

THE CANADIAN LIBERAL MONTHLY

Vol. III. No. 10.

OTTAWA, JUNE, 1916.

Two Cents

THE MISSION OF LIBERALISM



Pointing The Way to Young Canada

CONTENTS OF THIS NUMBER.

<i>The Mission of Liberalism. (Cartoon)</i>	109
<i>Patronage Extraordinary—The Quebec Elections—Wilful, Cheerful Waste</i>	110
<i>Liberalism and Industrial Education</i>	111
<i>The Quebec and Saguenay Deal</i>	112
<i>New Brunswick Serves Notice</i>	113
<i>The Bilingual Question</i>	114
<i>A Dispassionate Presentment</i>	115
<i>Speech of L. A. Lapointe, M.P.</i>	116
<i>Speech of Sir Wilfrid Laurier</i>	117, 118, 119, 120
<i>Speech of Hon. G. P. Graham</i>	121
<i>Speech of Hon. Frank Oliver</i>	122
<i>Speech of E. M. MacDonald, M.P.</i>	123
<i>Speech of F. F. Pardee, M.P.</i>	124
<i>Speech of E. B. Devlin, M.P.</i>	126
<i>The Fuse Inquiry</i>	127, 128, 129
<i>Diary of the Month</i>	129
<i>Protecting the Grain Act</i>	130, 131
<i>The Month in Parliament</i>	132

PATRONAGE EXTRAORDINARY.

THAT the Conservative party is devoted heart and soul to the system of patronage for political purposes is a matter of common knowledge. But that it has reached a state where party organizers will publicly boast of their success in securing "jobs" for the needy faithful is almost enough to cause surprise. At the annual meeting of the Ottawa Conservative Association on May 9th, the Secretary issued a report in which he apparently looked for great credit for the fact that during the year he had written 2,219 letters for Government positions for members of the Association, resulting in 1,461 being given employment. Modestly, he admits that the majority were temporary jobs, but "quite a number," he boasts, were permanent positions. The Secretary is to be congratulated on his success, but it must be remembered that he could not have attained it unless he found sympathetic co-operation from the people in higher places than himself who can provide the "jobs" and authorize the appointment with the wave of a hand.

THE QUEBEC ELECTIONS.

THE Liberal government of Quebec, led by Sir Lomer Gouin who has enjoyed the unquestioned confidence of the people of his province for eleven years, received well earned endorsement in the general elections on May 22nd. The extent of the Liberal triumph was rather greater than could have been foreseen, as it represents a net gain of ten seats, making a Legislature composed of 75 Liberals and 6 Conservatives. That the Conservative party had little heart for fight against a government so strongly entrenched in the respect and confidence of the people was shown by the fact that on nomination day no less than twenty-three Liberals were returned unopposed.

The result in Quebec is a tribute to the sturdy principles of Liberalism which the Gouin government has worked out in actual practice by ad-

ministering the affairs of the province for the benefit of the people, notably in connection with road improvement, colonization, aid and instruction in agriculture and general public instruction. To those Conservatives and Conservative newspaper organs who strain their eyes to see some other reason for the result, we commend the hearty tribute of the Montreal Star, a staunch Conservative paper, which said on May 23rd, "So complete a mandate to a government could not be secured in this or any other province without a pretty general obliteration of party lines. Quebec—having a long and painful experience in annual deficits and in piling up the prize provincial debt of the Dominion—has a hearty welcome for a business administration; and the party squabbles which cost us so dearly in the past have been forgotten."

WILFUL, CHEERFUL WASTE.

FROM half a million to a million dollars of public money is being wasted every year in useless and unnecessary Government printing and through lack of proper methods, according to Col. John A. Currie, Conservative member for North Simcoe. Col. Currie is Chairman of the Committee on Public Printing and therefore in a position to know. Introducing the report of the Committee to the House on May 13th, he protested particularly against the enormous waste caused by the printing of Government bluebooks, tens of thousands of which are sent out annually to people who make no use of them. He also protested against the system whereby the number printed is a matter of mere guesswork. "Thousands of tons of books are published every year merely to be destroyed—to be thrown aside as junk," he said.

Col. Currie argued that it should not be necessary for him to urge upon Parliament the duty of considering means of saving money. He pointed out that the Government is carrying on an advertising campaign in favor of "Thrift and Production." "If we take our own advice in regard to this matter of printing we can save from half a million to three-quarters of a million dollars a year" said Col. Currie in proceeding to show further instances of unbusinesslike methods which he held could be cured readily by the application of standards of reasonable meeting of necessary demands and by proper supervision of the whole business of Government printing.

According to the statement of Col. Currie there is an absurd and needless duplication of statistics by the Trade and Commerce Department and the Customs Department from month to month. There is also a great waste in distribution as mailing lists have never been checked up and all kinds of expensive books and pamphlets are being printed and sent through the mails in the names of thousands of dead persons and organizations no longer in existence. His statement, on the whole, indicates a degree of wasteful carelessness on the part of the Government officials which is little short of criminal and is still another striking commentary on a Government which preaches economy and thrift to the people of Canada but has been shown to be utterly averse to practising what it preaches.

LIBERALISM AND INDUSTRIAL EDUCATION

AMONG the outstanding achievements of Liberalism in Canada is the creation of a Department of the Federal Government to further the well-being of the masses of the people. Other governments established Federal Departments of Finance, of Trade and Commerce, of Railways and Canals, of Customs and Inland Revenue; but it remained for the government of Sir Wilfrid Laurier, true to the well-being of the many, which is the main concern of Liberalism, to establish in 1900 the Department of Labor.

Achievements of Department of Labor.

The record of the Department of Labor in the establishment of the Labor Gazette, of anti-sweating and fair wages policies on government contract work, in the enactment of legislation for the protection of workers against false representations at home and abroad concerning opportunities of employment, of legislation for the prevention and settlement of industrial disputes, of legislation for the investigation of combines, monopolies, trusts and mergers, of legislation suppressing the opium traffic, and the use of habit-forming drugs; and the efficient enforcement of all these and many other measures during more than a decade of Liberal administration, constitutes one of the most hopeful and inspiring chapters in Canada's history.

Investigations Brought Valuable Results.

Beside this chapter might be placed the interest aroused in problems affecting the well-being of the masses through the many important investigations extensively conducted under the auspices of the Department of Labor during the Liberal regime, such, for example, as the investigation into the method of carrying out government clothing contracts in Canada and abroad, the investigation into the question of Oriental immigration and its effect upon the future interests of the Dominion, the investigation into the condition of telephone operatives in the province of Ontario, and the condition of operatives in the cotton mills of the province of Quebec, investigations into the fraudulent practices of employment agencies in the cities and sub-contractors in construction camps in unorganized districts, investigations into rents, wages and prices, and the cost of living. These and many other inquiries of less outstanding prominence constitute but a part of the investigation of industrial conditions in Canada for which the Liberal government was responsible while in office, and which at the time and ever since have operated to improve the lot of the workers in Canada.

Contrast Between Parties is Fundamental.

What a contrast between the constructive legislative work of Liberalism in its concern for the people, and the total absence of any legislation of the kind by the Borden administration since it came into power nearly five years ago! What a contrast between investigations instituted by Liberalism for

the purpose of bettering social and industrial conditions and the kind of investigations which the Conservative government has instituted with the hundred and more Royal Commissions it has appointed since assuming office!

It would be a mistake to assume that a contrast so marked was a matter wholly of circumstance or accident. The reason goes deeper than that, and may be found in the fundamental difference between Liberalism and Conservatism as attitudes of government. As has been frequently pointed out, Liberalism by its very nature assumes to promote the well-being of the masses of the people; Conservatism by its very nature assumes to safeguard existing privilege. **Liberalism is primarily concerned with people; Conservatism is primarily concerned with property. Liberalism cares for men; Conservatism for money.**

Vocational Education—The Liberal Record.

Possibly no better example of the natural attitude of the two parties towards a question of great national importance is to be found than exists in that of the Liberal and Conservative governments respectively towards the question of Industrial Training and Technical Education, or, as it is sometimes referred to, Vocational Education. Recognizing that a nation's population is mainly made up of the workers in its trades and industries, that their happiness is largely dependent upon their earning capacity, and that their earning capacity is dependent upon the efficiency of industrial processes and individual skill, the late Liberal government, true to Liberalism which seeks to ever widen the opportunities of men, sought to arouse public interest in the national significance of Industrial Training and Technical Education in Canada by appointing a Royal Commission with practically unlimited powers to investigate the needs of trades, industries and communities in Canada, and the methods by which similar needs were being most efficiently met in other countries of the world. Seven Commissioners in all were appointed. On this Commission were representatives of Labor, of Capital, and of the Public. The Commissioners spent a couple of years in careful study of the whole problem. Opportunities were afforded to all classes to present their views, and the Commission while travelling abroad was afforded every facility for favourable observation and study.

As a result of its work, the Commission published a voluminous and comprehensive report which was unanimously agreed to by its members. In this report the great need of advancing industrial scientific research, and of furthering Industrial Training and Technical Education in all the provinces from the Atlantic to the Pacific in accordance with a broad statesmanlike policy has been brought home to the Canadian people. Recommendations have been made which if carried out would mean a gain to every industry and calling and to every worker in Canada.

Conservative Indifference—With a Reason.

Since assuming office, the present government has studiously avoided giving any attention to this great subject. When at its last session the government was confronted with a resolution drawing attention to the recommendation of the Commission, it thought to side-track all action by raising questions of jurisdiction which were wholly apart from the main issue, and which would have no bearing at all were the government's aim that of seeking a means to an end, rather than the avoidance of the end itself. **Because Industrial Training and Technical Education opens a vaster field of opportunity to the masses of the people, it is not congenial to Conservatism.** A government which seeks to retain power by winning from special interests the support it can obtain through special favors in the way of tariff restrictions, bounties and other perquisites of privilege, is not likely to look with favour on any development on a national scale of methods which, if successfully applied to industry would mean freedom to employers and employees alike from a thralldom of this kind. Individuals are not to be blamed; it is an attitude of mind. The stand Conservatism has taken towards this far-reaching factor of national development is a stand Conservatism may be expected to maintain. It is natural that it should. It is equally natural and

inevitable that the work which Liberalism has commenced, Liberalism should carry on. That is why Liberalism and Industrial Training and Technical Education must go hand in hand, if Industrial Training and Technical Education are to receive in Canada the development their national importance merits. Having commenced with the establishment of a Royal Commission composed of enlightened and representative men to advise the country as to the best methods of advancing Industrial Training and Technical Education, Liberalism is committed to the great task of developing through this means Canada's resources, her trade, commerce and industries, and the skill of her workers. To this task Liberalism may be expected to devote its best energies and powers once opportunity for constructive effort is again afforded.

It may well be that in developing its aim, Liberalism will have to consider with care many questions of jurisdiction. This, Liberalism has ever been ready to do, for among its main concerns has been a regard for provincial rights, and the safeguarding of the interests of minorities. But while questions of jurisdiction may require consideration, Liberalism will seek to make of them instruments of the most effective means to a great national end, and not, as Conservatism has done, insuperable barriers in the path of national progress.

THE QUEBEC & SAGUENAY DEAL

The Borden government lived up to its own best traditions when it made the last act of the recent session of Parliament the forcing through of legislation for the purchase of the Quebec & Saguenay Railway. It means that some \$4,000,000 of public money will have to be paid out as soon as the necessary formalities are complied with, but according to reliable authorities it will mean an ultimate expenditure of about \$10,000,000 before the road can be completed and ready for use. And for this the country gets a railway which was a losing proposition from its inception and which is unlikely to be able to pay its way.

The Quebec & Saguenay is a line about 62 miles long, from Quebec to Murray Bay, on the north shore of the St. Lawrence. About 85% of the line is graded and rails are laid on only 7 miles, from Murray Bay to a pulp mill, and this is fast falling into disrepair. The section unfinished traverses a country with only 30,000 people in sparse settlements, and who have ample water transportation during the summer months. The whole deal, on the face of it, is improvident and indefensible, but particularly so at a time when the Government is faced with the necessity of conserving every energy and every dollar of cash for the crying needs of the War. It was vigorously opposed by the Liberals, notably by Hon. Geo. P. Graham who branded the transaction as "monstrous" and by Mr. J. G. Turriff (Assiniboia) who characterized it as nothing short of a political steal. Significant evidence that this charge is justified is to be found in the fact that Sir Rodolphe Forget, M.P., the original promoter of the railroad, herded the Quebec Nationalists

carefully into the Government fold for the vote on the Lapointe resolution on bilingualism and then had the same vote with him, with government backing, to force the Quebec & Saguenay bill through the House.

Probably no action of the Borden government since it came into power has raised so great an outcry from the Press, including many leading Conservative papers. Thus the Ottawa Journal, the Tory organ in the capital, protesting against the bringing down of such legislation in the very last days of the session said:

"There looks to be special reason for objection this time in the Quebec & Saguenay Railway matter. We don't know anything about the rights and wrongs of the money wasted or practically stolen in connection with the enterprise, but that a heap of money has disappeared in the scheme in one or both of these ways is a wide-spread suspicion. If the proposition to buy out the road had been made earlier in the parliamentary session, permitting fair time for inquiry, either the proposition would have been blocked or a reassuring argument made out for the purchase, which is not the case at present."

