue, qu., 2040
Prince Rupert Dry Dock & Engineering Co., 3514
Rental of buildings, 1257
Vessels constructed at, qu., 606

Princess Mary, marriage of, 39

Printers, immigration of, 3055

Printing. *See also* Printing Bureau; Publications
Canadian National menus, qu., 1931
Customs and excise, 1674
Joint Committee on, 211, 326, 1132
Public archives, 1673

Printing Bureau
Government printing, 1373
Government publications, distribution of, 1971
Legislation, 1972
Plant
New, 1970
Repairs and renewals, 1970
Statutes, 1972
Supreme Court reports, 1274

Printing and Stationery
Criminal Code, 1717
Interior, 1680
Post Office department, 1711
Statutes, 1717

Prison Reform, 1277-8; qu., 1773, 2397
Atlanta penitentiary, 1278
Dorchester penitentiary, 1278
Inspection by grand juries, qu., 1773, 2397
Jail farms, 1277-9; qu., 1773
Youthful offenders, qu., 1773

Prisoners, Contagious diseases of. *See* Penitentiary Act Amdt. bill

Pritchard, Mr. John (North Wellington)
Address in reply, 250. Congratulations, etc., parliamentary groups and class representation, 250; manufacturers and the tariff, 251; agricultural conditions, 252
Experimental farms, 806, 810

Private Bills, Committee, 374
Bouchard, Mr., substitution for Mr. Stein, 2035
Vien, Mr. substitution for Mr. Ouimet, 2355

Private Bills Discussed
Canadian Pacific Railway Company
Amdt. (Mr. Carmichael) 1606, 1856
Canadian Transit Company, 1746, 1770
Dominion Chain Company, Limited, 3490, 3495
Esquimalt and Nanaimo Railway Co., 1353, 1439
Amdts. (Mr. Neill) 1156, neg. 1163; 1354, neg. 1357; 1602, neg. 1606
Fraser Valley and Southern Railway Company, 1577
Montreal, Joliette and Transcontinental Railway Company, 1577
Niagara River Bridge Company, 1486
Ottawa Gas Company, refund of fees, 1657

Private Bills Undiscussed. *See* Journals of the House

Private Secretaries. *See* Privy Council

Privilege, questions of. *See* House of Commons

Privy Council
Appeals, 139
Salaries and contingencies, 410

Proclamation. *See* Canada Temperance Act

Progressive Party, 295. *See also* Address; Budget; Canadian Council of Agriculture; Crerar; United Grain Growers; Wheat Board
Alleged split, denial, 2458
Alliances of, 2095-7
Attitude towards Government, 2233, 2507, 2842
Big interests and, 2393-4
Budget debate and, 2692
Canadian Pacific, and, 130
Class legislation and, 224. *See also* Address; Budget
Liberal negotiations with, 34, 48, 51, 240-1
Oleomargarine, attitude on, 2380. *See also that title*

Progressive Party — *Con.*
Ontario in, 2301, 2893-4
Origin of, 2512
Platform, revision, 2552
Redistribution, attitude towards, 1364-70

Prohibition. *See also* Canada Temperance Act; Liquor
Opium and Narcotic drugs, 2017

Property, alien enemy. *See* Aliens

Proportional Representation, 59. *See also* Dominion Elections
M. (Mr. Good) for adoption of alternative vote method, 1633
Residential qualification, 1301

Prorogation of Parliament, 3616

Proscription. *See* Criminal Code (Scrip frauds)

Protection, 143, 228. *See also* Address; Budget
Boots and shoes, 102
Manufacturers and, 2435-40. *See also* Budget
Policy of, 1088
Tariff and, 170, 2110. *See also* Tariff

Protocols. *See* League of Nations

Provinces. *See also* Natural Resources. For individual provinces, *See their titles*
Air Force and civil aviation, 1722
Unemployment relief, 1069
Western. *See that title*

Provincial Rights, infringement. *See* Lake of the Woods bill

Ptomaine Poisoning. *See* Meat and Canned Foods

Public Accounts. *See also* Consolidated Revenue and Audit Act
Committe, report, 1460, 3359
Date of closing, 1264-66
Non-productive assets, 1467

Public Archives
Estimates, 702, 1673, 2025
Monckton papers, purchase of, 1673

Public Buildings, 1755. *See also* their respective titles; Public Works; Supply
Alberta, 3545
Appropriations and expenditures for 1921-22, 1259-60
Chambers, Mr., 1244
Char service. *See* Ottawa

Public Buildings — *Con.*
Coal, importation of, 1759
Estimates, 1238, 1258, 1755
Expenditure, accounts not closed, 1262-66
Fittings, supplies and furniture, 1757
Flags, qu., 599, 1264
Generally, 1260-5
Heating, 1755-1758
Immigration, repairs, 1757
Maritime provinces generally, 1243
New, 1255, 2461
New Brunswick, 1239
New departmental designs, 3541
Nova Scotia, 1238
Ontario, 1245-59, 1258, 3544
Alleged neglect of, 1248
Ottawa, 1245-52, 1265, 1755. *See also that title*
Parliament buildings. *See that title*
Penitentiaries, 1277
Quebec, 1245
Rental and purchase of, 1764
Calgary, 1254
Ottawa, 1252
Prince Rupert, 1257
Waterbury, Mr., retirement of, 1244

Public Debt, 2106, 2225, 2370, 2496, 2501, 2895. *See also* Address; Budget; Finance; Loans
Taxation and, 2459

Public Expenditure, 1249, 2276, 2860
Capital expenditure on harbours and rivers, 1472
Comparison by departments, 1137
Debt, and, 2557
Dominion and provincial overlapping, 2461
Economy in, 1475. *See also* Address; Budget
In 1877 and 1922, qu., 1211
Income and, 2104
Reduction of. *See* Address; Budget; Militia and Defence; Naval Service

Public Harbours. *See* Harbours

Public Health. *See* Health

Public Lands. *See* Dominion Lands and Parks; Natural Resources

Public Ownership. *See* Address; Budget; Canadian National Railways; Railways; St. Lawrence River Waterway

Public Service Retirement Act Amdt. bill (Extension for one year)
Res. 1661, 3025; 1r., 2r., com., 3025; com., 3148; 3r., 3149

Public Services, nationalization of, 2324, 2328. *See also* Address; Budget; Canadian National Railways

Public Works. *See also* Public Buildings; Supply
Bridges. *See that title*
Dauphinee, Mr. Charles, dismissal of, ques., 1902, 2458, 2584
Department
Carty, Captain, 1062
Chief Architects' Branch, qu., 963
Estimates, 1238, 1755, 1988, 3531
Estimates branch, 1270
Expenditures, 1249
Minister, selection of from British Columbia Government, 2238
Salaries, etc., 692, 747
M. (Mr. Boys) reduce item, 695, 699
Harbours and rivers. *See that title*
Miscellaneous, 2008
New public buildings, 1256
Quarantine stations, 1238-45
Public buildings. *See that title*
Roads and bridges, 2007
Burlington, 2007
Edmonton, 2007
Telegraphs and telephones, 2007, 2012
Unemployment relief, 1082
Yukon territory, expenditure in, 1275

Publications, Government. *See also* Editorial Committee
Co-ordination and economy, 1374
Demand and distribution, 1344, 1971
Geological survey, 1237
Mines, 1234-6
Printing and translation, 1373. *See also* Printing Bureau
Printing, unnecessary, 1374

Publicity Agent. *See* Labour

Pulp and Paper Industry, 2322. *See also* Natural Resources; Paper Control
British Columbia in, 175
Export duty on pulpwood, 2667

Purchasing Commission, 2674
Coal, for public buildings, 1758
Estimates, 2025
Goods purchased, origin of, 2042
Suggested abolition of, 2674
Warlike stores, sale of, 1173

Purchasing Power of Money, 1151-3, 1175, 1177, 1292, 2331, 2603. *See also* Address; Budget; Civil Service; Cost of Living; Money

Putman, Mr., C. V., qu., 935

Putnam, Mr. Harold (Colchester)
Address in reply, 309. Congratulations to Mr. Speaker, 309; Progressives and the party spirit, 310; leader of the Opposition; immigration; tariff; railway problems, 311; Intercolonial railway, 312; elections and campaign literature, 315

Budget, 2282. Election issues and results; congratulations to Finance Minister; tariff reductions; no time for drastic changes; Liberal platform of 1919, 2283; interprovincial trade; geographical, physical and climatic difficulties, 2284; reciprocity with the United States, 2285; tariff reductions, 2286; trade with Germany; sales tax; the amendment, 2287; political pledges and promises, 2288; Liberal platform of 1919; record of the Opposition party, 2288; Union government; public honour; War Time Elections Act; tariff commission; intercolonial railway; promise of Mr. McCurdy to restore headquarters to Moncton, 2289; the Progressives, 2290
Canadian National railways, ties, qu., 934
Canadian Patriotic Fund bill, 3478
Civil Service, returned soldiers, 3088
Condensed milk, tax on, 3265
Oleomargarine Act Amdt. bill, 3425-34
Rural postmasters, 3080

Quadruple Pacific Treaty, 3160

Qualification of Voters. *See* Dominion Elections Act

Quarantine. *See also* Health; Immigration
Detention at Partridge Island, 2021
Estimates, 2021
Immigrant refusing vaccination, 2022
Stations
Grosse Isle, repairs, 1245
Halifax, repairs, 1238
North Sydney, repairs, 1238
St. John, repairs, 1239-40
William's Head, improvements, 1255

Quebec (City)
Admiralty, local judge in, 1275
Arsenal, 1979, 2085, 2091
Customs dues, 1978
Canadian National railway terminals, 1475
Champlain market station, 1475, 2399
Newspapers, political policies of, 1480

Quebec (City) — *Con.*
Palais station, 1068
Plains of Abraham, 1467
Riots, 676, 3089
Compensation for damage, qu., 1508

Quebec (Port). *See also* Quebec Harbour Commission bill
Appropriations for, 1486
Borden, Right Hon. Sir Robert and, 1474
Elevators, 1471, 1483
Grain shipments through, 1466, 1471
Harbour Commission, 1283, 1464. *See also* Quebec Harbour Commission bill
Ocean tonnage, 2008
Parc St. Charles Co. Ltd., proposed payment to, 1469
Political patronage, 1478
Revenue and expenditure, 1471

Quebec (Province)
Attitude of towards Opposition, 168-9, 187, 206-7, 290. *See also* Budget; Speeches on Address
Attitude towards West, 2912
Board of Pensions Commissioners, representation, 1350
Canals, 2779. *See also that title*
Census figures, 1366
Chaudière valley floods, 3492
Conscription and. *See* Military Service Act Amdt. bill
Election issues and results, 245
Fisheries, 142
Transfer to province, M. (Mr. Marcil) 377, 493, 616, 623
Order in council tabled, 8
Request for order in council, 5
Harbours and rivers, 1998
Harmony with, 14, 270, 291, 362, 2421
Public buildings, improvements, 1245
Public expenditure in, 1468
Public ownership and, 71. *See* Address; Budget
Superintendent of lighthouses, qu., 2584
Unfair treatment, alleged, 2398

Quebec and Western Railway. *See* Canadian National Railways; Gaspé Railways

Quebec Battlefields Commission, 119

Quebec Chronicle, 1477

Quebec Harbour Commission
Gravel, Mr. 1477
Inquiry for return, 1283
Tremblay, General, 1477
Watson, Major-General Sir David, 1477

Quebec Harbour Commission bill (Further advances)
Res. 1464; reported, 1486; 1r., 1486; 2r., com., 3195; 3r., 3198

Quebec, Oriental and Atlantic Railway. *See* Canadian National Railways; Gaspé

Questions. *See their several titles.* For rulings, *See* Deputy Speaker; House of Commons; Speaker

Questions Passed as Orders for Returns
Accounts branch, Dept., of Militia and Defence (Mr. Vien) 2994
Animal diseases, compensation for, (Mr. Sutherland) 940
Armouries (Mr Baldwin) 1288
Army Service Corps (Mr. Lanctôt) 1905
Auditing, payments for, (Mr. Vien) 2993
Bankruptcy Act, Montreal district trustees (Mr. Archambault) 1183
Binder twine and rope (Mr. Gordon) 1905
Blackfoot reserve, greater production (Mr. Garland, Bow River) 1288
British Columbia fisheries (Mr. Neill) 2306
Calgary, Government office buildings, (Mr. Shaw) 939
Canadian National railways, coal purchase (Mr. Macdonald, Pictou) 2306
Canadian Northern, payments from, 1914 (Mr. Kennedy, Glengarry), 615
Chief Architect's branch employees, (Mr. Fournier) 1067
Civil Service
Appeals against classification (Mr. Lanctôt) 1508
Bonus and statutory increases (Mr. Lanctôt) 939
Number and salaries paid, 1912 and 1922 (Mr. Séguin) 1832
Officials receiving more than deputy ministers (Mr. Chisholm) 1508
Permanent employees, 1920-1922, (Mr. Demers) 706
Coal importations
Canadian National by, (Mr. Macdonald, Pictou) 2306
Government, by, (Mr. Logan) 939
Doherty, Right Hon. C. J., amounts paid to since 1855, (Mr. Lanctôt) 472
Grand Trunk and Grand Trunk Pacific, amounts paid to since 1914, (Mr. Kennedy, Glengarry) 615
Halifax dry dock, (Mr. Stevens) 706
Harbours, improvements and expenditures, (Mr. Church) 828
From 1900 to 1921 (Mr. McBride) 372

Questions passed as Orders for Returns — *Con.*
Homestead pre-emptions, areas, (Mr. McTaggart) 732
Hotels owned and operated by Canadian National railways (Mr. Coote) 2806
Military districts (Mr. Lancôt) 1775, 2305
Militia and Defence
Buildings occupied (Mr. Lanctôt) 2305
Officers and men at headquarters (Mr. Lanctôt) 1775, 2305
Ministers' trips to Europe (Mr. Lanctôt) 1402
Multigraph machines (Mr. McDonald, Timiskaming) 1508
Montreal
Canadian National railways, employees (Mr. Archambault) 1288
Customs, Income Tax, Post Office, employees (Mr. Archambault) 1288
Drydock (Mr. Stevens) 706
Parry Sound customs collections (Mr. Arthurs) 967
Postmasters
L'Assomption-Montcalm (Mr. Séguin) 1775
Richmond-Wolfe (Mr. Tobin) 1508
Prince Rupert dry dock (Mr. Stevens) 706
Quebec dry dock (Mr. Stevens) 706
Quebec Harbour Commission, advances to Sir Henry Drayton) 615
Railway systems, purchase of bonds (Mr. Baxter) 828
Rental of public buildings (Mr. Lucas) 615
St. John drydock, (Mr. Stevens) 706
School lands, sale of (Mr. Spencer) 1661
Soldiers' Civil Re-establishment and Pensions, 615
Stationery, purchase of, (Mr. Prevost) 1288
Trade agents (Mr. Prevost) 1661
Transcontinental railway, amounts paid, (Mr. Kennedy, Glengarry) 165
Vancouver drydock, 706 (Mr. Stevens)
Victoria, drydocks, 706 (Mr. Stevens)
War
Advances to Imperial Government (Mr. Vien) 1288
Material furnished British Govt. (Mr. Vien) 1067

Race and Religious Differences, 14, 270, 291-2, 362, 2421

Race Disqualification. *See* Dominion Elections Act M. (Mr. Euler)

Racing, Fishing schooners. *See* International

Radial Railways. *See* Hydro-Electric

Radiotelegraph Service, 1749

Radium. *See* Nanaimo and Esquimalt Railway

Rail Contracts. *See* Railways

Rails, Steel, bounty on, 304-5

Railway Act, 1919, Amdt. bills
1. Return Tickets. (Mr. Jacobs) 1r., 821; 2r., ref. to Railway Com., 1395
2. Special passenger rates (Mr. Church) 1r., 1460; 2r., 1719
3. Transportation Costs. (Crowsnest pass agreement (Mr. Kennedy, Essex.) 1r., 3588; 2r., com., 3595; 3r., 3597

Railway Commissioners, Board of. *See also* Crowsnest Pass Agreement; Freight Rates; Railways
- Applications to, 201-202
- Board of Railway Commissioners Act, 1088, 1101
- Campbell, Mr. W. E., qu., 937
- Carvell, Hon. F. B., alleged statement at Calgary, 2775
  - Statement of Mr. Motherwell, 2773, 3491
- Chairman of, 233. *See also under this title,* Carvell
- Chief Traffc Officer, qu., 1377, qu., 2215, qu., 2457
- Coastal boat service, and, 182
- Commodity rates, 234
- Drayton-Acworth report, 125
- Freight rates, 234, 276, 2773. *See also* Crowsnest Pass Agreement
- Intercolonial rates, 193, 312
- Norris, Premier, reported statement of, 1213
- Official report of proceedings, 2776
- Rates. *See also* Freight Rates
  - Grain on, 300
  - Increases, 131
- Recommendations to by Drayton-Acworth report, 126
- Tenure of office, 2777

