DOMINION OF CANADA

OFFICIAL REPORT

OF

DEBATES

HOUSE OF COMMONS

FIFTH SESSION—THIRTEENTH PARLIAMENT

11-12 GEORGE V, 1921

IN FIVE VOLUMES

Volume I: Pages 1-1000 **Volume II: Pages 1001-2026**
Volume III: Pages 2027-3003 **Volume IV: Pages 3005-4040**
Volume V: Pages 4041-4580

VOLUME CXLVII

COMPRISING THE PERIOD FROM THE SEVENTEENTH DAY OF MARCH TO THE TWELFTH DAY OF APRIL, 1921, INCLUSIVE.

OTTAWA
F. A. ACLAND
PRINTER TO THE KING'S MOST EXCELLENT MAJESTY
1921

CANADA

House of Commons Debates

OFFICIAL REPORT

Thursday, March 17, 1921

The House met at Three o'clock.

PRIVATE BILLS COMMITTEE

Mr. MICHAEL STEELE (South Perth) presented the first report of the Select Standing Committee on Miscellaneous Private Bills.

REPORTS

Re-organization of the Department of Public Printing and Stationery.—Right Hon. Sir George Foster.

Conditions in the Department of Printing and Stationery; supplementary report.—Right Hon. Sir George Foster.

RESIGNATION OF SIR HERBERT B. AMES

Mr. SPEAKER: I have the honour to inform the House that I have received the resignation of Sir Herbert B. Ames as member for the electoral district of St. Antoine, Montreal. I have accordingly issued my warrant to the Chief Electoral Officer to make out a new writ of election for the said electoral district.

QUESTIONS

(Questions answered orally are indicated by an asterisk.)

DOMINION CANNERS—GREEK AND ROUMANIAN PURCHASES

*Mr. ARCHAMBAULT:

1. Has the Government paid to the Dominion Canners Company certain sums of money for goods bought on behalf of Greece and Roumania?

2. If so, (a) for what amount, (b) what date, (c) what is the nature of these goods?

Right Hon. Sir GEORGE FOSTER:

1. No.

2. Answered by No. 1.

TRADE AGENTS IN UNITED STATES

Mr. BUCHANAN:

1. Has it been recommended to the Government that trade agents should be appointed in different sections of the United States in order to develop an export trade with that country?

2. If so, does the Government intend to act favourably on the proposal.

Right Hon. Sir GEORGE FOSTER:

1 and 2. Previous to the outbreak of the war, a more general extension of Canadian trade agencies had been under consideration but was then postponed owing to the general disorganization due to the war. The matter has since been taken up and is now under advisement by the Department. When a decision has been finally reached, the intention of the Government will be made known.

DOMINION NOTE CIRCULATION

Mr. SINCLAIR (Antigonish and Guysborough):

1. What was the Dominion note circulation on the 31st of March, 1914?

2. What is it now?

Sir HENRY DRAYTON:

1. $117,795,718.53.

2. February 28, 1921, $290,194,519.92. Of this total $137,115,075 is against approved securities under the provisions of the Finance Act.

CREDIT TO BELGIUM

Mr. PACAUD:

1. Is the credit of $25,000,000 that was granted to Belgium on the 21st of March, 1919, still in force?

2. If not, at whose request and for what reason was it cancelled?

3. Is the Government aware that the Belgian Government would like to avail itself of such a credit to purchase in Canada our Canadian wheat?

4. If so, does the Canadian Government intend to renew such a credit?

Sir HENRY DRAYTON:

1. No.

2. Under the agreement of March 21st, 1919, purchases were to be made before the thirty-first day of December, 1919, the unemployed portion of the credit at that date to be cancelled.

3. No.

4. Answered by No. 3.

Mr. W. N. TILLEY, K.C.

Mr. BROUILLARD:

1. Upon whose recommendation was W. N. Tilley, K.C., appointed Counsel for the Government of Canada on the arbitration proceedings between the Dominion of Canada and the Grand Trunk Railway Company?

2. What is his remuneration in such services?

Right Hon. Mr. DOHERTY:

1. Mr. Tilly was retained upon the responsibility of the Government.

2. Retainer, $10,000; $400 per day for days engaged out of Toronto; $100 per day for days in Toronto.

MR. E. F. NEWCOMBE, BARRISTER

Mr. BROUILLARD:

1. Is E. F. Newcombe, barrister, Ottawa, employed by the Government with the arbitration proceedings between the Dominion of Canada and the Grand Trunk Railway Company?

2. If so, what is his position and upon whose recommendation was he appointed?

3. What is his remuneration?

4. Is he a son of the Deputy Minister of Justice?

5. Is the Government aware that he was only admitted to practice law within the past two years?

6. What are his special qualifications for this work?

7. Has he received any other work from the Department of Justice?

8. If so, upon whose recommendation, and what was the kind of work given him and how much has he earned to date for services other than connected with the Grand Trunk Railway arbitration?

Right Hon. Mr. DOHERTY:

1. Yes.

2. He was retained by Mr. W. N. Tilley, K.C., leading counsel for the Dominion, who, when he was retained, stipulated the right to select junior counsel.

3. $30 per day for each day upon which he is exclusively engaged upon the work of the arbitration.

4. Yes.

5. No. He was admitted in 1916.

6. The Government is advised that his qualifications are excellent.

7. Yes.

8. Upon the responsibility of the department; litigated matters; earnings according to departmental record $570.

QUESTIONS PASSED AS ORDERS FOR RETURNS

Mr. SINCLAIR (Antigonish and Guysborough):

1. Was suction dredge Tornado employed in dredging in Courtney Bay or St. John Harbour, N.B., during the year 1920?

2. If so, who is the owner?

3. Whre was the dredge built?

4. At what date did she arrive at St. John?

5. From what port did she sail?

6. What was the total expenditure to December 31st, 1920, in connection with the work done by this dredge?

7. Were certain pontoons lost at the time that said dredge was brought to St. John?

8. If so, were the same recovered?

9. Where is the dredge Tornado now?

[Mr. Brouillard.]

Mr. EDWARDS:

1. What were the amounts appropriated for the National Gallery of Canada from April 1, 1916, to April 1, 1921?

2. How were these appropriations expended?

3. Who is in charge of the National Gallery, when was he appointed, at what salary and what is his present salary?

4. How many officials are on the staff at the Gallery, what are their names, dates of appointment and respective salaries?

5. What officials on the Gallery staff have been drawing their salaries while the Gallery has been closed and at what work were they employed?

6. When was the National Gallery closed, why, and when will it be re-opened?

EASTER ADJOURNMENT

Right Hon. ARTHUR MEIGHEN (Prime Minister) moved.

That when this House adjourns on Wednesday, the 23rd instant, it do stand adjourned until Tuesday, the 29th instant.

Motion agreed to.

WEDNESDAY EVENING SITTINGS

Right Hon. ARTHUR MEIGHEN moved:

That on Wednesday, the 30th instant, and on all subsequent Wednesdays to the end of the session, the House shall meet at Three o'clock, p.m., and that the sitting on such days shall, in every respect, be under the same rules provided for other days.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: May I ask my right hon. friend if the motion proposes to do away with the Wednesday evening adjournments?

Mr. MEIGHEN: Yes. I am moving the resolution at about the usual time of the session, but I believe that on the first coming up of the motion it is not usual to press it if it is felt that the delay of another week would be convenient to hon. gentlemen on either side. However, the Government would like to have the motion passed.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: I would like to suggest to the Prime Minister that he should follow the custom of previous years, unless there is some very strong reason why it should be departed from.

Mr. MEIGHEN: It will be observed that the motion does not propose to take Wednesday as a Government day, what is proposed is simply to sit for the entire day on Wednesday. If the hon. gentleman would prefer I will have the motion provide for another week's delay and follow it possibly by a motion to take Wednesday as a Government day later.

Mr. SPEAKER: The motion stands.

TRADE WITH RUSSIA

On the Orders of the Day:

Hon. CHARLES MURPHY (Russell): Mr. Speaker, in view of the announcement that a trade agreement has been entered into between the Government of Great Britain and the Soviet Government of Russia, may I inquire if this Government has taken or is about to take any steps to promote trade between Canada and Russia?

Right Hon. Sir GEORGE FOSTER (Minister of Trade and Commerce): Mr. Speaker, no particular steps have been taken of late. The situation as regards Russia and Canada is simply this—that any Russian subject has a perfect right to come to Canada to make purchases and provide for payment to the Canadians from whom he makes purchases; and Canadians have a perfect right to trade with Russian subjects. Notwithstanding the trade commissions that we sent to Russia, conditions in that country entirely apart from general world conditions, are not favourable to Canadian trade; but since the Armistice there has been no embargo on trade relations between the two countries.

Mr. J. H. SINCLAIR (Antigonish and Guysborough): Mr. Speaker, do the terms of the treaty which has been completed between Great Britain and Russia apply to Canada?

Sir GEORGE FOSTER: The treaty between Great Britain and the Soviet authorities has been concluded entirely irrespective of the self-governing dominions.

Mr. MURPHY: May I ask the right hon. gentleman if the conditions in Russia to which he referred militate against Canada to any greater degree than they do against Great Britain?

Sir GEORGE FOSTER: The conditions in Russia are equally unfortunate for both countries. They arise from the confused state of affairs in Russia itself and from the almost complete breakdown of transportation facilities there; those are the special conditions. Then, of course, there is the general trade condition of the world in the matter of exchange and credits.

CANADIAN NATIONAL RAILWAYS

PRODUCTION OF PAPERS

On the Orders of the Day:

Mr. F. S. CAHILL (Pontiac): Mr. Speaker, I wish to ask the Minister of Railways and Canals (Mr. Reid), in view of his statement regarding the resolution of the hon. member for Quebec West (Mr. Parent), if it is the policy of the Government that correspondence between the officers of the Canadian National Railways will not be produced in this House when asked for?

Hon. J. D. REID (Minister of Railways and Canals): Mr. Speaker, the answer I gave to the hon. member (Mr. Parent) was that the correspondence he asked for was not in the possession of the Government, and of course I could not produce it.

Mr. CAHILL: I would ask the minister whether he refuses to produce the correspondence? The matter has to do with his department.

Hon. W. S. FIELDING (Shelburne and Queen's): Does my hon. friend mean to imply that transactions relating to the Canadian National railways are not to be brought to the notice of this House, and that an hon. member cannot properly ask, subject to the usual rule regarding confidential matters, to have brought before Parliament any correspondence relating to any public matter in the Dominion of Canada?

Right Hon. ARTHUR MEIGHEN (Prime Minister): This is a subject that has come up very frequently, and the rule adopted by Parliament is, I think, well known. The board of directors of the National railways operate the system just as the board of directors of any other railway whose stock is not owned by the Government operate their system. The correspondence of the board of directors is in the possession of the National Railways, and it has not been the practice that this Government should ask that all matters of operation be submitted to it or to this House for review; they come before the House in the usual way in the annual report of the board of directors. That is the policy which has been adopted and which now prevails.

Mr. FIELDING: Subject to the general rule that confidential documents cannot in the public interest be produced, which we admit readily, does my right hon. friend imply that because the Canadian National Railways take the form of a company, in which the people of Canada are the owners of all the stock, therefore we cannot ask for papers relating to the transactions of that vast enterprise in which the people's money is invested?

Mr. MEIGHEN: This House has review of the work of the enterprise of course. But correspondence in connection with the operation of the road between the board of directors and anybody concerned is not in the possession of the Government, and is not the same at all as correspondence between departments of Government and others, which, of course, must be brought down upon resolution of this House. It has not been the practice, nor do I know how we can have such a thing as independent non-political operation of the road if the correspondence of the Canadian National system is to be produced. It is impossible. You must choose between one way and the other

Hon. W. L. MACKENZIE KING (leader of the Opposition): Does my right hon. friend recognize no obligations, by virtue of these being government-owned railways, to produce any correspondence as distinct from correspondence of a privately-owned corporation? Is there no obligation on the Government to produce any correspondence relating to the Canadian National railways?

Mr. MEIGHEN: I have answered that as fully as I can. The question is not removed from difficulty, I admit. The Government of the country is the owner of the stock of the road. But if any matter connected with operation is, by means of the production of correspondence, to be brought before this Parliament for review, that means direct political control of the road, and that we are determined to avoid.

CANADIAN NATIONAL RAILWAYS

OPERATION—CANCELLATION OF TRAINS

On the Orders of the Day:

Mr. GEORGE PARENT (Quebec West): May I ask the Minister of Railways if his department has anything to do with the cancellation of certain trains on the Canadian National railways?

Hon. J. D. REID (Minister of Railways and Canals): The Department of Railways and Canals has nothing whatever to do with the cancellation of trains or in fact with anything connected with the operation of the road.

Mr. PARENT: I wanted to find out from the minister, because on February 28 he answered that the Government had something to do with the cancellation of trains and was in possession—

Mr. SPEAKER: On the Orders of the Day there can be no cross-questioning of ministers; any answer received must be accepted.

Mr. JACQUES BUREAU (Three Rivers): Are the Canadian National railways operated under the Canadian National Railways Act passed by this Parliament some years ago?

Hon. Mr. REID: No, Mr. Speaker, that Act has not yet been brought into force.

SUPPLY—RULE 17C

On the Order being called for the House to go into Committee of Supply.

Mr. SPEAKER: Under Rule 17c the mere calling of this order makes it necessary for the Speaker to leave the Chair without question put, but the Minister of Railways and Canals (Mr. Reid) has intimated to me that he would prefer to make his railway statement with the Speaker in the Chair. I therefore submit the question to the House, as to whether he shall have unanimous consent for the purpose of making his statement, following which, and complying with the rule, I shall leave the Chair.

Mr. BUREAU: Is this a motion?

Mr. SPEAKER: No. It does not abrogate the rule in any way.

Mr. CRERAR: Is this a statement by the Minister of Railways preliminary to the introduction of his estimates?

Mr. REID (Grenville): This is my annual statement in connection with the National Railways showing the results of operation for the year 1920.

Mr. SPEAKER: Is it the pleasure of the House that the hon. minister should have leave to make his statement?

Some hon. MEMBERS: Carried.

CANADIAN NATIONAL RAILWAYS

ANNUAL STATEMENT BY THE MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS

Hon. J. D. REID (Minister of Railways and Canals): Mr. Speaker, before you leave the Chair and the House is in Committee of Supply, I wish to submit my annual statement in connection with the Canadian National railways. I wish to follow the usual custom and make a statement in connection with the operation of our Canadian government-owned and controlled railway systems for the year 1920. The statement I intend to submit is compiled from statistical information which I will

submit to the House before I close, and which was supplied me by the Board of Management who have charge of the operation of the National Railway system. Before going into the matter it would be well perhaps to explain how the operation of our National Railway system is being carried on. When the Government took over the Canadian Northern system and connected it up with the Intercolonial and Transcontinental railways, a policy had to be decided on as to how the roads would be managed, the Prime Minister of Canada, Sir Robert Borden, announced to the House and to the public what that policy would be. His announcement appears in Hansard, of the session of 1918, May 15, page 1999, when, speaking of the management of these railways, he laid this down as his policy.

As to the immediate future, I have already said that we do not intend to operate the Canadian Northern Railway system directly under a department of the Government; it is our intention to operate it for the present through the corporate machinery by which it has been operated in the past. There will be a reconstituted board of directors. We shall endeavour to get the best men we can and we shall not interfere with them. We shall leave the administration and operation of that road to be carried on absolutely under that Board of directors and we shall use every means available to the Government (and if necessary, we shall come to Parliament for that purpose) in order that anything like political influence, political patronage, or political interference—I am using the word political in its narrower sense—shall be absolutely eliminated from the administration of that road.

That was the policy laid down by the Prime Minister, and in accordance with it a board was constituted and has been in charge of the management of Canadian National railways from its organization up to the present time, and the operation has been carried on quite independent of the Department of Railways and Canals.

I regret they were not able to submit a statement as satisfactory as I would like. A year ago I announced the deficit for 1919 as $47,993,312. When final figures were available the actual loss was found to have been $48,242,536

Mr. FIELDING: Does that mean in operation only?

Hon. Mr. REID: No, that is operation and fixed charges. My statement explains these matters in detail. After I get through, if there are any questions I shall be glad to answer them.

When I made my annual statement of the operation of these roads a year ago I believed from discussions I had with the management I would be able to advise the House this year that the deficit of 1919 had been reduced in 1920. Instead of a reduction I must inform the House that the loss in operation alone for the year ending December 31st, 1920, is much larger, and is as follows:

Canadian Northern	$16,258,579 80
Canadian Government	10,449,876 43
Total operating deficit of the Canadian National Railways:	26,708,456 23
To which we add the operating deficit of the Grand Trunk Pacific, which since Aug. 23rd last has been under management of the Canadian National Board, amounting to	10,134,513 94
Making a total operating deficit of	$36,842,970 17

To this must be added the interest on bonds, etc., or what are called fixed charges and which have been paid or assumed by the Government, and are as follows:—

Canadian Northern	$24,155,988 48
Grand Trunk Pacific	9,332,776 23
Making the total deficit for operation and fixed charges	$70,331,734 88

And this does not take into consideration any interest or fixed charges on Transcontinental or Intercolonial railways.

A Canadian National income credit, which will be shown in the statement of detail, reduces this sum to $69,593,441, which is the loss on operation and fixed charges for 1920, as against 48 millions in 1919. The management explain this increased loss of twenty millions chiefly by increased expenditures in pay-rolls and fuel.

In carrying on maintenance the management explain that the cost of many materials and supplies had increased very much over 1919. They also state that prices of equipment such as locomotives and cars advanced very greatly, all of which have added, and will continue to add, to the cost of operation. In a word, out of every dollar earned we had to pay 75 cents for operating wages, and 20 cents for fuel, leaving 5 cents for all other requirements which totalled 29 cents.

The mileage operated by the Canadian National management last year was as follows:—

	Miles
Canadian Northern	9,859·78
Intercolonial Railway and branches.	2,221·86
Transcontinental Railway	2,006·58
Quebec & Saguenay and St. John & Quebec	234·07
Grand Trunk Pacific	2,732·40
Total at end of 1920	17,054·69

There were added during 1920, 140 miles by purchase of 236 miles on completion of of new construction.

To put in simplest form possible the earnings and operating expenses I submit the following statement:—

	1920	1919
GROSS EARNINGS		
Canadian Northern System	$66,695,398 80	$53,562,177 57
Canadian Government	44,537,803 85	40,179,380 93
Grand Trunk Pacific	14,408,549 66	11,294,617 87
	$125,141,752 31	$105,036,176 37
OPERATING EXPENSES		
Canadian Northern System	$ 82,953,978 60	$ 60,034,023 92
Canadian Government	54,987,680 28	47,728,205 73
Grand Trunk Pacific	24,543,063 60	17,587,567 37
	$162,484,722 48	$125,349,797 02
OPERATING DEFICIT		
Canadian Northern System	$16,258,579 80	$ 6,471,846 35
Canadian Government	10,449,876 43	7,548,824 80
Grand Trunk Pacific	10,134,513 94	6,292,949 50
	$36,842,970 17	$20,313,620 65
FIXED CHARGES		
Canadian Northern:		
Due public	$13,933,695 36	$13,030,336 68
Interest due Gov't	10,326,260 69	6,939,373 68
Grand Trunk Pacific:		
Due public	6,048,950 60	6,048,950 00
Interest due Gov't	2,475,474 00	2,460,088 40
Interest on Receiver's certificates for 1920	808,351 63	212,176 05
	$33,652,732 28	$28,690,925 41
TOTAL DEFICIT (OPERATING AND FIXED CHARGES).		
Canadian Northern System	$40,578,535 85	$26,441,556 71
Canadian Government	10,449,876 43	7,548,824 80
Grand Trunk Pacific	19,467,290 17	15,014,163 95
	$70,495,702 45	$49,004,545 46

The figures for 1920, while subject to minor changes, are practically complete.

The management emphasize the fact that maintenance deferred during the war made it absolutely necessary to as far as possible overtake this work at increased cost during 1920 to protect the property. They also found it necessary to improve to a large extent terminal facilities and main lines if they were to take care of the traffic satisfactorily to the public and be in a position to compete with other lines operating throughout the country.

Coming now to the year 1921, or the Estimates before you, the management figure on considerable reduction in the deficit in operation owing to curtailment of train services, reduction of maintenance forces and other economies. They also expect a re-adjustment in the price of materials, also in the wage schedules and working conditions, which should have a substantial effect in reduction of operating costs. The Estimates as submitted to the House were those submitted by the officials of the Canadian National railway, and in detail show the following for 1921:

Loss on Canadian Northern, including fixed charges	$23,074,847
Canadian Government Railway, operating deficit	7,000,000
Grand Trunk Pacific, deficit on operation and fixed charges	19,817,873
	$49,822,720
To this should be added $11,000,000 interest payable to the Finance Department for advances made to the Canadian Northern system by the Dominion Government, or a total of	$60,822,720

The votes passed by Parliament last session in order to acquire additional rolling stock and motive power to enable the system to properly handle its proportion of the traffic of the country was expended in the purchase of the following equipment:

LOCOMOTIVES

20 Medium Pacific, from Montreal Locomotive Works.
10 Heavy Pacific, from Montreal Locomotive Works.
25 Sante Fe, from Montreal Locomotive Works.
20 Switchers, from Canadian Locomotive Works.

FREIGHT

650 General service cars, from Eastern Car Company.
500 Box cars, from Eastern Car Company.
1,500 Box cars, from National Steel Car Co.
1,000 Box cars, from Canadian Car Company.
500 Refrigerator cars, from Canadian Car Co.
350 Ballast cars, from Hart-Otis Car Co.
150 Stock cars, from Canadian Car & Foundry Co.
80 Cabooses, from Canadian Car & Foundry Co.
20 Cabooses, from Preston Car & Coach Co.
6 Snow plows, from Eastern Car Company.

PASSENGER

18 Sleepers, from Canadian Car & Foundry Co.
12 Diners, from Canadian Car & Foundry Co.
20 Baggage cars, from Canadian Car & Foundry Co.
20 Express Refrigerator, from National Steel Car Co.

4,901 Total.

All of this has been delivered with the exception of the passenger train equipment. The sleepers are now arriving, and will be completed by the end of March. Baggage car deliveries commenced March 9, and completion is promised by the end of April. Dining car deliveries are promised commencing April 8, and completion of the express refrigerators has definitely been promised during the month of May.

With reference to the purchase of locomotives, cars and rolling stock in general, prices have been increased very much. I submit the following statement for the information of the House showing some of the increases, caused by increased cost and heavier power and steel construction:

	1914-15		1920
Locomotives	$24,000	$61,250 to	$72,500
Standard sleepers	28,250		49,500
Dining cars	25,050		46,000
Baggage cars (wooden)	6,166	(Steel)	24,000
Freight refrigerators	1,640		5,025
Express refrigerators	4,642		12,240
General service freight cars	1,346		3,250
Box cars	1,150		2,960
Stock cars	846		2,640

These figures will show what the railways are up against.

Freight tonnage increased sixteen per cent over 1919 and passenger traffic by about a million, but while the quantity of freight and number of passengers increased, the haul in each case was shorter and returns not as great as expected.

Rate increases have been given from time to time in an effort to meet increased cost of operation under the McAdoo and United States Labour Board awards, under which the average wage per employee of the Canadian National system is now $1,850 as compared with $700 before the war. The result is the operating pay roll last year was $83,505,072 as compared with $40,606,170 in 1917. In addition wages on capital work required $12,222,045, making a total pay roll of $95,727,117. These figures justify immediate discussion between employees and management.

Of course, the railway situation in Canada, as elsewhere, is a product of the war. Every country in the world had to stand behind its railways during the war. We had no alternative but to follow suit and I am satisfied that, without the powerful support of the Government in the crisis which the war developed the railway situation would have been such that we would not have been able to carry on necessary war transportation facilities, and a collapse of our whole transportation system would have followed.

Let me refer briefly to the general railway situation throughout the United States. The total operating revenues for 1920, as reported by the Interstate Commerce Commission were $6,225,000,000, the largest in the history of American railroads, and $1,041,000,000 greater than for 1919. Operating expenses, however, consumed $5,826,197,000 of this, or $1,406,000,000 more than in 1919. The net operating income was only $62,264,421, as compared with an average of over $900,000,000 for the three years preceding the war. It is less than the roads should earn in one month to receive the six per cent which the United States Transportation Act prescribes as the measure of fair return on the investment; it is less than one-fourth of the various taxes payable by the roads, and represents a profit of almost exactly one per cent on the gross business done during the year, when the railroads handled more freight and passengers than ever before in their history. The sixty-two millions of net operating income was earned by about half of the Class 1 roads, the other half having deficits for the year. The United States Government has had to come to the rescue by a guarantee of about $600,000,000 for the six months' period following de-control. Of this sum about $200,000,000 has, it is

stated, already been paid out for back wages under the Railroad Labour Board award. Only a special Act of Congress authorizing partial payments pending final settlement of the guarantee made it possible for many of these roads to avoid bankruptcy.

In England, passenger fares are seventy-five per cent above pre-war figures, and freight rates, from September 1st last, 112 per cent. Costs of materials have increased 200 per cent, and wages have increased 250 per cent. Further rate increases are contemplated, though short-distance freight has already commenced to move over the highways. In twenty months, the Government has had to provide about $350,000,000 under the Government guarantee, and claims are being made by the railways totalling $750,000,000 for arrears of maintenance, abnormal wear and tear, and replacement of stores. The British Government, therefore, faces a threatened loss of a billion dollars.

I hope I have made it clear that the result of the operation of Canadian National railways was not worse than obtained generally on the other side of the line and overseas. But that does not mean we should not take action to try and prevent these losses. At the present time the country is faced with permanent fixed charges as follows:

Interest public debt (including sinking fund)..	$142,800,000
Pensions..	31,816,000
Permanent expenditure for carrying on the affairs of the Government about..	127,000,000
Total, about..	$301,616,000

This without one dollar for carrying on public works, expenditures in connection with soldier settlement and re-establishment, and many other expenditures that must be provided for.

This means very heavy taxation for many years, and it would be a very serious matter to have increased taxation for railways to the extent of fifty, sixty or seventy million of dollars per annum to meet the cost of operation of railways.

As regard these heavy losses I must frankly admit I cannot see much hope of any management materially reducing the loss on Grand Trunk Pacific and Transcontinental railways for some years, but I do feel the losses on the other portions of the road can be reduced, and must be very materially, every year.

[Mr. J. D. Reid.]

Grand Trunk Railway

The members should have a full statement with reference to the operations of the Grand Trunk railway, and when I say Grand Trunk railway I refer to the Grand Trunk Railway system now being taken over by the Government, the valuation of which is at present being decided by the board of arbitration.

I have not been able to get the annual closing statement from the Grand Trunk management up to the present time. Their staff is busy in connection with the arbitration proceedings. I had to send one of our expert auditors to secure from their books, and submit, a statement as to results of operations for the years 1919 and 1920, and he gives me the following report as approximately correct. After providing for operating expenses, tax accruals, income deductions, etc., the amount available for interest and dividends was, for 1919, $11,164,035.53; for 1920, $5,692,300.74. These amounts were available to meet interest and fixed charges on the following: 4 per cent and 5 per cent debenture stocks of the Grand Trunk, interest on all mortgage bonds of the Grand Trunk, interest on all mortgage bonds of the Grand Trunk Western, interest on all mortgage bonds of the Central Vermont, interest on secured notes of the Grand Trunk Railway, interest on equipment notes of the three companies, interest on guaranteed stock, first preference stock, second preference stock, third preference stock.

Out of the above amounts, the railway was able to meet in 1919 the interest on their fixed charges, but not on the share capital which includes the 4 per cent guaranteed stock, first, second and third preference stock, and ordinary stock. In 1920 the company falls short $6,563,091.33 of meeting interest on fixed charges. In justice, however, to the Grand Trunk management I should add that they had to pay $3,635,000 to the employees for back pay between May 1st and September 1st, when no increases for freight rates had been allowed.

In making this statement, however, it must be remembered that I am not taking into account the loss of $19,817,873 on the Grand Trunk Pacific railway, a subsidiary of the Grand Trunk railway, which the Grand Trunk Railway Company are responsible for, an amount sufficient to wipe out at any time all of the excess earnings as shown in the above statement. Later on in the session I hope to have from the

management, further information in order to give more details.

What is the best way to improve the situation? I am ready to take, in fact I seek, advice from any or every member of this House, or whoever may be able to make any suggestion of value. Our present system of administration by a board entirely free from interference by any minister, by any department, or by the Government, is one which public opinion has demanded, and which, if we can carry it on and make the railways a success, is no doubt better for all concerned. The press and public opinion are very critical over our railway problem, and rightly so. Notwithstanding the dark side I have shown, I am still a firm believer in the ultimate success of our National Railways. But as in all other large institutions, success depends on how they are managed. This question is too big to be a political football. Might I ask the House to discuss it in its larger aspect rather than in some minor detail? Let us have instead a frank discussion of the whole railway policy.

The solution of the problem is one which will require joint action by the management and employees. Not only as employees, as operators of the road, but as citizens of Canada, their interests are identical, and I feel sure that if they, the management and employees, meet and take up the whole railway problem, they can deal with it in such a way as to preserve the good relations which have so far existed between them. Unless some action is taken, not only to reduce the annual loss occurring each year, but also to place the railways in a position to reduce the freight rates, I am satisfied the future advancement of the country will be seriously interfered with. Our railways were built to develop our natural resources, to build up our country, and to connect the East with the West in interprovincial trade. Good work has been done and it must not stop. Let me give you one or two illustrations of what high freight rates are doing. We in the province of Ontario have for many years required, in fact used, lumber and timber grown and manufactured in the province of British Columbia. To-day this trade is absolutely cut off owing to high freight rates, thus injuring British Columbia, and Ontario and our country as a whole. British Columbia requires the markets of the western provinces and even the eastern provinces for their products. It is impossible for British Columbia to grow and ship fruit and lumber at the present high rates of freight. The Prairie Provinces must live from the products of the soil. They cannot produce wheat and other products of their farms and ship it to foreign markets if these high freight rates are to continue indefinitely, and vice versa, things that are manufactured in the East that the people of the prairie and British Columbia require, cannot be produced and shipped to the western provinces if these high rates of freight are to continue. And if we are hindered in the production and manufacture of our natural products which improve our financial condition and add to the wealth of our country, does it not mean that the development of our country will be delayed until we are in a position to produce and manufacture on a basis equal to that of other countries? Surely this is a fair statement of the situation.

I must now conclude, but cannot do so without repeating my own honest opinion that our railways are a great asset for the future of Canada. If well and properly managed, and the press and public will only boost and not knock, it will be possible in a few years to show to the world just what a magnificent country we have in Canada.

Now, Mr. Speaker, with the permission of the House I would like to place on Hansard certain statistical and detailed information concerning last year's operations which has been suplied me by the management and which will be found of great value by hon. members.

These statements include comparative summaries of operating results and traffic statistics; a statement with regard to betterments and new construction during 1920, a comparative statement of equipment and some useful detailed information as to increased costs of rolling stock, material and supplies.

Mr. SPEAKER: The House, is of course, aware that only under exceptional circumstances are documents permitted to be inserted in Hansard when they have not been read. But, as the documents in question are of undoubted importance, I should like to know the pleasure of the House, whether it gives unanimous consent to their being incorporated in Hansard unread.

Some hon. MEMBERS: Carried.

(The documents referred to are as follows):

CANADIAN NATIONAL RAILWAYS
CANADIAN NORTHERN RAILWAY SYSTEM
CANADIAN GOVERNMENT RAILWAYS

COMPARATIVE SUMMARY OF OPERATING RESULTS 12 MONTHS ENDING DECEMBER 31, 1920-1919.

——	1920.	1919	Increase or Decrease	% Increase or Decrease
	$ cts.	$ cts.	$ cts.	
Operating Revenue—				
Canadian Northern	66,695,398 80	53,562,177 57	13,133,221 23	24·52
Canadian Government	44,537,803 85	40,179,380 93	4,358,422 92	10·84
Canadian National	111,233,202 65	93,741,558 50	17,491,644 15	18·66
Distribution—				
Passenger	21,092,253 10	21,837,744 47	−745,491 37	− 3·41
Freight	80,193,342 44	63,154,773 39	17,038,569 05	26·98
Other	9,947,607 11	8,749,040 64	1,198,566 47	13·70
Operating Expenses—				
Canadian Northern	82,953,978 60	60,034,023 92	22,919,954 68	38·18
Canadian Government	54,987,680 28	47,728,205 73	7,259,474 55	11·86
Canadian National	137,941,658 88	107,762,229 65	30,179,429 23	28·00
Distribution—				
Maintenance of way and Structure	34,759,329 17	28,476,450 66	6,282,878 51	22·06
Maintenance of Equipment	27,963,511 21	19,950,409 17	8,013,102 04	40·15
Traffic	2,140,576 09	1,478,372 41	662,203 68	44·79
Trans.—Rail	68,146,727 31	52,914,891 80	15,231,835 51	28·78
Trans.—Water	348,553 63	782,316 69	−433,763 06	−55·45
Miscellaneous	2,320,234 54	1,877,168 08	443,066 46	23·60
General	2,965,769 87	2,282,620 84	683,149 03	29·93
Trans. of Capital account material (credit)	703,042 94	.....	703,042 94	.....
Operating Ratios—				
Canadian Northern	124 38	112 08	12 30	10·97
Canadian Government	123 46	118 79	4 67	3·93
Canadian National	124 01	114 96	9 05	7·87
Operating Deficit—				
Canadian Northern	16,258,579 80	6,471,846 35	9,786,733 45	151·22
Canadian Government	10,449,876 43	7,548,824 80	2,901,051 63	38·43
Canadian National	26,708,456 23	14,020,671 15	12,687,785 08	90·49
Average Mileage operated—				
Steam	13,854·9	13,502·5	352·4	2·61
Electric	126·2	126·2	.....	.....
Total	13,981·1	13,628·7	352·4	2·58
Revenue Train Miles	33,127,889	29,633,398	3,494,491	11·79
Earnings per R.T.M	3·30	3·09	0·21	6·79
Expenses per R.T.M	4·11	3·57	0·54	15·13
Net Earnings per R.T.M (Water lines excluded).	−0·81	−0·48	−0·33	−68·75

CANADIAN NATIONAL RAILWAYS
CANADIAN NORTHERN RAILWAY
CANADIAN GOVERNMENT RAILWAYS

—	1920	1921	Increase or Decrease	Increase or Decrease
	$ cts.	$ cts.	$ cts.	$ cts.
Operating deficit	26,708,456 23	14,020,671 15	12,687,785 08	90·49
Canadian Government Rentals	567,240 00	697,344 22	−130,104 22	−18·66
Miscellaneous Income (Credit)	1,585,061 68	1,255,143 15	329,918 53	26·28
Deficit St. John and Quebec	346,015 49	187,269 97	158,745 50	84·77
Net deficit, excluding Canadian Northern fixed charges and miscellaneous income balance	26,035,650 04	13,650,142 19	12,386,507 85	90·74

CANADIAN NATIONAL RAILWAYS
CANADIAN NORTHERN RAILWAY
CANADIAN GOVERNMENT RAILWAYS

COMPARISON OF PAYROLL, TWELVE MONTHS ENDED DECEMBER 31, 1920, INCLUDING BETTERMENTS

—	1920	1919	Increase	%
	$ cts.	$ cts.	$ cts.	
Canadian Government	37,103,129 97	31,855,264 61	5,247,865 36	16·47
Canadian Northern	54,973,613 24	43,366,183 65	11,607,429 59	26·76
Canadian National	92,076,743 21	75,221,448 26	16,855,294 95	22·40

EXPLANATION OF INCREASE

—	Canadian Government	Canadian Northern	Total	%
	$ cts.	$ cts.	$ cts.	
Due to adoption of U. S. Labour Board Award No. 2	5,013,700 00	7,759,500 00	12,773,200 00	16·98
Betterments, Deferred Maintenance and Increased Service	50,537 33	3,549,292 35	3,599,829 68	4·79
Wages paid in 1920, properly chargeable, to 1919	183,628 03	298,637 24	482,265 27	0·64
Total	5,247,868 36	11,607,429 59	16,855,294 95	22·41

AVERAGE NUMBER EMPLOYEES

—	1920	1919	Increase or decrease	%
Canadian Government	23,849	24,057	−208	−0·86
Canadian Northern	33,654	30,212	3,442	11·39
Canadian National	57,503	54,269	3,234	5·96

CANADIAN NATIONAL RAILWAYS TRAFFIC

—	1920	1919	Increase or Decrease	Per Cent.
1. *Passengers Carried* (exclusive of Electric Lines)—				
Canadian Government	7,266,749	6,821,515	445,234	6·53
Canadian Northern	5,648,352	4,925,547	542,805	11·02
Canadian National	12,735,101	11,747,062	988,039	8·41
2. *Number of Passengers Carried One Mile*—				
Canadian Government	370,030,589	492,197,448	—122,166,859	—24·82
Canadian Northern	387,818,185	344,773,029	43,045,156	12·48
Canadian National	757,848,774	836,970,477	—79,121,703	—9·45
3. *Tons of Freight Handled*—				
Canadian Government	12,859,955	11,199,425	1,660,530	14·83
Canadian Northern	14,504,411	12,439,314	2,065,097	16·60
Canadian National	27,504,796	23,638,739	3,866,057	16·35
4. *Tons of Freight Moved One Mile*—				
Canadian Government	3,319,371,190	3,004,692,955	314,678,235	10·47
Canadian Northern	4,729,604,499	3,979,456,934	750,147,565	18·85
Canadian National	8,048,975,689	6,984,149,889	1,064,825,800	15·25

—	Per Passenger		Per Ton Freight	
	1920	1919	1920	1919
5. *Average Haul*—				
Canadian Government	50·92	72·15	258·12	268·29
Canadian Northern	70·92	70·00	326·08	319·91
Canadian National	59·51	71·24	292·64	295·45

CANADIAN NATIONAL RAILWAYS

Train Mileage

—	1920	1919	Increase or decrease	Per cent
Passenger—				
Canadian Government	4,791,387	4,744,179	47,208	0·99
Canadian Northern	6,992,016	5,847,229	1,144,787	19·58
Canadian National	11,783,403	10,591,408	1,191,995	11·25
Mixed—				
Canadian Government	1,236,931	1,174,923	62,008	5·28
Canadian Northern	1,824,059	1,826,898	—2,839	—·16
Canadian National	3,060,990	3,001,821	59,169	1·97
Freight—				
Canadian Government	6,611,115	6,199,775	411,340	6·63
Canadian Northern	11,559,893	9,788,196	1,771,697	18·10
Canadian National	18,171,008	15,987,971	2,183,037	13·65
Special—				
Canadian Government	28,618	7,118	21,500	302·05
Canadian Northern	82,132	51,127	31,005	60·64
Canadian National	110,750	58,245	52,505	90·14
Work—				
Canadian Government	622,360	547,594	74,766	13·65
Canadian Northern	1,712,118	1,503,398	208,720	13·88
Canadian National	2,334,478	2,050,992	283,486	13·82
Total—				
Canadian Government	13,290,411	12,673,589	616,822	4·87
Canadian Northern	22,170,218	19,016,848	3,153,370	16·58
Canadian National	35,460,629	31,690,437	3,770,192	11·90

Copy.

CANADIAN NATIONAL RAILWAYS.

Memorandum re Operating Deficits for year 1920.

Canadian Northern Railway		$16,258,579 80
Canadian Government Railways		10,449,876 43
Divided as follows:—		
Intercolonial Railway	$6,549,629 48	
Prince Edward Island Railway	729,772 16	
Transcontinental	2,780,359 46	
Moncton and Buctouche Railway	43,800 68	
Elgin and Havelock Railway	47,518 25	
St. Martins Railway	60,305 39	
York and Carleton Railway	21,317 39	
Salisbury and Albert	88,033 60	
Lothbinière and Mégantic	20,413 49	
Caraquet and Gulf Shore Railway	29,329 87	
Cape Breton Railway	14,621 65	
Quebec and Saguenay Railway	13,189 84	
Hudson Bay Railway	51,585 17	
Grand Trunk Pacific Railway		$10,134,513 94
Total Operating Deficit		$36,842,970 17

CANADIAN NATIONAL RAILWAYS

STATEMENT SHOWING DETAILS OF EQUIPMENT ON HAND DECEMBER 31, 1919—DELIVERIES, RETIREMENTS AND POSITIONS AT DECEMBER 31, 1920

——	Dec. 31 1919	Retirements During Year	Delivered During Year	Dec. 31 1920
Locomotives—				
Passenger	1,439	25	55	1,469
Freight	.....	.....	.....	.....
Switching	193	7	20	206
Electric Locos	13	.....	.....	13
Total	1,645	32	75	1,688
Passenger Equipment—				
First-class Cars	379	6	21	394
Second-class Cars	214	8	10	216
Combination Cars	131	1	33	163
Emigrant Cars	308	26	2	284
Dining Cars	48	7	9	50
Parlour Cars	44	2	15	57
Sleeping Cars	146	5	31	172
Postal Cars	25	1	20	44
Baggage and Express	386	12	15	389
Business and Pay Cars	55	1	.....	54
Other Cars in Passenger Service	84	23	.....	61
Total	1,820	92	156	1,884
Freight Equipment—				
Box Cars	42,257	608	2,285	43,934
Flat Cars	7,920	273	.....	7,647
Stock Cars	3,205	25	.....	3,180
Coal Cars	6,184	276	1,000	6,908
Tank Cars	79	1	.....	78
Refrigerator Cars	1,229	2	525	1,752
Other Cars in Freight Service	961	40	226	1,147
Total	61,835	1,225	4,036	64,646
Work Equipment—				
Gravel Cars	91	2	14	103
Derrick Cars	151	11	15	155
Caboose Cars	789	15	129	903
Other Road Cars	3,120	76	72	3,116
	4,151	104	230	4,277
Total Locomotives	1,645	32	75	1,688
Total Cars	67,806	1,421	4,422	70,807

GRAND TRUNK PACIFIC RAILWAY

COMPARATIVE SUMMARY of OPERATING RESULTS FOR YEAR ENDING DECEMBER 31, 1920

—	1920	1919	Increase or Decrease	Increase
	$ cts.	$ cts.	$ cts.	%
OPERATING REVENUE	14,408,549 66	11,294,617 87	3,113,931 79	27·57
Distribution—				
Passenger	2,491,318 48	2,161,565 20	329,753 28	15·25
Freight	10,757,773 29	8,073,267 64	2,684,505 65	33·25
Other	1,159,457 89	1,059,785 03	99,672 86	9·40
OPERATING EXPENSES	24,543,063 60	17,587,567 37	6,955,496 23	39·55
Distribution—				
Maintenance of Way and Structures	8,147,888 61	5,057,098 29	3,090,790 32	61·12
Maintenance of Equipment	6,871,192 13	5,251,895 16	1,619,296 97	30·83
Traffic	316,139 00	293,904 11	22,234 89	7·57
Transportation—Rail	8,548,878 70	6,265,460 67	2,283,418 63	36·44
Transportation—Water	1,582 16		1,582 16	
Miscellaneous	244,428 53	218,048 34	26,380 19	12·10
General	412,954 47	501,161 40	−88,206 93	−17·60
OPERATING RATIO	170 33	155 72	14 61	9·38
OPERATING DEFICIT	10,134,513 94	6,292,949 50	3,841,564 44	61·04
Mileage operated	2,840·53	2,840·53		
Revenue Train Miles	4,792·470	4,017·923	774,547	19·28
Earnings per R.T.M.	3·01	2·81	0·20	7·11
Expenses per R.T.M.	5·12	4·38	0·74	16·89
Net Earnings per R.T.M.	−2·11	−1·57	−0·54	−34·39

TRAIN MILEAGE

—	1920	1919	Increase	Per cent
Passenger Trains	1,539,184	1,291,480	247,704	19·17
Freight Trains	2,817,337	2,265,085	552,252	24·38
Mixed Trains	435,949	461,358	−25,409	−5·51
Total	4,792,470	4,017,923	774,547	19·27

GRAND TRUNK PACIFIC RAILWAY

STATEMENT SHOWING DETAILS OF EQUIPMENT ON HAND DECEMBER 31, 1919, DELIVERIES, RETIREMENTS AND POSITION AT DECEMBER 31, 1920.

—	Dec. 31, 1919	Retirements during Year	Delivered during Year	Dec. 31, 1920
Locomotives—				
Passenger	111	.....	.....	111
Freight	154	3	15	166
Switching	18	.....	10	28
Electric Locomotives	.....	.....	.....	.....
Total	283	3	25	305
Passenger Equipment—				
First-class cars	63	.....	.....	63
Second-class cars	23	.....	6	29
Combination cars	21	6	.....	15
Emigrant cars	51	.....	.....	51
Dining cars	22	.....	.....	22
Parlour cars	13	.....	.....	13
Sleeping cars	30	.....	.....	30
Postal cars	22	.....	.....	22
Baggage and Express	37	.....	.....	37
Business and Pay cars	11	1	.....	10
Other cars in passenger service	62	.....	.....	62
Total	355	7	6	354
Freight Equipment—				
Box cars	11,676	686	.....	11,590
Flat cars	1,992	22	.....	1,970
Stock cars	289	4	.....	285
Coal cars and general service	.....	.....	500	500
Tank cars	.....	.....	.....	.....
Refrigerator cars	242	1	11	252
Other cars in freight service	.....	.....	.....	.....
Total	14,199	113	511	14,597
Work Equipment—				
Gravel cars	1,032	2	.....	1,030
Derrick cars	8	.....	.....	8
Caboose cars	138	8	30	160
Other Road cars	393	9	.....	384
Total	1,571	19	30	1,582
Total locomotives	283	3	25	305
Total cars	16,125	139	547	16,533

CANADIAN NATIONAL RAILWAYS—GRAND TRUNK PACIFIC RAILWAY

Annual Report with regard to betterments for the fiscal year ending December 31st, 1920.

The total main track mileage operated by the Canadian National Railway System on January 1st, 1920, was 13,945.97 miles.

On December 31st, 1920, the operated mileage was as follows:

Hudson Bay Railway	243.00
Intercolonial Railway, including International & N.B., and P.E.I. Railway	1,670.58
Prince Edward Railway	275.99
Branch lines in Nova Scotia, New Brunswick and Quebec	275.22
Quebec and Saguenay Railway	92.71
St. John & Quebec Railway (leased)	172.07
Transcontinental Railway, Eastern and Western lines, including the Lake Superior branch	2,006.58
Canadian Northern Railway System	9,868.90
Grand Trunk Pacific Railway	2,732.42
Total mileage Canadian National Railways all operated lines	17,337.42

During the year the following mileage was added by purchase:

Lotbiniere & Megantic Railway, purchased by the Dominion Government, and put into operation April 1st, 1920	29.59
Caraquet & Gulf Shore Railway, purchased by the Dominion Government, and put into operation June 1st, 1920	80.01
Cape Breton Railway, purchased by the Dominion Government, and put into operation July 1st, 1920	30.64
Total mileage added by purchase	140.24

Lines on which construction was completed and taken over for operation:	
Canadian Government Railways—	
Quebec & Saguenay Railway, put into operation October 1st, 1920	62.00
Canadian Northern Railways, Eastern lines—	
Washago cut-off, put into operation June, 1920	1.10
St. Marc cut-off, put into operation September 23rd, 1920	2.36
Cartierville spur, put into operation October 25th, 1920	0.84
Canadian Northern Railways, Western lines—	
Speddon to St. Paul Junction, put into operation January, 1920	98.50
Dunblane to Lucky Lake, put into operation October 3rd, 1920	19.75
Eaton to Alsask, put into operation December 20th, 1920	33.13
Speddon to St. Paul de Metis, put into operation December 20th, 1920	22.80
	240.48
Reduction in mileage due to connection between the Grenville and Lachute subdivisions	4.40
Net increase in mileage due to construction	236.08

On August 23rd, 1920, the Grand Trunk Pacific Railway, which was operated under the receivership of the Minister of Railways and Canals, was taken over, with a mileage of 2,732.4 miles.

Total mileage added during the year, 3,108.72 miles.
Betterments made to roadbed and track during the year, as follows:
New 85-lb. rail laid, 1920—

Canadian Government Railways, Eastern lines	158 miles
" " " Western lines	12 "
Canadian Northern Railway, Western lines	161 "
" " " Eastern lines	72 "
	403 "

Ties put in track—

Canadian Government Railways, Eastern lines	1,245,472
" " " Western lines	204,773
Canadian Northern Railway, Western lines	2,441,177
" " " Eastern lines	1,457,768
Grand Trunk Pacific Railway	1,422,479
	6,771,669

Ballasting, 1920—Chargeable to Capital Account—

Canadian Government Railway	30 miles
Canadian Northern Railway, Western lines	230 "
" " " Eastern lines	306 "
	566 "

Tie plates, 1920—

Canadian Government Railway, Eastern lines	560,400
" " " Western lines	54,400
Canadian Northern Railway, Western lines	232,000
" " " Eastern lines	433,600
Halifax & South Western Railway	Nil
	1,280,400

Rail anchors, 1920—

Canadian Government Railway, Eastern lines	5,000
" " " Western lines	25,000
Canadian Northern Railway, Western lines	14,000
" " " Eastern lines	6,800
Hudson Bay Railway	Nil
	50,800

Fencing—wire and snow—

Canadian Government Railways	77 miles
Canadian Northern Railway, Western lines	94 "
" " " Eastern lines	50 "
	221 "

New Structures and Improvements to Existing Facilities as follows:—

—	Canadian Government Railways		Canadian Northern Railway		Totals
	Eastern Lines	Western Lines	Eastern Lines	Western Lines	
Station —New	6	2	22	17	47
Extensions	6	.....	3	14	23
Freight Sheds—New	3	.....	3	4	10
Extensions	7	.....	1	7	15
Bunk House—Section dwellings	38	5	37	69	149
Other Buildings—New	13	2	11	111	137
Extensions	2	.....	1	14	17
Coaling Plants	8	.....	1	7	16
Water supplies	14	.....	9	8	31
Sidings	102	8	57	86	253
New Culverts	137	.....	30	12	179
New Bridges	10	1	29	18	58
Bridges and Trestles filled	2	16	54	23	95

In addition to the above there were numerous other works undertaken and completed such as the construction of platforms, ashpits, drop-pits, road and farm crossings, ditching, wells for station water supplies, roadways, etc., and the providing and installation of turntables, track scales, machinery in shops and roundhouses, heating and lighting of stations, platforms and other buildings, interlocking plants, etc.

The following are some of the larger items carried out during the year:—

Canadian Government Railways

At Halifax Ocean Terminals, the train shed and platforms were completed. Grading of engine terminal site at Fairview was 80 per cent completed.

Paving of city streets in the vicinity of stations, freight sheds and terminals was done at four locations.

Work of re-arranging the yards at Mulgrave, Stellarton, Sydney, Royalty Junction, Drummondville, McGivney and Amos, as well as several smaller yards, was carried out, the majority of this work being completed.

Double tracking between Truro and Belmont, Springhill and Maccan, Chaudiere Junction, and St. Nicholas, Bagot and St. Rosalie Junction was completed and put into operation. The cut-off from the St. John subdivision to the N.T.R. at the west end of Moncton yard was completed, with the exception of a small amount of ballasting.

Grading for engine terminal site at Moncton was completed and is now ready for the erection of new terminal buildings and yard tracks. The provision of this new yard and terminal along with the new connection at the west end of yard will permit of all traffic being handled in one yard and greatly facilitate the handling of trains and engines and make large reduction in the cost of conducting traffic.

At Island yard, St. John, nine new yard tracks having a capacity of 590 cars for the handling of export traffic were completed and put into operation.

The replacement of the substructure for a double track bridge over the Tantramar river near Sackville was 42 per cent completed during the year.

At Cape Tormentine it was found necessary to dredge the entrance channel and turning basin to provide greater depth of water, there being danger of the ferry steamer Prince Edward Island touching bottom during low tides and gales This work was 30 per cent completed.

Between McGivney Junction and Fredericton on the Fredericton subdivision grade and alignment revisions were undertaken at Durban and Taymouth. 55 per cent of this work was completed.

At Chaudiere Junction a commencement was made on the work of improving engine facilities which were inadequate and inefficient. The increased terminal facilities at this point will, when completed, permit of the abandonment of the G.T.R. engine facilities at Point Levis and the N.T.R. engine facilities at Bridge on the north side of the St. Lawrence river, the business of the three terminals being handled at Chaudiere. A connection between Charny and Quebec bridge to facilitate the operation of the railway was 25 per cent completed.

At St. Malo shops additional equipment, tools and machinery were installed and additional tracks provided.

Canadian Northern Railway (Western Lines)

New elevator at Port Arthur was put in operation.

Yard re-arrangement at Atikokan—Additional tracks were put in and existing tracks re-arranged to provide suitable yard accommodation to take care of business.

Fort Francis—At this point roundhouse, boiler shed and turntable were installed.

Additional machinery was added to Fort Rouge shops at Winnipeg to facilitate repairs to equipment, etc.

Work was commenced on shop, engine and yard facilities at Nutana.

Additional tracks, ash pits and general improvements made to yard at Humboldt.

At Eaton, on Elrose subdivision, new divisional point buildings are being erected and yard tracks, etc., being put in.

Prince Albert yard facilities were improved.

Canadian Northern Railway (Eastern Lines)

Alterations and additions to tracks and freight office building were made at Cherry St. yards, Toronto, on account of co-operation of C.N.R. and G.T. Railway. By doing this savings were effected.

A connection between C.N. Railway and G.T. Railway was made at Pembroke to allow C.N.R. train to use the G.T.R station. The C.N.R. yards at this point were enlarged to take care of combined business.

Temporary connection was installed between C.N.R. and G.T.R. at Napanee and Washago

Restaurant and Express facilities combined at North Bay.

At Capreol on the C.N.R. a Y.M.C.A. building was finished.

Improving line and strengthening bridges on the St. Lawrence subdivision.

Grand Trunk Pacific Railway

Track diversions were made on the Lucerne and Fraser Subdivisions.

Improvements were made to car Ferry Slip at Prince Rupert.

Right of way fencing was done on Mountain Division on Cut Knife Branch.

Water supplies were improved at Colfax, Shontz, Prince George, Justice, Kinsella and Bruce.

Some of the station buildings constructed were located at Avonhurst, Lorlie, Gilroy, Domreny, Wakaw, Carruthers and Houston.

Culverts were installed and bridges filled at a number of locations.

General work of ballasting, ditching, riprapping and stuccoing stations was carried out.

During the present year it is proposed to continue works which were uncompleted at the end of last year and undertake new works of which the larger items are briefly referred to below:—

Canadian Government Railways

Continuation of the work of dredging at Cape Tormentine, double track bridge over the Tantramar river near Sackville, terminal facilities at Moncton, Island Yard, St. John, strengthening of Branch Lines in Nova Scotia, New Brunswick and Quebec, grade and alignment revisions on the Fredericton Subdivision, and engine facilities at Chaudiere Junction.

Large new works include the installation of automatic block signals between Maccan and Painsec Junction, Moncton and Pacific Junction, Charny and Bridge and the replacement of trestles on the Transcontinental Railway, Eastern and Western Lines.

In connection with the co-ordination of the C.G.R. and G.T.R. it is proposed to make extension of St. Rosalie yard and provide a new water supply, the present supply being inadequate.

On the Quebec & Saguenay railway during the past year construction work was done to complete the line for operation and line was put into operation on October 1st, 1920. This year it is proposed to provide riprap protection to embankments and make repairs to equipment.

On the Hudson Bay railway it is proposed to provide 170,000 ties and do a certain amount of ballasting and surfacing.

Canadian Northern Railway (Western Lines)

New bridges are proposed for crossing over Otter Tail river and on North Lake Subdivision also across South Saskatchewan river near Saskatoon.

At Winnipeg Terminals additional tracks are required and it is proposed to construct new yard at Nutana and make alteration to yard at Edmonton and commence new yard at Wayne.

New water supplies are required at Dana, Lloydminster and Kindersley to facilitate operation of trains.

It is considered necessary to relay a portion of the line on Hanna SD. with 85 lb. steel on account of heavy coal traffic originating at Drumheller Mines, also about 25 miles of the Main Line on the Kamsack Subdivision.

It is proposed to complete third car barge for service between Vancouver Island and Mainland.

Canadian Northern Railway (Eastern Lines)

Improving of Terminal facilities at Joliette, Limoilou.

New bridges to be put in on Jonquiere, Roberval, St. Lawrence, Muskoka, North Bay, Pembroke, Oba and Long Lake Subdivisions, and strengthening other bridges to carry heavy power.

Interlocking Plant to be put in at Harrowsmith, to further facilitate the safe operation of trains.

Light steel bridges to be replaced and trestles to be filled and replaced on Chester, Liverpool and Port Wade Subdivisions of Halifax & South Western railway.

Grand Trunk Pacific Railway

Track diversion at Firdale.

Station and restaurant building at Prince George; and station, baggage room, etc., at Prince Rupert.

Improve roundhouse facilities at Melville and Edson.

Water supplies at Melville, Hubbard, Archydal and on Riverhurst, Boundary and Cudworth Subdivisions.

Building large culverts preparatory to filling lumber trestles on Brulé and Evansburg Subdivisions.

Car Shops at Edmonton.

Salmon Wharf at Prince Rupert.

Co-ordination C.N.Rlys. and Grand Trunk Rly. and C.N. Rly. and G. T. Pacific Railway.