The Montreal Gazette, another paper usually to be found applauding any act of the Borden government, eschewed comment on the merits of the case but protested against the fact that only a small fraction of the membership of Parliament was present when the bill was forced through, and said: "Legislation passed under such circumstances does not command respect. . . . **The present House of Commons has lost its vigor and the sooner it is replaced by a new one the better for the country.**"

NEW BRUNSWICK SERVES NOTICE

The result of the provincial by-election in Westmoreland, New Brunswick, on May 30th is abundant proof that the electors are fully awake to conditions surrounding the Conservative administration of that province. Hon. P. G. Mahoney, newly appointed to the cabinet as Works Commissioner, was appealing to the electors of his county for the necessary confirmation of his appointment, and entered the fight with all the confidence and assurance of success indicated by a Tory majority of 450 at the last general elections. His Liberal opponent, Dr. Ernest A. Smith of Shediac, was elected with a majority of 83. The enormous turnover, despite the fact that the whole weight of the Conservative party, provincial and Federal, was thrown into the contest and that the fight was made without regard to money or methods, carries a clear meaning—it is the death warrant of the Tory administration in New Brunswick.

Liberal Opposition Forced Exposure.

The Conservative government of New Brunswick stands discredited as the result of public exposure brought about by a determined and fearless opposition, although that opposition was numerically about as small as is recorded in the history of provincial legislatures in Canada. It consisted of only two Liberals. But, to quote the independent Ottawa Citizen, it has "exposed a legislature honey-combed with ignorance and vice and greed." It forced the resignation of Hon. J. K. Flemming, former premier, after a judicial investigation and thus awakened the whole province and the whole of Canada to the scandalous condition of affairs.

In April, 1914, Mr. L. A. Dugal, Liberal member for Madawaska, made his formal charges against Mr. Flemming and Hon. H. G. McLeod, formerly Provincial Treasurer, now member for York in the House of Commons. He charged that Mr. Flemming, through the agency of W. H. Berry, extorted money for election funds from holders of timber limits in the province. He also charged that Mr. Flemming and Mr. McLeod had in a like manner extorted money from contractors engaged in the construction of the Valley Railroad. Mr. Dugal made his charges so specific that they could not be ignored and a Royal Commission was appointed which made its report in November, 1914.

Royal Commission Found Flemming Guilty.

The finding of the Royal Commission was that some \$71,000 had actually been collected from the holders of timber licenses and that the money had actually been extorted by Berry and that Flemming was well aware that moneys were being collected for a purpose unquestionably improper." Also, they found, it was manifest that Flemming, the Premier, directed the disposition of such money when collected." In the matter of the Valley Railroad, the report of the Commission exonerated Mr. McLeod but found Flemming guilty of compelling railway contractor to pay \$2,000.

When the Commission findings were published Mr. Flemming entered a general public denial and

declared that he would resign and contest the Dominion constituency of Carleton and Victoria in opposition to Mr. F. B. Carvell. He did resign shortly after and then presented himself before a convention of the Conservatives of Carleton and Victoria and was actually given the nomination.

Fresh Exposure of Amazing Graft.

But the facts proved before the Royal Commission were only a small part of the infamous story. It was not until the recent Westmoreland by-election that the full truth became known through the publication of an affidavit made by Mr. Harry M. Blair, who until a short time ago was Deputy Minister of Public Works. Mr. Blair swore that in February, 1914, long before the Dugal charges had been made in the Legislature, Mr. H. F. McLeod became interested in an attempt to get Premier Flemming to contribute \$5,000 to pay a note for funds raised by a Conservative committee for use in the Guthrie-Scott by-election in York County. In order to protect the signers of the note and to coerce Flemming into putting up the money, Mr. McLeod dictated to Mr. Blair, in the presence of a number of others, a letter which Mr. Blair preserved. The affidavit says in part:—

"The said Hon. H. F. McLeod dictated to me, and I wrote from his dictation the following letter:—

Fredericton, N.B., February 12th, 1914. The St. John Daily Telegraph, St. John, N.B.—

I desire to make public a matter which is absolutely of public importance.

I charge that Hon. J. K. Flemming, premier of the province of New Brunswick, received from Mr. A. R. Gould, president of the St. John and Quebec Railway Company, the sum of \$100,000 previous to the general provincial election of 1912.

That this was the contribution of Mr. A. R. Gould to the provincial election fund.

That the said Hon. J. K. Flemming received the sum of \$10,000 from Sir William Mackenzie of Mackenzie and Mann.

That the said Hon. J. K. Flemming received the sum of \$9,000 from the Prudential Trust Company, of Montreal.

That the said Hon. J. K. Flemming received the sum of \$8,000 from the Maritime Dredging Company, Limited, St. John.

That the said Hon. J. K. Flemming received from the James H. Corbett & Sons, Inc., the sum of \$10,000—making a total of \$137,000, all of which was contributed for election purposes.

I also charge that there was expended in the said provincial election of 1912 in the way of campaign funds the sum of \$76,000, leaving a balance unexpended of \$61,000."

Comment on this amazing story of Tory graft in the highest places would be superfluous. Even more amazing is the fact which must not be forgotten—this J. K. Flemming, ex-Premier of New Brunswick, discredited and forced to resign office, is the man who was able to turn to his Tory friends and with the consent of Sir Robert Borden, the leader of the Conservative party, take the nomination for the Federal constituency of Carleton-Victoria to oppose Mr. F. B. Carvell, the present Liberal member.

The Bilingual Question

The Lapointe Resolution clearly expressed its whole meaning; the discussion in the House of Commons bore out its whole purport and intention:

No interference with Provincial Rights.

No suggestion of Disallowance.

No dictation--no coercion--not even advice--Ontario's supreme right to decide for and by herself is not questioned.

Every child must be taught English.

The principle of teaching French in Ontario schools is not at issue--that is settled by the Conservative Legislature in the Law of Ontario today.

Simply a plea for better mutual understanding of the Law by which French children may be taught French in their own schools.

THE CANADIAN LIBERAL MONTHLY, 1916, JUNE, 1916
The
discord
tions,
anguag
comm
prejudi
s misr
discuss
questio
derati
iciousl
the hop
when
accomp
Europe
their w
people
a few p
Let
the pr
school
been
govern
throug
the te
What
our F
create
passed
Thi
which
reader
the Fr
taught
betwee
is not
a legal
Th
applica
Ontari
any in
by it n
who sp
that it
amend
before
speaki
Th
Comm
advise
govern
contro
of the
has be
and th
While
the la
helples
Su
situati
come
upon
observ
the P

A DISPASSIONATE PRESENTMENT

The attempt of the Tory Press to create racial discord at the present time and under existing conditions, is not only indefensible but wicked. The language question was discussed in the House of Commons in a dignified, statesmanlike and unprejudiced spirit. In the Tory Press the situation is misrepresented, those who took part in the discussion on the Liberal side maligned, and a question which ought to receive the sacred consideration of all lovers of their country is being maliciously used to inflame passion and prejudice in the hope of gaining political advantage. At a time when unity and harmony are essential for the accomplishment of the Empire's great purpose in Europe—these mischievous papers do not halt in their work of engendering bitter feeling among the people with the sole object apparently of gaining a few paltry votes.

Let it be understood once and for all that the principle of the teaching of French in the schools of Ontario is not at issue.—That has been finally settled by the present Ontario government which introduced and passed through the House legislation making legal the teaching of French in Ontario schools. What was hitherto enjoyed as a privilege by our French speaking fellow citizens has been created into a legal right by the Ontario law passed in 1915.

This amendment is known as Section 17, about which so much has been heard, and the most casual reader will admit that it creates the legal right of the French speaking parents to have their children taught French. There is no difference of opinion between the parties on this point for the principle is not only admitted, but has been embalmed into a legal enactment, by the Ontario government.

The difference of opinion arises as to the practical application of the details of the new law. The Ontario government says that it works out without any injustice to the French speaking population and by it no privileges are taken away from the minority who speak that language. Those who differ maintain that it is possible in working out the details of the amended legislation, that some of the privileges heretofore enjoyed may be taken away from the French speaking children.

The resolution introduced in the House of Commons did not dictate nor coerce nor even advise, but after admitting that in the Ontario government rests the sole power of action and control, suggests the wisdom of making the meaning of the new law clear, so that the agitation which has been going on to the detriment of the country and the injury of the children, may come to an end. While lawyers are disputing over the meaning of the law, the schools in Ottawa are closed and the helpless children are walking the streets.

Surely no man with a full appreciation of the situation can, after reading the resolution honestly come to any other conclusion, but that the attacks upon it are unwise and unwarranted. It will be observed that in addition to making it clear that in the Province rests the sole authority to deal with

this question, Mr. Lapointe also made plain the universal view, that in order to be fully equipped for the duties of life on this Continent every child, no matter what his or her origin, must be given a good English education. So far as any attempt being thought of to make French the dominant language, the very opposite is the case.

The Tory Press insist that Mr. Lapointe had no right to bring this resolution before the House of Commons, and they further say that it was an attempt to coerce Ontario. What are the facts? The question being raised as to the right of the member for Kamouraska to introduce this resolution, the Speaker postponed his decision till the following day. **He then ruled that the member had a perfect right to introduce this resolution, giving as the chief reason, that it was not an attempt to interfere with Ontario, but was intended to record only an expression of opinion.**

This ruling being appealed against, a vote was taken and the Speaker's decision was upheld almost unanimously, every member of the government and every Tory in the House with the exception of one, voting that the Speaker was right. In the face of this decision of the Speaker and the vote of the Tories themselves, how under Heaven can their press claim—almost with oaths and curses—either that Parliament had no right to discuss this question or that it was an attempt to coerce the Province of Ontario.

The question will naturally be asked if this all be true—why did not the Western members vote for the resolution? The answer is obvious. Conditions in Eastern Canada are not the creation of the present, or the immediate past. They were created prior to and at Confederation. Those speaking the French language were in this part of Canada first, and were allowed to retain according to the wise and liberal policy of the British Empire, certain rights and privileges when they came under the British Crown. These conditions were confirmed at Confederation. Western Canada did not then become a part of the Dominion and consequently found no ready-made conditions, but was and is at full liberty to create conditions pleasing and suitable to itself. Hon. Mr. Oliver in his speech made this very clear. There is such a diversity of tongues in the West owing to the influx of immigration that those Provinces have deemed it wise to have only one language taught in their schools. In other words—Eastern Canada had conditions thrust upon it which will be ever present to be dealt with, while Western Canada is making its own conditions, and members from the West realizing all this, undoubtedly felt a delicacy in even making any suggestion as to what should or should not be done in Eastern Canada.

There is no cause for alarm, for the Liberal slogan will continue as heretofore to be "Hands off the Provinces," though surely among sensible men, no harm can accrue by the discussion of topics which are of such deep interest, but on the contrary, good may result if a proper spirit be maintained.

SPEECH OF MR. E. LAPOINTE, M.P. (Kamouraska, Que.) INTRODUCING THE RESOLUTION.

"That it has long been the settled policy of Great Britain whenever a country passed under the sovereignty of the Crown by treaty or otherwise, to respect the religion, usages and language of the inhabitants who thus become British subjects;

"That His Majesty's subjects of French origin in the province of Ontario complain that by recent legislation they have been to a large extent deprived of the privileges which they and their fathers have always enjoyed since Canada passed under the sovereignty of the British Crown, of having their children taught in French;

"That this House, especially at this time of universal sacrifice and anxiety, when all energies should be concentrated on the winning of the War, would, while fully recognizing the principle of provincial rights and the necessity of every child being given a thorough English education, respectfully suggest to the Legislative Assembly the wisdom of making it clear that the privilege of the children of French parentage of being taught in their mother tongue be not interfered with."

The resolution, quoted in full above, which brought the question before the House of Commons was moved by Mr. Ernest Lapointe, member for Kamouraska, Quebec. Mr. Lapointe prefaced his argument of the merits of the question with a clear cut statement setting out his reasons for bringing the question before Parliament. In this connection, he said:—

Ignoring Problems Is Not Solving Them.

Mr. Speaker, I feel it to be my imperative duty to move this resolution and to invite the discussion of this subject, which is of the utmost importance for the welfare of this country. I assure the right hon. the Prime Minister, for whom I have the greatest respect, that, previous to his appeal of yesterday, I had given to this matter the most earnest and serious consideration. I knew that the course which I had adopted would be disagreeable to many and that I would receive remonstrances and even castigations. For the last few weeks we have been cautioned and warned against approaching this subject in the Dominion Parliament on account of its extreme gravity, lest it should lead to further and more acute dissension between the two great races which compose the majority of the Canadian people. But ignoring difficulties, ignoring problems, is not solving them. On the contrary, I believe it is our duty, as the national representatives of the whole of Canada, to deal with the subject which is embodied in the resolution which I have the honour to move.

A National Question That Must Be Solved.

This question, from its nature, has become a national question. We cannot ignore it. We have

to treat it courageously and patriotically. There is no question which affects vitally one section of this country which does not affect the other, especially is that the case when it relates to the language which one-third of the population of the country claim as their birthright.

I earnestly hope that this discussion, instead of being a cause of discord, will promote a better understanding and a closer union between the two races. I do not want to create any ill-feeling, although unfortunately that exists at the present time. I do not want to accentuate any ill-feeling that exists; my purpose is to dispel it. During the last two years Mr. Lloyd George has pleaded with Great Britain for peace at home. That is what we need in Canada also.

Duty of Public Men to Seek Solution.