Railway Transportation Costs, Special Committee on. *See* Freight Rates

Railways. *See also* Canadian National Railways; Speeches on Address; Budget
- Advances to, qu., 471
- Annual statement by Minister of Railways, 872
- Branch lines, 1688
- Canada Car Company, 1696
- Canadian in United States, 312
- Canadian National railways. *See that title*
- Canadian Railway Board of Adjustment, No. 1, 1060
- Car demurrage, 2981
- Car repairs, 1688, 2399
- Car shortage, 166
- Caraquet and Gulf shore, qu., 1504
- Carriage of mails by, qu., 825. *See also* Mail Contracts
- Co-ordination of, 2328. *See also* Address; Budget
- Deficits, 2314, 2890
- Drayton-Acworth report, 45-46, 1921
- Duplication and waste, 125
- Eight-hour day and, 228, 2316-17
- Electric and steam locomotives, 630, 1188
- Electrification of, 70, 1317, 1323, 1326, 1330, 1940
  - M. (Mr. Deslauriers) 627. *See also* St. Lawrence River Waterway
- Expenditure on in last 25 years, 111
- Exploitation, 2245. *See* Budget; Speeches on Address
- Freight and commodity rates, 131, 175, 233, 234, 261, 273, 357. *See also* Freight Rates
  - Coal on, 193
  - Legislation, qu., 934
  - Tonnage into Toronto, qu., 936
- Government-owned, administration in United States, 67
- Harvest excursions, 337
- Labour conditions, 2315. *See also* Labour
- Loans and subsidies to, 1921
- Mileage in 1877, qu., 1183
- Nationalization of, 235. *See also* Address; Budget
- New Zealand, 181
- Overbuilding of, 202, 2569
- Paralleling of existing lines, 203
- Passes in maritime provinces, 315
- Passenger rates. *See* Railway Act Amdt. bills
  - Increase, 132
- Policy, 201, 1905, 1920, 1933
- Prince Edward Island, cost of, 229
- Problems. *See* Address; Budget; Freight Rates
- Provincial obligations, 229
- Public ownership, 2570. *See also* Budget; Canadian National Railways; Freight Rates; Speeches on Address
- Rail and car repair contracts, 1688
- Shipping facilities. *See* St. John terminal facilities

Railways — *Con.*
Steel rails
Bounty on, 304-5
Purchase of, 1912
South Africa, 2688
United States, purchase in, 2611. *See also* Canadian National Railways; Grand Trunk
Vote for, saving in, 384
Wages, 2317, 2417. *See also* Labour
Water transportation competition, 69. *See also* St. Lawrence River Waterway
Western provinces, indebtedness for, 229

Railways and Canals. *See also* Canals
Department
Estimates, 1133, 1687, 1905, 1933, 2747, 3035, 3518
Salaries and contingencies, 407, 1133
Governor-General's cars, 1688
Loan to the Canadian Goverment merchant Marine, 3035
Rail and car repair contracts, 1688
Surveys and inspections, 2779
Welland ship canal. *See that title under* Canals

Rainbow. *See* Naval Service

Rankin, Mr. J. P. (North Perth)
Canadian Transit Company bill, 1770
Penitentiary Act Amdt. bill, 791

Rates, Special. *See* Railway Act Amdt. bills

Raymond, Mr. W. G. (Brantford)
Address in reply, 253; congratulations to Mr. Speaker; Liberal party and big interests, 253; Mr. Church and Toronto; Mr. Meighen's reference, 254; election campaign, 255; Mr. Meighen's election manifesto, 255-6; attitude of Brantford manufacturers, 257-258; binder twine industry; liberty of the franchise, 258; War Time Elections Act; manufacturers and taxation, 258; basic and key industries, 259; tariff policy to build up country, 260; transportation rates, 261; national railway system; Liberal party and big interests, 262
Budget, 2373. Tariff; "Liberal protectionist"; congratulations to Finance Minister, 2373; amendment; duties of members; Liberal party and protection; free trade, 2374; agricultural implements; reduction of duty on; Brantford factories closed; binder twine factory, 2375; basic industry argument; manufacturing industries and

Raymond, Mr. W. G. — *Con.*
Budget — *Con.*
production of wealth, 2377; United States competition, 2378; key industries; Great Britain's mercantile marine; world trade; protection for the skilled labourer; United States tariff; capital, 2379; Progressive party and oleomargarine; Wheat Board, 2380; revenue tariff giving incidental protection; duty on binders, 2381; International Harvester company; principles of the two old parties; history of Liberalism; Toryism and tyrannical power, 2383
Customs duties on agricultural implements, 3230-1
References to, 27, 255, 263, 2384, 2536, 2705

Receipt Tax. *See* Special War Revenue Act Amdt.

Reciprocal Trade. *See* Reciprocity

Reciprocity. *See also* Trade
Australia with, 9, 33, 2900
United States with, 33, 53, 77, 94, 102, 208, 224, 278, 333, 2201, 2234. *See also* Address; Budget; United States

Red Cross. *See* Canadian Red Cross; Canadian Patriotic Fund bill

Redistribution, 59, 198, 283, 2330, 2339, 3611. *See also* Proportional Representation
Announcement of Prime Minister, 3608, 3611
Census, completion of, 1363-71
Former, 1369
Inquiry, 733
M. (Mr. Shaw) opportunity for discussion of, 1719, 1769
Meeting of defeated candidates in Alberta, 2858
Progressive party, attitude towards, 1364-70

Re-establishment. *See* Pensions; Soldiers' Civil Re-establishment

Reed, Mr. William S. (Frontenac)
Mixed farming, Kingston fair, 992

Refills. *See* Opium and Narcotics

Regina, Speech of Hon. Mr. Motherwell at, 2555

Regional Bureau, International Catalogue of Scientific Literature, 3528

Reid-Newfoundland Railway, 2027

Relief Work. *See* Canadian Patriotic Fund; Unemployment

Rental of Buildings. *See* Public Buildings

Reparations. *See* Germany; War Claims

Repatriation Expenses, 3503

Representation. *See also* Census; Proportional Representation; Redistribution
Unit of, 198

Research. *See also* Industrial and Scientific Research
Promotion of, 235. *See also* Natural Resources
Research Council, lignite plant, 1233

Residence Qualification. *See* Dominion Elections Act Amdt.

Resources. *See* Natural Resources

Restaurant. *See* Parliamentary Restaurant

Retail Merchants Association of Canada
Oleomargarine, resolution on. *See that title*
Oriental immigration, 1513

Retirement Fund. *See* Civil Service; Public Service Retirement

Returned Soldiers. *See also* Canadian Patriotic Fund bill; Pensions; Soldiers; Soldiers' Civil Re-establishment; Unemployment
Alleged ill-treatment of children of, 2638
Blind, 3358
M. (Mr. Church) 3404
Pensions, 3310
Cash bonus to. *See* Soldiers' Bonus
Civil Service salaries, 549
Disabilities, 386 *See also* Pensions
Government's policy, early announcement of, 2637
Housing, 271. *See also that title*
Insurance, 3294. *See also* Returned Soldiers Insurance Act Amdt.
Pension regulations, 327
Repatriation, 3403
Special Committee on. *See* Pensions
Tubercular, 318. *See also* Hospitals
Unemployed
Hikers, qu., 3153
Inquiry as to Government's policy, 2458
Unemployment, 3290, 3304, 3307, 3331, 3335, 3339, 3345-7, 3356. *See also that title*

Returned Soldiers' Insurance Act Amdt. bill
Res. 3358, 3388; 1r., 2r., com., 3402; com., 3437; 3r., 3439

Returning Officers. *See* Baxter; Caldwell

Returns. *See* House of Commons

Revenue, 2171-2. *See* Address; Budget; Consolidated Revenue Act
Expenditure and. *See* Public Expenditure
In 1877, qu., 1211

Revenue Act. *See* Consolidated Revenue and Audit Act

Revenue Bills
1. Customs Act and the Department of Customs and Excise Act Amdt. bill, 1r., 2r., com., 3222; 3r., 3477
2. Customs Tariff Act, 1907, Amdt. bill
Res., 1r., 2r., com., 3476; 3r., 3477
3. Income War Tax Act, 1917, Amdt. bill
Res., 3278; 1r., 3359-3360; 2r., com., 3484; 3r., 3486
4. Inland Revenue Act Amdt. bill
Res., 3239; 1r., 2r., com., 3r., 3477
5. Special War Revenue Act, 1915, Amdt. bill
Res., 3252; 1r., 2r., com., 3r., 3477

Rice Jones, Mr. Cecil, statement of, 2489-2490

Richibucto, repair works, qu., 375

Rideau Canal. *See* Canals

Rideau Hall, fuel, maintenance, etc., 1756

Riddell, Hon. Mr. Justice, qu., 366, qu., 3600.

Right of Appeal. *See* Opium and Narcotic Act Amdt.

Riley's Army, qu., 3364. *See also* "General" Macdonald's army

Rinfret, Mr. Fernand (St. James)
Canadian National railways
Canadian Northern, subsidies, qu., 1504
Public ownership, 1942
Canadian navy, qu., 965
Cost of living, purchasing power of the dollar, 1177
Dominion Elections Act, residential qualification, M., 1296
Exports and imports, 1876-77 and 1921-22; qu., 1376
Military expenditure and policy, 1176
Militia and Defence
Annual drill, 1177
Expenditure and policy, 1584

Rinfret, Mr. Fernand — *Con.*
Montreal Gazette editorial comment, 1584
Montreal post offices, business done, qu., 1065
Peat, deposits and experiments, qu., 1505
Railway mileage, in 1877, qu., 1183
Railway policy, 1942
Representation of provinces in 1877, qu., 1183
Revenue and expenditure in 1877 and 1922, qu., 1211
St. Lawrence river waterway, 1195
Topographical maps, qu., 1631

Riordon Company
Income tax, 60
Collections, qu., 372; qu., 607; qu., 927

Ritchie, Mr. Hugh, qu., 3361

River St. Lawrence ship channel. *See* Marine and Fisheries; St. Lawrence

Rivière du Loup
Arsenal, qu., 1181, 1690
Car shops, qu., 1181, 1690

Roads. *See* Highways; Public Works

Roads and Bridges. *See* Bridges; Highways; Public Works

Robb, Hon. J. A. (Minister of Trade and Commerce)
Budget, 2179. Reforms long overdue; the amendment; tariff reductions; Liberal platform of 1919, 2180; war time extravagance; restoration of confidence; economy; markets; Mr. Fielding's visit to Washington, 2181; trade with Great Britain and United States; cattle embargo; imports and exports, quantity and value of; uniform development; coal and water power, 2182; tariff policy; German trade; marking of goods, 2183
Campbell, Mr. J. A., claim for flax shipment, 2836
Canada Grain Act, administration of, 2834
Car demurrage, 2981
Complaints of unfair dealing, 2987
Canadian exhibition in France, 2031
Canadian Wheat Board, advances, 3541. *See also under this title,* Wheat Board
Census
Cost, 1363
Enumerators, 1366
Payment of, 1369
Registration of Canadians, 1363

Robb, Hon. J. A. — *Con.*
Dominion Bureau of Statistics, 1363
Dominion Chain Company, Limited, 3490
Elevators
Licenses to private, 2838
Ontario, in, 2978
Terminal, maintenance and equipment, 2978
Government publications, 1373
Demand and distribution, 1374
Grain Inquiry Commission, 50, 2982
Implements, agricultural, duty on, 3120
Industrial and Scientific Research, 1372
International Customs Tariff Bureau, 1372
Linen yarn bounty, 1361, 3128
Oleomargarine Act Amdt. bill, 3429, 3488
Pratt vs. Delphine, 303
Redistribution and the census, 1363-71. *See also under this title,* Census
Statistics, co-ordination of work, 1366
Steamship services, 2027, 3505
Canada, Australia, New Zealand, 3034
Canada, West Indies, South America, 3026
Freight rates, 2028
Quebec and north shore ports, 3034
St. John-Cuba, 2028
Trade and Commerce department
Director of commercial intelligence, 700
Estimates, 1361, 2834, 2978, 3026, 3505, 3541
Officials, 700
Trade commissioners and agents, 2989
Trade with Mexico, 700
Wheat Board, 50
Wheat Board bill, 3174-5, 3184, 3188, 3380, 3383, 3386

Robb, Mr. W. D., qu., 728

Robertson, Hon. Senator, 505
Statement on Civil Service, 555

Robertson, P. L. Company, refund of duties, qu., 1774

Robinson, Mr. E. W. (Kings, N.S.)
Root Vegetables bill, potato grading, 3373

Robitaille, Mr. Clement (Maisonneuve)
Address in reply, 320. Public ownership of railways; Wheat board; returned soldiers' pensions, 320

Rockefeller Foundation, 61

Rods. *See* Steel

Rome, International Institute. *See* Agriculture

Root Vegetables, Sale and Inspection of, bill
Res., 2743; 1r., 2747; 2r., ref. to Com. on Agriculture, 2972; com., 3142, 3194, 3367; 3r., 3487

Ross, Mr. A. E. (Kingston)
Canadian Patriotic Fund bill, 3482
Militia expenditure, policy, 1587
Niobe, sale of, 2068
Pension Act Amdt. bill, 3450
Pensions Com., final report, 3343
Soldiers' civil re-establishment
Hospital staffs, 1345
Nurses, salaries of, 1342
Venereal diseases, qu., 935

Ross, Mr. Thomas E. (North Simcoe)
Address in reply, 95. Congratulations to Miss Macphail; decline in prices of farm products, 95; soldier settlers, 96; re-establishment; economy in administration; increase in sessional indemnity, 97

Ross Rifle, 2609, 2616

Roumania, loan to, qu., 1400, 2888

Round Table, 3170-1

Routhier, the late Sir Adolphe, 1275

Royal Assent, 722, 1988, 1995, 3617

Royal Canadian Artillery, qu., 370, 1982

Royal Canadian Mounted Police. *See also* National Defence bill
Amalgamation with Dominion Police, 675
Barracks, Fairmont, improvements, 1255
Buildings, 2129
Canadian expeditionary force, in, qu., 2038
Detachments in Arctic regions, 3497
Discontinuance of, qu., 377
Enlistments from A and B squadrons in Canadian expeditionary force, qu., 2038
Estimates, 2129
Income tax office, Hamilton, 1253
Indians, relief to destitute, 1715
Labour espionage and, 670
Lethbridge, Drs. Lovering and Taylor, qu., 1211
Macleod detachment, removal of, 2584
Naturalization, investigations, 1671, 2024
Opium and Narcotic Drugs Act, reports, 1289, 1377
Pensions, 2131
Northwest rebellion, 3523
Removal from British Columbia, 173, 184, 327, 522

Royal Canadian Mounted Police — *Con.*
Salaries, 775
Secret service, 670-9
Unorganized territories in, M. (Mr. Woodsworth) to confine to, 829; neg. on div., 843
Winnipeg strike, 671
Zaneth, Corporal, 671

Royal Canadian Navy. *See* Naval Service

Royal Military College, 1985

Royal Naval College, 2047, 2203, 2458

Royal Trust Company, 1085

Rubber Goods, manufacture, 2469

Rubber Industry, occupational diseases. *See* Labour

Rulings. *See* Deputy Speaker; Speaker

Rural Depopulation, 301, 2470. *See also* Address; Budget; Census; Population

Rural Mail. *See* Post Office

Rural Postmasters. *See* Civil Service; Post Office

Russell, Mr. T. A., 1663, 2695

Russia
Competition in wheat market, 2157
Consortium to re-establish trade, 1463
Public ownership, 1942
Re-establishment of business in, 1463
"Save the Children Fund", 2516
Wrangel Island, 1751

Ryckman, Mr. Edmond B. (East Toronto)
Address in reply, 284. Congratulations to Mr. Speaker, 284; economy in government; Mr. Church's record, 285; protective tariff; Great Britain and the tariff, 286; protection for farmers, 287; Liberal tariff and election campaign, 288; speeches of Prime Minister and Minister of Justice, 289-90; Sir Lomer Gouin and Quebec attitude, 291; sectionalism in politics, 292
Arsenals
Lindsay, 2088
Quebec, 2093
Canada Temperance Act Amdt. bill, 3006
Canadian National railways, consolidation, 1962
Cigars and cigarettes, tax on, 3241
Dominion lands and surveys, 1038

Ryckman, Mr. Edmond B. — *Con.*
Dominion Textile Company, 584
Lambton, loss of, 3508
Mines department, economy, 688-9
Parliament buildings, architects' fees, 2014
Public buildings, heating, 1761
Sales tax, 3269
United States tax on German goods, 3411

Ste. Agathe Sanitarium, 1342

Ste. Anne Hospital, 1342

Ste. Anne de la Pocatière, water supply, qu., 2213

St. Catherines Post office building, 1246-50

St. Charles Park. *See* Parc St. Charles

St. Charles River Improvements, 2400

St. George, N.B., public building, 1240

St. John, N.B.
Cold storage, 3521
Courtenay bay, 2013
Harbour, qu., 1401
Improvements, 2013
Immigration buildings, 2027
Income tax office, qu., 826
Negro Point breakwater, 2013
Ocean tonnage, 2008
Port. *See* British Preference, M. (Mr. Logan)
Quarantine station, 1239-40, 2021
Terminal facilities, M. (Mr. Caldwell) 639, 844; withdrawn, 851

St. John Ambulance Association, 3387

St. John and Quebec Railway
Acquisition by Canadian National, qu., 1774, qu., 1293
M. (Mr. Caldwell) 1293; neg., 1296

St. John River
Pollution of by United States mill owners, 2168
Wharves on tidal waters, qu., 2200

St. John Valley Railway, 3039

St. Lawrence River Ship Channel
De Beaujeu bank, dredging, 1495
Elevator dredge, 1494
Maintenance and operation, 1494
Pilotage dues, 1499
Self-propelling hopper barge, 1495
Sorel shipyard, 1494. *See also that title*