Joint committees were appointed for the purpose of organizing efficiency and the reduction of expenses by joint operation and joint facilities when possible. During the present year to consolidate facilities with the Grand Trunk Railway it is proposed to construct connections at Washago, Otter Lake and Napanee; construct additional trackage at North Bay and Napanee and provide various facilities at Hawkesbury and Rockland. To consolidate with the Grand Trunk Pacific railway it is proposed to construct new connections at Stony Plains, Alix and Calgary; provide additional trackage and consolidate existing trackage at Portage La Prairie, Stony Plains, Edson, Jasper and Riley; make track alterations to permit of the elimination of interlocking plants at Portage La Prairie, Yorkton, Mile 600, Evansburg Subdivision, Lampman and Regina.

CANADIAN NATIONAL TELEGRAPHS

STATEMENT OF POLE AND WIRE MILEAGES

	January 1, 1921		January 1, 1920	
	Poles	Wires	Poles	Wires
C.N.R. System (including Transcontinental and Intercolonial)	10,424	44,553	10,294	35,967
Great North Western System	8,181	29,401	8,264	29,465
Grand Trunk Pacific System	2,820	14,430	2,822	14,252
Total	21,425	88,384	21,380	79,684

PRINCIPAL ADDITIONAL WIRES ERECTED IN 1920

Number	Kind of wire	Between	Mileage
2	Copper	Toronto and Montreal	746
1	"	Montreal and Quebec	177
1	"	Quebec and Chicoutimi	227
3	"	Toronto and Winnipeg	3,927
1	"	Montreal and Winnipeg	1,457
1	"	Toronto and Montreal	373
1	"	Toronto and Parry Sound	149
1	Iron	Edmonton and Vancouver	776
1	"	Kamloops and Vancouver	260
		Total	8,092

CANADIAN NATIONAL RAILWAYS

Statement of work done on construction of new lines during the year 1920.

Eastern Lines—

There was no work done on Eastern Lines in the way of constructing new branches, all this work during the year being confined to Western Lines.

Western Lines—

Grading—

During the year there was the equivalent of 141.5 miles of grading completed. By "equivalent" is meant that in certain places each mile may not have been completely finished so the percentage of this in yards to the whole yardage was taken to get the number of miles done.

Of this 141.5 miles of grading 88.8 miles were done on prairie lines and 52.7 in British Columbia on the Okanagan branch.

An appended statement gives in detail the branches on which this grading was accomplished, and is divided by provinces; this shows there was completed in Manitoba 14.4 miles, in Saskatchewan 52.6 miles, in Alberta 22.1 miles and in British Columbia 52.7 miles.

Bridges and Trestles—

On new lines in 1920, in the erection of 40 bridges and trestles 2,781,893 F.B.M. of timber, 79,682 lin. ft. of piling, and 139,910 lbs. of iron were used. There was also placed one 147-foot wooden deck Howe truss. Detail of where this work was done is given on an attached statement.

Tracklaying—

There was laid in 1920, 147.6 miles of track on new lines; 128.1 miles being laid on prairie lines and 19.5 miles in British Columbia on the Vancouver Island line. A detailed statement attached shows the branches on which this track was laid, and divided into

provinces shows there was laid in Manitoba 0.0 miles, in Saskatchewan 73.9 miles, in Alberta 54.2 miles, and in British Columbia 19.5 miles.

In connection with tracklaying; 86 switches and frogs were placed for sidings and wyes on new lines, 20 sidings having been installed as well as 4 wyes. This used up 8.9 miles of track in addition to the main line track referred to above.

Ballasting and Surfacing—

In 1920 there were 182.5 miles of new track ballasted; 163 miles of this was on prairie lines. made up of 40 miles on the Alsask branch, 120 miles on the Oliver branch and 3 miles on the double track, Munson-Wayne, near Drumheller. The balance of 19.5 miles was done on the Vancouver Island line.

Buildings and Structures—Water Tanks—

Seven water tanks were completed in the season for new lines, and four pump houses and 6,400 lin. ft. of pipe line built to serve them.

Stations—

During the year four 3rd class; five 4th class stations, 17 freight and passenger shelters, 19 loading platforms and 15 stock yards were erected on new lines.

Section Houses—

Sixteen section houses were completed on new lines during 1920. The branches on which these buildings were placed is shown in the attached table.

Miles put in operation—

During 1920 on Canadian Northern Western Lines there were 85.23 miles of new lines turned over to the operating department for permanent operation, and in addition to this 120.8 miles of new lines were turned over to the operating department for operation on behalf of construction department, or a total 206.03 miles. Attached is detailed statement showing these lines and mileages.

CANADIAN NATIONAL RAILWAYS

STATEMENT OF GRADING AND TRACKLAYING DONE, DURING 1920 ON NEW LINES

No. on Map, 1921	—	Grading	Track-laying
	Manitoba—		
1	Amaranth Extension	4·5	.....
2	St. Rose du Lac	9·63	.....
	Totals for Manitoba	14·1	.....
	Saskatchewan—		
12	Alsask, S.E	.....	19·7
16	Acadia Valley	2·6	.....
13	Eston, S.E	5·2	.....
7	Humboldt—Melfort	3·9	31·87
1	Luck Lake	6·1	.....
6	Melfort, N.E	11·7	.....
3	Peebles—Lampman	1·8	.....
10	Swift Current	4·1	7·14
4	Thunderhill Extension	5·8	7·25
15	Jackfish Lake	5·9	8·00
8	Prince Albert, N.E	3·9	.....
14	Turtleford, E	1·6	.....
	Totals for Saskatchewan	52·6	73·9
	Alberta—		
16	Acadia Valley	6·9	.....
18	Hanna—Medicine Hat	5·1	8·0
20	Oliver, N.E	0·4	20·9
22	Onoway	2·9	19·2
21	Red Deer Spur	3·8	6·1
25	Munson Double Track	3·0	.....
	Totals for Alberta	22·1	54·
	British Columbia—		
	Okanagan Branch	52·7	.....
	Vancouver Island Line	.....	19·5
	Totals for British Columbia	52·7	19·5

Summary	Grade	Track
Summary—		
Manitoba	14·1	.....
Saskatchewan	52·6	73·9
Alberta	22·1	54·2
Total Prairies	88·8	128·1
British Columbia	52·7	19·5
Totals	141·5	147·6

CANADIAN NATIONAL RAILWAYS

STATEMENT OF WORK OTHER THAN GRADING AND TRACKLAYING DONE BY CONSTRUCTION DEPARTMENT IN 1920 ON NEW WESTERN LINES

No. on Map	——	Track Surfaced	Turn-outs Placed	Tanks	Pump Houses	Pipe Lines	Third Class Status	Fourth Class Status	F. & P. Shelter	Section Houses	Loading Platform	Stock Yards	No. of Trestle	Trestles	Piles Driven	Iron
		Miles				Lin. Ft.								M.F.B.M.	Li t.	Lbs.
1	Alsask, S.E.	40	4	2	1	.....	1	2	1	3	3	5	.....	.....	.....	.....
7	Melfort—Humboldt	.....	10	.....	.....	.....	1	.....	.....	1	1	1	5	38,000	2,280	2,280
18	Hanna—Medice Hat	.....	7	1	.....	1,500	1	1	3	5	7	3	4	279,963	16,920	14,186
15	Jackfish Lake Branch	.....	2	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	3	63,600	2,525	3,200
25	Munson Double Track	3	21	1	1	400	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	15	201,312	15,127	4,215
20	Oliver N.E.	120	12	1	.....	1,000	1	1	8	6	7	5	1	295,780	11,330	10,490
22	Onoway Branch	.....	5	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	9	1,436,407	31,500	69,019
21	Red Deer Spur	.....	5	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....
10	Swift Current Ext.	.....	5	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	1	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....
4	Thunderhill Br.	.....	7	1	1	2,500	.....	1	1	1	.....	1	.....	.....	.....	.....
	Total Prairie Lines	163	78	6	3	5,400	4	5	13	16	19	15	37	2,315,062	79,682	103,390
	Vancouver Island Line	19·5	8	1	1	1,000	.....	.....	4	.....	.....	.....	3	466,830	.....	36,520
	Total	182·5	86	7	4	6,400	4	5	17	16	19	15	40	2,781,892	79,682	139,910

CANADIAN NATIONAL RAILWAYS

Statement of miles of new lines put into either permanent or temporary operation, 1920.

Lines turned over to Operating Department for permanent operation, 1920.

	Miles	Miles
Saskatchewan—		
12. Alsask S.E. line from Eaton, Mile 115 to Alsask, Mile 148.13..	33.15	
12. Alsask S.E. from Glidden, Mile 105 to Eaton, Mile 115..	10.0	
11. Luck Lake..	19.75	62.90
Alberta—		
20. Oliver N.E. from Spedden, Mile 98.5 to St. Paul, Mile 120.85..	22.35	22.35
Total mileage new lines put in permanent operation..		85.25

Lines turned over to Operating Department for operation on behalf of Construction Department.

Saskatchewan—		
4. Thunderhill extension from Preeceville, Mile 72.6 to Lintlaw, Mile 100.3..	27.7	
10. Gravelbourg extension from Gravelbourg, Mile 79 to Hodgeville, Mile 104.6..	25.6	
7. Melfort-Humboldt line from Humboldt to Lake Lenore..	15.0	68.3
British Columbia—		
Vancouver Island line, Victoria to Mile 52.5..	52.5	52.5
Total mileage new lines put in temporary operation..		120.8
Total mileage new lines put in operation..		120.05

CANADIAN NATIONAL RAILWAYS

CANADIAN NORTHERN RAILWAY SYSTEM

COST OF EQUIPMENT

—	1914	1915	1916	1917	1918	1919	1920
	$ cts.	$ cts.	$ cts.	$ cts.	$ cts.	$ cts.	$ cts.
Consolidation Type Locos....	.....	.....	.....	.....	58,000 00	.....	.....
Pacific Type Locomotives...	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	57,000 00	.....
Medium Type Locomotives..	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	61,250 00
Heavy Pacific Locomotives..	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	64,250 00
Santa Fe Locomotives.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	72,500 00
6-Wheel Switching Locomotives.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	40,500 00	37,000 00	39,225 00
1st Class Coaches.....	16,586 00	16,250 00	.....	.....	.....	33,000 00	.....
Compartment Observation Cars.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	46,000 00	.....
Standard Sleepers.....	.....	28,250 00	.....	.....	35,890 00	46,000 00	49,500 00
Dining Cars.....	25,050 00	.....	.....	.....	34,100 00	44,000 00	46,000 00
Tourist Cars.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	39,500 00	.....
Mail Cars.....	11,500 00	.....	11,500 00	.....	.....	29,750 00	.....
Freight Refrigerator Cars....	1,640 00	.....	.....	2,700 00	4,097 00	4,000 00	5,025 00
Express Refrigerator Cars....	.....	.....	.....	.....	4,642 00	.....	12,240 00
Steel Baggage Cars.....	.....	*6,666 00	*8,000 00	.....	.....	23,500 00	24,000 00
Steel Colonist Cars.....	16,575 00	.....	.....	.....	.....	32,500 00	.....
General Service Cars.....	1,346 00	1,346 00	.....	.....	3,179 00	3,179 00	3,250 00
Ballast Cars.....	.....	1,261 50	.....	.....	3,179 50	3,075 00	3,425 00
Cabooses.....	.....	1,485 00	.....	2,096 00	2,376 00	2,888 64	3,033 10
Box Cars.....	1,150 00	1,150 00	.....	.....	2,750 00	2,507 00	2,960 00
Stock Cars.....	846 00	.....	875 00	.....	2,271 00	2,285 00	2,640 00
Flat Cars.....	.....	*850 00	.....	.....	2,370 00	2,215 00	.....
Snow Plows.....	.....	5,000 00	.....	.....	8,000 00	8,484 52	9,141 50

*The baggage cars in 1915 and 1916 were wooden and in 1919 and 1920 they were steel. The flat cars in 1915 were wooden and in 1918-19 they were steel underframe.

STATEMENT OF COMPARATIVE PRICES

Material	1914	1920	Increase Percentage
Airbrake Material	Less 25%	Plus 50 %	100
Axles	2·25 cwt.	6·00 cwt.	166
Angle Bars, 60 lb	1·65 cwt. f.o.b. Soo	3·50 cwt. f.o.b. Soo	112
Angle Bars, 80 lb	1·65 cwt. f.o.b. Soo	3·50 cwt. f.o.b. Soo	112
Bolts, Track, 60 lb	3·10 cwt.	6·75 cwt.	117
Bolts, Track, 80 lb	3·10 cwt.	6·75 cwt.	117
Brake Shoes (Freight Car)	35·00 net ton	80·00 net ton	128
Brake Shoes (Driving)	56·00 net ton	95·00 net ton	69
Castings, (steel)	4·75 cwt.	13·00 net ton	173
Castings (grey iron)	2·30 cwt.	5·25 cwt.	128
Cement	1·66 f.o.b. Montreal	3·60 (April f.o.b. Longue Pt.)	116
Couplers (Sharon Freight)	20·50 pair	56·00 pair	173
Coal Oil	·14 gal.	·27½ gal.	96
Fencing	·20 rod	·56 rod	180
Gasoline	·15 gal.	·40 gal.	166
Hose, air brake	·85 piece	1·70 piece	100
Hose, steam heater	1·17 piece	2·95 piece	152
Iron and soft steel bars	1·75 cwt.	4·00 cwt.	128
Lumber and Timber—			
Spruce Car Decking	22·00 M	47·50 M	115
Fir Car Roofing	33·50 f.o.b. Sudbury	90·00 f.o.b. Vancouver	168
Pine Lumber	27·00 M	70·00 M	159
Nails	2·00 cwt.	5·65 cwt.	182
Paints—			
C.N. Freight Car Red	·80 gal.	2·00 gal.	150
Pullman Car Body Color	·22 per lb.	·45 per lb.	104
White Lead in Oil	7·25 cwt.	16·15 cwt.	122
Boiled Linseed Oil	·60 gal.	2·50 gal.	316
Pipe	List less 74½—7½—2½	Less 30%	204
Rails	32·00 G.T.	60·00 G.T.	87
Steel and Iron Sheets	3·00 cwt.	10·55 cwt.	251
Spikes, track	2·07 cwt.	4·85 cwt.	124
Switch stands, Main Line	17·00	38·50	126
Switch Stands, Yard	16·00	36·50	128
Tie Plates	1·85 cwt. f.o.b. Ottawa	3·85 f.o.b. Toronto	108
Tires	2·10 cwt.	7·50 cwt.	257
Waste—cotton wiping	·0772½ lb.	·15¾ lb.	118
Freight Car Wool	·0970 lb.	·2685 lb.	176
Loco. & Passgr. Car Wool	·1195 lb.	·33½ lb.	180
Wheels, freight car	28·00 net ton	43·00 net ton	53
Fuses	13·50	23·25	72
Uniforms, Conductors	20·00	40·00	100
Ties	·45	·81 f.o.b. part of shpt.	80
Coal	3·16 ton	6·86	111

Mr. P. F. CASGRAIN: May I ask the minister—

Mr. SPEAKER: Before the hon. member proceeds, I must direct the attention of the House to the fact that it is questionable whether the minister may be interrogated at this stage. If hon. members desired to question the minister, their scope of inquiry at present would be very limited, and I think it would be far better, as I have no doubt the House will agree, that questions be deferred until the House is in Committee of the Whole.

Mr. JACQUES BUREAU: I understand that we automatically go into Supply now, under the rules, and I would like to point out that there may be an opportunity for a general debate on the railway situation.

[Mr. J. D. Reid].

Mr. SPEAKER: I should have left the Chair without question put when the order for Supply was called in the first instance, but I then stated that I would ask the unanimous consent of the House for the minister to make a statement, following which I would leave the Chair, according to rule.

SUPPLY

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

Entomology—$26,000.

Mr. MURPHY: Will the Minister of Agriculture explain the reason for the increase of $8,000 in this item?

Mr. TOLMIE: This item for entomology covers the study of insects which has a relation to agriculture, many of these

insects doing damage to agricultural products, to the extent of something over $100,000,000 a year. The increase of $8,000 is made up, first, by a grant to the Imperial Bureau of Entomology amounting to $5,000. This Imperial Bureau has its headquarters in London, and consists of representatives of all the British dominions. It carries on investigation there, and gathers information regarding various insect parasites from all over the world. The Bureau is contributed to and maintained by the various Dominions that are interested in it. The Bureau also issues from time to time certain printed matter giving the latest information regarding the insects in question. This information is available to our Department at any time it is required, and where its value in particular comes in is, that in the event of any strange insect appearing among our crops in Canada from which we expect damage we can immediately find out the life history of that insect and all the particulars that are known concerning it, by applying to the Bureau in London. The other $3,000 is to cover extension work; certain extra assistance will be required in the fall this year in connection with the corn bore infection in the corn growing counties in southern Ontario; for extra printed matter and general expenses of the office.

Mr. FIELDING: The minister referred to a Bureau in London. By whom is Canada represented at that Bureau?

Mr. TOLMIE: We have no representative on the ground, but we contribute to the maintenance of the office and for that reason all the information gathered is available to us on application, in addition to the printed material that is issued regularly.

Mr. MORPHY: Will the minister state what other Dominions are contributing to the maintenance of this Bureau and the amount of such contributions?

Mr. TOLMIE: I am sure that India, South Africa, Australia and New Zealand are contributing, but I cannot at present give the hon. member the exact amount in each case.

Mr. FIELDING: I suppose the reports issued by the Bureau in question will show the manner in which these sums of money are being expended, and by reference to the reports we could get the desired information?

Mr. TOLMIE: Yes. I understand that information is printed.

Mr. BUREAU: Before this item carries I would like to have a point settled in connection with a ruling which was given by the Chair on Tuesday night. I do not dispute the ruling, and I am not going to argue the matter, but it was to the effect that when an item was carried in Committee of Supply any minister could call the estimates of his department, or could call the estimates of any department, practically at any time when the Committee of Supply was sitting, and the only way by which we could hold back the calling of the items of a special department which we had not agreed to discuss at the time, was not to let the particular estimate under consideration pass. Now, I do not desire to obstruct the passage of the estimates of the Minister of Agriculture; on the contrary my desire, if anything is that they should be put through with all possible despatch. But I notice that last night when the hon. member for Shelburne and Queen's (Mr. Fielding) asked the Prime Minister what business would be taken up to-day he received the following reply:

> To-morrow is Government day. The orders to be taken up will include the motion to go into Supply upon the Estimates of the Department of Agriculture and any others that we may be entitled to consider.

Now that is rather a vague statement. The Minister of Trade and Commerce (Sir George Foster) and the Minister of Justice (Mr. Doherty) will, I am sure, bear me out in the statement that in former years it has always been customary for the Government to make a definite statement each night when adjourning as to what work would be taken up next day. That has been the practice ever since Confederation. But now we seem to be drifting into rather a vague policy, and it is just as well to have the point settled now as to the right course to pursue, in order that there may be no misunderstanding in the future. For my part I am willing to further the dispatch of the business of the House, but it is desirable that in respect to the conduct of affairs there should be definiteness and not vagueness. If it is going to be a question of taking some small advantage out of this vagueness, I am prepared to discuss the matter to a conclusion. If we cannot have the required understanding then in my opinion hon. gentlemen on this side should continue speaking to this item until we are vouchsafed the information as to what is coming next. I think we are entitled to be treated with more deference than appears to have been the case, and I

think greater progress will be made if we are given that information which we consider we are entitled to. I should draw the inference from the ruling made by you, Mr. Chairman, the other night, that the ministers have the right to take up on Thursdays and Fridays only, those items which have previously been considered, but that on all other days—they could take up anything.

The CHAIRMAN: If the Committee will allow me I shall draw the attention of the hon. member to the wording of the ruling which I gave on Tuesday evening. At page 1004 of Unrevised Hansard he will find that in answer to the question asked by the hon. member for Quebec East (Mr. Lapointe) as to whether all hon. ministers could call the items of their respective departments on the same day, I stated:

> —that if the committee would consent to dispose of those Estimates with sufficient speed to allow them to do so, the ministers would have that right except on Thursday or Friday when their estimates had not previously been taken up.

The only Estimates that have heretofore been taken up are the Estimates of the Department of Agriculture, and for that reason, without the unanimous consent of this committee no Estimates of any other department can be taken up to-day.

Mr. BUREAU: And on Tuesday?

The CHAIRMAN: On Tuesday any Estimates can be taken up.

Sir GEORGE FOSTER: On motion.

The CHAIRMAN: Yes, after a motion that Mr. Speaker leave the Chair for the House to go into Committee of Supply, has been agreed to.

Mr. FIELDING: This matter is rather one of courtesy than a rule of the House. I think the hon. member for Three Rivers (Mr. Bureau) has correctly stated that it is for the convenience of the House as well as a courtesy to the Opposition that at the close of the business each night we shall have an announcement of what business is coming on next day; and if the order of business as announced be changed, it should be a matter of courtesy to so advise hon. gentlemen on both sides.

Sir GEORGE FOSTER: I quite agree with my hon. friend.

Mr. ROBB: Might I suggest to the right hon. gentleman leading the House that we might with considerable advantage follow the practice adopted in the British House of Commons and on Thursday of each week have a statement from the ministry of what business will be taken up on each day of the following week.

Sir GEORGE FOSTER: That would be sometimes difficult to do and would not always meet the convenience of the House. I think the rule as it has just been stated by the Chairman, coupled with the conversation we have had across the floor, will be sufficient.

Mr. BUREAU: While we are on the subject I am going to call the attention of the leader of the House to the fact that the statement made yesterday regarding the order of business for to-day is very indefinite. The Prime Minister then stated:

> The order to be taken up will include the motion to go into Supply upon the Estimates of the Department of Agriculture and any others that we may be entitled to consider.

I want to know if we are going to be left in that uncertain position. We should know definitely what is coming forward and then we can see what we will do.

Sir GEORGE FOSTER: The Chairman has just ruled what we are entitled to do, but at the same time it is quite reasonable that whoever makes the final announcement in the evening should make it as definite as it can possibly be made. I am sure there is no other intention.

Mr. SINCLAIR (Antigonish and Guysborough): We on this side of the House do not admit that the spirit of the rule is observed. The rule might operate towards destroying the privilege which members have of discussing any department when it first comes before the House in the Estimates. In Bourinot I find on page 424 the following:

> The object of the proviso is to permit of debate before first entering upon the Estimates of any department, but in practice, the consent of the House is generally given to taking up a department's Estimates without preliminary debate, under a general understanding that such debate will be entered upon at some more convenient time. The British Parliament has a somewhat similar rule.

As the ruling was made the other evening it would appear to me that the ordinary privilege members have of discussing a special department before we enter upon the Estimates of that department was taken away altogether. I think it would be well for the leader to let us know what the policy of the Government is in regard to this matter; otherwise, as my hon.

friend from Three Rivers has said, we might be under the necessity of preventing the passing of an item for fear the Government would call an item in another department that had not yet been considered.

Sir GEORGE FOSTER: I think my hon. friend need have no fear that he will be ill-treated.

Administration and enforcement of the Destructive Insect and Pest Act, $180,000.

Mr. McKENZIE: What progress is being made in the work to which this vote applies? Last summer in the Maritime Provinces we were reading about the incursion of the army worm into the province of Ontario. Has the minister been furnished with any effective means of combatting this pest?

Mr. TOLMIE: I may briefly outline the work that has been carried on under this expenditure, which is rather large. We have a staff in the field continuously at work not only on what might be called the animal insects, but also the fungous or vegetable insects. We have been dealing with the cut worm in certain sections of the country—a pest which is very destructive to field and garden crops. We have furnished farmers with a reliable remedy, based on a mixture of molasses and arsenic with some common body such as bran or other suitable material, and this has been found very effective indeed. With respect to the wire worm, we have found that it is necessary to take considerable time to study this insect as it requires about four years to complete its life history. So far we have found cultural methods most useful in dealing with this pest. In connection with the grasshopper plague which we have had in the West, we have found three particular varieties of grasshoppers doing considerable damage in the Prairie Provinces and also in the States to the south. We figure that in co-operation with the Provincial Governments we have this year saved agriculturalists in the province of Manitoba about $17,000,000 by adopting certain combative methods for overcoming the grasshopper plague; in Saskatchewan it is estimated that 1,400,000 acres were favourably affected by our treatment; and in Alberta our operations have also been extensive during the past year. In addition to carrying on this work our department conducted a number of experiments. One was with what is known as a hopper-dozer, drawn by a team and consisting of a vessel containing coal oil and other ingredients, in which the hoppers are captured as the machine is drawn across the fields. This, however, was found not to be nearly so effective as some of the other methods. We also carried on tests with chlorine gas, but found it very expensive, it costing at the rate of about $20 per acre. It has also this disadvantage that there is considerable danger in using it, and changing winds might have very disastrous results. Then, again, if the gas was heavily applied we found that it destroyed the vegetable matter which we hoped to save. The most satisfactory remedy was the baiting system, that is, where we used bran as the bait. Some of our men discovered that if 50 per cent of its bulk was made up of sawdust a considerable saving could be effected. We mixed this bait with molasses to attract the grasshoppers, and then added enough arsenic to kill them. In that way we have destroyed a very large number of these pests and found it the cheapest and most efficient system to handle. We have also, as I pointed out a moment ago, carried on a considerable amount of work in combatting the European corn borer. This parasite comes in from the United States and affects some of the districts in Ontario where corn is grown to a considerable extent. The United States Government is so impressed with the seriousness of this parasite that last year they expended $400,000 in trying to prevent it reaching the corn belt and in stopping its ravages in those districts where it had already appeared. The fly lays its eggs on the corn plants, develops into a caterpillar and bores into the stalk of the corn and also up into the cob. We have given all the information we could in the various districts where the trouble has existed, and we have also issued 25,000 circulars dealing with the subject. We have also been dealing with the brown-tail moth, particularly in Nova Scotia and New Brunswick, with considerable success. It has been found practicable to import certain pests that prey on this particular insect. We sent men to the United States to study the work done there in that connection, and a number of these parasites were brought here and released in districts where the brown-tail moth was causing trouble. We have also been dealing lately with what is known as the apple-sucker, a parasite supposed to be recently imported from Europe. We sent out a number of men to investigate the action of the army worm. We used poisonous remedies as in the case of grasshoppers, and also advocated the ploughing and digging of

moderately deep trenches into which the army worm would fall when travelling across the ground—a mechanical method of fighting the pest. These suggestions on the part of the department have been found very helpful. We have also done excellent work in connection with the testing of various insecticides. As I have pointed out, the results in connection with the grasshopper work have been very satisfactory. It is estimated by the department that we have saved the farmers over $400,000 during the past season by suggesting cheaper remedies that were just as efficient as those that were used the year before. We are also carrying on inspection of nursery stock. We have fumigating plants at various points throughout the country—Vancouver; North Portal, Saskatchewan; Winnipeg; Windsor, Ontario; Niagara Falls; St. John, New Brunswick, and St. Johns, Quebec. All nursery stock coming from the United States must pass through these ports and is thoroughly fumigated before being released, our object being to prevent the introduction of the San Jose scale from the United States.

In connection with the botanical side, we are studying roots, vegetables and grains which are subject to the attacks of various fungi, and are disseminating such information in that regard as we are able to obtain from time to time. With regard to the increase of $10,000 this year, it is required to meet the re-classification, to provide for additional travelling expenses, additional expenses at our laboratories throughout the country, and also to carry on the corn borer work—of course, we cannot tell ahead of time how much this work will cost. The increase is necessary also to cover any emergency that may arise during the coming year.

We have been doing excellent work in combatting the cabbage maggot and the rose midge. All who are interested in agriculture know what a considerable amount of damage is done by the cabbage maggot. Shortly after the cabbage is planted it wilts and falls over, the result of the work of a little maggot which attacks the root, cuts off the stalk and ultimately destroys the plant. We handle that pest successfully by using a one to one-thousand solution of bichloride of mercury, or common corrosive sublimate. We estimate that we have saved the cabbage growers and rose growers of Canada during the past year over $100,000 by suggesting these remedies. We have also done good work in experimenting with and then advocating the use of dust applications to overcome these parasites, instead of the ordinary old-fashioned sprays. The dust applications are more efficient and cost less.

Mr. ROBB: Did I understand the minister to say that in certain sections of country where they were purchasing bran for mixing, to be used in the destruction of grasshoppers, the bran contained a very large percentage of sawdust?

Mr. TOLMIE: No, I said that by experiment we had discovered that we could fool the grasshoppers by substituting fifty per cent. sawdust, making a substantial saving.

Mr. GOULD: This question has been one of particular interest to the people of my district since 1918. In that year the southern part of the district was invaded by grasshoppers and for miles from the international boundary the crop was totally destroyed. Just about that time the Winnipeg strike was on, and we were therefore unable to secure supplies of arsenate of lead and Paris green for the purpose of destroying or preventing the spread of these insects which were coming into the district from North Dakota. We also found when we began to seek ways and means of combatting this evil that our departments in Canada were not as well advised of the necessary measures to adopt as were the experimental farms in North Dakota. As a matter of fact, two weeks before the information reached us from our own Department of Agriculture we got from the state of North Dakota and put into application the method of distribution of poisoned feeds over the affected areas. That is one reason why we are interested in seeing that means are provided whereby our scientific research department here may be able to carry on its work and find out the means of fighting these pests which attack our crops in the West. I myself am particularly interested because I have been affected to the extent of the loss of some thousands of dollars during the last three years. I have, however, much praise for our department on account of the hearty co-operation they gave the provincial authorities least year in combatting these evils. The increase of $10,000 in the Estimates this year should be commended by the committee. I brought this question up a few nights ago because I thought that the sum of $8,000 in the preceding item meant an increase in salaries for those who were devoting their time to research matters. I support the view that the policy of the Government should be one of retrenchment; yet after listening to the frequent declara-

tions made by hon. members with regard to the importance of agriculture, I am somewhat disappointed to find that expenditures on agriculture are limited in the Estimates to approximately $5,000,000, while the expenditures for, say, the Department of Militia amount to $11,750,000. That is not bearing out in practice that which is preached in theory. If I were as big a man intellectually and physically as the Minister of Agriculture, the Minister of Finance would not frighten me; I would demand that agriculture receive its proper share of the appropriations. I have received many letters from my people in my constituency demanding a more equitable distribution of the funds available and asking that agriculture should receive its share. I repeat that our people heartily approve the efforts that are being put forth by the Department of Agriculture in an effort to combat the pests that are attacking our crops. I believe this evil is largely extant in our country because the minister is circumscribed in his sphere or in the amount of capital he has to invest in combatting it. While I am prepared to support a general policy of retrenchment, yet I believe the proportions are absolutely unfair to the great industry of agriculture in this country.

Mr. FOURNIER: I have a little bit of criticism to offer to the Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Tolmie), not that he is not spending money, but that he is not spending enough money for agricultural purposes. I have the same complaint as the hon. member for Assiniboia (Mr. Gould) has. The amount spent yearly for the destruction of destructive insects is a miserable pittance, when we realize that parasites are destroying crops to an amount estimated at $125,000,000 yearly. The amount expended for good seed is altogether too small when one considers that an increase of one bushel per acre in Canada's crop would add about $80,000,000 to the country's wealth, and that is something worth considering. As regards the amount expended for agricultural instruction, it is a shame that such a small amount should be asked. In the midst of the social and economic battles which are being fought between nations in order to regain their equilibrium there is no more important and essential problem than that of agriculture. For the last six years, the great cry has been "Back to the land", that is to say, back to the economic truth. That cry has been heard by sound economists, bankers, railroad directors and business men generally, but what do we find? With such a small amount expended for agriculture, we find that the tide for the last thirty years has been flowing to the cities, and I submit, Sir, the more farmers, the more of everything,—railways, factories, towns, cities, churches, colleges, art schools, conservatories, music and all the apparatus and appurtenances of the highest civilization. The Government apparently does not desire such a condition, and with a lack of encouragement, the rural population is fast declining.

Agriculture should be the domain of high politics, politics of the first order, and I ask the minister, when he goes to the Council chamber, as solid as he is, to have the Estimates of his department approved, not to be too shy with his colleagues. If I were in his place, I would soon get a little money out of the Minister of Finance, the Minister of Militia, and the Minister of Railways and Canals. In private or in public affairs nothing goes forward if one is not able to display the necessary will, even to the point of being audacious. All those who work for the future must determine the scope of individual will and collective will as well. To move the collective will, politics should formulate, on essential points, principles and reforms that all groups must admit. It is necessary that vital questions should not fall the prey of faction, nor of ambitions. And vital questions are those which make national greatness and prosperity,—the moral value of population, social justice and material prosperity. To bring collective will to these questions, politics must bring forward sentiments and common interests, sentiments of generosity, justice and courage, interests of social and economic order. I commend these words to the minister.

Before resuming my seat, I wish to make a slight reference to a statement made by the hon. member for Dufferin (Mr. Best), when he was at his "best" yesterday evening. The hon. gentleman stated that many hon. gentlemen speak of farming when they know absolutely nothing about it. I must differ from that statement, so far as my part of the country is concerned. We closely observe the eleventh commandment which says: "Thou shalt mind thine own business." We do not care who goes on the land, whether it is an honourable judge, a lawyer, a physician, a notary or anyone else; in fact, we welcome anyone on the land, and we know that many things that are to-day employed in agriculture were not invented by farmers. The man who invented Paris green was a chemist,

but Paris green is used extensively on the farm for the protection of the potato. The man who invented formalin is another chemist; and many presidents and officials of agricultural colleges do not farm for themselves. I commend these words to my hon. friend. I have not asked the minister for an experimental farm; I know he has not the money; but when he goes to the Council chamber and gets a little more money from his colleagues, if I am still a member of this House next year, he will hear from me when he comes before us with his Estimates again, if he has not more money to spend for agriculture.

Mr. SUTHERLAND: I am sure, after listening to the statement made by the Minister of Railways and Canals, (Mr. Reid) this afternoon, we must all feel that we cannot very consistently advocate an increase in expenditure for anything we can possibly get along without. I realize, however, that this is a very important item, and the work that can be done is certainly very great. I do not very often appropriate to myself credit for anything to which I am not entitled; but I believe if I have convinced the minister and the Government of the efficacy of bran for poisoning grasshoppers, I have done something during the time I have been in this House. If there is on hand any of the old bran, such as was used during the last few years, he should get a monopoly of it, put a little molasses on it and scatter it out. I think it will destroy most of the grasshoppers.

Perhaps the pest about which I wish to speak might more properly have come under the item which we have just passed. I refer to the white grub which is very prevalent in Ontario and which has destroyed vast areas of pasture land. I believe the department has an officer at Strathroy in East Middlesex. Can the minister give the committee any information as to the possibilities of combatting this pest that is destroying thousands of acres of the old pasture lands? In fact, the new land also that a few years ago was covered with a beautiful sod has been absolutely destroyed by this pest, and the land is now covered with weeds. I believe the white grub larvae is laid by what is commonly called the June bug, which we see flying around in such large numbers in the month of June. I think it would be well to have the experts inquire whether anything can be done to destroy this pest, and I should like to know what reports the minister has received on the matter from the officer at Strathroy, in which section of the country vast areas have been converted to grazing purposes during the past few years. This is a serious matter in those districts, because these lands have to be broken up and again brought under cultivation.

Mr. TOLMIE: I rgret I cannot give the hon. member any information as to the investigations that are now being carried on, but if this pest is creating as much trouble as my hon. friend says, I shall take steps to familiarize myself with the conditions at once, and see that such measures are taken as may be advisable under the circumstances. An investigation is going on, but I do not know just what stage it has reached.

Answering the question of my hon. friend opposite (Mr. Fournier), I am pleased to note he realizes the importance of agriculture in Canada. Certainly, there is a very great field for development. Agriculture, to use a western expression, "is Canada's one best bet." I might point out that while during the last five years our appropriations for agriculture have been in the neighbourhood of three millions a year, or slightly more, this year we are appropriating between five and six millions, which is a decided increase.

With regard to what my hon. friend from Assiniboia (Mr. Gould) has said about the grasshopper plague, we maintain a man in Manitoba at Treesbank and keep in close touch with the grasshopper work at all times. South of the line, where they have an earlier spring, it is only natural the Americans should get busy a little sooner than we do. So far as our staff is concerned, I think it is a very excellent one. It was organized by the late Dr. Hewitt, whose value was almost inestimable, but who unfortunately was lost to us by his untimely death about a year ago. He was making a reputation for himself throughout the whole world as one of its leading entomologists. He established our branch and brought it up to its present state of efficiency. We are doing our utmost to maintain that efficiency, and I am quite sure that the staff we have now will compare very favourably with that of any other similar branch in the world.

Mr. ROBB: Would the minister make a statement as to the duplication of work by the federal and provincial Departments of Agriculture? I notice in the minister's own publication, dated December, 1920, that full credit for combatting the grasshopper plague is given to the Department of Agriculture of the province of Saskatchewan. I gathered to-day from the minister that it was his department that did the work.

Mr. TOLMIE: I thought I was very clear in stating that we hade done this work in co-operation with the Provincial Governments. We maintain a staff of experts here in Ottawa who study these various insects, and are able to give very valuable information as to the methods that should be adopted. The life history of a number of parasites has been studied, because you must know their history before you can suggest any remedy. We have also assisted the provinces in experimental work with the various appliances, such as gas, the doser, and various insecticides. We also had men on the ground giving advice and studying the whole situation, and the provinces get the full benefit of any information they may gather.

Mr. ROBB: Are not the taxpayers in some cases paying the salaries of two men where one might do the work?

Mr. TOLMIE: Our men do the directing, and offer the results of the information they have gathered. There is no duplication of the staff we maintain here in any one of the provinces. The provinces carry out most of the work, and put up most of the expense.

Mr. SINCLAIR (Antigonish and Guysborough): Do fumigation stations come under this heading?

Mr. TOLMIE: Yes.

Mr. SINCLAIR (Antigonish and Guysborough): How many are there in Nova Scotia?

Mr. TOLMIE: None now; there used to be one at Digby. Our station is now located at St: John, N.B.

Mr. SINCLAIR (Antigonish and Guysborough): I have been informed that plants coming from nurseries in the province of Ontario to Nova Scotia have to be sent to Digby to be fumigated. My own experience in getting roses for my garden has been that the insects are killed so effectually that the plants themselves are dead when they arrive. If this matter is not in the minister's department, I have nothing to say about it.

Mr. TOLMIE: There were stations at Digby and Truro, maintained in co-operation with the Provincial Government, but that agreement has expired, and we are not doing business at either of these points now. Our station in the Maritime Provinces is at St. John.

Mr. SINCLAIR (Antigonish and Guysborough): Then plants coming to Nova Scotia from Ontario nurseries must first go to St. John, N.B., to be fumigated?

Mr. TOLMIE: Not necessarily. They can go direct to the purchaser in Nova Scotia, unless Nova Scotia provides otherwise. It is plants coming from the United States that we fumigate.

Mr. SINCLAIR (Antigonish and Guysborough): I was speaking of plants coming from the city of Hamilton, in Ontario. I would suggest to the minister that if his department is going to continue that work, the most convenient point in Nova Scotia would be truro. It takes considerable time to send goods to Truro to Digby and back again to Truro, and then on to their destination. The plants are delayed so long on the way that it is injurious to them. I have not been able to understand how under the past arrangement Truro was not utilized instead of Digby, especially in shipments to eastern Nova Scotia.

Mr. TOLMIE: That inter-provincial trade is all taken care of by the Provincial Governments. I shall be very glad, however, to look into my hon. friend's suggestion with regard to Truro.

Mr. CURRIE: In the early part of this session members were deluged with a very alarming pamphlet about the prevalance of what is known as the bud worm in the spruce forests of Canada. As the exports of spruce products from this country amount to between forty and fifty million dollars a year, one would be led to believe by this pamphlet that in ten years all our forests would be destroyed. What department is that under? As we are now on an item which virtually covers it, may I ask if there is any department of the Government taking steps to stop that pest? I understand that it was in Quebec and is now in the Timiskaming region of Ontario. It is destroying the forest right and left, and I should like to know what, if anything, the Dominion Government is doing in the matter.

Mr. TOLMIE: There is at present a staff studying the spruce bud worm, and as soon as we have information available of any value we shall be glad to publish it. Indeed, we shall do that from time to time.

Mr. McDERMAND: What particular form of the European corn worm is affecting Ontario? This strikes me as a very important matter, and as a considerable quantity of seed is procured from affected districts to supply the rest of Ontario, it

would be well to know whether the disease is conveyed in the seed.

Mr. TOLMIE: The European corn borer is a dangerous parasite and one that has created considerable alarm in the United States. We are alive to its importance, and I can assure my hon. friend that a staff is kept combatting it during the season. As regards its treatment, we advise cutting the crop as low as possible, cleaning up all debris and burning it, and then ploughing the land. The disease is not conveyed by the corn seed once it has been shelled, but there is a danger in shipping unshelled corn from affected districts. That, however, is prevented by our officers. We have been studying the question with care, and purpose giving it still closer study during the coming summer.

Mr. McDERMAND: I understand that those counties under quarantine are not allowed to ship seed at the present time. Will that regulation be continued?

Mr. TOLMIE: They are not allowed to ship seed on the cob. Future quarantines, I may say, will be enforced so long as we think the precaution necessary, that is to say, as developments occur.

Mr. McKENZIE: I am much obliged to the minister for the exhaustive information he has given us concerning the way in which he is battling with the farmers' enemies in the shape of insects. We have in Nova Scotia, and particularly in the part of the province from which I come, one enemy to which I shall now refer. There may be a special name for it in scientific nomenclature, but it is vulgarly known as the potato bug. It is a very destructive insect, and causes considerable damage. Is any progress being made towards exterminating this particularly troublesome pest, which largely destroys a splendid article of food? I know we have in Nova Scotia, under the provincial department of Agriculture, possibly with some assistance from the Dominion Government, demonstrators who go through the country showing the farmers how things can be done in various ways to improve agriculture; but I am not aware that they have been demonstrating any very effective means of wiping out this enemy of the farmer. When a man is advised to settle on the land in our part of the country he replies that he sees no good in going on the farm because, when he plants cabbages, or potatoes, these insects destroy them, rendering much hard labour absolutely futile, and that it is therefore not inviting to take up land. Now, we certainly want every man we can get to go on the farm, and we should put every means at his disposal to overcome these pests. I want to know especially what is being done to get rid of this potato bug. I understand that the germ stays in the soil from year to year, and perhaps some method might be found—I do not know whether any has been devised so far—of treating the soil in order to kill the germ. Perhaps the minister will inform the committee on this point.

5 p.m.

Mr. TOLMIE: We give demonstrations in the use of both liquid and dust sprays to overcome fungoid diseases in potatoes, of which there are about half a dozen, and among other pests we encounter the potato bug. The treatment costs about a dollar or a little more per acre, including labour and material. What is known as the potato spraying machine is used; it covers several rows at a time. This particular pest cannot be controlled, so far as I know, by any treatment of the soil, but the other remedies I have mentioned, while not costly, are, I think, highly efficient.

Mr. DECHENE: The member for Cape Breton (Mr. McKENZIE), raised an interesting question in his reference to the potato bug, and I am sure the minister is aware of another potato disease, which is known in French as " la glande noire ". Last fall, in our part of Quebec, a large portion of the potato crop was lost as a result of this plague. Perhaps the minister will inform us what is being done by the Government in the way of co-operation with the provincial department of Agriculture in order to overcome, or at all events, to restrict, as far as possible, this harmful disease. Sometimes one takes up a potato that looks perfect, but on cutting it one finds several black rings in it. A farmer may store in the fall a crop of potatoes that have every appearance of soundness, but in a few months the whole thing begins to rot, and by January or February there is little of the crop left. If this plaugue is not checked, in Quebec and in other provinces as well, in a few years' time our potato output will be seriously diminished. I suppose the minister is aware of this trouble and if anything is being done by his department in the matter, I should like to have an assurance from him to that effect.

Mr. TOLMIE: In connection with these diseases, I may inform my hon. friend that we issue information from time to time. Furthermore, we have inspectors in the

different districts who, besides giving information to the farmers, co-operate with the representatives of the departments of agriculture in the various provinces. These different varieties of rot are dealt with by proper spraying. In the first place, there is a careful selection of seed. which is examined for traces of the disease. Having assured yourself that you have good seed a rotation of crops should be followed so that you shall not next year plant potatoes on land that has been infected with one of these diseases. Place that land under some other crop and follow out a regular rotation. By following a rotation, adopting proper spraying, and making careful selection of the seed the matter can be remedied to a very great extent.

Mr. MICHAUD: Are there inspectors in the Maritime Provinces who are taking charge of importations of potato seed? Because sometines bad seed is brought in from the United States and it is highly desirable that our growers should be protected against such seed.

Mr. TOLMIE: We have a regular system of inspection of seeds, and the persons purchasing these seeds must protect themselves to the best of their ability, or consult our men and secure information from many of our establishments where they can get it for nothing. The information will be given to them freely and they will be instructed to purchase their seeds from those districts where good seed is procurable. There are certain sections of Canada where it is easily possible to obtain clean, pure seed, particularly in the newer districts—seed produced from plants grown on new land. By following the simple rules which I have indicated the farmer can protect himself fully. In addition to that we shall be glad at any time to furnish information in the shape of printed matter with regard to these potato diseases. To secure that information the farmer need only make application to the Central Experimental Farm.

Mr. CURRIE: I may say that the growing of potatoes is quite an industry in the riding which I represent, and it is a marked success. The Ontario Government have published a pamphlet on the growing of potatoes, describing how to take the seed and dip it in a solution that will destroy any germs that may be present in the seed. After the potatoes are planted, the growers are told how to treat them with solutions—for instance Bordeaux mixture and arsenate of lead. That is what they now employ largely instead of paris green where it is desired to grow potatoes in any quantity. The pamphlet referred to is an excellent one, and gives full particulars to anyone who wishes to grow potatoes. I do not know whether the pamphlet is published in French or not; nor I do not know whether the federal Department of Agriculture has published a pamphlet of a similar character. I believe they have issued one which is virtually the same. I am sure that the information given to the farmers in these pamphlets has increased the quantity of potatoes grown per acre fully fifty per cent. It is now known, after experimental work, that when potatoes have been treated several times with the common Bordeaux mixture there is no likelihood of danger to them at all, no matter what the soil conditions were previously. That shows the good work which has been done by these institutions to which I am alluding and speaks well for them. I have listened to a great deal of criticism from hon. members opposite with respect to the work of the Department of Agriculture since these Estimates have been under consideration. It is the first time in my experience in the House that a Minister of Agriculture has been criticized in this way or has been found fault with on account of the amount of money which he has expended. Now, I hope that no hon. member in this Chamber will find fault with the money spent in this direction. The Central Experimental Farm at Ottawa alone, by reason of its discovery of Marquis wheat has added some millions of dollars to the value of the grain crop of Canada; in fact it has yielded results that would pay for the cost of the farm more than a thousand times. Then, too, through the discovery of Banner oats by the Ontario Department of Agriculture, thousands of bushels of oats have been added to the oat acreage of Canada, and sufficient money derived therefrom to pay for the entire work of that department. I speak of the work performed by the department of the province of Ontario because I was associated for some time after I entered parliamentary life with the former Minister of Agriculture of the province, Hon. James Duff, who recently died. It may be a surprise to many members in this House to know that to the late Hon. James Duff is due the credit of establishing the system of district representatives which is resulting in so much good to the cause of agriculture not only in Canada but in the

United States. The late Mr. Duff was the first Minister of Agriculture in the world to appoint district representatives. He took young men from college and placed them in various sections of the country so that there would be one in each district. These young men selected experimental plots; they taught the farmers how to spray their apples, how to grow corn, how to spray their potatoes, how to judge their cattle; and so they caused a revolution in the work of agriculture throughout the province of Ontario. The initiation of that work was due to the late Mr. Duff, when he was Minister of Agriculture for Ontario. I want that justice to be done to his memory; I want it known that he was the man who initiated that system. It was so good a system that it has been copied all over the United States. You cannot take up any American paper but you will read about these district representatives and the wonderful work they have done. All this work was first begun in the province of Ontario. Then the system of co-operation amongst the farmers was first put into effect in the province of Ontario. Hon. Mr. Duff established farmers' clubs where the farmers could meet and talk together and inaugurate co-operative marketing and work of that character. I am very sorry to say that after these clubs were instituted some people, more influenced by politics than common sense, turned the majority of these organizations into political clubs instead of retaining them as farmers' clubs which they formerly were. It never was intended by Mr. Duff when he established the farmers' clubs that they should become centres of discontent. I know that other clubs have been established throughout the country. The West has followed the footsteps of Ontario, and in many cases they have gone one better. The knowledge that is being disseminated through the various provinces is owing to the efforts of students who have passed through the College of Agriculture of Ontario. Take the United States and you can scarcely go to a state and ask "who founded this agricultural college?" but you will be told "so-and-so from the Ontario College of Agriculture." These men have led the way in the development of agricultural knowledge and work, and not sufficient credit has been given to them. They did not work for any political purpose; they worked to benefit humanity and to promote the interests of the farmer. To-day there is a great deal of outcry about the "poor farmer." We have had

politicians going all through the country, especially in my own riding, crying out, "Oh, the poor farmer; the farmer has such a poor time farming in Ontario." Now the province of Ontario produces more farming wealth than any other province, and yet what happens? The late Minister of Agriculture for Canada stated not long ago that the farms of Ontario were deserted by the agriculturists, that the farmers were all going to the city. I say that is not true. The agriculturists from Ontario have gone West. The young man from the Ontario farm has shown his mettle in the West, and if you see a good farmer in the West you can depend upon it he is a young man from Ontario. That is where the surplus population from Ontario has gone. We do not begrudge the West those men. There is a certain amount of the population who will go to the city no matter what you do for them. I may say this for the benefit of the hon. gentleman who was the former Minister of Agriculture that I have for some time been taking the Fabian pamphlets published by the Socialists in London, and in one pamphlet after another and as a means of causing discontent among the farmers you find this question of rural depopulation raised. In fact the English socialists, the reds, over there are trying to cause all the trouble they can amongst the rural population of England. I wish further to say that the farms of Ontario and of the West would be worth exactly one hundred per cent more than they are to-day if we had less of these "whining Willies" going around and crying out about the poor farmer. The farmer organizations in the United States do not discuss such questions and cry aloud what poor people they are. Take the price of farm land in Wisconsin or Ohio—I have been in those states within the past few months—and take the price of farm land in the province of Ontario, which is nearer to good markets, and is superior to any kind of farms they have got over there. What do you find? You find farms in Ohio and Wisconsin selling at $300 an acre; but you do not find farms in Ontario selling at half that figure.

Mr. ROBB: My hon. friend forgets the difference in population.

Mr. CURRIE: There is no difference whatever. I have been on those farms and know their size and quality; they are not any larger or better than any we have in Ontario.

Mr. ROBB: They have a larger market

Mr. CURRIE: Nothing of the kind. The best farmers' market in the world is in the city of Toronto.

Some hon. MEMBERS: Oh, oh.

Mr. CURRIE: Hon. members may laugh, but I know; I live in the city of Toronto and I have to pay the price. Why, in Toronto eggs are always higher than they are in Chicago or in Buffalo; and so with the price of potatoes and other farm produce—there is a market right at the farmers' door. Everything he produces he can find a ready sale for in Hamilton, Toronto and other large centres. To my mind the man who goes around drawing a long face for the farmers of Ontario is wasting his time, and I think if a little more boosting was done for those farmers in regard to their land, cattle and crops it would be much better for them than the shedding of all these tears. These tears are simply for the purpose of boosting some political party. If you go along the roads and look at the fine brick farm houses and bank barns, you will discover on inquiry that their owners are not politicians, they are usually men supporting this side of the House; but if you find a tumbledown farmhouse and a barn with the roof off you may be certain that the owner is going around the country talking politics all the time.

The CHAIRMAN: Order. I must draw the attention of the hon. member to the fact that we are discussing item 42.

Mr. CURRIE: I bow to your ruling, Mr. Chairman. I suppose we should come back to the bug question. I was dealing with political bugs rather than the bugs that are so destructive to our farmers. I do not think that the Minister of Agriculture has yet found a cure for the political bug, but I hope the farmers themselves will apply the proper remedy. The work done by the Dominion Department of Agriculture and the provincial departments of agriculture is not overlapping. The two departments work together in Ontario. There is the experimental department, and there are also the demonstration farms which are controlled by the Ontario Government. There is lots of room for improvement in every direction, and the less groaning and wailing there is about the lot of the farmer the happier he will be and the more work he will do. Why all this shouting about the sad condition the farmer is in to-day? We are told that a farmer will say: I am only going to put half my land under crop this year. What a terrible thing to cause all this outcry! I think it is a crime to allow bugs to grow either of the political or of the field kind; and it seems to me that the sooner we "get down to brass tacks" so far as the farmer is concerned and leave him a chance to speak for himself, and not have the grain speculators speak for him, the better it will be for the country at large.

Mr. MOLLOY: I would advise the hon. member for North Simcoe (Mr. Currie) to allow the Minister of Agriculture to speak for himself. I am sure the minister does not object to wholesome criticism of his Estimates, and I think if the hon. member will consult him he will say that he has been fairly used; and we on this side of the House all agree that we have been fairly used. We are asking for certain information in the interest of the people of this country, and my hon. friend in his tirade about our criticism of the minister is wasting time in saying nothing when he might have remained silent and allowed the minister to give us the information asked for. He has been making a sort of manufacturers' speech and attacking the farmers. The farmers are interested in what the Minister of Agriculture has put forth; the manufacturers are not interested to the same extent. So far as the province of Ontario is concerned, one would think, after listening to the hon. member, that that province was the whole earth. Now, Ontario may produce the finest looking men, the most beautiful women, the best horses, so on and so forth, but there are other places in the Dominion of Canada; there is the Great West and there is Eastern Canada. Some people run away with the idea that because they are from the province of Ontario that is the whole thing. I want to tell my hon. friend that although I was born in that province, there are farmers in the other provinces just as good as any man who ever came from the province of Ontario.

Mr. MAHARG: No doubt hon. members will expect me to talk about political bugs, but that is not the subject before the House at the present time. The hon. member for North Simcoe has sown a little seed about political bugs. Well, we will let them germinate, and when the proper time comes we will deal with that particular kind of bug. A few minutes ago the minister informed the committee that he had lost the services of a very valuable man in connection with the work that this item has reference to. I wonder if he would care to express his opinion as to

just why he lost that very valuable official?

Mr. TOLMIE: Mr. Chairman, the official died.

Mr. MAHARG: I am sorry that is the answer. Still, there are other officials that the minister has lost from different causes. I have been looking over these Estimates; and while, Mr. Chairman, it may be a little out of order, yet the loss of officials of this department probably is of interest in connection with any of the items covered by the Estimates of the minister's department. I find that the salaries paid to officials and other employees in this department are very discouraging indeed. In one instance, where I think there can be no difference whatever in the character or degree of the work, I find that filing clerks in some other departments are paid $360 per year more than they are paid in this department. Has the minister anything to say at all in fixing the salaries of his staff?

Mr. TOLMIE: Mr. Chairman, as I pointed out yesterday, these salaries are fixed by the Civil Service Commission.

Mr. MAHARG: You have nothing to say in the way of recommending increases to the staff to make the salaries equal to those of officials in other departments doing similar work?

Mr. TOLMIE: As a minister I do not have any recommendations to make in regard to those salaries, they are fixed by the Civil Service Commission. In fact, I think you will find that it is rather against the law for the minister to take any steps along those lines.

Item agreed to.

Dairying, $175,000.

Mr. LEGER: I would like some information as to the disposition of this amount. In New Brunswick, we have several butter and cheese factories, and in the interests of the whole country I would like to see more of those factories in operation. We have one such factory in my county, not far from where I live, and it is doing very good work. In Moncton there is a co-operative dairy establishment which makes the butter for parts of the counties of Kent, Albert and Westmoreland. It is a great enterprise, and deserves much credit for the work which it is doing. I think we should encourage as much as possible the butter and cheese industries all through the province. I would like to know whether this vote is to encourage such industries, or is it simply to pay the butter inspectors who travel around the country?