The Canadian Confederation was a compromise. It is certainly to be regretted that almost periodically questions arise that endanger the work of unity and national harmony which is so essential to the building up and development of a great country. Such questions are to be expected, and we cannot avoid them; but it is the duty of Canadian public men to approach and to deal with them in a spirit of tolerance, justice and liberty. It is impossible to prevent those troublesome questions from being thrown into the political arena; but surely, after fifty years of Confederation, the two branches of the Canadian family must have come of age; they must be able to put aside the fanatics and the demagogues; they must be able to adjust their difficulties and to settle their controversies in that most commendable spirit described by Lincoln: "With malice toward none; with charity for all." Our social fabric is based entirely upon the mutual respect of the two great Canadian races. This principle is at the very root of our constitution. It is necessary for those who are not familiar with the history of this country that they should be made acquainted with that fact. There is no place in Canada for narrowness of mind or prejudice; indeed, there should be no place for them in any country in the world. Moderation, tolerance and charity must be the governing principles of all creeds, races and colours, and the Golden Rule should apply to all.

No Call for Disallowance— Provincial Rights are Supreme.

I do not purpose dealing with the legal or constitutional aspect of the question, although I may refer to it incidentally for the purpose of my argument. This resolution does not recommend the disallowance of any of the provincial laws of Ontario. It does not imply any blame or censure upon the course adopted by the government in dealing with the petitions praying for the disallowance of the legislation. Indeed, I personally believe that disallowance would have been unwise; the remedies, perhaps, have increased the disease. Coercion of any kind will not settle the difficulties.

SPEECH OF RT. HON. SIR WILFRID LAURIER, P.C., K.C.M.G., M.P.

House of Commons, May 10th, 1916.

"I appeal, not to passion or prejudice, but to the sober reasoning and judgment of my fellow countrymen of all origins. I discard at once all reference to constitutional arguments. I do not here and now bring within the purview of this discussion the British North America Act. I do not here and now invoke the cold letter of any positive law. Still less do I question the paramount power of the Legislature of Ontario to finally pass judgment upon this question and record the final verdict of its people. I rise, Sir, not for the purpose of giving advice or admonition to the Province of Ontario. I rise to plead before the people of Ontario, in behalf of His Majesty's subjects of French origin in that Province, who complain that, by reason of a statute passed by the Province they have been deprived of rights, in the matter of education, which they have enjoyed, themselves and their forefathers before them, ever since Canada became a possession of the British Crown."

In these words—clear, frank, earnest—Sir Wilfrid Laurier prefaced his appeal to Parliament in support of the Lapointe resolution pleading for a clarification by the Ontario Legislature of the statute, varied interpretations of which have resulted in the deplorable disturbance at the time, of all times, when Canada should stand harmonious, united and strong. The Liberal leader—true to the traditions of Liberalism, true to the basic principle of his own life-long convictions—made earnest and emphatic declaration as to his fundamental adherence to the full measure of provincial rights. Sir Wilfrid spoke from the heart of French Canada to the heart of her Anglo-Saxon and Celtic sisters.

Pleading the Cause of National Harmony.

It was a memorable speech by a master—and by a man. The master spoke from the heights of lofty eloquence. The man made the intensely human appeal of the blood. Crowded galleries sat in tense silence. Members of both political parties drew their chairs into a narrowed semicircle and listened eagerly to every spoken word. Through bursts of applause, through sagging succeeding moments of silence, the wonderful septuagenarian—seemingly oblivious to all—went on. All unconscious he gradually moved forward until, on one occasion, he found himself out in front of his desk on the open floor of the Chamber. Time and again he wiped the perspiration from his forehead. He was once more—and more than ever—the matchless orator, pleading the cause of a long life service, the cause of national harmony, of mutual understanding, trust and good-will.

Liberalism the School of Provincial Rights.

"I am of the old school of Mowat and Blake," he exclaimed, "the parent school of Provincial Rights. By that doctrine I stand. The Province of Ontario, and the Province of Ontario alone, will and shall determine for herself the decision. Yet is it forbidden by the code of the new converts to the doctrine of provincial rights that I stand at the bar before my fellow-countrymen of Ontario and make my plea? Is it forbidden that I respectfully present the petition of a humble servant of French origin?"

Britain's Glory, What Her Flag Stands For.

Sir Wilfrid Laurier's tribute to Britain will become historic; the development of her great heart, her lofty ideals, her noble treatment of conquered races, the things her proud flag stands for. The story of the Boers in South Africa, the history of Wales, the Scottish Highlands, India, Egypt, Mauritius, Malta, was told in simple and impressive words. "It is England's glory that men are to-day gladly dying for England who could never speak the English tongue."

Then he passed to Ireland, and the long struggles in the "distressful Isle." Gladstone had set out to "bind and heal the bruises that for centuries had hurt." Like Moses, Britain's Grand Old Man was not destined to lead the people into the Promised Land. Yet the new policy of trust and conciliation had borne fruit. Ireland had played her patriotic part, and it was not to be thought of that the insane plot which culminated in three days of Dublin riots should dash aside the cup of achievement which was at her lips.

Course of Bourassaism Deplorable

So with Canadians of French origin. Sir Wilfrid Laurier has not shut his eyes. "I know," said he, "there is in the Province of Ontario a sense of irritation at the position taken by some of my fellow-countrymen of French blood in the Province of Quebec, who have from the first deprecated the participation of Canada in the present war, and who have exerted their influence to attempt at least to prevent enlistment. Alas, it is true; it is only too true. It is deplorable, and, to me, as unintelligible as it is deplorable. It is true, alas, that there are in my Province men of French origin who, when France is fighting the fight of heroism which stirs the blood of mankind, remain with their blood cold, who tell us: 'No, we will not lift a finger to assist Britain in defending the integrity of France, but we want our wrongs to be righted in Ontario.'

"Wrongs, or no wrongs," exclaimed Sir Wilfrid, "there is a field of honor; there is a call of duty."

Eloquently Sir Wilfrid pleaded that "the ignoble stand of men who have so far forgotten the duty

they owe not only to their British allegiance, but to the French blood which flows in their veins," should not impede and impair consideration of his appeal "if our cause be just and fair."

Appeal to Sir Wilfrid from Orange Sentinel.

A few weeks ago, Sir Wilfrid pointed out, he had been appealed to, on behalf of an important section of the Province of Ontario, by the Orange Sentinel, under the signature of its editor, ex-Mayor Hocken, of Toronto, to intervene, give his views and endeavor to put an end to the unfortunate agitation going on. Some had resented this appeal. Sir Wilfrid did not share that view. "I stand here in Parliament," he said, "and hold myself accountable to every citizen of Canada who temperately addresses me, as I was then addressed, to give my views upon every question which concerns the peace, good order and good government of this country. . . . Therefore, if I have to accept the invitation which was extended to me, I want to know if there is any other place where I could better answer it than here from my place in the Parliament of Canada?"

Appeal to Conscience of Just Free Men.

The Orange Sentinel, in its address, referred to Sir Wilfrid as the leader of the French race in Canada. Sir Wilfrid disclaimed the title. "It has been my honor," said he, "for the last 28 years to be accepted as the leader of Liberal Canadians—Canadians of all origins, Canadians by birth and Canadians by adoption—of all those Canadians who find their ideals expressed in those principles of British Liberalism advocated in their time by Fox, by O'Connell, and by Gladstone, and cardinal among which was the protection of minorities. For those 28 years I have been at the head of the Liberals of Canada. I have been at their head in good report and ill report; in victory and in defeat, and in many an arduous agitation. But I think I can affirm here, where my record is open to discussion, that at no time in any of those discussions, in any of those agitations, have I appealed either to race or creed. I have endeavored on every occasion to find a solution by appealing to the consciences of all men who love freedom, justice and tolerance. That is the position which I take to-day upon this question which is now before Parliament." Sir Wilfrid asked no man to follow him upon this question "unless he thinks in his conscience that the cause which I am now advocating is a right cause."

Britain and France in a New Entente.

In eloquent words the Liberal leader extolled the new entente between Britain and France, cemented by blood on the battlefields of Flanders, an alliance which received its last consecration in the resolution adopted by the inter-parliamentary committee of both countries which recently met in the British House of Lords and suggested that the languages of both countries should be made compulsory in all the schools of Great Britain and France.

Sir Oliver Mowat established, or reorganized, the bilingual schools of Ontario, and they gave satisfaction for many years until, six or seven years ago, it was complained that they had become inefficient. "I grant," said Sir Wilfrid, "that the schools may have become inefficient, not because the system was defective, but because it was not properly enforced." In his judgment the efficient remedy would have been to have had the system of schools carried out as it was achieved. Instead regulations and legislation had been passed which, it was claimed by the French minority, made the schools almost nugatory and barren of results. As a result appeal had been taken to the courts and disallowance of the legislation complained of had been asked.

Common Meeting Ground Only Sound Solution

With the refusal of the petition for disallowance Sir Wilfrid stated emphatically he had no quarrel.

"The government," he said, "have refused the petition for disallowance, and as to that I have no fault to find. I have no quarrel with the government. I do not know that they could have taken any other course. The remedy by disallowance is very illusory. It is not a positive remedy; it is a negative remedy; the government can annul a law, but it cannot do any more than that. Our experience for many years has been that disallowance—and I have no word to change in what was quoted a moment ago by my right hon. friend—has not given satisfaction. Instead of giving satisfaction, it has been the cause of many of the agitations which we have had in this country."

Remedy from the courts under the present circumstances would be very illusory. All that could properly be done was to respectfully suggest to the Provincial authority that an effort be made to "frankly approach the subject from the basis of our common Canadian nationality, and, if possible, find a meeting ground. . . . I ask no more than that."

Referring to statements in certain of the press that Ontario is an English-speaking Province and will remain so, Sir Wilfrid queried: "Who asks for anything else?" The impression that the French-Canadian had some sinister motive behind his agitation would be ridiculous if it were not put forward so seriously. There were French-Canadian extremists which he reprovved as strongly as did any man of British origin. All he asked was the continued privilege of having the children of French-speaking citizens of Ontario taught untrammelled their mother tongue. Would that make Ontario less British? If the people of Wales were deprived of the schools in which their children were taught the Welsh tongue, would Wales be any more British?

Call of the Colors to French-Canadians.

Turning again to the letter addressed to him by the Orange Sentinel, Sir Wilfrid read the following paragraph from it:

"Settle the bilingual controversy by convincing your people that they have no rights in Ontario, and we may look for a better recruiting record in Quebec."

pre
Fre
I a
wo
bre
cot
wh
the
wh
sel
for
in
in
fre

P

the
in
the
nor
said
duc
the
con
Wh
Car
of e
the
I an
this
peo
whi
Ma
gov
ma.
not
hav
of t
edu
the
Gov
law
Hou
whi
tob.
to
Is t
else
doi
of
peo
grie
or n
and
I ar
The
my
was
to t
side
and
the
to M

"Sir," exclaimed Sir Wilfrid, "I am not prepared to say that my fellow-countrymen of French origin have no rights in Ontario; but I am prepared to say this, and I want my words to be heard throughout the length and breadth of this land. Whether my fellow-countrymen have rights or no rights in Ontario, whether those rights are granted or denied, these considerations are no bar to the duty which the French-Canadians owe to themselves and to the honor of their race to come forward in their fullest numbers and take part in the great struggle that is going on to-day in the land of their ancestors for the cause of freedom, and of the civilization of mankind."

Position of Manitoba and the Fight of 1896.

Criticism by Sir Robert Borden of the failure of the resolution to contain reference to the situation in Manitoba caused Sir Wilfrid to comment that the premier's references had added neither strength nor dignity to his argument. "He endeavored," said the Liberal leader, "to compare my conduct of to-day with my conduct of 1896. Is there any parity or disparity between my conduct of to-day and my conduct of 1896? What was the situation in 1896? This Canadian Parliament undertook to pass a law of education for the Province of Manitoba over the heads of the Legislature of Manitoba. Did I and my friends undertake to do anything of this kind? Did we attempt to force upon the people by the will of this Parliament a law which would be repugnant to the majority of Manitoba? The law as introduced by the government of 1896 was obnoxious to the great majority of the people of Manitoba. Sir, is it not a fact that the Legislature of Manitoba, having behind it almost the whole of the people of the Province, had put an end to a system of education which they found obnoxious to them? Is it not also a fact that the Canadian Government of that day undertook to put a law upon the statute book, by the power of the House of Commons and the Senate of Canada, which a large majority of the people of Manitoba resented? Well, Sir, I would not submit to that; I fought that proposed legislation. Is that all that I did? No, I did something else. I did then the very thing that I am doing to-day. I appealed to the government of Manitoba, to the Legislature and to the people of that Province, saying: 'Here is a grievance. I do not care whether it is debated or not; I ask you to be generous to the minority and correct the evil which you have created.' I am glad to say that my appeal was heeded. The Legislature of Manitoba, in response to my appeal, undertook to amend the Act which was agreeable to the majority but obnoxious to the minority, so as to remedy to a considerable extent the grievance of the minority."

This law in Manitoba had now been repealed and Premier Borden had reproached him because the Lapointe resolution did not include an appeal to Manitoba as well as Ontario. "So far as I am

concerned" said Sir Wilfrid, "if I have advice to give my fellow-countrymen of French origin I will tell them not to be hasty, not to be premature, to take their time to consider what course they should follow. We have not yet heard the voice of the people of Manitoba at the bar of the House of Commons or at the door of the Legislature of that Province: There is time enough for all this. The situation will be canvassed at the proper time. But, Sir, I resent that in a matter of so great moment an attempt should be made to mix up situations which ought not to be mixed up. I resent any attempt to look at this question from any standpoint except the broad basis of what is reasonable, right, just and fair."

Fair Play and Justice of People of Ontario.