St. Lawrence River Waterway, 70, 121, 134, 137, 269, 2266, 2327, 2398. *See also* Address; Budget; Canals; Quebec Harbour Commission; Transportation; Waterpowers; Welland Ship Canal
Calder, United States Senator, 1206
Climatic conditions, 1187
Coal, conservation of supply, 1188
Co-operation with United States, 2750, 2767
Correspondence with United States Government, 2207, 2583, 2755, 2760, 2767
Tabled, 2256
Cost, 269, 1191, 1195-99, 1203-07, 1315, 1320, 1329
Deep Waterways Association, 1206-8
Electric power development, 1188, 1205, 1317, 1319, 1321, 1326, 1397
Export of power, 1203
Niagara river, 1322, 1327
Electrification of locomotives and railways, 133, 1188, 1317, 1323, 1326, 1330. *See also* Electrification; Railways
Finance, 1189, 1195, 1318, 1320
Finney, Col. John, 1189
Freight rates, 1204
Georgian bay canal, 1199, 1204, 1209
Grain production and shipment, 1203
Great Lakes-St. Lawrence Tidewater Association, 1319
Harding, President, 133, 1184
History of project, 1185
Imperial Government, communication with, qu., 1508
Industrial development, 1318
Information available, 1195
International Joint Commission, 1191, 1199, 1206, 1315-21, 1469
Report, qu., 377
Distribution of, 2357
International partnership, 1191, 1199, 1209, 1315, 1332, 1396
Land adjacent to development, 1200
Long Sault, 1199
Manchester ship canal, 1190
M. (Mr. Church) 1183, 1314, 1396
Navigation, 1195
Negotiations, inquiry, 786
New York state commission, 1197
Progress report, 2969
Ocean steamers, 1193-95, 1205
Opportunity for further discussion, 1462
Opposition to project, 1184, 1193, 1199, 1202, 1206, 1209
Proposed bond issue, 1318, 20
Public ownership, 1189, 1318-31
Support of western states, 1184

St. Lawrence River Waterway — *Con.*
Surveys and investigations, estimates, 2765
Taschereau, Premier, 1191
Ten Eyck, Congressman, letter re acquisition of land adjacent to development, 1200
Traffic through Panama, Suez and Soo Canals, 1203
Transportation, 1186, 1201, 1208, 1315, 1325, 1327
Treaty with United States, 2207, 2760, 2767. *See also* Welland Ship Canal
United States and, 1396
Water power, 629, 1188, 1197, 1199, 1205
Welland canal, 1205, 1207

St. Lawrence Shipping and Trading Co., 1400

St. Louis, Municipal currency, 2506

St. Malo Car shops, 1699, 2399

St. Père, Mr. Edouard C. (Hochelaga)
Address in reply, 281. Immigration, 281, 282; Public ownership of railways; Race harmony, 284; Tariff; unemployment, 282; Wheat Board, 283
Canadian Navigation Company, qu., 1284
Cotton industries, wages and hours, qu., 1903
Parliament hill monuments, qu., 936
Warships and torpedo boats, qu., 827

St. Peters' Reserve. *See* Indians

St. Pierre water supply, qu., 2213

St. Thomas-Niagara Falls Highway, qu., 936

St. Vincent de Paul Penitentiary. *See* Penitentiaries

Sabotage. *See* Labour; Nova Scotia Miners; Strikes

Safeguarding of Industries Act, 2409, 2423-4

Salaries. *See* Civil Service

Salaries Act and the **Senate and House of Commons Act Amdt.** bill; 1r., 363; 2r., com., 746; 3r., 787

Sale and Inspection of Root Vegetables. *See* Root Vegetables

Sale of Agriculture Fertilizers. *See* Agricultural Fertilizers

Sales, Mr. Thomas (Saltcoats)
Animal Contagious Diseases Act Amdt. bill, 2103

Sales, Mr. Thomas — *Con.*
Binder twine, 257, 2575
Budget, 2574. Sales Tax; Canada a dear country to live in; burden on the poor man; automobiles, 2574; protection; binder twine; success of a free trade industry; agricultural implement manufacturers; successful competition in other markets, 2575; infant industries; farming conditions; distribution and marketing; exchange value of farm products; intermediary between producer and consumer, 2576; bleeding the victims white, 2577
Canada Grain Act, 2838
King vs. Manitoba Grain Co., decision, 1132
Licenses to private elevators, 2838
Canadian National railways, restaurants at Rivers and Melville, Sask., qu., 2038
Customs
Dumping clause, 3420
Officials, 764
Dredging, Saskatchewan, 2006
Elevators
Excess overages, qu., 1401
Private, 2981
Terminal, 2839
Exhibitions, 982
Experimental farms, 799, 807
Grain Commission, 2839
Grain, selling without growers' permission, 2989
Humboldt-Fort Pitt telegraph line, 2008
Mixed farming, 981
St. Lawrence river waterway, 2761
Saskatchewan Elevator Company, 2989
Welland canal, grain transportation, 2761
Wheat Board, 3181
Wheat Board bill, 3386

Sales Tax, 2297, 2425, 2661, 2843. *See also* Budget; Special War Revenue; Taxation
Automobiles, 2177
Collections, qu., 375
Confectionery, 2177
Exemptions, 2672, 2689
Dried beet pulp, 2858
Fertilizers, 2858
Increase, 2365
Lumber, 2177
Regulations, 2858

Salmon Canning. *See* Fisheries Act Amdt.; Meat and Canned Foods

Salmon Fisheries. *See* Fisheries

Sanitarium. *See* Soldiers' Civil Re-establishment

Sardines, export of, qu., 1182

Saskatchewan
Aerial patrol, 1724
Canada Temperance Act Amdt., 2997. *See also that title*
Dry areas, 1042
Harbours and rivers, 2004
Indian reserves, qu., 608
Liquor
Export of, 2977
Warehouses, qu., 1211; qu., 1660
Importations, qu., 2037; qu., 2303
Public buildings, improvements, 1253
Second homesteads, 1042
Wheat marketing, 115. *See also* Wheat Board

Saskatchewan Court of Appeal. *See* Judges Act Amdt. bill

Saturday Sittings. *See* House of Commons, Sittings

Sault Ste. Marie, Algoma Steel Co. rail contracts, 1704

Saunders, Dr. C. E., resignation of, 590, 3522

Savard, Mr. Edmond (Chicoutimi-Saguenay)
Canadian National railways, right of way and lease agent, qu., 1633

Save the Children Fund, 3516

Savoy, Mr. J. Clovis, qu., 3363

Sawmill Machinery, 3126

Scandinavia
Immigration, 2144
Trade relations with, 2990

Schools. *See also* Education
Closing in West, 152
Lands, 339. *See also* Dominion Lands; Natural Resources
Nova Scotia in. *See* Nova Scotia Miners
Refusal of banks to advance money to, 2627

Scientific Research. *See* Research

Scott, Mr. Frank, qu., 728

Scrip Frauds. *See* Criminal Code Amdt.

Sea-Going Vessels. *See* St. Lawrence River Waterway

Seals, destruction by. *See* British Columbia Fisheries

Seaports, Canadian. *See* British Preference

Secondary amendments. *See* House of Commons; Speaker

Secord Case. *See* Criminal Code (Scrip Frauds)

Secret Proceedings. *See* Prime Ministers' Conference

Secret Service. *See* Royal Canadian Mounted Police

Secretariat. *See* League of Nations

Secretary of State department
Adjustment of War claims, 1672, 2977
Estimates, 601, 1670, 3499
Public archives, 1673

Sedition. *See* Criminal Code Amdt.

Seduction. *See* Criminal Code Amdt.

Seed Grain
Advances, 1053
Freight on, 3522
Purchasing Commission, 1011

Séguin, Mr. P. A. (L'Assomption-Montcalm)
Forest, Mr. Médard, customs officer, qu., 2355
Gaboury, Mr. L. J., salary, qu., 3599

L'Assomption and Montcalm
Excise officers, qu., 1774
Employment and dismissal of, qu., 2355
Lightkeepers, qu., 1904, qu., 2215
Postmasters, 1775
Tobacco experimental station, 1776

Select Standing Committees. *See* House of Commons

Selective Conscription. *See* Military Service Act Amdt.

Senate
Amendments concurred in:
Agricultural Fertilizers bill, 3607
Criminal Code Amdt. bill, 3607
Dominion Elections Act Amdt. bill, 3486
Escheats Act Amdt. bill, 3486
Insurance Act, 1917, Amdt. bill, 3607
Loan Companies Act, 1914, Amdt. bill, 3607
National Defence Department bill, 2806
Opium and Narcotic Drug Act bill, 3607

Senate — *Con.*
Amendments concurred in — *Con.*
Trust Companies Act, 1914, Amdt. bill, 3607
Amendments, non-concurrence:
Bankruptcy Act Amdt. bill, 3611
Canada Temperance Act Amdt. bill, 3608
Dominion Lands, Cancellation Leases bill
Concurrence, 3616
Conference, 3614
Chief accountant, salary, qu., 2583, qu., 2803
Expenditure, qu., 2583
Free conferences with, 3613, 3616
Indemnity, proposed reduction, 2513, 3509
Reform, 138, 2894
Salaries and contingent expenses, 2026

Senate and House of Commons Act. *See* Salaries Act Amdt.

Senn, Mr. Mark C. (Haldimand)
Corn-borer, destruction by, 818
Grand River bridge, York, Ont., qu., 1287

Sergeant-at-Arms. *See* House of Commons

Serums. *See* Accredited Herds; Agriculture

Sessional Indemnity. *See* House of Commons; Members

Settlers. *See* Immigration

Sexsmith, Mr. Edward J. (Lennox and Addington)
Address in reply, 293. Change in administration; agriculture; railway problems, 283; soldier settlement, 294
Dominion Elections Act Amdt. bill, 2812
Soldiers bonus, M. (Mr. Arthurs) 447

Sexual Offences. *See* Criminal Code

Shaughnessy, Lord
National railway scheme, 89-90, 127
On immigration, 2478

Shaw, Mr. Joseph T. (West Calgary)
Agriculture Com. report, Wheat Board, 782
Banff-Windermere road, 1683
Blankets, duty on, 3136
Boots and shoes, M. to reduce duty, 3238
Calgary, post office building, 1254
Canada-Australia, steamship service, 3034
Canada Temperance Act Amdt. bill, 3003
Date of coming into effect, 3007; Withdrawn, 3008
Canadian National railways
Representation at meeting of steamship companies, 2584
Canadian Patriotic Fund bill, 3484
Coal lands, transfer of by Canadian Pacific Railway Company, 2214

Shaw, Mr. Joseph T. — *Con.*
Criminal Code Amdt bill, fines, 2832
Expenditure, comparison by departments, 1137
Explosives Act, 1234
Freight rates, M. (Mr. Kennedy, Essex) for Special Com., 1444-8
Grain companies, security of, 2837
Indians
Education, 1227, 3536
Stony Reserve school, qu., 965, 1218, 1227, 3536
Military and other expenditures, 1137
Militia and defence
Expenditure and policy, 1590
Permanent force, 1983
War medals, 2976
Ministers and Directorships, 1126
Naval service, 1738
Opium and Narcotic Drugs, 3022
Pensions Com., final report, 3305
Amdt., 3349, 3358
Prime Ministers' Conference, naval defence, 1742, 1745
Railway Commission, Carvell, Hon. F. B., alleged statement of Mr. Motherwell, 2775, 2779
Redistribution
Inquiry as to intention of Government, 3611
M. (Mr. Shaw), opportunity for discussion, 1719
Reply to leader of Opposition, 3611
Royal military college, 1985
Soldiers' Civil Re-establishment, Alberta hospital, 1345
Tariff commissioner, 1665
Tariff, reciprocal arrangement with France, 2032
Tourist traffic, 1683
Trade commissioners and commercial agents, 2989
War memorials, 2101
Wheat Board, 3182
Wrangel island, 1751

Sheard, Mr. Charles (South Toronto)
Address in reply, 294. Congratulations to Mr. Speaker; defeat of Meighen Government due to taxation, 294; Progressive party; railway problem, 295, 296; immigration; tariff and protection, 297
Criminal Code Amdt. bill, docking of horses, 2833
Soldier Civil Re-establishment, salary increases, 386

Sheep Industry. *See* Agriculture; Live Stock

Shelburne wharf, 1768

Shellfish. *See* Meat and Canned Foods

Shells. *See* Ammunition

Sherbrooke
Post Office inspector, qu., 1507
Soldier Settlement Board employees, qu., 1658

Sherman, General William T., war, 1336

Shibley, Mr. A. D., Secretary-Treasurer of Union of Canadian Municipalities, 1392

Ships and Shipbuilding. *See also* Canadian Government Merchant Marine; Labour; Limitation of Armaments; Marine; Naval Service; St. Lawrence River Waterway; Steamship Services; Unemployment; Vessels
British Ministry of Shipping, claim for hospital ship, 1752
Canada Shipping Act. *See that title*
Canadian navigation companies, life-saving equipment, qu., 1284
Con Rein, sinking of, 1382
Coolie labour, 2042
Dominion Iron and Steel Co., steel plates, 1677
Drydocks. *See that title*
International deep sea racing. *See that title*
Nova Scotia, 1387
Pilotage dues, 1499. *See also* Canada Shiping Act
Registration of, 1493
Sorel shipyard, 2169
Dismissal of employees, qu., 605, 1283
Maintenance, 1494
Men employed, qu., 1062
Steamboat inspection, 2169
Steel plates, cost of delivery, 3508
Vickers Company, elevator dredge, 1494
Wooden ships constructed at Victoria, B. C., qu., 364

Shuswap Lake
Dredging, 2006
Wharf, 3547

Siberia, Service of Mounted Police, in, qu., 2038

Silk Fabrics, duty on, 2662, 3137

Silver. *See also* Coinage; Mines and Minerals
Coins. *See* Currency Act Amdt. bill
Discovery in Yukon, 1276
English hall marks, protection of. *See* Criminal Code

Simpson, Mr. T. E. (West Algoma)
Dredging, St. Mary's river, 2006
Good roads, Ontario, qu., 372
Lambton, wreck of, 1497, 3508
Rail and car repair contracts, 1703
Receipt tax, 3262
Sales tax, workmen's clothing, 3272
Sault Ste. Marie wharf, 2006
Unemployment
Insurance, 1075
Rails and car repair contracts, 1704

Sinclair, Hon. J. E. (Queen's, P.E.I.)
Harbours and rivers, Prince Edward island, 1990
Root Vegetables bill, potato grades, 3375

Single Tax, 2191. *See also* Budget; Taxation

Six Nation Reserve. *See* Indians

Slaughter Houses, Inspection. *See* Meat and Canned Foods

Smuts, General, International Disarmament Conference, 1283

Socialism, 1290

Soft Drinks, tax on, 2329, 2617, 2852, 2857. *See also* Taxation

Soldier Land Settlement, 83, 96, 147, 183, 252, 294, 305, 318, 327, 345, 3294, 3298, 3307, 3333, 3338. *See also* Address; Budget; Pensions Committee
Abandoned farms, 2132
Building loans, 3475
Cost and results, 2159
Estimates, 2023, 2131
Expenditure, statement of, 2132
Foreclosure, 2132
Homestead rights, 2132
Inflated values, 2133
Land speculation, and, 2136
Municipal taxation, payment by Government, 1257
Revaluation of land, 2136-42
Taxes, collection of, 2134

Soldier Settlement Act Amdt. bills
1. Mineral rights. (Mr. Malcolm) 1r., 2035
2. Consolidation of Indebtedness. (Mr. Stewart, Argenteuil)
Res. 3358, 3405; 1r., 3409; 2r., com., 3475; 3r., 3476

Soldier Settlement Board, qu., 608
Amounts loaned, etc., qu., 469
Estimates, 2023, 2131-43
Comparison with last year, 382

Soldier Settlement Board — *Con.*
Loans, 147
Sherbrooke office employees, qu., 1658
Six Nation Indians, 1221

Soldiers. *See also* Pensions Returned Soldiers; Soldiers' Civil Re-establishment; Unemployment
Bonus, 394, 402, 1618, 2533, 3337
M. (Mr. Arthurs) 429; neg. 450
Exchange on pay, qu., 826
Homes, establishment of, 1348
Insurance, 1349. *See also* Returned Soldiers' Insurance bill
Land settlement. *See that title*
Pensions, 271. *See also* Pensions

Soldiers' Aid Commission, 3315-16

Soldiers' Civil Re-establishment, 168, 271, 1617
Building requirements, 1261
Calydor sanitarium, 1279
Department, decrease in activities of, 1340
Doctors, 1343, 1351
Employers' Liability, compensation, 1348
Estimates, 1279, 1339
Expenditure on, 266
Reduction of, 1339
Hospitals, 1262, 1341, 1344, 1348
Nurses, salaries of, 1342
Operating expenses and working capital, 1347
Patients, care and medical examination of, 1280
Pension Commissioners, Board of, 396, 1339, 1349. *See also* Pensions
Ste. Agathe sanitarium, 1342
Ste. Anne hospital, 1342
Salaries, 385, 1339
Reduction of vote, 1339-46
Waddington, Mr., 385, 398
Staff, reduction of, 3602
Tubercular patients, treatment of, 1344
Unemployment relief, 1347, 1352, 3524
Vocational loans, 1346
Fishermen, to, 1346
Vocational training, 1281, 1340
War Service gratuity interest, 1346

Soldiers' Civil Re-establishment Department bill (Report of Re-establishment and Pensions Committee)
1r., 3597; 2r., com., 3609; 3r., 3610

Soldiers' Re-establishment and Pensions Committee. *See* Pensions Committee

Sorel Shipyard
Dismissal of employees, qu., 605. 1283
Estimates, 2169
Maintenance, 1494
Men employed in May 1921, qu., 1062

Soulanges Canal. *See* Canals

South America Steamship service. *See* Steamship Services

Speaker, Hon. Rodolphe Lemieux. *See also* Deputy Speaker; House of Commons; Marcil
Rulings and statements of
Acoustics of Chamber
Member speaking from centre of Chamber, 632
Member speaking from front seat, 3286
Agreement between Whips as to 11 o'clock adjournment, 173
Amendments, 3284
Imposing tax, cannot be moved by private member, 722
Secondary amendments (amdts. to amdt.) 2473-4, 2519
Baker, the late Col. G. H., M.P., memorial, 1929
Bills
Introduction by unanimous consent, 3597
Military Service Act Amdt., 644
Money, must be preceded by res, 548
Private
No sponsor, first reading postponed, 2102
Refund of fees, 1577, 1657
Reference from Com. of Whole to Special Com., 1395
Repealing legislation, 644
Second reading on day of introduction, 1460
Trade or money, to be preceded by res., 1282
Chair to be addressed, 2415
Clerk Assistant, correctness of record, 1843
Committees
Leave to sit while House in session, 1988
Motion in advance of report of, 1901
Refund of fees, 1577
Special, members opposed to principle of bill not to be chosen, 1502
Congratulations to on 25th anniversary, 3489
Criminal Code and statutes, reprinting of, 1717