Mr. TOLMIE: Last year the value of our dairy products was $252,000,000, the largest, I think, in the history of the country. The Dairy Branch is under the supervision of Mr. J. A. Ruddick, a man well known to dairymen all over Canada; a man whose reputation as an expert is world-wide. The showing for this year is, I think, very creditable indeed. As to the work which is carried on, I may say that we maintain at Finch, Ontario, an establishment for the manufacture of dairy products under ordinary commercial conditions, and I am pleased to say that this establishment, although Government-owned, pays a profit. We also have men who are engaged in promoting the cow-testing associations throughout the country. As hon. members are aware, no one can tell the yield of a cow by looking at her; very often a farmer, even one who is an expert, may be under the impression that his best cows are his fattest ones. When he takes advantage of these testing operations, he is in a position to know from which cows he is getting the best results, and may then profitably discard those which do not come up to what he considers to be a fair standard for profit. That line of work has done splendid service for the dairy industry, not only on this continent but also in Europe, particularly in Denmark, where it has been very thoroughly followed out. Down in New Brunswick we have men travelling about and promoting these various cow testing associations; Mr. Gaudet is one of them. The creameries and dairy organizations are under the supervision of the various provincial governments. We have a butter grader at the Port of Montreal, and we have five representatives in Great Britain, which is our best dairy market. We are doing all we can to ensure that our dairy products sold overseas shall be of the highest possible standard. We feel that when we are in competition with such countries as Denmark and Ireland we must maintain a high standard for our products if we are to be successful. In connection with the butter grading at the port of export, it is our intention to take steps to provide for an increased production and to ensure the better carrying on of the work. We propose also to appoint a dairy demonstrator, a person who will travel about the country from place to place demonstrating the value of dairy products as food, in comparison with other foods ordinarily found on the table. This person will also give demonstrations and exhibitions, make exhibits of dairy products

or assist in making them, with a view to giving the consumer the fullest possible information as to the value of the products of the cow. This has been very successfully done in other countries. We are also carrying on practical experiments and investigations with regard to the various forms of manufacture. We propose to begin as soon as possible the manufacture of certain lines of cheese that are now generally imported—lines that are a little out of the ordinary; lines that we pay a very high price for in this country and which can be produced here just as well as in other countries. We feel that this will be a distinct encouragement to the dairy industry. We also carry on a system of cargo inspection at Montreal and Halifax. We administer the Dairy Act and the Oleomargarine Act. During the past year the convictions made for violations of the Oleomargarine Act were 12 in number and those in connection with the Dairy Act, 128; in 1919 the figures were 8 and 111 respectively. We also issue daily market reports, so as to give full information to the producer regarding the condition of the markets from time to time. We make arrangements with the railways to assist producers in securing a refrigerator car service. This department also handles a cold storage system under the cold storage bonuses that are given, which are referred to in an item to be taken up later. That, roughly, is the scope of the work carried on by the Dairy Branch. When you compare the value of the total dairy output for the year, $252,000,000, with the very modest appropriation asked for by the Department of Agriculture in connection with dairy work, you will agree that the proposed expenditure is not extravagant. It should also be remembered that we have something like 3,500,000 cows in this country which average less than 4,000 pounds each of milk a year. If that average was brought up to 7,000 pounds a year, the value of our dairy products would be tremendously increased. Nothing can render better service along this line than the cow testing associations and the improvement of our sires as carried out by the Live Stock Branch.

Mr. JOHNSTON: Will the minister explain just what he means by cow-testing associations?

Mr. TOLMIE: A cow-testing association is an association organized by one of our representatives, the object being to offer to the farmer an opportunity whereby, under certain conditions, he can send samples of milk to a creamery with which our department has already made an arrangement, and have that milk tested from time to time as to its butter-fat content. In that way, he is able to eliminate cows that are low in butter-fat. Some cows will run as low as 2 per cent in butter fat in the summer time when they are on the grass, in the flush-flow of milk. Some cows will give as high as 6 per cent of butter fat. By weighing his milk daily and marking the weight down in a chart, and by having that milk tested from time to time, the farmer is able to move out from his herd or dispose of in some other way cows that are unprofitable for the dairy business. By the use of a good sire and by the selection of his best cows, he can often double, in a short time, the output of his herd.

Mr. PROULX: Are those tests carried out at experimental farms or illustration stations?

Mr. TOLMIE: This testing is done throughout the country. We make arrangements with creameries in almost every district where cow-testing associations are established.

Mr. KENNEDY (Glengarry and Stormont): I do not rise to criticize in any way the appropriations for which the minister is asking, because I think, in view of the work which he has outlined and which I know is being accomplished, the appropriation is a very modest one. I should like, however, to ask him if he has anything in view for the coming year as to the grading of cheese at the point of export?

Mr. TOLMIE: We are grading cheese at Montreal now, and we propose to extend the work in the near future.

Mr. CALDWELL: What steps will a farmer in any locality have to take in order to get a cow-testing association?

Mr. TOLMIE: If he will be good enough to drop a line to Mr. Ruddick, Dairy Commissioner, Mr. Ruddick will be very pleased to furnish full information; or the hon. member could write to Mr. Gaudet, who is in his own province.

Mr. DECHENE: The minister has just stated that our best market is in England. How much butter was exported to Great Britain during last season?

Mr. TOLMIE: I am sorry I can not give that off hand.

Mr. DECHENE: Can the minister state about how many million pounds approximately?

Mr. TOLMIE: About 10,000,000 pounds.

Mr. DECHENE: Do we export more to the United States than to Great Britain?

Mr. TOLMIE: No, our greatest field of export is Great Britain.

Item agreed to.

Cold storage warehouses, $26,000.

Mr. LEGER: Regarding cold storage, I should like to have from the minister some explanation in reference to a certain delegation which came from the Maritime Provinces last year and which was attended by many members from those provinces. Their application was to be looked into and a further report was to be made. Has anything been done in reference to the matter since that time? At that time, I was appointed one of a committee; but I am sorry to say that I was never invited by the chairman to attend any meetings of the committee and, therefore, I am not supposed to know if anything has been done in the matter. Cold storage is a matter which should be taken into serious consideration in the interest of the Maritime Provinces. The other day members for several provinces invited the minister to visit their districts and see how the matter stands. I would extend an invitation to the minister to visit the Maritime Provinces in order to see the situation in New Brunswick, Nova Scotia and Prince Edward Island. I think he could make up his mind in a short time that they are entitled to some consideration as regards cold storage, and they would be treated in that regard to an extent that, I think, would be only reasonable to all concerned.

Mr. LEMIEUX: Before the minister answers the hon. member for Kent, N.B. (Mr. Leger)—the other day I drew the attention of the House to the question of refrigerator cars for the transportation of fish; but as we are now discussing this item, I am reminded that some years ago my hon. friend's predecessor, the Hon. Sydney Fisher, had organized a system of refrigerators for use in the fishing districts of the country. I do not know how those establishments have fared; but from complaints which I have received from the Gulf of St. Lawrence, it seems that they have not been a success. During the last few months, probably during the last two years, some gentlemen have organized co-operative societies in my county, the county of Gaspé, and I believe that if the organization already in the department for the establishment of those freezers, was transferred to those co-operative societies, perhaps they might be more successful in their operation than they have been in the past. This is a matter of great interest for the fishing communities of the counties of Gaspé and Bonaventure, and the north shore of the St. Lawrence. In those refrigerators they can do two things—preserve the bait when the bait is abundant and, preserve the fish until it is shipped either by cars or by boat to centres such as Quebec, Montreal, Three Rivers and even as far as Toronto and Central Canada generally. On the coast of Gaspé, there are times when, as I stated a moment ago, herring, which is used as bait, or squid, is very abundant; but as they come by schools, they also disappear by schools, and then the fishermen are running about to get bait in order to catch fish which is always very abundant on the banks nearby. It is proposed to have those freezers as reservoirs for the bait of the fishermen in case of need, so that, as operations do not last long, because the seasons are short in that part of the gulf of St. Lawrence, the fishermen will be given an opportunity of going on steadily with their fishing operations; and, second, the consumption of our fish in the centres of Canada will be encouraged. If fish can be kept fresh where it is caught and can be easily shipped, it would be to the advantage of the consumer. Fish is a very wholesome article of food, and I notice with pleasure that the Minister of Marine and Fisheries has instituted a Fish Day for Canada. Of course, we who belong to the Roman Catholic church have our weekly fish day, and we know that a fish diet is very wholesome, not only from the religious, but also from the physical point of view. The consumption of fish ought to be encouraged, but if we wish to encourage its use as a food all over Canada the Government must be prepared to help the fishermen, and have the fishing community use refrigerators such as were started a few years ago by the Department of Agriculture, but which for some reason or other were not a success. I think that now, in view of the existence of these co-operative societies, which in the long run will be a great success with our people, the department would do well to consider whether it would not be feasible to adapt their machinery for refrigeration purposes to those of the co-operative societies.

Mr. TOLMIE: Coming from a seacoast province I fully agree with what the hon.

gentleman has said concerning fish as a food and its desirability on the table, but I think the matter he refers to really comes within the purview of the Department of Marine and Fisheries rather than that of Agriculture. Under our Cold Storage Act as amended some time ago, our assistance is only given to municipally-owned cold storage plants. With regard to what my hon. friend from Kent (Mr. Leger) had to say with reference to the establishment of a cold storage plant in the Maritime Provinces, at Halifax, I am sorry that he was not included on the committee at that time. The committee, I thought, was selected very carefully. Did I understand him to say that he had received no intimation from the chairman?

Mr. LEGER: That is it.

Mr. McMASTER: He was chosen but not called.

Mr. TOLMIE: We have looked into this matter vary carefully. We sent representatives of the Live Stock Branch to the Maritime Provinces to look into the supply of live stock that would be necessary to maintain a cold storage plant and abattoir. We found on investigation that the volume of the supply would not be sufficient, and on the recommendation of our Live Stock Commissioner we have assisted in the co-operative marketing of livestock down there, and in stimulating its production. Marketing is one of our principal features, because I have always felt that farmers will produce if they believe they can sell at a reasonable profit. We hope that just as soon as the volume increases sufficiently to warrant it, a cold storage plant may be established in some spot in that section of the country. When we take into consideration the export of dressed beef, there is no doubt that a large cold storage plant situated down there would be of the greatest importance. It has been suggested that cattle raised in Alberta and the Prairie Provinces should be loaded on cars and slaughtered at Atlantic Ports, but I have not yet received sufficient information to convince me that that would be a success. There are a good many objections. In the first place, a finished steer on the prairies will dress out about 60 per cent. of beef, so on every steer weighing only one thousand pounds—and that would be a light steer—there would be 400 pounds of by-product, which might just as well be kept in the West. But undoubtedly if shipments became general, we would need a cold storage plant in that section of the country as an assembling plant before loading on the ships. I have known one well-known western shipper of dressed beef, located in Calgary, who had to return a whole train load of beef to Montreal to have it properly iced and taken care of because it did not connect with the vessel on the Atlantic. I can assure my hon. friend that we are studying that situation and its prospects. At the present time with the prevailing price of beef, we cannot overlook the competition of the Argentine. They are able to produce beef very much more cheaply than we can. We are quite alive to the subject, however, and as soon as there is a sufficient volume of business, I shall be glad to assist in the establishment of a cold storage plant in that part of the country.

Mr. LEGER: The explanation given by the minister, that the available supply would not be sufficient to justify the establishment of a cold storage plant, is satisfactory. I think, however, that everything should be done to encourage the farmers in that part of the country, and I am sure that a cold storage plant there would encourage the production of beef. The production of beef cannot very well be increased at the present time, because we have not the facilities for receiving the meat. However, I am glad to learn that in a very short while when the available supply has increased, the minister will be glad to assist the farmers in that part of the country. I am sure that his statement will greatly encourage them.

Mr. TOLMIE: I might point out that any municipality, such as Halifax, can obtain assistance now from the Federal Government, to the extent of 35 per cent, in building a cold storage plant.

Mr. MICHAUD: Have you only one cold storage in the whole Maritime Provinces?

Mr. DUFF: Do I understand the minister to say that under the Act assistance is given to the establishment of cold storage plants, but not to those intended for fish or fish products? If the plant that is contemplated to be built at Halifax is built, would it not be able to take care of the products of the sea? I should like to know whether under our present Act the minister cannot assist in the establishment of a cold storage plant for fish purposes?

Mr. TOLMIE: Under our present Act we are only granting assistance to municipalities. Some of them, I understand, do store fish. At all events, they can store anything they want in the way of fish. Un-

less an establishment is municipally controlled, wo do not give a grant. There is one firm down on the Atlantic that is asking for a grant. It applied for a grant before the war, but after receiving permission they were not able to fill their part of the contract owing to war conditions. That matter has been given favourable consideration, I understand, and they are going ahead but have not signed up as yet.

Mr. DUFF: Is that the business in North Sydney, Cape Breton?

Mr. TOLMIE: Yes.

Mr. DUFF: What grant will the Government give towards the establishment of that cold storage?

Mr. TOLMIE: About 35 per cent of the cost of the plant, on condition that it meets with the approval of our commissioner.

Mr. REID (Mackenzie): I am sorry to hear the minister say that the grant is available only to municipally-owned cold storages, because we have in Saskatchewan what is known as the Saskatchewan Creameries Limited, owned by the farmers co-operative concern, and they also provide a cold storage plant in connection with the creameries. I am a believer in public utilities, and when a municipality is slow to go into that business and a number of people co-operate and start enterprises of this kind, I think the minister should consider very seriously aiding such enterprises, because the idea of co-operation is spreading throughout Canada to-day. I trust the minister will seriously consider this matter. Does he think that the amount asked for, of $26,000, is sufficient to encourage the building of cold storage plants?

Mr. TOLMIE: The present Act was not always confined to municipalities, and in previous years we made grants in Saskatchewan, one in Moosejaw, one in Regina, one in Saskatoon, and one in Vonda. With regard to the appropriation asked for now, we are of opinion, judging from past years, that it will be sufficient to meet the present situation.

Mr. REID (Mackenzie): Have the Saskatchewan Co-operative Creameries Ltd. asked for any moneys in connection with the cold storage plant being built at Yorkton?

Mr. TOLMIE: No.

Mr. DECHENE: Mr. Chairman—

The CHAIRMAN: It is now six o'clock.

Mr. DECHENE: I desire to point out that the item is not carried.

[Mr. Tolmie.]

The CHAIRMAN: No.

At six o'clock the committee rose and the House took recess.

After Recess

The House resumed at eight o'clock.

SUPPLY

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

Mr. DUFF: With regard to cold storage, in looking over the report of the Minister of Agriculture I noticed that under an Order in Council passed on May 26th, 1919, the payment of subsidies under the Act is limited to public cold storage warehouses directed and operated by the municipality, or other governing body. I understood from what the minister told me that a cold storage warehouse that was being erected or has been erected in Cape Breton is receiving aid. I wondered if that Order in Council had been rescinded, or under what statute the thirty-five per cent of the cost of this cold storage plant was being paid by the department.

Mr. TOLMIE: The authority given under the old Cold Storage Act was not limited to municipalities, but about two years ago, I think, the Act was changed so as to apply to municipally-owned plants. Previous to that time this aid was given to privately owned plants.

Mr. DUFF: I understood that the cold storage plant in Cape Breton is a new concern, and that it is only now being erected.

Mr. TOLMIE: As I explained before dinner, this concern made application under the provisions of the Act and the application had been accepted previous to the war. Owing to the war conditions they were not able to carry out their plans. We have decided to allow them to go ahead, but up to the present they have not, I understand, signed up.

Mr. DUFF: What is the name of the concern?

Mr. TOLMIE: I am sorry I cannot give the name off-hand, but I will be very pleased to get the information for the hon. gentleman.

Mr. DUFF: Can the minister give some information as to the objects of these cold storage plants?

Mr. TOLMIE: I understand they are for all the ordinary purposes of cold storage —the storage of fresh fish, fruit, beef, eggs and other food commodities.

Mr. SINCLAIR (Queen's, P.E.I.): There is a reference in the minister's report to an arrangement that is being made with the Harbour Commissioners of Montreal, with respect to a cold storage plant. Is the arrangement with them on the same principle as in the case of the cold storage plant in North Sydney?

Mr. TOLMIE: The cold storage plant being constructed in Montreal by the Harbour Commissioners is not receiving any assistance from us.

Item agreed to.

Fruit, $145,000.

Mr. LEGER: I would like to know from the minister what this item is for. If it is intended for the purchase of fruit we on this side have not yet received any. However, I suppose the vote is for the purpose of encouraging fruit growing, but I would like to have some explanation in reference to it.

Mr. TOLMIE: This vote covers district fruit inspection, the travelling expenses of the fruit inspectors, office help, and certain experiments that we are carrying on in connection with cold storage fruit cars. We made some experiments last year in carrying fruit from British Columbia to eastern points. In doing so we used the ordinary brine tank car and we found that by making very simple changes it was very suitable for the carrying of fruit. We are also making demonstrations in various ways with regard to the production of fruit, and we are issuing market reports. During the shipping season from the Maritime Provinces we keep in close touch with the British market by cable, and we issue these market reports to all the people interested in shipping to that export market, which reports have been found of the greatest possible assistance. We are also helping to organize co-operative selling associations. Then there are expenses in connection with administering the Fruit Market and Sales Act. It will be remembered that last session we passed an Act regulating fruit packages and we hope in a very short time that small fruit packages will be of uniform size throughout the Dominion. We are rendering general assistance in every possible way to the industry, but particularly in helping along the successful marketing of our fruit products. We are also engaged in demonstrating the best methods of packing and spraying, as I have already described, and assisting in the exhibition of our fruits in various places where we think it might tend to promote the sale of our fruit. Last year we had a meeting of fruit inspectors from all over Canada at which fruit conditions in the various provinces were fully considered. We find that this bringing together of representatives of fruit associations from different parts of Canada at intervals has had a very excellent effect in assisting in the sale of Canadian fruit, while a general discussion of the conditions with respect to fruit growing and packing all over Canada has been highly beneficial.

Mr. DUFF: Will the minister give us the names of the fruit inspectors for the province of Nova Scotia?

Mr. CHISHOLM (Inverness): And also where they are located?

Mr. TOLMIE: The inspectors for the Maritime Provinces are: A. S. Alcorn, Berwick, Nova Scotia; W. S. Potts, St. John, New Brunswick. The temporary inspectors are: S. C. Dimmock, Windsor, Nova Scotia; A. H. Milner, Annapolis Royal, N.S.; A. T. Morse, Bridgetown, N.S.; F. B. Westcott, Gaspéreau, N.S.; W. J. Sangster, Falmouth, N.S.; J. B. Wilson, Waterville, N.S.; G. E. Hutchinson, Morristown, N.S.; G. A. LeCain, Annapolis Royal, N.S.; R. B. Neily, Middleton, N.S.; H. G. Woodworth, Berwick, N.S.; H. F. East, Melvern Sq., N.S.; S. B. Marshall, Clarence, N.S.; G. H. Ruffee, Wolfville, N.S.; W. P. Fox, Lower Gagetown, N.B.

Mr. DUFF: These inspectors seem to be all located in two counties.

Mr. MICHAUD: They are all in Nova Scotia.

Mr. DUFF: And New Brunswick; but I am speaking of Nova Scotia. I notice practically all these inspectors are located in the two counties of Annapolis and King's. It is quite true that perhaps the greater proportion of the fruit grown in Nova Scotia comes from those counties; but while I do not want to boast of my own county, still I think the minister must know that the county of Lunenburg is renowned for its fruit, and its quality is as good as that of the fruit grown in Annapolis and King's, although the quantity perhaps is not as large. It seems to me that we should have at least one inspector in my county, in justice to the fruit growers there.

Mr. TOLMIE: While these men happen to be located in these two counties as their home centres, their activities are by no means confined to those particular sections; they travel all through the province and visit every district where they can render active service to the fruit growers.

Mr. DUFF: That explanation leaves a little food for thought. I was just wondering whether these men were appointed by the Civil Service Commission or under the old patronage system, for it seems rather strange that they should all be located in the two counties, although they have to travel all over the province. It would be cheaper for the country and be more satisfactory to the fruit growers to have those inspectors distributed throughout the province; for instance, there should be one or two located in the county of Lunenburg and one or two in the county represented by the Minister of Public Works.

Mr. McMASTER: They grow tomatoes in that country.

Mr. DUFF: That was in the old days. But a great deal of fruit is grown in several counties besides Annapolis and King's, and I would suggest to the minister the desirability of seeing if those inspectors cannot be located in various centres in the province instead of being all grouped together in one or two counties. While I am not speaking for my own county particularly, I may say that we have three or four fruit warehouses and have shipped thousands of barrels of apples to the Old Country, and it seems to me that we are entitled to at least one inspector in the county of Lunenburg. By distributing their inspectors throughout the province the department would save a great deal of expense incurred by their men travelling to and from their present centres. Looking over the list of the amounts paid last year for travelling expenses, I find that Mr. Alcorn's were $1,069.86, Mr. DeVany's $112.05, Mr. Harri's $608.45, Mr. Le Cain's $693.81, Mr. Milner's $581.42, Mr. Neily's $484.70, Mr. Vroom's $1,556.80, and Mr. Woodworth's $777.50. These were men located in Annopolis county. I think the minister will agree with me that that money was practically wasted, because if these men were located throughout the province their travelling expenses to and from points within their respective districts would be practically nil. There is between $7,000 and $8,000 expended by these men in travelling from King's and Annapolis counties all over the province (and that money might just as well have been saved. I would suggest to the minister taking up the matter with the Civil Service Commission or the patronage committee, whichever it is, with a view to seeing if these men cannot be sent back to their farms and other men appointed in every county. That is the practical and businesslike way, and it would be in the interest of the fruit industry and of the country. Does not the minister think my suggestion a valuable one?

Mr. TOLMIE: I have made a note of the hon. member's suggestion. I may point out that nearly all of these men were appointed by the Civil Service Commission, and I presume that that commission selected them for their ability in their particular line of work. Naturally, those two counties being very largely engaged in fruit growing, the most able and experienced men would be easily secured in those particular sections. The fruit inspectors would visit those points in the province where the big crops were being grown so that they would have an opportunity for demonstration work in the way of spraying, packing, and so on. They do not devote their time to the counties in which they are located, but travel around so that they may give the fullest possible service whereever they are required in the province. With the present high cost of travel it is almost impossible to avoid a certain amount of expense in connection with the activities of these inspectors. However, I will look closely into the details, and if an improvement can be made I shall be very glad to follow the hon. member's suggestion.

Mr. DUFF: The minister said a moment ago that he thought these men were appointed by the Civil Service Commission because of their ability and knowledge of the fruit business, gained in their home counties. I want to say that in other counties in Nova Scotia there are just as capable men in the fruit growing business. I cannot understand how three commissioners sitting in the Hunter building in Ottawa can pick out men in Annapolis and King's who are thoroughly qualified to inspect fruit in the province of Nova Scotia. To my mind the minister or his deputy is the right and proper man to pick out these inspectors, and not Dr. Roche, Mr. Jameson and Col. Larochelle. The quicker we get back to first principles in the appointment of these men the better it will be for this country. I do not know how these inspectors were chosen, but their selection seems rather strange, and if the Civil Service Commission advertised in the proper way I do not understand how only men from King's and Annapolis were appointed. In

fact, I am very doubtful if there was not some underhand work in their appointment.

Mr. DOUGLAS: No, no.

Mr. DUFF: I can quite understand the prospective senator from the West saying "no, no." I hope he will very soon be able to say "yes, yes," in the other Chamber. I think the minister understands that this is rather a serious business. Last year, something like $7,000 was paid in travelling expenses—not salaries—for these men to get to and from their respective home counties to other parts of Nova Scotia. That is bad business, and I think the minister should have a change made and so save a large sum of money to the taxpayers of this country. Wherever fruit is grown, in any county, that county should have an inspector, instead of all the inspectors being grouped as at present in the two counties of Annapolis and King's. I trust that the minister will look into the matter and see that this state of affairs is remedied.

Mr. MAHARG: We are not large producers of fruit in the Prairie Provinces, but we have felt the need of an inspector in connection with our purchases. Has the minister given that much consideration?

Mr. TOLMIE: Inspectors who work actively in the field during the summer are at work in the markets inspecting fruit in the winter.

Mr. MAHARG: In markets from which the fruit is sold, or where it is delivered to the consumer?

Mr. TOLMIE: Where is it delivered to the consumer?

Mr. MAHARG: We have had great difficulty in the West in getting in touch with these inspectors. We have had some shipments of fruit, over which, I am sure, there was not much supervision while the packing was being done. How are these inspectors distributed throughout the West?

Mr. TOLMIE: We have three at Winnipeg, one at Calgary, one at Saskatoon, one at Brandon, one at Edmonton, four in British Columbia.

Mr. MAHARG: I notice that the two great consuming provinces in which there is little fruit produced have no inspectors at all. I suggest that the minister at least arrange for an inspector at each of the large centres from which the fruit is distributed.

Mr. LEGER: The minister may have named some inspectors who are working in New Brunswick, but so many of them were stated to be in Nova Scotia that I thought they were all there. I hope that he will take into consideration the needs of our province in this respect.

Mr. TOLMIE: We have one inspector at St. John and one at Gagetown.

Mr. McMASTER: Throughout the Eastern Townships orchards have been diminishing in number during recent years. We have had some extremely severe winters which have been very hard on the trees. Would it be possible, by experiments conducted throughout the Eastern Townships, to determine what trees are best suited to the hills of that part of the country? It occurs to me that very valuable advice in this connection might be given by the Experimental Farm. The farm sent me some trees which they developed recently, some new varities which I am trying in my own orchard, and I wonder whether this plan could not be extended somewhat in order that it might be ascertained what kind of tree is best suited for that part of the country.

Mr. TOLMIE: If the hon. gentleman will apply to the Central Experimental Farm he will receive full information. At Lennoxville and at Morden, Manitoba, we are carrying on experiments with a view to producing hardy fruits for those sections of the country where fruit does not thrive under ordinary conditions. We have a man scouting through Northern Canada on the lookout for hardy varieties of trees which can be crossed with softer varieties so as to produce a hard variety that will withstand the more severe weather conditions. The United States has for some time had a man in our northern country engaged in similar work.

Mr. FAFARD: Upon examining the Auditor General's report I find that an amount of $70 was paid to Roger Gagnon, Rivière du Loup, for "travelling expenses" Of course, we cannot grow fruit in Quebec as it is grown in British Columbia, but in some parts of my county fruit growing is quite extensively carried on. I can quite understand that in having a Minister of Agriculture from British Columbia we have to pay for a little, but I think we are at least entitled to our share in this matter.

Mr. CHISHOLM: On looking over the Auditor General's report I find the names of a number of persons working in one county

under the Destructive Insect and Pest Act. Would that come under this item?

The CHAIRMAN: That item was passed, but if the hon. member was not here when it was discussed, perhaps he will have the unanimous consent of the committee to put a question concerning it.

Mr. CHISHOLM: On page A-18 of the Auditor General's report, volume 1, I find the names of ten or twelve men who are evidently doing the same work in one county. The name of Mr. Baker is among them; he is from Middleton, Nova Scotia. I am anxious to know what these men are doing.

Mr. TOLMIE: These gentlemen operating under the Insect and Pest Act are engaged in investigating the ravages of various insects found to be injurious to agriculture, such as the wireworm, the cutworm, the brown-tail moth, the spruce bud worm, the army worm, parasites injurious to turnips and other roots, and all those which I described this afternoon. The hon. gentleman will find a full report of that in to-morrow's Hansard; I gave it shortly before dinner.

Mr. CHISHOLM: What are the particular qualifications of these men? Has location anything to do with their appointment?

Mr. TOLMIE: Some of them are graduates of agricultural colleges. They go into the field first as assistant or temporary inspectors, and as they work with men who are well versed in the business they become qualified to act as permanent inspectors.

Mr. CHISHOLM: Do they send reports to the department?

Mr. TOLMIE: Yes, reports are sent in by all these field men at regular intervals.

Mr. CHISHOLM: I am anxious to know how it is that ten or twelve inspectors are appointed in one county while in other counties there are none at all. Are these insects entirely confined to the counties in which men are appointed?

Mr. TOLMIE: If the hon. member will look at their expense accounts he will find, I think, that their activities are not confined to one county. These men may be selected from one county; I do not know anything about that. All I care about is whether they have the required qualifications and whether they render satisfactory service to the department. They may be sent anywhere we wish to send them. In fact, in the engaging of all these men, the arrangement is generally made that they can be moved to any part of the country where their services may be required. In the case of a serious outbreak we could move them from British Columbia to the Maritime Provinces, and so on.

Mr. CHISHOLM: Are they appointed by the Civil Service Commission?

Mr. TOLMIE: Yes.

Mr. CHISHOLM: My hon. friend (Mr Duff) gave a list of names of men who were, I think, all located in one county.

Mr. DUFF: Two counties.

Mr. CHISHOLM: My surprise is that I find all these men are located in that county also, and some of them are costing this country as much as $3,700, a good deal of that being travelling expenses. It appears to me extraordinary that one county should be selected as a place from which all these officials should come, and in that they should confine their operations mainly to that county.

Some hon. MEMBERS: What county?

Mr. CHISHOLM: If my hon. friends will look up the Auditor General's report, they will find out what county it is. It is not right that the people of this country should be paying travelling expenses in order to have these men located in one county. I would be delighted to see some of them in my county. The minister says that they are graduates of colleges. We have college graduates throughout the country. While I know the minister is desirous of doing all he can—and he is doing well—I am sure his object would be attained much more successfully if he were to scatter these men throughout the province, and I am speaking just now of Nova Scotia. In that case, I might be able to say to my friends in Inverness county when they came up against such a proposition, that such a man was located at such a place, and they could apply to him. But if I have to tell them that they will have to go down to this county, which I will not name, it might be difficult for them to get in touch with the inspector. It would be much better if the minister would scatter these officials throughout the province, one here and another there, in counties where they can do the most effective work and where their efforts will be of most benefit to the people. It is the service to the public that will issue from their efforts that I am consid-

ering, not the accommodation of some gentlemen in a particular county. I dislike being unduly critical, but when you consider the fact that this county is selected and fifteen, twenty-five or thirty officials, who are engaged in a particular effort, are confined to one county, while their duties must be scattered throughout the province, such a condition of affairs is extraordinary.

Mr. BEST: I understood the minister to tell us that these inspectors were selected by the Civil Service Commission, and I understand that every civil servant has to pass a certain examination. It can, therefore, be readily seen that all these civil servants may be in one district and this is one of the faults that I have to find with the Civil Service Commission. As the two hon. gentlemen have said, it is possible for every civil servant in any particular branch to be selected from any one county in the Dominion, because the Civil Service Commission send circulars throughout the country and those who stand highest in the examination get the positions. It may be in this case, that the circulars were sent throughout the different counties, and the fruit inspectors were all appointed from those two counties. That is one of the evils that I see in the Civil Service Commission, and as the hon. member (Mr. Chisholm) states, it is not fair to the Dominion, or to the different counties, that men are appointed to different positions, not only in the Department of Agriculture, but in every other department, all in a few counties, whereas, if we had some other system, especially in the outside service, appointments would be distributed over the various counties. I can readily understand that the minister has no power or control whatever to see that these people are appointed in different counties, because they are appointed by the Civil Service Commission under an examination system, and they may all happen to be from one county. I hope this evil will be remedied in the near future.

Mr. DUFF: I cannot agree with my hon. friend (Mr. Best) that the minister has no responsibility or control in the matter. If the minister requires twelve inspectors for this particular branch of his department for the destruction of insects and pests of all kinds, it is his duty, or that of the deputy, when he sends word down to the Civil Service Commission, that he requires twelve inspectors, to say that he requires them for certain counties.

Mr. BEST: Would he not be breaking the rules imposed upon to the Civil Service Commission if he did that? I understand the Civil Service Commission claim that he would.

Mr. DUFF: I do not think he would be breaking any rule. If the Department of Agriculture requires twelve inspectors, it is the duty of someone in the department, when the request is sent to the Civil Service Commission for the appointment of these men, to say that they are to be located in certain counties, and not to leave the matter wide open so that the Civil Service Commission, when they send out the notices and receive the applications, will, for instance, appoint twelve men in Victoria county, which is the most northerly county in Nova Scotia, when their work will be principally in Yarmouth, Queen's and Shelburne, and Digby. That is a stupid way of making appointments. Some responsibility must attach to the Department of Agriculture, and if it has failed to instruct the Civil Service Commission that these men are to be in different counties, the department has failed in its duty to the public. I have no complaint as regards where these men live; my complaint is that the people of this country are paying seven or eight thousand dollars in travelling expenses for these men, when that money could be saved. I have no complaint because they live in one county and have more knowledge and consequently receive the appointments; I am proud this county is able to produce this number of inspectors; but after receiving the appointments, they should be sent into the different counties of the province to do this work, thereby saving this large sum of money in travelling expenses.

Mr. TOLMIE: It is really an advantage to have these inspectors located in those particular counties in which the bulk of their work is to be carried on, because when an inspector lives at home, he costs us nothing for hotel expenses. While I am very glad indeed that the hon. gentleman has brought this to my attention, I might point out that under the Civil Service Act the minister cannot name any particular man he wants appointed.

Mr. DUFF: I did not suggest that the minister should name the man, but that he should designate the county for which he wants him appointed.

Mr. TOLMIE: The Civil Service competitive examinations are open to the whole

country and the men are appointed, I understand, according to their standing in the examination. However, I will bear in mind what the hon. gentleman and other hon. members who have spoken along the same line have said, and see if we cannot break up some of these groups.

Mr. ROBB: What the minister says about appointments is probably true, but surely the Department of Agriculture has authority to dictate where the inspector, whoever may be appointed, shall reside, thereby saving a certain amount of money that might be more profitably used than in the travelling on the railways.

Mr. TOLMIE: The bulk of the fruit work is in only two counties.

Mr. McKENZIE: It seems to me there is too much travelling done in the province of Nova Scotia by these officers, and that there are far too many inspectors appointed. There are twelve or fourteen of them, and there are only eighteen counties in the province. I understood the minister to say that these men are all located in one county. That does not strike me as business, herding them all in one county. There cannot be work for them all there.

Mr. DAVIDSON: Does the hon. gentleman refer to apple inspectors or to what officers?

Mr. McKENZIE: I am told they are inspectors who go around seeing if there are any pests. I do not know whether my hon. friend from Digby and Annapolis (Mr. Davidson) feels the pest coming up his spine or not, but from the fact that he is coming to his feet one would think it is coming home to him. Perhaps he has particular knowledge of who these men are, and where the flies are that they are chasing all the time. My point is that if there is work to be done all over the province, these twelve or fourteen inspectors should not all be located in one county, but in different parts of the province at a convenient distance from their work. In that way they could be consulted more readily, and it would save the expense of travelling from one end of the province to the other. I can readily understand that the minister cannot provide against who shall be appointed, if the appointment is based upon a competitive examination open to the whole Dominion, but he certainly should be able to say where these officers shall be located, so as to give the best service to the country and to avoid unnecessary expense.

[Mr. Tolmie.]

Mr. DAVIDSON: I think there is an entire misapprehension in the minds of hon. gentlemen in reference to this matter. I think all will agree that if the Civil Service Commission are going to appoint apple inspectors it is only natural that they should go to a county where they would find expert apple growers, men who knew the business. It is also not unnatural to suppose that these people should reside where the work is to be done. Now, as a matter of fact, as hon. gentlemen on the other side who have spoken and who come from Nova Scotia know very well, there are practically only three fruit counties in Nova Scotia. They are Hants, King's and, most important of all, the county of Annapolis. These constitute practically the fruit belt of the province. There are a few crab apples grown in the county of Lunenburg, but as a matter of fact, probably 95 per cent of the apples grown in Nova Scotia are grown in the three counties I have mentioned. The fruit inspectors are divided pretty nearly equally between those counties. There are fewer in the county of Hants, because fewer apples are grown there. There are more in the counties of King's and Annapolis, because they are the two largest fruit growing counties. My hon. friend from Inverness apparently resented the idea that these men were not located in his own county.

Mr. CHISHOLM: I had no reference at all to inspectors, but was referring to men who were working under the Destructive Insect Pest Act.

Mr. DAVIDSON: The duties of these men are largely to suggest means of combatting the pests which visit the fruit belt; that is their primary duty. Now it would be very absurd to send an inspector for brown tail moth, caterpillar, or something of that kind, away up into the desolate wastes of Inverness county where there are nothing but rocks and that kind of thing, for there would be nothing there for him to do. Consequently, it is only natural to find that those gentlemen whose duty it is to safeguard the fruit industry, and to prevent the ravages of insects, should be located and do their work in the fruit districts.

I want to say just a word in regard to the matter brought up by my hon. friend from Brome (Mr. McMaster). He suggested that the Department of Agriculture might discover some hardy variety of apple that would grow in his constituency and not be killed by the severe frosts which visit that locality. The minister intimated

that the department were endeavouring to make some investigation along that line, and I dare say the department are getting some good results, but I want to point out to my hon. friend from Brome a fact which he as a free trader will very well appreciate, and that is that it is better to allow a county that is adapted to growing apples to grow apples, and to allow a county that is adapted to growing maple sugar to grow maple sugar. If my hon. friend wants shade for his farmers in Brome, and wants trees which will not be killed by the frost, I believe it would be better if he gave up altogether the idea of growing apples and stuck to maple sugar instead. Maples would afford quite as good shade as apple trees, and would be better suited to the climate in that locality.

Mr. DUFF: In the course of my remarks I distinctly stated that the counties of King's, Annapolis and Hants were the principal fruit growing counties in Nova Scotia. You will notice, Mr. Chairman, that the hon. member for Digby and Annapolis said that the only apples that grew in Lunenburg county were crab apples. That certainly was a very statesmanlike remark; it could fall only from the lips of a statesman. We all remember how the hon. member for Digby and Annapolis took an oath that he was a statesman. I am not in that class, and consequently I am not going to say that the only fruit they grow in his country is crab apples. My point is this: If, as the hon. gentleman says, the counties of Annapolis and King's are the principal fruit growing counties of the province, most of the work done by these twelve men would be done in those two counties. Therefore, why is there such a large amount charged in the Auditor General's Report for travelling expenses? My objection was not that these men were from Annapolis and King's, but that this country was spending $7,000 or $8,000 in travelling expenses, and that money must have been expended in travelling between Annapolis, Lunenburg, Yarmouth, King's, Shelburne, Colchester and Cumberland counties, and perhaps as far down as Inverness, Cape Breton and Victoria. I say that in the interests of the country the amount so spent in travelling expenses should be saved, and that instead of these men being located in King's and Annapolis counties, they should be located in different parts of the province.

Mr. DAVIDSON: I did not for a moment wish to make any disparaging remarks about the county which is represented by my hon. friend from Lunenburg. As a matter of fact, he represents a very fine county, a much better county than you would naturally think, and I do not mean to say that the only fruit grown there is the crab-apple.

Mr. DUFF: That is what you said.

Mr. DAVIDSON: They do grow chokecherries there, and the county is a very prosperous one, but I think my hon. friend will admit that it is not a great apple-growing county. The agriculturists in Lunenburg county, while excellent in other directions, are not particularly proficient in the art of horticulture, and in view of that fact, one would not naturally expect to find very many efficient apple inspectors in that locality. As a fact, nearly all the work of these inspectors, especially of apple inspectors, is done, so far as I know, in the three counties I have mentioned, and in the city of Halifax, which is the shipping port. An inspector is kept there and must be paid travelling expenses, and he is allowed a per diem charge while on duty in that port. My hon. friend will discover, I think, if he takes the trouble to investigate, that very little of this money, the expenditure of which grieves him so much, is really spent in his county. There is not much occasion for these officers to do work in that particular locality, and I do not see that the hon. gentleman has any great reason to complain of extravagance on the part of the Government in this connection. Now, he referred to the fact that I had taken an oath on one occasion that I was a statesman. Well, let me say that I have never heard that statement contradicted in Canada.

Mr. DUFF: Mr. Chairman, we do not need to argue about the knowledge which the hon. member for Digby and Annapolis has regarding my county, or any other county than his own. We have only to use our eyes to size up the situation in a few moments. I am not contending that my county is the biggest apple growing locality in the province from which I come, but the hon. member displays his absolute ignorance of matters of fact when he says that we do not grow many apples in Lunenburg.

9 p.m. Let me say that the fruit grown in that county is second to none in Canada. Besides, we export thousands of barrels to London, England.

Mr. PARENT: Is there any arrangement between the Federal and the Provincial Governments with regard to inspection?

Mr. TOLMIE: There is not.

Mr. PARENT: I am sorry there is not. In our part of the country, and also in Kamouraska, a famous plum was produced a few years ago, but for certain reasons which I do not know, its culture has been discontinued. At any rate, it is no longer marketed. Has the minister taken any steps to see that this particular fruit is again cultivated and put upon the market?

Mr. TOLMIE: We had in that district an expert who was familiar with the conditions there, but, unfortunately, he was killed in the war, and so far we have not been able to secure a first class man to take his place. As soon as one is available, however, we shall see that he is assigned to that district.

Item agreed to.

Health of Animals, administration of the Animal Contagious Diseases and Meat and Canned Foods Acts, $1,410,000.

Mr. McMASTER: What indemnities are paid to farmers whose herds, wholly or in part, are destroyed because of disease? I understand there is a difference in treatment between accredited herds and ordinary herds. Perhaps the minister will shorten the discussion on this item by succinctly telling us what the operation of the Act is in this respect?

Mr. TOLMIE: As regards compensation paid for animals, it is immaterial whether a herd is accredited or not, except in the case of tuberculosis. We pay compensation for animals destroyed under the accredited herd system and also under the municipal system. In computing the compensation for grade cattle, we pay two-thirds of a maximum valuation of $80, or $53.33, assuming the maximum is paid. For pure bred animals the maximum valuation is $250, and compensation on the two-thirds basis would represent $166.66. In either case the inspector exercises care to ascertain the actual market value of the animal at the time of slaughter.

Mr. PARENT: How much has been paid for cattle slaughtered throughout the country under this item?

Mr. JOHNSTON: May I ask, before the minister answers this question, whether the compensation is paid in respect of all breeds?

Mr. TOLMIE: Yes, it is applicable to all breeds. Last year we paid $21,827.94 for accredited herds.

Mr. PARENT: Where?

[Mr. Parent.]

Mr. TOLMIE: Throughout the whole Dominion.

Mr. SINCLAIR (Queen's, P.E.I.): For how many animals?

Mr. TOLMIE: Two hundred and twelve.

Mr. SINCLAIR (Queen's P.E.I.): What disposition is made of the debris?

Mr. TOLMIE: That goes to the owner; but where the carcase is found to be unfit for food, it is destroyed. Now, while these figures are large, I may point out that the accredited herd system covers only pure bred herds of cattle. In such herds where there are a few grade animals, it is necessary, of course, to eliminate them so as to make the herd perfectly clean. That is why we handle grade animals in these herds. Under ordinary conditions the system deals with pure bred herds altogether.

Mr. JACOBS: I do not want to pose as an expert in matters of this kind, for the reason that the shoe-maker should stick to his last. However, I have a recollection that the minister told us a few days ago, when discussing the question of the British embargo, that we have not had a serious case of contagious disease among our animals for nearly two generations. Now, it seems to me that $1,410,000 for a department which I gathered at the time, of the minister's speech, was really not functioning at all because there was no necessity for it, is a rather large sum, more particularly as we are increasing it this year by $390,000. This is very much like Mark Twain's patent medicine advertisement which stated: "One bottle cured me, please send another dozen."

Mr. TOLMIE: There is no country in the world that I am aware of where the herds are absolutely free from tuberculosis. What I said the other day in discussing the embargo was that we had not had pleuro-pneumonia in this country for thirty-four years, and that that particular outbreak—the last one we had on this side—was found in a shipment of cattle from Europe. The disease was discovered in quarantine, and the animals were destroyed and the premises disinfected. I said further that we had not had foot and mouth disease for thirty-six years, and that particular outbreak also was found in quarantine. I drew attention to the fact, too, that the Health of Animals Branch was able to protect the boundary line of some four thousand miles between this country and the United States when the highly infectious foot and mouth disease occurred

there on three or four different occasions, and when that country lost millions of dollars in consequence. That is what I said. I notice that some hon. members, in referring to what I had stated, went so far as to assert that I suggested that the country was absolutely free from disease. I did not make that statement, and I do not want such an impression to get abroad, because it would be ridiculous to any veterinarian familiar with conditions throughout the world. Now, while we have some attacks of tuberculosis in this country we are no worse off than other countries, and Great Britain could not possibly keep our cattle out on that account, for it is a well-known fact that some British herds are also affected with tuberculosis. We have been doing a very large business in pure bred cattle with the United States. The United States took up what is known as the accredited herd system and it was adopted in this country on the 20th September, 1919, having been followed since. This was adopted in this country on 20th September 1919, and we have been following it up since. I think it will be proper for me to give the hon. members a brief account of what the accredited herd system is. We accept only pure bred herds of cattle. We test them with tuberculin under certain conditions, destroying those animals which are infected, or isolating them under what is known as the Bang system, thoroughly disinfecting the premises. After the cattle have passed three tests within twelve months, or two tests a year apart, without finding any disease on the premises, the owner is given a certificate that he possesses what is known as an accredited herd. That herd must be taken under the supervision of the Health of Animals Branch. The owner must not allow any other animals on the premises without being tested to the satisfaction of the Veterinary Director General, and there are certain other stringent rules under which he must maintain this herd. When he has done that the United States government will accept his herd, provided it has been tested within twelve months, without any question whatever and there be no testing at the boundary line. We have arranged with the United States government to accept their cattle under similar conditions.

I feel that it would be an immense undertaking to attempt to clean-up tuberculosis in a country-wide way. In the first place we have not the efficient help that would be necessary, and it would be useless to tackle it in a country as big as this is without the approval of the farmers and livestock men in general. So that through the medium of this accredited herd system we will be cleaning up certain herds throughout the country, and in that way educating the farmers as to the value of keep disease-free herds. Out in the province of British Columbia—a province that has perhaps made greater progress than any other in Canada in cleaning up tuberculosis—I may say that when the tuberculin test was first introduced amongst dairy herds we met with a good deal of opposition; but after a while certain herdsmen began to clean up their herds and the dairy districts began to get free from tuberculosis. In a very short time we found that the cities were beginning not to accept milk except from herds that were free from tuberculosis, and the result is that whole districts are now free from this disease, and the farmers have experienced a very direct benefit from the cleaning up of their herds. We hope to educate the farmers throughout the country by beginning first with the accredited herd system. Afterwards, from time to time, as seems practicable, further steps may be taken along these lines. In handling these cattle of the accredited herds the Veterinary Director General must be advised very fully of any movement of these cattle—the sale of cattle from these farms or the purchase of cattle for stocking them—breeders are obliged to work under very strict rules, and careful sanitary measures must be observed on the farm. Failure to comply with these regulations will result in the cancellation of their accreditation.

In regard to the increase in our appropriation for which we are asking at the present time, I may say that this is largely due to the popularity of this particular movement. It has become popular much faster than we had anticipated. The people of the country have taken it up, or rather the pure bred stock breeders, in a wholehearted way and the result is that more money will be required next year than is needed at the present time. To give you an idea of the extent of our operations I may say that we now have about 463 applications and 150 of these are on the waiting list, it being very difficult indeed to secure a sufficient number of expert veterinarians to carry on this work. We are now using what is known as the triple test wherever possible. In the first place they used what is known as the subcutaneous test under which we took an animal's temperature for several hours and then injected tuberculin, and followed this

up the next day by taking the temperature of the animal every three hours. As a result of this we came to a conclusion as to whether there was a sufficient rise of temperature or not. Whenever the animal's temperature showed no rise we considered that animal a healthy animal; and in other cases where the temperature went up three degrees we considered the animal was affected with tuberculosis. There have been a number of improvements lately and we are now using what is known as the intra-dermal test in which we inject only about three drops of tuberculin into the layers of the skin, and we form our diagnosis by the swelling or enlargement at the point infected. We also have what is known as the ophthalmic test in which a little plaque containing tuberculin is placed in the eye and, as a result, in the diseased animal there ensues an inflamed eye with a certain amount of discharge a few hours afterwards. It is very important to have these tests for the reason that some unscrupulous breeders are attempting to frustrate them by saturating their animals with tuberculin; but the triple test has greatly increased the difficulties in the way carrying out any such fraudulent trick as that. The facts which I have narrated account very largely for the increase in our appropriation. This is a very valuable work indeed. To give you an idea of how popular it is in the United States, I may state that they now have over there 5,000 herds fully accredited at the present time, and 27,842 herds under test. They are very much behind in their work however, for the same reason that we have experienced—they find it is very difficult to obtain a sufficient number of properly qualified men for these duties.

Then again during the past year we had a number of outbreaks of hog cholera which has made it necessary to pay rather more compensation than is customary. The handling of the enormous number of cattle in the mange area in the West was a work of extreme difficulty. They number some 220,000 and the whole of these were dipped twice in a bath of hot sulphur and lime at a temperature of 120 degrees. All this work was done within a few weeks. It was necessary to have a large number of inspectors for this work and in addition we secured the co-operation of many cowboys who ranged over an area of some 2,600 miles in order to see that a clean drive was made and that no animal was left behind. This year has been a very busy one indeed in connection with the health of animals work. We expect the coming year will be one in which there will be a great deal more work to do along the lines I have indicated.

Mr. PARENT: The minister has made a very admirable statement and we are very greatly indebted to him for it. He has mentioned that out of a vote of $1,410,000 about $20,000 have been spent in connection with the slaughtering of cattle. Will he be good enough to tell us what breeds of cattle these were?

Mr. TOLMIE: I have not the information as to the breeds of cattle. It would require a return to bring down all the information for which the hon. member asks.

Mr. PARENT: The $20,000 must have been spent very quickly.

Mr. TOLMIE: If the hon. gentleman is anxious to get the information I shall be very pleased to get it for him.

Mr. PARENT: I should like very much to get it.

Mr. LEGER: In the province of New Brunswick we have good farmers and good stock raisers and any information we can get upon topics of interest to them will be welcome. I would like to ask the minister whether there is more than one veterinary surgeon employed in the province of New Brunswick and, if so what their names are. I would also like to know who is the inspector of meat and canned foods for that province?

Mr. TOLMIE: While the deputy is looking up that information I would like to state the effectiveness of the work of the Health of Animals Branch. Previous to 1914 the disease known as dourine prevailed among range horses in Western Canada causing serious losses. The compensation paid in the year was no less than $48,000 for that one disease. We had a very efficient staff handling that work, including our present chief pathologist, Dr. Watson. That officer was able to discover a method of testing the blood of these animals thus rendering the diagnosis very easy. The following figures show the excellent results of the work done. In 1914, $48,000 was paid in compensation; 1915, $32,000; 1916, $17,000; 1917, $3,000; 1918, $1,340; 1919, $261; 1920, $70; and in 1921 nothing.

Mr. MORPHY: Before the minister leaves this item I would like him to state what the difference is between tuberculosis and pleuro-pneumonia in cattle?

Would an animal affected with tuberculosis be rejected as a food product, and also would an animal affected with pleuro-pneumonia be rejected as a food product? And what is the difference, if any, between the two diseases?

Mr. TOLMIE: We may have tuberculosis in a number of stages. An animal might be affected with tuberculosis without any external symptoms whatever. In fact, I have seen cattle shown at our exhibitions that were beef fat and yet they were fairly putrid with tuberculosis. The chronic form might be found located in any part of the body, usually in the lymphatic glands, very often in the lungs, and sometimes in the intestines and in the liver and other organs; in fact, it might appear anywhere in the skin. In contagious pleuro-pneumonia you have the pleura and the lungs affected principally and the animal lives only a short time. In pleuro-pneumonia cases the carcases would be entirely destroyed. In tuberculosis all animals pass through our public abattoirs under inspection, and where the disease is generalized, that is, where it has reached a stage to indicate that the whole system may be affected, the animals are destroyed; but where only a few small organs are affected in a slight way, or the disease is incapsulated, those affected parts are destroyed and the carcase is passed as fit for food. That is done in all abattoirs in every country and is considered a perfectly safe practice.

In reply to the hon. member who enquired regarding employees in New Brunswick, I may say that we have the following veterinary inspectors: D. McCuaig, McAdam Junction; J. A. Ratte, Edmundston; J. H. Shonyo, St. John; and one car inspector, Howlett, St. John. There are no meat inspectors there. The meat inspection system of the Health of Animals branch is carried on only in those abattoirs that slaughter for export or interprovincial trade. It is true that a good deal of the meat slaughtered under those conditions is used locally. But we do not maintain any inspection of slaughter houses which kill for local business only. That inspection is supposed to be within the purview of the municipalities and the provincial governments.

Mr. SUTHERLAND: In reference to the inspection of animals slaughtered for export and interprovincial trade, it has always appeared to me to be a very peculiar state of affairs that we exercise such extreme caution in those cases and throw very little safeguards around the food that is consumed by our own people. It is true, as the minister has just said, that is left to the municipal authorities, but we all know that they do little or nothing in that respect, and surely if any people are deserving of these safeguards it is the people right in our own country. With reference to the accredited herds, it seems rather remarkable to me that only 212 head of cattle have been slaughtered under this system for which compensation has been paid.

Mr. TOLMIE: That was for last year.

Mr. SUTHERLAND: Well, I know of one herd where over 80 head were slaughtered, and I know of other herds where various animals were slaughtered and in all those cases compensation has not yet been paid. I think the excuse given was that the department did not have funds to meet those particular claims. Is it not a fact that where many animals have been found to be suffering from tubercular trouble they have not been slaughtered, but have been disposed of in order to clear the disease out of the particular herd? I understand it is a common practice for dealers to purchase diseased animals from such herds and ship them into some other part of the province for sale by auction. Has the minister any information as to this practice?

Mr. TOLMIE: When a person applies to come under the accredited herds system he hands his herd over entirely to the Veterinary Director General and his Health of Animals branch, and any animals condemned for slaughter, if not generalized, are shipped to an abattoir where they are slaughtered strictly under inspection of the Health of Animals branch. We do not permit a man to remove his animals from the premises and send them to another place to be auctioned off. While I am on this particular item I may say that the hon. member for Frontenac the other night in referring to a case where the Health of Animals branch had destroyed some animals for glanders, stated:

> As it was, the farmers could not prepare their ground for the next year's crop; they could not even get out their potatoes or anything of that kind, and on the whole they were left in a very bad position as regards their crop for this year.

On making inquiry at the Health of Animals branch I find there were twenty-seven horses quarantined in the outbreak referred to divided among twelve owners.

Of five horses destroyed, three belonged to one owner, and of these one was a colt and could not be worked. This particular owner bought two new horses, giving him the same number of work horses that he had before. The other two horses belonged to two different owners. So that they suffered inconvenience to that extent while these changes were being made; and these men lost two horses.

Then, again, the hon. member for South Oxford (Mr. Sutherland) criticized the Health of Animals Branch on account of their action in connection with an outbreak of hog cholera on the farm of one Alderson. He stated that Alderson said that his hogs were not infected with hog cholera and were free from disease. I am quite sure that the hon. gentleman was not fully informed or he would not have made the statement. In the first place, the ordinary garbage inspector who was sent down to inspect these hogs—this being a garbage feeding plant—had no difficulty whatever in diagnosing the disease among those hogs as hog cholera. He immediately advised the Health of Animals Branch inspectors; a careful inspection was made, and they had no difficulty in confirming the lay inspector's diagnosis. I may say that we permit the feeding of garbage to hogs only under license, for the reason that a great deal of this garbage-fed pork, particularly if imported, may communicate hog cholera. Unless pork is thoroughly cooked it may produce hog cholera if it comes from a hog which has had cholera or a hog which has had the double immunization treatment which is given in the United States. On these premises the inspectors found garbage that was not cooked, and any one breaking that rule forfeits the right to compensation. The son of the proprietor, who was on the premises at the time, admitted after some conversation with the inspectors that some hogs had already died. Under the rules he should have at once reported that to the Veterinary Inspector-General's Branch. I am sure that the hon. member for South Oxford and the hon. member for Frontenac would not have made the statement they did had they had the full information. It is only fair to our inspectors that this explanation should be made; for I am sure they are trying to do their best to keep our animals free from contagious disease.

Mr. SUTHERLAND: With reference to the last remark of the hon. minister, I think I made it quite clear the other night when I referred to it that the man who had suffered the loss stated most emphatically, and his son made an affidavit that no disease existed on his premises, that no hogs were sick and none had died. Since making that statement I have received a report from the head of the Health of Animals Branch with regard to this matter which has given me some information that I did not have at that time, but which, I believe, emphasizes the justice of the claim made by the person whose two hundred and twelve hogs were destroyed by the inspector. It is true that the business he was carrying on was located near Toronto; it was what was known as the old Humber piggery, erected by the Government of Ontario many years ago, and he has been carrying it on for quite a number of years. He has been breeding hogs as well as buying them. He claims that when the inspector came there he had in a separate pen some of the culls from the different litters. It is well known to any stock breeder that there are often some unthrifty pigs in a litter and that it is good business to separate them from the larger and more thrifty ones; so this man had a few unthrifty ones in a separate pen. The inspector looked at them and said: "Why, there must be something the matter with these pigs." He took their temperatures; he killed one of them and asserted that the pigs were diseased; that there was cholera among them and that they would all have to be destroyed.

The minister has stated to-night that this man's son admitted that a number of the pigs had died. Well, my information from the proprietor and his son is that they did not make any such admission; that they had not lost a pig in two years except some small pigs which had died while they were with the brood sows. Now, the one who should know whether or not there was disease among the animals would surely be the man who owned them. As to cooking the garbage, he has a complete outfit for that purpose. Before he could get a license from the Government he had to waive all claims for damages unless he could prove that the disease had been brought in from some outside source, so he would be careful to see that the garbage was well cooked. I understand that there is no piggery in the country that has been kept better or in a cleaner condition than this one, and the minister will find that his inspectors reported to that effect on previous occasions. When the inspector took the temperature of a number of these pigs and informed the proprietor that they were to be slaughtered, the proprietor asked the privilege of taking some of them

after they were slaughtered and dressing the carcasses because they were almost fit for market. A number of them were picked out that did not have any symptoms of disease. As a matter of fact this man stood outside the pen while the animals were driven out of twelve different pens and selected as they came out some of those that were fit for market—that is, that were fleshy enough and would meet the demands of the market. Thirty-three of these animals were dressed by the proprietor; the intestines were left alongside where the inspector could examine them, which he did—and not one animal of the thirty-three was found diseased.