Coming back to the Ontario situation Sir Wilfrid said: "I want to appeal to the sense of justice and fair-play of the people of Ontario, and to their appreciation of British institutions—no more. Even if I am wrong—and I hope I am not—I am sure that a frank understanding between the majority and the minority in the Province of Ontario, between the two great elements which compose the Canadian people, may force a solution of this troublesome question. Every man in the Province of Ontario, every man in this room who comes from the Province of Ontario, whether he sits on that side or on this side, is determined that every child in the Province of Ontario shall receive an English education. To that, Sir, I give my fullest assent. I want every child in the Province of Ontario to receive the benefit of an English education. Wherever he may go on this continent I want him to be able to speak the language of the great majority of the people on this continent. I want it, I say, not only because it is the law of the Province, but because of merely utilitarian considerations. No man on this continent is equipped for the battle of life unless he has an English education. I want every child to have an English education."

Every Canadian Child to Learn English.

"Now I come to the point where I want to speak to my fellow-countrymen in the Province of Ontario. When I ask that every child of my own race should receive an English education, will you refuse us the privilege of education also in the language of our mothers and our fathers? That is all that I ask to-day; I ask nothing more than that. I simply ask you, my fellow-countrymen, British subjects like myself, if, when we say that we must have an English education, you will say: 'You shall have an English education and nothing else.' There are men who say that in the schools of Ontario and Manitoba there should be no other language than the English language. But, Sir, when I ask that we should have also the benefit of a French education, will you refuse us that benefit? Is that an unnatural demand? Is that an obnoxious demand? Will the con-

cession of it do harm to anybody? And will it be said that in the great Province of Ontario there is a disposition to put a bar on knowledge and to stretch every child in the schools of Ontario upon a Procrustean bed and say that they shall all be measured alike, that no one shall have the privilege of a second education in a second language? I do not believe it; and, if we discuss this question with frankness, as between man and man, in my humble opinion, it can yet be settled by an appeal to the people of Ontario. I do not believe that any man will refuse us the benefit of a French education."

Doubt in Interpretation of Regulation.

Sir Wilfrid rejoiced in the generous indignation of certain newspapers in their assurance that there was no disposition to curtail the teaching of French. Yet he thought he could show that the teaching as organized by Sir Oliver Mowat between 1880 and 1890 had been restricted. The use of the word "hitherto" in Section 4 of Regulation 17 was interpreted to mean that French henceforth should be taught only in settlements where that language prevailed and where it had hitherto been taught. If it did not mean that, as had been alleged in certain interpretations, if it really was meaningless, Sir Wilfrid asked that it be removed, and "we shall have no further quarrel." He also directed attention to the dual interpretations placed upon the words "where necessary" in Sub-Section 1, Paragraph 3 of Regulation 17, which stipulates that where necessary in the case of French-speaking pupils French may be used as the language of instruction in Form I. Sir Wilfrid quoted the words of Sir Oliver Mowat on this point as delivered at Woodstock on December 3, 1889. Sir Oliver said:

"Our opponents pretend that the Government should insist on all instruction being given to the French children in the English language. No such regulation was suggested by the Commissioners (Commissioners appointed by Sir Oliver to investigate the question) and none such has been made, because such a regulation would be absurd, and, instead of serving the cause of education, would often prevent education altogether."

Sir Wilfrid Laurier also referred to the Imperial Conference held in London in 1911 on education, when a special session, presided over by Rt. Hon. Walter Runciman, then President of the British Board of Education, was devoted to the subject of bilingualism. There were present experts from India, from Canada, from South Africa, from Malta, from Jersey, from the Scottish Education Department and from the Board of Education of England and Wales. Sir Wilfrid quoted the statements of many of these experts to show that children commencing their own education in their own tongue could take up English more easily after. This was particularly emphasized by Mr. Owen Edwards, Chief Inspector of the schools of the Welsh Department; Mr. A. T. Davies, Secretary of the Welsh Department, and Mr. Warre Cornish, the expert who represented the Scottish Department supporting the use of the Welsh and the Gaelic as mediums for school education in English to Welsh and Highland Scottish children.

Following in Footsteps of the Motherland.

Dealing finally with the question raised by Premier Borden as to why the Lapointe resolution had been brought forward during wartime, Sir Wilfrid Laurier replied: "It has been introduced in this House for the same reason that a similar motion was introduced at the meeting of the Inter-Parliamentary Committee of the Allies, held in old Westminster Hall. Assembled there to consider means for bringing about the end of the war, the committee declared that it would be in the best interests of unanimity to have the English and the French languages taught wherever the banners of France and England floated. It is less than a month since eminent members of the French and English Parliaments met in that old hall. Did they believe that in doing this noble work they were doing anything that would militate against the successful ending of the war? No, Sir, their thought rose higher. They believe that in so doing they were fostering the very object which we have in view—and what a lesson it is for us to-day, my fellow-citizens in the House of Commons!

"Sir, we are engaged in this stupendous war, which is to determine whether or not henceforth might or right is to rule the world. Alas, it is only too plainly evident that we are still very far from the end. More sacrifices will be needed; more mothers will have to mourn over their lost sons, and more horrors will have to be piled up on the soil of brave desolate France and on the soil of unfortunate Belgium. But already to this black cloud there is visible a silver lining. After nearly three months of fearful battering, the citadel of Verdun, ever proud and defiant, still flies the tricolor at its masthead. This failure of German arms makes it very plain that in this contest Germany cannot win—that might cannot triumph over right. Already it is plain to any observer that in the trenches will be buried many of the old hatreds and old prejudices, and that from the soil of the battlefields will germinate a new spirit of affection and brotherhood, such as has never before been heard or known since the angels themselves brought from Heaven the divine message of "Peace on earth, goodwill toward men."

"We have an earnest of this new spirit in the resolution adopted by the Inter-Parliamentary Committee of Britain and France, which, as I said, came to us from Westminster Hall itself, that old and noble building which goes back to the time of the Norman King, and which has seen the development and evolution of all that is contained in those old principles of freedom, justice and tolerance. That call which was made in Westminster Hall to all British subjects, to all French citizens, I make bold to make here in Ottawa, not in any spirit of dictation, but in the same spirit which has inspired and is the true spirit of British institutions, in the hope that it will be heard in Ottawa, heard in Toronto and heard in Winnipeg." (Prolonged cheers.)

SPEECH OF HON. GEO. P. GRAHAM

(South Renfrew, Ont.)

Hon. Mr. Geo. P. Graham, the acknowledged Leader of the Ontario Liberals in the Federal House, spoke briefly and what he said may be thus condensed:

1. As a citizen of Ontario, he would have preferred to discuss this question in the Province of Ontario, elsewhere than in the House of Commons.

2. The Speaker had made two things clear. (a) That Mr. Lapointe was acting entirely within his rights in bringing the question up. (b) That there was nothing in the resolution to suggest interference with the rights of Ontario, but it was merely an expression of opinion. This ruling was supported almost unanimously by the House.

Ontario Has Sole Right of Decision.

3. He believed that Ontario had the right and the sole right to settle this question and all other questions pertaining to education in that Province, and he would never vote, much less speak, in favor of any resolution based on any other assumption. In this connection, Mr. Graham said:

"I want to reiterate that, so far as I am concerned, I would not vote for a resolution, much less speak for it, which had even the semblance of interfering with the rights of this province or of any other province. If I thought that my action was construed in that way by those who have moved this resolution—I know it is not—I would not vote for the resolution at all, because Ontario is the only power that can deal with this question."

4. He had no patience with the extremists no matter in which province they were found, and begged that the people of Ontario and Quebec should not be judged by the rantings of these men. The individuals who keep in the middle of the road are the only ones worth while.

5. He resented the statement of those who said the members of the Ontario government, or of the Legislature or the people of the province, were bigots. He declared they were nothing of the kind.

Opposed to Disallowance.

6. He commended the Federal government for not disallowing the Act as that would but add to the irritation, and would be condemning legislation which was wholly within the purview of the province. For the same reason, he was opposed to an appeal to the courts, adding that while commercial and constitutional controversies would thus be dealt with, questions which reached men's hearts rather than their heads, could only be solved by mutual understanding. Mr. Graham said in reference to disallowance:

"I need not say that I am not in favor of the disallowance of this Act. There have been very few Acts passed the disallowance of which I would favor. Sir Allen Aylesworth, Minister of Justice in the former government, once made the statement that in his opinion a province had a right to do wrong if it wanted to. That was possibly putting it broadly, but, to a large extent, the powers given to the provinces

under the Act of Confederation enable them to do that, so long as some great public right is not interfered with. I know of legislation for the disallowance of which petitions came to the Federal authority in the time of the administration of my right hon. leader that bore upon their face evidences of injustice. The Minister of Justice then took the ground that the people of Ontario had the power to punish a government that would pass that kind of a law and that the matter was their business and not ours. I think that is fairly sound logic and sound constitutional practice, although the law would allow them to take another view."

Court Judgment Useless.

As to the argument that a settlement might be found in the courts, Mr. Graham said:

"If this were a question of commerce, if this were a question of some minor importance, of something that dealt only with the heads and not the hearts of people, I would say that a decision by the courts would settle it. But this is a question far and beyond and above anything in the way of a commercial transaction or of a commercial dispute. It is something that touches the beings of men, something that touches their history and their traditions, and no decision of any court, no matter what it may be, can alleviate the irritation that exists. I say to those who are prosecuting that case and taking it to the courts, no matter what the decision may be, the people of Ontario will have to deal with the question ultimately."

7. Mr. Graham emphasized very strongly the view that violation of the law was not the proper way to go about having grievances alleviated. He believed that if the Mowat law had been strictly observed, instead of English being ignored in some of the bilingual schools, the present trouble might never have arisen.

Teaching of French Not Real Issue.

8. The question of the teaching of French is not the real issue, (as the Ontario government and Legislature not only provide for such teaching, but had legalized it), and the only difference in existence is as to the real meaning of that Legislation. The Ontario government maintains that it is not intended to and does not deprive the children of French speaking parents of any privileges they have before enjoyed. On the other hand, those who complain, contend that the law as amended, can be construed so as to greatly curtail those privileges.

A Suggestion for Settlement.

9. As statesmen and lawyers of eminence disagree on this point, all Mr. Graham suggested was that the legislation be made clear so that there will be no basis for difference of opinion. This being done, he hoped and believed that all cause for

irritation would disappear. He had every confidence in the fairness of the Ontario government and Legislature, and believed that if members of the Federal government from Ontario were to discuss this matter with Premier Hearst and his colleagues, it could be settled in a few hours. So as to remove all semblance of political design, he would be willing to accompany the members of the government on such a mission. Mr. Graham said:

"Now this resolution only suggests, nothing more. It does not ask; it does not advise; it merely expresses the opinion that, that being the case, it would be wise if all doubt were removed by having the legislation of Ontario made so clear that nobody could say that it did not mean what the Ontario Government says it means. That is not a very big demand. Knowing the members of the Ontario Government, I believe that if the Minister of Trade and Commerce, the Prime Minister, the Minister of Finance, the member for East Toronto and the member for South Toronto—Ontario men, who have the right to sit down and discuss it directly with the Ontario Government—I believe that if they were to sit down and discuss this matter with Premier Hearst,

this grievance would be removed in twenty-four hours. I know the men of whom I speak, and I say in all fairness to the members of the Ontario Government that I have never found any of them showing the least symptom of bigotry, or a desire to interfere with any man on account of his race or origin. That being true, I urge upon the Government and the members from Ontario the wisdom of sitting down quietly with the members of the Ontario Government, and pointing out that if they will make clear what they say is their intention, much of the trouble will be removed. If that can be done—and it seems to me very simple—there will have been accomplished by this discussion, conducted as it has been without any irritation, harshness or abuse, something that will be worth all the money that has been expended in the holding of this session of Parliament, if it accomplished nothing else."

10. As the successful prosecution of the War is our supreme object at the present moment,—he was convinced that if by the removal of this element of discord in Canada, even ten men could be added to the fighting force of the Allies at the front, the effort would be worth while.

SPEECH OF HON. FRANK OLIVER (Edmonton, Alta.)

Hon. Frank Oliver was the only Western Liberal to take part in the debate and his speech in the main was a clear exposition of the difference between conditions in Eastern Canada and Western Canada in respect to educational affairs. The Eastern provinces, he pointed out, had entered Confederation with conditions fixed by the customs and understandings prevailing for generations preceding that time, while the Western provinces came in later with small populations, unhampered by precedent, tradition or custom. Hon. Mr. Oliver's speech is given here in summary:—

Good Must Result From Discussion.

Hon. Mr. Oliver said that while he held that Parliament, the high court of the nation, had the right to consider this or any other question of interest of whatever nature or wherever it arose, he had voted in support of the point of order raised to exclude the motion of the Member for Kamouraska because he feared the discussion might be acrimonious, and was therefore to be avoided.

The tone of moderation in which the debate had so far been conducted had changed his view and he now believed that good would result from the full and free consideration of the various phases of this very difficult question in the spirit of mutual conciliation that had been manifested in the speeches from both sides of the House.

East Must Meet, West Must Create Conditions.

The difference between eastern and western conditions in regard to bilingual education had been brought out strongly by the preceding speeches.

Eastern Canada was in large measure a region of fixed conditions, fortified by custom, tradition or possibly prejudice. It was the business of the leaders of public thought, to meet those conditions with the least possible friction consistent with the greatest measure of efficiency. In the East, past conditions necessarily and properly influenced present action. The West became a part of Canada from the desire of the statesmen of an earlier day to secure opportunity for national expansion under new and favorable conditions. Many who take advantage of the opportunities of the West do so to escape from customs, traditions or prejudices which hampered or were distasteful to them in their former homes. It is the supreme responsibility of those charged with the direction of public affairs to see that the new conditions necessarily arising from day to day are so met and dealt with as to secure the greatest moral, intellectual and material efficiency of the future population. In the East the first duty is to meet conditions. In the West to create conditions.