Speaker, Hon. Rodolphe Lemieux — *Con.*
Rulings and Statements — *Con.*
Crowsnest pass agreement, suspension of Rule 11, 1502
Daylight saving, discussion in order, 944
Debate
Closed by mover, 835, 1295, 1836
Relevancy
Criticism of British Columbia Government during Budget debate, 2238
Hon. John Oliver, quotation from Vancouver Sun, 2236
Debates, Official Report
Insertion of documents, 942
Decorum, conversation in Chamber and lobbies, 2640
Election of, 1, 4
Kingston election petition, 2692
Language, "False" or "falsely", 3603
Libellous statements reflecting on honour of Canada, 822
Letters, anonymous, 944
Library of Parliament, 3517
Salaries, 3517
Members
Customary to speak from seats, 632, 3286
May speak only once on motion for 3r., 3487
Must address Chair, 2415
Must address other members in third person, 165
Payment of, 3611
Speaking, not to be interrupted, 2361
Motions
Amdt. to amdt. (Mr. Crerar on Budget) 2473-4, 2519
For concurrence in, notice required, 703
In advance of report of Com., 1901
Non-debatable, 865
Notice given in Votes and Proceedings, 378
Ministers and Directorships, seconder, 1084, 1094
Private members, involving expenditure, out of order, 844
Re-drafted, in order, 844
Newspaper extracts, 821
Orders of the Day
Arguments not permissible, 822, 1721, 1842, 2256, 2995, 3492, 3601
Member may make personal explanation or ask question, 3602-3
Question not debatable, 3602
Reading newspaper extracts, 303, 374-5
Right of members to raise question of privilege on, 2638

Speaker, Hon. Rodolphe Lemieux — *Con.*
Rulings and Statements — *Con.*
Pairs, 1463
Petitions, irregular, 1929
Privilege
Member may make personal explanation or put question, 3602-3
Member must confine himself to question, 3366
Must affect honour of member, 3493
Right of member to raise on Orders of the day, 2638
Prorogation of Parliament, 3610
Questions
Argumentative, 2805-2806
Discretion of Ministers respecting, 1775
Standing as orders for returns, 1660, 1775
Reading of letters, 948
Resolution
Adopted, binding on Government, 639
Affecting civil rights of provinces, 829
Money, should originate with Government, 639
Must be positive, 644
Royal Assent, 1988
Rule 11, suspension of, 1502
Senate, free conference, 3613
Sergeant-at-Arms to prevent disorder in lobby, 3606
Supply
Concurrence, 1843
Discussion of particular item on motion, 1337
Redress of grievances before going into Com., 1337
Tedious repetition, 944
Unanimous consent, 703, 726, 3597
Bill, introduction of, 3597
Vacancies
Kamouraska, 1459
War memorials, 2100
Wheat Board, point of order, 2935, 2949

Speaker, Mr., Bereavement of, 496, 596

Speakman, Mr. Alfred (Red Deer)
Address in reply, 80. Co-operation necessary; agricultural prosperity, 81; tariff for revenue; taxation forms; immigration, 82; unemployment; soldier settlement, 83
Agriculture, subsidies to, 1698
Budget, 2881. Alleged selfishness of prairie provinces; Budget as it affects the West; protection, 2881; tariff and cost of living; textile industry; protection and prices; price of agricul-

Speakman, Mr. Alfred — *Con.*
Budget — *Con.*
tural products set by export market; policy of give and take, 2882; tariff as means of taxation; commodity tax fundamentally wrong; restriction of export market and reduction of prices, 2883; excise duty on protected goods; depreciated currency; cost of manufacturing in Germany, 2884; agriculture and lower costs of production; transportation; marketing; compromise; reciprocity, 2885; attack on the Progressive party; the amendment; political morals, 2886; idealism in politics, 2887
Dredging, 2006
Enfranchisement of foreign-born women, 490
Estimates, reclassification, 455
Fishing schooner race, 3511
Imperial Mining Resources bureau, 1237
Indians
Education, 1715
Red Deer school, 1229
Militia, purchasing agents, 587
Oleomargarine, M. (Mr. Neill) 1833
Pensions
Committee
Expenditures, 3523
Final report, 3297
Widowed mothers, M. (Mr. Power) 1309
Promotions and salaries in Civil Service, 577
Rail and car repair contracts, 1698
Sales tax, 3269, amdt., 3269
Soldier settlement
Board, qu., 608
Revaluation, 2141
Special Com., work of, 2141
Soldier Settlement Act Amdt. bill, 3406

Special Loans Bill
Res., 3252, 3358; 1r., 2r., com., 3r., 3476-77

Special War Revenue Act Amdt. bill
Res., 3252, 3409; 1r., 2r., com., 3r., 3477
Subjects and sections discussed:
Automobiles, 3272-3
Cheques, stamp tax, 3258
Condensed milk, 3264-3271, 3409
Drawbacks, 3263
Excise tax of two and a half per cent, 3263
Insurance premiums, 3253
Lumber, 3263
Matches, 3262
Receipt tax, 3262

Special War Revenue Act Amdt. — *Con.*
Subjects and Sections discussed — *Con.*
Sales tax, 3409
Condensed milk, 3264-71, 3409
Exemptions, 3263, 3410
Job printing, 3409
Taxation under, 2116, 2857. *See also* Taxation

Speech from the Throne. *See* Address

Spence, Mr. David (Parkdale)
Egg inspectors, qu., 727
Entomology, 913-14
Meighen, Right Hon. Arthur, 406
Militia expenditure and policy, 1592
Pension Act Amdt. bill, 3463
Root Vegetables bill, 3142, 3194, 3367
Soldiers' Civil Re-establishment, royal commission, 406
Stamp tax on cheques, 3260

Spencer, Mr. Henry E. (Battle River)
Agriculture, condition of, 2158
Banks, circulation, interest, qu., 3598
Blankets, duty on, 3128, 3132
M. to reduce, 3234
Budget, 2629. Congratulations to Finance Minister; public men, 2629; Mr. Fielding and the Liberal platform of 1919; conditions in Canada; restricted credit; purchasing power; home market; per capita wealth; labour troubles; after affects of war; statement of Mr. W. Bell; private financing of public production, 2630; capital investment in agriculture and manufacturing; foreign and home markets; returns from agricultural and industrial enterprise; farmers and the income tax; agricultural products; prices and cost of production, 2631; prices of hides and boots and shoes; woollen goods; profits of textile industries, 2632; profits of milling industry; food, shelter, and clothing; Mr. Stewart (Argenteuil) on the tariff; driving capital out of business; conscription of wealth, 2633; no radical taxation proposed; credit system; urban development and infant mortality, 2634
Calgary milk inquiry, qu., 823
Canadian National railways
Dining car service, qu., 2040
Mail contracts, qu., 2038, qu., 2213
Canadian Pacific railway
Bill, 1608
Mail contracts, 2040

Spencer, Mr. Henry E. — *Con.*
Census, agricultural assets and liabilities, 2159
Crowsnest pass agreement, M. (Mr. Kennedy, Essex) for Special Com., 1423
Dominion notes, qu., 935
Fabre, Madame, pension, 2024
Farming industry, 809, 2158, 2159
Grain, per capita production, 2159
Grain Growers' Grain Co., alleged contributions to political organizations, 2488
Immigration
Central European, 2158
Land speculation, 2159
Pamphlets, 759
Policy, 2158
Imported liquor, excise duty, qu., 828
Income tax-payers, qu., 3362
Livestock industry, 984
Marshall, Mr. Duncan, 590
Militia and Defence
Transport and freight, amdt. to reduce item, 1987
Mixed farming, 983
Naturalization Act, 2024
Nova Scotia miners, M. (Mr. Irvine) 515
Population
Rural, decline in, 2158
Slow growth of, 2158
Post office saving banks, interest, qu., 1932
Soldier settlement, cost and results, 2159
Steamship services, 2027
Welland canal, qu., 3600
Wheat Board, 3185
Wheat Board bill, 3380

Sportsmen's Patriotic Association, cadet camps, 1973

Spruce Bud Moth, 595, 815, 2668. *See also* Entomology

Stamp Tax. *See* Special War Revenue Act

Standard of Living. *See* Oriental Aliens

Standard of Valuation. *See* Customs

Standard Time. *See* Daylight Saving

Standards, Bureau of, 235, 1372

Stanfield, Dr., Bienfait briquetting plant, 1234

Stansell, Mr. J. L. (East Elgin)
Accredited herd system, 995, 999
Address in reply, 359. Definition of party names; farmers and protection, 360;

Stansell, Mr. J. L. — *Con.*
Address — *Con.*
defeat of late government; economy; cattle embargo; railway situation, 361; racial differences, 362
Agriculture dept., estimates, 994
Budget, 2290. "Grit and "Tory"; suggested identity of Liberal and Progressive policies, 2290; tribute to the Minister of Finance; attitude of Progressives, 2291; sales tax; income tax, 2292; constructive criticism; tariff and the masses; protection; adjustment of tariff to changing conditions; revenue, 2292; encourage maximum production; sales tax; increase of burden upon consumers, 2293; income tax,; taxes passed on to consumers, 2294
Canned milk industry, 3264
Civil service patronage, 3087
Commissioner of Agriculture, qu., 609
Experimental farms, 809
Freight rates, Special Com. report, 3596
Live Stock industry, 994
Ministers and directorships, 1124
Oleomargarine, M. (Mr. Neill) 1825
Railway Act Amdt. (Crowsnest pass) 3597

State-Owned Railways. *See* Canadian National Railways

Stationery. *See* Printing and Stationery

Statistics. *See also* Census; Population; Trade
Concentration of, 580
Dominion Bureau of, 1363
Dominion Statistician, Mr. R. H. Coats, 1364-71

Statutes
Printing of, 1972
Revision of, 1717

Steamship Services, qu., 614. *See also* Trade and Commerce
British Columbia coastal, qu., 3152
Canada-Australia-New Zealand, 3034
Canada-Newfoundland, 2027
Canada-West Indies-British Guiana, qu., 2356
Canada-West Indies-South America, 2027, 3026
Charlottetown-Pictou-New Glasgow, 3506
Charlottetown-Victoria-Halliday's Wharf, 3506
Competition with railways, 182
Freight rates, 2028
Halifax-Canso-Guysboro, 3507

Steamship Services — *Con*
Mails, carriage of, 2028
Miscou-Shippegan Island, 2029
Mulgrave-Arichat-Petit de Grat, 2029
Murray Bay-Tadoussac, 3035
Newcastle-Neguac-Escuminac, 2029
Pelee Island and mainland, 3034
Pictou-Mulgrave-Cheticamp, 3050
Port Mulgrave-St. Peters-Irish Cove, 3507
Quebec Natashquan-Bras d'Or, 2029, 3034
St. Catherines Bay-Tadoussac, 2029
St. John-Bay of Fundy-Minas Basin, 3507
St. John-Bear River, 3507
St. John-Cuba, 2028
St. John-Digby, 2030
St. John-St. Andrews, 2030
St. Stephen-Deer Island-Campobello, 2030
Sydney-Bras d'Or lakes, 2031
Sydney-Whycocomagh, 2030, 3035
Vancouver-Howe Island, 2027
Victoria-Vancouver-Skagway, 2027

Steedsman, Mr. James (Souris)
Budget, 2721. Inconsistencies of the tariff; implement duties; opportunities for manufacturing in British Columbia, 2721; prairie farmers paying tribute to manufacturers and fruit growers; cost of wheat production beyond market value; farming unprofitable, 2722; survey of conditions in West; boot and shoe industry, 2723
Tractors, 3124
Turtle Mountain reserve, qu., 615

Steel. *See also* Railway estimates; Rail repairs
Bounties, 304-5, qu., 3360
British Empire Steel Corporation. *See that title*
Dominion Iron and Steel Company, contract for ship plates, 1677, 2170
Drawbacks, 2175
Industry, subsidies to, 1692, 1696
Plates, 1677, 2170
Delivery of, 3508
Prices, 2411-12
Rails
Competition with Germany, 2412
Contracts for, 1688
Price of, 1680-1709, 2412
Purchases of, 1913
Unemployment, 1077
Rods, refund of duties, qu., 1774
Steel plates, 1677
Damage claim of Dominion Iron and Steel Co., 1677
Settlement of, 2170
Structural, importation of, qu., 1931

Stefansson Expedition, 1750

Stevens, Hon. H. H. (Vancouver Centre)
Address in reply, 230. Death of Prime Minister's brother; debate on address opportunity for vigorous discussion, 230; importance of aids to agriculture; marketing of wheat, 231; Wheat Board, 232; elevator facilities, 233; freight rates on commodities, 234; bureau of standards, industrial and scientific research, 235; immigration, 236; Bank Act, revision of; unemployment, 237; the tariff question; customs taxes, cost of collecting, 239; tariff, platform of Liberal Convention; speech of Mr. Marler, 240; survey of ministers, 241; Minister of Justice and big interests, 242; minister and directorships, 242-3
Air board, 1722
Air Force and civil aviation
Customs aerial patrol, Vancouver, 1730
Forest patrol in Railway Belt, 1730
Archives, book binder, 703
British Columbia house, purchase of, 3537
Budget, 2640. Tariff announcement will allay alarm of manufacturing interests; cheque tax, 2640; discriminatory tax on confectionery; repeal of anti-dumping clause; fruit; marking act and depreciated currency clause, 2641; German situation; depreciated currency, 2642; post war industries and commercial development of Germany; position of France; reparations; physical suffering; Germany's budget deficits; issues of paper currency; unemployment; comparison of conditions in 1915 and 1921, 2643; Germany's foreign trade; adverse balance; Canada's imports from Germany; purchasing power of the mark; internal and external value; Mr. Maynard Keynes; Dr. Melchior; situation in France, 2645; Austria, Hungary; prohibitory tariffs in central Europe; German exports to Canada; pocket knives, 2646; German goods, method of distribution; agents of German manufacturers in Canada, 2647; sale of brokers' goods; enormous profits of German manufacturers; congratulations to Prime Minister on recently bestowed honour; Australian Preservation of Industries Act; direct and indirect taxation, 2648; inaccurate statements issued by Canadian Council of Agriculture; Mr. Crerar's figures

Stevens, Hon. H. H. — *Con.*
Budget — *Con.*
as to agricultural exports, 2649; consumption of agricultural products in Canada, 2650; taxation of capital; income tax — who pays?; per capita payment of customs duties, 2691; grievances of western farmers; technical and not fiscal problems, 2652; the tariff; business profits and taxation; United Grain Growers; watered stock, 2653; business principles enunciated in Grain Growers' report, 2654
Canadian exhibition in France, 2031
Canadian National railways, deficit, 1919
Canadian Pacific railway bill, 1858
Cash grants to soldiers, Liberal pledge, 399, 433
Chinese immigration
Agent in China, 2026, qu., 2214
Estimates, 2026
Civil service bonus, inquiry, 2996
Coal, Canmore and Drumheller miners' dispute, 1058
Conciliation and Labour Act, 1053, 1054
Congratulations to Mr. Fielding, 3279
Customs Act, depreciated currency, 2642, 3224, 3410
Dredging, 2005
Shuswap lake, 2006
Dumping provision, 2641, 3412
Employment offices, 1058
Enfranchisement of foreign-born women, M. (Mr. Euler) 487
Fisheries, salmon canners' license fees, 1748
Ford automobile company, 3274
Forests, depletion of, 1046
Fraser Valley and Southern Railway, 1577
Fruit growers, protection, 2641, 3423-4
German valuation of goods, 2642-48, 3226
Government publications, 1373
Grain Inquiry Commission, qu., 705; qu., 1181, 2842
Harbours and rivers
British Columbia, 2005
Quebec, 1998
Hides, price of, 3138
Immigration
Commissioner of at Canton, China, qu., 1901, 2026; qu., 2214
Foreigners admitted as farmers, 1068
Industrial and scientific research, 235, 1372
Industrial Disputes Investigation Act, 1058
Interior dept., economic adviser, 455
International Opium Convention, qu., 1066
Job printers, taxation, 3264

Stevens, Hon. H. H. — *Con.*
Labour department
Employees, 460, 468
Estimates, 571
M. to reduce item, 562, 579
Salary increases, 562
Liquor importation, 733
McCoig, Senator, attendance before Agriculture Com., 1901
McInnes, Mr. W. W. B., qu., 1901, 2026; qu., 2214
Marine and Fisheries
Eddie, Capt., 1492
Ice-breaker, repurchase of, 1490
Lightkeepers, salaries, 1497
Navigation schools, 1492
Steamers and ice-breakers, 1490
Marshall, Mr. Duncan, 754
Mennonite emigration, qu., 732
Mexico, trade with, 699
Militia and Defence
Purchasing agents, 416-17
Training camps, qu., 2584
National Defence bill, 739
National Liberal-Conservative platform, trade, 2540
Naval Service
Royal Canadian navy, 1882-91
Royal Naval college, closing of, qu., 2458
Niagara River Bridge Company bill, 1486
Northwest rebellion, pensions for Mounted police, 3523
Nova Scotia miners strike, 1054
Opium and Narcotic Drugs, 775, 3017
Oriental aliens, and, 2018
Prohibition, and, 2018
Oriental aliens
Immigration
Chinese, restriction, M. for papers, 1776
Japanese, restriction, M. for papers, 1776
M. (Mr. McQuarrie) for exclusion of, 1548, 1573
Pilotage dues, 1500
Point of order
M. in advance of report of Com., 1901
Right of member to complete speech, 3540
Unfinished statement of member ruled out of order, not debatable, 3603
Post office, railway mail service in British Columbia, 2799
Public buildings, heating, 1758
Radiotelegraph service, 1749
Railway Commission, Hon. F. B. Carvell, statement, 2777