It may be said that hog cholera will remain dormant. My experience has not been very great but I know of an instance that occurred a few years ago where inspectors went into a certain district, destroyed all the hogs in a certain locality and placed a valuation on them which was the most absurd that could be imagined—one would almost think that the men had never seen a hog before, judging from the valuation they placed upon these animals. The result was the appointment of an independent commissioner to take evidence in the matter and to place a value on the animals, and the matter was satisfactorily adjusted. The minister tells us that these men are above reproach; that they are the best men that can be found in Canada or in the world. We have heard that statement very often in reply to criticisms that have been levelled against men who are in the Department of Agriculture. Well, these men are like a good many others who go into the Civil Service, who have a soft job as long as they live and do not get too busy or pay too much attention to their work. That has been my experience, at least. In this case the person aggrieved makes the request that an independent commission of practical men take evidence in regard to the matter, and he is prepared to abide by the result. But he objects strenuously to being practically ruined by the act of some inspector. When animals of that kind were selling at the high price prevailing in April of last year, it is a serious matter to have 212 hogs slaughtered by an inspector under those conditions, particularly in view of the fact that the man, his son and his manager are prepared to substantiate every statement that they have made; that there was no disease in their herd; that not an animal died from disease, and that the food was cooked properly because they have all the appliances for cooking it. There is a straight denial by the owner, his son and his manager of the statement of the inspector in this department, which we are told is composed of men who are the best to be found in any country. In any case, the action was a pretty high-handed one. These 33 hogs, which were not picked out because they did not show any signs of disease, but which were picked out by the proprietor who stood outside and selected them as they were driven out of different pens, did not show any signs of disease after they had been slaughtered, and they were all disposed of by him. The rest of the animals were destroyed. The proprietor claims that there was no disease; the minister's official claims that there was disease and that the man is not entitled to any compensation.

Mr. MORPHY: To whom were the 33 animals disposed of and by whom?

Mr. SUTHERLAND: By the owner of the animals to either some packing house or dealers in Toronto.

Mr. MURPHY: With the consent of the inspector?

Mr. SUTHERLAND: Yes.

Mr. MOLLOY: Were those animals condemned by a lawful veterinary surgeon, an inspector under the Health of Animals Branch?

Mr. SUTHERLAND: I am not sure whether he was a qualified veterinary surgeon. He was an inspector under the Health of Animals Branch. I could not say what his qualifications were, but from the information I have received, I do not think they were very good. It is impossible for a man to do business except under a heavy fine unless he has a license from the department, and when he gets a license he has to sign a statement to this effect:

> In consideration of the granting of a license to me, I hereby agree to maintain my hogs in a clean, sanitary condition, to sell no hogs except for immediate slaughter, to notify the veterinary inspector if sickness appears among my hogs, to forfeit all claim for compensation in case it is necessary to destroy any of my hogs as a result of hog cholera unless it can be shown that the infection came from some other source than from feeding garbage.

He has to show that the disease had entered his herd from some other source than the feeding of garbage. In this particular case, the man claims that there was no disease; that his hogs were perfectly sound and healthy except for a few culls from litters that were put in a pen by

themselves on account of their unthrifty condition. That is rather a remarkable document to compel a man to sign before he is granted a license. These regulations, to which I have referred to-night, are not embodied in the Act for compensation for the slaughter of animals when diseased; they are made by virtue of power given to the department to make regulations. I am not objecting to that power remaining in the hands of the minister and his department if it is not abused; but I am satisfied by past experience that some of these men are not competent or safe men to be travelling around this country inspecting herds and doing the things they have done. I remember where one of these inspectors came to half a dozen farmers in my riding and in a sneering way went around, shot their hogs on their farms wherever they were to be found, and left without giving them any satisfaction. Eventually other inspectors and a commissioner had to be sent there in order to have the matter adjusted, and by the exercise of a little common sense the matter was satisfactorily adjusted. In view of the seriousness of the results, under conditions such as this to which I have referred, we ought to be very careful before we place unlimited power in the hands of any of these inspectors to go around the country in a high-handed manner and to do the things which have been done.

Before we pass this item, I should like to have some assurance from the minister that a further inquiry will be made into this matter, and that it will not be cut off by a statement of one or two of his inspectors: I have not the slightest doubt that, had the minister himself or the head of the Health of Animals Branch had some personal knowledge of conditions in that case, the matter would have been much more satisfactory, and I understand that they are placed in a somewhat awkward position by reason of some officials in that branch who have not been showing as good judgment as they might have done. If, as we are led to believe from statements of those inspectors, hog cholera was prevalent in that herd, then I contend that they are absolutely unfitted for the position which they hold if they permitted thirty-three animals to be slaughtered and placed on the market in this country. If hog cholera was through this herd of hogs to the extent to which we are led to believe it was, those animals should all have been condemned and destroyed instead of being placed on the market as food. It what better way could the disease have been spread broadcast, if this disease is as dangerous and deadly as we believe it is.

When hog cholera enters a herd, there is no doubt in the mind of the owner or anyone else in the course of a very few days whether the disease is there or not. The matter is not open for argument or dispute at all, because the animals' lives will be very short; they will be turning up their feet in short order. I am sorry I have had to speak so strongly as I have in this matter. The other night, I referred to the fact that I had the temerity to write to the head of the branch in reference to this case a few months ago at the request of the owner who was born in the county of Oxford, who has lived there, whom I have known practically all his life, and who is a man of good standing. His son is a most exceptional young man, a man whose word I would consider to be beyond reproach, and who lived in the town of Ingersoll until a few years ago. If the owner, his son and the general manager are prepared to make the statements that they claim they are willing to make—and I believe the son has already made an affidavit to that effect—then a further inquiry should be made into this matter and the question cleared up, for the satisfaction, not only of the department, but of the people in general. I am satisfied that if that is done, it will be found that some of these inspectors have not shown as good judgment as we would like them to show.

Mr. MOLLOY: I should like to say a word on this question of the competency or incompetency of inspectors generally. I think it was in the fall of 1905 that I happened to be appointed to that position myself in the province of Manitoba under the former government. Hon. Mr. Fisher was Minister of Agriculture at that time, and Dr. Rutherford was Veterinary Director General. The disease we had to deal with at that time was glanders entirely. The province of Manitoba and the whole of Western Canada was over-run with glanders, as can readily be proven by the records. That the chief inspector, myself and one or two others who were employed on this work at that time encountered great opposition is true. I remember very well in 1906 going to the town of Rathwell, to the barn of a livery man of the town, who was also a large farmer in the immediate district. It would be about the 1st of August; I am speaking from memory, but that was the date approximately. The number of horses I tested would be about 15, and if my memory serves me right, all

but one reacted. The owner of these horses and his neighbours in the town appealed to me to let him have the use of the horses until he cut his crop. I went out and viewed the crop, and it was a splendid one. I was not the chief inspector, but was working under Dr. C. D. McGilvray, who is now principal of the Ontario Veterinary College. I wish to say for Dr. McGilvray, that there is no abler man in the veterinary profession in this country to-day; there are others just as able, but none abler. I tried to communicate with him, but I could not get in touch with him either by telephone or telegraph. The only thing left for me to do was to wire to Ottawa. My telegram was answered by Dr. Hilton, and by the way, in answer to a question the other night I was informed that the Chief Veterinary Inspector was Dr. Hilton. I am well satisfied that he is. The office was new to me, and that is the reason I made the inquiry. He told me to use my own judgment. The day following the test of these fourteen or fifteen horses I went to Indian Ford, about six miles away, and there I condemned at least six or seven horses out of ten or twelve that I tested. The owner happened to be a widow, and she appealed to me because the news had been carried from Rathwell to Indian Ford as to what I might do there. In the meantime I had not received the telegram I have mentioned. The next night I went back, and I received the telegram telling me to use my own best judgment.

Foolishly for myself, I consented to leave these horses in the possession of the owners. They cut their crop, a matter of about a month or five weeks, and got it out of the way. The Veterinary Director General of that day demanded that the horses be destroyed on my report. I was busy in other parts of the province, and Dr. McGilvray was sent out to destroy these animals. The stage was all set. The owner of the horses in Rathwell had three veterinarians on hand from the district immediately adjacent to the town, and they were prepared to put up a fight. They said: "There are no symptoms of these horses being glandered." In the meantime let me add that I first demanded that the livery horses and those that were clinical be taken out to be destroyed, and I did destroy three or four of them. These other horses had no outward symptoms of glanders. The only thing that was against them was my report, made after a very careful examination—I never make any other kind—and I had condemned them as being glandered.

Well, Dr. McGilvray, who was chief in Manitoba, went out to handle this case. They had these three veterinarians on hand prepared to fight. There were no symptoms that a layman could see that these horses were glandered, but the symptoms in a clinical case are very simple and easily understood by the owner or by a passerby. Being somewhat of a diplomat, Dr. McGilvray said to the owner "I will do this. Pick out your best horse"—if I remember, there were eleven—"put on as a valuation, whatever you and your confreres here may think fit, and if that horse is not glandered I pledge myself, and my position, that the Government will pay you the price of that horse, and no other horse will be destroyed unless this one is proven to be glandered. Those that are destroyed will be paid for." The owner said "Very well." The horse was destroyed by Dr. McGilvray and he and the other three veterinarians made a post-mortem examination. They took a section of the lung of that horse, sent it to Dr. Bell, the city bacteriologist of Winnipeg, and awaited his report. In the meantime the people in the neighbourhood were saying that the Government would pay for this man's horse. I am sorry I have not the owner's name, but I did not know this matter was coming up to-night. What happened? Dr. Bell of Winnipeg made a thorough examination, microscopic and otherwise, and his report was this—"The best specimen of a glandered lung that I have ever examined."

The result was that the owner willingly consented to the destruction of the other ten and received his compensation, and I allowed him fair compensation. When I gave him that compensation sanctioned by the Parliament of this country, I gave him more than the government of any other country in the world was paying for a diseased animal, particularly a glandered animal. Canada at that time was paying more for diseased stock than any other country in the world, and since that time the compensation has been increased. We can well afford to increase the compensation, because the disease has largely disappeared from Canada.

I stand by the Health of Animals Branch of this Government, and of the previous Government, until some stronger evidence is laid before the House than was given by my hon. friend from South Oxford to-night. I say that these men are qualified, and I stand by the Minister of Agriculture, I stand by the Veterinary Director General and by his assistants until my hon.

friend or anyone else can satisfy me or prove to the majority in this House that the people's money is being paid to inspectors who do not know their duty.

In the Indian Ford case, which I dealt with myself, Dr. Rutherford said: "I have your report. Go out and re-test these animals, and if they re-act destroy them." What did I find when I arrived? I found there the local veterinarian from the town of Holland ready to find fault with anybody and everybody because he did not happen to do the work. I re-tested those animals in this man's presence. He came there to work his game of bluff, but everybody does not succeed in working that on me; at least he did not. I took out these animals and destroyed them, and in doing that, I did that family a great favour. I want to warn the Minister of Agriculture, if warning is needed, and the Veterinary Director General, to advise their inspectors to be careful in exercising any leniency in a case of glanders or any other disease. Within six miles of my home in the year 1906—this was in November and the others were in August—I also granted the use of three horses to a man to do his fall ploughing, and that man gave me more trouble than the Tory party ever did. I went out of my way and risked my reputation as a veterinary inspector to give him a chance to do his fall ploughing, and what did he do? He promised faithfully that when he finished his work he would consent to the destruction of the animals. Did he do it? Well, I guess he did not. He called for a veterinarian from the town of Emerson, and in the meantime he defied me to go to his place. It was a waste of his time to tell me that. When I arrived there, however, I found that the other man was already on the scene. The test was made and the animals reacted. I destroyed them and through the laws passed by a former Government I paid him more for diseased animals than the law in any other country would allow. I paid him the compensation allowed for animals not worth 5 cents. In 1906, in Manitoba, two human beings, two young men, died as a result of contagion from contact with glandered animals. I am not acquainted with my hon. friend's case. Perhaps he is right; I am not prepared to contradict him. He is not a young man, and he is not a fool. He is a member of this House and has made what I consider to be a serious statement. If I made such a statement as that made by the hon. member for South Oxford, I would do one of two things—I would either press the charge to the hilt, or I would do the other thing.

Mr. SUTHERLAND: How would you go about it?

Mr. MOLLOY: How did these people go about it? They brought in all the assistance they desired; they even brought in political assistance. Now, I did not want to say that at first, but I say it now. They brought in veterinarians opposed to the Government of the day, opposed to me, and opposed to my chief. They had these men there. That animal was destroyed in the town of Rathwell, in the presence of perhaps two hundred persons, and a section of the lung was taken by Dr. McGilvray and put into a glass jar. All this was done in the presence of these people, and the jar was afterwards sealed and expressed, the cost being defrayed by Dr. McGilvray, at his own expense. Would my hon. friend try to make me believe, if I were the owner of 240 hogs, and they were condemned for hog cholera, and I were convinced as a layman that they were not infected, that I would not have done exactly as those people did? I have no fault to find with those who acted in that way to me, except that I went out of my way to do something for them and they turned upon me like an adder. But it was proven to the hilt that I was right and they were wrong. I would do as they had done if I were convinced, as my hon. friend from South Oxford is certainly convinced by the statement of the owner and his son, that the animals were not diseased. Why did he stand by and allow them to be destroyed? The Government of Canada was responsible for what was done. They can be held responsible, and that is the ground on which I would have proceeded. There was one other case. In this case the horses reacted but were not clinical and I left the animals in the possession of the owner, Mr. Walsh. When I was ordered back to make the re-test, the animals reacted and I destroyed them. That is the only man I dealt with, to whom I extended a kindness, who did not resent it afterwards so far as I was concerned. I will stake my reputation as a veterinarian, that the man who condemned the hogs, if he was a veterinarian employed by this Government, or by the former Government, knew his work, and carried out his orders and the chances are that the man who

10 p.m.

owned the stock and the people in that neighbourhood have been benefited in consequence.

Mr. SUTHERLAND: It is quite evident, from my hon. friend's last remarks, that it would be futile to attempt to convince him, for the reason that he is convinced already, that the inspectors were right.

Mr. MOLLOY: I convinced the other inspectors.

Mr. SUTHERLAND: I have no doubt the hon. member would exercise diplomacy and good sense in dealing with a case such as I have mentioned, but I think he will admit that there is a wide difference between a horse with glanders and a hog with cholera. There is no comparison between them; the conditions are not similar. The hon. member knows a great deal more about veterinary science than I do, and I think he will agree with me that when hog cholera breaks out in a herd there is not much doubt in the mind of the owner, or of anybody else, as to whether the disease exists or not. It does not require much time or insight to ascertain the fact; there is abundance of evidence to prove it. I pointed out that the owner's son had made an affidavit to the effect that the food was properly cooked, that there was no sick animal there, that none had died from the disease, and that hog cholera had not been found in the pens while he had been there for nearly a year and a half. That affidavit was forwarded to the department. Now, the hon. member for Provencher asks: why did he not prove this matter if he was in doubt? I may point out to him that the inspector valued these hogs and led the owner to believe that he would be compensated. He put a valuation on every animal slaughtered, and that information is in the hands of the Veterinary Inspector General to-day. The hogs were destroyed. It was impossible to get evidence. All the evidence available was the fact that he had dressed and disposed of hogs for food from this destroyed herd. The hon. member will agree that it would be difficult for him under the circumstances to get evidence. The inspector told him: "We are going to kill every animal. Clean up as many as you can to-day, because I am going to shoot every hog on the premises to-morrow." And he did so. These thirty-three hogs were driven out of a number of different pens. I understand from practically every pen, with the exception of one, where there were some small common pigs, was cleaned out. He has given evidence to that effect and expects that the Government will be reasonable before he takes steps. It will be readily understood that it is a difficult matter to collect compensation from a Government or from a department if they refuse, as they have done in this case, to consider the matter, simply brushing it aside.

When I spoke before I referred to the experience which we had a few years ago with some of these infallible inspectors. The evidence that was reported on that occasion demonstrated clearly to my mind not only that they are not infallible, but that some of them are not even reliable. I do not say that is true of all of them. I believe that the Veterinary Director General is as careful in connection with these matters as it is possible to be, but here again you have a system under which men are not selected because of their judgment or because they are diplomatic—they are selected at random by the Civil Service Commission, sitting here in Ottawa, who do not know whether or not a man is competent for that work. The man may pass the examination to which he is subjected, he may be a graduate of a veterinary school, but that does not mean that he is either a reliable person or one suitable to undertake the duties which will be entrusted to him. I do not know any of these inspectors. Many of them, I recognize, are suitable men and would perform their duties all right. I am not criticizing them. I know nothing good, bad or indifferent about these different inspectors who inspected these animals, but I repeat again that when the owner and when his son, a most estimable young man, made affidavits that no disease existed in the herd and that no animals had died, they were entitled to consideration. The inspector who examined these hogs made a valuation and allowed the owner to believe that he would be compensated. Therefore I say it is pretty high-handed work on the part of the department to act as it did, and for the minister to get up here and declare that he has the best system of inspection in the world, and that these inspectors are almost infallible and beyond reproach. There are two sides to every story, and, from my knowledge of the men on whose behalf I am speaking to-night, I affirm that they are just as responsible and just as reliable as any of the inspectors of the department, and that may be saying a good deal.

Mr. McGIBBON (Muskoka): Were the 33 hogs that were infected selected from the rest of the herd?

Mr. SUTHERLAND: Yes.

Mr. McGIBBON (Muskoka): And were the rest of the herd not condemned?

Mr. SUTHERLAND: They were all condemned.

Mr. McGIBBON (Muskoka): Were they all inspected?

Mr. SUTHERLAND: I presume they were.

Mr. McGIBBON (Muskoka): You are not sure?

Mr. SUTHERLAND: Well, the whole herd was condemned. Every hog on the premises, and some for which compensation was sought were the best finished that this farmer had. The owner did not take the hogs out of the pens; they were driven out by the inspector. The owner stood outside and pointed out to the inspector the ones he thought were fit for the market.

Mr. McGIBBON (Muskoka): They had been condemned previously?

Mr. SUTHERLAND: Yes, sir.

Mr. TOLMIE: I was very much interested to hear what the hon. member for Provencher (Mr. Molloy) had to say in regard to his experience with glanders. Any veterinarian who has done a certain amount of service under the Health of Animals Branch has had the same experience over and over again. Therefore it may be interesting for him and the rest of the committee to know that the Health of Animals Branch, which is praised by hon. gentlemen on one side of the House and abused by hon. gentlemen on the other, has reduced the amount of compensation paid for glanders from $147,851 in 1905 to $6,000 in 1921.

With regard to the hog cholera situation and the facts in this particular case, I may say that when hog cholera appears in a herd it will very often show itself only slightly at the beginning. The first case will be indicated perhaps by a hog refusing to eat. Some morning when the rest of the hogs are busy he is inclined to lie down and hide away in some other part of the pen. There is a condition of feverishness and there is a slight discharge from the eye, which perhaps would not be noticeable to the ordinary layman feeding those hogs. Afterwards the infected hog may show a little wavering in his walk owing to weakness in the hind quarters. Then possibly acute symptoms develop, with redness on the abdomen and the back of the ears. These symptoms are familiar to veterinarians. As the disease progresses you might get a lot of acute cases, and very often a week or ten days, or sometimes less, will make a very big difference in a herd where the infection has just been introduced.

With regard to our veterinary system, I have not said that the inspectors were infallible. What I did say, and what I repeat, without fear of contradiction, is that we have one of the best qualified veterinary services to be found in any country in the world, and to prove it I have only to say that we have less contagious disease in Canada than in any other country on the globe that I know of; and on that one ground alone if there is one country which is entitled to ship cattle to Great Britain it is the Dominion of Canada. Our inspectors are not selected at random. First of all, every inspector has to be a graduate of a recognized veterinary college. In the second place, he has to pass a special examination, a professional examination, before he is appointed at all, and finally the appointment, under the system which now prevails, is made by the Civil Service Commission. These men are experts in their particular line. I worked fourteen years in this profession. I was chief inspector for British Columbia for that length of time, handled hundreds of cases of hog cholera and am fairly familiar with the details. Hence, I consider myself fairly efficient to form a judgment in such matters, as compared with the average hog owner. These inspectors are fully qualified, and there is no object in their causing hogs to be destroyed that should not be destroyed. It is very much easier to go on to a man's premises and tell him that he has a clean bill of health than it is to destroy his hogs.

It is a very interesting story that the hon. member (Mr. Sutherland) has told to-night—very interesting indeed. I have heard it time and time again west of the Rocky Mountains. I have heard men frequently say: "There is nothing wrong with my hogs but look out for my neighbours." In this particular case had the work been done by a newly appointed veterinarian there might perhaps have been the least doubt, but as it happened the inspector was one of our very best men on this work, Dr. Hall, a man who has been in the service for twelve or thirteen years, and whose word I would take any day of the week before I would take that of a man who was not qualified and had not received the proper training of an inspector. How are we going to carry out the require-

ments of the Animal Contagious Diseases Act in this country if we cannot rely on our inspectors? How are we ever going to keep disease out of the country, and maintain the enviable position we now enjoy in regard to contagious disease, if we are going to turn down the statement of our experts and accept the word of the hog owner. The mere fact that only thirty-three out of two hundred and thirty-five hogs were found free from disease, is an indication that there certainly was hog cholera in that herd. The veterinary director general in his report states:

> If prompt notification had been given, the loss would have been very materially reduced, and instead of finding over 200 hogs so badly diseased as to be a total loss and only 33 that could be saved, the figures would have been reversed and over 200 would have been saved and only 33 lost.

In regard to garbage feeding, it is recognized in every country and particularly in this country where we import pork from the United States to a considerable extent, that garbage is a dangerous feed to give to hogs. I had a very excellent opportunity to study this sort of feeding in British Columbia, where in the cities of Victoria, Vancouver, New Westminster and Nanaimo large numbers of Chinese were raising hogs on garbage feed. They had all sorts of ramshackle premises and very poor cooking plants. They did not cook the feed properly, and hog cholera was always present, with the result that the disease would scatter over the country and we had hog cholera all through the province. Then we introduced a system of feeding regulations and insisted on those men keeping their premises perfectly clean. I left that department in 1917 to become the representative of Victoria in this House, and at that time we had succeeded in compelling those Chinamen to keep their premises in such clean condition, and we maintained such a close watch on them, that for years British Columbia had been entirely free from hog cholera. The feeding of garbage to hogs is very dangerous except under careful regulations. We have in force certain rules under which this feeding is permitted. One of those rules is that all the garbage must be thoroughly cooked, the cooking being necessary to sterilize and make it perfectly safe for the hogs. In this particular case to which the hon. member for South Oxford has drawn attention, our inspectors found garbage not thoroughly cooked. While the owners of those hogs may be very respectable men, and I am willing to accept his word for it, yet we know that our inspectors are reliable men who have been in the service for a long time, there is no reason to think they did not tell the truth, and until the opposite can be proved we are bound to accept their word. The owners of those hogs broke the rule not only in failing to cook the garbage thoroughly, but also in not reporting that the disease existed on their premises, and therefore they forfeited their right to compensation. All the thirty-three hogs were slaughtered under inspection. In the United States they have a double immunization test, introducing on one side of the hogs a serum which does not contain living germs, and on the other side injecting a virus from the blood which does contain germs. In that way, while these hogs might have passed inspection as hogs that had been doubly immunized, still the pork from those animals, if fed in an uncooked state, might convey hog cholera to hogs. Hog cholera is not a disease that is communicable to man. The carcases of those thirty-three hogs were passed by competent men of the department, and were therefore fit for food just the same as if they had passed through an ordinary abattoir. Had those two hundred and thirty-five hogs passed through an abattoir two hundred and two of them would have been condemned as affected with hog cholera, and thirty-three would have been passed as fit for food in the usual way. I feel the hon. member for South Oxford is very much interested in this case, and I was very glad to hear what he had to say in regard to it, but if we are not going to enforce these rules as to the feeding of garbage we are going to have hog cholera all over the country as we used to have in British Columbia. These cases are all passed on by qualified veterinarians of the department, and their reports are then submitted to the veterinary director general and carefully considered by him.

To give you an idea of the danger of uncooked garbage fed to hogs, a short time ago one of our inspectors, I think during last summer, happened in his ordinary rounds of inspection to visit premises where hogs were kept. Only the day before a young hog had been slightly hurt by other hogs in one of the pens and he had been placed in a temporary pen on the outside to give him a chance to recover. He had sufficiently recovered to be able to walk around, and was able to reach a place where garbage was unloaded and put in the boiling vat. At that particular point were some boards covered by some of this garbage in an uncooked state, and

the little pig was gnawing off what he could of this garbage. The inspector called the owner's attention to it and told him "You will have hog cholera in this pen within a certain number of days." On his return there a few days after, sure enough, he found this little hog infected. That shows how infectious the disease is if the rule regarding proper feeding is not strictly observed. Therefore if we are to carry out these regulations we must accept the verdict given by the reliable men whom we have appointed to see to their enforcement.

Mr. NESBITT: I always understood that whenever hogs were killed on account of hog cholera the owner received compensation, and I have been listening anxiously to know why the minister did not allow compensation in this case. I think the minister is perfectly right in insisting that garbage should be thoroughly cooked before being fed to hogs. That was one mistake made by the owners, the other was in not reporting the disease. As to this latter mistake, it is quite possible that they did not know the hogs were infected, and I would suggest to the minister that it is always wise not to be too strict in matters of this kind, where a man might have erred in ignorance. As an illustration, I may say that I had hog cholera among my own hogs. I knew there was something the matter with them, but I had no more idea than the babe unborn what was the real trouble. I sent for a veterinary, and he diagnosed the case as hog cholera, and immediately sent for an inspector. These hogs of mine were fed with nothing but the best of meal from my own grain and skim milk from my own dairy, and I could not account for the disease, neither could the inspector, nor the veterinary, because there was no hog cholera within fifty miles of us. The only cause we could suggest was that as the railway ran through the paddock these hogs frequented, perhaps some infection from a car of hogs being shipped through might have been washed down upon the track as it slanted into this paddock, and my hogs thus became diseased. In that case I was compensated by the Government—the late Conservative Government. A good many of my hogs from pens that were not quite adjacent to those containing the hogs that were infected when slaughtered showed no signs of cholera at all. I know these people myself, and I think they are absolutely honest and decent. It is quite evident that they were ignorant of the existence of cholera among their hogs, and I would rather err on the side of clemency than on the side of strict regulation in this case. I rose merely to urge the minister to exercise a little clemency, because the man mention by my hon. friend from South Oxford is not able to stand the loss without some remuneration.

Mr. McGIBBON (Muskoka): I would just like to second the remarks of the hon. member for North Oxford (Mr. Nesbitt). I can quite conceive that it is not always possible for a farmer to diagnose cholera at an early stage, and in this case the owner should not be blamed for not reporting it. I quite agree that the minister must accept the advice of his scientific advisers, but when it comes to matters of adjustment, whether in this department or in connection with pensions or anything else, I do not think the final authority should be left to some official who is more or less independent of Parliament and independent of the people. We must take the humane view of it; we cannot stand by and see people ruined, even through their own fault—in this case, probably through ignorance. But it is strange—perhaps there is an explanation of it—that only thirty-three of these hogs were tested and that those thirty-three were found to be fit for the market. Why did they not inspect the rest of them? At least more—perhaps one hundred or one hundred and fifty—might have been found sufficiently free from disease to permit their being disposed of, thus reducing the loss. The fact is that this man has sustained a serious loss apparently through the neglect of an official, who should have determined whether these hogs were or were not fit for consumption. If they were fit for consumption, he should have been allowed to sell them; if they were not, the public should not have been allowed to buy them. I submit that in testing only thirty-three of these animals, selected promiscuously—all of which were found in fit condition—and in simply slaughtering the remainder without compensation to the owner or without determining whether they were in condition for the market, the inspectors have condemned themselves. I would not advise the minister to stand behind a record of that kind, especially if the Government is not going to compensate the owner for his loss. I agree with the member for North Oxford that the minister should take this

matter in his own hands, give it a little human consideration, and see whether it is possible that justice can be done.

Mr. TOLMIE: The usual practice in cleaning up a bunch of hogs affected with cholera is not to hold post mortems on those clinical cases in which the disease is easily discernible. In such cases the animals are destroyed; it is usual to pick out for careful post mortem only those animals which are apparently healthy, to destroy the hogs when lesions are found, and to allow those cases to pass in which no disease is evident. No doubt this was the course followed by these men; it is the course followed by inspectors everywhere in dealing with outbreaks of hog cholera.

Mr. McGIBBON (Muskoka): May I ask the minister whether it actually was followed? The member for South Oxford says it was not. That is quite important.

Mr. TOLMIE: I understand from the Veterinary Director General that the usual course was followed. However, I will get further information.

Mr. SUTHERLAND: How many of these animals were tested by the inspector?

Mr. TOLMIE: What do you mean by "tested"?

Mr. SUTHERLAND: Whatever test they apply.

Mr. TOLMIE: There is no test. The animals are slaughtered and a post mortem held in those cases where there are no external symptoms of hog cholera. If you saw a hog waddling along the road with ears red and abdomen red, showing all the symptoms of hog cholera, it would be a waste of time to examine him. A post mortem is held only in those cases where no external symptoms are evident; where the hog appears from an ordinary physical examination to be healthy. Then, if on post mortem lesions of hog cholera are found, the carcass is condemned, and if entirely free from disease, it is passed. The raising of hogs which are fed on garbage is a very profitable business, because city garbage can be furnished as food at comparatively small expense. Owing to the danger which accompanies the feeding of garbage we insist upon the regulations with regard to cooking, etc., and as the member for North Oxford has pointed out, when a license is taken out the owner agrees that no compensation shall be paid where outbreaks occur on garbage-feeding premises unless he can prove that the disease comes from some source other than the garbage. He undertakes that before he gets a license to feed the garbage at all, and in this case, although he had reported the disease, and although the garbage was found to be thoroughly cooked, unless he could prove that the disease came from some other source, he would not be entitled to compensation.

Mr. TWEEDIE: I wish to direct the attention of the minister to another matter in connection with the slaughter of animals in Alberta, near the city of Calgary. A large number of dairymen have establishments in the vicinity of the city, and recently some of their cattle have been found to be infected and have reacted to the tuberculin test. The result is, of course, that the cattle have been ordered to be slaughtered. Compensation is afforded to the owner at the rate of two-thirds of the value of the cattle, the owner bearing one-third of the loss. But the difficulty is that the Government has fixed arbitrarily the maximum compensation to be paid per animal; I think it is $80. The dairymen feel that that amount is not coommensurate with the loss they sustain when their animals are destroyed and they have sent a petition to the Government asking that the maximum compensation be increased to $120. In discussing the question of the embargo last week the minister fixed the value of dairy cattle at anywhere from $125 to $175 or $200. It will be seen, therefore, that $80 is no compensation to the dairyman for the loss of his cattle. Besides, in the destruction of his cattle the dairyman is deprived of his means of livelihood. Another difficulty arises; when the cattle are slaughtered, there is no one who has authority to make immediate settlement with the owner in order that he may have the necessary funds to buy other cattle to replace those which have been destroyed, and it is a matter of weeks, sometimes of months, before he receives the compensation to which he is entitled. That being the case, it is almost impossible for him to replace his herds immediately after the cattle are destroyed. The dairymen desire, therefore, besides the increase of the maximum to $120, that when cattle are slaughtered someone shall have authority to make settlement at once, and, furthermore, that the Government inaugurate some system under which destroyed dairy cattle can be replaced immediately from the Government herds within the provinces, the dairymen to pay a reasonable

price for the animals thus obtained. This matter has been before the Minister of Agriculture for some time, and I should like to have him state to-night, if he possibly can, whether or not the Government have arrived at any decision as to the stand they purpose taking in connection with the matter.

Mr. TOLMIE: I have been giving a good deal of attention to this question of the slaughter of those cattle. I presume the hon. member is referring to cattle at Calgary.

Mr. TWEEDIE: Yes.

Mr. TOLMIE: Those cattle are being slaughtered under our arrangements with municipalities in cleaning up milk supplies to the cities. If cities will make it necessary for milk supplies to come from herds free of tuberculosis we will undertake to test herds supplying milk to those cities. We have now in Canada about a dozen cities, one of which is Ottawa, that have taken advantage of this offer to clean up their herds and ensure a healthy supply of milk. As regards valuation, our valuation for grade cows is $80 and for pure-bred cows $250, of which we pay two-thirds, or $53.33 for grade animals and $166.66 for pure-bred animals. In the United States only $50 is paid for grades as a maximum, and $100 for pure-bred cattle, so that we are more generous than they are to the south of the line. We also leave the carcass in the possession of the owner. The animal is slaughtered in an inspected abbatoir under the inspection of our meat inspection man, and it is treated there just the same as it would be in the case of any ordinary animal shipped to an abattoir for food purposes. In some cases the tubercule might be no larger than a pea or a walnut, perhaps isolated and in a calcareous condition, and in that case the carcass would be fit for food, so that in addition to the compensation of $53.33, the owner would receive the beef value. In addition to that the owner can dispose of the offal of any one of those animals to the abattoir. There is the hide and the head, and there are also various organs which, in a diseased animal are useful for fertilizing purposes. They are cooked up at a high temperature so that they are only fit for fertilizing purposes. The compensation we give is very favourable in comparison with that of other countries. At one time we allowed on grade animals compensation on a valuation of only $60, but this was increased to $80. The great tendency in the cattle market is not towards an increase in price, but rather towards a reduction; from 1914 to the present date, there has been a decided falling off, and at present the department does not see its way clear to recommend that the amount of compensation be increased. What is a diseased cow worth once you know that she is diseased? You cannot sell her in the market according to law, and we do not purpose paying a full valuation for any animal of that kind. As regards prompt payment of compensation, the point taken by the hon. member is very good, and while recently there has been a little delay in issuing cheques for compensation, I have made arrangements only to-day whereby those cheques will be sent out as promptly as possible after animals are destroyed.

Mr. McMASTER: Have these animals to be pure-bred or grade in order that compensation be given? Can a man receive compensation for the ordinary common animal, which is neither a grade nor a pure-bred?

Mr. TOLMIE: The common garden variety of animal is also eligible for compensation under those conditions.

Mr. TWEEDIE: Has the department considered making arrangements whereby animals that are slaughtered can be replaced promptly from Government herds within the province?

Mr. TOLMIE: No arrangements are made along those lines. That is a matter that could very nicely be taken up by the provincial Department of Agriculture.

Mr. SUTHERLAND: Before leaving this item, which is a very considerable one, and which shows a big increase, I should like to have a moment or two to refer to some of the arguments advanced by the minister why no compensation should be paid in the case to which I have referred. He says that these men have placed themselves outside of the class of those who ought to be compensated because the garbage was not properly cooked, and also because they had not reported the disease. I think he gave us the names of two inspectors who are very competent men. In looking over some of these papers, I came across an affidavit made by the son of this man, and it reads in part as follows:

I, Alfred E. Alderson, of the township of Etobicoke in the county of York, do solemnly declare that I am the manager of the piggery owned by George B. Alderson in the township

of Etobicoke aforesaid and have held the same position since the first day of May, 1919.

That during the whole period of my employment as aforesaid all garbage fed to the hogs in the said piggery has been properly and efficiently cooked.

That from the said first day of May, 1919, until the destruction of the above-mentioned hogs by the Government inspector, all of the hogs in the said piggery were always in a healthy state and we never had in the piggery during that time a case of cholera.

That is a very clear statement to be made by the son, and yet that is not to be considered at all. The minister has referred to two inspectors whose word he is prepared to accept. I have here a statement signed by inspector T. H. Richards, who inspected the hogs and valued them, and it is not Mr. Hall, or the other inspector mentioned by the minister, who was there and examined those hogs and permitted the man to dress as many animals as he could in that day. Mr. Alderson states himself that he could very well have handled many more, but he had only the one day to do the work in, and with the help he had, 33 hogs were as many as they could attend to. I see by the Public Accounts that Mr. T. H. Richards is a Toronto inspector. I do not know whether he is a veterinary or lay inspector. It is possible he may be a veterinary inspector. In view, however, of the clear and definite statement made by the owner and by his son that to their knowledge no disease existed amongst their herd, I do not think they should have been considered as having waived all rights for compensation. Knowing this young man as I have known him for many years when he was in business in the town of Ingersoll begoing to work at this place, I am satisfied that when he made an affidavit of that character, he believed absolutely every word he was saying.

Consequently, I say that it ought to be beneath the Government of this country to pass such an act as the Animal Contagious Diseases Act—no, it is not the Act, but the regulations that have been drafted, and which he was compelled to sign, and waive all rights unless he could establish that disease had come into his herd from some outside source. It is absolutely impossible for him to establish that for he says there was not any disease. The inspectors say there was. There is a conflict of opinion, and it would be a very difficult thing to prove now that the hogs have been destroyed. The hogs were ordered to be destroyed and their carcasses to be deeply buried with lime. Mr. Alderson has waited for a considerable time in view of the statement made by Richards that he was valuing these hogs. Mr. Richards did value them, and sent in to the department his valuation, showing that he was under the impression that Alderson was entitled to compensation. I think this is a matter that ought to receive a little more consideration from the minister than it has, and I think that if he realized the character of these men, and the positive statements they have made in this case, he would see that further consideration be given to it. It is a pretty serious matter to have that many head of hogs destroyed, with prices as high as they have been, and for the man to have his premises closed up. He was not permitted to continue business there, nor has he done so since that time. I trust the minister will see the seriousness of the position in which the man is placed.

Mr. MORPHY: I would like to add a word in support of the case made by the hon. member for South Oxford. I have read the letter of Mr. F. Torrance, Veterinary Director General, and it is quite clear to me that some subterfuge has been employed to deprive this man Alderson of compensation for his hogs. On the face of it, it is quite clear to me that the Veterinary Director General has strained a point to try and deprive the man of his right, and I think the minister would be well advised to look at the language the director general uses. In the first place, the director general's report takes two or three pages to deal with what the minister knew very well was the law. When you get down to the real facts, you can see the subterfuge that has been employed. He is attempting to becloud the issue and deprive the man of compensation by specious language. That shows on the face of the report itself. I direct the minister's attention to the following:

Mr. Alderson's premises were visited from time to time and were found in a satisfactory condition until April 19, 1920, when Inspector Baker visited the premises and found several of his hogs showing signs of sickness.

No hog cholera, no suggestion of cholera.

Mr. TOLMIE: That man was a lay inspector.

Mr. MORPHY: It does not make any difference. Nobody in this report says the sickness is hog cholera. It goes on:

This officer who is a lay inspector in charge of the garbage feeding, took a temperature of one hog and found it was 105⅘. As Dr. O. Hall of this office was in the Toronto district at the time he proceeded to the premises with Inspector Baker and two or three other officers who were conducting accredited herd tests in

the district also accompanied Dr. Hall to the premises.

Then on page 4 of the report I find this:

Dr. Hall slaughtered the hog which Inspector Baker suspected was affected with hog Cholera.

It does not say the inspector suggested it was hog cholera. Inspector Baker does not say that himself. Neither does the director general. Inspector Baker reported that a number of hogs on the premises were showing symptoms of illness and the director general turns that into hog cholera without any authority, without any mandate, if one may use the term, without any foundation in any report that anybody had made up to that time. No report had been made that it was hog cholera, according to this very report of the director general. It goes on:

As Dr. Hall had to attend to other work Inspector Richards took charge of the case.

He is the third man.

He corroborated Inspector Baker's report that a number of hogs on the premises were showing symptons of illness.

Nothing about hog cholera yet.

Out of 245 hogs, which were slaughtered, there were only 33 of these hogs fit for pork, and a license was issued permitting the owner to dispose of the carcasses of these animals.

Who ascertained that? There is no report of that on record. The director general says so, but he has not the word of Hall, Richards or Baker for it, that any inspection was made. It was just the statement of the director general.

Mr. TOLMIE: This information is reported to the office on regular forms. It will be on file in the office.

Mr. MORPHY: But the director general does not say so on his report. So far as this report shows, it may be only hearsay evidence of the three inspectors. The report goes on:

Mr. Alderson at the time of Inspector Hall's visit took the attitude that he did not know there were any hogs sick. As, however, Dr. Hall found so many of them exhibiting symptons—

Of what? Exhibiting symptoms of illness.

—he questioned the owner, and finally was informed that a few hogs had died a short time previous.

This is absolutely denied. The issue is clear between what Dr. Torrance says the inspector was told, and what the man himself says. There is direct evidence in the one case, and indirect evidence in the other. What was alleged is denied. Now it does seem to me that the position taken by the hon. member for South Oxford in a case like this, which is not well made out by the director general's report, ought to be considered by the minister in the light of the subject as against the state. Here is a man who has lost $7,000 or $8,000, if I figure it correctly,—a man who has been in the business for many years, against whom there has been no previous complaint, and of whom this very report says that up to the 19th of April his premises had been from time to time inspected and everything was well ordered, kept in good condition. There was nothing slovenly; the man was not careless, but was one of the best men feeding hogs on the garbage system. Now a man of that class, who is careful, who is reputable, who has suffered a severe loss, surely has the right to appeal to the highest court open to him, the court of Parliament, against an extraordinary and drastic remedy that Parliament has, and I suppose the appeal which the hon. member for South Oxford has made on behalf of a citizen of this country. The minister should not be bound hard and fast to the members of his staff, should not take for granted that every inspector under his jurisdiction is telling the truth and that everybody else is telling falsehoods. The least that can be done in a case like this, where the subject through no fault of his own has been deprived of the compensation that the law allows, is that he should be given a chance of having denials made on a more sound and substantial basis than I find in this report. The least the minister can do, I think, is to consider that the man has been a great sufferer, and where the state exercises drastic remedies, as in a case like this, the least it can do through its responsible ministers is to say: As the action of my executive officers has been seriously challenged, and as the report of the director general has been made on hearsay, we will take this matter into consideration and have a thorough investigation made, take evidence on oath, and satisfy ourselves whether or not this young lad perjured himself, whether the man who suffered the loss perjured himself, or whether some of the officers of the department are trying to gain kudos from the minister in bolstering up a case that will not stand the light of investigation.

Mr. SUTHERLAND: There is a considerable increase in this item over previous years, and in view of the attitude of the minister in regard to the case I have brought before the department, and others that have been laid before him, to which

very little attention has been paid, I think we ought to know something more as to why we are voting an increase of $390,000, and where the money will be spent. I for one want to know whether men who are going to have such authority vested in them will go all over the country regardless of regulations passed by this House. Will those regulations be ovserved, or will there be substituted for them others framed by the officers in the various departments? I think we are somewhat too lax in this respect. I have in my pocket a letter I received in the mail last night in connection with a Bill put through last year, and there are no fewer than six pages of finely printed regulations passed by the department by virtue of a clause in the Act which gave the minister authority to make such regulations. These regulations have been passed by officers of the department, with the consent of the minister—not the present minister, but some of his predecessors—and I think that when a man suffers a loss of $7,000 or $8,000 he is entitled to a little more consideration than apparently this man is receiving. Now, before we increase the number of these inspectors—and it is quite apparent from the way in which they flocked around that part of the country that there was no dearth of inspection, at least judging from the report of the veterinary inspector general—in view of the difficult conditions that face us just now, I think that $390,000 is a large additional sum to vote, and we are entitled to know just what it is to be used for. We should not be in any great hurry to declare it carried. I venture to say that nine out of ten of those hon. gentlemen who are shouting "carried" do not care a fig, and do not know a button, about what these inspectors are appointed for. My experience has been just as I have stated to-night, and I must say that I am anxious to have some more information as to what these inspectors will do since you are increasing the staff to such a great extent. I believe that we have at the present time in some of the packing houses in the country a number of men going around as inspectors who are doing absolutely nothing. I am sure that there are great temptations in the paths of some of these people, and that they are not doing their duty as they should. I say this, knowing something of the conditions that prevail in some of the stock yards of the country where inspectors are supposed to operate. Stock is going to these yards, and instead of being examined and slaughtered it is being taken out and sold for food. My experience convinces me that your inspectors are not quite as infallible as we are led to believe, and instead of increasing their numbers and sending them all over the country into every place it is possible to send them, some of them now on the job ought to attend to their work a little better than they are doing, particularly in the big stock yards. It is well known to the provers that there is no difficulty in sending to those stock yards and there disposing of them, stock that ought to be condemned. I have not so far heard an explanation from the minister for this increase of $390,000.

11 p.m.

Some hon. MEMBERS: Carried.

Mr. HAY: I desire to say just a word in connection with the matter brought up by the hon. member for South Oxford (Mr. Sutherland). I agree with him that this man should receive justice at the hands of the department. I am glad the hon. member brought this matter up, because this is clearly a case in which justice is due, and we, as representatives of the people, should see that it is meted out and full investigation held. I understand that before the hogs in question had been slaughtered a promise had been made that the owner would be compensated, and now the department is seeking to evade responsibility in the matter and refusing to pay for the animals. I think this is unfair. They have practically put the man out of business and I feel that an injustice has been done. I should like to see a thorough investigation made of the whole case. I agree with the view of the hon. member who introduced this subject that we should look for justice to all classes of people. I do not conceive it to be the duty of the inspectors in the different departments to harry a man out of business in which he is lawfully engaged. I do not think it is their duty to do anything that would deprive him of compensation to which he is entitled. That could hardly be the intention of the Government in appointing these inspectors, and I would strongly urge upon the department the necessity for a full investigation into this case.

Some hon. MEMBERS: Carried.

Mr. FIELDING: Mr. Chairman, may I say—

Mr. SUTERLAND: Mr. Chairman—

Mr. FIELDING: Pardon me; I did not intend to speak on the item. I thought it was carried.

Some hon. MEMBERS: Carried.

Mr. SUTHERLAND: Before the item is carried, I think that my request for some explanation as to what is going to be done with this $390,000 of an increase is but a reasonable one. But the minister apparently does not regard it as worthy his attention. He simply sits there and is prepared to have some of his henchmen in the back benches and opposite, declare the matter carried. I think there are others in this House, however, who just as much right to be heard as those who loudly say "carried." The sum of $390,000 is a considerable item. I have seen some of our friends opposite trotting up and down the back stretches of the province of Ontario within the last few years, crying about the terrible injustice which the farmers of the country had been suffering. Yet they sit here to-night with their mouths shut and have not a word to say. Nor do they say a word on any occasion when any matter affecting the farmers comes up in this House. I suppose, as the hon. member for Maple Creek (Mr. Maharg), would say, they are exercising their political sagacity. Well, I have not been exercising political sagacity during all the time I have been here.

Mr. MAHARG: I rise to a point of order. I never made that statement which the hon. member attributes to me. What I said was that we had been credited, by some hon. members opposite, with exercising political sagacity.

Mr. SUTHERLAND: My recollection of the hon. gentleman's statement is as I have stated. However, I will accept his correction. But it is rather remarkable, Mr. Chairman, that while these Estimates are under consideration—

Mr. McMASTER: I also rise to a point of order. I understand that we are discussing the item:

Health of animals, administration of the Animal Contagious Diseases, and Meat and Canned Foods Acts.

And I am quite unable to see what any reference to the political opinions or practices of the United Farmers has to do with that item. The item has been very thoroughly discussed and if there is to be further talk upon it I think it should be more relevant. I submit that with all respect, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. SUTHERLAND: I am not going to accept any responsibility for the density of the hon. member for Brome. I do not think it is necessary to show the connection between those members who are calling "Carried, carried" and the item itself. There is, however, a direct connection because of the desire of these gentlemen to get away from this item without having the matter discussed, or without having any explanation from the minister. I think we are entitled to some further explanation other than we have yet received as to why there is an increase of $390,000. We are entitled to know what these men are going to do and whether the minister is going to accept their statements in preference to the statements of responsible citizens of this country. I have given the statements of reliable citizens from their affidavits to-night and yet you are not prepared to admit—

The CHAIRMAN: Order. I must draw the attention of the hon. member to the rule that all remarks must be addressed to the Chair. It would be well if that rule were strictly adhered to.

Mr. SUTHERLAND: I bow to your ruling, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. MAHARG: I desire to ask a question. It is quite evident from the remarks you are making—

Some hon. MEMBERS: Order.

Mr. SUTHERLAND: Address the Chair.

Mr. CURRIE: The hon. member is out of Order.

Mr. MAHARG: The point is this, Mr. Chairman, I want to ask the hon. member if he is of the opinion that I am one of those who have been shouting "carried" to-night?

Mr. SUTHERLAND: It is not necessary for me to answer the question. I think it is evident from the direction in which a good many of the interjections originated.

Mr. MAHARG: I rise to a point of order again. I have never at any time to-night said "carried" to any one item.

Mr. CURRIE: That is not a point of order.

Mr. SUTHERLAND: The interjections during this discussion have been somewhat significant and remarkable. I do not want to prolong this debate nor do I want to be unreasonable. I think that I have been both fair and reasonable in my presentation of the claim of this party who has suffered loss at the hands of these inspectors. I think that I have a perfect right to have some further information from the minister as to why there should be an in-

crease of $390,000 for the appointment of more inspectors in his department at the present time.

Mr. TOLMIE: For about two hours I have been trying to tell the hon. member for South Oxford and other hon. members what we propose to do with the amount asked for, and I think nearly everybody has now got a fair idea of how the money is to be expended. With regard to this particular case I have no particular objection to reviewing it personally and looking into the matter. I do not want to do anything that is unfair but up to the present moment I must say, that having received a report from the Veterinary Director General and getting further information in conversation with him, I have not seen anything to indicate that this man complied with the law and that he is entitled to compensation. However, if the committee, or any particular member of it, so desires I shall be only too glad to go into the subject very carefully, and if there is reasonable ground for going any further I will do so.

The CHAIRMAN: Shall the item carry?

Mr. SUTHERLAND: I have listened, I think, as patiently as any hon. member has done to the minister's statements with reference to the item before us, and I have not heard him give any explanation as to why there should be this large increase in connection with this branch of his department.

Mr. TOLMIE: My experience in this House has not been as lengthy as that of the hon. member for South Oxford, and perhaps I have been unable to explain myself sufficiently but I have heard no objection from any other member in that particular regard.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: Shall the item carry?

Mr. SUTHERLAND: No, Mr. Chairman, before leaving the item I think we might well learn something about the men who are at present in the service of the government before we place the power in the hands of the minister to have a lot more inspectors appointed through the Civil Service Commission, without any well defined knowledge as to what their qualifications are. I notice in the Public Accounts that there are a great many of these men who are receiving, I shall not say very high salaries, but very good stipends, and a bonus is also given to most of them. I would like to know from the minister whether or not it is intended to have this bonus continued. The bonus was given a few years ago as a "war" bonus and a great many of these men did not go to the war. The word "war" was afterwards omitted and the grant called a straight bonus. I now wonder if that bonus is going to be perpetuated, and I would therefore ask how much of this proposed expenditure is for bonus and how much for straight salary.

Mr. TOLMIE: The bonus will end on the 31st, March and after that date these officers will be treated in the same way as other civil servants.

Mr. SUTHERLAND: Does the item provide for the payment of the bonus or does it not?

Mr. TOLMIE: No, Mr. Chairman, it does not.

Mr. SUTHERLAND: It covers the amount that is in the Estimates for the present year?

Mr. TOLMIE: Yes it does.

The CHAIRMAN: Shall the item carry?

Mr. SUTHERLAND: I notice there have been payments made for hogs slaughtered in a great many other cases. I observe that payment has been made for hogs slaughtered in the case of W. Reid of Brampton and F. Staggs of Brockville, the amount being $3,256.56. What inspectors examined those hogs and how wide-spread was the disease? Was there more evidence of disease in those cases than there was in the other instance to which I have drawn attention? Could the minister give us any information as to the extent of the disease in the herds where these large amounts were paid?

Mr. TOLMIE: I regret that I am unable to give that information off-hand.

Mr. MOLLOY: What are the minimum and maximum salaries of inspectors at the present time?

Mr. TOLMIE: $1,800 and $2,000.

Mr. MOLLOY: The amount of $1,800 is the minimum?

Mr. TOLMIE: Yes, sir.

Mr. SUTHERLAND: How many of these inspectors have been receiving bonuses?

Mr. TOLMIE: All of them.

Mr. SUTHERLAND: How many new inspectors do you propose appointing under the increased vote?

Mr. TOLMIE: I did not hear your question.

Mr. SUTHERLAND: I am not often accused of whispering in this House, and I think I spoke loud enough for any one not afflicted with ear trouble to gather the purport of my question. My request was to know how many inspectors you purpose—

Some hon. MEMBERS: Order.

Mr. SUTHERLAND: —how many inspectors the minister purposes to appoint under the vote he is asking for tonight.

Mr. TOLMIE: There may be more inspectors appointed, and there may not be; it depends entirely on the amount of contagious disease that we have to deal with in the coming year. As to that, I have no information as to what may occur in the future.

Mr. SUTHERLAND: I see that a considerable item here is under the Meat and Canned Foods Act, and I also notice that the minister has a motion on the order paper—which I presume will become law before we leave here—in connection with the permanent manufacture of oleomargarine. I would ask him if he is anticipating appointing a whole raft of inspectors to take charge of this work?

Mr. TOLMIE: I am not proposing, Mr. Chairman, to appoint a whole raft of inspectors to take care of the manufacture of oleomargarine. That does not come under this Act except in regard to the inspection of margarine manufactured in the packing houses, and we already have a staff to take care of that particular work.

Mr. SUTHERLAND: In connection with the staff that you already have—

Some hon. MEMBERS: Order.

Mr. SUTHERLAND: —that the minister already has taking care of this particular work, I would like to know whether they make a special report to him as to the prices and the proportions of the ingredients that enter into the manufacture of this commodity by the packing houses. Is there absolute information furnished the minister by those inspectors as to these matters?

Mr. TOLMIE: These inspectors, and all inspectors of the Health of Animals and of the Meat Inspection branch, make reports from time to time as to exactly what they are doing. With regard to the manufacture of oleomargarine, no particular standard is laid down; it varies in different packing houses.

[Mr. Tolmie.]

Mr. SUTHERLAND: Well, we are getting a little information that we did not have before, and it may be useful later on. Mr. Chairman, I have never yet in this House made any effort to unnecessarily prolong discussion; I think hon. members will give me credit for that at least. And I think I have been reasonable in asking for information in connection with this item to-night; but if the minister does not see fit to give an answer to what I consider is a perfectly reasonable request, I will have to adopt some other method, that is all.

An hon. MEMBER: Come over here.

The CHAIRMAN: Shall the item carry?

Mr. SUTHERLAND: Mr. Chairman, I do not propose letting the matter drop here. If it is the desire of the committee that the item should be adopted, well and good. I beg to move that this item be reduced by $390,000 and leave it exactly where it was last year.

The CHAIRMAN: Shall the amendment carry? In my opinion the noes have it. I declare the amendment lost.

Mr. SUTHERLAND: I would like the vote to be counted.

The CHAIRMAN: When I pronounced the words, "In my opinion the noes have it," five hon. members should have risen in their places in order to have the vote counted. As no hon. members did rise, the Chairman could not call for a vote. I declare the amendment lost and the motion carried.

Amendment (Mr. Sutherland) negatived.

Mr. FIELDING: I hope the minister does not desire to go further to-night. We on this side of the House have been giving him all the help we can. There is now only half an hour left of St. Patrick's day, and certainly my right hon. friend the Minister of Justice should not be kept here any later.

Progress reported.

On motion of the Right Hon. C. J. Doherty the House adjourned at 11.25 p.m.

Friday, March 18, 1921

The House met at three o'clock.

PRIVATE BILLS

FIRST READINGS

Bill No. 31, respecting the Canadian Pacific Railway Company.—Mr. Mewburn.

Bill No. 32, to incorporate The Canadian Transit Company.—Mr. Kennedy (Essex).

Bill No. 33, respecting the "Crédit Foncier Franco-Canadien."—Mr. Chabot.

Bill No. 34, respecting The London and Lake Erie Railway and Transportation Company.—Mr. Glass.

REPORT

Report of the Department of Labour for the fiscal year ending 31st March, 1920.—Right Hon. Arthur Meighen.

PUBLIC ACCOUNTS

Mr. JOSEPH ARCHAMBAULT (Chambly and Verchères) moved:

That the Public Accounts of Canada, and volumes 1, 2 and 3 of the Auditor General's report, for the fiscal year ending March 31st, 1920, be referred to the Select Standing Committee on Public Accounts.

Motion agreed to.

PRISONS AND REFORMATORIES ACT AMENDMENT

Right Hon. C. J. DOHERTY (Minister of Justice) moved for leave to introduce Bill No. 35 to amend the Prisons and Reformatories Act. He said: There is one provision of this Bill which is of general application; its purpose is to raise the age at which persons defined as children may be committed to reformatories instead of to penitentiaries or goals. The present age limit is sixteen years; the Bill proposes to raise it to eighteen years. There have been pretty widespread representations on the desirability of this change. Furthermore its desirability has been impressed upon my mind from observation of cases of very young people, slightly over sixteen years of age, who have been committed to the penitentiaries, which, under the present law, was the only place to which they could be committed. The other provisions of the Bill are to meet proposed changes in the reformatory system in the province of Nova Scotia, in order to adjust our legislation to meet those changes which are desired by the provincial authorities. I think there will be an opportunity later on of fully explaining those proposed changes.

Motion agreed to, and Bill read the first time.

BANKRUPTCY ACT AMENDMENT

Mr. S. W. JACOBS (George Etienne Cartier) moved for leave to introduce Bill No. 36 to amend the Bankruptcy Act.

Mr. MEIGHEN: Explain.

Mr: JACOBS: Mr. Speaker, this is a Bill to amend certain sections of the Bankruptcy Act in order to enlarge the scope of the Act which was passed last session. I may say that this amending Bill is introduced at the suggestion of the judge of the bankruptcy court for the province of Quebec. It is felt that the Act would operate more successfully were these amendments made.

Motion agreed to, and Bill read the first time.

BANKRUPTCY ACT (FRENCH VERSION) AMENDMENT

Mr. S. W. JACOBS (George Etienne Cartier) moved for leave to introduce Bill No. 37 to amend the Bankruptcy Act (French version).