Centre of Canada Must Move West.

For centuries the heart of Canada had been in the Valley of the St. Lawrence and its Lakes. The heart of the greater Canada of the future must by reason of natural conditions lie between the Red River and the Rocky Mountains. The problem of establishing and rearing on those great plains a population that shall realize the hopes, aspirations and ambitions that our fathers held and that we hold for the future of our country is the greatest that we, as a nation, have to deal with; and the efficiency of the rural or prairie school is the very foundation of the solution of the problem. That

thought is deep in the minds of the people of the west. On rural roadside, in village, town or city the best building is the school. The school is the landmark of the newest prairie West, just as the church and spire is the landmark of the oldest province of the East, and represents an idea just as sacred to the people—the idea of universal obligation to society and to posterity.

Educational Problem Most Difficult in West.

The problem of securing an efficient education to the children of the prairie settler is most difficult. Houses average at least half a mile apart, therefore the school population within reach of a rural school is necessarily small. A large porportion of homesteaders are single men. New settlers are almost always poor, and cannot carry a heavy burden of taxation for school support. Owing to severe winter climate rural schools are frequently open only seven months in the year. These conditions demand that the limited opportunities the children have shall be counterbalanced as far as possible by the most efficient teaching. Efficient teachers in two or more languages cannot be secured at the salaries such school districts can pay; and if they could be, the children have not the time to acquire education in more than one language; nor do the circumstances admit of successful teaching of more than one language. Further difficulty arises from the fact that where the rural population is not English speaking there is generally a mixture of language, so that is in fact impossible to meet a demand for teaching in the several languages of the parents.

The Experience of Manitoba.

The attempt was made and fully tried out in Manitoba. When separate schools were abolished in that province a measure of conciliation was adopted—the Laurier-Greenway agreement—that provided for bilingual schools. The Roblin-Rogers government gave schools and teachers of every language to everybody that wanted them with the result that after eighteen years when the Norris government took office they found a condition of educational chaos and inefficiency, that could only be dealt with by repealing the bilingual law. The essential purpose of educational expenditure and administration had been defeated, and the future of a great number of the children of the province prejudiced, if not ruined, by the attempt to do the impossible; the material conditions being as they were.

The Experience of Alberta.

From the first in Alberta there had been and still was only English teaching. Experience had shown that the teaching of non-English speaking children by teachers who only spoke English was not only possible but had the great advantage that the children thus taught spoke English without an accent—as acquired from the teacher—as they could not have done had the teacher spoken English imperfectly.

Efficiency the Only Standard.

In the West this is not a question of race preference or prejudice, it is a question of educational and national efficiency, and of justice to the children of the West. Whether a child be of Franch, German or other parentage—however great and noble the traditions behind it—unless it is efficiently and sufficiently educated to stand on an absolute equality with other children in other localities, it is unduly handicapped in the race of life, and has not received justice or fair play at the hands of those in authority and responsible for its education.

West Recognizes Eastern Conditions.

The West recognizes that the Eastern provinces, particularly Ontario and Quebec, have their difficulties, limitations and frictions in educational and other matters that must be allayed and adjusted from time to time. We feel that those who have most knowledge and greatest interest in these matters are best fitted to secure their adjustment in both local and national interests. We ask our friends who have brought this resolution forward to give the same consideration to the conditions, limitations, aspirations and ambitions of the West in dealing with our problems as we are willing to accord them in dealing with theirs.

Because the problems of the West cannot be dealt with as they would deal with the problems of the East, the conditions being radically different, it is not fair that the suggestion of intolerance or of racial or sectional prejudice of any kind should be made against us. We are liberals as they are liberals. We are just as strong for conciliation and against coercion, and for the maintenance of the rights of minorities where those rights can be maintained without becoming wrongs either of the majority or of another minority. I will go as far as they will in maintaining rights; but I am not prepared to maintain what I know to be a wrong because it is called a right.

SPEECH OF MR. E. M. MacDONALD, M.P. (Pictou, N.S.)

Mr. E. M. MacDonald, member for Pictou, N.S., recognized as one of the leading Liberals of the Maritime provinces, was one of the last speakers in the debate and devoted a large part of his time to answering and setting aright a number of the arguments of preceding Conservative speakers. Turning to the general question and his attitude as a Liberal from the far eastern part of Canada, Mr. MacDonald reviewed briefly the history of the English nation and the English language to show the traditional

policy of recognizing the right of all peoples to their own language. He referred particularly to South Africa where the Boers in large numbers left British territory and took up their abode in German territory, only to return to British territory when they found the difference in the principles of government of the two nations. The impelling motive, he argued, was the fact that under the British flag the right of their own language was accorded to them, as a result, these people were fighting to-day the fight

of the British Empire for freedom. Turning to Canada, Mr. MacDonald said, in part:

"When we come to Canada, I know that gentlemen like the hon. member for Calgary (Mr. Bennett) tell us that we must have one language in this land from the Atlantic to the Pacific. We have heard that, and it a very pleasant thing to say in certain quarters. Men of the dominant race will say we should have one country, with one language, that we should have one flag, and there should be no exception to that proposition. But, we in Canada are fettered in regard to that matter. We do not control that question. Those of the class to which I have referred, like to say there should be only one language in Canada. But that cannot be the case. Why?—because Imperial enactments and treaties have provided conditions in this country by which men of the French race who were here when our fathers came are given in the courts, and in the province of Quebec certain rights and privileges that can never be taken away.

Traditional and Constitutional Rights.

Not only in this Parliament can a man come from any part of this Dominion speaking the French language, representing people who speak that language, and have the right of audience here, the right to expect that a gentleman shall sit in the Speaker's chair who shall know what is being said when he addresses him on behalf of those who elected him to Parliament, but in the Supreme Court any man who speaks the French language has the right to demand that his plaint shall be heard by a court composed of men who understand the French language. You have the Exchequer Court, which travels from the Atlantic to the Pacific under Judge Cassells and under Judge Audette. Every litigant in this country can hire a counsel who does not understand one word of English, under the law created by the Imperial Parliament, he has a right to have his plaint heard.

When my hon. friend talks about conditions in this country, when he talks as if the men of the French race, whose rights are embalmed in the constitution under which we live, are to be told that there is only to be one race in Canada, he must remember that whatever we would like to do, whatever individuals might desire, the hands of the Canadian Parliament and of the Canadian people are fettered by reason of these conditions imposed by the British Parliament and by the conditions under which our constitution arose. That being so, what are we going to do in this land? Are we to be continually aggressors against each other? Is it by preaching such a doctrine that we are going to attain that peace and unity which are so essential to the upbuilding and the future of this country? Is it

by preaching division amongst these races that this unity is to be had?

Problem Affects Only Three Provinces.

No problem with regard to the French language in the schools arises in any of the provinces of this Dominion except Quebec, Ontario and Manitoba. And why does it arise in Manitoba? Simply and solely because in 1897 this Parliament chose to create certain rights in that province, which created a condition from which you cannot get away. But in all the other provinces of the Dominion there is no restriction, no danger for those who worry in regard to this question. The legislatures of every one of our provinces except Ontario, Quebec and Manitoba have absolute, supreme and exclusive rights in regard to every question of education, and this Parliament cannot interfere in any way with those rights, and it does not propose to interfere. What is our situation here?

No Invasion of Provincial Rights.

This resolution is not an invasion of provincial rights. This Parliament does not in any way intend to interfere with provincial jurisdiction. On the contrary, it recognizes it. Hon. gentlemen in this House who have spoken in this debate, no matter from which side of the House, have admitted that there is an agitation and grievances. This question has been presented fairly and equitably from both sides, and is it not reasonable and natural to expect this Parliament, forgetting all questions of party, to say: If we have in Canada these conditions, everybody should recognize them, and so far as we can, we should model ourselves on the lines laid down by the Imperial Parliament; both races should go along under this Constitution in amity and friendship. That is the proposition which is made to this House. That is all that is asked for by the mover of the resolution and by the right hon. leader of the Opposition.

Realizing to the full that Ontario is supreme on this question, and without any desire to restrict her rights by any legislative action, all we say is that if there are grievances there should be a rehearing of the case, and an investigation of all the facts, and we would then leave it to the good sense of the people of the province of Ontario to recognize the rights that exist, and deal fairly by all classes of the population. That is the intent and meaning of the resolution presented by the hon. member for Kamouraska. If it meant an invasion of provincial rights I should be the first to vote against it, but there is no desire to invade or attack the supremacy of Ontario. All that we ask is a rehearing, full and fair consideration of the exact conditions, free from prejudice. That, and that alone, is what is sought."

SPEECH OF MR. F. F. PARDEE, M.P. (West Lambton, Ont.)

Proper Matter for Parliament.

Mr. Speaker, the subject which is before this House is so important that, although there has been some considerable discussion of this resolution, I feel it due to myself as a member from the province of Ontario that I should not cast a silent vote upon

this question. Let me say further, Sir, that I propose to give reasons, as shortly and clearly as I may, why, in my opinion this resolution is properly here, and why, in my opinion it should be supported.

The Hon. Minister of Trade and Commerce (Sir George Foster) who has just sat down, has found

fault with the fact that this resolution is here. Why is it, that a resolution of this kind should be before this House? Let me say that, in the first place, this House can only speak by resolutions. Let me say, in the second place, that we are here as representatives of the whole of the Dominion of Canada, and as such we have a right to have put before us and to have aired any grievance which any portion of the people of the Dominion of Canada may suffer; and it is for us to say then whether or not, that grievance having been put before us as representatives, not of any province but of the whole Dominion, it is fit and meet that we should take some action in regard to it.

A Canadian Precedent.

The resolution that is presented to the House to-night by the hon. member for Kamouraska (Mr. Ernest Lapointe) is not without precedent, and I would give to the House a precedent established in 1872, which I take from the journals of this House. At that time Mr. Colby, a Conservative member for Stanstead, there having been some trouble with regard to a school law in the province of New Brunswick moved:

That this House regrets that the School Act recently passed in New Brunswick is unsatisfactory to a portion of the inhabitants of that province, and hopes that it may be so modified during the next session of the Legislature of New Brunswick as to remove any just grounds of discontent that now exist.

Great Canadians Voted for Similar Resolution.

The question went to a vote, and in those days they were no pigmies as they are not to-day, but big broad-minded men, who sat in the House of Commons representing this Dominion, men who had quite as much appreciation of provincial rights as any man in this House to-day. Amongst the men who voted for that resolution, I find, were Blake, Cartwright, Hincks, Howe, Mackenzie, Tilley, Tupper, and Sir John A. Macdonald. Could we, I ask, in all sincerity, have a better precedent than was there laid down by the very men who were responsible for the foundation and confederation of the Dominion of Canada? There you had men, who recognized that a grievance existed in a certain portion of the Dominion, who were here as representatives collectively of the whole Dominion, bringing the matter before the Legislative Council of New Brunswick, and asking, as this resolution to-night asks, with all humility and with all respect that the Legislature look into the grievance, and give at least some aid towards its removal.

Unity of Races is Vital Necessity.

Sir, there are two things in the Dominion of Canada that are uppermost to-day. One is the winning of this war, and the other is the unity of the races in the Dominion of Canada. No country can be great, no country can prosper, where there is not unity among the inhabitants. Of provincial rights, let me say this: I was brought up in the cradle of provincial rights, and my father before me. No man ever held stronger views about provincial rights than he, and those views he trans-

lated into positive and concrete action in the province of Ontario. I inherited them, and I feel as strongly in regard to them as any man could feel.

Provincial Rights Not Infringed.

But I challenge any man on the other side of the House to show me wherein provincial rights are by one jot or tittle infringed in this resolution. Further, I say that to raise the question of provincial rights in this debate is to go far afield of the question at issue. The hon. member for Kamouraska, the mover of this resolution, stated his position in language so plain that nobody could misunderstand his meaning. He started his speech by stating that had disallowance been moved in this House he would have been one of the first to oppose it. He further said:

Indeed, I personally believe that disallowance would have been unwise; the remedy might, perhaps, have increased the disease. Coercion of any kind will not settle the difficulties. I am a true Liberal and a believer in provincial rights. I will go so far as to admit that to be effective and successful any final settlement of this question must be made in Ontario and by Ontario herself. But, Sir, is it not the right of this Parliament, while declining to interfere with the provincial legislation of Ontario or otherwise, to appeal to the rulers of that province for a generous and peaceful settlement of this disturbing question and for a redress of the grievances of the minority?

I ask, could anything be more simple, and at the same time more forcible, or could anything show a greater appreciation of what the mover of the resolution conceived his position to be. Granting all the provincial rights that Ontario possesses, he said, will you not consent to make some effort towards the peaceable settlement of the grievance which we think exists. That is all he asks. It is plain, simple, direct, and is the plea of a minority to a vast majority. It puts in words a plea to which the House surely cannot fail to pay heed, so far as the passing of this resolution is concerned, a plea for some effort towards settlement of this very great difficulty.

No Mandate, No Admonition.