Stevens, Hon. H. H. — *Con.*
Returned Soldiers' Insurance bill, 3393
Senate indemnity, 3509
Soldier settlement, 2024
Soldiers' bonus, M. (Mr. Arthurs) 433
Soldiers' Civil Re-establishment
Pension Board officials, 404
Salary increases, 386
Special War Revenue Act, exemptions, 3263
Standards, bureau of, 235, 1372
Steamship services, 2027
Atlantic and Pacific, Canadian ports, 3026
Unemployment
Relief, 1061, 2022
Employment offices, 2023
Tariff and, 3527
Vancouver drydock, 2005, 2008
Vancouver Harbour Commissioners bill, 2996
War, payment of cost of, 2405
Wheat Board, 2931
Point of order, 2933
Proceedings in Agriculture Com., 2931
Special Com. report, delay in concurrence, 2306
Women, the franchise and, 485
Yukon radiotelegraph service, 1749-50

Stewart, Hon. Charles (Minister of the Interior; Superintendent General of Indian Affairs; Minister of Mines)
Alpine Club grant, 1053
Assiniboine river floods, 3491
Bienfait briquetting plant, 1233
Budget, 2216. Congratulations to Minister of Finance; review of agricultural and industrial conditions from introduction of national policy, 2216; prosperity following change of government in 1896; reciprocity; depression of 1914; agricultural implements; tariff reductions; public debt; war conditions, 2217; railways, 2218; tariff proposals; markets; freight rates, 2219; United States, trade with; taxation; sales, income tax, 2220
Canadian national parks, 1501
Chinese. *See also under this title,* Immigration; Oriental Aliens
Arival of at Vancouver, 2026, 3604
Criminal Code Amdt. (Scrip frauds) 3220
Calhoun, Mr., telegram from, 3601
Deville, Dr., 1045
Dinosaurs, museum specimens, 1237
Dominion lands
Homestead re-entry, 1041
Reclamation by drainage, 1051
Salaries of staff, 1035

Stewart, Hon. Charles — *Con.*
Dominion Lands — *Con.*
Surveys, 1037
Expenditure, 1045
Mackenzie-Peace river districts, 1044
Reduction of vote by, $30,000, 1044
Dominion Lands, Cancellation of Leases, bill, 3151, 3465-74
Senate amendments, 3615
Editorial Committee, 1235
Electrical storm in the West, 3493
Emigration, record of, 2160
Explosives Act, 1234
Forbes, Mrs. E. S., compassionate allowance, 3517
Forestry, 1046
Spruce bud moth, 1049
Tree planting on prairies, 1051
Geological museum specimens, 1237
Geological survey
Co-ordination of survey work, 1236
Reduction of vote, 1237-62
Immigration, 3054
Agents, bonus to, 3063
British artisans, 2208
Chinese, 2026, 3604
Doukhobors, 2160
Hutterites, 2160, 3060
Italian, 2171
Medical inspection, 3052
Mennonites, 2160, 3060
Ministers' statement, 2143
Money qualification, 2208
Policy of department, 3051-2
Reception of immigrant, 2160
Shandro, Mr., proposed colony, 2159
Unemployment, 2143, 3058
Immigration and Colonization, estimates, 754, 758, 2143, 3499
Immigration — Criminal Code bills, 3284
Imperial Mining Resources Bureau, 1237
Indian Act Amdt. bill, 2991, 3192
Indian Affairs Dept., estimates, 681, 685, 1214, 3536
Indians
Blood reserve, 1221
Devon band, proposed removal, 1216
Education, 1227, 1231, 3536
Edmonton school, 1231, 3536
Stony reserve, 1228, 3536
Expenditure, 1216
General expenses, 1226
Greater production, 1224
Health, 1228
Hospital grants, 1218
Medical attention, 1218
Potlach institution, 3192

Stewart, Hon. Charles — *Con.*
Indians — *Con.*
Six Nations, 1221
Enfranchisement, 2991
Soldier Settlement Board, 1221
Sydney reserve, proposed transfer, 1215
Interior department
Employees, transfer to, 457
Estimates, 3517
Printing and supplies, 454
Salaries, 452
International boundaries, 1033
Lignite
Bienfait briquetting plant, 1233
Utilization board, 3524
Mines and Minerals
Clay deposits, investigation of, 1234
Estimates, 685
Investigation of resources, 1234
Reduction of vote, 1236-62
Officials, 687
Ore-dressing plant, 1235
Tar sands, 1236
Nelson, Mr. Frank, 3517
Oriental aliens, M. (Mr. McQuarrie) for exclusion, 1565
Amdt. "effective restriction", 1567, 1574
Preston, Mr. W. T. R., claim of, 3503
Public buildings expenditure, 1262
Research council, 1233
Seat for, in Quebec province, 12
Seed grain advances, 1055
Soldier settlement, 2024
Estimates, 2131-42
Land purchases, irregularities, 2140
Taxes, collection of, 2134
Soldier Settlement Act Amdt. bill, 3405, 3475
Water powers, surveys, 1051
Wheat Board bill, 3189
Yukon territory government of, 1034

Stewart, Mr. C. Wallace (Humboldt)
Budget, 2597. Progressive amendment, 2597. Amendment; does not express progressive view; budget proposals; congratulations to Finance Minister, 2598; the average citizen and public affairs; taxation; revenue; debt; economy; reciprocity with the United States; direct taxation; freer trade; marking and valuation of currency acts, 2599; tariff reductions; agricultural implements; sales tax; undue burden on people with small incomes, 2600; political pledges; constructive criticism; income tax; business profits tax; inheritance tax; land tax; estimated revenue from, 2601; conditions of

Stewart, Mr. C. Wallace — *Con.*
Budget — *Con.*
western farmers; need of wider markets; Wheat Board; transportation; Hudson Bay railway; branch lines, 2602; purchasing power; re adjustment of taxation; immigration; unoccupied lands, 2603
Hudson Bay railway, completion of, 2602, 2789
Insurance premiums, tax on, 3255
Macphail, Miss, alleged statement of, 3221

Stewart, Major Duncan, qu., 823

Stewart, Mr. H. A. (Leeds)
Brockville and Westport railway, qu., 704
Canadian Ford company, taxes, qu., 3599
Canadian National railways, passenger traffic, qu., 927
Condensed milk, tax, 3271
Daylight saving, M. (Mr. Kay) 955
Militia and defence, cadet services, 1978
Nova Scotia miners, McLachlan correspondence, qu., 704
Oleomargarine, M. (Mr. Neill) 1791
Returned Soldiers Insurance bill, 3391-2

Stewart, Hon. John A. (Lanark)
Alcohol for retail druggists, qu., 1400
Canadian National railways
Board of management, 913
Minister's statement, 912
Public ownership and operation, 1956
Rail and car repair contracts, 1914, 1958
Toronto Globe editorial, 1134
Crowsnest pass agreement, M. (Mr. Kennedy, Essex) for Special Com., 1427-32
Genoa Conference, 582
Grand Trunk and Grand Trunk Pacific railways, qu., 2037
Intercolonial railway management, 408
Labour department
Director of technical education, 577
Policy, and building trades, 582
Publicity agent, 466
Supplies clerk, 585
Public Works estimates, 698
Rail and car repair contracts, 1690, 1694, 1700. *See also under this title* Canadian National Railways
Railway Commission, alleged statement of Mr. Motherwell, 2777
Railways
Administration, 408
Co-ordination, 408
Freight rates, legislation, qu., 934
Policy, 1956

Stewart, Hon. John A. — *Con.*
Railways and Canals dept., salaries, 1134
Rideau canal, 2764
Soulanges canal, 2768
Trent canal, construction and betterments, 2764
Unemployment, car repair contracts, 1690
Welland ship canal, 2747

Stewart, Mr. T. J. (West Hamilton)
Hamilton post office building, 1251
Mineral waters tax, 3278
Oleomargarine, M. (Mr. Neill) 1835
Stamp tax on cheques, 3261

Stock, Transfer, tax, 2117

Stockyards. *See* Live Stock

Stony Reserve. *See* Indians

Stork, Mr. Alfred (Skeena)
Address in reply, 330. Canadian Northern and Grand Trunk Pacific railways in British Columbia, 331; oriental question, 332
Daylight saving, M. (Mr. Kay) 962
Opium and Narcotic Drug Act Amdt. bill, 3013
Oriental Aliens, M. (Mr. McQuarrie) 1516
Prince Rupert post office building, 1257

Strike-on-the-Job. *See* Nova Scotia Miners

Strikes. *See* Labour; Unemployment

Sturgeon Falls
Indian agent, qu., 1285
Postmaster, qu., 1285

Submarine Cables, qu., 3151-2, qu., 3360

Submarine Construction. *See* Limitation of Armaments

Submarines, 1845. *See also* Naval Service

Subsidies. *See also* Steamship Services
Canadian Northern, 189-190, qu., 1504, 1921
Federal, Ontario, qu., 2214
Provinces to, 330
Steel companies to, 1692-96. *See also* Steel

Sudbury mail contract, qu., 1285

Suez Canal, 191. *See also* St. Lawrence River Waterway

Sugar
Atlantic refineries, refund, 2850
Beet industry, 2177, 2232, 2273, 2373, 3246, 3251
M. (Mr. Fansher) to reduce duty, 3248

Sugar — *Con.*
British preference increased, 2116
Excise duty on, 2116-7, 2232, 2273, 2853-5, 3267. *See also* Budget Speeches; Inland Revenue

Superannuation. *See* Civil Service; Public Service Retirement Act

Supervisor of Expenditure. *See* Soldiers' Civil Re-establishment

Supplementary Estimates. *See also* Estimates;; Supply
Tabled, 1258

Supply. *See also* Interim Supply
Committee of, 378, 385, 429, 451, 493, 548, 598, 644, 681, 747, 791, 873, 967, 1018, 1040, 1133, 1163, 1214, 1339, 1361, 1489, 1578, 1662, 1722, 1747, 1843, 1905, 1933, 2010, 2043, 2129, 2747, 2834, 2975, 3026 3051, 3495

Supply, Committee of
Amendments
Cash bonus to soldiers, M. (Mr. Arthurs) 429; neg., 450-1
Defence Forces, remarks of Mr. Clark on motion for Supply, 1335
Bills. *See* Appropriation Acts
Concurrence, 1769, 3489, 3547
Estimates. *See that title*
Procedure, motion to reduce vote, 1579
Subjects and items discussed
Agriculture, 588, 644, 1018, 3504
Cold storage, 818, 3521
Destructive Insect and Pest Act, 3520
Entomology, 813
Experimental farms, 795, 799, 3521
Fruit, 967
Health of animals, 967, 3521
Livestock, 971, 1018, 3521
Seed, Feed and Fertilizer Control, 1011
Stock-grazing and feeding, 1718
Air Board, 1722
Air Force and Civil Aviation, 1722
Annuities, 776
Assay Office, Vancouver, 1236
Auditor General's Office, 793
Board of Commerce, 1715
Boy Scouts Association, 772
Canada Temperance Act, 3499
Canadian National parks, 1051, 1681
Canadian National railways
Advances
Canadian Government railways ($7,000,000) 2779

Supply, Committee of — *Con.*
Subjects and items discussed — *Con.*
Canadian National railways — *Con.*
Advances — *Con.*
Canadian Northern ($42,800,000) 1905, 1933
Grand Trunk ($25,750,000) 1969
Grand Trunk Pacific ($15,900,000) 1969
Grand Trunk Pacific ($800,000) 3520
Rail and car repair contracts, 1688
Canadian Press, Limited, 772
Canadian Representation in United States, 2026, 2990
Canals
Chambly, 3518
Ontario-St. Lawrence, 2779
Quebec, 2779
Rideau, 2764, 2769
St. Lawrence ship canal, 2767
Soulanges, 2768
Staff and repairs, 2779
Trent, 2764
Welland ship canal, 1687, 2747
Civil aviation, 1722
Civil Service
Bonus, 3528
Commission, 3064
Conciliation and Labour Act, 1053
Customs and Excise, 762, 1674
Distressed Canadians, relief of, 2027
Dominion lands, 1035, 1051
Dominion lands and parks, 1681, 3517
Employment offices, 1058
Exhibitions, 2026
External affairs, 411, 3508
Finance, 770
Charges of management, 1663, 3495
Paper Control inquiry, 1673
Tariff commissioner, 1663
Forestry protection, 1046
Geodetic survey, 1033
Geological survey, 1233, 1236
Genoa Conference, 1715
Girl guides, 774
Governor General's Secretary's Office, 751
Grain Inquiry Commission, 2982
Harbours and rivers. *See also under this title.* Public Works.
Nova Scotia, 1269, 3545
Prince Edward Island, 1270
Health, 775
Immigration, medical inspection, 2021
Quarantine, 2021
High Commissioner's office, 413
House of Commons, 2026
Housing, 774

Supply, Committee of — *Con.*
Subjects and items discussed — *Con.*
Immigration, 754, 1711, 2143, 3051
Adjustment of war claims, 1711
Chinese, 2026
St. John immigration building, 2027
Salaries, 3499
Indians, 681, 1215, 3536
British Columbia, 1713
Destitute, 1712-14
Education, 1715, 3536
Field and garden seeds, 1712
General expenses, 1712
Industrial Disputes Investigation Act, 1058
Insurance, 791
Interim. *See* Interim Supply
Interim Supply bill, 378, 598
Interior, 452, 1033
Dominion lands and parks, 1681, 3517
Migratory birds, 1684
National parks, 1051, 1681
Printing and stationery, 1680
Yukon, administration of, 1681
International Labour Conference, 1060
Joint Industrial councils, 1060
Justice, 451, 1274
Civil government, 1668, 3495
Exchequer court, 1274
Litigated matters, 1276
Supreme court, 1274
Yukon territory, 1275
Labour, 458, 493, 548, 1053
Conciliation and Labour Act, 1053
Employment Offices Co-ordination Act, 1058
Industrial Disputes Investigation Act, 1058
Unemployment relief, 1970, 2022
Lake of the Woods Control Board, 2025
Lignite
Bienfait briquetting plant, 1233
Utilization board, 3524
League of Nations, Permanent Secretariat, 2026
Lighthouse and coast service, 1495, 1677
Live stock, 971, 1018, 3521
Marine and Fisheries, 1676, 3051
Deep sea fisheries, conservation, 2169
Examination of masters and mates, 1490
Fish culture, 2169
Fishways, 2166
Investigation into wrecks, 1492
Life-saving service, 1494
Lighthouse and coast service, 1405, 1677
Salaries and allowances, 1497

Supply, Committee of — *Con.*
Subjects and items discussed — *Con.*
Marine and Fisheries — *Con.*
Marine signal service, 1499
Meterological service, 1501
Navigation, aids to, 1498
Navigation schools, 1492
Ocean and river service, 3507
Pilotage, administration of, 1499
Prince Rupert Drydock Co. claim, 3514
Registration of shipping, 1493
Removal of obstructions in navigable waters, 1493
St. Lawrence ship channel, 1494
Salaries of officers and guardians, 2166
Sorel shipyard, 1494, 2169
Steamboat inspection, 2169
Steamers and icebreakers, 1489
War claims, adjustment, 1677
Wrecking plants, subsidies, 1493
Militia and Defence, 415, 586, 1163, 1578, 1601, 1922, 2974, 3498
Allowances, active militia, 1135
Annual drill, 1163, 1578, 1610
Arsenals
Lindsay, 1979, 2085
Quebec, 1979, 2091
Battlefields memorials, 2098
Cadet services, 1972
Civil government, 415, 586, 3498
Civil pensions, 1711, 3499
Clothing and necessaries, 1978
Customs duties, 1978
Engineer services and works, 1980
Maintenance of military properties, 1980
Ordnance arms, lands, etc., 1982
Ordnance building, Quebec, repairs, 1711
Permanent force, 1982
Reductions, 1174, 1578, 1631, 1972-87, 2091-98
Royal Military College, 1985
Salaries and wages, 1985
School of instruction, 1985
Staff, pay of, 1982
Topographic survey, 1985
Training areas, 1986
Transport and freight, 1986
War claims, adjustment of, 2098, 2974
Mines and Geological Survey, 1233, 3524
Mines and Minerals, 685, 1234
Naturalization Act, 2024
Naval Service, 418, 1735
Dockyards, Halifax and Esquimalt, 1752
Fisheries protection service, 1747
Hydrographic survey, 1746

Supply, Committee of — *Con.*
Subjects and items discussed — *Con.*
Naval Service — *Con.*
Patrol of northern waters, 1750
Radiotelegraph service, 1749
Royal Canadian navy, 1735, 1843, 1972, 2043
Salaries and contingencies, 1745
War claims, adjustment of, 1752
Newfoundland-Labrador boundary, 1276
Paris agency, 2025
Parliamentary guide, 2024
Passport office, 2026
Patent record, 2026
Penitentiaries, 1670
Pensions, 3522
European war and active militia, 1349
Madame Fabre, 2024
Post Office, 691, 1711
Outside service, 2799
Printing and stationery, 1711
Printing Bureau, 1970
Privy Council, 410
Public Archives, 702, 2025
Public health, 2017
Public Works, 692, 747, 1238
Dredging,, 2005
Harbours and rivers, 3541
British Columbia, 2005, 3547
Manitoba, 2003, 3545
New Brunswick, 1991
Nova Scotia, 1269, 1765, 3545
Ontario, 1999
Prince Edward Island 1270, 1988
Quebec, 1998, 3545
St. John harbour improvements, 2013
Saskatchewan and Alberta, 2004, 3547
Miscellaneous, 2008
Public buildings
Alberta, 1254, 3545
British Columbia, 1255
Fittings, supplies and furniture, 1757
Generally, 1260-4
Immigration buidings, 1757
Lighting, etc., 1755
Maritime provinces generally, 1243
Ontario, 1245-68, 3544
Ottawa, 1265
Parliament buildings, 2014
Rents, repairs, etc., 1238, 1265, 1764
Rideau hall, 1756
Quarantine stations, 1238-45
Halifax, 1238
St. John, 1238-45
Williamshead, 1255
Quebec, 1245
Saskatchewan, 1253