Sir GEORGE FOSTER: Expliquez en français.

Mr. JACOBS: Mr. Speaker, seeing that the Bill is derived from the English law, perhaps I may be permitted to explain it in English. This is a Bill to amend section 9 in order that both the English and the French versions may harmonize. In the French version it is declared that certain property shall be movable and immovable; while in the English version it is declared that the property shall be real and immovable.

Motion agreed to, and the Bill read the first time.

OPIUM AND NARCOTIC DRUG ACT AMENDMENT

Right Hon. ARTHUR MEIGHEN (For Hon. J. A. CALDER) moved:

That to-morrow the House do go into Committee of the Whole for the purpose of considering the resolution to amend the Opium and Narcotic Drug Act, Chapter 17 of the Statutes of 1911, as amended by chapter 31 of the Statutes of 1920.

Mr. BUREAU: May I ask the right hon. gentleman who is Minister of Health for the time being?

Mr. MEIGHEN: Hon. Mr. Calder.

Motion agreed to.

RESIGNATION OF SIR HERBERT B. AMES

On the Orders of the Day:

Hon. W. L. MACKENZIE KING (Leader of the Opposition): Mr. Speaker, in view of the declaration of Sir Herbert Ames, which was communicated by you to the House yesterday, and which appears

duly recorded in the Journals of the House at page 104 of the Votes and Proceedings of March 17, I desire to ask the right hon. the Prime Minister (Mr. Meighen) for an explanation of the answers which have been made to certain questions asked in this House respecting the resignation of the former member for St. Antoine. The declaration to which I have referred is as follows:

To the Honourable Speaker of the House of Commons:

I, Herbert B. Ames, member for the House of Commons of Canada, for the electoral district of St. Antoine, Montreal, do hereby resign my seat in the said House of Commons, for the constituency aforesaid.

Given under my hand and seal at Ottawa, this fourteenth day of February, A.D. 1921.

Herbert B. Ames. (L.S.)

Witness, W. S. Middlebro.
Witness, Howard P. Whidden.

I would direct the attention of my right hon. friend the Prime Minister to the fact that it is set forth in this declaration that it was given under the hand and seal of Sir Herbert Ames at Ottawa on the 14th day of February, 1921. The 14th of February was the day of the opening of the present session of Parliament. I would also direct his attention to the fact that the witnesses to the declaration are the hon. member for North Grey (Mr. Middlebro) the chief whip of the Government party, and the hon. member for Brandon (Mr. Whidden). It is known that Sir Herbert Ames has not been in Canada during the present year; he has been in Europe and has been there for some months.

Mr. SPEAKER: Order. I regret to have to remind the hon. gentleman that while I wish to allow every latitude in the statement which he is making for the purpose of leading up to a question, it would be highly improper on his part to make any argument on the Orders of the Day when there is no subject before the Chair. The hon. member, if he desired to go into the question fully, would have an opportunity to do so at any time on a motion to go into Committee of Supply.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: I have no desire to present an argument, but I regard it as material to an understanding of the significance of the questions which I am about to read that I should direct the attention of the House to the date to which I have just referred. The first question with reference to the resignation of Sir Herbert Ames was asked by the hon. member for Quebec East (Mr. Lapointe) in the course of the debate on the Address. This question, which was asked on March 2 and will be found on page 489 of Hansard (unrevised), was as follows:

There is another matter to which I wish to direct your attention, Mr. Speaker. On July 21, 1920, the hon. member for Ste. Antoine, Montreal (Sir Herbert Ames), delivered a very eloquent address before the Empire Parliamentary Association in London on "The Dominions and the League of Nations." This address was printed, and I have a copy of it in my hand. With your permission, I will read the following words from page 5:

"Now, I have just returned from a hurried visit to Canada. Mr. Balfour has alluded to the double capacity which I occupied at that time, and for the moment still occupy. For sixteen years I have been the representative of Western Montreal in the Canadian House of Commons. My resignation is in the hands of the Speaker because I have found that my new work is quite enough to occupy all the time and attention that I am capable of giving to it."

This was on July 21, 1920. Why should the electors of St. Antoine, Montreal, be disfranchised? Why has the resignation of Sir Herbert Ames been kept secret and withheld? I am sure that it must have been intercepted on its way to Your Honour, because you could not have it in your hands without acting upon it—but that is always the humiliating method of avoiding an election and evading a defeat. Shall this be permitted to continue? Will the Canadian people stand for that much longer?

To this question, you, Mr. Speaker, made the following reply immediately upon conclusion of the speech of my hon. friend:

Mr. SPEAKER: Two references in the speech of the hon. member for Quebec East (Mr. Lapointe) make it highly essential, I think, that the position of the Chair should be stated clearly and beyond all question. ....

The second reference to which I wish to allude has to do with the statement credited to the hon. member for St. Antoine (Sir Herbert Ames) that his resignation was in the Speaker's hands. The House will at once realize that it would never do for the impression to go abroad that the Speaker was a party to withholding a document of that character.

Some hon. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

Mr. SPEAKER: I therefore deem it my duty to make it clear to the House that I have not in my possession the resignation of the member for St. Antoine, nor have I ever received a document which was, or which purported to be, the resignation of his seat in this House.

On March 3, the day following, I addressed the following question on the Orders of the Day to the right hon. Prime Minister. It will be found on page 506 of Hansard:

THE MEMBER FOR ST. ANTOINE, MONTREAL

On the Orders of the Day:

Hon. W. L. MACKENZIE KING: Is the Prime Minister aware, of the hon. member

for St. Antoine (Sir Herbert Ames) having made any public declaration to the effect that he had tendered his resignation as a member of this Parliament? Has the Prime Minister or any other member of the Government received an intimation from that hon. gentleman of his desire or intention to tender his resignation?

To this question the right. hon. the Prime Minister replied:

Right Hon. ARTHUR MEIGHEN: I have seen no public declaration made by or on behalf of the hon. member for St. Antoine, nor have I received any communication that I can give to the House.

On March 4 the following question by the hon. member for Charlevoix-Montmorency (Mr. Casgrain) appeared upon the Order Paper; it will be found in Hansard, page 608:

REPRESENTATION OF ST. ANTOINE, MONTREAL

Mr. CASGRAIN:

1. Is it true that the member for Saint Antoine, Montreal, has sent in his resignation as a member of the House of Commons?
2. If so, when was it received by the Speaker of the House?

It was replied to as follows, by you, Mr. Speaker:

Mr. SPEAKER: The answer to the first question is, No. The second question is answered by the reply to No. 1.

In justice, Mr. Speaker, to Sir Herbert Ames himself and to hon. members of this House, I should like to ask the Prime Minister how it comes that this document, bearing the signatures of hon. members opposite as witnesses, happens to be dated at Ottawa on the 14th of February, of the present year, when Sir Herbert Ames, so far as is known, was in Europe at that date and has been in Europe all of the present year? Assuming that the declaration was made on the date set forth, the second question I should like to ask my right hon. friend is, who is responsible for having withheld this important document from you, Mr. Speaker, for over a month, from February 14 until March 17? The third question is, in view of the existence of this declaration by Sir Herbert Ames, what explanation has the Prime Minister to make of the answers given to the questions I have just quoted?

Right Hon. ARTHUR MEIGHEN (Prime Minister): Noting, as I have, the formality with which the leader of the Opposition has framed his questions and the rather long recitals which preceded them, I suggest that it would have been fairer had he given me notice of the subject matter; but that has not been his practice. However, there will be no difficulty at all in replying to his questions. Every answer given in this House by the Government as read by my hon. friend is absolutely correct. I knew of no public declaration Sir Herbert Ames had made; if Sir Herbert Ames himself had stated—I had not seen the statement before—that his resignation was at the time mentioned in the Speaker's hands, it could not have been correct. His resignation was not in the Speaker's hands until shortly before the time Mr. Speaker announced it. The fact is that Sir Herbert Ames had his resignation made out and left with a friend, to be dated within certain limits fixed by him. His instructions were fully carried out and the resignation forwarded accordingly.

TEMPERATURE OF THE CHAMBER

On the Orders of the Day:

Mr. W. D. EULER (North Waterloo): I would like to direct the attention of the hon. Minister of Public Works (Mr. McCurdy) to a matter which, while not of urgent public importance, is of some importance to the members of this House. I refer to the temperature of the Chamber. For a week or more the Chamber has on frequent occasions been extremely draughty and quite cold, and I would like to ask the Minister whether it is not possible for him to make such arrangements as will enable us to do business in ordinary comfort.

Hon. F. B. McCURDY (Minister of Public Works): The complaint which has been made by the hon. member has come from various parts of the Chamber, and concurrently complaints have come from other members that the temperature is too high. The official in charge of heating has instructions to keep the temperature of the Chamber as near as possible to 67 degrees, which, I believe, is proper for a House of this character whether on the Government side or in the shades of Opposition.

INTERNATIONAL JOINT COMMISSION

On the Orders of the Day:

Hon. JACQUES BUREAU (Three Rivers and St. Maurice): I see by an Ottawa despatch in the Montreal Gazette that the Prime Minister has notified all parties interested in the Lake of the Woods control legislation to appear at Ottawa to present their case on Monday next at 11.30 o'clock. Have the parties representing the Americans and

the parties representing Canada on the International Joint Commission also been notified? I will put the question otherwise. Has the International Joint Commission been notified to appear with the Manitoba, Ontario, and other people interested?

Right Hon. ARTHUR MEIGHEN (Prime Minister): That is, on Monday at 11.30?

Mr. BUREAU: Yes.

Mr. MEIGHEN: No. Monday at 11.30 has been fixed as the date on which any parties interested in the legislation who wished to make representations against it may be heard by the Government. The International Joint Commission, neither American nor Canadian section, has, so far as any knowledge has reached us, any objection to this legislation.

CANADIAN LOAN TO ROUMANIA

On the Orders of the Day:

Mr. JOSEPH ARCHAMBAULT (Chambly and Verchères): I should like to call the attention of the Government to an article appearing in the Montreal Gazette this morning regarding the Roumanian bonds. The article reads:

> Roumanian bonds pay no dividends. Canada's chances of securing interest soon are very slim. Canada's chances of securing payment of the interest on the bonds representing the $25,000,000 loaned to the Roumanian Government two years ago as a trade credit has practically disappeared for the present.

The article further states:

> The Roumanian Government now states that it is unable to pay these bonds, and proposes that they be renewed for one year, offering to pay interest at the rate of 8½ per cent instead of the 5 per cent originally fixed.

Is the Government aware of these facts, and has any proposition been made to the Canadian Government regarding a settlement of bonds and interest?

Hon. Sir HENRY DRAYTON (Minister of Finance): My recollection is that this matter has already been dealt with by a formal question and answer already given to the House. It is not new. The interest has not been paid. The only thing Roumania is now suggesting is that we should agree to defer our claim for interest, so that that interest would not be in default.

Mr. ARCHAMBAULT: Has the Government arrived at any decision?

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: The Government is endeavouring to collect the debt.

[Mr. Bureau.]

TRADE WITH RUSSIA

On the Orders of the Day:

Mr. THOMAS VIEN (Lotbinière): There appears in this morning's papers an article relating to the resumption of trade between Great Britain and Russia. Is it the intention of the Canadian Government also to resume trade relations with Russia, and in that case, will the Minister of Trade and Commerce (Sir George Foster) have his trade agents instructed to see what business openings are available for Canadian trade or will he leave Canadian interests to look after the trade themselves. I would point out to the right hon. gentleman that, owing to the difficulties of communication with Russia at present, it might be preferable that his trade agents be instructed to look out for business openings.

Right Hon. Sir GEORGE FOSTER (Minister of Trade and Commerce): If my right hon. friend will kindly refer to Hansard of yesterday, he will find my answer to a question which is almost precisely the same as his.

Mr. McKENZIE: May I ask the Minister of Finance if there is such a thing now as a Russian national currency?

Sir HENRY DRAYTON (Minister of Finance): I am afraid that that is a question of which due notice ought to be given.

CATTLE EMBARGO

On the Orders of the Day:

Mr. S. W. JACOBS (George Etienne Cartier): I see by the press that Mr. Lloyd George has declared that a commission is to investigate shortly the matter of the embargo on Canadian cattle. Has the Government any official knowledge of that and, if so, does it intend to be represented before or on that commission?

Right Hon. ARTHUR MEIGHEN (Prime Minister): The Government has received a communication from the High Commissioner to the effect that such a commission was promised by the British Prime Minister. The terms of the commission have not yet reached the Government. It will depend upon the terms of the commission what action we should take, but I would think, undoubtedly, the Government would see to it that the facts in support of Canada's contention will be fully and carefully laid before that commission.

THE IMPERIAL CONFERENCE

Hon. CHARLES MURPHY (Russell): Has the Prime Minister observed a despatch stating that the Prime Minister of Australia intends to acquaint the Australian Parliament with the subjects to be taken up at the approaching conference in London and to give that Parliament an opportunity of discussing them? Is it my right hon. friend's intention to give this Parliament the same statement and a like opportunity?

Right Hon. ARTHUR MEIGHEN (Prime Minister): I had not observed any statement by the Australian Prime Minister to the effect described by the hon. gentleman, but I had myself moved in the matter and a little earlier than he. I have already given this House, in outline, the subjects that will probably be discussed. The exact agenda has not yet reached us, but the three important topics that had been suggested were stated in an answer made about three weeks ago to the hon. member for Chambly and Verchères (Mr. Archambault) and the answer to his question went on to state that, should it appear the desire of a substantial number of members that special opportunity be afforded in this House for discussion, it would be provided. Ever since that, at any time on occasions when subjects such as that might be brought up, the subject might have been discussed. Should further information reach us making certain that other important topics would be considered, I will feel it my duty to state those topics or their substance to the House.

SUPPLY

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

The CHAIRMAN: Item No. 4 Justice—salaries—contingencies—

Mr. BUREAU: The consent of the House is necessary before this item is called, because the Estimates of this particular department have not been taken up before.

Mr. DOHERTY: We had understood—I hope, not misunderstood—that we would be permitted to go into Justice. Might I remind the hon. gentleman that I did not absolutely insist on my rights the other evening and, perhaps, one good turn deserves another.

Mr. BUREAU: I claim that a minister who wants to go on with his Estimates like this, should, before going on, ask for the consent of the House.

Mr. DOHERTY: I quite concede that. If I was under a misapprehension, I am sorry, but I thought the House understood that I was to go on.

Mr. FIELDING: It was announced definitely last night that agriculture would be taken up.

Mr. MEIGHEN: And Justice.

Mr. FIELDING: The Prime Minister said any others might be taken up.

Mr. MEIGHEN: I said Justice as well.

Mr. LAPOINTE: Members of the House must consent to that. The announcement of my right hon. friend is not sufficient.

Mr. MEIGHEN: I quite agree with that, but let me read what I said last night:

> Mr. Fielding: What business will be taken up to-morrow?
> Mr. Meighen: The motion to go into Supply.
> Mr. Fielding: On the same Estimates?
> Mr. Meighen: On the same Estimates and those of the Department of Justice, and any others that we may have a right to go on with.
> Mr. Bureau: That is rather vague.
> Mr. Meighen: I do not think that there are any others that we have a right to go on with, consequently they could not be taken up but by consent. If we do ask for consent it will be on the Estimates of the Department of Trade and Commerce. If all those go through, we will proceed with Government orders.

So the Department of Justice was specially mentioned, it being the understanding, as I was informed by my hon. friend, that he would be permitted to go on, in view of the fact that he did not insist on his right to go on with his Estimates on Tuesday night, I think it was, when they were reached.

Mr. BUREAU: My object is not to raise any opposition, but to affirm a right. I do not think this vote should be called by the chairman before a formal motion is made asking for the unanimous consent of the House. There is no objection to giving unanimous consent, but it ought to go on the record that that is the proper procedure.

Mr. DOHERTY: I quite recognize that I am not entitled to proceed without the consent of the House, and I beg through the chairman to ask whether the House is prepared to consent to my taking up the items I have mentioned.

The CHAIRMAN: The point raised by the hon. member for Three Rivers (Mr. Bureau) is, of course, as admitted by the right hon. the Minister of Justice (Mr. Doherty) well taken. The Estimates of the Department of Justice having not yet been

taken up this session, and this being Friday, it is necessary that the committee should give its unanimous consent before these Estimates can be considered. Is it the unanimous desire of the committee that the Estimates of the Department of Justice be now considered?

Mr. BUREAU: Carried.

Mr. CAHILL: If the objection of one member is sufficient to prevent the Justice Estimates being proceeded with now, I wish to object.

Mr. FIELDING: May I ask my right hon. friend what is the difficulty about proceeding with the Agriculture Estimates? We were in the midst of a very interesting discussion last night, and we do not want to lose the thread of our thoughts.

Mr. MEIGHEN: There is no objection at all to proceeding with Agriculture first, but I understood from the Minister of Agriculture last night that there were only four items left, and we thought it would likely expedite matters if we went on with the Justice Estimates first, and took up the four remaining items in the Agriculture Estimates later. I think the long experience of my hon. friend from Shelburne and Queen's will lead him to concur with me in that expectation.

I do not want to call attention to the fact that the Government might have insisted on its right to go into the Justice Estimates the other night, especially as it promised that ample opportunity would be given for a motion on going into Supply on another day on the Justice Estimates. That having been done, I think it is hardly fair that objection should be raised. However, it has been raised, and we will go on with the Department of Agriculture.

Department of Agriculture—Publications, $34,500.

Mr. LEGER: Would the minister explain what these publications are?

Mr. TOLMIE: Our Publications Branch was located at 66 Queen Street, but we are now moving to the Robinson Building on the same street. We publish what is known as the Agricultural Gazette. It is published about six times a year, and has in its columns all the latest information regarding agriculture. It is distributed to the Departments of Agriculture in the various provinces, institutions of learning, agricultural societies, and members of Parliament. The Publications Branch also maintains a distribution office, through which the reports and bulletins of the department are issued. During the last five years this branch has distributed some 13,000,000 bulletins and during seven months of the present year 1,150,000. The branch also prepares press notices.

[The Chairman.]

Mr. LEGER: Are these publications intended to be distributed to the agricultural societies in the different provinces? If that is not already being done, I think it would be a very good idea, because while these societies may get instructions from other sources, direct instruction from the Minister of Agriculture by means of these reports would be of great assistance to the farmers.

Mr. TOLMIE: Is my hon. friend referring to the Agricultural Gazette?

Mr. LEGER: Yes, and other publications of the Branch.

Mr. TOLMIE: The general course followed is to distribute the publications to those who directly apply for them. We have found that if distributed freely, the publications often fall into the hands of men who have no particular interest in them, do not read them, and consequently do not benefit. But when a man takes the trouble to write a letter for a certain publication, we assume that he takes an interest in the work in question, and the publication is sent with some beneficial object in view. We do not distribute except to people who send in an application, but we gladly send our publications to those who do.

Mr. LEGER: I would suggest that the different publications be sent either to the Governments of the different provinces, or to the secretaries of the agricultural societies in each province. In New Brunswick we have about eight or ten agricultural societies. I think this would afford a direct channel of instruction to the farmers throughout the country, and would prove very valuable.

Mr. CLARK (Red Deer): Does the minister think that the nation gets full value from the expenditure on the Agricultural Gazette and these various leaflets? This item is not a very large one, and I have no desire to obstruct, I need not tell my hon. friend, but we all realize the need of economy, and it has got to be begun somewhere. There is nothing I am more struck with in connection with government generally than the deluge of printed matter that descends upon the heads of members of Parliament and, I assume, upon the Senators also. It would be a mistake for me to judge the activities

of my fellow-members by my own, so I will content myself with saying that I have not time to read anything like all the material that is sent to me, not only from this department but from other departments of the Government. If I did, I should have no time for the Scriptures, and that would be a very serious matter for me, as for other hon. members. I see my hon. friend (Mr. McKenzie) smiles, but it is not quite a smiling matter, I may tell him. Is the minister quite sure that we get value in these publications? Thirteen millions of leaflets is a tremendous crop. I am not sure that all the crops raised under the Department of Agriculture bear anything like a fair relationship to this one. But I am confident that if this particular crop is meant for seed, then more of this seed goes to waste in the ground than most of the other crops raised under the direction of my genial and able friend.

Mr. McKENZIE: Perhaps the minister will allow me to ask a question before he replies to my hon. friend. Is there any systematic scheme of circulating these blue books that are printed in the department? From my own knowledge the information contained in some of these publications is valuable and so long as money is expended in printing them, and the postage is free, I think it is unfortunate that this literature should not find its way to the farmers. I am sure it would do them some good. The hon. member for Red Deer (Mr. Clark), says that his whole time is occupied in reading the Scriptures. Well, if he does not gain any better results from his reading of the blue books than he does from his perusal of Holy Writ, I would say let us publish no more blue books. However, that is a mere aside. When the money in connection with this work is spent and the pamphlets are published, it is really too bad that they should be thrown away from year to year. But it is evident that they must be discarded if they are not sent to the farmers, and a little extra labour would put them into circulation so that the people generally, and particularly the farmers, would be able to get the benefit of the information thus published. Let me urge upon the minister the necessity for the widest possible circulation of all literature prepared by his department.

Mr. TOLMIE: First of all, for the information of the hon. member for Red Deer (Mr. Clark), I think that excellent results are obtained from the distribution of these bulletins. We do not distribute them except to those who send in their names with a request to be placed on our mailing list. Those who desire to have these publications select bulletins dealing with the particular line of work in which they are interested, and the mere fact that they go to the trouble of writing to the department and requesting that they be supplied with these publications, is abundant evidence that they are interested and are anxious to have information. As a pratical farmer and stock man I have derived a great deal of benefit, not only from our Canadian bulletins, but from United States publications. For a number of years I kept my name on the mailing list at Washington for agricultural bulletins, and I can assure the committee that on various occasions the information contained in a single publication, if followed, was enough to ensure success, while ignorance of the instruction imparted would, in all probability, mean failure. Now, let me make it clear that we carefully watch the situation in order to prevent any waste in these pamphlets, and the plan of sending publications only to those who request them has worked out as economically as any scheme could.

Mr. DECHENE: How much per year is spent on the Agricultural Gazette?

Mr. TOLMIE: The expenditure for this year is $18,000.

Mr. STEIN: Will the minister be kind enough to see that copies of all his publications are distributed throughout the county of Kamouraska? I had occasion to refer to this matter the other day. The agricultural school at St. Anne de la Pocatière, as I was informed by the professor a few days ago in a letter which I sent to the King's Printer, has not been receiving all the bulletins published by the department. The same thing applies to the classical college in the same place. The greater part of that institution was destroyed by fire last winter, and the library containing over 35,000 volumes was completely wiped out. I wish the Minister would note these facts and see that these institutions are properly supplied. I might add that the school of domestic science for girls at St. Pascal is also in need of such publications of the department as are suitable for the work there. I am sure the minister recognizes the needs of these schools. As I said the other day, his deputy frequently visits the county of Kamouraska and is aware of its importance, and I think he will agree with me that the requests of these colleges for these publications are only reasonable.

Mr. TOLMIE: Both these institutions are now on the mailing list, but if they are not receiving a sufficient number of copies of any publication, or, as the hon. member suggests, are not receiving some publications at all, I shall be only too glad to look into the matter and see to it that they are both properly supplied.

Mr. STEIN: The minister is evidently overlooking the third. May I remind him of the school for girls at St. Pascal?

Mr. SUTHERLAND: I have seen in the press the statement that the department has decided to discontinue the publication of the Gazette, the explanation being that the ground is so well covered by agricultural magazines throughout the country that there is no great necessity for this particular publication. I have in my hand another publication issued by the department, and one which has been very freely distributed throughout the western part of Ontario in all public places such as banks and post offices, where there is a fine stack piled up on desks for people to make use of. There is on the cover of this publication a map showing the location of the various farms, and the following inscription accompanies the picture:

In the above map, note the location of experimental farms and stations. The superintendent of the experimental farm or station nearest to you will be pleased to give you any information in his power. Why not communicate with him?

Well, it is rather unfortunate, as one may discover from a study of this map, that the experimental farms are practically all in Eastern and Western Canada. It is true that about five hundred miles west of here there is a little tobacco farm in the county of Essex, I think, or Kent. But many of the people throughout Western Ontario are not very much interested in the growing of tobacco. I would suggest that if it is not the intention to provide experimental farms in western Ontario, then this circular should be distributed where it is more acceptable, because it is an absolute waste of money to publish this pamphlet and leave it in public places in that part of the country for distribution when there is not one person out of a thousand in Western Ontario who is greatly concerned about the growing of tobacco, and that is the only farm with which people could communicate. More than that, this circular has, in the past, been very largely circulated in the Old Country, having been available there in the emigration offices, and I want to point out that it conveys a very unfair impression to the prospective immigrant regarding this country. He looks over this map and sees the location of these farms, and finds that Ontario is scarcely recognizable on the map. West of the Great Lakes you will see the circular dotted with experimental farms and stations, there being no fewer than thirty-one altogether, while in Western Ontario, there is a little farm in the bush, away north on the Grand Trunk Pacific, and a little tobacco station at Harrow. If the minister wants to economize, I suggest that he send no more of these publications into Western Ontario until there are some radical changes in the experimental farm system.

Mr. DECHENE: I have frequently read some very interesting articles in the Gazette. They are usually not written by officials of the department, and I wonder whether the contributions are paid for.

Mr. TOLMIE: They are free contributions.

Item agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN: I now repeat the request made by the Minister of Justice for the unanimous consent of the committee to take up the Estimates of the Department of Justice. Does the committee give its unanimous consent?

Some hon. MEMBERS: Carried.

Justice—Salaries, $190,832.50; Contingencies, $25,000.

Mr. THOMSON (Qu'Appelle): I notice a good many increases. I presume they are statutory increases allowed from year to year.

Mr. DOHERTY: They also include the results of the recent reclassification.

Mr. PROULX: Who is the Assistant Deputy Minister?

Mr. DOHERTY: Mr. Edwards.

Mr. PROULX: Who is the senior advisory counsel?

Mr. DOHERTY: I am not in a position at the present moment to mention who is the senior. But the accountant of the department will be here in a moment or two and then I will be able to give the hon. gentleman that information. I may say that this ranking of seniors results from the classification of the Civil Service people who divided the counsel into senior advisory counsel and junior advisory counsel fixing different salaries according to the position.

Mr. GOULD: I notice that the Deputy Minister of Justice receives a salary of $10,000 a year whereas the Deputy Minister of Agriculture only receives $5,500, and the deputies of other departments $6,000. Does the minister consider that discrepancy fair and equitable?

Mr. DOHERTY: I am not in a position to say what would be a fair and equitable salary for the deputy minister of agriculture, or the deputy minister of another department; but parliament in 1913 or 1914, fixed the salary for the deputy minister of justice at $10,000 and it has continued at that figure ever since. I am quite confident we would not be able to obtain the services of a counsel of the eminence and high qualifications of the gentleman who is at present Deputy Minister of Justice at any lower figure than the salary that is provided.

Mr. LAPOINTE: I see there are eight lawyers employed in the department as counsel—3 senior advisory counsel, 2 advisory counsel and 3 junior advisory counsel. Has any one of these eight gentlemen any special duties, is he supervising any part of the law department, or are they all on the same footing and working in the same branch?

Mr. DOHERTY: They are all working under the direction of the deputy minister, taking up such matters as he assigns to them. I may say that we have two gentlemen who are especially qualified in the law of the province of Quebec, and who occupy themselves principally if not entirely with matters under that law. I can now inform my hon. friend (Mr. Proulx) that the senior advisory counsel are Mr. Renaud, Mr. Chisholm, and Mr. Bill.

An hon. MEMBER: Bill who?

Mr. DOHERTY: It is not an undue familiarity. That happens to be his surname.

Mr. PROULX: There are two other advisory counsel and three junior advisory counsel. The designations are new, I never saw them in the Estimates before.

Mr. COPP: It is the work of Griffenhagen.

Mr. PROULX: How many lawyers have been appointed to the department since 1911?

Mr. DOHERTY: The designations to which the hon. gentleman refers are the result of the classification as applied to existing officers. I do not think we have made one addition to the number this year, in fact the estimates show that
4 p.m. to be the case. As the hon. member knows, the department was classified in common with all the other departments, and this system of classification was adopted in which the lawyers employed in the department were divided into senior advisory counsel, advisory counsel, and junior advisory counsel.

Mr. PROULX: Are they appointed by the Civil Service Commission and are their salaries fixed by that body?

Mr. DOHERTY: Their salaries were fixed by the Civil Service Commission. They were already in the department before the present Civil Service system came into effect. If the hon. gentleman will refer to the Estimates he will see that there are no new appointments.

Mr. LAPOINTE: Will the minister say which of these officers appoints the lawyers who represent the department before the different courts in the respective judicial districts?

Mr. DOHERTY: I think that as a rule the lawyers are selected because of the nature of the different cases. It is not a matter of practice to appoint a lawyer to do all the business in a district. In many instances it does happen there is one lawyer who deals with practically all the cases; but as I understand the practice, lawyers are selected rather with a view to particular cases and the particular business to be done. That selection is usually done by the assistant deputy minister in consultation with the deputy minister, and occasionally with the minister.

Mr. LAPOINTE: The reason I ask the question is that I happen to be in the courts quite often and I see the Department of Justice represented in many cases, but in no single case during the last few years have I seen a lawyer who happens to be a Liberal representing the department. In these days when there is "no political patronage" I would like to know what officer it is who knows the lawyers so well as to always select the few Conservative lawyers, in the city of Quebec for instance, when there is a case in which the Department of Justice is interested?

Mr. DOHERTY: I shall make enquiry as to who has that particular scent.

Mr. LAPOINTE: It is a matter of intuition.

Mr. ARCHAMBAULT: It must be a matter of instinct.

Mr. BUREAU: I understand there are law officers in every department of the Government. Do these officers relieve the counsel of the Justice Department of any of their work, or do the latter take up en banc the various questions that are submitted to their department after the law officers have passed on them?

Mr. DOHERTY: Everything is subject to review by the Department of Justice as provided in the statutes. When matters call for litigation, or serious questions arise, they are always submitted to the Department of Justice. I understand that these law clerks—I think it is rather a misnomer—are in the different departments for the convenience of being available with regard to purely routine matters that require to be dealt with from day to day.

Mr. PROULX: When the Crown is represented in the courts by the officers of the Department of Justice—the deputy minister or some of these counsel,—and costs are allowed to the Crown, who gets those costs, the department or the counsel?

Mr. DOHERTY: The Crown gets the costs—when they are paid.

Mr. McMASTER: It seems to me that when a lawyer acting for the Crown is successful and gets costs, surely that should be enough to encourage him to do as well the next time or better.

Mr. COPP: Every lawyer does the best he can at all times.

Mr. DOHERTY: That argument is of general application, but we are fortunate in having lawyers who do so well that they need no encouragement to do better.

Mr. LAFORTUNE: Has the vacancy caused by the retirement of the warden at St. Vincent de Paul filled; and if so, by whom?

Mr. DOHERTY: That really comes under the penitentiary item which we shall be dealing with in a minute or two, but I have no objection to giving the information now. The warden at St. Vincent de Paul has retired, and the question of appointing his successor in going through the machinery of the Civil Service Commission.

Mr. THOMSON (Qu'Appelle): I notice on page 75 of the Estimates that one law clerk stenographer receives $2,100, but no others received more than $1,200. I also notice that the highest-paid senior law clerk stenographer gets $1,740. How does it come about that one clerk who apparently is not a senior is receiving so much more than even the senior law clerk stenographer?

Mr. DOHERTY: I believe the explanation of that difference is that that particular officer is under the old system under which law clerk stenographers got an annual increase, and it is simply by the number of years that that law clerk stenographer has been in the service that that result has been brought about.

Mr. THOMSON (Qu'Appelle): Has he the same duties to perform as those who get only two-thirds of his salary?

Mr. DOHERTY: I do not know that the duties can be described as being much heavier. t was the law though, and this lady—I am sure that will appeal to the hon. gentleman—gradually acquired this large salary by reason of the additional number of years she has been in the service; and I suppose, from a lady's point of view it is worth a good deal to have to admit the acquisition of those additional years. However that may be, I may say that that particular employee is about to retire, so the anomaly will disappear.

Mr. THOMSON (Qu'Appelle): I do not suppose that, like the laws of the Medes and Persians, this system cannot be changed. It seems to be very unfair.

Mr. DOHERTY: Of course, it would be very unfair where a party was appointed under a certain system, and acquired a right under that system, to deprive her of that right. However, the lady is retiring very shortly.

Mr. MICHAUD: What is the duty of the confidential messenger?

Mr. ARCHAMBAULT: He is a political booster.

Mr. DOHERTY: No, the position is purely non-political. The confidential messenger is a personal messenger of the minister, and it must be apparent that many things have to be dealt with, other than those political, where the minister needs a messenger in whom he can place implicit confidence.

Mr. PROULX: I see in the Estimates "Allowances to Private Secretaries." Has the minister two private secretaries?

Mr. DOHERTY: Yes; and I am blessed in the fact that they are both bi-lingual. One is a gentleman whose mother tongue is English and the other is a gentleman whose mother tongue is French. We have a very considerable French correspondence in the department, and I do not think we would be able to get along with less assistance in that regard.

Mr. ARCHAMBAULT: Does not the minister think that that would be a good rule for all the departments?

Mr. DOHERTY: I always seek to set the kind of example that ought to be followed.

Mr. COPP: What salaries are being paid to these private secretaries?

Mr. DOHERTY: One gets $3,360 and the other $3,180.

Mr. COPP: Does that include $600 allowance to each?

Mr. DOHERTY: No, that is the salary without allowance; but that $600 is divided between the two secretaries.

Mr. COPP: The allowances to private secretaries are given at $1,200.

Mr. DOHERTY: The other $600 is for the secretary of the Solicitor General.

Mr. COPP: I have never been able to understand why these allowances are made to private secretaries in addition to their salaries. Why should not their salaries be inclusive?

Mr. DOHERTY: That is a survival of an old practice also, and it applies to all private secretaries appointed under that system.

Mr. COPP: I know it does.

Mr. DOHERTY: Under the old practice, when a private secretary was appointed he became a clerk in the department with the salary attached to whatever class he was assigned to, and this $600 allowance was made because of the fact, as I understand it, that the private secretary of the minister—differing in that respect from other clerks—is not called upon to attend simply during the fixed hours of the day; he has to be at the disposal of the minister late and early when the minister needs him.

Mr. COPP: Late possibly rather than early.

Mr. DOHERTY: In some instances more often late than early. But it may be a little more burdensome on some persons to be late. I understand that is the reason why that special allowance was fixed. With regard to those to whom it still applies, they are gentlemen who were in that position when that was settled, and to take it away from them now would be equivalent to reducing their salaries.

Mr. COPP: I have no desire to suggest that it should be taken away. I only wanted an explanation, because I find it all through the Estimates and I really did not understand why their salaries came from two sources.

Mr. LAFORTUNE: What is the name of the purchasing agent of the department?

Mr. DOHERTY: Mr. Dillon.

Mr. PROULX: Is that gentleman still in business as a druggist?

Mr. DOHERTY: Not that I have any knowledge of.

Mr. PROULX: Is it not the rule that the purchasing agent of a department must not engage in any outside business; that he must give his whole time and attention to the work of the department?

Mr. DOHERTY: I understand there is such a general rule, not with regard to the purchasing agents particularly, but with regard to Civil Service employees.

Mr. PROULX: Can the minister say that Mr. Dillon is not engaged in the business of selling drugs?

Mr. DOHERTY: I have no knowledge of his being engaged in that business. There is a firm which is managed and administered, so far as my knowledge goes, by other people; I do not know whether or not he is a stockholder in the concern: I can ascertain that if the hon. gentleman is interested to know. I know that Mr. Dillon has given most active and energetic service to the department; I have never found that he was not available when needed.

Mr. McMASTER: Shortly before the session opened, the members of Parliament received a circular letter from a gentleman who described himself, if I mistake not, as the head of a purchasing commission, which had been formed in direct contradiction to the will of Parliament. The matter was brought up last session and the session before and an attempt made to form a purchasing commission, but the measure was not carried because hon. gentlemen on both sides were opposed to it. Shortly before the session

opened a commission was formed by Order in Council. This being the case, why should there be any purchasing agents for the different departments?

Mr. DOHERTY: The hon. gentleman is quite mistaken when he suggests that a purchasing commission was appointed in direct opposition to the decision of Parliament. He is quite mistaken, and so is the hon. gentleman who shakes his head, because I do not think either of them know the nature of the commission that was appointed under Order in Council. It was a totally different thing from what was contemplated by statute; it made provision for general supervision and direction, by one body, of the purchasing of the different departments. Even when we had a purchasing commission with the wider powers, appointed under the War Measures Act, that commission acted in direct communication with the purchasing agents of the different departments, who submitted to the Purchasing Commission their operations. When the supervisory or directing commission to which the hon. gentleman refers was appointed, the same system continued as between them and the purchasing agents of the different departments.

Mr. ARCHAMBAULT: Was there a purchasing agent for the Department of Justice before the War Purchasing Commission was instituted?

Mr. DOHERTY: Yes.

Mr. ARCHAMBAULT: The same one?

Mr. DOHERTY: Yes.

Mr. LAFORTUNE: What is the name of the confidential messenger?

Mr. DOHERTY: Mr. Pearson, a gentleman whose services we had to dispense with during the war because he was engaged in the trenches. Of course, his position was retained for him.

Item agreed to.

Justice—Miscellaneous Expenditure, $10,000; living allowance for judge of Atlin district, B.C., $1,200; office expenses of purchasing agent, $2,000.

Mr. REID (Mackenzie): I would like to ask why an appointment of a judge has not been made in the Yorkton judicial district. Since the death of Judge Parker some time ago, that district has been without a judge. A court house has been erected at a cost of between $150,000 and $200,000. I am informed that the judicial district of Yorkton is the second largest in Saskatchewan, and the Law Association there are very anxious that an appointment should be made.

Mr. DOHERTY: We had a general intimation from the provincial authorities that they were contemplating such regroupings as might result in a diminution of the number of judges to be appointed. We did not, therefore, make haste to fill all the vacancies that existed.

Mr. PROULX: What is comprised in the item "miscellaneous expenditure"?

Mr. DOHERTY: The item covers costs of administration of justice in the Northwest Territories as now constituted and in any unorganized territory; expense incurred in connection with extradition cases and cases of fugitive offenders from or to other parts of the Empire; expenses of commission of inquiry; copies and translations of evidence required in dealing with applications for clemency; sundry small expenses not otherwise provided for. This is the usual amount that we ask for. The expenditure last year was $7,560; in 1918-19, $8,361; in 1917-18, $9,905.34. I do not think it is possible to estimate it any more closely.

Mr. PROULX: Why is there a living allowance for the judge of Atlin district, B.C.?

Mr. DOHERTY: It was provided for at the time of his appointment. We went into the question a year or two ago whether the conditions still justified the payment of this living allowance, and we satisfied ourselves that they did. It is further to be said that the gentleman accepted the appointment with that provision made at the time. Quite apart from that, however, the district is a remote one and I think that the conditions fully justify the granting of a living allowance.

Mr. PROULX: Is the cost of living any higher there than elsewhere?

Mr. DOHERTY: I am not prepared to give the details just now. As I stated, we went into the question a couple of years ago, and we felt satisfied that it was preferable to continue the allowance. It must further, of course, be considered whether it would be right, years after the gentleman had accepted the appointment with this allowance attached to it, for us to intervene now to take it away. Such action

might, perhaps, be open to question. In any new cases, we have avoided providing such allowances, and with the exception of the Yukon where an allowance is provided by law, this is the only case of the kind.

Mr. LAPOINTE: As questions concerning judges are now in order, I should like to ask an explanation regarding what appears to be a conflict of opinion, or a misunderstanding, with regard to the number of judges in the judicial district of Quebec. Last year, according to the new law concerning the organization of tribunals in that province, the number of King's Bench judges was increased. As my right hon. friend will remember, the judge who was sitting for the district of Beauce (Mr. Justice Flynn) was appointed to the King's Bench court, and the district of Beauce has been deprived of a judge for over a year until recently a new judge, I think (Mr. Justice D'Auteuil), was appointed for that district. What happens is this. One of the judges of the judicial district of Quebec, Mr. Justice Cannon, died some time ago, and the vacancy has not been filled. Is it the intention of the minister to appoint a judge to replace Mr. Justice Cannon, or is it true that this vacancy will not be filled? There is a misunderstanding about the matter.

Mr. DOHERTY: It is not the present intention to make a nomination to fill the vancancy to which the hon. member refers. In the first place, the delay in regard to the district of Beauce in particular, was, I think, attributable to the fact that a modification of the provincial law is in contemplation so as to do away with the attachment of judges to particular districts. At one time, it was anticipated that that modification would go through more promptly than has proved to be the case. When it became evident that there was to be a delay, we filled the position in the district of Beauce. I think there was a misunderstanding about an additional judge in the district of Quebec. At the time that the system in the province was changed, whereby the number of judges in the court of appeals was largely increased and the number of judges in the superior court was decreased, legislation of the province was so enacted as to call for a new additional judge. At the time I felt very strongly in regard to the matter, and I called the attention of the Attorney General of the province to the fact that, when there were being made in the constitution of the courts in our province, changes involving such a large additional burden upon the Dominion treasury, it seemed to me to be not an occasion for increasing the number of judges, but, on the contrary, an occasion on which an effort ought to be made to avoid such increases as that. I may say that I believed the strongest justification for a change in the system was that it ought to conduce to making a lesser number of judges necessary. I am not suggesting that there should be a reduction from the old number, but the change ought to conduce to avoiding the necessity of an increase in the number. At the time that legislation was under discussion between us, I clearly pointed out that I thought there should not be an increase at that time, and in the legislation which I proposed should be enacted in this House, I did not contemplate making provision for both the numerous increases that were involved in salaries and a further increase in the number of judges. It is true that, if we read our statute as we passed it last year, there is room under it for an additional judge. That was the result of an error, pure and simple and this is how it came about. Under our previous statute there were enumerated a certain number of judges for the district of Montreal and a certain number for the district of Quebec, and the section went on to say that when the Chief Justice was in the other district, one of the fixed number would be the acting Chief Justice. In drawing up the new statute provision was made in a separate section for the acting Chief Justice, and then precisely the same number of judges was repeated when it came to deal with the puisne judges, it being overlooked that we had taken one of those and provided for him under the title of acting Chief Justice; so that when I went over the number for the purpose of satisfying myself that we were not increasing the number, I found that, owing to the fact that I have just mentioned, we did not apparently in words at all events, increase the number. I think our friends in Quebec ought to realize—and I trust there is a disposition to do so—that they should not press at the present time for an increase in the number of judges. Let the new system have a trial, and let us see whether it will produce, what I think we all agree in hoping it will produce, namely, results which will make it possible to carry on with a smaller number of judges. One would think the concentration ought to produce that result. For these reasons, I did not have in contemplation

making a nomination for that additional judgeship at the present time.

Mr. LAPOINTE: The net result is that there is one judge less for the judicial district of Quebec, and legal business is suffering very much on that account. There is, at the present time, an accumulation of cases, and all the lawyers and, of course, their litigants are complaining about the matter. If there is no change such as my right hon. friend suggests, namely, that all the judges should reside in Quebec and administer justice there, and tour the district, I do not see what the remedy will be.

Mr. DOHERTY: I am assured by the Premier of the province, who has transmitted to us a Bill for that purpose, that he intends to put the Bill through this session. I do not, however, want to tie that hon. gentleman down, because something may happen. And I cannot control the matter. Moreover, I rather understood that any immediate overcrowding that there was, was in large measure due to the unfortunate fact that certain of the judges were not in good health and, therefore, not able to carry on their work at the moment. I think the hon. gentleman will realise that the remedy for a momentary condition like that is not by increasing the number of judges, because we hope these gentlemen will recover their health, or in case they should not recover, they will be replaced by gentlemen capable of carrying on the work. I have every hope there will be goodwill enough in the province, in which I have confidence, and in that particular district of it, at all events, to give us a fair opportunity to try out the system and see whether we cannot carry on without an increase in the number of judges.

Mr. PROULX: What is the limit of leave given to a judge who is in poor health and who is not able to fulfil his duties?

Mr. DOHERTY: The law makes no absolute provision as to what leave you can give. Of course when a judge is so ill as not to be able to go to court and do his work, it does not make very much difference whether you give him leave or not, because if he is in a condition where he cannot do the work, the work will not be done because you refuse to give him leave. Last year—and I am pleased to mention this, and I should like hon. gentlemen to think it over—I did give notice of a resolution looking to a petition for such modification of the British North America Act as might make it possible for the Government in instances where a judge's usefulness had entirely ceased, without its being a question of misbehaviour on his part, to have the facts established and to have the judge removed. I gave notice of that resolution, but did not proceed with it because I was given to understand there would be very strenuous opposition to it and I did not desire to propose a resolution looking to an amendment of our Constitution unless there would be substantial agreement upon it among the members of this Parliament. I take this opportunity of mentioning it again, and I would be glad if hon. gentlemen would give a little thought to the matter, and see if they cannot alter their attitude, in which event I should be glad to re-introduce the resolution.

There is a very serious difficulty that arises under the present provision of the British North America Act. A judge is appointed for life—he is appointed, rather, during good behaviour. I think that is an excellent provision so far as it goes. It, of course, makes the judge absolutely independent; he is quite beyond any governmental control, and I think that in principle that is quite right. The only method by which, even if you charge him with misbehaviour, any action can be taken looking to terminating his holding of office is by an impeachment before both Houses of Parliament, and every one will realize that that is a very cumbersome mode of procedure, even if it be applicable in all cases.

Then there is this other consideration. The judge is appointed, as I have said, during good behaviour. Now it is perhaps susceptible of suggestion, perhaps more than suggestion, that the mere fact that a judge has ceased to be physically able to do his work is not a case of bad behaviour—though I may say, speaking for myself, personally I would be disposed to believe that where a judge has become incapable of doing his work, it can hardly be described as good behaviour—for him to insist on holding his office and refrain from resigning. Now we have in different parts of the country some cases, at all events, where I think that is fairly the situation, and it was to enable us to deal with such cases that I made the suggestion last year.

Mr. PROULX: I approve the minister's suggestion. I do not think any distinction should be made between Supreme Court and County Court judges in the matter of incapacity to perform their duties. If a County Court judge is not capable of performing his duties, and does not want to ask for superannuation, the Government can force him to retire. I do not see why

that should not apply also to Superior Court judges. There are some judges who have not performed their duties for many months, and perhaps have no prospect of performing them in the future, but they do not want to ask for superannuation because they are drawing a higher salary than they would receive if retired. But the interests of the litigants suffer, and I think it is only proper that the Government should be given power to force those judges to ask for superannuation.

Mr. FORTIER: With regard to the reorganization in the province of Quebec, I have already drawn the attention of the Minister of Justice to how it is working in a part of the province, especially the district of Hull. I think the reorganization has not proved a great success, especially in that part of the province. In principle, centralization was good for the larger centres. It gave them the advantage of having a greater number of judges, but in the rural districts, especially those that are remote, such as the district of Hull, the result has been to deprive them of the judges who were administering justice. I drew the minister's attention to that state of affairs lest sesion. Since the new law has been in operation, I have no complaint to make of the Chief Justice in Montreal, but our district has not had the advantage of having the requisite number of judges to administer justice. Under the reorganization, Quebec and Montreal have been considered the two main centres of the province, but there are also two other centres of some importance, Three Rivers and Sherbrooke. I think the city of Hull should have been included with these two, on account of its importance. In the matter of population it is larger than either Three Rivers or Sherbrooke, and for these reasons and in view also of its remoteness from Montreal, I think it should have been included with these other two cities. Whether it is on account of the small number of judges, or because we are a considerable distance from Montreal, the fact remains that we did not have a judge to attend to our term. We used to have one residing judge, and a second judge administering justice in Hull, and we used to have twenty or twenty-one days of term every month. It was necessary for the expeditious despatch of business that two judges should administer justice there, but since the new law has been in operation, we have not had five days of term every month for the administration of justice. We have, however, sometimes had the advantage of a judge from Montreal, and we appreciate that very much. I think it is my duty to call the minister's attention to this state of affairs, and I hope he will confer, if necessary, with the Chief Justice in Montreal, or with the Attorney General of the province, in order that the necessary number of judges for the administration of justice may be appointed, and also in order that this reorganization may be amended in order to have the city of Hull placed on the same footing as Three Rivers and Sherbrooke, so that we will have the privilege of residing judges in the future, as we had in the past.

Mr. DOHERTY: The hon. gentleman doubtless appreciates that I am quite powerless with regard to determining how the districts shall be divided, or where the judges shall reside. That is a matter absolutely for the provincial authority to determine. As for conferring with the Chief Justice, or with the Attorney General or Prime Minister of the province, I certainly will always be most happy to do so whenever they may think that my advice or a conference would be of service, but the hon. gentleman can understand that I have no quality to go forward and force any opinions of mine upon either of these gentlemen, whose duties are perfectly clearly defined. However, if I should be consulted on the matter, I shall be glad to bring to their attention what the hon. gentleman has represented with regard to conditions in his own particular district.

Item agreed to.

Exchequer Court, Canada, $8,333.34.

Mr. McKENZIE: In this court, I understand, we have two judges, and if I remember rightly, provision was made a couple of years ago to appoint a third. Does the Government intend to make that appointment shortly?

Mr. DOHERTY: The matter is not in contemplation at present, although I should not like to speak positively. My impression is that the provision for the third judge was repealed. I may be wrong, but I had that idea. At present there is a president of the court and one judge. We have had no representations recently of there being any pressing need for a third judge, and the matter was therefore not in immediate contemplation.

Mr. McKENZIE: I remember distinctly that provision was made for a third, and it never occurred to me that it had been repealed.

Mr. DOHERTY: I will send for the Judges' Act of last session. I am rather of the opinion that that Act made no provision for more than one judge in addition to the president of the court.

Mr. VIEN: Whilst the Chief Justice of the Exchequer Court is acting on the Grand Trunk arbitration, is there a judge ad hoc?

Mr. DOHERTY: No judge ad hoc has been appointed. We have not had any representation upon the subject, but in the statute there is a provision for such appointment if necessary upon representation.

Mr. VIEN: Is it the intention of the Government also to appoint a judge in Vice Admiralty in the district of Quebec in the near future? I may point out that last year there were several cases pending before the Exchequer Court in Admiralty district, in the district of Quebec, and we were long delayed in the hearing of them because we had to wait until a judge in Vice Admiralty of the district of Montreal, who is at the same time a judge of the Superior Court of that district, could come down to the city of Quebec, a thing which I think could easily be avoided if, as heretofore, a special judge were appointed. Since the death of Sir Basil Routhier, no judge has been appointed in the Vice Admiralty district of Quebec. Does the minister intend to appoint one in the near future?

Mr. DOHERTY: I cannot at the present time announce a decided view upon that subject. We have in the past appointed a judge of the Superior Court or, in some cases, a judge of the Court of King's Bench, to act as Vice Admiralty judge. There was one such judge in Montreal and one in Quebec. It has been suggested from respectable quarters, and there seems to be a good deal to say for the proposal, that there is no special reason why we should pick out a particular judge to discharge these duties. It has been said that the business might be more expeditiously disposed of if we left it as a matter in which all the judges of the court should have jurisdiction, without appointing a special Vice Admiralty judge. Of course, there has to be a Vice Admiralty court. As I say, I am not prepared to announce any final decision on the subject, but it has been under consideration, and we should come to a conclusion shortly. There would then arise the question, even if we decided to maintain the appointment of a distinct judge, whether there is really business to call for two judges in Vice Admiralty, in the province of Quebec. However, the matter will have careful attention.

Mr. VIEN: I would suggest that a judge in Vice Admiralty be appointed instead of giving jurisdiction to a number of judges. Cases in Vice Admiralty, though numerous in the course of a year, are not so numerous as ordinary cases, and jurisprudence in Vice Admiralty cases is also quite different from ordinary civil jurisprudence. Now, if a judge were specially appointed, he would be better qualified to administer justice in Vice Admiralty cases than would be an ordinary judge of the civil court, no matter how devoted the latter might be to the performance of his duties. In this respect I think we were very fortunate in the past, as much in Montreal as in Quebec, in having judges well posted on precedence as well as on general jurisprudence in Admiralty cases; and I venture the suggestion that for the proper administration of justice it would be preferable to appoint a judge to have special jurisdiction in these cases. Such a man would be more familiar with the jurisprudence and law on these subjects than a judge who did not specialize in this direction.

Mr. DOHERTY: There is certainly force in the suggestion.

Mr. PROULX: The Chief Justice of the Exchequer Court hes been acting as a member of the Grand Trunk arbitration board for some months. Is he paid a salary or does he get fees for acting as arbitrator?

Mr. DOHERTY: There is a provision in the statute for remuneration to be paid by both parties to this particular arbitration. I do not think that the amount of the remuneration has been fixed.

Mr. STEIN: I would suggest to the minister to allow the judges in the different judical districts in the province of Quebec to act as judges under the Bankruptcy Act. In the judical district of Kamouraska, we have had a few assignments already under that new law, and we have encountered great difficulty and inconvenience by reason of the fact that we have no local judge. We have to apply to the judge in Montreal, and I think that the judge appointed under the Bankruptcy Act in Montreal will find enough to occupy him in the district of Montreal alone. All local judges should be appointed as judges under the Bankruptcy Act.

Mr. JACOBS: I oppose that contention of my hon. friend.

Mr. STEIN: You want them all in Montreal.

Mr. DOHERTY: It is well I did not speak before I discovered where you stand.

Mr. JACOBS: As I understand the Act, the object of appointing one judge for each province was to obtain uniformity in the new law respecting bankruptcy. Under the Bankruptcy Act, the judge can delegate certain powers he has to the local judge from time to time. Bue when it comes to dealing with large and important questions under the Bankruptcy law, it is well to have one judge in order that there might be no difference of opinion between the local judge and himself. Judges differ in the same way as lawyers, and if we had twenty-five or thirty superior judges, dealing with bankruptcy, the effect of the law would be rendered nugatory before we get very far. I think my hon. friend knows that under the Act the registrar has certain considerable powers; and when necessary, the Bankruptcy judge visits these districts from time to time to apply the law. I am opposed to the view of my hon. friend.

Mr. CANNON: I think the contention of my hon. friend from Kamouraska (Mr. Stein) is a very good one. If the argument advanced by the hon. member for George Etienne Cartier (Mr. Jacobs) were to prevail, the minister should appoint one judge for the whole of our province. Then we would have uniformity.

Mr. STEIN: Civil and criminal cases are just as important as commercial litigation. Criminal cases require celerty of treatment; that is why we require a local judge in each district. In one case that is pending I submitted some objections that I had to our registrar who argued that he was not authorized to allow them. We wrote to the judge and he would not then had to our registrar, who argued that he express any definite opinion. We had no time to wait until that judge came to the district, and our local judge had no authority to act.

Mr. DOHERTY: I am not sure that this is a matter that rests with the Minister of Justice to deal with. If my recollection of the Bankruptcy Act is correct, the Minister of Justice is empowered to appoint a judge on bankruptcy for each bankruptcy district so to speak. Now I believe each province is a bankruptcy district. I am of opinion, however, that power is vested in the Secretary of State to divide a province into districts and create a larger number. That would be a preliminary condition before the Minister of Justice could take action in the matter. My own understanding of the Bankruptcy Act, and I speak with deference in the presence of the hon. member for George Etienne Cartier (Mr. Jacobs) is, that through the powers which the judge in bankruptcy can confer upon his colleagues there is ample provision to meet the immediate wants of a particular district. In that, however, I may be mistaken. Of course, there is this further fact to be pointed out: If the provincial legislation to which I referred a little while ago should be carried out you would not in that event have in each district a resident judge even if you made him a bankruptcy judge. It had occurred to me, however, that if that legislation were carried out it might be a proper thing in the province of Quebec to create four bankruptcy districts, and in the province and there would then be four districts where there would be a resident judge. However that is not my function to determine, it is the duty of the Secretary of State. I shall be glad to confer with him on the subject, see what his view is, and try to establish a balance between the conflicting views of my hon. friend from George Etienne Cartier (Mr. Jacobs) and my hon. friends from Kamouraska (Mr. Stein) and Dorchester (Mr. Cannon).

Mr. VIEN: Should not these districts harmonize with the judicial districts which now exist? It seems to me that there should be no distinction, and in that event the judges in each district could act under full authority with respect to the Bankruptcy Act as they do under any other Act. Further, in answer to the objection which the minister finds in the fact that the judges now residing in four main places of the province I would say this: These judges attend to the administration of justice in their districts at least once a month, so that there would be very litle delay if they were empowered to deal with these other matters—when they came to administer justice generally they could dispose of the other litigation as well. I think the ends of justice would be better met if they were empowered to act in these other cases, and if the districts created under the Bankruptcy Act were made to harmonize with the judicial districts generally. There is another question I would like to bring to the minister's attention. Under this item we are voting the salary of

5 p.m.

the Marshal in Admiralty in the district of Quebec. Under what title does it fall?

Mr. DOHERTY: I am informed the registrar is paid by fees. I know that was the practice when I had occasion to deal with the court in Montreal and I should suppose that the same practice prevails now.