My hon. friend the Minister of Trade and Commerce has talked about a mandate, and the right hon. the Prime Minister has talked about admonition and direction. I defy any man who reads that resolution through to show me where the mandate is, where the admonition is, or where the direction, or even the hint of direction to the province of Ontario or to its Legislative Assembly is. The resolution reads:

"That this House especially at this time of universal sacrifice and anxiety, when all energies should be concentrated on the winning of the war, would, while fully recognizing the principle of provincial rights and the necessity of every child being given a thorough English education, respectfully suggest to the Legislative Assembly the wisdom of making it clear that the privilege of the children of French parentage of being taught in their mother tongue be not interfered with."

A grievance there undoubtedly is. Everybody in the province of Ontario knows that that grievance exists. I am not saying that it is right or that it is wrong, but I do say that to pass this resolution would only do justice to those who suppose that they have a grievance. If it should be proved,

after due inquiry, that they had no grievance, the passing of this resolution would prejudice nobody. If that is so, then why cavil? Why not at least let us say as men, having the best interests of the country at heart, that it being a matter of common knowledge that the grievance is there, we will pass this resolution, and if we do, can we possibly, in any way whatever, or by any stretch of imagination, be said to be admonishing the Ontario Government or infringing upon provincial rights? Although no man will uphold provincial rights more strongly than I, where provincial rights are not being entrenched upon, and where a civil request is made, no demand, it would not in the least prejudice the best interests of our country, which we are supposed to be here to uphold, if we adopt this resolution. May I say to some hon. gentlemen who sit on the other side of the House, that were they to vote for the resolution as it stands, they would only be upholding the traditions of Sir John Macdonald, whose principles they profess to so greatly admire. The passing of that resolution will mean that there will be greater unity in Canada and a closer adhesion of races and peoples.

Principle Above Political Expediency.

I have been told by my friends, some of them political, some of them otherwise, that, as a member

for an Ontario constituency, for me to vote for the resolution means political oblivion. All I have to say is that if the time ever comes in this House why I cannot give good reasons for the faith that is in me, for the measures I support, I sincerely hope that I shall not continue to be here. I can do little less than satisfy my own conscience as a man, and if I do vote for the resolution, and if it does mean political oblivion, I only have to say that the passing of political parties, or the passing of any one member of a political party, makes little difference, as they are sure that they have done full and complete justice to the cause which they are supposed to have at heart, and if they pass out they do so feeling satisfied with the course which they have pursued. Ever since I have been in public life—and it is not a matter of yesterday—at periodical times, there have been raised racial and religious questions within the province of Ontario. Well do I know whereof I speak, but I want to say this, that if we here to-night, with this resolution before us, can, by the exercise of a little moderation, and by setting aside all party associations, pass this resolution and bring about a stifling of these racial cries which are rending Canada from time to time, we will have done full justice to ourselves, and we will have done a benefit to Canada as a whole and to the provinces collectively and individually.

SPEECH OF MR. E. B. DEVLIN, M.P. (Wright, Que.)

Mr. E. B. Devlin, member for Wright, seconded Mr. Lapointe's resolution in a speech in which, as an English speaking representative of a Quebec community, he pleaded earnestly for a fair and unprejudiced consideration of a vexed question. He said, in part:—

"Mr. Speaker, listening to the prayer with which we open our daily proceedings in this House, the words "May peace and harmony always reign among us," appealed to me as they always have since I have had the honor of a seat in this House, and I trust that the temper and spirit of my words this afternoon will not in any way be in discord with that pious supplication. It has been said by hon. gentlemen opposite that it is a great pity that this resolution ever came up in this House. Might I say at once that I have that feeling myself. I think it is unfortunate that legislation should be passed by any province which would so affect the sensibilities of a great minority in this country as to force them to apply to this House for redress. Nevertheless, certain legislation, to which I shall refer, has been passed by the Legislature of Ontario. Petitions have come to this House, applications have been made to the representatives of the people to bring this question before the Canadian public through the Federal Parliament; speeches have been delivered from the public platform; I take it that all these are an appeal on behalf of the French minority in this country, not for the disallowance of any Act which has been passed by the Ontario or any other Legislature, but an appeal to the intelligence, to the judgment, and to the generosity of the Canadian people. I am a Canadian. I

believe in the most absolute freedom and liberty for the people of all races and of all creeds in this country."

Proceeding, Mr. Devlin quoted from a speech by Sir Robert Borden at Bristol, England, on August 10th, 1915, in which the Premier paid a high tribute to the Canadians of French ancestry who had crossed the seas to fight the battles of the Empire and in which he said: "In the development of constitutional government in Canada—which has indeed proceeded very much on the same line as with you—Canadians of French descent have labored harmoniously and effectively with us whose forefathers came from these islands. And no better exponents of the cause of constitutional government and liberty in Canada have been found than those descended from the first pioneer race of Canada, the French race. We in Canada find the need, realized everywhere throughout the Empire, that we should know and understand each other a little better. In a vast country like ours, with scattered communities, diverse in race, diverse in creed, and sometimes in ideal and apparent interest, there is the greatest need of mutual understanding and comprehension."

This, said Mr. Devlin, was a sentiment which must be applauded throughout Canada, and he proceeded to quote a number of other notable utterances of great men of Canada and the Mother Country in the same vein, from all of which he argued the wisdom and the propriety to mention nothing of the real necessity of a dispassionate and clear-minded facing of the situation in Canada referred to in the Lapointe resolution.

THE FUSE INQUIRY

SINCE the doings of the Canadian Shell Committee became a matter of public concern and widespread discussion, the Liberal Monthly has endeavored to give from month to month a brief summary of the most important developments. The course of the discussion in the House of Commons has been recorded and last month certain developments before the Meredith-Duff Commission were dealt with. At the time this is being written, the Commission has finished the examination of witnesses but the argument of counsel for the various interests is still being heard. No attempt will be made, therefore, to review the whole case at this time. Instead, a summary is given to show how far the statements made by Mr. G. W. Kyte, M.P. in the House of Commons have been borne out by the sworn evidence before the Commission.

Borden's Interpretation of Kyte Charges.

In order that there may be no question of the meaning of the Kyte statements or the construction to be put upon them, we adopt for the purposes of this article the construction put upon them by Sir Robert Borden himself as made public by him in submitting to Parliament a copy of the cablegram sent by him to Sir Sam Hughes when the Minister of Militia was summoned back from England at the time the Premier decided to have a Royal Commission probe the American fuse contracts. The text of this cablegram is to be found on page 2447 of the Official Unrevised Hansard of the House of Commons, March 30th, 1916. It will be quoted herewith, paragraph by paragraph, with discussion of the evidence before the Royal Commission after each.

Organization of "Mushroom" Company.

Ottawa, March 25th, 1916.

Hughes,
London.

"Following is synopsis of Kyte's statement in Shell Committee Debate last evening."

"On May 25th American Ammunition Company was incorporated. Minimum capital \$1,000, and maximum capital \$1,000,000."

The facts as produced before the Duff-Meredith Commission have doubly proven this.

Mr. E. B. Cadwell testified on May 12th, 1916, that the American Ammunition Company was incorporated on the 25th day of May, 1915, and the certified copy of the letters of incorporation were placed in evidence.

Sir Robert Borden's cablegram proceeded:—

"On June 19th last a contract was made between the Shell Committee and this Company (The American Ammunition Company) for the purchase of two million five hundred thousand fuses."

"It was signed by E. B. Cadwell as President of the Company, by General Bertram for Shell Committee and ratified and confirmed by General Hughes in accordance with authority duly conferred upon me by His Britannic Majesty's Government."

Mr. Cadwell testified to this effect and produced to the Meredith-Duff Commission a copy of this

document which is identical with the statement above referred to.

The cablegram said:—

"There was to be an advance of dollars one million, forty-one thousand six hundred on execution of agreement, eight hundred during first four months to assist Company in financing contract."

The terms of the agreement were identical with the statement which Mr. Kyte made to the House.

The Million Dollar Rake-off.

Then the Borden cablegram proceeded:—

"On June tenth, 1915, ten days previously, an agreement had been made between B. F. Yoakum, E. W. Bassick and Cadwell reciting the Shell Committee had agreed to purchase two million five hundred thousand fuses from a manufacturer to be designated E. B. Cadwell & Company, that Yoakum, Bassick and Cadwell and Company were together instrumental in negotiating and effecting said contract that Cadwell & Company, Yoakum and Bassick were together entitled to receive as their Commission for negotiation and effecting said contract the sum of one million dollars in the whole being at the rate of forty cents per fuse. The agreement went on to divide this amount four hundred and seventy-five thousand to Yoakum, two hundred and seventy-five thousand to Bassick and two hundred and fifty-thousand to Cadwell & Company. The total was to be received by Cadwell & Company in first instance in trust for all. Yoakum and Bassick agree to continue to use their best endeavors to bring about the execution and delivery by said Shell Committee of said contract for two million five hundred thousand fuses. Following or annexed to this is an agreement signed by the American Ammunition Company by E. B. Cadwell, President, to cause to be paid to Cadwell & Company forty cents per fuse in accordance with the foregoing agreement if the contract for two million five hundred thousand fuses in such agreement mentioned is granted to us in acceptable form by Canadian authorities."

From this paragraph of Sir Robert Borden's cablegram it will be readily seen that he had quickly become seized of the true meaning of the documents read to Parliament by Mr. Kyte and which indicated that a most questionable deal had been consummated. These documents showed that this deal had allowed such profits as to permit of a round million dollars of rake-off, over and above the ordinary and reasonable profits of the actual manufacturers of the fuses. They also showed that Allison and his combination of manipulators, including Yoakum, Bassick, were actually to receive this million dollars of excess profit on one-half of the fuse contract. **Every word and every detail of this arrangement has been proved by the sworn evidence before the Commission.**

Cadwell's Frank Admissions.

On June 11th, Mr. E. B. Cadwell gave evidence before the Commission that an agreement was made to divide the million dollars as follows: \$225,000 to himself, \$475,000 to Yoakum and \$275,000 to Bassick. (See page 725, Official Evidence.) Salient points of Cadwell's evidence may be quoted:

By MR. HELLMUTH:—

Q.— the American Ammunition Company, of which the incorporators, the real incorporators were Messrs. Yoakum, Bassick and yourself, agreed as a company, the American Ammunition Company agreed that if they got that contract for 2,500,000 fuses to pay you three, as they were paid, forty cents per fuse? A.—Correct.

Q.—One million dollars? A.—One million dollars. That is correct.

Q.—Your forty cents per fuse was not based on what the profits might be, or on what the losses might be? A.—No.

Q.—And they said that before the company could get the contract, before the American Ammunition Company could get the contract it must undertake to pay them for securing it? A.—Correct.

Mr. Yoakum confirmed this and gave details as to how his \$475,000 was sub-divided, and it might be interesting to read what he said in this respect. He first stated that \$30,000 of this amount was to be given to Mr. Craven who assisted in the negotiations, and \$5,000 to himself for travelling expenses in connection with securing the contracts. This left a balance of \$440,000 to be divided between himself and J. Wesley Allison.

Where Allison's Share Was to Go.

As to where Mr. Allison's share was authorized to go we quote herewith the orders which Mr. Allison gave to Mr. Yoakum providing for \$195,000, leaving \$25,000 to go to J. Wesley Allison himself. Herewith are the orders which Mr. Allison gave:

December 2, 1915.

Hon. B. F. Yoakum, 71 Broadway, New York City, N.Y.

Dear Sir,—Out of the commission due me on account of contract, dated June 19, 1915, between the American Ammunition Company, Incorporated and the Shell Committee of Canada, for the manufacture and purchase of 1,666,666 No. 100 fuses, and 833,334 80/44 fuses, I irrevocably authorize you to pay to Major George Washington Stephens the sum of \$10,000.00. The above sum to be paid to Major Stephens on a pro rata basis as and when commissions are received by you.

Yours very truly,
(Sgd.) J. Wesley Allison."

December 2, 1915.

Hon. B. F. Yoakum, 71 Broadway, New York City, N.Y.

Dear Sir,—Out of the commission due me on account of contract, dated June 19, 1915, between the American Ammunition Company, Incorporated and the Shell Committee of Canada, for the manufacture and purchase of 1,666,666 No. 100 fuses, and 833,334 80/44 fuses, I irrevocably authorize you to pay to E. E. Lignanti, the sum of \$50,000.00. The above sum to be paid to Mr. Lignanti on a pro rata basis as, and when commissions are received by you.

Yours very truly,
(Sgd.) J. Wesley Allison."

January 20, 1916.

Hon. B. F. Yoakum, 71 Broadway, New York City, N.Y.

Dear Sir,—Out of the commission due me on account of contract, dated June 19, 1915, between the American Ammunition Company, Incorporated and the Shell Committee of Canada, for the manufacture and purchase of 1,666,666 No 100 fuses, and 833,334 80/44 fuses, I irrevocably authorize you to pay to Colonel William McBain the sum of \$30,000. The above amount to be paid to Colonel McBain on a pro rata basis, as and when commissions are received by you.

The above does not include the 3,000,000 shells contracted for by the Canadian Car and Foundry Company, which 3,000,000 shells is in addition to the original 2,000,000 shells taken by that Company. It does, however, settle in full all other matters of every nature and description.

Yours very truly,
(Sgd.) J. Wesley Allison."

March 3, 1916.

Hon. B. F. Yoakum, 71 Broadway, New York City, N.Y.

Dear Sir,—Out of the commission due me on account of contract dated June 19, 1915, between the American

Ammunition Company, Incorporated and the Shell Committee of Canada for the manufacture and purchase of 1,666,666 No. 100 Fuses and 833,334 80/44 fuses, I irrevocably authorize you to pay to M. G. Edwards, the sum of one hundred and five thousand dollars (\$105,000.00). The above sum to be paid to M. G. Edwards, on a pro rata basis, as and when commissions are received by you.