Supply, Committee of — *Con.*
Subjects and items discussed — *Con.*
Public Works — *Con.*
Telephone service, 1757
Roads and bridges, 2007
Telegraphs and telephones, 2007, 2012
Purchasing Commission, 2025
Railway Commission, 2773
Railways and Canals, 407, 3518
Arbitrations and litigation, 2772
Canadian Govt. Merchant Marine, loan, 3035
Canadian National railways, 1933. *See also that title*
Canadian Northern advance, 1905, 1933
Canals. *See under this title,* Canals
Governor Generals cars, 1688
Grand Trunk arbitration, 2779
Hudson Bay railway, 1970
Intercolonial, 2767
Port Colbourne elevator, 1687
Railway policy, 1905, 1933
Salaries and contingencies, 1133
Surveys and inspections, 2779
Royal Canadian Mounted Police, 775, 2129
Royal Canadian navy, 1735, 1843, 1972, 2043
Secretary of State, 701
Civil government, 1670
Naturalization expenses, 1671
Public archives, 1673
War claims, adjustment of, 1672, 2977
Seed Grain advances, 1053
Senate, 2026
Soldiers' Civil Re-establishment, 385
Capital expenditure, 1279
Employers' liability compensation, 1348
Operating expenses and working capital, 1347
Pensions
European war, active militia, 1349, 1353, 1361
Salaries, 1339
Unemployment relief, 1347, 1352, 3524
Vocational loans, 1346
War service gratuity, interest on, 1346
Soldier settlement, 2023, 2131
Statutes, reprinting, 1717
Steamship services, 2027, 3026, 3505
Supplementry estimates, 1662
Taxation, business profits, income, 2024
Trade and Commerce, 699, 3541
Canada Grain Act, administration of, 2834
Dominion Bureau of statistics, 1363
Gas and electricity, inspection, 1373
Gold and Silver Marking Act, administration, 1372

Supply, Committee of — *Con.*
Subjects and items discussed — *Con.*
Trade and Commerce — *Con.*
Industrial and Scientific Research, 1372
International Customs Tariff Bureau, 1373
Linen yarn bounty, 1361
Printing of publications, 1373
Steamships services, 2027, 3026, 3505. *For individual services see that title*
Terminal elevators, 2978
Trade commissioners and commercial agents, 1373, 2989
Unemployment relief, 1061, 3524-6
Victorian order of nurses, 772
War Graves Commission, 774
Water powers, 1051
Wheat Board, 3541
Yukon territory, 1034, 1275

Supreme Court
Cameron, Mr. E. R., K.C., estimate and expenditure, 1274
Decision. *See* Wheat Board
Estimates, 1274
Library, 1274
Reports, 1274

Supreme Court Act Amdt. bill (Appeal from provincial courts of final resort) 1r., 2456; 2r., com., 3r., 2974

Survey and Map Work. *See also* Interior Department
Co-ordination of, 1986

Surveys. *See also* Dominion Lands; Geodetic; Geological; Topographic
Water power resources, 1051

Sussex public building, 1239

Sutherland, Mr. Donald (South Oxford)
Accredited herds, diseases, 1001
Adulteration of mill feeds, 1011, 2490
Agricultural implements, duty, 3134
Agricultural Instruction Act, 1012-1013
Air Force and civil aviation, 1731
Alderson claim, 1002-3
Beet sugar industry, 3251
Blake, late Hon. Edward, 2657
Budget, 2481. After war conditions; tribute to Finance Minister, 2481; election promises not carried out; breach of faith; the amendment; leader of Progressive party making excuses for Government; Hon. George Brown and violation of political pledges, 2482; statement of Prime Minister; Liberal declarations in favour of free trade;

Sutherland, Mr. Donald — *Con.*
Budget — *Con.*
Finance Minister chastises colleagues; opposing views in government party, 2483; a policy to suit every constituency; tacit understanding between Progressives and Liberals; public statements as to fiscal policy of Liberal party; Mr. Fielding and protection; duty on agricultural implements, 2484; reciprocity agreement; attitude of United States towards Canada; proposed duties under reciprocity, 2485; importation of agricultural products from the United States; world tendency to increase tariff barriers; valuation of currency, 2486; trade with Germany; labour costs; marking of goods; United States legislation to prevent unfair competition; industrial development of the West; sectionalism; two-party system;, 2487; Progressive party, origin and policy; record of the old Tory party; Union government tariff policy; Wartime Elections Act; tariff concessions to western Canada; Grain Growers' Grain Company contributions to political organizations, 2488; resignation of Mr. Crerar from Union government; statement of Mr. Rice Jones; Mr. Crerar's salary as president of United Grain Growers, 2489; oleomargarine; recleaned screenings; adulteration of mill feed, export duty on dairy produce; Mr. Rowell and Mr. Clark on tariff proposals of Union government; protective policy; Premier Drury and land tax, 2491; tax on unimproved land values; free trade; sales tax; condensed milk, 2492; railway situation; debt; inheritance from former Liberal government; Transcontinental railway, 2493; dumping clause; value of German mark; economy in administration, 2494; amendment, 2495
Cattle
Embargo, 1002, 1031
Free carriage of, 1029
Freight on, 1010
Stockyards, 1030
Condensed milk tax, 2492, 3266
Crowsnest pass agreement, M. (Mr. Kennedy, Essex) for Special Com., 1437, 1455
Customs revenue, qu., 614
Drainage tiles, 3270-1

Sutherland, Mr. Donald — *Con.*
Experimental farms, number of, 797, 801, 805, 813, 1015
M. to reduce item, 812
Farm tractors, duty on, 769
Feed Control Act, 1011
Filled milk and cream, qu., 963
Freight on hay for stock, 1007
Health of animals, Alderson claim, 1002-3-5
Hides, price of, 3139
Hog cholera, 1009
Alderson claim, 1005
Immigration
Bonus to agents, 3062
Unemployment and, 3058
Imports into Canada, qu., 610; qu., 612; qu., 613
Marshall, Mr. Duncan, 1032
Meat and Canned Foods Act, 3050
Militia and Defence
Arsenals
Lindsay, 2091
Quebec and, 1982, 2087-97
Expenditures and policy, 1981
Military properties, 1981
Naval Service, co-ordination with, 420
Pay of staff, M. to reduce item, 1982
Milk herds, tuberculosis, 1006
National Defence, department of, 1732-4, 1981
Naval policy, 2073
Royal Canadian navy, 2073
Oleomargarine
Importation of materials, qu., 613; qu., 704; qu., 728
Manufacture and importation, M. (Mr. Neill) 1816
Materials for, 3270
Oleomargarine Act Amdt. bill, 3432, 3487
Parliament buildings, purchase of furniture, 1756-7
Pensions Board investigation, 3156
Pensions Committee, 3348-9, 3357
Final report, 3351
Sales tax, 3270
Soldiers' bonus, M. (Mr. Arthurs) 447
Stallion clubs, 1031
Standard of living, 3139
Sugar beet industry, 3267
Wheat board, 2947
Wool, duty on, 3132-35

Sutherland, Hon. Mr. Justice, qu., 366

Swift Current post office building, 1253

Sydney, N.S.
Pilotage district, 3508
Reserve. *See* Indians

Sydney, N.S. — *Con.*
Steel workers, unemployment, 1076
Unemployment contracts for steel rails, 1688

Tadoussac-Murray Bay steamship service, 3035

Tampa Exhibition, 2026

Tar Sands. *See* Mines and minerals

Tariff, 1290. *See also* Budget; Customs; Trade. *For items discussed See* Customs Tariff
Amended resolutions, 2854
Australia, preferential treatment, 2110
Automobiles, 2116, 2186, 2206, 2230. *See also* Budget
Book paper for magazines, 2855
Canada-West Indies trade agreement, 2110
Changes, 2174, 2851
Cigarettes, 2855
Commission, proposed permanent, 2269, 2339, 2351, 2625
Commissioner, 1663
Salary, 3504
Comparison with Laurier-Fielding tariff, 208
Dumping clause, 2184, 2197. *See also* Speeches on Budget
Duty on boots and shoes, 159-160
Fordney. *See* United States
France, 2032
Fruit, 2197. *See also that title*
Fuel oil, 344, 1761
Immigration and, 2157
Inquiry, 1920-21, cost, etc., qu., 2215
Legislation, history of, 2184, 2429-30, 2655
Liberal policy. *See* Liberal Convention of 1919
Ministers and Directorships, 1088
Prohibitory Central European, 2646
Reduction, 2111, 2114, 2286, 2844
Resolutions, 2118. *For items See* Customs Tariff
Amended, 2851, 2874
Bill, 3476-7
Revision, 2110-14
Former, 2426
Necessity for. *See* Speeches on Address; Budget
Shoe manufacturers and, 141. *See also* Boots and Shoes
Tractors, 2115. *See also* Budget
Unemployment and, 3527
Valuations for duty, 3413-15

Taschereau, Premier, and St. Lawrence river waterway, 137, 1191

Taxation, 2496. *See* speeches on Budget; Revenue Bills
Amusement, 2395
Automobiles. *See under this title,* Sales tax
Bachelor, 82
Bank circulation, 2117
Beer, ale, etc., 2117, 2567, 2852, 2857
Bond and stock transfers, 2117, 2853
Bonds held in United States non-taxable, 1133; qu., 2971
Breadner, Mr. R. W., Commissioner, salary, 2024
Burdensome, 2242, 2248, 2600, 2661. *See also* speeches on Address; Budget
Urban population on, 2394
Business profits, qu., 1657, 1658, 2024, 2172-9, 2281, 2562, 2653
Administration of, 2024
British Empire Steel Comporation, qu., 1067
Canadian Ford Company, qu., 3599
Cheque tax, 1036, 2117, 2177, 2269, 2329, 2462, 2640, 2676, 2852, 2856, 3258
Protests against, 2395
Classification of income tax-payers, 1063
Condensed milk, 2492, 3264, 3271, 3409
Confectionery, 2177, 2641, 2676, 2852, 2857
Commodity tax, 2883
Consumer of, 2507
Customs. *See* Customs Tariff; Tariff
Debt and, 2459. *See also* Public Debt
Direct and indirect, 2386, 2402, 2648, 2707
Effect on trade, 2859
Estimated revenues from, 2172
Evasions, 2395
Excess profits, 2441, 2695
Express money orders and travellers cheques, 2856
Garbage collection tax in Ontario, 1256
Income, 2442, 2686. *See also that title*
Administration of, 2024
Banks, payments by, qu., 1400
Forms, 3485
Members of provincial legislature, 3486
Railway men and commercial travellers, 3485
Revenue and classification, 1063; qu., 1399-1400
Inequalities, 2255
Inheritance tax, 184, 2442, 2510, 2601, 2626, 2686, 2708, 2844
Insurance
Foreign companies, 2462
Premiums, 2117, 3253

Taxation — *Con.*
Land values, 2191, 2405, 2443, 2492, 2510, 2626, 2686, 2695-6, 2844,
Estimated revenue from, 2601
Loan companies, 2299
Luxuries, 2260, 2561, 2696
Modification of, 230. *See* Speeches on Address; Budget
Municipal, payment of by Government, 1256, 1257
Mutual insurance companies, 3477. *See also under this title,* Insurance
New, 2116, 2177, 2329
Non-taxable bonds, 1133, 2971
Overlapping, 2463
Per capita, 2341
Post Office money orders, 2857
Principle of, 2281
Property, 2443
Provincial, payment to British Columbia govt., 1714
Receipts, 2270, 2853-7
Riordon Company, qu., 372; qu., 607
Sales tax, 2220, 2843. *See also* Special War Revenue bill
Ale, beer, etc., 2117, 2567, 2852, 2857
Automobiles, 2116, 2186, 2206, 2260. *See also* Automobiles; Budget
Collections, qu., 375
Confectionery, 2117, 2641, 2676
Exempted goods, 2126
Beet pulp dried, 2852
Fertilizers, 2852
Goods on which tax was collected, 1921-22, 1212
Increase, 2393
Mineral waters, 2117
Soldier settlement, municipal taxes, 1257
Special War Revenue Act. *See that title*
Stocks and bonds, 2856
Stock transfers, 2117, 2853
Telegrams and cables, 2117, 2178, 2856
Transient aliens, 2155

Taylor, Dr., qu., 1211

Technical Education. *See* Labour

Telegraphs. *See also* Wireless

Telegraphs and Telephones
British Columbia, 2008, 2012
Canadian National lines, qu., 3360
Humboldt-Fort Pitt telegraph line, 2007
Lower St. Lawrence and maritime provinces, 2012
Prince Edward Island, 2012
Public buildings, Ottawa, 1757
Saskatchewan and Alberta, 2007, 2012

Telegraphs and Telephones — *Con.*
Telegrams and cables, tax on, 2117, 2178, 2856
Yukon, cost of, 1275, 2012

Telephones. *See* Telegraphs and Telephones

Temperance. *See* Canada Temperance Act

Ten Eyck, Congressman, 1396

Terminal Elevators. *See* Grain and Grain Trade

Terminal Facilities. *See* St. John

Territorial Waters, Fishing beyond. *See* Fisheries Act Amdt.

Territories, Unorganized. *See* Royal Canadian Mounted Police

Textile Industry, 2882. *See* Speeches on Budget
Foreigners engaged in, 2518
Occupational diseases. *See* Labour
Profits, 2632

Thompson, Colonel Andrew, soldiers' bonus, 403, 432

Thompson, Colonel J. T. C. *See* Pensions Board

Thompson, Mr. T. H. (East Hastings)
Dairy inspection, 1009
Dairy produce, grading of, 655-6
Stamp tax on cheques, 3261

Three Rivers Clerk of the Peace. *See* Criminal Code

Threshing Machines. *See* Agricultural Implements

Thunder Bay, icebreaking, 1677

Thurston, Mr. John J. (Victoria, Ont.)
Immigration, travelling expenses, 757
Militia and Defence, Lindsay arsenal, 2085
River-gauging and metering, 2011
Trent canal, Nassau dam, qu., 2457

Tidal Fisheries. *See* Quebec Fisheries

Tidal Survey. *See* Naval Service

Timber. *See also* Lumber
Acquisition of British Columbia areas by Japanese, 2311
Gaspé, in, 625
Illegal cutting on Tobique reserve, 1233
Lease of Ontario areas, 2805; qu., 2992
Protection of. *See* Forestry

Tobacco
American Tobacco Company, 2547
Bull Durham, comparative prices, 2546
Cigarettes, duties on, 2394, 2547, 2852-3
Cigars, duties on, 2115, 2853, 2857
Duties, 2115, 2394, 2546, 2891
Experimental station at L'Assomption, 1776
Imperial Tobacco Company, 2546
Industry, protection, 2891
Raw leaf, 2115, 2673, 2853

Tobin, Mr. E. W. (Richmond and Wolfe)
Canadian National railways, purchase of ties, qu., 1659
Oleomargarine, importation and manufacture, qu., 1506
Richmond and Wolfe
Post offices, qu., 1507
Postmasters, qu., 1508
Rural mail routes, qu., 1505

Tobin, Lieut. Col., Vancouver, letter of, 1975

Tobique Reserve. *See* Indians

Todd, Mr. W. F., election promises in Charlotte, N.B., 1994

Tolmie, Hon. S. F. (Victoria City)
Accredited herd system, 2738
Agricultural exhibitions, 650
Agriculture
Cattle embargo, 973-4
Dept., Mr. T. N. Lynton, 588
Live stock industry, 971
Livestock trade with South America, 648
Salaries, 656
Animal Contagious Diseases bill, 2734-43
Bovine tuberculosis, 2738
Budget, 2591. Duration of previous Parliament; congratulations to Finance Minister, 2591; tariff and agricultural implements; trade relations with Australia; agricultural conditions; mixed farming, 2592; wool and sheep raising; dumping clause; British Columbia fruit industry; United States competition, 2593; tax on temperance beverages; fruit juices; grading hogs for the British market; extermination of hog cholera, 2594; United States system of dealing with disease; eradication of bovine tuberculosis, 2595; horse racing, Federal control of and revenue from, 2596; cattle export; embargo; new taxes; amendment, 2597;
Cold storage, 818
Entomology, orchard protection, 816

Tolmie, Hon. S. F. — *Con.*
Esquimalt and Nanaimo railway bill, 1156, 1161, 1353, 1355, 1604
Esquimalt dry dock, 597
Experimental farms, British Columbia, 796
Fisheries dept., 2166
Fishing schooner race, 3512
Fruit growers, protection, 2593, 3424
Health of Animals
Diseases, 968, 2594, 2738
Tuberculosis, 2594, 3521
Hog cholera, 2594, 2738
Horse-racing, federal control, 2596
Immigration of Japanese, 1289, qu., 1459
Marine and Fisheries
Examination of masters and mates, 1491
Lightkeepers' salaries and allowances, 1497
Ministers' secretaries, 413
Oleomargarine, M. (Mr. Neill) 1785
Opium and Narcotic Drug Act Amdt. bill, 2825, 3017
Oriental Aliens, M. (Mr. McQuarrie) 1567
Oriental immigration
Japanese, 1289, qu., 1399, qu., 1459
Patronage, civil service, 3083
Victoria post office building, repairs, 1255-8