Mr. VIEN: We have in Quebec a Vice-Admiralty district. The district is organized, but unfortunately the registrar is obliged to provide all the stationery,—books, pens, ink and other material—and he receives a meagre pittance as far as fees are concerned. We are very fortunate in having a Mr. Bradley, the present registrar, a most competent man, and I think this faithful servant of the state should receive a little better consideration from the Government. I would urge the Government to grant this gentleman a salary, and also to provide him with all the necessary stationery and other supplies which are absolutely essential for the decent upkeep of the office in Quebec. This gentleman is very competent, well posted in the law, very faithful in the discharge of his duties, and should receive better treatment. I would urge the minister to give him a fixed salary, as the fees are so uncertain and vary so much from year to year that it will be impossible when this gentleman, who is over seventy years of age, passes away—at least it will be very difficult—to find a successor.

Mr. DOHERTY: I will be glad to look into the circumstances. Of course the hon. gentleman will see at a glance that if the business is so small that the fees do not provide a living for the registrar, it makes it a serious question whether we should maintain two separate admiralty courts in the province instead of having only one where the business would be sufficient with the fixed fees, to adequately remunerate the registrar. However, I shall look into the matter. It is not the first time I have heard of Mr. Bradley's good qualities and I shall give the subject sympathetic consideration.

Mr. VIEN: As to the volume of business done I may point out to the minister that although in some years the amount is small, in other years it is really very considerable so that the court cannot be abolished. It would be a great inconvenience for those who are subject to Admiralty law in the district of Quebec if the court there were abolished. I would rather recommend to the Minister that he should change the present system; that he should make the fees payable to the Government and pay a fixed salary to the registrar so as to ensure to the department the services of a good man.

Mr. POWER: I was not in the Chamber when my hon. friend from Lotbiniere (Mr. Vien) first spoke, but from what I have gathered he has been protesting to the Minister of Justice because no judge in Admiralty has been named in Quebec since the death of the late Judge Routhier. Now it is very inconvenient for pleaders in Quebec, and for the shipping concerns in that city and district, to be obliged to go to Montreal and pay the extra fee which they have to incur by reason of the transfer of cases to that city. I understand that the bar of Quebec have protested against this and have asked the Minister of Justice to name some judge to replace the late Judge Routhier. I understand that it is possible for the Minister of Justice to nominate a practicing barrister to this position; and there is no real reason why he should not do it. I might say that the leader of the bar in admiralty practice in that province has had considerable experience, and, besides his professional qualifications, is eminently qualified from the standpoint of the minister—he has been a stern unbending Tory for many years, and as one of the pillars of the party in Quebec he has supported his party in its darkest days. Therefore it seems to me that there should be a certain amount of gratitude, even in Tory breasts, and that the minister ought to reward men of that type who have served their party so well and faithfully in the past. I hold no brief for Mr. Pentland. His qualifications are well known to the bar and to the shipping interests of the city of Quebec, and they all agree that he should be suitably recognized. I would recommend to the minister that he take this into consideration, and also the fact that such an appointment is necessary and would meet with the desires of the business community and of the bar.

Mr. DOHERTY: I have already said all I could say upon this subject of the admiralty court. I promised the hon. member for Lotbiniere (Mr. Vien) that in any event we would have a prompt decision. Perhaps I need hardly add that I have taken a note of the very high encomiums passed by the hon. member for Quebec South (Mr. Power) on our friend Mr. Pentland. I shall treasure up those observations and endeavour to give to each one

its due and proper weight. I had not quite realized that the member could make an appeal to which my heart would be so absolutely responsive as the one he has just made.

Item agreed to.

Yukon Territory, $42,300.

Mr. PROULX: The expenses of the administration of justice in the Yukon Territory seem to be very high in proportion to the population.

Mr. DOHERTY: We have managed to decrease them $2,000 this year. I think it must be admitted that the administration of justice in the Yukon costs fairly heavily in proportion to the population of the territory, but it must be remembered that we cannot cut down the expenses as the population dwindles. For instance, we have a judge with a fixed salary; and the other expenses are similar. Certainly we are anxious to keep the expenditure within the limits of what will "carry on" the territory, but we must "carry on."

Mr. VIEN: I think, we should not let the minister run away with the credit for the decrease in the expenditure.

Mr. DOHERTY: I do not want any credit.

Mr. VIEN: It would be illuminating to the committee to consider that it is more the good character of the population of the Yukon Territory which is responsible for the decreased expenditure by $2.000, for that decrease has taken place in the item for the maintenance and transport of prisoners, and I would imagine that the number of prisoners has dwindled.

Mr. DOHERTY: And that decrease in the number of prisoners is attributable to the excellent system of government under which crime has disappeared. Surely there can be no higher tribute to the Government.

Mr. VIEN: If the right hon. gentleman takes it in that light, that the increase or the decrease in the number of prisoners is closely related to the good or bad character of the Government, it may be dangerous for him, for we might point out that according to the judical statistics the number of prisoners who are now in our jails has greatly increased as compared with the number there in 1911.

Mr. DOHERTY: I will give an explanation of that when the time arrives.

Mr. VIEN: I know the minister has always a good explanation to offer—at least apparently. However, I quite appreciate the explanation given by the right hon. gentleman in this instance, that the cost of administration of justice is not only dependent on the population, but also is dependent to a considerable extent on the area of the territory to be administered.

Mr. PROULX: I notice a big item for the transportation of prisoners. Is there no jail in the Territory?

Mr. DOHERTY: I understand that prisoners are detained in the Mounted Police establishments, which in the Yukon Territory, as in fact in any unorganized territory, generally serve the purposes of jails.

Mr. JACOBS: I notice that this item includes the maintenance and transport of prisoners. Have we gone back to transportation days? Have we any local Botany Bay? What is meant by "transport of prisoners?"

Mr. DOHERTY: Just what is meant by the transportation the hon. gentleman pays for—but I suppose he does not pay for it—when he comes from Montreal to Ottawa.

Mr. JACOBS: Is the second item, living allowance of Judge, $5,000, in addition to his regular salary?

Mr. DOHERTY: The judge has a salary of $5,000, and in addition has a living allowance of $5,000. That allowance has been attached to the position ever since it existed. I may say that until a few years ago we had three judges in the Yukon, each at a salary of $5,000 and a living allowance of the same amount, but we arranged, quite a number of years ago, with the reduction of business, to reduce them to one. It will be noticed that the salary of this judge is considerably less than the salary of High Court judges in other provinces; against that he has his allowance of $5,000.

Mr. VIEN: Do the officers of the court and the police magistrate receive a living allowance?

Mr. DOHERTY: The police magistrate receives $1,400 as a living allowance; the other officers receive $1,800.

Mr. CANNON: Is the travelling allowance for the judge paid to him whether he travels or not?

Mr. DOHERTY: No; he sends in his bill, just as any other judge does, for his travelling expenses.

Mr. CANNON: How much did he get last year for travelling expenses?

Mr. DOHERTY: I am informed that he got nothing. Dawson and White Horse are the only two places where judicial business is required to be carried on. In fact, the judicial business of the Yukon is not very extensive. We keep a judge there not because there is work, but because, of course, we owe it to that population, small as it may be, to provide means for the administration of justice.

Mr. PROULX: The minister has said that the salary of the judge is $5,000. On page 13 of the Estimates the salary of the judge, territorial court, Yukon territory, is given as $7,000, an increase of $2,000 over the preceeding year.

Mr. DOHERTY: Of course, that is merely for information; the salaries are settled by the statute. I may say that the judge waited on me last week to represent the grave injustice he had been subjected to because his salary had not been increased. At the moment, however, I cannot find any provision in last session's statute increasing the salary of the judge of the Yukon. I think it must be an error in this statement—which, of course, is not, properly speaking, in the Estimates; it is information as to what is to be paid under statute. However, I will make certain and let my hon. friend know.

Mr. SINCLAIR (Antigonish and Guysborough): I understood the minister to say that the judges are paid travelling allowance according to the actual mileage travelled. Am I correct in that?

Mr. DOHERTY: It is not a matter of mileage. The judge is entitled to his transportation expenses, to $6 as a living allowance for every day he serves elsewhere than at the place he is by law to live, if that place is not a city, and $10 a day if it is a city. They do not send mileage bills; they set forth what were the transportation expenses incurred, how many days they were away, and where they were.

Mr. SINCLAIR (Guysborough): I find in the Auditor General's report that the net sum of $500 was in a great many cases paid for travelling allowance last year. I was wondering how it would work out at $500 in all these cases if the amount of the account depended upon the number of days that the judge served while travelling about.

Mr. DOHERTY: I think the hon. gentleman will find that these are district court judges of Ontario who, I believe, receive a fixed allowance of $500.

[Mr. Cannon.]

Mr. CANNON: Do they get it whether they travel or not?

Mr. DOHERTY: Yes, it is provided by statute.

Mr. CANNON: How can the Auditor General get over that? How can $500 be paid to a judge for travelling when he does not travel?

Mr. DOHERTY: Parliament thought that in view of the conditions in these districts the judges ought to receive that allowance, and we pay what Parliament has said they ought to be paid.

Mr. SINCLAIR (Guysborough): Have these judges passes on the Government railways?

Mr. DOHERTY: I have no information, but I should think not.

Mr. VIEN: It is quite true that the expenditure authorized by statute covers the salary of the judge in the Yukon Territory, but it seems to me that before we vote the item in respect to the living allowance of the judge, we should be quite positive as to the exact amount of his salary under the statute. I do not object to this gentleman getting $7,000; I think he should get it; but if he gets $7,000 a year as his salary, I would be inclined to think at first sight that his living allowance could be reduced. With $7,000 a year of salary, $5,000 for living allowance, and $500 for travelling expenses, that gentleman would get $12,500, that is to say, $2,500 more than the Chief Justice of Quebec or the Chief Justice of Ontario, and $3,500 more than judges of the superior court or the high courts of justice, or the Court of King's Bench in Quebec. I would not be absolutely definite on the point; but if it is the intention of the minister, as the item would indicate, to increase the salary of this gentleman to $7,000, I would like to study this item of living allowance a little further.

Mr. DOHERTY: The printing of what was intended to be a copy taken from the statute is no indication whatever of any intention in my mind. I would not propose to alter a judge's salary by vote of Parliament. We are not going to vote that $7,000; we are not going to say anything about it. I quite agree with the hon. gentleman that, if this gentleman had $7,000 a year of salary, he ought not to have $5,000 of living allowance. I am practically positive that that $7,000 is an error, and I am quite prepared to assure the hon. gentleman that, if this item goes through

I shall verify the fact and if there be any doubt about it, I shall see that a correction is made. I may say that my practical certainty about the matter results from the fact that, within the last week, I have been waited on by the judge urging me to make his salary $7,000 and his living allowance $3,000, and I think the judge would know if his salary was already $7,000.

Mr. VIEN: What is the interest of the hon. gentleman then to urge the minister to introduce a change?

Mr. DOHERTY: If his salary was $7,000 and his living allowance $3,000, the gentleman is of an age to begin to look forward to a cessation of his usefulness, and his pension would be based upon his salary, not including his living allowance.

Mr. VIEN: And it would be fair?

Mr. DOHERTY: I think so.

Mr. VIEN: What is the living allowance of the police magistrate under the item $6,800?

Mr. DOHERTY: It is $1,400.

Mr. VIEN: In addition to his statutory salary of $4,000?

Mr. DOHERTY: Yes.

Item agreed to.

Miscellaneous—expenses of litigated matters conducted within the Department of Justice, $13,000.

Mr. PROULX: What is this amount for when we have so many lawyers in the Department of Justice?

Mr. DOHERTY: This is not to pay lawyer's fees at all. This is to carry on litigation which is not litigation which pertains to particular departments and which, of course, we carry on, but the payment of the expenses of which is provided by the other departments. This is for whatever litigation we have to carry on on behalf of the Government which is not chargeable to any other department. It may be that, in cases where we have to retain lawyers on the outside, their fees are paid out of this appropriation. Last year we spent $7,655 for this purpose; the year before, $1,259, and in 1917-18, $5,146. The amount varies from year to year. For a long number of years past we have inserted the same amount in the Estimates.

Mr. VIEN: What is the meaning of the expression "within the Department of Justice"?

Mr. DOHERTY: I understand it would cover items such as this: When applications are made to the Privy Council, we have to provide money to pay counsel who appear to make answer; or when we have occasion to send counsel over, when the matter is conducted by the deputy minister himself, as in many instances it is, where we have no outside counsel, we have to provide for expenses of that kind for carrying on litigation which the department—I was mistaken in referring to outside lawyers—carries on without the assistance of outside lawyers. There is always, in carrying on litigation, expense other than the payment of fees to lawyers.

Mr. VIEN: Do I understand the minister to say that none of that amount goes towards paying fees to lawyers?

Mr. DOHERTY: I am not in a position to say absolutely whether it would include any payment to an outside lawyer, but the general nature of the expenditure is what I have indicated, that is, the expense that arises in connection with litigation which is being carried on in the department itself.

Mr. VIEN: Would the minister point out to us in the Auditor General's Report the expenditure of $7,655 which was incurred last year?

Mr. DOHERTY: That would be rather difficult.

Mr. VIEN: Or give us details of the item?

Mr. DOHERTY: I would be very glad to get the details, item by item, for the hon. gentleman if he is interested in them.

Mr. McMASTER: Might it be proper on this item to suggest to the minister the advisability of limiting as much as possible appeals to the Privy Council? Of course, sometimes the Department of Justice will be the respondent and will have to follow the litigant wherever he goes, but in other cases the department may be the appellant. Might I point out to the minister what I am sure is quite unnecessary, that appeals to the Privy Council constitute a depressing element upon our Supreme Court. Our Supreme Court can never rise to the position which the Supreme Court of a nation should occupy so long as it is not the court of final result for the nationals of that nation.

Mr. JACOBS: I am in thorough accord with what my hon. friend from Brome (Mr. McMaster) has said on this matter. The Supreme Court is a child of our own creation and it does seem to me that the Government ought to see that the child it

has created should be treated with proper dignity and respect. We, at least, ought to be satisfied with the decision of the highest court we have created. I concur with every word my hon. friend has said with respect to that.

Mr. VIEN: Does the item on page L-118 in the Auditor General's Report, litigated matters, $7,635, apply to this vote?

Mr. DOHERTY: This must be the vote, because that is the exact amount of which I have a note here as having been spent last year.

Mr. VIEN: I also see this: Exchequer Court of Canada, law stamps, $800. Do I understand this to mean that the Department of Justice when they have litigation pay the law stamps to the Exchequer Court?

Mr. DOHERTY: Yes, we pay just like any other litigant.

Mr. VIEN: I understand that the law stamp is a tax. Now, kings and sons of kings pay no tax.

Mr. DOHERTY: Does not the hon. gentleman know that the different departments pay customs taxes on what they import? We pay our law tax just as anybody else pays it. It comes around in the end, I fancy, to the same pocket, but just the same we pay it.

Mr. VIEN: Then it amounts to the King paying taxes. That is an unsound principle.

Mr. DOHERTY: I shall communicate with His Majesty and ask him whether he feels badly about it.

Mr. McMASTER: I should imagine it is a mere question of book-keeping between departments. At the same time it is an expense to the Government, as my hon. friend (Mr. Jacobs) has pointed out, to pay customs brokers for passing entries for the different departments. That appears to me to be extravagance, and a work of supererogation.

Mr. DOHERTY: Perhaps my hon. friend will get after the Minister of Trade and Commerce on that subject.

Mr. McMASTER: We will.

Item agreed to.

Annual contribution to the Canadian Law Library, London, England, $500.

Mr. LAPOINTE: Where is that library?

Mr. DOHERTY: It is in connection with the office of the Judicial Committee of the Privy Council. There is maintained there a law library for the use of Canadian counsel, and we have for a long time paid this annual contribution towards its upkeep.

Mr. McMASTER: That would be saved if appeals to the Privy Council were done away with.

Item agreed to.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: Are there any further items under the heading "Miscellaneous"?

Mr. DOHERTY: No, I do not find any. Call Item 35.

Mr. VIEN: May I ask the right hon. gentleman if he does not think that a nation which has attained full nationhood, as Canada has, should dispense with appeals to the insular tribunal of England?

Mr. DOHERTY: The hon. gentleman will have to give me a little while to take in the full effect of the description of the tribunal as "insular." That may make a very great difference. I would just call the attention of the hon. gentleman to this fact, that the jurisdiction of his Majesty's Judicial Committee continues to exist because this Parliament thinks it ought to exist. When the Parliament of Canada makes up its mind that there will be no more appeals from the Supreme Court to the Judicial Committee, there will not be any more appeals, and when the legislatures of the provinces make up their minds that they do not want appeals from their ultimate court of appeal to the Judicial Committee, there will, as I understand it, be no more appeals. I have never been able to understand why people had to use adjectives like "insular" and others more or less flattering, to express what seems to be in their minds—a sort of resentment of the existence of a jurisdiction which exists because the people of Canada are willing it should exist.

Mr. VIEN: The minister has not answered my question.

The CHAIRMAN: I must point out to the hon. gentleman that there is no item before the committee, and that a debate upon the abolition of appeals to the Privy Council would certainly not be in order upon the Estimates which we have just disposed of.

Mr. VIEN: May I point out to the Chairman that we were discussing item number 296, and if the committee has passed it I must have missed the Chairman's intimation to that effect. The Chairman was

very quick indeed in passing that item, because so far as I am concerned I never heard the judgment of the committee to the effect that it had been voted. If it has not been voted, as I believe, I submit that I am quite within the rules, when discussing a grant to a library near the Privy Council, to speak of that institution itself. I await the ruling of the Chair.

The CHAIRMAN: The item was certainly passed and declared "carried" by the Chair.

Mr. VIEN: Nobody heard it.

The CHAIRMAN: The Minister of Justice was further asked what would be the next item called, and after looking through the list he asked me to call item 35. I think the other members of the committee are all aware of that fact.

Mr. VIEN: I would like to call the attention of the Chairman to the fact that before passing an item, the question should be put to the committee. I do not believe the question was put on this item.

The CHAIRMAN: I have already stated to the hon. member that the question was put to the committee and the item was declared carried.

Mr. VIEN: I might point out to the Chairman that on the next item I shall watch for that feature.

Penitentiaries, $1,371,600.

Mr. McMASTER: I see that large increases are provided for the penitentiaries, especially in connection with the province of Saskatchewan.

Mr. LAPOINTE: It is a reflection on the province.

Mr. McMASTER: It would appear to me that some explanation why the expenditure has increased so greatly in the province of Saskatchewan is due to the committee, in view of the character and demeanour in this House of the representatives from that province, which somehow gives one the idea of respectability, honesty, and other virtues.

Mr. DOHERTY: There are two explanations, neither of which reflects upon the virtue of the province of Saskatchewan. We have made Saskatchewan the scapegoat, having laid upon her the sins of the province of Alberta in the matter of penitentiaries, so that she is now carrying a double burden of fault. That was done for motives of economy, as I think everyone will realize. We can carry on, with overhead expenses of one penitentiary, much more economically than if we had two institutions to the same number of persons. In addition to that there have been very considerable necessary improvements to the penitentiary buildings themselves at Saskatchewan. If hon. gentlemen will turn to the details which are given immediately underneath they will see wherein there are increases. There are increases in salaries and retiring allowances, attributable, in the first place, to the reclassification, and in the second place, to the fact that we have a larger number of officers because the number of convicts, if not double what it was, has very largely increased. In the item "Lands, buildings, and equipment" there is an increase of some $60,000, all of it rendered necessary, as I am instructed, and as I have reason to know, from work that has been going on for some time, by the necessity of enlarging the accommodation afforded by these buildings.

Mr. EULER: Has there been any great increase within the past year in the number of convicts as compared with previous years? If so, what is the reason?

Mr. DOHERTY: In the western provinces there is no increase in the sum total of criminals. In the eastern provinces though, I am sorry to say, we have an increase of between 70 and 80 per cent in our penitentiary population. At Kingston I believe the increase is 70 per cent.

Mr. EULER: Between 70 and 80 per cent?

Mr. DOHERTY: I was in error in that respect. Taking the entire eastern part of the country the increase would be about 48 per cent.

Mr. EULER: What is the nature of the crimes for which the prisoners have been sentenced?

Mr. DOHERTY: I understand they are very largely crimes of violence, in which there has been an increase.

Mr. McMASTER: Can the minister state the increase in crimes for the province from which we both come?

Mr. COPP: Is it a crime to come from that province?

Mr. DOHERTY: The superintendent tells me that a year ago the penitentiary population of St. Vincent de Paul was 465; it is now 554.

Mr. JACOBS: Probably there has been an increase in population.

Mr. DOHERTY: There is an increase of 89 prisoners in the total number.

Mr. FIELDING: What about Dorchester?

Mr. DOHERTY: The increase there is from 229 to 336.

Mr. EULER: Can the minister give us the number of prisoners confined in the respective penitentiaries?

Mr. McMASTER: Where is Dorchester?

Mr. DOHERTY: In New Brunswick; it serves the three Maritime Provinces. The convicts in the various penitentiaries are as follows: St. Vincent de Paul, 554; Kingston, 722; Manitoba, 195—which is chargeable partly to Alberta—Saskatchewan, 194; British Columbia, 142; and Dorchester 336. These figures are as at the last day of last month.

Mr. JACOBS: What is the cost per head of these convicts?

Mr. DOHERTY: Including all expenditures, such as buildings and every other sort of outlay, it is figured that the convicts cost $1.61 per head per day.

Mr. PROULX: What has become of the property of the Alberta penitentiary?

Mr. DOHERTY: The surface rights of the property are still owned by the Government. There are valuable mining rights in the property, such as coal deposits, which mining rights have been disposed of. We called for tenders for the sale of the property, but the prices were not satisfactory, and we are confident that the part of wisdom is to wait until a better opportunity offers rather than to try to sell now.

Mr. PROULX: What has been done with the buildings themselves?

Mr. DOHERTY: The buildings in part have been removed, the materials having been found valuable for use in other penitentiaries. I am told that we utilized in that way for other purposes $185,000 worth of material, all turned to good account.

Mr. PROULX: Were the buildings demolished?

Mr. DOHERTY: They have not all been destroyed. One of the cell blocks was demolished and the material carefully taken out preserved for use elsewhere, thus being of greater advantage to us than it would be if we tried to sell it. The demand in the market for penitentiary buildings is not particularly great.

Mr. JACOBS: I understand that the St. Vincent de Paul penitentiary convicts are working overtime at election ballot boxes. Is that true?

Mr. DOHERTY: I have not heard that they were working overtime.

Mr. JACOBS: Well, devoting all their time to this work.

Mr. DOHERTY: Penitentiary labour has been utilized, I believe, in the making of ballot boxes, at the instance of the Chief Electoral Officer.

Mr. VIEN: Will those boxes be used shortly?

Mr. DOHERTY: We expect they will be used in the temperance referendum.

Mr. COPP: What is allowed each prisoner in the way of discharge expenses?

Mr. DOHERTY: I understand that each man on discharge gets $10, with transportation expenses to the place from which he came. Besides this, he gets a suit of clothes, including an overcoat.

Mr. COPP: Are those clothes made in the institution?

Mr. DOHERTY: Yes.

Mr. PROULX: Are the clothes made in the penitentiaries sold outside?

Mr. DOHERTY: No, we do not sell anything outside.

Mr. JACOBS: Who is the present warden of the Dorchester penitentiary?

Mr. DOHERTY: Mr. William Meighen.

Mr. JACOBS: Was he recommended by the Civil Service Commission?

Mr. DOHERTY: Yes. He was appointed through the Civil Service Commission and by promotion.

Mr. EULER: What articles are manufactured in the Kingston penitentiary?

Mr. DOHERTY: I understand the men are instructed in practically all the trades—mason work, stone cutting, carpentering, tailoring, boot and shoe making, blacksmithing, machine work. They also bake bread, do quarrying work, and carry on farming on a very extensive scale. We do our utmost to furnish them with employment of as diversified a kind as is possible.

Mr. COPP: When did the vacancy occur in Dorchester penitentiary to which Mr. Meighen was appointed?

Mr. DOHERTY: I think at the beginning of March about a year ago.

Mr. COPP: When was the appointment made?

Mr. DOHERTY: It took some little time I think as the mills of the gods grind slowly.

Mr. COPP: It would be better for the minister to say "the mills of the lords."

Mr. DOHERTY: At all events regardless of whose mills they are they do not grind as fast as they might. I believe it was in June that the finished product was turned out.

Mr. COPP: Who occupied the post prior to that appointment, and what was the cause of the vacancy?

Mr. DOHERTY: Mr. Pipes occupied the position and he was retired on account of failing health.

Mr. COPP: Was anything paid to him in the way of an honorarium, and if so, how much?

Mr. DOHERTY: He was paid the gratuity to which he was entitled under the provisions of the statute.

Mr. COPP: How much was that?

Mr. DOHERTY: I believe $6,000 was the amount. He had been for a lengthy period of years in the service.

Mr. SINCLAIR (Queen's, P.E.I.): Was there no superannuation allowance?

Mr. DOHERTY: No.

Mr. VIEN: Was he retired at his own request?

Mr. DOHERTY: He resigned.

Mr. COPP: Upon request?

Mr. DOHERTY: Well, his state of health was such that he would naturally want to retire.

Mr. COPP: Was he not requested to retire by the Government?

Mr. DOHERTY: I think when it became quite evident that his health was not such as to enable him to properly per-
6 p.m. form his duties, the officers of the department in the discharge of their duty would call his attention to the fact. I think that was done.

Mr. COPP: I should have thought he would have realized that himself.

Mr. DOHERTY: If the hon. gentleman had as much to do with public employees as some other people have he would not be so willing to assume that a man is always ready to recognize when the days of his usefulness have gone by.

Mr. LAPOINTE: Hear, hear.

Mr. DOHERTY: I am not referring to some people who have a sure and certain knowledge of the general public demand. I am talking about gentlemen who are occupying salaried positions, and we find there is not a terrible readiness on their part to come forward and say "I am not as well as I used to be."

Mr. COPP: I quite agree with my hon. friend. I have not had the long experience that he has had, but if his experience were mine I would be willing to retire when people wanted me to.

Mr. DOHERTY: I have no doubt the hon. gentleman would, but I think he would be surprised to learn just how soon the people would want him to retire.

Mr. COPP: That is the way with my right hon. friend.

Mr: FIELDING: How would the minister define the difference between the dismissal of an officer and a demand for his resignation? What is the difference?

Mr. DOHERTY: Well I should not say there would be any very material difference between the dismissal of an officer and a demand for his resignation; but an intimation, or rather a suggestion, to an officer that in view of his condition of health it would be proper for him to retire, seems to me to differ from a demand for his resignation.

Mr. FIELDING: It is a case where a wink is as good as a nod.

Mr. DOHERTY: I must say that I think that the officer in charge would be sadly failing in his duty if he did not call the attention of an official who was breaking down in health to the fact that it would be better for him to resign. I think it would be only the part of kindness not to leave such official there until the person in authority felt compelled to dismiss him, leaving him without any opportunity to obtain what the law intended him to attain when, owing to broken down health, his usefulness has ceased.

Mr. VIEN: There is a regulation shortening the time of prisoners in the peni-

tentiary. What is the nature of that regulation and how does it work?

Mr. DOHERTY: Roughly speaking a man with a fairly long sentence may gain about one-third of his time. If my memory serves me, during the first six months a man earns six days in the month of remission of his sentence until he has completed seventy-two days. After that he may earn ten days in the month. I think the system works satisfactorily and it is an incentive to good conduct. A man who misbehaves is liable to have so much of his remission struck off, and I think perhaps a strong motive working on the mind of the prisoner is the desire to shorten the period of his imprisonment.

The CHAIRMAN: Shall the item carry?

Mr. COPP: No, the item had better stand until after six o'clock, we have some other matters to bring forward in regard to it.

At six o'clock the committee rose and the House took recess.

After Recess

The House resumed at eight o'clock.

PRIVATE BILLS

NORTH AMERICAN TRUST COMPANY OF CANADA

On motion of Mr. Fripp:

that the House go into Committee on Bill No. 15, to incorporate the North American Trust Company of Canada, and recommending that the title be changed to "An Act to incorporate the Scottish Canadian Trust Company of Canada."—Mr. Mowat.

Hon HUGH GUTHRIE (Solicitor General): Mr. Speaker, in regard to the first Bill on the Order Paper, number 15, to incorporate the North American Trust Company of Canada, I would ask either that the Bill stand over or that it be referred back to the Committee on Private Bills in regard to a change of name. As the House will see, the name of the company incorporated under this Bill is the Scottish Canadian Trust Company of Canada. Obviously, there is a difficulty in that name; but besides that there is a company doing business in Canada at the present time known as the Scottish Trust Company. That company desires to be heard, and states that it had no notice of this proposed change of name, because the Bill, as originally introduced, provided a name for the new company of the North American Trust company. That, however, has been changed by the Private Bills Committee to the name now appearing on the Order Paper, namely, the Scottish Canadian Trust Company of Canada. As the Scottish Trust Company had no notice of the change and desires to be heard, I think the Bill should be referred back to the Private Bills Committee for further consideration, and I would so move.

Mr. SPEAKER: I would point out to the minister that the motion before the House is, that I do now leave the Chair for the House to resolve itself into Committee of the Whole. Action on the specific Bill will have to be in Committee of the Whole, and it would not be competent at this stage to refer it back to the Private Bills Committee. I have no doubt that the Order can stand.

Motion agreed to, and the House went into Committee on the Bill—Mr. Boivin in the Chair.

Progress reported.

THE CANADIAN BAR ASSOCIATION

House in Committee on Bill No. 3 to incorporate the Canadian Bar Association. —Mr. Jacobs.

On the preamble:

Mr. FORTIER: I expressed my disapproval of this Bill before the Private Bills Committee, and I want to repeat my objection. I do not think the Canadian Bar Association should be allowed to use this title. We have our bar associations in the various provinces and the members of those associations are precluded from practising law outside their own province. So although I might be a member of this Canadian Bar Association I would have the right to practise law only in my own province. Therefore the name is a misnomer. I do not discuss in any way the objects of the association, I think probably they are commendable, and I am only opposed to the Bill on the ground that an association with such a name would apparently entitle members to practise anywhere in the Dominion, whereas such would not be the case. The name might be changed to the Association of Provincial Bars of Canada. I think the Committee will appreciate that my objection is well founded, as the practise of the law in Canada is a matter of provincial right. There can be no such thing as a Canadian Bar Association according to our law, and therefore I think that this Bill should be referred back to the Private Bills Committee in order that some other name may be given to the association.

Mr. DOHERTY: I think everybody will agree with the hon. gentleman that the different bars are provincial in their organization and scope, but that they do not designate themselves by the name "association." I do not think the adjective "Canadian" as applied to this association is intended to be applied for the purpose of designating that there is a Canadian Bar; but it is applied to the association, which is a bar association solely because it is composed of members of the various provincial bars of this country. In other words, it is an association of Canadian lawyers. It is to be borne in mind that although this association is now being incorporated, it has been in existence for a number of years past and has become known under that name, without conveying to any one the idea that it has any pretension of creating a Canadian bar. The provisions of the Bill itself make it perfectly clear that a bar society is not being created in the sense in which we have those societies in each of the provinces; but rather an association is to be incorporated to which all members of our provincial bars are eligible, and it is in that sense, and in that sense only, that it is called a bar association. I do not think any evil can come to us as members of the provincial bars because we recognize the existence of a Canadian association composed of the members of all those bars. The association is certainly doing excellent work for the profession in particular and for Canada as a whole in bringing together from all the provinces representative members of the profession. These men get together in this association and discuss on the plane of our common Canadian interests matters that particularly pertain to the profession. It seems to me that perhaps the hon. gentleman is a little too apprehensive of the possible meaning that might be attached to the name of this association. I think the Committee should hesitate before depriving this recognized association of the name by which it has been known, and for which it has earned a very creditable reputation, and a name that I think Canadian lawyers as a whole would like to continue to be attached to the association which they have formed, composed of lawyers without distinction of the different bars to which they belong.

Mr. PROULX: I am of the opinion of the right hon. Minister of Justice. I think the objections of my hon. friend from Labelle are not well founded. In the English provinces the name "Bar" has not the same signification that it has in Quebec. I understand that in Quebec the Bar is the body that regulates the admission to the study and practice of law; in Ontario we do not use the word "Bar" in that sense. The corresponding institution in that province is the Law Society of Upper Canada, a very old organization, dating from 1792. If we adopt the title suggested by the member for Labelle, it might be mistaken for some other bars which have been abolished in the different provinces. A Canadian Bar Association was formed about twenty-five years ago, and has since carried that name. I submit that the objection made by my hon. friend is not well founded and that there should be no change in the name.

Preamble agreed to.

Mr. VIEN: I rise to a point of order. I do not find a copy of the Bill on my file, and I cannot get it. I note further that it is not printed in French. I ask therefore, that the consideration of the Bill be deferred until the rules are complied with.

The CHAIRMAN: The hon. member in charge of the Bill may consent to its being allowed to stand, but as a strict matter of right I must say that any objection to the fact that the Bill is not printed in both languages must be raised before the second reading of the Bill.

Mr. VIEN: Under what rule, please?

The CHAIRMAN: The rule asked for by the hon. member from Lotbinière (Mr. Vien) will be found on page 508 of Bourinot. It reads as follows:

> The letters E.F. on the Order Paper will show whether that has been done. If any objection be made on that ground, it will prevent the Bill being taken up for its second reading on that day. But if the motion has been made and the debate allowed to proceed thereon, it will be too late then to raise an objection as to the printing in French.

Mr. FORTIER: I really think that the Bill has been printed in French; as a matter of fact, I saw a copy of it in the Private Bills Committee. But that reminds me of another objection I have to make. In the French translation the Bill reads "bill pour incorporer la 'Canadian Bar Association'." I think that the name also should be translated so as to read, "L'Association du Barreau Canadien."

Bill reported read the third time and passed.

GILMOUR AND HUGHSON LIMITED

House in committee on Bill No. 14, respecting Gilmour and Hughson, Limited, and recommending that title be changed to "An Act to amend an Act to incorporate Gilmour and Hughson, Limited"—Mr. Fripp.

Mr. Boivin in the Chair.

On section 1—distribution of purchase money and interest ratified.

Mr. CAHILL: Would it be in order for the hon. member in charge of the Bill to give some explanation at this time of the reasons why this matter should be brought before Parliament in the form of a Bill instead of being dealt with in the usual way, through the department of the Secretary of State?

Mr. FRIPP: This Bill simply asks that the Dominion Act respecting Gilmour and Hughson Limited be amended to allow the shareholders to distribute among themselves a certain sum of money which they have received in part payment for the sale of their assets. Gilmour and Hughson have sold all their limits and assets to the Riordon Company and have been paid $500,000 on account. Nobody is interested in this sum except the two families, the Gilmours and the Hughsons; there are no creditors. It is simply asking Parliament to amend their Act so that the moneys may be distributed among those entitled to them as they are paid in, and until the purchase is finally concluded. The purchase price can only be paid out under the proposed legislation by the unanimous consent of all the shareholders, and, as I have intimated, there are no shareholders except the two families.

Mr. MARTIN (Halifax): Was that Bill not before the committee yesterday and deferred for further consideration?

Mr. FRIPP: No, the Bill was in committee yesterday and thoroughly discussed and, as it now appears, was unanimously approved.

Mr. VIEN: I do not quite understand the hon. member's explanation. Why is special legislation necessary in this case? Could not these moneys be distributed without special legislation?

Mr. FRIPP: The distribution of the assets cannot be made under the original Act unless the company is wound up. They do not want to apply for a winding-up order, because if they did, they would be asking for something that might be very injurious to them if all the payments of purchase money were not made in due course. the only way that they can distribute the first instalment of $500,000 amongst the shareholders is by having their Act amended giving them that power. That is all they are asking for by this Bill.

Mr. VIEN: The hon. member assures the committee that there is no objection to the Bill from any interested party?

Mr. FRIPP: None whatever.

Preamble agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN: There is a recommendation from the committee—this can, of course, only be carried out on the third reading—that the title of the Act be changed to "An Act to amend an Act to incorporate Gilmour and Hughson Limited."

Bill reported, and read the third time.

Mr. FRIPP moved that the said Act do now pass and that the title thereof be "An Act to amend an Act to incorporate Gilmour and Hughson, Limited."

Motion agreed to, and Bill passed.

CONSIDERED IN COMMITTEE—THIRD READING

Bill No. 24 for the relief of Frank Alexander Staunton.—Mr. Smith.

SUPPLY

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

Penitentiaries, $1,371,600.

The CHAIRMAN: When the House rose at six o'clock, the Estimates of the Department of Justice were under consideration. We had reached item No. 35, penitentiaries, $1,371,600. The item had been discussed, but the discussion had not yet terminated.

Mr. COPP: I notice quite a large increase amounting in all to $275,000, the increases going all through the different penitentiaries. Can the minister give some details in regard to the Maritime penitentiary situated at Dorchester? For instance, the first item, salaries and retiring allowances, amounts to $83,000 this year, whereas, last year it was $60,000. What is the reason for the increase? How many officials are in the institution and what are their salaries? How many have retired?

Mr. DOHERTY: The increase is attributable to the classification. The classification affects not merely the amount of salary, but the amount of retiring gratuity,

the retiring gratuity consisting of a certain number of monthly payments, I think a month for each year that a man has served, but based on his average salary for the the three years preceding his retirement. Thus an increase in salary means also an increase in gratuity to those retiring, and the increase in this particular penitentiary is almost entirely attributable to this cause.

Mr. COPP: Has the minister a list of those proposed to be retired during the coming year who will come under this? An increase of $28,000 for one institution is very large.

Mr. DOHERTY: As regards retirements that may happen in the future, we can proceed only by an estimate; we cannot say now in advance that a certain man will be retired during the coming year. If we did, that man might die before he was due to retire.

Mr. COPP: Of shock?

Mr. DOHERTY: We do not retire people indiscriminately at a fixed age. A man's retirement depends upon his usefulness. If he breaks down so that he cannot be useful to the penitentiary, we will retire him. There may be men to-day in possession of all their faculties and capacities—we cannot determine in advance that they may have to be retired—but in the course of a year they may fail. We can proceed only by making an estimate based upon past experience of what we anticipate will be required for that purpose.

Mr. COPP: Is that item of $50,000 for lands, building and equipment, for the purchase of land, or what?

Mr. DOHERTY: It does not include the acquisition of any land; it is for the completion of a new cell wing, the installation of proper waterworks, and the maintenance of the necessary building repairs.

Mr. MICHAUD: I understand the Government in the past bought a large farm adjoining this penitentiary and that the convicts are working on it, cultivating it, daily during the summer season. Has this farm been a paying proposition during the last few years? What kind of crops are grown? Are cattle raised? What is the income from the farm?

Mr. DOHERTY: The income from this farm last year was $21,000. If we take the penitentiaries as a whole, the value of the products of last year, taken at ordinary wholesale prices, was some $94,000. I think we have every reason to recognize that our farming operations have been carried on to advantage.

Mr. MICHAUD: How many acres does the farm comprise?

Mr. DOHERTY: About 900 acres at Dorchester. I am told most of it is marsh land; it is not all available for cultivation.

Mr. EULER: The minister told us this afternoon that in the Kingston Penitentiary the number of inmates was 722. What staff of officials and employees is required to take care of those inmates?

Mr. DOHERTY: The permanent staff at Kingston penitentiary is at present 98.

Mr. VIEN: Are the various supplies necessary for the maintenance of the penitentiary purchased by tender? Let me cite a few items: woollen from the Amherst Woollen Mills, Truro, $5,639.

Mr. DOHERTY: Tenders are asked for and the purchasing is supervised by the Purchasing Commission. In this particular instance, tenders were asked for.

Mr. VIEN: Was the contract awarded to the lowest tenderer?

Mr. DOHERTY: I understand contracts are always awarded to the lowest tenderer. The purchasing is done under the control and direction of the Purchasing Commission.

Mr. VIEN: And the minister is responsible to Parliament so far as that commission is concerned.

Mr. DOHERTY: I take my responsibility for the purchasing, and I am assured that in this instance, as in all instances, the contract was awarded to the lowest tenderer.

Mr. VIEN: Were tenders also called for in connection with that item of $4,523, purchased from the Canadian Cottons at Montreal?

Mr. DOHERTY: I am told that tenders were called for in that case that in fact they are called for in the case of all purchases, the calls being sent out by our own purchasing agent under the direction of the Purchasing Commission.

Mr. VIEN: How are they called?

Mr. DOHERTY: The forms are sent out under the direction of the Purchasing Commission.

Mr. VIEN: To whom?

Mr. DOHERTY: To all those from whom the Purchasing Commission considers you could expect to purchase goods of the kind.

Mr. PROULX: Has the department purchased any supplies for the penitentiaries from the Militia Department? I see by the newspapers that some distributors in Ottawa, Smith and Carey, for example have blankets, sheets, and comforters for sale, from the Department of Militia. If these could be supplied to the penitentiaries, they would not cost as much as if they were bought from the wholesale merchants.

Mr. DOHERTY: We have had quite a number of articles transferred from the Militia Department and from the Soldiers' Civil Re-establishment, without payment, of course, the goods belonging to the Government. As the result of the cessation of the war there has been an overplus in the Militia Department of some goods, and where there has been an overplus of articles in any department that we required for the penitentiaries we have had them transferred to us.

Mr. CAHILL: By what authority is the Purchasing Commission operated?

Mr. DOHERTY: The Purchasing Commission as I explained this afternoon, is operating under an Order in Council providing for the supervision and direction of the purchasing operations of the different departments. There has been some confusion—I do not know whether the hon. gentlemen has that same thing in his mind —between the Purchasing Commission so operated, and the Purchasing Commission which existed with special powers under the War Measures Act. The present commission is a commission appointed by the Governor in Council to supervise the general purchasing operations of the different departments, so that there may be one common direction.

Mr. CAHILL: I do not wish to get into a discussion about the Purchasing Commission, but I have a recollection of an attempt to pass legislation in this House in two previous sessions creating a purchasing commission, and I merely wish to know if this present commission has been foisted on the public by Order in Council after it had been refused by Parliament. Is it the same commission, the same personnel?

Mr. DOHERTY: It is a body with quite different powers. The Purchasing Commission which it was proposed to constitute by statute would have been a body exercising

authority and power under the direct statutory enactment of this Parliament. The present Purchasing Commission is purely a body appointed by Council—Council having the supervision of the purchasing of all the departments—to exercise a power of supervision and direction over the purchasing operations of the departments generally. It is quite a different body from what was contemplated under the proposed statute which never was enacted. If the hon. gentleman will carry his memory back he will remember that Parliament voted a special sum of money to provide for the expenses of this purchasing body, the explanation I am giving now having been given at that time.

Mr. CAHILL: Is the personnel of the present commission the same as that of the other commission?

Mr. DOHERTY: The personnel of the present body is not the same as the personnel of the Purchasing Commission under the War Measures Act.

Mr. VIEN: Would the minister cite the statutory power which the Government had to pass such an Order in Council appointing such a commission?

Mr. DOHERTY: I can give no specific statutory power that we had to do that, but the Government has not only the power but the duty to administer the business of the country, and each one of the departments makes its purchases subject to its responsibility to the Government. The entire Government is responsible for the operations of each department. That being so, it was thought wise to appoint a body that should endeavour to co-ordinate these different operations and see that some common principle ran through them all, but the entire power of that body is the power of the Governor in Council. Its functions are to assist the Governor in Council in carrying out that part of its duty of administering the public affairs which involves seeing that the purchasing is done, so far as possible, under the best circumstances.

Mr. VIEN: But the right hon. gentleman will not tell this House that the Governor in Council has the right to appoint a commission without statutory power, general or specific? What I wish to know is: what general or specific power had the Governor in Council to pass the Order in Council referred to by the minister?

Mr. DOHERTY: As I tried to make clear, but evidently did not succeed—

Mr. VIEN: I understood very clearly what the right hon. gentleman said, but he did not say everything I wanted.

Mr. DOHERTY: I am afraid it would be quite impossible for me, adhering strictly to the truth, to say all the things the hon. gentleman wants me to say. There are some limitations put on a man when he is trying to tell the truth. Perhaps it does not always happen that the hon. gentleman wants to hear what is the truth. As I said, the Governor in Council is responsible, because it is the executive body, for the administration of the public business.

Mr. CAHILL: Not responsible to Parliament?

Mr. DOHERTY: Of course, it is responsible to Parliament. I did not conceive it was necessary to add those words. We are responsible to Parliament, and through Parliament to the people of Canada, for the proper administration of the general public business, and part of that business that devolves upon the executive is the purchasing of those things required for the Government. The Government adopts what seems to it the best method of ensuring that that purchasing is properly supervised so that the public interest may be fully taken care of, and it designates certain employees to do that. The mere fact that these people are called a commission does not alter the situation in the slightest. The authority of the Government to select people to do the best they can to see that the purchasing is properly co-ordinated is the inherent authority that necessarily follows from the fact of this duty being the Government's. So far as the constituting of that particular body is concerned, the authority of Parliament was given by the vote of Parliament. Parliament voted the money to provide for the constitution of a body of that kind, and it was explained what the purpose of that commission was.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: I think the committee understands clearly that the Purchasing Commission, to which my hon. friend is now referring, is acting under a different authority from that which would have been exercised by the commission that would have been appointed under the Bill introduced last session, had that Bill become law. What is the difference between the function and nature of the Purchasing Commission, as appointed under the Order in Council, and those which would have existed under the Bill as drawn last session?

Mr. DOHERTY: If the Bill had been passed that commission would have been constituted as a statutory body, not dependent upon any particular department, but with functions of its own exclusively. As the matter stands now, it is merely a body of employees whom the Government has designated to supervise the purchasing, and to endeavour to effect the necessary co-ordination so that purchases of similar things for different departments may be made through, and with the co-operation of a body that has knowledge of the requirements in different departments, the knowledge acquired in connection with one transaction being available when dealing with another. The purpose is to establish one common principle that will apply to all departments. The other body, on the other hand, would have had authority of its own. Whereas the present commission acts for the departments, the other body would have been in a sense a distinct department, entitled on its own authority to determine these matters, and to make all purchases. Under the other system, the commission would have been a sort of purchasing department. Here it is a mere committee or commission—the word is immaterial—of officials selected by the Government, to supervise and direct the purchasing of the different departments.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: The minister nas made it clear that there may be a difference in names. But what is the difference in function between this commission or committee existing now and the body that would have exercised purchasing power under the Bill had it been passed?

Mr. DOHERTY: It is a difference between servants of departments, and of the united departments as represented by the Government, and a body constituted by Parliament to control purchasing of its own authority. That is the difference. These are the employees of the executive Government, with no functions assigned to them by Parliament exercisable otherwise than under the direction of the Governor in Council.

Mr. MACKENIE KING: The minister has not answered my question yet. He has elaborated on the difference in the nature of the composition of the two bodies.

Mr. DOHERTY: Let me make it as short as I can: The other body was a statutory purchasing authority; this is a body acting under the authority of the Governor in Council, which is charged with

purchasing and responsible for its being done. Now, I do not know whether I have made myself clear.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: Leaving aside the question of authority, what would the other purchasing body have done, which this particular commission now is not doing?

Mr. DOHERTY: It would have exercised that authority to determine matters itself which this body does not do. I am endeavouring to make the positon clear, but the thing is so palpable to me that I cannot understand how there can be any room for misapprehension.

Mr. DUFF: It is as clear as mud to us.

Mr. DOHERTY: Well, I am sorry the mud is so thick over there that the light is not able to penetrate. That, however, is not my fault.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: Let me put the question another way. Are there any purchases which this particular body might make to-day which the other body would not have been authorized to make and, vice versa, would the other body have had power to make certain purchases which this body has not the right to make?

Mr. DOHERTY: I have not before me the enumerated powers of the other body, but the substantial distinction is this: the other body would determine what should be bought and how it would go about buying it. It settled those transactions on its own authority. This body supervises the operations of the different departments and co-ordinates them, and its authority begins and ends with the authority of the Governor in Council. It is derived from the Governor in Council. The other body had authority of its own which might operate adversely to the decision of a department. It controlled the purchasing, which was taken as a substantial thing by itself and put into its hands. The present body simply supervises and co-ordinates the purchasing. The provisions of the proposed statute, which was not enacted, intended to create a purchasing commission as a distinct body standing on its own feet.

Mr. CAHILL: Were the members of this commission or purchasing body appointed by the Civil Service Commission?

Mr. DOHERTY: No; they were not appointed by the Civil Service Commission, but by Council.

[Mr. Doherty.]

Mr. CAHILL: Under what authority were they appointed by Council without reference to the Civil Service Commission?

Mr. DOHERTY: They were not under the Civil Service Act at all.

Mr. CAHILL: Apparently they are under no Act at all except the act of the Government, which is not a very good one.

Mr. DOHERTY: I think the hon. gentleman will have to be satisfied with my statement.

Mr. CAHILL: What is the personnel of this commission which is purchasing under the authority of the Governor in Council?

Mr. DOHERTY: The commission is at present composed of Mr. Howard, chairman, and Col. La Fleche.

Mr. CAHILL: Only two?

Mr. DOHERTY: Yes.

Mr. VIEN: I think the law provided that the Civil Service Act should of necessity apply to the appointments of all servants either in the inside or outside service. Will the minister tell us how, after passing the Civil Service Act, they can appoint servants of the State, civil servants, without the formality of submitting such appointments to the Civil Service Commission?

Mr. DOHERTY: These positions are not clerical in the sense of embodying in them civil servants of the country. These men were appointed to exercise particular supervision on behalf of the Governor in Council. It was judged at the time that it was possibly open to the Governor in Council to appoint them to perform these duties, and they were appointed. It did not seem to us that they came under the jurisdiction of the Civil Service Commission. If we are open to criticism in that regard, well we will have to consider it from that point of view. Personally, I confess it is the first time it occurred to me that there should be any question with regard to their being appointed by the Civil Service Commission. Perhaps I may be permitted to point out at this stage that we have travelled a very long distance from the estimates for the penitentiaries.

Mr. VIEN: May I answer the right hon. gentleman in this way—that I asked some questions as to how the purchase of certain articles falling under the item we are now considering, that is to say the penitentiaries, was made. The right hon. gentleman told us that the purchase had been made by a commission appointed under an

Order in Council; and I say that we are strictly within the rules of the committee, and are adhering closely to the point, when we put questions to the minister as to the character of the commission. Its personnel, its appointment, and any questions in reference to that commission, are, to my mind strictly in order. Since the right hon. gentleman has told us that the members of that commission were not statutory officials of the Government but that they were servants of the state—"ordinary servants" to use his very words—I wish to ascertain from him how he can escape from the rule laid down in a statute, sanctioned by this Parliament, which made it obligatory on the part of the Government not to appoint any servants of the state except through the authority of the Civil Service Commission, or by virtue of a special Act. The right hon. gentleman has told us that there was no special statute in this case—that the Government were acting under the general powers which are vested in His Excellency the Governor General in Council and that in the exercise of that authority they had appointed the purchasing commission in question. I want to go a step further and ask my right hon. friend a very simple question: Are there any members of the Civil Service in Ottawa who can be appointed without the authority of a statute and without the authority of the Civil Service Commission?

Mr. DOHERTY: I must decline, in advance to go into an enumeration of the powers of all the other departments, but so far as my knowledge goes there are employees who are appointed without the intervention of the Civil Service Commission. Now as to the question of the regularity—

Mr. VIEN: Would the minister be good enough to point out some instances?

Mr. DOHERTY: With all respect I do suggest that I should not be called upon to enter upon an accounting with respect to other departments than the one with which I am concerned. I will be very happy to discuss the general question of the appointment of a purchasing commission, and of the nature of the present one, upon a proper occasion; but I am asking no vote whatever in connection with that body. It is not a body attached to any department in any way—it is a general body appointed for general purposes. My hon. friend and myself seem to have to differ in opinion as to the method by which the commission ought to be appointed. I have expressed my view upon the subject. It does not meet the approval of the hon. gentleman, and I have to admit that I do not see how I am going to convince him that my view is right. Unfortunately his views differ from mine, and that is all that I can say about it.

9 p.m.

Mr. VIEN: There is something further to be said. Is there not an Order in Council which prohibits the Government, in the case of contracts amounting to more than $5,000, from accepting those contracts except upon tender, the tenders to be opened by the minister himself in the presence of the secretary of the department?

Mr. DOHERTY: It is not to my knowledge that there exists any such Order in Council. I do understand—

Mr. VIEN: Is there a statute?

Mr. DOHERTY: I do understand that there are statutes with regard to certain departments and the purchases to be made by them, but I am not aware that there exists an Order in Council such as the hon. gentleman refers to.

Mr. VIEN: Well, let us say a statute then. Is there not a statute which makes it obligatory for every department of the state not to purchase any articles, or award contracts, for any higher amount than $5,000, except upon tender called for by the department, and opened by the minister himself in the presence of the secretary of the department?

Mr. DOHERTY: I am not aware of any such general statute. I believe that there are statutes with regard to specific departments. If my memory serves me, there is a statute containing such a provision with regard to the Marine and Fisheries Department. I think there is a similar statutory provision with regard to the Public Works Department; but I can only say to the hon. gentleman that I, this evening, do not know of such a statute as that to which he refers. Of course I do not pretend to know all the statutes that are in existence. I came here prepared to discuss the Esti mates of my own department.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: I think I can promise to quote the statute in question to my right hon. friend before the evening is over.

Mr. DOHERTY: Of universal application?

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: Yes, a general statute.

Mr. DOHERTY: I have not denied that there exists such a statute. I have said in reply to the question put to me that at this moment I cannot recall that a general statute exists. However, I am quite fallible; I may be mistaken.

Mr. McKENZIE: We have perhaps drifted far afield—

Mr. DOHERTY: Yes, we have.

Mr. McKENZIE:—but perhaps I can say a word further along that line. Now as to the appointment of these commissioners I do not follow the reasoning of the minister in saying that he, or any other minister, or any department, has inherent power to make appointments. I do not think they have. The Government, and every department of Government, is created by statute. There is no such thing as a minister of common law; there are no common law ministers. They, and every department of Government are created by statute, consequently you must go to the statute to find the powers of a minister or the powers of a department. The statute which created each department governs it; and if it does not give a minister such power, I would say, with all due respect to the minister, that no such power exists at all. Therefore these appointments cannot be made under an inherent power which, in my judgment, does not exist. If there is a statute giving such powers in a general way, then of course there would be the inherent power of carrying out what was incidental to the real purpose of that statute; but we have statutory provisions made with respect to all these departments governing the appointment of a purchasing agent. That statute is supposed to have provided for all that is necessary in each department; but I cannot agree with the minister that he can go beyond that and create another body for the purpose of having the general supervision of the purchases in all departments. I submit it is irregular for the Government to make such appointments, and in doing so and undertaking to pay salaries to such parties, they are acting utterly without authority.

Mr. CAHILL: Could the minister tell us when the commission was appointed under the Order in Council referred to?

Mr. DOHERTY: It is difficult for me to recall the exact date. While I have no desire to unduly limit hon. gentlemen in the discussion, at the same time they should appreciate the fact that this commission was not appointed in my department. I have not come here prepared to discuss a question of this kind. It may be a very debatable question, and I shall be glad to discuss it at the proper time. If I had had any notice that it was going to be brought up I would have come prepared with these dates and with the terms of the Order in Council itself ready to discuss the reasons why—whether they be sufficient in the eyes of hon. gentlemen opposite or not—it was thought proper for the members of that purchasing commission to be appointed as they were appointed. I shall be glad to look into the whole of the circumstances and to facilitate the further discussion of this matter. But I think hon. gentlemen opposite will appreciate that we cannot get any very satisfactory result in trying to continue this discussion with a minister who avowedly has not come here with the necessary information for which hon. gentlemen very naturally ask.

Mr. CAHILL: I only asked the minister in order to get him out of his present dilemma by having him tell us when the purchasing commission was appointed. I understand my hon. friend from Lotbiniere asked a question regarding an item that was purchased in the fiscal year ending March 31, 1920. I do not think that this Purchasing Commission was in existence under Order in Council or otherwise at that time. Perhaps the minister can give us a different answer to that which he originally gave, and in that way overcome his difficulty regarding the present Purchasing Commission, which is illegally constituted and is causing him additional worry.

Mr. DOHERTY: I am very much obliged to the hon. gentleman for trying to extricate me from my troubles. My recollection is that the commission was appointed in the month of July.

Mr. CAHILL: Of what year?

Mr. DOHERTY: The vote was passed in the last days of the last session of Parliament, which I think terminated on the 1st July; but I would not undertake to be accurate in that statement.

Mr. VIEN: Will the minister tell us under what department that Purchasing Commission operates?

Mr. DOHERTY: The Commission reports to the Department of Finance.

Mr. VIEN: It is under the Finance Minister then?

Mr. DOHERTY: So far as it is under a specific minister, because it is dealing with all the departments.

Mr. VIEN: I quite appreciate the answer given by the minister a minute ago, which I think was quite fair, that he is not ready to discuss the whole subject of the commission. the right hon. gentleman said also that he had not been given notice of the question; otherwise he would have been prepared to answer fully. I might point out to him that this discussion was absolutely sprung on us by reason of the fact that the minister told us that the purchases under review had been made through that commission. This was all new to us, for the simple reason that the War Purchasing Commission was abolished at the expiration of the War Measures Act. It is true a bill was introduced last session to give the Government power to appoint a permanent purchasing commission, but that bill was withdrawn. Then notwithstanding the fact that Parliament had not granted authority for so doing, we find that a commission was appointed by Order in Council under no statutory powers except the general powers vested in his Excellency in Council. We find moreover that these officials are not statutory officials but that they are servants of the state, although the provisions of the Civil Service Act are flatly in contradiction of the minister as to the powers of the Governor in Council to make appointments to the inside service at Ottawa. But I will not insist further on this point. I think it is only fair to defer the discussion to a later date to enable the minister to get the information of which he stands so much in need tonight, so that when we take up the subject again he may be able to supply the committee with the facts.