Yours very truly,
(Sgd.) J. Wesley Allison."

Rake-off Added to Cost of Fuses.

Both Mr. Cadwell and Mr. Yoakum gave evidence that this figure, one million dollars, had been arrived at on the basis of 40 cents a fuse. The public will not be slow to grasp the significance of this. Had not this 40 cents a fuse extra, above reasonable cost, been provided for, the Shell Committee could have secured these fuses much cheaper.

Allison, Yoakum and Lignanti.

Continuing, Sir Robert Borden's cable said:—

"At some date prior to January, nineteen fifteen, J. Wesley Allison and Eugene Lignanti had entered into an agreement to use their best endeavors for their mutual profit to procure as brokers contracts for supplies of exports to certain European countries. Later Benjamin F. Yoakum became associated with them. In September, 1915, apparently because it was decided that Lignanti should withdraw, an agreement was made, fixing the terms upon which certain commissions and profits should be divided among them. This agreement recites that Yoakum procured contract of June 19th, for American Ammunition Company from Shell Committee and declares Lignanti entitled to fifty thousand dollars out of payment by Company to Yoakum. Kyte asserts Allison and Yoakum were to share together in amounts remaining after Lignanti was paid."

In this connection it may be recalled that Mr. Kyte read in the House of Commons from a statement which appeared to have been prepared from a copy of the agreement just referred to. Apparently in the belief that the original document was not in Mr. Kyte's possession and that he might never be able to get it, Tory newspapers throughout Canada declared that no such document had ever existed. They said, and so did many politicians and friends of the Minister of Militia, that the whole affair was a myth in the mind of Mr. Kyte. But when Mr. Yoakum appeared on the witness stand before the Royal Commission he admitted that such an agreement had been drawn up and actually produced a copy of it, exactly the same in every detail and word as that read by Mr. Kyte. Col. Allison, when his turn came on the stand, also admitted the whole business.

Edwards Valve Company Contract.

The Borden cablegram continued:—

"Then he alleges another contract procured by Yoakum from Shell Committee for Edward Valve Company to furnish 500,000 cartridge cases and that twenty thousand dollars commission less two thousand five hundred paid to Lignanti was to be divided between Yoakum and Allison."

Members of the Shell Committee, also Yoakum and Allison, gave evidence in this matter which showed that the Edwards Valve Co. was negotiating and had agreed to take a contract to furnish 500,000 brass cartridge cases at \$2.39 each, but that later the price was raised to \$2.43 per case. The agreement between Yoakum and the Edwards Valve Co. was that Yoakum was to get \$20,000 if the

contract was carried out, and Yoakum then had an understanding with Allison to divide the \$20,000 half and half, except that Allison was to give Lignanti \$2,500. Where the four cents added price came in, and why, is told in plain words in the evidence of Yoakum (page 973, Unrevised Official Evidence). The quotations are of Mr. Johnston's questions and Yoakum's replies:

Q.—Perhaps you can explain (it may be very simple as you know the facts) to me the effect of that agreement, which I see was put in as an exhibit; or this provision of the agreement: "the price of said cartridge cases shall be \$2.39 per cartridge case in lawful money," and so on. Do you know how that came to be put in there? A.—No. The price was \$2.39 net, that is, the four cents made up the four cents I get.

Sir Robert Borden's cable again continued:

"Kyte also alluded to many other transactions in which Yoakum and Allison were to receive and divide commissions of very large amounts but on inquiry none of them were found to relate to Shell Committee."

That is quite true. The reference which Mr. Kyte made to other transactions did not refer to the Shell Committee here at Ottawa and therefore were not subject to investigation by the Duff-Meredith Commission.

Sir Robert Borden's cablegram to Sir Sam Hughes was a fair synopsis of Mr. Kyte's actual statements in the House. It has been reproduced here, paragraph by paragraph, and it may fairly be left to the reader to judge for himself if the evidence on oath before the Meredith-Duff Commission did not support every single statement made by Mr. Kyte.

Sir Sam's Responsibility.

A large section of the Tory press throughout Canada has undertaken to read a greater meaning into the statements of Mr. Kyte and has insisted that he had charged Sir Sam Hughes with actual criminal participation in the profits of the contracts referred to. As a matter of fact Mr. Kyte never made any such charge or accusation. It has never been charged by Mr. Kyte or any other Liberal member that Sir Sam benefitted personally, financially or otherwise.

But that does not mean that Sir Sam Hughes had no responsibility. It must not be forgotten that Sir Sam made himself responsible for Col. J. Wesley Allison. On March 2, 1916, in the House of Commons, as may be seen from the Official Hansard of that date, Sir Sam stated that he had chosen J. Wesley Allison as his "adviser, counsellor and guide in connection with the various matters that would come before us in connection with this War." Not only this, Sir Sam specifically declared and led the House of Commons and the people of Canada to believe that Allison was not receiving "one cent" in the way of commissions or otherwise from anyone. Thus, Sir Sam said in the House on January 26, 1916:

"I may say further concerning Col. Allison—I shall refer to the matter of fuses in a very short time—that in all his dealing with business firms in the United States he has in each instance, so I am informed and believe, given those with whom he dealt the following letter, or one similar."

and he then read the following letter:

May 14, 1914.

"Confirming my verbal statements to you of yesterday and in order that there can not be any room for mis-

understanding, I now reaffirm in writing my position in connection with the fuse question.

"I have been and am doing my very best to secure the lowest prices possible for the Government, and above all things wish to do whatever I can to aid them in procuring the best workmanship, lowest prices, and largest deliveries possible; and if you are bidding for the manufacture of this fuse for the Shell Committee or the Canadian Government, I want it distinctly understood that I do not want any profit added to the price under any conditions, with the intention of providing a commission for me, as I would not under any circumstances accept a commission of any kind from anybody, in connection with this matter.

Very truly yours,

(Sgd.) J. Wesley Allison.

Again in the same speech on March 2nd, Sir Sam Hughes speaking of Col. Allison's work made the following statement:

"As far as Canada was concerned, nothing was to be added to the prices, and that at the close of the War we should endeavour to recompense Col. Allison in some other way, because he has consistently refused to take any commission, although he has had to pay out money in express and freight charges, and I hope he has kept the bills." (See Hansard, p. 1409.)

And Still He Sticks to Allison.

So much for Sir Sam's loyalty to his "adviser, counsellor and guide," J. Wesley Allison, prior to the revelations under oath before the Meredith-Duff Commission. But even after these revelations—after it had been shown that Allison was instrumental in getting together the Yoakum-Bassick-Cadwell-Allison combination that was to split a rake-off of a cool million dollars—Sir Sam was asked on the witness stand if after hearing these statements his feelings toward Allison had at all changed. Sir Sam replied "Not a particle, strengthened." This statement is to be found on page 1251 of the Official Evidence.

The foregoing is a fair summary of the evidence given before the Royal Commission in respect to the specific statements made by Mr. Kyte. It must be left to the judgment of the public, which pays the bills, to decide whether there was between Sir Sam Hughes and his "adviser, counsellor and guide," Allison, any bond closer than the bond of disinterested friendship.

DIARY OF THE MONTH.

1916.

May.

- 6 DAVIDSON COMMISSION at Ottawa, examination of Col. J. Wesley Allison continued.
- 7 HON. G. P. GRAHAM at special recruiting service, Montreal.
- 9 OTTAWA CONSERVATIVE ASSOCIATION, annual election of officers, meeting addressed by A. E. Fripp, M.P. and others.
- 13 DR. M. CLARK, M.P. (Red Deer) at recruiting meeting, Montreal
- 13 DAVIDSON COMMISSION, inquiry re Sale of Small Arms Ammunition, examination of SIR SAM HUGHES and Col. J. Wesley Allison.
- 15 QUEBEC PROVINCIAL ELECTIONS, nominations result in return of 22 Liberals, 3 Opposition, by acclamation.
- 22 QUEBEC ELECTIONS, LIBERAL GOVERNMENT RETURNED.
- NOVA SCOTIA LEGISLATURE DISSOLVED, nominations June 13, elections June 20.
- DAVIDSON COMMISSION, continuation of special inquiry re Sale of Small Arms Ammunition.
- 25 HON. T. C. CASGRAIN (Postmaster General) left Ottawa for England.
- 26 Hon. R. H. Brand, C.M.G. (England) appointed to Imperial Munitions Board.
- SIR GEORGE FOSTER (Minister of Trade & Commerce) left Ottawa for England.
- DAVIDSON COMMISSION adjourned to June 12.
- 30 PROVINCIAL BY-ELECTION, Westmoreland, New Brunswick Hon. P. G. Mahoney, new Works Commissioner, defeated by DR. E. A. SMITH (Liberal) of Shediac. Majority 67.
- 31 BRITISH COLUMBIA LEGISLATURE PROROGUED (last session).
- Hon. P. A. Landry, Speaker of the Senate, resignation announced

PROTECTING THE GRAIN ACT

THE Grain Act, a piece of Liberal legislation designed to protect the interests of the farmer in the sale and shipment of his grain and which has proved so successful in its purpose that it has been the object of assault by the railways and the grain buying interests since its inception, was once more the subject of a sharp fight during the recent session of Parliament. The abnormally heavy crop of last year found many Western farmers with larger quantities of grain than they could possibly get under shelter after threshing and the trouble was accentuated by the inability of the railway companies to move the crop fast enough to make room in elevators or to supply anything like enough cars to fill the orders of farmers who had their grain ready to haul to loading platforms. Winter came with millions of bushels of grain heaped in the fields either without shelter or with only the flimsiest of covering, so that the danger of damage as spring approached was very great.

A Dangerous Amendment.

The trouble appears to have been accentuated in certain parts of Saskatchewan and representations made by the farmers caused the Government in March to bring down an amendment to the Grain Act which would give the Grain Commission wide powers to order a special supply of cars to the districts most affected. With the effort to relieve the pressing necessity of farmers who were threatened with heavy loss the Liberal members of Parliament were in hearty accord, but they found on examining the amendment introduced by Sir George Foster that it was couched in such broad terms that it would have given the Grain Commission powers which would have endangered the most vital protection which the Grain Act affords to the farmer.

Liberal Vigilance Prevented Change.

Careful scrutiny of the amendment showed that it would give the Grain Commission power to depart from the regulations which insist that railway companies must provide cars for shipment in the order in which they have been applied for. The Grain Commission would have been given wide discretionary powers to disregard this most vital provision of the Grain Act—a provision which has proved of immense value to the farmer in protecting him against the rapacity of the middleman who in the past found little difficulty in getting the railways to work with him to the disadvantage of the farmer. As a result of the vigorous protest of a number of Liberal members Sir George Foster changed his amendment to make it apply only to such specific conditions as appear to have existed this year, and then only after the Grain Commission has made "due examination."

This incident affords one more proof of the necessity of eternal vigilance on the part of the Opposition in Parliament to prevent amendments which might destroy the effect of important and valuable legislation. The Grain Act, passed by a

Liberal government to protect the farmers of Canada, and especially the farmers of the West, is of such importance that a brief review of its history and its effect may be given at this time.

Liberals Enacted Grain Law.

The Grain Act was first brought into Parliament by the Liberal government in 1898 by Mr. J. M. Douglas, Liberal member for East Assinaboia, now Senator Douglas. Its object was to protect the Western grain grower from the monopolistic tendencies of the elevator companies and the railroads.

The reason for this legislation was the fact that the grain is handled in bulk, not in separate packages as are other farm or manufactured products. Grain is much more economically handled from America to Great Britain in bulk, while from South America or Australia it is handled in sacks. The advantage of handling in bulk from Canada is on account of the enormous transshipments from railroads to lake and canal boats and then to the ocean boats, which necessitate frequent handling by elevators. In handling the grain in this way it is impossible to preserve the identity of any particular shipment, the whole being mixed up in the general mass.

The purpose of the Grain Act is to preserve identity of the grade or quality of the wheat so as to ensure the delivery in England of an equal quantity of wheat of equal quality to that originally sold by the grain grower.

This had been done by mutual consent as a business arrangement before increasing difficulties with regard to the elevators and railroads necessitated Government action to make such arrangements a matter of law rather than mutual agreement.

Cured Practice of "Mixing."

The great difficulty was from the practice of "mixing" by elevator owners. A buyer might purchase a shipment of wheat from the grower as high class No. 2, he might then purchase from another grower a shipment of high class No. 3, and ship them to Winnipeg for inspection. If he owned an elevator at Winnipeg he would mix the high class No. 2 and the high class No. 3 and so make the whole mass fit to inspect as a scant No. 2 grade and as such it would be shipped to Liverpool. But the English miller while he buys according to grade, mills according to flour producing quality and fixes his price on that basis, the result being that lowering the value of a grade by "mixing" reacts upon the selling quality of that grade with the ultimate result that the grower of the high grade wheat suffers from the "mixing." The dealer makes money while the grower of good wheat is "skinned down."

To prevent this the Grain Act provided for Government inspection so that every grade would be of a fixed standard, this being carried out by a complete system of inspection in the interest of the grower.

Allowed Farmers to Ship Direct.

Another drawback to the grain grower dealt with by the Grain Act was the transportation system. The railway companies refused to load grain direct to cars at stations where there were elevators, but would only load from the elevators. This threw the buying of the grain into the hands of the elevator owners, giving them a monopoly which they used to the limit. The Grain Act compelled railways to allow the erection of warehouses at all their stations and sidings and compelled them also to provide loading platforms so that the farmer could get ordinary storage for the grain he hauled to the station or load it direct to the car.