Topographic Maps, qu., 1631

Topographic Survey, 1043

Tormentine Reef, buoy, 1499

Toronto
Campaign advertisement, 198-199
Cheque tax, 2395, 2329
Customs house, 198-9, 1246-51
Harbour improvements, qu., 365, 1187, 1467, 1471, 1474, 3541
Imperial convention of teachers, 1673
International yacht race, 3513
Post Office, qu., 108-9, 368
Building, 1246-51
Revenue, 1250
Power plant, public ownership, 123
Prison reform, municipal farms, 1277
Railway facilities, 66
Viaduct, qu., 1660
Railway grades, reduction of, 74
Rate increases, 131
Representation of, 1365
Soldiers' Civil Re-establishment staff, 1343
Steam railway freight, qu., 936
Street railway
Public ownership, 1937
Service, 63
Toronto Suburban railway, qu., 2457
Transportation commission, 130
Unemployment, 86

Toronto Electric Light Company, 123

Tourist Traffic
Banff-Windermere highway, 1681
Highways, 1681. *See also that title*
Visitors to Canadian National parks, 1052

Town Planning, Banff, 1052

Townsend, United States Senator, 1206

Tracadie Lazaretto, 1240, 2021

Tractors, 769, 2354, 3123. *See also* Agricultural Implements
Value $1,400 and less to be free, 2115

Trade and Commerce, 2108. *See also* Customs and Excise; Exports; Imports; Speeches on Budget; Tariff
Agreements and negotiations, 2110, 2172
Agricultural implements, in, 2620-1. *See also that title*
Australia, with, 9, 174-5. *See also* Steamship Services
Austria, with, 2535
Bills to be preceded by resolution, 1283
British Preference and Canadian seaports. *See* British Preference
Canada-Mexico, qu., 606, 699-700, 2989
Canadian ports by, 104. *See also* British Preference
Channels of, 336-7
Competition, 223. *See* Speeches on Budget
Consular agents, repeal of Act of 1921, 3222, 3477
Consular certificates, 2114, 3222, 3477
Department
Canada Grain Act, administration, 2834
Estimates, 1361, 2834, 2978, 3026, 3541
Salaries, etc., 699
Elevators, terminal, maintenance and equipment, 2978
Exchange value of commodities, 2868
Expansion, 2021
Export. *See* St. John Terminal Facilities
Exports and imports, 1876-77 and 1921-22, qu., 1376. *See also* Imports
Foreign. *See also* Germany
France-Belgium, 3223
Freight rates, effect on, 276
Germany, with, 138, 2203, 2279, 2535, 2859. *See also* Customs; Germany; Speeches on Budget
Great Britain, 2540. *See also* British Preference
And United States, 2369
International, 2862
Interprovincial, 2284

Trade and Commerce — *Con.*
Italian, effect of currency valuation on, 2849
Mexico, with, qu., 606, 699-700, 2989
Necessity for revival, 105. *See also* Budget; Industrial Depression; Speeches on Address
Potatoes. *See that title*
Russian, consortium to re-establish, 1463
Southern Pacific dominions, 2990
Steamships Services. *See that title*
Total
1876-77 and 1921-22, statement, 1376
1900-1921, qu., 1633
Statement, 1376
Trade commissioners and commercial agents, 1373, 2114, 2581, 2989
United States with, 2223, 2449-50. *See also that title*
West Indies. *See* St. John Terminal Facilities; Steamship Services

Trades and Labour Congress
Oriental immigration, 1514
Unemployment insurance, 1081

Transatlantic Traffic. *See* St. Lawrence River Waterway

Transcontinental. *See* Canadian National Railways

Transportation, 2580, 2611. *See also* Crowsnest Pass Agreement; Freight Rates; Railways; St. Lawrence River Waterway
Cattle, free carriage of, 1029
Commodity and freight rates, 234
Costs. *See* Freight Rates
Farm products of, 231
Fish, 2166
Loss of, 175
Maritime provinces in, 106-111, 2687-8
Nationalization, 2325. *See also* Canadian National railways
Problems. *See* Budget; Speeches on Address. *See also that title*
St. Lawrence River Waterway, 269
M. (Mr. Church) 1183, 1203-8
Tonnage rates, 234
Water, 1939

Trawlers. *See* Naval Service

Treaties. *See also* Conferences
Anglo-Japanese, 168
Chinese Customs Tariff Treaty, 3161
Far Eastern, 3160
Four Power. *See* Limitation of Armaments

Treaties — *Con.*
France-Belgium, 3223
Hungary and Turkey, 3490, 3547
Tabled, 3359
International Opium Convention, qu., 1066
Japan, with, 1511
Lemieux treaty with, 1459
Limitation of Armaments, 3158
Peace treaty with Germany, Lusitania claims, 3599
Pelagic Sealing, 1844
Prevention of use of noxious gases and chemicals, 3159
Protection of neutrals and non-combatants at sea, 3159
Quadruple Pacific, 3160
Versailles, 2848

Treaty of Peace with Hungary and Turkey bill
1r., 3490; 2r., com., 3r., 3547

Tree Planting. *See also* Forestry
Provincial highways, qu., 2039

Tremblay, General, Quebec Harbour Commission, 1477

Trent Canal. *See* Canals

Trenton Harbour bill
Res., 3436, 3493; 1r., 2r., com., 3494; 3r., 3495

Trépanier, Alderman, of Montreal, 1392

Trial by Jury, 1388. *See also* Criminal Code Amdt.

Trusts and Combines, 2395, 2414. *See also* Address; Budget
Minister of Labour and, 200

Trust Companies Act Amdt. bill
1r,, 1210; 2r., ref. to Banking and Commerce Com., 1464; com., 3r., 3142; Senate amdts., 3607

Tsur, Dr., Chinese-Consul General, 1776

Tuberculosis. *See also* Health; Hospitals
Bloc areas, 3521
Bovine, 2556, 2595, 3521. *See also* Animal Contagious Diseases bill
Indians, 1225, 1228
Returned Soldiers. *See* Pensions; Returned Soldiers' Insurance; Soldiers' Civil Re-establishment
Soldiers' Civil Re-establishment hospitals, 1344

Tupper, Sir Charles, and maritime union, 107-108

Turgeon, Mr. Onésiphore (Gloucester)
Address in reply, 273. Congratulations; maritime provinces and the Intercolonial, 274-276; government ownership of railways, 277; tariff questions, 278; natural resources of western provinces, 279
Budget, 2188. Mr. Fielding's visit to Washington; Fordney tariff; relations with the United States, 2189; public debt; income and business profits taxes; economy; British preference; duties on farm implements, 2190; fishing industry; lumber; alcohol for medicinal purposes; sales tax; taxation of land values, 2191; Liberal platform of 1919; capital and labour; immigration, 2192; railways; Transcontinental; opposition of C.P.R., 2193; board of directors; grain shipments, 2194; public ownership; Intercolonial, 2195; regional control of Canadian National railways, 2196
Canadian National railways
Board of directors, 2194
Hanna and Mitchell, Messrs., salaries, qu., 471
Public ownership, 2193
Transcontinental
Grain shipments, 2194
Opposition of Canadian Pacific to, 2194
Canadian Pacific railway, cost, 2193
Civil Service patronage, 3082
Immigration, agricultural workers, 2193
St. John terminal facilities, 848
Single tax, 2191

Turkey, Peace Treaty with, 3359, 3547

Turtle Mountain Forest reserve, qu., 615

Ukrainians. *See* Immigration

Ultra Vires, Canada Grain Act, 1132

Undesirables, deportation of. *See* Criminal Code; Immigration; Opium and Narcotic Drugs

Unemployment, 1290, 2331, 2627. *See also* Address; Budget; Canadian Patriotic Fund bill; Housing; Immigration; Labour; Returned Soldiers
Agricultural conditions and, 2158
Banff-Windermere road, 1052, 1682
Canada, number in, qu., 3362
Cities, in, 86

Unemployment — *Con.*
Continuance of, 237
Credit system, 219
Economic causes, 1081, 3526
Employment offices, Co-ordination Act, 1058, 2022
German competition and, 2178. *See also* Germany
Farm labourers, 2331. *See also that title*
Housing, 219. *See also* Housing
Immigration and, 225, 2143
Importations and, 210
Insurance, 88, 218, 1070, 1081
Land settlement and, 182-3
Military expenditures, 1144
National conference proposed, 1082
Nova Scotia miners, 1759. *See also* Labour
Occupational diseases. *See* Labour
Policy of Government, inquiry, 3491
Proposed order steel rails to relieve, 1691
Rail and car repair contracts, 1690, 1912
Relief, 1061, 1719, 1970, 2022; qu., 3152
Camps, 86
Expenditure for, 86, 2023
Report of Ontario Government commission, 218
Returned soldiers, 2458, 3311, 3329-30. *See also that title*
Hikers, qu., 3153
Riley's army, qu., 3364. *See also* "General" Macdonald's Army
Seasonal, 87-88
Soldiers, 3524. *See also* Returned Soldiers
Soldiers' Civil Re-establishment, relief, 1347, 1352
Standing Committee, proposed, 1082
Toronto, aid to, 121, 199
Unemployment Service Council, recommendations, 2803
Unemployment situation, 1069-84
Welland canal, 2750

Unimproved Land Values, tax. *See* Taxation

Union of Canadian Municipalities
Foreigners, immigration of, 1392
Immigration, 2155

Unions. *See* Labour

United Farmers of Alberta
Loan system, resolution, 220

United Farmers of British Columbia, 1354
Oriental immigration, 1514

United Farmers of Ontario, 63
Platform, 2393
Protection and, 2440

United Grain Growers' Limited, 2489, 2653
Agricultural implements, 304, 2693, 3119
Crerar, Mr., and, 2489
Political organizations, contribution to, 2488
Report, 2654

United Mine Workers. *See* Nova Scotia miners

United Shoe Machinery Co. of Canada, 1902

United States. *See also* St. Lawrence River Waterway
Air Service, 1726
American Bankers' Association, resolution, 2189
Amicable relations with, 91
Bonds held in, non-taxable, 1133
Canadian exports to, 209. *See also* Exports
Canadian-owned railways in, 312
Canadian representation in, 2990
Coal and steel industries, 2419
Coal, importations from, 124, 1759. *See also* Coal
Con Rein, sinking of, 1382
Duty on Canadian apples, 164. *See also* Fruit
Duty on Canadian potatoes and wheat, 239. *See also* Root Vegetables
Emigration to, 2516. *See also* Immigration
Factories in Canada, 2413-14, 2467
Farmers, competition with, 2527
Farmers' bloc, 69, 210, 988, 2323. *See also under this title,* Fordney
Flag, 1265
Fordney tariff, 53, 93-94, 209, 272, 343, 2112, 2178, 2189, 2219, 2336, 2367, 2409, 2527, 2580
Effect of, 2454
Grand Trunk mileage in, 191
Immigration from, 236, 2147. *See also that title*
Comparison, 3056
Figures, 758
Years' residence in Canada, 236
Imperial pensioners in, 1347
Importations, duty on, 208-209
Importations of British goods through, qu., 375
Income tax, non-resident aliens, 1304
Industries developing Canadian resources, 2667
Insurance companies, tax. *See* Special War Revenue Act
Investment in Canadian industries, 2368, 2546
Iron and steel industry, 2412-13
Magazines, imports, 3109

United States — *Con.*
Medical inspection of immigrants for Canada, 2022
Military expenditure, 1622
Oriental immigration, 1515
Pecuniary claims convention with, 1276
Pelagic Sealing Treaty, 1844
Railway difficulties, 67-70, 129, 1917-18
Railways
Lines in Canada, 204
Purchase of, 2611
Reciprocity, 77, 102, 2111, 2201, 2285, 2368, 2463, 2485, 2511, 2527, 2616, 2694, 2846. *See also* Address; Budget
St. Lawrence and Welland canals, 2749
St. Lawrence river waterway, 1184, 1315 1396. *See also that title*
Treaty, consideration of proposed, 2207
Steel prices, 2412
Tariff discrimination, 2466
Tariff legislation, 113, 988, 2487, 2620-1, 2864. *See also under this title* Fordney
Trade, 2111, 2178, 2610,. *See also under this title,* Reciprocity
Cattle, 2695
Relations, 2908
War operations, 1336
Washington
Hon. Mr. Fielding's trip to, 2112, 2189, 2300
Wrangel Island, 1751
Russian claim to, 2208

Unopposed Motions for Papers
Algoma Indian lands, timber leases (Mr. Simpson) 942
Appraisers, Paris and London, (Mr. Parent) 1068
Avignon, Que., post office (Mr. Marcil) 829
Bonaventure
Mail contract (Mr. Marcil) 829
Post office, (Mr. Marcil) 829
Caisse, Mr. J. J., Montreal post office (Mr. Marcil) 828
Canadian Expeditionary Force, 112th Battalion band instruments (Mr. Martell) 372
Canadian Northern and Grand Trunk insurance (Mr. Macdonald, Pictou) 828
Canadian Northern bonds (Mr. Stevens) 2458
Canadian ships, damage during war (Mr. Bristol) 1183
Caraquet and Gulf shore railway (Mr. Hanson) 1183
Carleton, Que., post office (Mr. Marcil) 829
Cattle embargo, Hon. Manning Doherty (Mr. White) 616

Unopposed Motions for Papers — *Con.*
Civil Service bonus, (Mr. Garland, Carleton) 828
Dauphinee, Mr. Charles, dismissal (Mr. Baxter) 2584
Dominion Iron and Steel Co., contract (Mr. Caldwell) 616
Extra-territorial rights (Mr. Meighen) 1068
Fisheries
Establishment of independent department (Mr. Martell) 372
Transfer to British Columbia (Mr. McQuarrie) 2042
Fort Edward lands (Mr. Martell) 372
Genoa conference (Mr. Boys) 1905
Grand Trunk Railway Company 1921 loan, (Mr. Putnam) 828
Griffenhagen and Associates report (Mr. Séguin) 1633
Holland, Lee, deportation (Mr. Meighen) 372
Hudson Bay, St. John parish patents (Mr. Garland, Carleton) 829
Hudson, Govt. cutter (Mr. Baxter) 3600
Immigration
Foreigners admitted as farmers (Mr. Stevens) 1068
Western lands, on, 616 (Mr. Stevens)
Indian agency, Bear river, N.S., (Mr. Lovett) 828
Inverness Railway and Coal Co., (Mr. Chisholm) 372
Kootenay flats (Mr. Humphrey) 286
Legal costs, payments (Mr. Martell) 2971
McQuarrie, John C., dismissal of, 377
Mail contract, Rigaud-St. Rédempteur (Mr. Ouimet) 1776
Migratory Birds Convention, infraction, (Mr. Martell), 377
Nanaimo County judge (Mr. Neill) 2042
Nautical assessors (Mr. Church) 1633
Newspaper censors (Mr. Archambault) 1068
Nova Scotia
Barristers, payments (Mr. Martell) 707
Miners, McLachlan correspondence (Mr. Stewart, Leeds) 616
Order of Grain-Baggers (Mr. Stevens) 2806
Page, Mr. H. W. A. claim (Mr. Neill) 2042
Palais station, Que. (Mr. Parent) 1068
Parc St. Charles Company (Mr. Marcil) 372
Paspebiac post office, (Mr. Marcil) 829
Post Office department (Mr. Séguin) 3600
Purchasing Commission, origin of goods (Mr. Raymond) 2042
Quebec
Bridge (Mr. Parent) 1068

Unopposed Motions for Papers — *Con.*
Fisheries (Mr. Marcil) 616
Harbour Commission (Mr. Meighen) 372
Sardines for export (Mr. Grimmer) 1183
Shigawake post office, (Mr. Marcil) 829
Sorel shipyards, dismissals, (Mr. Hanson) 377
Tobacco experimental station L'Assomption (Mr. Séguin) 1776
Tug Pekin (Mr. Maclean, Prince) 1289
Victory bonds, (Mr. Putnam) 942
Winnipeg strike (Mr. McMurray) 1068
Yukon territory
Royalty on minerals (Mr. Black) 616
Transfer of mineral claims, (Mr. Black) 616

Universal Postal Union, 3173

Universities, Physical drill and military training, 1615

Unrestricted Reciprocity, Hon. Edward Blake on, 2677

Urban Population, loss of. *See* Immigration; Population

Vancouver
Anti-Japanese riots, 1511-16
Assay office, 1236
Ballantyne pier, wages of workmen, 1465, 1469
Board of Trade drydock, 2009
Customs aerial patrol, 1730
Drydock, 1255, 1484, 2005, 2009, 3542
Board of Trade telegram, 2009
Expenditure in, 2309
Free port, proposal, 2470
Harbour, 1473. *See also* Vancouver Harbour Commission bill
Mounted Police barracks, Fairmont, 1255
Ocean tonnage, 2008
Post office building repairs, 1255
Railway duplication at, 74-75
Shipment of grain from, 235
Sun, criticism of Hon. John Oliver, 2237
Unemployment conference, 1069
Unemployment relief camps, 86

Vancouver, Fraser Valley and Southern Railway Company, 798

Vancouver Harbour Commissioners Act
Amdt. bill (Port Warden and Shipping Master) 1r., 1929; 2r., com., 2821; 3r., 2996

Vancouver Island coal mines, 178

Vancouver Sun, criticism of Hon. John Aliver, 2236-7

Vegetables. *See also* Root Vegetables
Dumping clause, 2372. *See also* Speeches on Budget
Production of near Montreal, 1019

Versailles, Treaty of, 2848

Vessels. *See also* Canadian Government Merchant Marine; Shipbuilding
Aurora. *See* Naval Service
Britisher, 3514
Canadian Exporter, wreck of, qu., 1210
Canadian Farmer, 2311
Canadian Freighter, qu., 963, 2311
Canadian Inventor, 2312
Canadian Prospector, 2311
Canadian Winner, 2311
Champlain, qu., 1400
Con Rein, 1382
Foreign ships of war, exemption from pilotage dues. *See* Canada Shipping Act
Hudson, Government cutter, qu., 3598
James Whalen, 1677
Lambton, wreck of, 1492, 3507
Mildred McColl, 3598
Niobe, sale of. *See* Naval Service
Ocean-going, 1471. *See also* St. Lawrence River Waterway
Patrician. *See* Naval Service
Patriot. *See* Naval Service
Pekin, 1289
Phalarope, patrol boat, 1503
Plamonder, dredge, 2006
Quebec, in and out of, 1471
Scottish, 3514