Mr. DOHERTY: It will also afford hon. gentlemen an opportunity of discussing the subject with the minister to whom it properly belongs.

Mr. VIEN: Yes. But I think it was only proper that the minister should give this committee some information as to how the purchases are made in his department. I asked him how the purchases were made of some specific items, namely, from Green at Kingston, amounting to $9,900; from the Amherst Woollen Mills, Truro, $5,639; from Canadian Cottons, Montreal, $4,523; from Canada Cement Company, Montreal, $2,-314. The minister has told this committee that these purchases were made through the Purchasing Commission; but a few minutes later, in answer to a question from the hon. member for Pontiac, he replied that the commission had, to the best of his recollection, been appointed in July, 1920. The items to which I refer were for the year ended 31st March, 1920, so that the commission could not have been in existence at that time.

Mr. DOHERTY: There was a previous commission in existence.

Mr. DUFF: Not for those purchases; that was the War Purchasing Commission before.

Mr. VIEN: The right hon. gentleman will not contend that the War Purchasing Commission was functioning up to the 31st March, 1920. If the Purchasing Commission created by Order in Council in July 1920 was not the commission to which he referred, why did he answer the hon. member for Pontiac that the commission had been created by Order in Council of that date? Will the minister tell us something about that previous commission which did the purchasing at that time?

Mr. DOHERTY: As I said before, I am not in a position to give the hon. gentleman the details of these two commissions which succeeded each other.

Mr. VIEN: Was it the War Purchasing Commission?

Mr. DOHERTY: A commission was created under an Order in Council passed by virtue of the War Measure Act. my impression is that that commission continued in existence until the end of the last session. Then a commission was appointed afterwards. I spoke of that subsequently appointed commission in answer to the hon. member for Pontiac (Mr. Cahill); because hon. gentlemen were discussing a commission which, as they represented it, had been created by Order in Council and in spite of the refusal of Parliament to pass a statute. I was talking, therefore, about the particular commission to which they applied that description. As I said before, if the hon. gentleman desires a discussion that will involve the details of the constitution of these different commissions I shall be very glad to enter into that discussion with him, but certainly I do not think that either he or I have under our hands at the present moment the material necessary to make that discussion useful.

Mr. VIEN: I am satisfied for the time being, Mr. Chairman, I think that this further discussion will not be useless, be-

cause it will enable the right hon. gentleman to produce the information asked for with regard not only to this last commission, but to all previous commissions created by Order in Council or under the War Measures Act. I would like some information as to the purchase from McKelvey and Birch, of Kingston, of various articles aggregating $9,783, as set out on page L23 of the Auditor General's report. Were tenderers asked in connection with the purchase of these articles, and if so, from whom were tenders received?

Mr. DOHERTY: I can get the details of the particular contracts if the hon. gentleman is interested in them, but for the moment the only answer I can give him is that these purchases were made under the system followed in the case of all purchases,—that is, offers were called for, and under the supervision of whichever commission was at the time in existence, the purchases were made from those whose prices were found to be the lowest.

Mr. VIEN: Then I understand that the purchase was not made directly by the Department of Justice?

Mr. DOHERTY: I am not in a position to say whether the final purchase was carried out through our purchasing agent with the assent and approval of the commission, or whether it was carried out through an officer of the commission. I shall be very glad to obtain that information for my hon. friend.

Mr. VIEN: In view of the answer given by my right hon. friend I wish to point out that it is not proper for a minister of the Crown to come before the committee unprepared to give full information concerning expenditure reported by the Auditor General for the previous year. We are now called upon to vote $1,371,000 for the maintenance of penitentiaries. Last year the amount was considerably less. For the Kingston penitentiary the appropriation last year was $71,000 less; for St. Vincent de Paul, $65,000 less; for Dorchester, $49,000 less, and so on. It is with a view to the furnishing of full information that the Estimates of a department are not brought up in the House until the Auditor General's report is laid on the Table. In answer to the leader of the Opposition the other day the Prime Minister clearly stated that no Estimates would be taken up until the report of the Auditor General in respect to the departments concerned had been brought down. The minister, assisted by his officials on the floor of the House, is supposed to give full information concerning each item set forth in the report. I might commend to the right hon. gentleman the example of the Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Tolmie) who gave the fullest particulars concerning his Estimates and who satisfied both sides of the House with the information he furnished, to the point that he got a certificate of ability from the hon. member for Dorchester (Mr. Cannon). I will not say that the Minister of Justice is not capable, but I do say that there is a lack of preparation on his part in connection with the presentation of his Estimates which this committee should lay stress on. Now, I should like to ask the minister how the following items were purchased as set forth on page L-23 of the Auditor General's report: basin cocks, 46 at $1.45; bends, 21 at $1.40; branch headers, 20 at $6.25; brass bolts and nuts, 250 at 15 cents, etc., to the amount of $9,783. I have my suspicions, Sir, that these various items were not purchased by tender. In this case of plumbing supplies it would seem to be better to make the purchases wholesale. If they were purchased wholesale, tenders must have been called.

Mr. DOHERTY: I have already stated that tenders were called for these as they are called for everything. Now, I am at a loss to know in what respect the hon. gentleman finds fault with me for not having the particulars or details. Does he want the papers about each particular purchase? If he is satisfied with a general statement, all of these things were purchased after proper tenders were called for them. No doubt where quantities were large enough to enable us to buy wholesale, we bought wholesale. But if only a couple of taps were wanted, one could not very well go and buy a large enough quantity to make one's order a wholesale order.

Mr. VIEN: In this item, there are purchases amounting to $9,000 from one firm for one penitentiary in one year. It seems to me that those supplies, particularly in view of the fact that we have so many penitentiaries, should always be purchased wholesale. When they purchased from McKelvey and Birch in Kingston, hard rubber stops, 603 at $32.25, I have serious doubts that these were purchased by tender. The minister told us a minute ago that purchases were made by tender when the quantities were sufficient to warrant a purchase by wholesale.

Mr. DOHERTY: I think I said that we purchased them from wholesalers when the quantity was sufficiently large to make that possible.

Mr. CAHILL: Were the tenders opened in the department of the minister or by this "fly-by-night" commission?

Mr. DOHERTY: They are opened in the presence of the Purchasing Commission or their representative, by the purchasing agent of the Department of Justice.

Mr. CAHILL: The minister does not attempt to divest himself of responsibility as to purchases made through the Purchasing Commission?

Mr. DOHERTY: I am here carrying full responsibility for the purchases, and nothing is purchased excepting after the requisition has been submitted to me and initialled by the minister. Under the general practice, purchases under $500 may be initialled by the deputy minister; but if the amount is over $500, before the purchase is made, the requisition has to be initialled by the minister, and I have the full responsibility. Tenders are not opened by myself personally. I do not think that was ever done in the Department of Justice, and with the great respect that I have for the positiveness with which certain hon. gentlemen are convinced that they can produce a general statute with the requirements that they have mentioned, I think it will be found that they are mistaken in that regard. The practice that is followed is the practice that has been followed from time immemorial. Everything that we bought and what we paid for it are in the public accounts; the documents in connection with it are absolutely available if any one wants to inquire into them, and certainly they will be readily and willingly produced and subjected to any scrutiny that may be thought desirable. This is the first time that it has been suggested to me that, in not coming myself with, at my finger-ends, the details of each particular purchase that can be found in the Auditor General's Report, I have come showing a very grave lack of preparedness. If I had anticipated that there would be a desire for such detailed information, I would have brought it. I shall see that the hon. gentleman gets it with regard to any item whatever which he thinks calls for further inquiry and, of course, as is the case with the entire Public Accounts, those relating to my department are open to the closest possible scrutiny and investigation in the proper place—before the Public Accounts' Committee.

Mr. VIEN: The minister's long parliamentary experience will tell him that all ministers of the Crown, the Minister of Public Works, the Minister of Agriculture and the ministers of each of the other departments, always come fully prepared to answer questions put as regards expenditures. I do not want to be obnoxious or unduly annoying to the minister; I am simply pointing out to him that we are now called upon to vote an appropriation of $1,371,600. The information that I seek to obtain is for the purpose of assuring myself that the purchases for these penitentiaries, the requirements of which are practically the same, are done on a general system which would save the department undue expense that would be occasioned by purchases being made at local retail stores. The requirements of all the penitentiaries are practically the same. If the minister's contention is right that these purchases were made through a Purchasing Commission, it does not appear to me that it should be necessary to have all the details that the Auditor General's Report contains, showing separate purchases here and there. I should think that the requirements would be purchased by the commission in large volumes, kept in a central store and given out to the various penitentiaries as required. This expenditure may be largely curtailed by a proper system, but the committee has not been able to ascertain, as a certain fact, whether these articles were purchased through the commission or the department.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: I might quote to the minister the chapter I had in mind, chapter 39 of the Revised Statutes of Canada in relation to Public Works. In the interpretation clause, there is this definition:

"Public work" or "public works" means and includes any work and property under the control of the minister.

Section 36 reads:

Whenever any works are to be executed under the direction of any department of the Government, the minister having charge of such department shall invite tenders by public advertisement for the execution of such works, except in cases,—

(a) of pressing emergency in which delay would be injurious to the public interest; or,

(b) in which from the nature of the work it can be more expeditiously and economically executed by the officers and servants of the department; or,

(c) where the estimated cost of the work is less than $5,000.

That is the section to which I referred.

Mr. DOHERTY: The only works we have to do in our department are done by the convicts. We do not get public works done for us. We have to get the material to be put into the works, but the works themselves are done by the convicts so that we never have a contract for a public work. These articles that are bought are either for use in the penitentiary or to be used in the construction work which the convicts carry on.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: Does the minister not regard material he has bought for construction work, as property under his control?

Mr. DOHERTY: I can see no application of that statute to things that are referred to here. You cannot make a public work out of a tap. Amongst things an hon. gentleman mentioned were taps that were purchased, I have no doubt, to be placed in the penitentiary, and the work is all done by the convicts under the supervision of instructors in the different trades within the penitentiary. We never have a contract to give for a public work.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: Does the minister not regard the spirit of the statute as an instruction given by Parliament in regard to calling for tenders?

Mr. DOHERTY: I should like to see the statute, because there are specific statutes with regard to specific departments. If the hon. gentleman will let me look at the statutes, I think I shall be able to point out to him that it does not apply in the present instance. Here it is; An Act respecting the Public Works of Canada. In this Act.

(a) 'Minister' means the Minister of Public works;

(b) 'Department' means the Department of Public Works;

(c) 'public work' or 'public works' means and includes any work or property under the control of the minister.

That is, under the control of the Minister of Public Works. This is entirely a statute with regard to the public works of Canada, and all the provisions are subject to this definition that 'Minister' means the Minister of Public Works, and that 'public work' or 'public works' means and includes any work or property under the control of the minister. That is, of the Minister of Public Works; the paragraph immediately preceding tells us that. I do not think we need go any further to see that this Act has no application in this case.

[Mr. Mackenzie King.]

There is a statute about the Department of Justice. There is a Penitentiaries Act, which deals with the manner in which penitentiaries are to be carried on, and so far as the statutory law is concerned, those are the statutes that govern the operations of the department. I think the hon. gentleman is quite in error in thinking the word 'Minister' there to mean any minister at all, in view of the fact that we have a definition of what 'Minister' is in this Act. The hon. gentleman will find there are other departments in regard to which an analogous provision about contracts exceeding $5,000 is expressly made. Now if the clause the hon. gentleman cites had the general application he is trying to attach to it there would be no reason for making this provision with regard to other departments. I do not think there is need for me to go any further. The section I have read makes it quite clear. The Act is divided into two parts. Part 1 applies exclusively to public works under the control of the Department of Public Works.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: Part 2 contains the section to which I have referred; that is the point. My right hon. friend will see that Part 2 includes all the departments.

Mr. DOHERTY: The hon. gentleman has not indicated where in the Act the purchasing of goods is described as a public work, and our contracts are for the purchase of goods.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: The minister will admit that he was mistaken when he said that this Act was confined to public works.

Mr. DOHERTY: Part 2 confines its application in a general way to public works.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: To any department of the Government.

Mr. DOHERTY: But we are not executing any public works at all. We are simply buying goods.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: It says: 'public work' or 'public works' means and includes any work or property under the control of the minister. Does the minister say that the material he uses is not property under his control?

Mr. DOHERTY: But 'Minister' is specifically defined as being the Minister of Public Works

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: That is in relation to Part 1, but not in relation to Part 2.

Mr. DOHERTY: Where do you find the reference in Part 2?

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: In section 36.

Mr. DOHERTY: If the hon. gentleman will indicate a case in which this department has been excuting a public work, then we may consider the matter, but our contracts are purchases of goods pure and simple.

Mr. EULER: Will the minister tell us which items in the Estimates comprise these purchases?

Mr. DOHERTY: These are the Estimates of what we expect to spend next year. It is not the money that we spent last year that is in these Estimates.

Mr. EULER: What is covered for example, by the item "working expenses?" In the case of Kingston penitentiary, there is a very large item of $7,000 for working expenses and $25,000 for industries. Just what is meant by that?

Mr. DOHERTY: I believe the largest single item included in working expenses is the purchase of coal. To carry on a penitentiary, among other things that we have to do is to heat it.

Mr. EULER: I think that would come under maintenance.

Mr. DOHERTY: Maintenance refers to the maintenance of convicts, that is, the feeding of convicts; whether that is the best possible way of expressing it I do not know. The term "working expenses" is used to cover the entire expense of working the penitentiary. I understand that it covers all the supplies, other than the feeding of the convicts, which are necessary to carry on a penitentiary.

Mr. EULER: What comes under the heading of industries?

Mr. DOHERTY: Industries are the works we carry on by which we earn some money. We have made mail bags, for instance.

Mr. DUFF: And ballot boxes.

Mr. DOHERTY: We made some ballot boxes too. We carry on a boot-making industry. We make all the boots for all the convicts and all the officers, as well as all the clothes the convicts and officers wear.

Mr. EULER: Are any of these industries revenue producing?

Mr. DOHERTY: We make no sales outside the penitentiaries, except certain things we have made for the use of the Government. We have repaired mail bags, for instance, and have made some clothing for the Indian Department.

Mr. VIEN: What is the limitation of the purchasing power of the superintendent of the penitentiary? Can he purchase directly?

Mr. DOHERTY: The superintendent has no purchasing power.

Mr. VIEN: The local authorities cannot purchase anything directly?

Mr. DOHERTY: In an emergency they may purchase something that is absolutely called for at the moment, in the case for instance of a bursting pipe or something of that kind, but they have no general purchasing power. The purchasing is done through the department here.

Mr. VIEN: I should like to illustrate the argument I put forward a moment ago as to the advisibility of having a central system of purchasing for the penitentiaries. For instance, if the minister will look at page 123, he will find that he purchased 1,200 bags of flour from the Lake of the Woods Milling Company at $5.40 per bag, and he purchased also six hundred bags of flour from McBroom, Kingston, at $6.35. So that there was a difference of 95 cents a bag between these two purchases of flour. I will not bother the minister for details because he is not in a position to give them, but he will see that there is apparently a lack of system in purchasing.

Mr. DOHERTY: There may be, and there may not. You buy what you require at the time you require it, or at the time you think you can purchase to the best advantage, and I have no doubt that these purchases were made at what was considered the most opportune and advantageous time. The purchasing agent has to use his judgment as to the best method of making purchases. Would the hon. gentleman suggest that it would have been better for us to have bought all that flour at the time we paid $6.35? As a matter of fact, it turned out that some other day we were able to purchase flour at $5.40. We have to exercise our best judgment in purchasing, and it may therefore be wiser at a certain time to buy a limited quantity, looking forward to being able to buy on a greater scale to better advantage later on. I am not myself an expert in matters of this kind, but I am advised by those who are

experts that the best way to obtain the final, general, good result is to entrust someone who is competent to exercise good judgment as to the best time to lay in your supply. That we have done, and I am satisfied that the general results would convince the hon. gentleman that our purchasing has been done to the best advantage.

Mr. VIEN: I quite appreciate the argument of the minister, but as regards the system of purchasing, I think he might give us some further enlightenment. I admit that it may be advisable to purchase a limited quantity when prices are excessive, but what I should like to know is just how this purchasing is done. The minister told us that it was done by his department, either through the purchasing agent, or through the commission; he did not know. However, we shall probably have occasion to come back to this question when the commission is under fire.

Mr. DOHERTY: The modus operandi is this: When they require certain articles at a penitentiary, they forward their requisition to the superintendent, who looks into it and passes it if he finds that the requirements are justifiable.

Mr. VIEN: Do they do that periodically, every three or six months, or every month?

Mr. DOHERTY: For things with which they require to be supplied for long periods, they do, such, for instance, as groceries and meats that are a matter of steady supply. Of course, there are some things they require one year and not another. At all events, as supplies are required, and as they anticipate the wants of the institutions, so far as they can be anticipated in things of the kind I have spoken of, they forward their requisition to the superintendent. He passes judgment upon it from the point of view of its propriety, and he then submits it to the purchasing agent. The purchasing agent examines it and also passes upon its propriety, and upon any suggestions that may be contained as to where the things ought to be bought, or as to prices that should be paid. Starting with the warden's certificate, with the vise of the superintendent, and the vise of the purchasing agent, it comes to the minister, who passes it if he thinks it right and proper. Then it goes back from the minister to the superintendent, and from him to the Purchasing Commission, and the purchasing agent, under the direction of the Purchasing Commission, calls for offers for the supplying of the goods. These offers, when received, are opened, I think, by the purchasing agent actually in the office of the Purchasing Commission, or, at all events, in the presence of its representative, and the order is awarded to the person who makes the lowest offer. That is the modus operandi.

Mr. COPP: I do not want to press unduly for information, but I feel with my hon. friend (Mr. Vien), that when the Auditor General's Report is laid before Parliament it should be compared with the Estimates, because it is the foundation of our study of the year's Estimates. I can understand the minister finding some difficulty in answering questions off-hand in regard to the Auditor General's Report, but it does seem to me that if he cannot at this time give the information sought, he should bring it down later and let the item stand until he is prepared to answer questions fully.

Mr. DOHERTY: If my hon. friend desires that, I have no objection.

Mr. COPP: I have in my hand a report of last year's operations of the maritime penitentiary situated at Dorchester in my own constituency. I know something about the work done in that institution. As I glance through this report, page after page, my curiosity, at least, if not my suspicion, is aroused, and I cannot help thinking that the minister is not properly advised as to the way in which things are conducted there. The country surrounding that penitentiary at Dorchester, and the city of Moncton adjoining, as well as the city of Sackville, do considerable business in flour and food-stuffs generally, and yet, with few exceptions, in the case of small items which might be called emergency purchases, this report shows only one man in that locality who has supplied anything to the institution during the year. That man has a small business concern situated in the parish of Dorchester, and he gets about $17,700 worth of business from the penitentiary. I find that the flour and meat are purchased in Montreal, although a very large proportion of the cattle and meat dealers in Montreal and other cities come right down to my own county, buy beef and take it back to Montreal, when they get the contract to re-ship this meat back to the same locality to feed the convicts in the penitentiary. I do not insinuate that the minister is apprised of the real facts, but it is obvious that there is something wrong somewhere. A dealer in Montreal

cannot possibly sell flour in Dorchester cheaper than a dealer in the Maritime Provinces can, and it does not seem proper that we should get things from outside and pay extra freight, bringing them to the Maritime Provinces from Montreal, Toronto, and elsewhere. Then, I see, Mr. Chairman, if they want a few pounds of clover and grass seed for Dorchester penitentiary a firm in Ottawa furnishes it. I note that 400 pounds of clover seed were purchased in that way; and I suppose at Dorchester they had to wait until word was sent to Ottawa and the purchase made there, although there are at least twenty business houses located not very far from the penitentiary that make a specialty of selling clover and grass seed as my hon. friend from St. John (Mr. Elkin) well knows.

Mr. EDWARDS: Where do they get it?

Mr. COPP: They get it from the west, and other places. They bring it in and have it on hand, and a telephone order for the articles would bring a response inside of six hours. But no, when they wanted clover seed they had to send to Ottawa for it. It arouses one's curiosity why these things happen. Then too, I notice that when they wanted some cotton duck they sent to New York for it. There were 808 yards of cotton duck bought from a firm in New York for the Dorchester penitentiary. This is but a small matter, but when such things occur year after year it arouses one's curiosity if not one's suspicions; there is a fear that something is working from the inside that the minister does not know about. I would like to have an explanation given why this is so, and why it is that these people at a distance are getting all the business for Maritime Provinces institutions, when the same articles can be obtained in the locality of the institution and at less cost, I believe, than is apparent under this item.

Mr. DOHERTY: I suppose my hon. friend noticed that I was criticized by the gentleman who preceded him because I did not buy everything in the same place.

Mr. COPP: No, I did not notice it.

Mr. DOHERTY: Now I am criticized because I do not distribute the purchases.

Mr. COPP: My right hon. friend misunderstood me. I was not attempting to argue that. I was arguing that everything should be bought by tender, and I agree with him that contracts should go to the lowest tenderers in all cases, wherever it may be possible; but to me these purchases seem utterly inexplicable.

Mr. DOHERTY: I shall be very glad to take up the items that the hon. gentleman refers to and send him precise information in regard to them. With respect to Mr. Palmer who was mentioned as having supplied goods to the amount of some $17,000, I understand the great bulk of it was coal purchased in the neighbourhood, which is a coal producing country. I have no doubt it will turn out that coal was purchased to the best advantage, and by tender. As regards the purchase of clover seed in Ottawa I would be quite willing to look into it, but I think the hon. gentleman rather conceded himself that if it had been purchased in Moncton the dealer would have been obliged to obtain the clover seed somewhere else.

Mr. COPP: That may be but there is a dealer there.

Mr. DOHERTY: I have not any doubt but that the Purchasing Commission got the colver seed where they could get it to the best advantage. However, I shall be quite happy to look into it and get the necessary information.

Mr. COPP: The firm in Ottawa would have to purchase the clover seed and resell it; they do not make it.

Mr. DOHERTY: Of course they do not gather it in the streets of Ottawa. I do not know what the circumstances were, put perhaps this particular firm in Ottawa were in a better position to handle clover seed at that moment than other firms were. All these purchases were carried out under the system which I explained a little while ago, but as regards any particular transaction, I shall be more than glad to furnish the hon. gentleman with the exact information in connection with the matter.

10 p.m.

Mr. PEDLOW: In view of the fact that the minister is not in a position to-night to give us the exact details of the expenditure during the past year, I purpose dealing with the summary statement as it appears before us for a few minutes. In the first place, I would like to know just how the several totals and increases that appear in the summary statement of the Estimates have been arrived at. I find there is a general summary statement covering the totals for the various penitentiaries. That summary statement covers the amount of $1,371,600 asked for under

this item for the current year. Against that we have a total for the year 1920-21 of $1,096,600, so that this estimate for the current year shows an increase of $275,000 over last year. That is in round figures an increase of twenty-five per cent on the entire estimate. Now, taking the details given in the summary statement under the different headings for the various institutions, we find that in Kingston the average increase is about twenty-five per cent, and the same with the other institutions all down the line. But when you come to the details you find a wide range of variation. That is the reason that prompts my question as to how these several totals and increases have been arrived at. Is it due to specific reasons in each case or is there a general average for the whole of the Estimates? I find in connection with Kingston penitentiary, under the heading of "salaries and retiring allowances" an increase of $24,500 or an increase over last year of about 19 per cent. I may explain that I have made these calculations hurriedly. I find the salaries and retiring allowance for St. Vincent de Paul augmented by $30,000, or an increase of 35 per cent over last year. I find that the salaries and retiring allowances for Dorchester penitentiary are larger by $23,000, or an increase of 36 per cent over last year. I find that the salaries and retiring allowances for Manitoba penitentiary are larger by $27,000, an increase over last year's Estimates of 66 per cent. In the case of the British Columbia penitentiary the increase for salaries and retiring allowances is only $9,000, or an advance of 17 per cent compared with last year. In the case of Saskatchewan penitentiary the salaries and allowances are $29,000 more, or an increase of 75 per cent as compared with last year. There seems to be an anomaly here. If increases under this heading are required there should be, I submit—without knowing the reason for these variations, because they have not so far been explained—a general average for the whole service. That is to say that the reasons for an increase with respect to one institution should apply to practically all of the penitentiaries with regard to the same class of work.

Mr. DOHERTY: I think the hon. gentleman will find that, subject to particular circumstances in particular institutions—some of which I dealt with this afternoon when I think he was not present—increases attributable to the same causes worked out at a fairly average percentage. Taking first the increase of $275,000 in the total expense, the sum of $142,500 is required to provide for salaries and retiring gratuities. Of that amount over $100,000 is attributable to increases due to re-classification, $11,000 to promotions of keepers called for under the re-classification, $10,000 to the creation of a school teacher class; and $21,500 to increases in the staff due to increased population, and increases in gratuities resulting from the augmentation of salaries under re-classification. It has been found necessary, also attributable to the increase in our prison population, to make a provision of $24,000 additional for the maintenance of the convicts. That increase in the number of convicts is 391 in twenty-two months, or an increase of twenty-three per cent, and it is estimated that if that rate of increase should continue to March 1922 we would require a further vote. As to the remainder of the additional requirements, there is a sum of $15,000 to complete the work on a new boiler house at the Kingston penitentiary. Some of the boilers there have been in use for over thirty-five years, and we have endeavoured to get the last ounce of usefulness out of them. Now we find it is necessary to replace them and to construct, of course by convict labour, a new boiler house. We have also found it necessary to provide an estimate of $20,000 to cover possible additional cost for coal during the course of the year. Last year our experinece was that we had to pay very much higher prices than we had anticipated.

In Saskatchewan, as I pointed out, there is a much larger increase in the amount asked for than in the case of the other penitentiaries. I explained that, I think, before the hon. member came in. It is attributable to the fact that there we are completing new cell accommodation, which is absolutely necesary because of the increased number of prisoners, mainly due to our making that one penitentiary serve now not only for the province of Saskatchewan but in large measure for the province of Alberta, the balance of Alberta's convicts being provided for in the Manitoba penitentiary. The Alberta penitentiary having been closed this will necessarily work out a very material economy, though at the outset it necessitates some additional expenditures elsewhere. I think I have covered all the observations made by the hon. gentleman.

Mr. PEDLOW: While the minister has covered considerable territory, he has failed

to quite grasp my wishes in regard to information. I am sorry that I was not in the House this afternoon when he gave his explanation regarding the increase of $60,000 for land, building and equipment in connection with the Saskatchewan penitentiary. But I find there, as I have already said, increased salary and retiring allowances of $29,000, or an increase over last year of 75 per cent, as against only 19 per cent increase for Kingston and 17 per cent for British Columbia. I find too—

Mr. DOHERTY: Would the hon. gentleman allow me to deal with his questions one at a time?

Mr. PEDLOW: That is what I wanted the minister to do, but he covered the whole field.

Mr. DOHERTY: Let me take this one item of the greater percentage of increase of employees at the Saskatchewan penitentiary as compared with similar increases at the penitentiaries. The answer is to be found in what I have already pointed out, that the Saskatchewan penitentiary this year takes over a double burden. We had until the middle of last year an additional penitentiary in Alberta. We have closed that penitentiary and have transferred the bulk of its convicts to the Saskatchewan penitentiary, and of course with this abnormal increase of inmates there necessarily goes an unusual increase of employees to take charge of them. Then, furthermore,—and this applies to all the penitentiaries—we have had to increase the number of employees to meet the very strong representations—and I think justifiable representations—that we ought to make such provision for men tied down to the kind of work that our guards have to do as would enable us to give to each man at least every eighth day off. That would not account for the greater percentage increase in Saskatchewan, but it does account for the increase that runs through the number of employees. Then the classification has added very materially to what we have to pay those employees, and that has involved, as I explained also before the hon. gentleman came in, our making a larger estimate in looking forward to the gratuities that may have to be paid, because their amount is governed by the amount of the salaries paid. The classification also has carried with it the necessity of engaging a larger number of employees owing to the manner in which the duties are now distributed.

Mr. PEDLOW: I suppose, Mr. Chairman, the classification was inaugurated by the Griffenhagen Company or the Arthur Young Company.

Mr. DOHERTY: No, we entirely escaped the claws of the Griffenhagen.

Mr. PEDLOW: The minister evidently believes in Home Rule in penitentiaries as well as in other parts of the world. The next item is maintenance of convicts. I find that whereas in the Kingston penitentiary the maintenance increase is 14 per cent; in St. Vincent de Paul it is 40 per cent; in Dorchester it is 50 per cent, in Manitoba 66 per cent; in British Columbia there is no increase whatever; in Saskatchewan the increase is 66 per cent. I think whoever is in charge of the penitentiary in British Columbia deserves to be well paid for his services, because he is evidently managing that institution along the right lines.

Mr. DOHERTY: He manages it so well that he does not get more people coming in there, and that makes a great difference in the percentage increase of cost of maintaining the convicts. That percentage increase in Kingston is very much larger than in the other penitentiaries, but the simple explanation is that the percentage increase of population to be fed, clothed and provided for generally is very much greater in that institution than in the others. If I am not mistaken the percentage increase of population in the Kingston penitentiary is between 60 and 70 per cent; in St. Vincent de Paul I think it is about 48 per cent; and very naturally you have a difference in the percentage increase of cost of maintenance corresponding very accurately I think to the different percentage increase of population. In British Columbia they have no increase of population, and it is natural enough therefore that they should have no percentage increase in the cost of maintenance. Saskatchewan and Manitoba have had to divide between them the penitentiary population that in previous years had been provided for by the Alberta penitentiary, which has been closed; therefore this year they have an unusual percentage increase in expenditure of every kind that attaches to maintenance.

Mr. PEDLOW: I notice that although the cost of textiles, fabrics, etc., which would be used in connection with the industries carried on in the penitentiaries, is decreasing, the appropriations under

this head are in most cases considerably increased this year. For Kingston the increase under the head of "industries" is $10,000, or 66 per cent; for St. Vincent de Paul, 50 per cent; for Dorchester, 35 per cent; for Manitoba, 100 per cent. In British Columbia, where there is good management apparently, there is no increase at all. The person in charge there should receive the commendation of the Government; he must be running the institution along the right lines. In view of the fact that materials of all kinds are from 25 to 33⅓ per cent less expensive than last year, I cannot understand why these appropriations should be so much higher. In Saskatchewan the increase is only a slight one, about 8 per cent.

Mr. DOHERTY: The gentleman for whom my hon. friend has so great an admiration has no increase because he has had no increase in convicts; consequently, he has practically no increase to provide for his industries. The hon. gentleman says there should be a decrease because materials are lower, but the fact is that the bulk of the increase at Kingston, for instance, is for the purchase of machinery.

Mr. PEDLOW: Would machinery not cost less for the current year than it did last year?

Mr. DOHERTY: Last year we were not buying any, or very little. We are trying to develop these industries and we have had to procure machinery for that purpose. These are not things which we shall be buying every year, but that expenditure will have to be incurred in Kingston this year. The increase at St. Vincent de Paul under that head of $5,000, is explained by the fact that we are buying less machinery at St. Vincent than at Kingston. At Dorchester the industries are of less consequence and we are investing less in them. At Manitoba also the industries do not play the same important role that they do in the larger penitentiary in the East. We have a smaller provision made in British Columbia; as I say, the industries there are comparatively small. There is nothing in the way of development; therefore we have no additional outlay to make this year. In Saskatchewan the industries play a minor role, though there is an increase of $4,000; some machinery is required there, I believe, for the carpenter shop and the machine shop. But farming is the great industry of the Saskatchewan penitentiary.

Mr. PEDLOW: I would like, if possible, to get information with regard to the details of these different items; that is, how much the minister proposes to spend for machinery and farming implements for the different institutions, and how much for textiles, woollen materials, fabrics, and so on.

Mr. DOHERTY: I have not the information with me to-night, but I shall be glad to get it for the hon. gentleman.

Mr. PEDLOW: We should not pass these items without knowing how this money is to be spent. I suggest, therefore, that we report progress until such time as we have that information.

Mr. DOHERTY: Of course, if the hon. gentleman thinks he requires it, I shall be happy to get it for him, and if he thinks that these items should stand until we can get this additional information—if he deems that essential to the proper performance of his parliamentary duties—I suppose we shall have to suspend them for the time being. I suggest, then, that we pass to the agricultural items.

Mr. McKENZIE: We can make progress and deal with those later.

Mr. DOHERTY: If hon. gentlemen consent to that, I should be glad if the item could be passed; it is the last one I have. Hon. gentlemen may count upon it that I will furnish all this information and, if necessary, make an opportunity for giving it to them. Certainly the opportunity will be forthcoming on the Supplementary Estimates, if not on some other occasion.

Mr. CAHILL: Did I understand the minister to say that the increase in the number of convicts in the Kingston penitentiary is greater than the increase at St. Vincent de Paul?

Mr. DOHERTY: Yes, the increase at St. Vincent was from 465 to 554, and at Kingston the increase was between 60 and 70 per cent the present population being 721.

Mr. CAHILL: Can the minister give us any idea of the cause of the larger increase in Ontario as compared with Quebec?

Mr. DOHERTY: Well, it would be difficult for me to give the reason. It is fair to Ontario to say that the Kingston penitentiary does get a certain number of convicts who are not chargeable to Ontario—women for instance, and also those convicts who are looked upon as specially incorrigible or dangerous. It is thought that there is better provision in that penitentiary for assuring the detention of ex-

ceptionally violent people, and in that way you must not charge to Ontario all of the surplus population of Kingston penitentiary. Of course, I can appreciate that the hon. member for Pontiac (Mr. Cahill) looks for greater virtue in our province than in the other provinces.

Mr. CAHILL: The minister has apparently no idea that the restrictive legislation would have any bearing on the excessive number of convicts over those in other provinces.

Mr. DOHERTY: I do not know what restrictive legislation the hon. member is dealing with. We do not get in the penitentiaries, to any appreciable extent, offenders against prohibitory laws; such offenders go to the jails. The increasing severity of such a law ought not to find itself reflected in an increasing number in the penitentiaries. I do not know that an increased thirst would operate to increase the tendency to crime.

Mr. SINCLAIR (Guysborough): Referring to the Purchasing Commission, we were told by the minister that there were two commissioners, but he did not tell us how many of a staff these commissioners have employed.

Mr. DOHERTY: The staff and so forth of that commission is something entirely outside of my department. I would be glad to get the information, but I do not have it with me. I have not any personal contact with the direction of that department, and consequently, I have not that information.

Mr. SINCLAIR (Guysborough): It appears to apply generally to all the departments of the Government, including the department of the minister.

Mr. DOHERTY: It serves us also, only that I have no connection with its practical operations. It supervises my purchasing as it supervises all the purchasing of the Government; but I am never brought into contact with it, and I never had occasion to inquire how many employees it had. I shall be glad to get the information. The commission reports to the Minister of Finance (Sir Henry Drayton), and on some occasion when he is being subjected to the examination of the committee, I have no doubt he would be glad to furnish all details of that kind.

Mr. SINCLAIR (Guysborough): I would suggest that we have the Order in Council under which this commission is appointed. We have spent a good deal of time discussing this matter, and I should like to know just where we stand.

Mr. DOHERTY: I shall be glad to get it.

Mr. SINCLAIR (Guysborough): It has been pointed out to the minister that the authority of the Government to appoint this commission has been challenged by the hon. member for Cape Breton North and Victoria (Mr. McKenzie), who says that the Government has no authority to appoint any commission without a statute. While I have been in the House, I think the practice has been to come to Parliament for statutory authority to appoint commissions. That was the case until the war started, and then the War Measures Act was passed under which a large number of commissions were appointed. The War Measures Act has expired, and the Government has undertaken to appoint a commission without statutory authority, and if it can appoint this commission in that way, I presume it can appoint any commission. The question that makes this matter look a little serious is that on two occasions when the Government came to Parliament for authority to appoint this special commission, opposition developed to the proposal largely on the Government side of the House, and the Government found that it was probably unable to push the matter through. After several attempts to do so, the Bill of last year was withdrawn, and my recollection is that, after it was withdrawn and after Parliament prorogued about the 1st July, in that very same month, the Government, behind closed doors, without authority of Parliament, did the very thing which Parliament refused to give authority to do. The Government appointed a commission by Order in Council, and whether it had authority or not, I submit it was bad practice to do that. I want to ask the minister now, when he comes before the committee again with his Estimates, to produce the Order in Council under which that commission has been appointed.

Mr. DOHERTY: I shall be glad to see that the Order in Council is put before the House, but I confess I do not see that it is pertinent to my estimates. I have no desire in the world to avoid the fullest possible discussion of this question of the commission, but I cannot see the usefulness of attaching it to my estimates because that only creates an embarrassment. We have before us no definite question about this commission; we are trying to decide

whether I should be voted so much money to carry on the penitentiaries, and we tack on to that a discussion whether this commission was lawfully appointed or not. I think, in the interest of the discussion itself, it would be better that it should not be attached to something to which it has no special relevancy in any event. I do not want to enter upon a discussion, but I would like to point out one or two things in connection with the statement of the hon. gentleman. According to my judgment, the question is: what powers were given to the body that was called a commission? It is not because it was called a commission or was not called a commission that the Government had or had not power to appoint it. The question is: did the Government give to that body of men any powers which it was not authorized, as the executive Government of Canada, to give? In other words, as I look at the matter: had the Government the right to take precautions to have the purchasing of the different departments supervised? That is, at all events, the question as it presents itself to my mind. As to the second point of saying that Parliament had just refused to pass a statute and that we went out and appointed a commission which ought to have been appointed under that statute, if hon. gentlemen will look up the Estimates of last year, they will see that Parliament voted us a sum of money, I think it was $50,000—I have forgotten the exact amount—for the establishment of that commisssion.

Mr. VIEN: Would the minister say that the vote of a sum of money would give impliedly the right to the Government to appoint a commission?

Mr. DOHERTY: I have always understood that a vote by Parliament of money to be employed by the Government for a specific purpose necessarily involves authority to the Government to do that specific thing. There is another question which the hon. gentleman raised; that is, whether, assuming that we could constitute that commission, we should have gone to the Civil Service Commission to appoint the individuals. I would be happy to discuss all those questions in proper time and place, but I would suggest that, perhaps, the committee might be willing to act upon the suggestion of the hon. member for Cape Breton North and Victoria (Mr. McKenzie) and let this one item, which is the last item I have, pass, with the assurance that upon the Supplementary Estimates, or if I have to make a special occasion, I will give a further opportunity for discussion about the penitentiary purchases; I will procure for the hon. member for Renfrew South (Mr. Pedlow) the information he desires, and if the hon. member for Lotbiniere (Mr. Vien) desires special information about the special items he has mentioned, I will furnish it.

Mr. VIEN: I will not insist upon the details. I only wanted to point out to the minister what occurred to my mind, namely, that a proper system of purchasing should be instituted. The minister told us that the purchases were made through a commission, and naturally we wished to know the character of the commission, information which the minister could not give us. Would the minister be good enough to lay on the Table the Order in Council so that it will be available for the information of the whole House? That would apply not only to the commission created by that Order in Council of 1920, but to all commissions to which the minister has referred to-night.

Mr. DOHERTY: I think the Orders in Council have been laid on the Table on different occasions. I will, however, see that the hon. gentleman gets copies of both.

Mr. CAHILL: Is the commission a permanent or a temporary commission? I ask that question because, if it is a permanent commission and the minister is shielding himself behind this commission, we might be more critical of the Estimates than we would be if the minister were prepared to furnish the House with information as to expenditure in his department.

Mr. DOHERTY: There is nothing permanent in the sense that that commission could not be dispensed with to-morrow if it was thought desirable to do that. There is no fixed period of time—I am speaking from memory, but I feel pretty confident—for which these gentlemen are appointed. However, we will be better able to discuss that when we have the papers before us.

Mr. VIEN: The minister knows that the appointment of a servant of the state by Order in Council creates what is known as a permanent civil servant, as distinguished from a civil servant temporarily employed under the authority of a minister, and I think if we take the ordinary meaning of the word "permanent" as applied to a civil servant or a commission under the Crown, this is a permanent commission as dis-

tinguished from a commission appointed for a specific purpose.

Mr. DOHERTY: I will find out whether it is or is not a permanent commission, and then we will not have to take time discussing what the meaning of the word is. As I said before, I am not here with the information at my finger tips, but I will see that it is procured.

Mr. CAHILL: I wish to ask the minister one more question about the commission?

The CHAIRMAN: The chairman has been very lenient to-night, but he must now rule that the constitution of the commission and of previous commissions, while the matter has been allowed to be discussed, is not strictly relevant. The right hon. Minister of Justice has pointed out that fact three or four times, and the chairman must now so rule.

Mr. CAHILL: I was just going to ask whether in future all purchases are to be made through this commission?

Mr. DOHERTY: So long as the commission exists, my department will welcome its supervision. We have no desire in the wide world but to have our operations submitted to all possible supervision. As I have already said—I may be blameworthy in that respect, but it never occurred to me that this was a matter to be dealt with in all the fullness of detail incidentally to the penitentiary Estimates—I am not prepared this evening to give the details with regard to this commission, to discuss its constitution, its past, and above all its possible future, but I shall be glad to discuss that question some other time.

Mr. PROULX: This afternoon we voted the salary for a purchasing agent for the Department of Justice. Now if all the purchases are to be made through a commission, I do not see the necessity of having a purchasing agent for the department.

Mr. DOHERTY: It may be it is unnecessary, but this is what was thought was wise: although the departments were empowered to do their purchasing, it was thought a wise thing to have the purchasers supervised and to have some co-ordination. I do not say those are the words in which the commission was appointed, but that is the purpose for which it was appointed. We have a number of departments with purchasing agents, and it was thought desirable that you should have some centre that would both see what was going on, supervise what was going on, and give direction as to how purchases could best be made. It is possible that was not absolutely necessary, but at all events, wisely or unwisely, it was thought to be a useful precaution. But that does not alter the fact that the purchaser retains his functions as purchaser for his particular department. The only difference is that he carries out his work under his general supervision.

Mr. PEDLOW: I appreciate what the minister has said as to not being prepared to give detailed information to-night, and in view of that I would suggest that the committee rise and report progress. I should like, however, to ask a question regarding the penitentiary in Alberta. I find that $5,000 is provided for that institution in the Estimates for the current year. I was under the impression that this institution had been closed up.

Mr. DOHERTY: It has been closed up, but we still own the property, and there is need for a watchman in charge, and certain other small expenses in connection with taking care of the property. It is a very valuable property, and we hope to dispose of it to very considerable advantage. We are asking this vote of $5,000 so that we may have something at our disposal to enable us to take care of the property. It may not all be spent.

Mr. PEDLOW: Has this property been advertised for sale?

Mr. DOHERTY: Yes, and tenders were called for, but we got no offers that commended themselves to our judgment. I have had the property valued by a gentleman absolutely disinterested, and most highly commended to me, and he puts a very substantial value on the property, but it does not seem to be a fortunate moment to dispose of it. Therefore, we think it is the part of wisdom to hold the property in the meantime and naturally that entails some small expense in taking care of it.

Mr. VIEN: If I read aright the Government's publication there is a substantial reduction in the cost of material and of living generally, but in the Estimates under working expenses and other headings connected with the penitentiaries I find considerable increases. Does not the minister expect that within the coming year there will be a considerable, or at least a certain reduction along these lines?

Mr. DOHERTY: We hope for a reduction in the cost of living, but if the cost of living keeps going down and the number

of people you have to feed keeps increasing, you cannot expect to feed them on a lesser amount. As to working expenses, if the hon. gentleman had been in the House a little while ago, he would have learned that under this heading are many items that are not affected by the cost of living. For instance, this year, as I explained, we are purchasing in connection with industries a certain quantity of machinery necessary for their operation. These are not things that will be purchased every year, but this year we are seeking to develop our work and have provided for this machinery. But we cannot make comparisons from year to year of expenses of that kind. I had tried to make that clear.

Mr. VIEN: The minister says that he does not expect to have to purchase every year the machinery that he will purchase this year. Does he purchase machinery for all penitentiaries?

Mr. DOHERTY: No.

Mr. VIEN: Do the working expenses show an increase for all penitentiaries?

Mr. DOHERTY: I shall be glad to begin all over again and go over the details, but it does seem a little unfortunate that hon. gentlemen should keep on passing in and out while I am giving explanations.

Mr. VIEN: I withdraw the question.

Mr. DOHERTY: I try to explain these items as well as I can, but I shall be glad to repeat anything that has not been understood.

Some hon. MEMBERS: Dispense.

Mr. FIELDING: Take it as read.

Mr. CAHILL: Is the minister sure that the item in the miscellaneous list will be passed by the Minister of Finance? In what way will these items be passed? I refer to page 64.

Mr. DOHERTY: My past experience has been that we have never asked for anything under this head—they are only small amounts—which the Minister of Finance or any one else called upon to pass them, has not found to be unreasonable. For example, I do not think it is an unreasonable thing that we should ask for $300 for possible unforeseen expenses in connection with Dorchester penitentiary. I should think that would commend itself as reasonable.

[Mr. Doherty.]

Mr. CAHILL: I do not think the minister grasps my point. I find under the general item of miscellaneous in the Estimates there is an item of $80,000 for the Purchasing Commission, I merely wish to know how we are to ascertain which minister will pass these items.

Mr. DOHERTY: I have explained that. As I understand it, the Purchasing Commission reports to the Minister of Finance and—

Mr. CAHILL: The Minister of Finance will pass the item?

Mr. DOHERTY: I anticipate there will be no difficulty in having the items passed upon.

Item agreed to.

Agriculture—International Institute of Agriculture, $10,000.

Mr. PROULX: What work is done in connection with this item?

Mr. TOLMIE: The work carried on by this institute is in connection with the International Bureau of Agriculture which has its headquarters in Rome. All the principal nations in the world are represented, and our branch in Ottawa handles the business for Canada. It handles crop reports received from headquarters. The institute furnishes information concerning supplies of various agricultural products throughout the world, prospects for the future, the growing of crops, probable yields and various statistics of a similar character. We maintain a valuable library in which all this information is gathered for the use of the department or for any one interested.

Item agreed to.

Live Stock, $1,000,000.

Mr. PROULX: What is the reason for the increase this year?

Mr. TOLMIE: The increase is due to increased travelling expenses, additions to some exhibitions that have qualified under the standard for such exhibitions during the past year, to necessary extension work, to the execution of policies already under way, and to general development along these lines. A sum of $25,000 has been set aside to meet probable expansions during the coming year.

Mr. PROULX: The minister spoke the other night about some sires the department lends to different counties. He said that we would deal with this subject when

we reached this item. How many sires are lent altogether to farmers' clubs?

Mr. TOLMIE: There have been lent to two hundred clubs 2,963 head.

Mr. JOHNSTON: About two months ago, early in January, a club was formed in Last Mountain constituency and they made application for a sire. That application was turned down in the first instance, the departmental officers expressing the opinion that the club did not need assistance because they were able to buy an animal for themselves. The matter was referred to me and I got into communication with the department, with the result that they reconsidered their decision and agreed to supply an animal. So far, however, that has not been done, at least to my knowledge. The last intimation I had was that the chief of the cattle branch had gone west and hoped to be able to purchase an animal at the spring sales. Two evenings ago, while discussing these Estimates, the member for Dorchester (Mr. Cannon), informed the committee that some time ago about eighty animals had been supplied to his constituency. Now, the people in my constituency will wonder why it is that it takes them so long to get one animal when eighty can be supplied to some other constituency. Of course, I am aware, that this did not take place during the present minister's regime. Nevertheless, it is the business of his department, and I felt rather keenly the fact that my constituents were not accorded the treatment they deserve. So far as I know, the club at Davidson, Saskatchewan, is the only one in that constituency, and these people are naturally anxious to go ahead. As a matter of fact, they intend building silos and going into the dairy industry in good shape, and I hope the minister will see that their application is honoured and that they are supplied with a sire at an early date.

Mr. TOLMIE: If this club is qualified, as the hon. member says, there should be no serious delay in supplying it with an animal. Our buyers have been purchasing at the spring sales. One was held at Regina this week, and a number of bulls were purchased, so that my hon. friends constituents will suffer no further delay. However, I shall look into the matter and expedite it as well as I can.

Mr. PROULX: Are these bulls obtained in this country, or are they imported?

Mr. TOLMIE: They are bred in Canada and bought at the sales here, and what we cannot obtain at sales we purchase privately.

Mr. PROULX: Are different breeds supplied?

Mr. TOLMIE: We supply any breed demanded by a club, but if any club secures an animal for two or three years and then gets another, we do not permit any change in the breed, because we do not encourage cross breeding. We like to keep to certain lines and develop that particular type of animal.

Mr. PROULX: The minister said the other night that these animals were lent for a period of three or four years. At the end of that term, should they not be returned, what action does the department take?

Mr. TOLMIE: Of course, we see that they are returned at the end of the term. They are usually sold by the agent for beef if they are not fit for further use, but if they are, they are lent to some other club.

Mr. PROULX: I think the hon. member for Dorchester said last year that some of those lent to his county were not returned.

Mr. TOLMIE: That was before my time.

Mr. PROULX: Does the minister know what became of those bulls?

Mr. TOLMIE: No. I understand this occurred about four years ago. I cannot give the details as to the disposition of these bulls offhand, but I will be glad to look it up and if the hon. member cares for further information I will be very pleased to give it to him.

Mr. PROULX: I certainly would like the information, because if the statement of the hon. member for Last Mountain (Mr. Johnston) is true that eighty head were loaned to the county of Dorchester when the rest of us cannot get any stock for our counties I think we should know what became of them.

Mr. TOLMIE: There was no such number as eighty head loaned to Dorchester county. I never heard of any county getting that number. Altogether, there were only a few bulls, but I cannot offhand give the exact number as the transaction occurred some years ago.

Mr. JOHNSTON: The statement with which I am credited did not originate from me. I simply repeated what the hon. mem-

ber for Dorchester (Mr. Cannon) said the other evening.

Mr. CAHILL: Before the item passes I wish to ask the acting leader of the Government if it is intended to take up any other estimates this evening.

Mr. DOHERTY: I do not think we will ask the committee to take up any other estimates after the passage of the few remaining estimates of the Department of Agriculture.

Mr. TOLMIE: I would like to finish the Estimates of the Department of Agriculture. Only two or three items now remain.

Mr. VIEN: Will the minister explain what he proposes to do with this vote of $1,000,000.

Mr. TOLMIE: With pleasure. First of all we spend money in federal assistance to horse breeding. That is we form stallion clubs throughout the country giving them a certain bonus amounting to about one-third of the cost to assist them in securing animals of high value and in improving the quality of the horse stock of the country. These animals must all pass a careful examination by a veterinarian, must be free from hereditary disease, and be of good weight and good quality. I may say that this is along the line of what is known as the Scotch Premium system for improving horse stock and has been followed with great success in Great Britain.

Mr. VIEN: What amount is to be devoted to that particular purpose?

Mr. TOLMIE: It will amount to about $90,000 altogether this year in that particular line.

Mr. VIEN: How long has the system been in force?

Mr. TOLMIE: It has been in force about four years. In addition to that, we have a distribution of pure bred sires which I described, I think, the other evening. Under this plan in any district where there are no pure bred sires to be obtained the farmers are permitted to form clubs of ten, and on making proper application to our department we will furnish them with a pure bred sire, loan it to them absolutely free, ship it to the district and pay the freight to the nearest
11 p.m. station. The animals must be maintained by the club and the loan will be for a period of from two to three years. The benefits particularly derived are these: First, it improves the quality of the cattle in that district; and after five or six years instead of having a number of scrub cattle there we find animals that are pretty well graded up and of fairly good quality. In the second place it is an educational feature of very great value inasmuch as it educates every member of that club to the value of using a pure bred sire. I may say that last year of the cattle inspected and killed in our inspected abattoirs less than ten per cent were fit for export to Europe, showing how necessary it is to raise the quality of our cattle in this country.

Mr. VIEN: What is the amount of that item?

Mr. TOLMIE: This year the amount is $60,000.

Mr. VIEN: What system of supervision is followed to ensure that the animal is maintained in good condition?

Mr. TOLMIE: Inspectors visit these various places and inspect the bulls from time to time. Unless they are maintained in proper condition they are taken away and that club's license is cancelled.

Mr. VIEN: Are the animals returned on demand from the department?

Mr. TOLMIE: Yes, they are returned to the department, and, as I pointed out before, are loaned to new clubs or, if their usefulness is over, are sold for beef and the money turned over to the department. In addition to that we have the "Canadian record of performance," which is a system whereby we carry on tests of pure bred dairy cattle throughout the country. For instance, a dairyman has a pure bred dairy herd and he wishes that herd to establish a reputation as a producing herd. On application we send a man to his premises, and he goes through a certain form in entering one, two, three, four, or five cows —whatever number he happens to have at that time. This man instructs the owner in the work to be carried on. The cow's milk is recorded every day. If she is milked twice, it is marked twice; whatever number of times she is milked is recorded. The information is all marked down on a sheet which is kept in the stable in a prominent place. Then our inspector visits the premises regularly from six to eight times a year, takes tests of the butter fat of these herds and carefully inspects the figures regarding the cows, comparing them with the notes he has taken during the

two days he remains on the premises. At the end of the year he is able to tell the amount of the milk yield, and also the amount of butter fat produced by each animal. This system is very valuable indeed in several respects. In the first place it vastly increases the value of that man's herd. I may mention that we have had one cow in British Columbia that produced as high as 33,000 pounds in a year. Similar results, or very nearly as good, have been obtained in other parts of Canada. Such a record gives that cow in that particular locality a special value; not only so, but when the farmer goes into a herd produced from a pure bred sire he is able to look at the record in the pedigree of that animal, and procure a producing animal rather than one which is simply a good looking animal but not descended from producing stock. We are having very great success in connection with this system. Quite a large number of animals have been entered in this record of performance and the number is increasing every year. Up to the present time we have had 15,960 applicants.

Mr. VIEN: What is the amount to be expended for that purpose?

Mr. TOLMIE: $23,880 this year. We likewise have what is known as the car lot policy. I pointed out a moment ago that there are thousands of head of cattle passing through our inspected abattoirs that are unfit to compete in the British market with Argentine or Australian produced beef. The number that is fit amounts to less than ten per cent. These cattle come to our abattoirs in a thin condition, not properly finished and small in size, so that we are doing all that we possibly can to encourage the finishing of livestock in this country. We have therefore introduced what is known as the car lot policy to help to improve cattle along these lines. We will pay the reasonable expenses of a man from the country down to the nearest livestock market and back again, providing he purchases down there one carload of upwards of fifty cattle to take back to his farm.

Mr. VIEN: On what basis is the subsidy given to the man who purchases a car lot of cattle to be finished?

Mr. TOLMIE: We simply pay him his ordinary expenses into the market and out again.

Mr. VIEN: Do you pay the freight going and coming?

Mr. TOLMIE: Not unless he takes breeding animals. This is simply his own fare and reasonable hotel expenses.

Mr. VIEN: The item involves an expenditure of how much?

Mr. TOLMIE: About $4,000. Then we have what might be called our rescue policy. During the dry years throughout our western country thousands of young female cattle, sheep and swine that were sent to market either for export to the United States or to be taken by the abattoirs were in such poor condition that when dressed they weighed only from 250 to 350 pounds per head, whereas well-matured animals should dress easily up to 800 pounds. We paid the freight on those animals back to the country points, and in that way since the introduction of that policy we have been able to rescue some 65,000 head of cattle, 60,000 ewes and 350 sows, which are now back on the farms and being used for breeding purposes. Last year on account of two very dry seasons in succession in the southern parts of Alberta and Saskatchewan, followed by a very heavy winter which began early in the fall and did not let up until pretty well on in April, if the settlers had been left to their own resources the losses of cattle would have been tremendous. We co-operated with the Provincial Governments and with the railway companies and paid the freight on hay from many other points in Canada for the relief of those cattle. The amount paid out by this department for that particular work was around $500,000. That was one-third of the total, the other two-thirds being contributed by the provincial governments and by the railway companies.

Mr. VIEN: That included freight on the feed?

Mr. TOLMIE: Yes, just simply to carry out our rescue policy. I understand that in some other departments of the Government it was found necessary to give food to the people themselves.

Mr. VIEN: Was that on the basis of a loan or a grant?

Mr. TOLMIE: A grant. It was simply a case of rescuing those cattle that otherwise would have perished, and many farmers in those sections would have been ruined.

Mr. VIEN: Is it contemplated to continue that help?

Mr. TOLMIE: No. We have been blessed with one of the best winters we have had

in the West for many years, and cattle are coming in in such good condition that many car loads of good fat grass cattle are going to market three or four weeks earlier than last year.

Mr. VIEN: Out of the $975,000 which was expended last year, I understand there was an item of $505,000 for the purpose just mentioned by the minister.

Mr. TOLMIE: No, this is an extra item not included in that particular one. It was in the Supplementary Estimates last year.

Mr. REID (Mackenzie): Have the members of a cattle club any opportunity to make a selection of the bull or bulls which they require? The reason I ask the question is that I have seen several of the Shorthorn bulls put out by the Department of Agriculture, and they are not up to the size they ought to be. As a consequence many of our fat steers are not fit for export, and if we do not have a heavy type of sire, especially for the beef breed, we will not get the heavy export steer.