The Act further compelled the railway to provide farmers with cars as they ordered them, the cars being supplied in rotation as the farmers' orders came in. The object of this was of course to break the monopoly of the elevator owners, and thus rescue the grain growers from the monopolistic grasp of the middlemen.

This Act was vigorously opposed by the elevator men, headed by Sir Rodmond Roblin, later head of the Manitoba government, and the Conservative party led by Sir Charles Tupper. It was fought all through one session of Parliament, but at the next session the Laurier government passed it.

Continuous Opposition from "Interests."

The Act was found so beneficial to the Western grain growers that it was continually opposed by the elevator and railway interests, while the farmers as strenuously fought for it. In 1906 the Laurier government appointed a Commission to investigate grain trade conditions in various countries, and on their report amendments to the Act satisfactory to the grain growers were made by Sir Richard Cartwright, and confirmed by Parliament in 1908, in the face of strong opposition from the railway and elevator interests, the Bankers' Association, the Millers' Association, and the Conservative party, who were joined together to defeat the demands of the grain growers.

Government-owned Terminal Elevators.

Eventually it was found impossible to prevent the "mixing" of grades at privately owned elevators, so it was proposed to have Government-owned terminal elevators. In 1911 the Laurier govern-

ment made provision for a revised Grain Act. This retained the original principles of car distribution to farmers, regulating of grade mixing and in addition the establishment of a Grain Commission to handle the trade and further provided for Government control or ownership of terminal elevators. This Bill was brought down by Sir Richard Cartwright in the Senate, and passed through. It was bitterly opposed by the Conservative Opposition in the Commons and talked out, being killed with the dissolution of Parliament on the reciprocity question.

Although temporarily killed by the Conservatives in Opposition, the Borden government at their first session found the demand for this legislation so strong that they were compelled to take it up as a Government measure and practically the only useful legislation of their first session was to carry out the Liberal plans with regard to the Grain Act.

Senate Saved the Act in 1912.

As usual however they tried to favor "the interests" and several apparently innocent amendments were made, aimed to interfere with the right of the farmer to share in the distribution of cars. The Liberal legislation made statutory provision for the supply of cars direct to farmers; the Tory version strove to give the Grain Commission authority to suspend that provision whenever they saw fit—that is they could play into the hands of the railways and elevator men if they wanted to. Other amendments were presented favoring the interests of the railways and elevator owners as opposed to those of the grain growers. Fortunately there was a Liberal majority in the Senate. These amendments were thrown out, and the Borden government was compelled to accept the Senate's amendments.

Owing to the vigilance of the Liberal Opposition and the Liberal majority in the Senate, therefore, the Grain Act is now practically in the same shape as it was presented by the Laurier government in 1911, when it was temporarily killed by the Tory Opposition. Whatever advantages accrue to the Western grain growers through its working are entirely due to the work of the Laurier government, which forced the measure through and to the Liberal Opposition since 1911 which has kept it from being emasculated by the Borden government for the benefit of "the interests."

SIR WILFRID'S APPEAL TO QUEBEC.

"This, my compatriots, is what I ask—this is the entente cordiale I would have us achieve by service together. I have followed the ideal of conscience as prompted by my heart. Do not let us waver from the right line of conduct. I am older than most of you, and I am more than ever convinced that there is no real success but that which is based and has its foundations on right and justice and the generous instincts of the human heart. Let us unite to allay and, please God, to extinguish the prejudices that pull us apart, and do our utmost like real men and women to bring together the two elements in our country.

"Come, my young compatriots, with these brave young men who offer their services—their lives—that France may live, that Britain may continue her noble and generous rule and that heroic Belgium may be restored to her standing as a nation."

Sir Wilfrid Laurier, at Recruiting Meeting, Monument National, Montreal, June 3, 1916.

THE MONTH IN PARLIAMENT

1916.
May.
- 1 **WAR LOAN, \$250,000,000;** motion and statement by SIR ROBERT BORDEN, discussion by A. K. MacLEAN (Halifax), W. M. MARTIN (Regina), J. H. BURNHAM (W. Peterborough), J. G. TURRIFF (Assiniboia), E. M. MacDONALD (Pictou), J. J. HUGHES (Kings, P.E.I.), A. B. COPP (Westmoreland), E. N. RHODES (Cumberland), A. A. McLEAN (Queens, P.E.I.), HON. F. OLIVER, HON. R. LEMIEUX, HON. G. P. GRAHAM and others,—Resolution reported.
 - 2 **SUPPLEMENTARY ESTIMATES 1916-17** introduced—**WAR LOAN \$250,000,000**, bill introduced by SIR ROBERT BORDEN—**CANADA TEMPERANCE ACT**, amendment bill passed—**GOVERNMENT RAILWAYS SMALL CLAIMS ACT**, amendment bill passed—**SUPPLY**, Public Works Dept.
 - 3 **CANADIAN NORTHERN AND GRAND TRUNK PACIFIC RAILWAYS**, proposed loans (supplementary estimates), papers presented by SIR THOS. WHITE,—**DEPARTMENT OF INTERIOR**, orders-in-council approved, discussion by HON. F. OLIVER and HON. W. J. ROCHE,—**ST. JOHN & QUEBEC RAILWAY**, motion re subsidy introduced by HON. J. D. REID, discussion by HON. WM. PUGSLEY, HON. J. D. HAZEN, J. H. BURNHAM (W. Peterborough), A. B. COPP (Westmoreland), P. MICHAUD (Victoria, N.B.), motion reported and bill introduced,—**SUPPLY**, Dept. Railways and Canals. Discussion re Mount Royal Tunnel & Terminal Co., by HON. C. MARCIL, HON. A. MEIGHEN, HON. G. P. GRAHAM, bill re rentals passed.
 - 4 **ROYAL COMMISSION ON SHELL COMMITTEE CONTRACTS**, discussion by F. B. CARVELL on motion to adjourn; question deferred by consent,—**SUPPLY**, Dept. of Railways and Canals; discussion re Intercolonial Railway and re Edmonton, Dunvegan & B.C. Railway.
 - 5 **ROYAL COMMISSION ON SHELL COMMITTEE CONTRACTS**, proposal of F. B. CARVELL for widening of scope of Commission inquiry; discussion by F. B. CARVELL, SIR ROBERT BORDEN, HON. WM. PUGSLEY, HON. C. J. DOHERTY, E. M. MacDONALD (Pictou), HON. A. MEIGHEN and others; motion negatived on vote 46 to 19,—**ST. JOHN & QUEBEC RAILWAY**, subsidy bill passed,—**SUPPLY**, Dept. of Militia & Defense.
 - 6 **WAR LOAN, \$250,000,000**, bill passed, discussion by R. LANCTOT (LaPrairie-Napierville), HON. T. C. CASGRAIN, J. G. TURRIFF (Assiniboia), SIR ROBERT BORDEN,—**SUPPLY**, Post Office Dept., Dept. of Militia and Defense and Dept. of Trade and Commerce.
 - 8 **CANADIAN NORTHERN AND GRAND TRUNK PACIFIC RAILWAYS**, proposed loans; statement by SIR THOS. WHITE, discussion by HON. G. P. GRAHAM, SIR ROBERT BORDEN, J. G. TURRIFF (Assiniboia), E. M. MacDONALD (Pictou), HON. WM. PUGSLEY, HON. R. LEMIEUX,—**SUPPLY**, Dept. of Militia & Defense, Dept. of Railways & Canals, Dept. of Public Works.
 - 9 **BILINGUAL TEACHING IN SCHOOLS**, motion of E. LAPOINTE (Kamouraska), discussion on point of order by W. E. KNOWLES (Moose Jaw), SIR ROBERT BORDEN, SIR WILFRID LAURIER and others,—**SUPPLY**, Dept. of Public Works and other miscellaneous items; discussion re proposed loans to Canadian Northern and Grand Trunk Pacific Railways.
 - 10 **BILINGUAL TEACHING IN SCHOOLS**, debate on motion by E. LAPOINTE (Kamouraska), E. B. DEVLIN (Wright), SIR ROBERT BORDEN, SIR WILFRID LAURIER, HON. T. C. CASGRAIN, HON. RODOLPHE LEMIEUX and W. F. NICKLE (Kingston).
 - 11 **BILINGUAL TEACHING IN SCHOOLS**, debate continued by HON. CHAS. MARCIL, J. W. EDWARDS (Frontenac), P. E. LAMARCHE (Nicolet), H. B. MORPHY (N. Perth), J. A. ROBB (Huntingdon), HON. F. OLIVER, A. C. MacDONALD (S. Toronto), HON. G. P. GRAHAM, SIR GEO. FOSTER, F. F. PARDEE, (W. Lambton), H. CLARK (N. Bruce), E. PROULX (Prescott), HON. C. J. DOHERTY, G. H. BOIVIN (Shefford), D. O. LESPERANCE (Montmagny), R. B. BENNETT (Calgary), E. M. MacDONALD (Pictou); amendment of E. Lapointe negatived on vote, 107 to 60.
 - 12 **CANADIAN NORTHERN and GRAND TRUNK PACIFIC RAILWAYS**, proposed loans, discussion continued by W. F. MacLEAN (S. York), R. B. BENNETT (Calgary), H. H. STEVENS (Vancouver), J. G. TURRIFF (Assiniboia), W. F. COCKSHUTT (Brantford), E. M. MacDONALD (Pictou), HON. WM. PUGSLEY, HON. A. MEIGHEN, HON. F. OLIVER.
 - 13 **PUBLIC PRINTING**, report of Joint Committee presented by J. A. CURRIE (N. Simcoe)—Resignation of J. A. LAVALLEE (Bellechasse, Que.) announced by Speaker, **GRAIN CONGESTION IN WEST**, discussion by R. CRUISE (Dauphin) and HON. WM. PUGSLEY,—**SALE OF SMALL ARMS AMMUNITION**, motion by D. D. McKENZIE (N. Cape Breton) for investigation by Meredith-Duff Commission; discussion by SIR ROBERT BORDEN, SIR WILFRID LAURIER, SIR SAM HUGHES, F. B. CARVELL (Carleton, N.B.), HON. C. J. DOHERTY, HON. WM. PUGSLEY, E. M. MacDONALD (Pictou); McKenzie motion negatived, 40 to 17. Canadian Northern Railway proposed loan, further discussion.
 - 15 **CANADIAN NORTHERN RAILWAY**, proposed loan, discussion continued by HON. WM. PUGSLEY, R. B. BENNETT (Calgary), HON. G. P. GRAHAM, SIR THOS. WHITE, F. F. PARDEE (W. Lambton), HON. F. OLIVER and others,—**QUEBEC & SAGUENAY and LOTBINIERE & MEGANTIC RAILWAYS**, purchase bill, second reading moved by HON. J. D. REID; discussion by J. G. TURRIFF (Assiniboia), HON. WM. PUGSLEY, HON. A. MEIGHEN, HON. T. C. CASGRAIN and others.
 - 16 **QUEBEC & SAGUENAY and LOTBINIERE & MEGANTIC RAILWAYS**, purchase bill, discussion by HON. WM. PUGSLEY, HON. A. MEIGHEN, HON. F. OLIVER, SIR RODOLPHE FORGET, HON. RODOLPHE LEMIEUX, J. G. TURRIFF (Assiniboia), SIR WILFRID LAURIER, J. H. SINCLAIR (Guysborough), J. GIRARD (Chicoutimi and Saguenay), D. D. McKENZIE (N. Cape Breton), SIR ROBERT BORDEN; motion by SIR WILFRID LAURIER to send bill back to Committee negatived; bill passed,—**SHIPBUILDING**, discussion by E. M. MacDONALD (Pictou), SIR ROBERT BORDEN, G. H. BARNARD (Victoria, B.C.), J. H. SINCLAIR (Guysborough), SIR THOS. WHITE, D. D. McKENZIE (N. Breton), W. THOBURN (N. Lanark), W. F. CARROLL (S. Cape Breton).
 - 17 **SUPPLY**, Civil Government, discussion re Civil Service Act and appointments; discussion re shipments to British Columbia via Panama Canal by J. G. TURRIFF (Assiniboia) and HON. J. D. REID,—**ALLOWANCES TO DEPENDENTS OF SOLDIERS**, discussion by HON. F. OLIVER, SIR ROBERT BORDEN,—**THE ROSS RIFLE**, discussion.
 - 18 **SOLDIERS' PENSIONS**, report of Special Committee; discussion by SIR ROBERT BORDEN, HON. J. D. HAZEN, E. M. MacDONALD (Pictou), HON. RODOLPHE LEMIEUX, W. F. NICKLE (Kingston), HON. F. OLIVER, A. C. MacDONELL (S. Toronto)—**PUBLIC PRINTING**, motion of Committee re proposed reduction in cost agreed to,—**PARLIAMENT PROROGUED**.

COMPETITION PRIZES COMMISSION

For Securing
Subscriptions to **THE CANADIAN LIBERAL MONTHLY**

BOYS AND GIRLS

(Under 18 years of age)

June, July and August

1916

TWENTY % COMMISSION TO CANVASSERS.

In addition **EIGHTEEN CASH PRIZES** to the boys and girls getting the greatest number of Subscriptions; also a **GENERAL PRIZE** for sending in 25 Subscriptions.

For Particulars write to the Secretary: Central Liberal Information Office, Hope Chambers, Ottawa, Ont.

Subscription Price
25 cents a Year.

BOYS AND GIRLS GET BUSY!



The Simmons Printing Company, Limited, Ottawa, Ont.