Vickers Company, 320, qu., 936
Claim, 2975
Elevator dredge, 1494

Victoria, B.C.
Drydock, 2009. *See also* Quebec Harbour Commission bill
Govt. expenditure in, 2309
Lightkeepers' salaries, 1497
Ocean tonnage, 2008
Post office building, 1255
Wooden ships constructed at, qu., 364

Victoria Bridge. *See* Bridges

Victoria Memorial Museum
Geological specimens, 1237
Potlach institution, 1377. *See also* Indians

Victorian Order of Nurses, 772
Unemployment, relief of, 86

Victory Bonds. *See also* Finance
Exempt from taxation, 263
Five year maturities, qu., 2993

Vidal's Point Park, 1052

Vien, Mr. Thomas (Lotbinière)
Daylight saving, M. (Mr. Kay) 948
Dominion lands, cancellation of leases bill, 3467
Senate amdts., 3615
Duty on apples, 164
Esquimalt and Nanaimo Railway Company bill, 1161
Judges' Act Amdt. bill, 426
Military expenditure and policy, 1145
National Defence bill, 661
Mounted police, 675
Pension Act Amdt. bill, 3451
Point of order, Rule 18, tedious repetition, 1360
Rail and car repair contracts, 1695
Royal Canadian Navy, 1868-89
Soldiers' bonus, 440
War, advances to Imperial Government, 1288
Wheat Board, 2969

Vimy Memorial, 2098

Vitamines, 1781

Voters, qualification of. *See* Dominion Election Act; Euler; Rinfret

Wabana Ore, 2412-13

Waddington, Mr., 398

Wage Cuts. *See* Nova Scotia Miners

Wage Investigators. *See* Labour

Wages. *See* Labour; Unemployment

Wallace, Mr. J. A. (Norfolk)
Tuberculous cattle, 2742

Wallace Shipbuilding Company, 3542

War. *See also* Militia and Defence
Battlefields memorials, 2098
Canadian and United States armies, operations, 1336
Claims, adjustment of, 1155, 1672, 1677, 2098, 2977
British Admiralty, 1752
Details of estimates, qu., 1288
Hospital ship, claim for loss, 1082, 2975
Militia and defence, 2974
Naval service, 1752
Repatriation, dependents of soldiers, 1711

War — *Con.*
Conscription and, 2570. *See also that title*
Conscription of wealth, 2725
Debts, 90, 174. *See also* Address; Budget; Public Debt
Demobilization, expenditure for, 1155, 1163, 1171
Equipment, 2616
Expenditures, 2228
First Canadian Contingent, qu., 1376
Foreign ships, exemption from pilotage dues. *See* Canada Shipping Act
Imperial War Graves Commission, 2099
Indebtedness, 2294
Kemp, Sir Edward, 1169
Laws of. *See* Limitation of Armaments
Medals, 1752, 2975
Mewburn, Hon. S. C., 1169
Mobilization of unfit men, 2608
Munitions, shipment of from Great Britain, 1154-63
Newspaper censors, 1068
Overseas ministry, 1169
Pensions. *See that title*
Preparation for, 1335. *See also* Militia and Defence; National Defence; Naval Service
Profiteering, 2221, 2247, 2395, 2440, 2455. *See also* speeches on Budget
Reparation claims, Lusitania, 3599
Results, 91, 2588, 2861-2, 2895
Scandals, 90
Taxation and, 2567. *See also that title*
War memorials Commission, 2098

War Finance Corporation, 54

War Graves Commission, 774, 2098

War Measures Act, 662, 663, 1362

War Purchasing Commission, sale of warlike stores, 1171

Ward, Mr. W. J. (Dauphin)
Animal Contagious Diseases Act Amdt. bill, 2738
Apple-growing industry, 3419
Boy Scouts, 773
British Columbia fisheries, M. (Mr. McQuarrie) 863
Budget, 2400. Congratulations to Finance Minister; reactionary and mysterious budget, 2400; the tariff; protection and indirect taxation; drydock on Pacific coast; purpose and principle of protection; invisible government; Canadian manufacturers a Bourbon; free trader when purchasing; pro-

Ward, Mr. W. J. — *Con.*
Budget — *Con.*
tectionist when selling; raw material and finished product, 2401; subsidizing of one industry means penalizing of another; immense wealth and dire need; results of indirect taxation; cumulative effect of tariff taxation, 2402; agricultural conditions in western Canada; rural depopulation, 2403; railway situation; land speculation; expenditures on agriculture contrasted with amounts paid to manufacturers; exports the source of wealth, 2404; Professor Ely on taxation; national debt; speculators and unearned increment; tariff from cradle to grave; land tax; payment of war costs; binder twine industry, 2405; basic industries, 2406
Canadian National railways
Directors, employees, represented, 2794
Yorkton branch line, 2139
Experimental farms, 811
Fisheries
Fish culture, 2169
Fishways, 2168
Generals Burstall and Gwatkin, retirement, qu., 1211
Income tax, cost of collection, 2025
Rail and car repair contracts, 1695
Rideau canal, 2767
Royal Canadian Mounted Police, estimates, 2130
St. John terminal facilities, 848
Soldier land settlement, 2136
Soldier Settlement Act Amdt. bill, 3406
Soldiers' Civil Re-establishment, employees, 3602
Supply, opportunity for members to speak, 1985
Welland ship canal, 2764

Warlike Stores. *See* Ammunition; Militia and Defence

Warships and Torpedo Boats, qu., 827

Wartime Elections Act, 14, 258, 350, 352, 473, 2229, 2289, 2488. *See also* Dominion Elections Act, M. (Mr. Euler)

Warner, Mr. D. W. (Strathcona)
Address in reply, 349. Progressive point of view; farmers not asking for special privileges, 349; excessive freight rates; immigration problem, 350; protective tariff and the manu-

Warner, Mr. D. W. — *Con.*
Address — *Con.*
facturers, 351; banking system, 352; Wartime Elections Act, 350, 352
Agricultural fairs, 651
Blankets, duty on, 3132
Budget, 2204. Tariff, disappointment at proposals of Finance Minister, 2204; small reductions; oleomargarine; dairying industry; protective duties on woollen goods and shoes; income tax; lack of purchasing power, 2205; british preference; agricultural implements; sales taxes; automobiles and the tariff, 2206
Canadian representation in United States, 2025
Crowsnest pass agreement, M. (Mr. Kennedy, Essex) for Special Com., 1429
Daylight Saving, M. (Mr. Kay) 952
Exhibition grants, 983
Experimental farms, 809
Forestry, aerial patrol at High River, 1050
Hudson Bay railway, completion of, 2797
Indian education, Edmonton school, 1231
Northwest rebellion pensions, 3523
Oleomargarine, Manufacture, etc., M. (Mr. Neill) 1829
Pensions Com. final report, 3338

Washington
Canadian representation in. *See* Canadian Representation in United States
Conference. *See* International Labour Conference; Limitation of Armaments
Visit of Finance Minister to, 2112, 2181, 2189, 2300

Water-Borne Traffic. *See* St. Lawrence River Waterway

Water Powers, 71, 124, 2182. *See also* Hydro Electric; Lake of the Woods; St. Lawrence River Waterway
Aluminum Company of America, Cedar Rapids, 71; qu., 728; qu., 1375
Canals, on, 2747
Development of, 223
Electric energy, 133. *See also* Electrification
Exportation from Niagara district, 137, 1188
Lake of the Woods Control Board, 2025
Joint board, 2805; qu., 2970
Regulation Act, 1921 Repeal bill, 2991, 3199, 3435
Niagara river power development, 137, 1188
Railway electrification, 1940. *See also* Electrification

Water Powers — *Con.*
St. Lawrence and Ottawa rivers, on, 629
St. Lawrence river, M. (Mr. Church) 1183, 1205, 1314. *See also that title*
Surveys, 1051
Welland canal, 2747

Water Transportation, 70, 73-74. *See also* St. Lawrence River Waterway
Canals in United States, 68

Waterways. *See* Canals; International Joint Commission
St. Lawrence river, 1183. *See also that title*

Watson, Major General Sir David, 1477

Ways and Means, Committe of, 362, 599, 1842, 2104, 2854, 3104, 3246, 3409, 3476, 3604, 3607
Amended resolutions, 2854
Interim Supply bill, 599
M. for (Mr. Fielding) 2104
Resolutions, 2118; amended, 2854
Supply bill, 3607

Wednesday Sittings. *See* House of Commons

Welland Ship Canal. *See* Canals

West Indies
Canada-West Indies trade agreement, 2110
Subsidized steamship services and freight rates, 3026, 3032
Trade with. *See* St. John Terminal Facilities

Western Provinces. *See* Budget; Natural Resources; Speeches on Address
Agricultural depression, 1475
Flags on public schools, 1265
Marketing of grain, 114. *See* Wheat Board
Natural resources, 7, 12, 22, 41, 148, 279, 328, 1017. *See also that title*
Interest of other provinces in, 23, 340, 355, 1017
Public buildings, alleged discrimination against, 1254

Weston post office, 1259

Westport Railway. *See* Brockville and Westport

Wharves. *See also* Harbours and Rivers; Public Works
Baddeck, 1269
L'Orignal, qu., 1212
Provincial, New Brunswick, transfer, qu., 2305

Wharves — *Con.*
Provincial wharves and tidal waters, 1991
Sault Ste. Marie, 2006
Selkirk, 2004
Tidal waters in, 1991, qu., 2209

Wheat. *See also* Agriculture; Grain and Grain Trade; Wheat Board
Competition with Russia, 2157
Cost of production, 114
Dumping of. *See* Customs, dumping clause
Duty on, 239
Early seeding in West, 115
Exports to United States, 209
Fordney tariff and, 210. *See that title under* United States
Free trade in, 2528
Freight rates on, 300. *See also* Freight Rates
Kubanka, 2454
Marketing, 46-47, 53, 115, 151, 231, 2453. *See also* Budget; Speeches on Address; Wheat Board
Prices of, 152
Shipments through Vancouver, 235
Transportation, 233. *See also* Railways; St. Lawrence River Waterway
United States demand for, 333

Wheat Board, 31, 283, 338; qu., 472, 1118-20. *See also* Agriculture and Colonization Com.; Budget; Grain and Grain Trade; Grain Commission; speeches on Address
Agriculture Com. report of:
Amdt. (Mr. Sutherland) to M. for concurrence in, 2951; neg., 2969
Concurrence in report, delay, 2306
Canadian Council of Agriculture memo, 377
Constitutionality of, opinion of Law Officers, 940
Fixation of prices, 2588
Kay, Mr. privilege, 872
Participation certificates, qu., 2304
Re-establishment of, demand for, 72, 115, 146, 152, 158, 232

Wheat Board Bill. *See* Canadian Wheat Board Bill

White, Mr. James
Newfoundland-Labrador boundary, 1276, 3495

White, Mr. J. F. (London)
Budget, 2352. Congratulations to Finance Minister; election pledges, promises and arguments; tariff proposals; proposed permanent tariff commission,

White, Mr. J. F. — *Con.*
Budget — *Con.*
2352; western agriculture; freight rates; climatic conditions; Wheat board; agriculture and protection; importation of farm produce; wider markets; free trade; farm tractors; tariff and manufacturers' profits; trade with Germany; unemployment, 2354
Experimental farms, 810
Lake Huron, marine allowance, qu., 1930
Soldiers' Civil Re-establishment, salary increases, 406

White, Sir Thomas, resignation of directorships, 1089, 1102

White Lead, duty on, 2297

White Slave Traffic, Suppression of, 3497

Whitley Councils, 1061

Widowed Mothers, Pensions. *See* Pensions' Committee

Wife Disertions. *See* Pension Act Amdt. bill

Wilson, Mr. G. C. (Wentworth)
Highways, approved, qu., 2040

Windermere Road, 1051, 1682

Windsor, N.S. removal of derelict in channel, 1493

Windsor, Ont., Canadian Transit bill. *See* Private Bills Discussed

Wines and Spirits. *See* Customs Act Amdt. bill

Winnipeg
Strike, 1068
Andrews, Mr. Alfred J., 1068
Royal Canadian Mounted Police, 671-9
Trials, cost of, qu., 1182
Unemployment, 86

Winnipeg River. *See* Lake of the Woods

Winnepegosis Wharf, 3545

Winter Ports in Canada. *See* Intercolonial Railway

Wireless Telegraphy. *See also* Radio
Lighthouses and, qu., 370
Marconi Wireless Telegraph Co., qu., 1063

Wives, Foreign-born, of British Subjects. *See* Dominion Elections Act, M. (Mr. Euler)

Wolves, destruction of livestock by, 990, 998-999

Women
Alien born. *See* Dominion Elections Act
Representation in Parliament. *See* Macphail, Miss
Voting in last election, 185

Wooden Ships, qu., 364

Woodmen of the World, 1905

Woods, Mr. R. J. (Dufferin)
Address in reply, 92. Congratulations to Miss Macphail, 92; changes in political parties; attitude of Progressive party; greater markets for farm products, 93; tariff revision; farmers not concerned with politics, 94
Budget, 2183. Tariff; history; classification; reductions; sales tax; added burden to consumer; dumping clause, 2184; free raw materials and high duties on finished products, protection on farm implements, 2185; duty on clothing, woollens, etc.; automobiles; Ford car; effect of 25 per cent duty; drawback system; farmers and protection, 2186; speeches of the Prime Minister in 1920; manufacturers free traders in raw materials; protection as it affects the consumer, 2187; agricultural implements, 2188
Canada Temperance Act Amdt. bill, 3004
Daylight Saving, M. (Mr. Kay) 953
Militia and Defence
Annual training, 1582
Expenditure and policy, 1582
Sales tax, 3264

Woodsworth, Mr. J. S. (Centre Winnipeg)
Address in reply, 84. Economic disturbance, 84-85; demand for markets; home market; unemployment, 85; unemployment insurance, 88; production, factors of; equipment; transportation question, 89; tariff revision; national debt and taxation; war fortunes and war scandals, 90; Defence department; relations with United States; war legacies, 91; reconstruction, 92
Blankets, duty on, 3132
Budget, 2242. Conservatives and Liberals, origin and policy; extension af franchise to ordinary people; agriculture and business interests not identical; labour view; sales tax unduly burdensome to family man, 2242; civil service pay;

Woodsworth, Mr. J. S. — *Con.*
Budget — *Con.*
immigrants to pay taxes and feed the railways; an administration bankrupt in ideas; no economic changes proposed; drifting and borrowing; "mortgaging the homestead"; foreign ownership of natural resources, 2243; concentration of wealth; railway exploitations; alieniation of lands and resources, 2245; mergers and watered stock; consolidation of financial organizations; grain trade and, 2246; the Great War and profiteering; financing, 2247; burden of taxation; repudiation; capital levy; income tax, 2448; profits and property rights vs. human welfare; labour and capital, 2250
Cadet camps, 1973
Canadian Government Merchant Marine, employees' wages, qu., 3598
Canadian National railways
Directors, representation of employees, 2798
Steel cars, qu., 2213
Civil Service, 3075
Bonus, 3533
Industrial councils, 1061
Patronage, 3097
Salaries, 2243
Criminal Code Amdt. (Sedition and Criminal Conspiracies) 364, 865, 1395, 3104
Debates, inaudibility of, 1755
Disarmament, 1143
Fishing schooner race, 3510
Immigration Act Amdt. (Bill 16) 364, 864, 1388, 3104
Immigration, British artisans, 2208
Immigration-Criminal Code bills
Report of Special Committee, 3281
M. to refer back, 3282
Income tax, taxpayers, qu., 1399-1400
International Labour Conference, 3601
Joint industrial councils, 1060
Labour
Industrial engineer, 494
Mounted Police and, 670-1
Military policy and expenditures, 1143
Military Service Act repeal bill, 424, 639
Ministers and Directorships, 1127
Mounted Police in unorganized territories, M., 829, 841
National Defence bill, 670
Naval Service, Royal Canadian navy, 1854
Nova Scotia miners, M. (Mr. Irvine) 516; qu., 605

Woodsworth, Mr. J. S. — *Con.*
Oriental labour on British ships, 2042
Post Office employees' salaries, 2801
Quebec Harbour Commission bill, fair wage clause, 1486
Railway Commission, representation of labour, 2776
Russian relief, 3516
Save the Children Fund, 3516
Unemployment
Relief, 3526
Returned soldiers, 2458
Situation, 1069-84
Unemployment Service Council, 2803
Winnipeg strike, Andrews correspondence, 2042

Wool. *See also* Agriculture; Livestock
Blankets, duty on, 3128
Duty on, 2415
Prices of, 985, 997
Woollen clothing, prices and labour cost, 2205, 2350, 2632. *See also* Speeches on Budget

Workmen. *See* Labour

Workmen's Compensation Act, 88, 1381

Wrangel Island, 1750, 1751
Russian title to, 2208

Wrecks. *See* Marine and Fisheries; Ships and Shipbuilding

Yacht Racing. *See* International Deep Sea Racing

York County, Ont., representation, 1365

Yorkton, Sask., Speech of Prime Minister at, 2730

Young, Arthur and Company, qu., 365, 1490

Yukon Territory
Administration of
Cost, 1681
Justice, 1275
Expenditure, 1275
Expenses, population, qu., 2456
Government of, 1034
Mineral discoveries, 1276
Parcel post, 2802
Radiotelegraph service, 1749
Telegraph line, 1749
Union for judicial purposes with British Columbia, 1275

Zaneth, Corporal, 671