Mr. TOLMIE: Nearly all these bulls are yearlings, Mr. Chairman, and unless they are carefully taken care of they will not develop as rapidly as they should. But I think the real cause of the steers not being fit for export, particularly where a pure bred sire is used, is that in many cases the feeding of these animals in their younger years is not carried out as well as it might be. In fact, we all know that in some of the range sections where the grass is pretty well eaten out, the cattlemen depend too much in winter time on a diet of oxygen for their stock and do not give them enough feed.

Mr. VIEN: What were the regulations under which that grant of $500,000 was distributed?

Mr. REID (Mackenzie): I still maintain that I am quite right in my statement that the bulls which I have seen, especially the Shorthorns, are not of the heavy type. I should add that this was of course before my hon. friend was in charge of the department. I do not care how well you feed the small type, Mr. Chairman, you will never get the weight in the steer that you will if you have the heavy beef type.

Mr. TOLMIE: These bulls are what might be called the ordinary field bulls. We do not buy the very highest type of thick low Shorthorn bulls, because they would run into too much money to cross with scrub cows. However, these Shorthorns are coming down in price now and we will be able to get a very much better quality of animal than we have been able to secure in the past. I admit that some of the bulls sent out by the department have not come up to the handle because with the very high prices prevailing and the keen demand for Shorthorn cattle it was difficult to get the proper type; and, besides, in many cases people demanded the dairy type of Shorthorn.

Mr. GOULD: I understand that the discretion which the members of a horse club themselves have as to the type of heavy draft horse they will breed, that is, Clydesdale, Percheron, Shire, or others of that nature, does not extend to the lighter grades of horses.

Mr. TOLMIE: It only extends to the heavy class of horses because the motor car has had a very serious effect on the light type of horse in this country. For the heavy horse there is always a good market. In some sections of the country there is such a great excess of light horses that we have tried to sell them in Europe in the shape of corned beef in barrels and in boxes, without any great success. I think last year the number of animals of this type which could not be used or sold ran to something like 26,000 head in Alberta, and in British Columbia we have large numbers of light horses and many bands of them running absolutely wild in the valleys. Therefore, on account of the very slight demand for this type we have not encouraged its breeding. Good road horses are still in demand, and also horses that can be used for hunting or saddle purposes.

Mr. GOULD: If a club commences with a Clydesdale horse, does the department demand that the club shall continue the breeding of Clydesdales?

Mr. TOLMIE: We use our best efforts to have them continue along those lines.

Mr. SINCLAIR (Guysborough): I should like to get some information from the minister about the clubs that he spoke of as being formed for the purpose of getting stallions for horse breeding. I am not sure that I understood exactly what he said in regard to them. I remember that last year a delegation from my own constituency representing local horse breeders came to Ottawa with the idea of endeavouring to comply with the regulation of the department in order to get one

of the grants mentioned by the minister. I understand that some difficulty had been experienced in complying with the regulations on account of the number of farmers who had to sign before anything was done. Is it the case that ten owners of horses are sufficient to form a club?

Mr. TOLMIE: Yes, there must be ten owners in these clubs, and we assist them by paying one third of the fee.

Mr. SINCLAIR (Guysborough): What I want to know is whether the rules have been modified recently.

Mr. TOLMIE: No, I do not think they have been modified; we have found them acceptable all over the country. I should be very glad to furnish the hon. gentleman with a copy of the rules, and also to meet him and give him any further details he may desire.

Mr. PEDLOW: If an animal loaned for breeding purposes dies while in possession of the farmers' club, who stands the loss?

Mr. TOLMIE: We do. We see, however, that the sire is kept in proper shape. We have travelling inspectors who inspect them from time to time.

Mr. PEDLOW: And if the animal died from neglect or abuse or lack of proper care, what then?

Mr. TOLMIE: We stand the loss, and in a case of that kind the man responsible would never be furnished with another of these animals. But with our system of inspection we usually get there before the trouble goes so far.

Mr. PROULX: These animals are not insured?

Mr. TOLMIE: No.

Mr. VIEN: Will the minister give me now the information for which I asked?

Mr. TOLMIE: The amount of freight paid was totalled up and we paid our share, one third, the provincial government and the railways each paying one third.

Mr. VIEN: Who distributed the money?

Mr. TOLMIE: Our Live Stock Branch took care of our end of it.

Mr. VIEN: Item 49 does not include any expenditure of the kind referred to by the minister.

Mr. TOLMIE: No, it does not include this special relief work.

Mr. VIEN: It seems to me that we are still very far from a million dollars, the amount of this vote.

Mr. TOLMIE: Oh, I had not finished. In addition to that we carry on a cattle market system, a system of district promoters. All our livestock yards are under propert regulation; we control them in everything they do—in the handling of feed, the fees charged, and so on. We see that the yards are kept in a sanitary condition. In this respect I think we are considerably in advance of our friends to the south of the line. On the 14th of January of this year I attended a meeting held in El Paso, Texas. I attended a similar meeting held there about four years ago, and at that time they were clamouring for such regulations as we now have. When I went down there last year I found they had not even then secured the adoption of such regulations; so we have made good progress along this line. We have a system under which we issue market intelligence from these different yards and furnish market prices that are accepted by the press throughout Canada. The information is sent from one yard to another and to the head office in Ottawa, and we have found that the effect has been beneficial in stabilizing the livestock markets of this country. In addition to that we have promoters out in the country who are encouraging the farmers to sell co-operatively, and the effect has been very marked, particularly in the Maritime Provinces, where the farmers get together and ship co-operatively in carload lots to such markets as Montreal and Toronto, thus securing much better prices than would be received had the animals been sold locally. This has been carried on in connection with our sheep and lamb markets, with very good results. Then, we have assisted in wool grading. We began by grading the wool for our local sheep associations, some of which have now formed a central association with headquarters in Toronto. They handle a large proportion of the wool produced in Canada through a central wool warehouse, and I am glad to learn that they have sold all the wool that has been placed in their hands up to the present time.

Mr. VIEN: What is the nature of the assistance given by the department?

Mr. TOLMIE: We began by assisting these associations, doing the wool grading. At first we did it in the field in various sections of the country from the Atlantic

to the Pacific; now we do most of it in the central warehouse at Toronto. Very much better prices have been obtained through the sale of this wool co-operatively rather than through itinerant dealers. In some cases the wool is worth about twice as much as it was at the time it was clipped; in fact we are now getting from 24 to 26 cents as compared with about 15 cents at the beginning of the season.

Mr. VIEN: Is the central warehouse a government property?

Mr. TOLMIE: No, it is rented by this association. What we have been able to do through this wool warehouse compares well with what has been done in the United States. While we have been able to dispose of all our wool, only from 30 to 40 per cent of the pooled wool in the United States has yet been sold. Another thing has been gained as a result of our grading; we find that our Canadian manufacturers are using more Canadian wool this year than they ever did before, and the wool owners, hearing about the success of this co-operative associations, have started the movement of their wool through the co-operative warehouse.

Mr. VIEN: How much is the Government spending for that purpose?

Mr. TOLMIE: On the wool grading service this year, about $8,000. In connection with the handling of eggs, we have formed egg circles throughout the country, through which last year we were able to sell 300,000 dozen eggs out of a total export of 600,000 dozen. This system is carried out in a big way in Prince Edward Island, New Brunswick, Nova Scotia and Ontario. The farmers agree to market co-operatively through a collector. These egg circles join other egg circles, secure a paid salesman and market to the best of their ability, thus securing very much better prices by keeping their eggs in proper condition. Under the old system they took their eggs into the country store and traded them for groceries, and as the eggs were often retained there for much longer period than they should have been, the city consumer was not always satisfied when the product finally reached his table.

We have had developments along similar lines in connection with dressed poultry. We are also carrying on a system of market reports in connection with the egg business, so that producers are continually informed as to egg market prices and are thus always able to get the best prices. We also carry on egg inspection for interprovincial movement and export; that is, eggs passing from one province to another and eggs that are exported to Great Britain. We are also carrying on now a record of performance for poultry. That is something that was not thought of in past years. We have set two standards—the hen that will lay 150 eggs in a year or a flock that will average 150 eggs per bird for a general record, and then the accredited hen with a high record of 225 eggs per year. The owners of hens producing those numbers of eggs are given a certificate to that effect, and cockerels or young roosters are registered when they come from dams possessing such records. In that way we produce a high standard of poultry, and by careful selection and breeding we have been able to bring the production of a single hen all the way from an average of 65 to 300 eggs in a year. Let me give an illustration to show what that is worth. If the produce of the 40,000,000 hens in Canada to-day could be increased by only one dozen eggs per hen in a year, that would amount to nearly $13,000,000 a year, so that it can be seen that there is an immense field ahead of us in increasing the production of our poultry.

Mr. VIEN: What is the nature of your service and assistance in that line?

Mr. TOLMIE: As regards the improvement of the eggs, the work is carried on at our experimental farms, and as regards the hen registration, the records are taken by representatives of our Poultry Branch which is connected with the livestock Department.

Mr. VIEN: Is there any grant?

Mr. TOLMIE: No, but there are wages, travelling expenses and so forth to pay in that connection.

Mr. VIEN: For the officials?

Mr. TOLMIE: In connection with the livestock service, we control the export under the Livestock and Livestock Products Act. The operations of stock yard management and the fees are controlled by our department. The operations of members of commission firms are under our department. The commission men are bonded, so that in the event of a commission man making a sale of cattle and getting away with the funds, we can recover. We carry on a bying service for farmers. Our representatives are always at the yards, and if a man is inexperienced in taking over a lot of cattle, he can go to one of our men who will give his assistance and start him on his way, and also give him information how to ship to the best advantage.

Mr. LONG: As regards the bonding of these commissioned men, I understand a little while ago there was a serious failure in connection with one of these firms in Winnipeg. How is the amount of the bond established? Is there a sliding scale, or is the bond just a fixed one?

Mr. TOLMIE: There is no sliding scale; the fixed sum is $10,000. We have been carrying on a system of exhibits at exhibitions. Many hon. members who have visited our big exhibitions have, no doubt, seen our exhibits of wool and eggs, candling eggs, and also some very temping looking samples of lamb and pork which were made of plaster of Paris and properly painted so that they made a very good imitation of the real article, the idea being to show the people the particular types demanded by the market and the most profitable ones to produce.

We have given grants to our summer fairs, and this year we have set aside a sum of $98,000 while the sum set aside for grants to winter fairs amounts to $25,000. We add prorata to the amount given by the fair in prizes up to $5,000. If a fair will give $2,500 in prizes, we add dollar for dollar to that. These winter fairs are fat stock shows, and this assistance is given with a view to encouraging the finishing of our cattle.

Mr. VIEN: Do you give these grants to all country fairs?

Mr. TOLMIE: No, only to those that can qualify under the cash system.

Mr. VIEN: What is the minimum in prizes that the local fair has to put up?

Mr. TOLMIE: A summer fair must pay at least $4,000 of its own money for livestock before receiving assistance.

Mr. VIEN: Are those grants limited to livestock?

Mr. TOLMIE: Livestock and poultry. We figure that the smaller country fairs come within the purview of the Provincial Government. We are giving our assistance to the big exhibitions. We are giving $25,000 a year to the Royal Agricultural Winter Fair Association of Toronto. This is a new exhibition established there along the lines of the big international show in Chicago. The big show in Chicago is one that has rendered a very valuable service to the livestock interests on both sides of the line, and on some occasions our Canadian breeders have been able to go over and compete with American breeders and win out. Anyone visiting that show would be astounded at the size of it and the high quality of the cattle exhibited there.

Mr. VIEN: May I point out to the minister the advisability of the department assisting these county fairs, not only the livestock or poultry ones, but all country fairs? As I pointed out when discussing the item of experimental farms the other night, very few methods of assisting agriculture generally are more progressive and practical than these county fairs which permit farmers to get together in the principal place in the county and see what has been done by the best and most progressive farmers of the districts. These county affairs are assisted by the Provincial Governments, but I think the Federal Government should also give assistance along that line. Last year, for instance, I tried to obtain a grant for the county fair of Lotbinière, which is one of the finest county fairs in my section of the province and which has been commended by the local Minister of Agriculture for its progressive methods. I would like the Department of Agriculture to take these county fairs into consideration and to see whether they could not divert some of the money or ask a vote from Parliament for assisting these county fairs in their local exhibitions.

Mr. STEIN: I should like to endorse the suggestion of my hon. friend from Lotbinière, not only as regards his county, but also the county of Kamouraska, of which I have spoken twice already during the discussion of the Estimates of this department. At St. Pascal, the county seat of Kamouraska, we not only hold a county fair each year, but we have there a large, splendid permanent building, built especially for exhibiting cattle. The father of my hon. friend from South Quebec (Mr. Power), who died last fall, had a farm in the county of Kamouraska and he was in the habit of exhibiting a great many thoroughbred cattle in this building at the county seat. I think in view of all the efforts that have been made in the past by the people of the county of Kamouraska for the development of agriculture, they should certainly receive some share of the money that is allotted by the department for these fairs.

Mr. FAFARD: Notwithstanding what has been said by my hon. friend from Lotbinière and my hon. friend from Kamouraska, their county fairs are not to be compared with the county fair we have in L'Islet.

Mr. VIEN: I take strong objection to that statement.

Mr. STEIN: Kamouraska is the only county that has a permanent fair building.

Mr. FAFARD: If I can persuade the minister to make a grant towards the fair in our county, I shall be very glad.

Mr. SINCLAIR (Queen's, P.E.I.): Those of us who are interested in a practical way in agriculture have heard with pleasure the description that has been given by the minister of the activities of the Livestock Branch in the marketing of livestock and livestock products. I think we in Eastern Canada have probably come closer to the officials and have had a better opportunity of seeing how the money was expended among the farmers to encourage co-operative marketing than have other parts of Canada, and I want particularly to say that a great deal of benefit has been derived during the past few years, and especially during the past season, through the assistance of the department's representatives in the marketing of livestock. There is one thing that the farmers in our co-operative associations are not very expert in, and that is in securing proper means of transportation over long distances. In that respect we have received a great deal of benefit during the past year from the livestock representative stationed at Moncton. We have also received a great deal of benefit in a general way from the Poultry Branch. I find on looking over the Estimates that the minister has brought down that the appropriation for the general conduct of the department this year is smaller than last year by about $250,000. The large item of $390,000 for the Health of Animals Branch represent an increase, but there have been decreases in the other items. I hope it is not the intention of the minister in any way to decrease the staff in the marketing or Livestock Branch, who are assisting the farmers in the marketing of livestock, hogs, sheep, poultry and eggs. It is important from the standpoint of the agriculturists of Eastern Canada that the expenditure on that work be increased. If we do not keep pace with the times and follow up the work that has already been done, we are apt to lose the benefit of what has already been accomplished. Speaking from personal knowledge of conditions in Eastern Canada, I think this Parliament and the people of this country generally would endorse the expenditure of more money in giving assistance to farmers' associations that have organized themselves in a co-operative way to reach the larger markets of Canada. As is well known to the members of this House, in marketing our livestock it is necessary for the farmers in Eastern Canada to ship to the city of Montreal, where the nearest stockyard and abattoir are located. We have none closer to take care of the surplus stock for which there is not a market in Eastern Canada, and it is necessary that the assistance that has been given during the past year be increased next season. If I judge correctly the sentiment of our people, and the progressive spirit they are showing in co-operating with the agents of the department in marketing their livestock, I am sure that a larger number of stock will be shipped to the stockyards of Montreal and Toronto next year than during the past year. I would particularly urge upon the minister to persuade, if possible, his associates in the Government to allow him a little more money than he has asked for in his Estimates for the development and carrying on the work of the Livestock Branch.

Mr. REID (Mackenzie): I wish to say a word in reference to the bonding of livestock commission men on the stock yards. The minister said that they were bonded so as to safeguard the stockmen who ship their stock to the yards against loss and so that they would be sure of receiving their money, but that is not always the result. Reference has already been made by the hon. member for Battleford to the failure of a firm in Winnipeg last fall. I have been informed that several stockmen lost heavily on shipments of stock through the failure of that firm. I think a bond of about $10,000 is not sufficient; the amount ought to be very considerably increased.

I also wish to say a word or two in regard to the work of some of the officials of the Live Stock Branch, and particularly in regard to the work being done by the official stationed in the city of Winnipeg. Mr. Johnson is doing excellent work there in educating the farmers to ship on the co-operative plan. The farmers will accompany a carload of steers to the stock yards, and in that way they see just what a fat steer ought to look like, and learn to judge just when their cattle are fit to ship. Then there is this further advantage, that they can ship back again a carload of steers for stockers. I wish to congratulate the minister upon carrying on this work and I hope he will see that it is continued. I would also impress upon him the importance of giving careful attention to the bonding of the livestock commission merchants.

Mr. TOLMIE: That question is under consideration at the present time.

Mr. CALDWELL: I should like to endorse what my hon. friend from Queen's P.E.I. (Mr. Sinclair) has said as to the assistance the farmers have received from the officials of the department in the shipping of their livestock. I have been chiding my hon. friend since he sat down for not going far enough. As he has said, we have to ship our stock to Montreal because we have no nearer market in the Maritime Provinces for our livestock. The other evening the minister said that an abattoir and cold storage plant had not been built in the Maritime Provinces because there was not enough stock in sight to keep it running the year around or make it profitable. Personally I think there never will be unless the abattoir and cold storage are started first. The plant could be started on a small scale, and once started, I am sure that business would increase very rapidly. At the present time our livestock must be shipped to Montreal or some other point in order to get the facilities of the abattoir and cold storage plant. Then the meat products have to be shipped back to us in Eastern Canada and we are therefore in the position of having to pay freight both ways. We pay freight on the livestock to the abattoir, and our dealers pay freight on the meat going back again to the eastern provinces. In the eastern provinces our winters are long and severe. Most of our farmers who have any stock to sell have to dispose of it at a time of year, towards the fall, when cattle are not easily fattened in the warm weather, principally by grazing. At that time there are no facilities for handling stock to be sold in the Maritime Provinces and the farmer gets a small price for his cattle. Unfortunately, we do not do enough winter feeding. If we had enough fat stock for sale at the time of year, round about Easter, when high prices obtain, and if we had facilities for handling cattle in the Maritime Provinces, the stock industry would develop very rapidly. We have a good country for growing stock, but we lack facilities to enable us to take advantage of the opportunities that offer. With regard to the grants to agriculture, I was interested to hear the minister's statement on this subject. Has any grant been applied for by the agricultural society with headquarters in Woodstock, Carleton county, New Brunswick? If so, what prospect is there of this grant being given?

Mr. TOLMIE: No formal application has been made. Judging from the report for last year, they have apparently qualified for the grant this year.

Mr. CALDWELL: I should think so. I heard hon. members boasting about the exhibitions they have; they claim they have the best buildings and grounds for exhibitions. I would invite, not only the Minister of Agriculture, but those members who have been bragging about their facilities for holding exhibitions, to go to Woodstock, New Brunswick, and see one of the most beautiful spots on earth for an exhibition.

Mr. VIEN: We shall be delighted.

Mr. CALDWELL: It is on an angle of the St. John river, reached by a bridge. I do not know the exact amount expended by that society in the past two years, but I know that they have spent something like $80,000 for buildings and a race course. People from the United States go to the exhibitions there and they tell us that the ground at Woodstock is the most beautiful they have ever visited. I hope, therefore, the minister will see his way to give us a substantial grant to assist our society.

Item agreed to.

Seed and Feed Control, $240,000.

Mr. VIEN: Will the minister give us some explanation of this item?

Mr. TOLMIE: In connection with the seed department, during the winter and fall months we carry on a system of inspection of seeds. These seeds are carefully examined at our different laboratories which are established in various parts of the country, the object being to secure a supply of pure seed to the farmers. In summer, we encourage the growing of good seed in communities, and aim at having them grow particular kinds of seed, so that purchasers may buy in carload lots. We also establish seed fairs, and have field men demonstrate the necessity for the use of good seed and how best to produce it. Our experimental farms carry on experiments with new varieties, or with varieties they have already produced. When these are found to be of substantial value, they are taken out by the seed branch and further developed along commercial lines in centres where we attempt to get as many good first class farmers as possible interested in the production of A1 seed. This is of the very greatest possible importance to agriculture in Canada. Poor seed is like poor stock; you cannot expect good results from poor seed

any more than you can expect good results from a scrub bull. So that, excellent results have been obtained. We also have a system of producing what is known as pedigreed seed. A pure strain is secured and developed, and after a careful selection running over a period of three years, when the varieties reach that state of purity that satisfies the inspector, after they have gone through the full process, they are accepted as pedigreed seed.

Mr. VIEN: Does this item comprise grants of seed, or grants of money as prizes for first class grain?

Mr. TOLMIE: The sum of $60,000 is granted to seed fairs, and in the marketing of seeds there is an organization in the local seed centre, and interprovincial and export trade is developed. Through the action of this particular branch we have been able to secure our own root seeds. We have greatly increased the production of timothy and other grass and clover seeds. Many of these seeds before the war were entirely imported. We carry on a publicity campaign with a view to directing attention to the value of Canadian grown seed, and we have also done a certain amount of work in connection with development of fibre flax and the inspection of potatoes. We have inspected during the last year, in the St. Lawrence valley, 171 car loads of seed potatoes. We also carry on seed grading at the terminal elevators. Seed is graded according to standard for home use and export. This particular branch carried on what was known as the Seed Purchasing Commission during the war with a view to securing a supply of pure seed so as to encourage greater production, and they were able since 1916 to do a business amounting to nearly $16,000,000 of clean and graded seed. The seed is forwarded to any person in Canada on application, and is shipped on sight draft. After expending all this money, I am glad to be able to say that they were in a position to get returns for every dollar, to pay all expenses and a fair rate of interest on the money. This particular branch controls ordinary feeds, such as bran, shorts, etc., under the new Act passed last year. Our men receive complaints from time to time regarding the condition of these feeds, and they make investigations to see that the law is complied with. But in view of the fact that the law has been in operation only a short time, our work so far has consisted largely in a campaign of education. Our men go into the various mills where feeds are mixed and take samples of them before they go into the hopper in order to secure information showing the value of the seed and as to whether the producer or manufacturer is complying with the law as to the ingredients he uses in various feeds. That is the general line of the work which is being carried on by this branch, which we consider one of the most important in the Department of Agriculture.

Mr. ARGUE: Will the Seed Commission be continued in existence this year?

Mr. TOLMIE: Yes, it will.

Item agreed to.

Grant to National Dairy Council, $3,000.

Mr. VIEN: What is the National Dairy Council?

Mr. TOLMIE: This Council is composed of representatives from all the dairy associations in the various provinces of Canada.

Item agreed to.

Progress reported.

On the motion of the Right Hon. Mr. Doherty the House ajourned at 11.55 p.m.

Monday, March 21, 1921.

The House met at Three o'clock.

CORRUPT PRACTICES AT ELECTIONS

BILLS WITHDRAWN

Bill intituled: "An Act to amend the Dominion Controverted Elections Act."—The Solicitor General.

Bill intituled: "An Act to amend the Corrupt Practices Inquiries Act."—The Solicitor General.

Bill intituled: "An Act to amend the Disfranchising Act."—The Solicitor General.

CORRUPT PRACTICES BILL

Hon. HUGH GUTHRIE (Acting Solicitor General) moved for leave to introduce Bill No. 39, to amend the statutes relating to corrupt practices at elections.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: Explain, please.

Mr. GUTHRIE: Mr. Speaker, this Bill is intended to take the place of the three Bills which appear on the Order Paper and which at my request have to-day been withdrawn. At first it was thought proper to amend the three separate Acts, namely, the Dominion Controverted Elections Act, the Corrupt Practices Inquiries Act, and

the Disfranchising Act. The amendments were all consequential amendments, consequent upon the passage of the Act last session known as the Dominion Elections Act. The House will remember that prior to the enactment of the Dominion Elections Act at the last session we had an offence under the former law known as the offence of "corrupting practice" or "corrupt practice". In the law passed past session we added an offence of irregularity, known as an "illegal practice", so that now we have these two irregularities in our law, the "corrupt practice" and "illegal practice." The Dominion Controverted Elections Act, the Corrupt Practices Inquiries Act, and the Disfranchising Act, were drawn in reference to the law as it formerly stood, and as these Acts appear on the statute book to-day, they take no cognizance whatever of "illegal practices." The Chief Electoral Officer has prepared the Bill which I ask for leave to introduce, to meet this difficulty and to apply as an amendment to the three Acts which I have just specified.

Motion agreed to, and Bill read the first time.

RESTRICTION OF IMMIGRATION

On the Orders of the Day:

Mr. J. F. JOHNSTON (Last Mountain): Mr. Speaker, I wish to ask a question based upon an interview given by the president of the Canadian Pacific Railway Company, Mr. E. W. Beatty, in which he is reported to have said something in regard to immigration into this country, giving it as his opinion that the present regulations should be modified. I desire to ask the Government if it is their intention to bring down legislation at this session making the immigration laws less restrictive with regard to the nationality of immigrants coming into Canada.

Right Hon. ARTHUR MEIGHEN (Prime Minister): The Government has no legislation under consideration on the subject at the present time. If any is to be brought down, announcement will be made in due course.

PONTIAC CENSUS COMMISSIONERS

On the Orders of the Day:

Mr. FRANK CAHILL (Pontiac): I wish to ask the Minister of Trade and Commerce (Sir George Foster) when the census commissioners for the county of Pontiac will be appointed.

Right Hon. Sir GEORGE FOSTER (Minister of Trade and Commerce): The census commissioners for the county of Pontiac have been appointed.

REPORT OF TARIFF COMMISSION

On the Orders of the Day:

Mr. PIUS MICHAUD (Restigouche): Is it the intention of the Government to submit soon to this House a report from the Minister of Finance (Sir Henry Drayton) of the information secured lately from all persons interested in every province in connection with the revision of the tariff?

Right Hon. ARTHUR MEIGHEN (Prime Minister): The Minister of Finance is not present to-day. I may say, however, that other committees of inquiry into the tariff have sat in the past and held inquiries, and to the best of my knowledge no formal report was ever submitted by them. The object of such commissions is to secure information upon which a tariff may be based.

PRIVATE BILLS

FIRST READING

Bill No. 38, to incorporate La Compagnie de Téléphone Québec Union Electrique (The Quebec Union Electric Telephone Company).—Mr. Power.

SECOND READINGS

Bill No. 31, respecting the Canadian Pacific Railway company.—Mr. Mewburn.

Bill No. 32, to incorporate The Canadian Transit company.—Mr. Kennedy, Essex.

Bill No. 33, An Act respecting the "Credit Foncier Franco-Canadien."—Mr. Chabot.

Bill No. 34, respecting The London and Lake Erie Railway and Transportation company.—Mr. Glass.

NORTH AMERICAN TRUST COMPANY OF CANADA

The House in committee on Bill No. 15, to incorporate the North American Trust Company of Canada, and recommending that the title be changed to "An Act to incorporate the Scottish Canadian Trust Company."—Mr. Mowat.—Mr. Boivin in the Chair.

On section 1—incorporation:

Mr. MOWAT: In view of the discussion which took place in the House at the last sitting, when objection was taken by another company, and having regard to

the fact that it is not the desire of the promoters of the Bill to take any undue advantage, I would ask that the matter stand and that the Bill be referred back to the Committee on Banking and Commerce.

Mr. LEMIEUX: Is there any connection between this company and the North American Life Assurance Company?

Mr. MOWAT: My hon. friend will see, from the report of the committee, that it is proposed that the name be changed to the Scottish Canadian Trust Company. But some objection has been made even to the change in name, and it is thought that the Banking and Commerce Committee can better dispose of these differences than they can be disposed of here.

The CHAIRMAN: Mr. Mowat moves that the committee rise, report progress and ask leave to sit again.

Mr. COCKSHUTT: Before this motion is adopted I desire to say a few words as chairman of the committee. When the matter came up on Friday last I was in my place and had intended to speak at that time, but it appeared to me that the procedure was not strictly in accordance with the rules of the House, inasmuch as the motion was put when the Speaker was about to leave the Chair. This special Bill should not have been mentioned at that time; the motion usually is that the House go into Committee of the Whole on private bills, no specific bill being mentioned. Now, we have endeavoured in the committee to arrive at satisfactory conclusions on the matters that have come before us. It would be well for this committee to look at rule 91, which refers to this matter and which distinctly states, on page 51, that when an application of this kind is made—

> The name of the proposed company shall be stated in the notice.

In this case, we had three names stated in the notice, and at the request of the promoters of the Bill, the change was made from the "North American Company to the Scottish-Canadian Company." During the six weeks that this Bill had been advertised, no objection was taken to the words "Scotish-Canadian." I think the committee will realize that it is very difficult to get a name that does not conflict with the ideas of someone with regard to incorporations. For instance, the word "Empire" occurs five times, and the word "Canada" probably occurs twenty times in lists of incorporations that have been made within recent years, so that it is difficult to get a name that suits all parties. The desire of the committee is that the name shall be distintive, and as regards the use of the words "Scottish" and "Canadian," if they the used together in any one Act, the name apears to me sufficiently distinctive. But in this particular case, if I am properly informed, though there is a company styled the "Scottish-Canadian," incoporated by an Act of the province of Quebec, that company has not been organized and is not doing business. I could not say definitely as to that, but that is my information. If that be the case, and it does not appear in the records of the House that we have ever granted an incorporation under that name, it would appear to me that it is not taking too much for granted if we allow the name "Scottish-Canadian" to stand. I do not want to take any ground that will jeopardize the rights of any company; as chairman of the committee, I am desirous that we should avoid doing so; but this House has power to fix the name and the committee has not.

Mr. LEMIEUX: Was any objection taken to the name while it was advertised?

Mr. COCKSHUTT: No, and the proposed incorporation was advertised for six weeks. Up to the present moment, I have, as chairman of the committee, had no intimation that the name was objected to. The first intimation I had was on Friday last when it was moved, without discussion, that the Bill be referred back, and I had no knowledge of the reasons for that action. We had three names to choose from—North American, Scottish-Canadian and Metropolitan. It is quite possible that the name "Metropolitan" will be objected to, so that the committee will then be powerless to give the Bill a name. It is particularly provided, under the rules of the House, that the final motion is that the Bill be passed and the title be as in the Order Paper, or some other name which the House is willing should be placed on the Bill. If there is material evidence to offer to the committee with regard to the objection of using the name "Scottish-Canadian," certainly we could have no objection to hearing that; but up to the present, I have had given to me no reason that I think at all sufficient to warrant the referring back of the Bill. I would suggest that the Bill be considered in order to find out if there is anything else to which objection might be taken, and then

if it is thought of sufficient importance by this committee to refer it back, that action might be taken.

Mr. LEMIEUX: I have no personal objection to the Bill as it stands, but I might remind hy hon. friend that the three names which have been suggested for this trust company are, to my personal knowledge, already used by insurance companies. I was mentioning one a moment ago.

Mr. COCKSHUTT: This is not an insurance company; it is a trust company.

Mr. LEMIEUX I know that, but the names are used by some big insurance companies. The North American Trust suggests the idea that it might be a subsidiary of the North American Life Assurance Company, the Metropolitan Trust suggests the idea that it might be a subsidiary of the Metropolitan Life Insurance Company, and the name "Scottish-Canadian" is, if I am not mistaken, used by the old London and Lancashire Insurance Company of Montreal, which has changed its name to the Scottish-Canadian Insurance Company. I happen to know this through some business which I did not very long ago with that company. I do not at all object if the committee is agreeable to giving that name to the trust company, but I warn my hon. friend that, perhaps, some interested parties might object to it. Perhaps, if we should refer the Bill back to the committee, after Easter it could come before the House again. I have no personal objection; I am only pointing out that all three names are suggestive of three life assurance companies, and my hon. friend, I know would be the last man to injure, even by implication and through a name, any other firm.

Mr. GUTHRIE: I know nothing about this particular case, except that on Friday night last at about five minutes to eight o'clock, the solicitor for the Scottish Canadian Trust Company or Scottish Trust Company of Canada—I do not know exactly which it is—came to me and asked me to request the committee to refer this Bill back in order that further consideration might be given to the name. There is an evident blunder in the name as it appears in the Orders of the Day. It is called the "Scottish Canadian Trust Company of Canada," so that there is an unnecessary duplication, and it would be necessary to refer it back on account of that. The complaint made to me was that when the Bill was originally advertised, it was advertised in the name of the North American Trust Company. It is true two alternative names were submitted, but any one glancing at the advertisement would think it was the North American Trust Company. It happens there is a Scottish Canadian Insurance Company and a Scottish Trust Company of Canada, both of them having their head office in Quebec. If the name is referred back to the committee the matter can be settled without great difficulty, and those persons who are interested or who think they have a grievance can appear and state their cases.

Mr. LEMIEUX: I should like also to say to my hon. friend (Mr. Cockshutt) that, as regards the use of the words "Royal" or "Empire," some years ago, that is, prior to 1911, an Order in Council was passed by the Federal Government at the request of the Home Government that the Canadian Government do not issue letters patent to or incorporate companies using those names. I know the rule was strictly adhered to, and I do not know how it has happened that since then we have allowed any companies to use the name "Empire" or the name "Royal."

Mr. COCKSHUTT: I quite recognize the force of the hon. gentleman's argument. I want to point out—I do not think I did so before—that we were limited to those three names, all of which my hon. friend (Mr. Lemieux) says will be objected to.

Mr. LEMIEUX: They might be.

Mr. COCKSHUTT: I understood my hon. friend to say that they would be. I am pointing out that, under the rules of the House, it is necessary that the name shall be stated and that it shall be advertised for six weeks. A period of six weeks at this stage of the proceedings is quite a serious item. It would be probably a week or two before the advertisement would appear, so that it might be eight weeks before this Bill could again come before the House, even if we succeeded fairly well in getting a name that is not objected to. The rule is that the name has to be advertised, and we could not violate that rule without special permission.

Mr. MACLEAN (Halifax): What is the name of the company?

Mr. COCKSHUTT: At present, as appears on the Order Paper, "The Scottish Canadian Trust Company of Canada."

Mr. MACLEAN: "Where does the word "Royal" come in?

Mr. COCKSHUTT: It does not come in at all. That word was just mentioned as a precaution, that we should not use it in any alternative name. The words "of Canada" are tautological, and should be struck out. The mover of the amendment did not notice that at the time, and I was going to move that those words be struck out. This committee could do that without referring the Bill back. I want the committee to understand, however, that under the rules, if one or other of these three names is not selected, it will be necessary to have another six weeks' advertising in the Gazette.

Mr. GUTHRIE: It has been done many times without it.

Mr. NESBITT: May I suggest that the committee can fix it in a few minutes. You could adopt one of these names. The name, North American Trust Company, does not conflict with the name of any other trust company that I know of.

The CHAIRMAN: I might point out to the hon. member for Brantford (Mr. Cockshutt) that on Friday evening no motion was made concerning this Bill whatever. When the Order was called for the House to go into Committee of the Whole on this Bill the motion, which will be found on page 112 of the Votes and Proceedings, read as follows:

> Mr. Fripp moved, That Mr. Speaker do now leave the Chair for the House to go into Committee of the Whole on Private Bills (pursuant to rule 109); which was agreed to.

This Bill was not considered in Committee of the Whole owing to the objection made by the hon. the acting Solicitor General, upon the motion to go into committee. Concerning the request which has now been made that the Bill be referred back to the Select Standing Committee on Banking and Commerce, I must rule that the Committee of the Whole House has no right to make this reference. It will therefore be necessary for this committee to report progress to Mr. Speaker, and a motion made in the House to refer the Bill back to the Banking and Commerce Committee, will then be in order.

Mr. COCKSHUTT: Perhaps I might be pardoned, Mr. Chairman, for drawing your attention to how the matter appears in Hansard, for that is where I was looking. It appears by Hansard that Mr. Fripp moved:

> That the House go into Committee on Bill No. 15, to incorporate the North American Trust Company of Canada, and recommending that the title be changed to "An Act to Incorporate the Scottish Canadian Trust Company of Canada."—Mr. Mowatt.

I think the Votes and Proceedings is correct, and that Hansard is incorrect.

The CHAIRMAN: The mistake in Hansard is easily explainable by the fact that the motion was made immediately after the Clerk Assistant had read that order, though it was a different motion that was submitted from the Chair.

Progress reported.

Mr. MOWAT: I beg to move:

> That the Order of the Day for the House to go into committee on Bill No. 15, An Act to Incorporate North American Trust Company of Canada, be discharged and that the Bill be referred back to the Select Standing Committee on Banking and Commerce.

Motion agreed to.

QUESTIONS

(Questions answered orally are indicated by an asterisk.)

CANADIAN NATIONAL RAILWAYS—CEDAR POSTS

Mr. MICHAUD:

1. Were tenders called lately for cedar posts in connection with the operation of the Canadian National railways?
2. If so, were notices advertising the calling of such tenders posted up in the northern part of the province of New Brunswick and particularly along the Intercolonial railway?
3. How many tenders were received, what were the names of those tendering and the respective amounts of each tender?

Hon. Mr. REID:

1. Tenders were called for cedar posts in connection with the operation of Canadian National railways. Notices of requirements were sent to 22 firms in the various districts who could supply posts. Twelve tenders were received, and contracts were awarded in the best interests of the railways. It is not in the public interests to disclose further information.
2. Answered by No. 1.
3. Answered by No. 1.

GRAND TRUNK RAILWAY—BOARD OF ARBITRATION

Mr. TOBIN:

1. What salary or allowance is to be paid to the members of the Board of arbitration appointed to determine the actual value of the Grand Trunk Railway company and subsidiary companies?
2. By whom is the said salary or allowance being paid to the said arbitrators?

Hon. Mr. REID:

1. The matter has not yet been considered.
2. Answered by No. 1.

CANADIAN NATIONAL RAILWAYS—OPERATING DIVISIONS

Mr. VIEN:

1. How many divisions, or operating divisions, are there on the Canadian National Railway, and what are their names?
2. What was the result of operations for each of the said divisions in 1919 and 1920 on account of
   (a) operation expenses;
   (b) gross receipts; and
   (c) surplus or deficits.

Hon. Mr. REID:

1. C.N.R. Western Lines: Pacific District; Western District; Prairie District; Central District; Duluth, Winnipeg & Pacific Railway.

C.N.R. Eastern Lines: Ontario Division; Montreal Division; Saguenay Division; Halifax & South Western Railway; Electric Lines.

Canadian Government Railway: Intercolonial Railway; Transcontinental Railway; Prince Edward Island Railway; Branch Lines.

2. Railway accounting does not provide for receipts, expenses, surplus or deficits being shown by divisions.

QUEBEC CITY IMMIGRATION OFFICERS

Mr. CASGRAIN:

1. What are the names of the officers of the Immigration Department in the city of Quebec?
2. Is the Government aware that a young lady of England, travelling under the auspices of the Canadian Council for the Immigration of Household Workers, and introduced by J. Obed Smith, Superintendent of Immigration for Canada, was refused entrance into Canada at Quebec by the officers of the Department of Immigration in the early part of 1920?
3. If so, what are the names and respective positions of the officers who refused her entrance?
4. What were the reasons for said refusal?
5. Are the said officers still in the employ of the Government?

Hon. Mr. REID:

1. The executive officers at Quebec in May, 1920, were: Dr. J. D. Pagé, Acting Dominion Immigration Agent; E. J. O'Connell, Assistant Dominion Immigration Agent; J. P. O. Mathieu, Chief Clerk and Inspector; Jos. Huck, Inspector; E. F. Willden, Inspector; Carroll Apter, Interpreter and Inspector.
2. Yes. Catherine Trowers.
3. Dr. J. D. Pagé, Acting Dominion Immigration Agent at Quebec.
4. Mental deficiency.
5. Yes.

Mr. L. J. GAUTHIER, M.P.

Mr. CASGRAIN:

1. Has the Government received a petition from the Montreal Progressive Club requesting the admission of Mr. L. J. Gauthier, member for St. Hyacinthe, to the Federal Cabinet?
2. If so, what is the intention of the Government in the matter?

Right Hon. Mr. MEIGHEN:

1. No.
2. Answered by No. 1.

FREDERICTON EXPERIMENTAL FARM

Mr. COPP:

1. What is the area in acres of branch Experimental Farm situated at Fredericton, N.B.?
2. How many acres of said farm are under cultivation?
3. How many acres were under cultivation in the years 1915, 1916, 1917, 1918, 1919 respectively?
4. What revenue was derived from the sale of stock and products produced from said farm in each of the following years, 1915, 1916, 1917, 1918, 1919 and 1920?

Hon. Mr. TOLMIE:

1. 450 acres.
2. 195½ acres.
3. 1915, 147¾ acres; 1916, 151¼ acres; 1917, 139¼ acres; 1918, 172¼ acres; 1919, 143½ acres; 1920, 195½ acres. The variations in acreage are due to under-draining operations and clearing operations; also underdrained land available for cultivation in normal years could not be cropped in excessively wet years.
4.

	Casual.	Refund.	Total.
1914-15	$ 2,173.74	.....	$ 2,173.74
1915-16	6,187.86	$ 1,966.28	8,154.14
1916-17	3,558.13	3,114.01	6,672.14
1917-18	3,334.54	2,281.13	5,615.67
1918-19	4,165.02	3,358.33	7,523.35
1919-20	11,353.10	691.63	12,044.73
	$30,772.39	$11,411.38	$42,183.77

EMPLOYEES IN PRINTING AND STATIONERY

Mr. MURPHY:*

What was the total number of employees of all classes in the Department of Public Printing and Stationery on the thirty-first day of December in each of the years from 1911 to 1920, inclusive?

Sir HENRY DRAYTON:

1911, 890; 1912, 949; 1913, 1,047; 1914, 1,106; 1915, 1,160; 1916, 1,240; 1917, 1,306; 1918, 1,169; 1919, 1,131; 1920, 703.

CANADIAN NATIONAL RAILWAYS—BOARD

Mr. KENNEDY (Essex):

1. What are the names of the gentlemen who compose the Board of Management of the Canadian National Railways?
2. What is the salary of each, and what amount did each receive as expenses during the past year?
3. Are any of these gentlemen also directors of joint stock companies doing business in Canada?
4. If so, of what company or companies are they respectively directors?

Hon. Mr. REID:

1. D. B. Hanna, A. J. Mitchell, R. T. Riley, R. Hobson, Major G. A. Bell, Sir Hormidas Laporte, Col. Thomas Cantley, A. P. Barnhill, E. R. Wood.
2. Director's fees, $2,000 each, and travelling expenses to and from their homes.
3. The Government has no information.
4. Answered by No. 3.

CANADIAN NATIONAL RAILWAYS—THEFT OF LIQUOR

Mr. CASGRAIN:

1. Is the Government aware that a theft of liquor was made at the station of Baie St. Paul on the line of the Quebec and Saguenay Railway in the month of January last?
2. Was a constable of the Canadian National Railway sent there to hold an investigation regarding the said theft? If so, what was his name?
3. Has a report been made by the said officer?
4. If so, will the Government produce same?

Hon. Mr. REID:

1. No.
2. Answered by No. 1.
3. Answered by No. 1.
4. Answered by No. 1.

CAMP GROUNDS, FARNHAM, QUE.

Mr. KAY:

1. What have been the receipts and expenditures on the camp grounds at Farnham, Que., per annum, for the last five years?
2. Is it the intention of the Government to retain this property?
3. If not, when will it be sold and will it be sold en bloc or divided?
4. Who is the superintendent of this property, and what remuneration does he receive?

Hon. Mr. GUTHRIE:

1. Receipts. Standing hay crop: 1916, $65; 1917, $60; 1918, $50; 1919, $40; 1920, $45; total receipts, $260. Expenditure—1916, salary of caretaker, J. Fontaine, $456.25, nails, lumber, etc., for repairs, $78.90, $535.15; 1917, salary of caretaker, $456.25, nails, lumber, etc., for repairs, $40.33, $496.58; 1918, salary of caretaker, $456.25, nails, lumber, etc., for ditching, $64.80, $521.05; 1919, salary of caretaker, $456.25, nails, lumber and painting, $247.74, $703.99; 1920, salary of caretaker, $456.25, civil labour and transportation of stores to Ottawa and St. Johns, $172.10, $628.35; total expenditure, $2,885.12.

2 and 3. No, the Government is considering the sale of this property at the earliest possible date.

4. Caretaker, J. Fontaine, $1.25 per diem

CENSUS COMMISSIONER, MISSISQUOI

Mr. KAY:

1. Who has been appointed Census Commissioner for the county of Missisquoi?
2. Who appointed him and on whose recommendation was he appointed?
3. When will the enumerators be appointed?

Hon. Sir GEORGE FOSTER:

1. Thomas H. Pickel, Cowansville, Que.
2. He was appointed by the Minister of Trade and Commerce.
3. In May next.

GRAND TRUNK OPERATING CHARGES, 1920

Mr. JOHNSTON:

1. Did the Grand Trunk Railway meet its operating charges in 1920?
2. If not, what was the operating deficit?
3. What were the fixed charges of the Grand Trunk Railway in 1920?
4. Were these paid?

Hon. Mr. REID:

1. Yes.
2. Answered by No. 1.
3. From information received from Grand Trunk Railway on 19th inst., fixed charges, including interest on guaranteed stock, were $14,025,637.07.
4. Yes; approximately $7,574,982.43 by Grand Trunk out of operating surplus and other net income; and $6,450,654.64, the amount of net loss, by funds advanced by the Government.

FOREIGN DECORATIONS TO CANADIANS

Mr. RINFRET:

1. Is the Canadian Government aware that representations have been made to the French Government asking that they refrain from awarding any decorations to Canadians?
2. Has the Canadian Government been informed by the Imperial Government or from other sources that such representations have been made?
3. Is it the intention of the Canadian Government to intervene in such cases?
4. Has the Canadian Government been informed as to whether like representations have been made by the Imperial Government to governments other than of France?

Right Hon. Mr. MEIGHEN:

1. No.
2. No.
3. No case for intervention has arisen, but the Government intends to carry out the

recommendations contained in the report of the Special Committee adopted by the House of Commons on May 22nd, 1919.

4. On October 18, 1919, the Canadian Government advised the British Government that in view of the address of the House of Commons to His Majesty the Canadian Government were precluded from giving any expression of approval of the desire of the Italian Government to confer honours on certain Canadians, and on November 1, 1919, the Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs accordingly advised the Italian Ambassador in London in this sense.

CUSTOMS—FOREIGN MONETARY STANDARDS

Mr. McMASTER:

1. At what date during the year 1920 did the Government change the method of calculating the value of the franc, lire, etc., for duty purposes?
2. Were any refunds made to importers who by reason of the former system had made payments of duty in excess of the amounts they would have paid had the duty been levied in the manner last adopted?
3. Who were these importers?
4. What were their addresses and what were the amounts so refunded to each?

Hon. Mr. WIGMORE:

1. 22 July, 1920.

2. No refunds made to importers in respect of goods entered for duty prior to 22nd July, 1920.

3 and 4. Answered by No. 2.

EXPEDITIONARY FORCE CANTEEN FUNDS

*Hon. Mr. MURPHY:

1. Is the Government aware that in England charges have been publicly made regarding the misappropriation of funds in connection with the Expeditionary Force Canteens surplus?
2. What steps, if any, have been taken by the present Government to secure payment of Canada's share of the said surplus?
3. Are the returned soldiers to benefit in any way out of Canada's share in the said surplus when it is paid? If not, to what purpose will the moneys be applied?

Hon. Mr. GUTHRIE:

1. No information.

2. Certain monies have already been received, and are at present on deposit in a Special Trust Account with the Receiver General.

The Imperial Authorities are at present engaged in winding up the affairs of the Expeditionary Force Canteens.

Canada's interests are being looked after by the High Commissioner for Canada, Sir George Perley.

3. The question of the distribution of this money has been submitted to the Special Committee on Pensions, appointed during the present session, for consideration.

CANADIAN NATIONAL RAILWAYS—INDEPENDENT AUDITOR

Mr. EULER:

1. Was the statement submitted to Parliament on March 17 by the Minister of Railways with regard to the losses and operation of the National Railways, the finding of an independent audit by a responsible auditor?
2. If so, what is the name of such auditor?
3. If the statement was not so audited, was it prepared by the regular officials or accountants of the National Railways?

Hon. Mr. REID:

1. The statements were prepared by the regular officials of the railways from the accounts of the railways which, as regards the Canadian Northern, had been audited by the firm of George A. Touche & Co., chartered accountants and auditors, Toronto, and, as regards Grand Trunk Pacific, by Marwick Mitchell & Company, Montreal. The accounts in connection with the Canadian Government lines are subject to the usual audit of the Auditor General's staff.

2. Answered by No. 1.

3. Answered by No. 1.

Mr. W. J. TOBIN

Mr. REDMAN:

1. Has W. J. Tobin or J. Tobin, been employed by the Department of Soldiers' Civil Re-establishment or by the Soldier Settlement Board or any other department of the Federal Government?
2. If so, between what dates was he so employed?
3. Was he at any time employed by either body at the city of Edmonton? If so, under what circumstances and between what dates?
4. Was he granted leave of absence? If so, between what dates and under what circumstances?

Hon. Mr. TOLMIE:

1. Yes; by the Soldier Settlement Board.

2. From September 15th, 1919, to February 11th, 1921, inclusive.

3. Not by the Soldier Settlement Board.

4. Yes. May 7 to 19 inclusive, 1920, special leave to go to Halifax, N.S., on account of his father being injured in street railway accident; August 16 to 28 inclusive, 1920, annual leave; February 7 to 11 inclusive, 1921, annual leave.

STIKINE AND DEASE RIVERS

*Mr. PECK:

1. Did two employees of the Public Works Department proceed up the Stikine River and down the Dease River to the lower post on the Liard last summer?
2. If so, what was the expense of this trip, including wages of these employees during the period they were engaged in same?
3. For what purpose was the trip made?
4. Was the purpose accomplished?

Hon. Mr. McCURDY:

1. Yes.

2. $1,065.08.

3. Reconnaissance was made and data secured as to requirements to improve the waterway for the handling of supplies, etc., to the mining district north of Dease Lake.

4. A report has been submitted and is receiving the consideration of the Department.

ANTELOPE IN WESTERN CANADA

Mr. BUCHANAN:

1. Did the Government establish a park as a preserve for antelope in Western Canada?

2. If so, where is it located?

3. How many antelope are within its bounds at present?

4. Has the Government any information as to the number of antelope in Western Canada?

Hon. Mr. TOLMIE:

1. A reserve of 5,000 acres was established in 1915 which it is intended to create a National Park.

2. Near Nemiskam, Alberta, in Township 7, Ranges 9 and 10, west of 4th meridian.

3. Approximately 100.

4. No definite information but estimated between 800 and 900.

UNOPPOSED MOTIONS FOR PRODUCTION OF PAPERS

Mr. PELLETIER:

For a copy of all correspondence, telegrams, reports, memoranda in the hands of the Minister of Public Works, Officials of the Public Works, Superintendent of Engineering Department in and for the Province of Quebec, Mr. A. R. Decarie and Engineering Department at Ottawa pertaining to and regarding the construction, repairs or improvements at the following named harbours: St. Ulric, Matane, Ste. Felicite, Ruisseau à Loutre, Méchins, all in Matane County, from January, 1918, to date.

Mr. PELLETIER:

For a copy of all correspondence, documents, telegrams, reports exchanged between any member of the Government and the Intercolonial Railway and Canadian National Railways Officials regarding the enquiry held at Sayabec, Matane County, P.Q., on the 17th day of June, 1920, by Mr. T. J. Tingley, District Special Agent, Canadian National Railways, and the dismissal of Mr. Edmond Banville, Station Agent at above named place.

Mr. PARENT:

For a copy of letters, telegrams addressed to the Government by any person from the Province of Quebec who has applied for a position of trustee, under the Bankruptcy Act, together with copies of all letters or telegrams purporting to recommend any person to such positions.

Mr. GERVAIS:

For a copy of the report of the inquiry held by Mr. Wiallard at Sorel and Montreal (December and January) concerning certain charges against the Government shipyards administration at Sorel.

Mr. MOLLOY:

For a copy of all letters, telegrams and other correspondence between the Dominion Government or any member thereof and the Government of Ontario or any member thereof, regarding Bill No. 23 (Letter D of the Senate), intituled: "An Act respecting the Lake of the Woods Control Board." or the subject matter thereof.

Mr. McCOIG:

For a copy of all correspondence, documents, telegrams, reports or other papers, exchanged between the Prime Minister of Canada or any of his Ministers and the Premier of British Columbia or any of his Ministers, with reference to the power of the province of British Columbia, under existing Dominion Legislation, to control the importation of liquor into that province.

CANADIAN NATIONAL RAILWAYS—SULLY, QUE.

On the Order (Mr. Gauvreau).

For a copy of all letters, correspondence, petitions, financial statements and all other documents, exchanged between the settlers of Sully and along the National Transcontinental in the county of Temiscouata, and the Superintendent of the Government Railways in connection with the erection of a station at Sully, Quebec.

Right Hon. ARTHUR MEIGHEN (Prime Minister): I do not know just what is meant by this correspondence between certain parties and the superintendent of the Government railways. I do not know whether the official meant in this Order is an officer of the National Railways. I think the motion had better stand.

Motion stands.

THE HOUSING PROBLEM.

PROPOSED ESTABLISHMENT OF A FEDERAL HOUSING BOARD

Mr. H. C. HOCKEN (West Toronto) moved:

That, in the opinion of this House, the general interest of the people of Canada will be served by making it possible for every industrious, frugal and thrifty citizen to become the owner in fee simple of a house and lot; that the Government of Canada should grant assistance to make that possible; and to that end, the sum of ten million dollars should be appropriated annually for a period of five years to buy land and build houses for men of good character who can make a small initial payment and undertake to liquidate the indebtedness incurred by monthly instalments as may be agreed upon; that a Federal Housing Board be appointed to carry out the plan which, for the first year—or such longer period as in the opinion of the Governor General in Council may be desirable—shall be confined to men who have served overseas.

Hon. RODOLPHE LEMIEUX (Maisonneuve): Before the hon. member proceeds, Mr. Speaker, I beg to raise a point of order. Although I should be very glad to hear the arguments which the hon. member might advance, yet I should like to have a ruling of the Chair on the motion as it reads, calling as it does for the expenditure of public moneys. I desire to know what the ruling of the Chair is on that question.

Right Hon. ARTHUR MEIGHEN (Prime Minister): Perhaps I may be permitted to say a word or two on the point of order. This is a general resolution which undoubtedly involves the spending of money, but in this respect it differs from the resolution to which I took exception the other day, moved by the hon. member for Nelson (Mr. Campbell). I am not going to argue that this resolution is in order, but I would point out that it might be held to be in order, while the other was ruled out of order, for a reason which I shall now advance. There is nothing in this resolution which, if the House saw fit to pass it, would involve a charge at any definite time upon the public treasury. The resolution of the hon. member for Nelson, however, had it carried, would have involved a charge this year on the public treasury. I was not in the House when your Honour's decision was given on that resolution, but it would seem to me that any resolution so reading should be held to be without the powers of a private member of the House. The present resolution is different and I do not wish to apply my argument thereto, but in my judgment it is well worthy of consideration whether it is not also beyond the competence of a private member.

Mr. SPEAKER: The point of order raises a question which involves a principle affecting to a rather marked degree the rights of private members of the House. In earlier years the practice was to exclude resolutions of this character as being money resolutions, and therefore not competent to be moved by private members. However, in recent years the tendency has grown up to relax the rule and to regard these resolutions, although in their own terms intending to involve the expenditure of money, as being merely an expression of opinion on the part of the hon. member who moves them, or of the House of Commons if the resolution should be adopted. Perhaps I should say also that as far as I can gather the spirit which has prompted speakers heretofore to not regard these resolutions as money resolutions in the sense that they ought not to be adopted is, that they were to be deemed merely an expression of opinion, and that the Government was not ipso facto to be bound to implement the expression of opinion contained in the resolution. In other words the constitutional rule and duty of the Government to be responsible for initiating financial legislation was not to be impaired in any degree.

As I said the other day my feeling with respect to such resolutions is this: that it seems to be in the highest degree desirable that hon. members should have as much latitude as possible to discuss all manner of questions affecting the public welfare, and that they ought not to be restricted by the application of the rigorous letter of the law. My own tendency is to so interpret the rules of the House as to always permit the widest possible measure of discussion. I shall not give a final opinion at present upon this resolution but will take further opportunity of looking into the matter. I have already indicated what my own view at the moment is, having regard to previous decisions, having regard to previous acts of this House, and having regard to the decision I gave a few days ago —which I may say I found out afterwards was confirmed absolutely by a considered opinion given by Mr. Speaker Sproule in this House a very few years ago, and I may add in connection therewith that it was a judgment reversing a decision of his own of the day before so that it was his matured opinion. At that time he restored to the Order Paper a resolution which on the previous day he had ruled out, a resolution which in its terms called for the expenditure of public money on the part of this House. As at present advised I am inclined therefore to regard this motion as being in order, but I shall take the question into consideration and acquaint the House with my decision in due course.

Mr. LEMIEUX: I do not rise, Mr. Speaker, for the purpose of questioning your ruling. On the contrary what your Honour has just stated seems to be most reasonable—that private members should have a right to express a pious opinion about public matters. In the present instance, however, my hon. friend (Mr. Hocken) seems to be going so much against the rules of the House—because he mentions in his resolution the desirability of making an annual appropriation of $10,000,000 for a period of five years—that I would suggest to him that if he were to amend the resolution by avoiding the men-

tion of that sum of money I think there would be no question as to its being in order.

Mr. SPEAKER: The suggestion of the hon. member for Maisonneuve is certainly an admirable one. If it meets with the wishes of the hon. member for West Toronto (Mr. Hocken), I am sure no question will arise with respect to the resolution under the rules of the House.

Mr. HOCKEN: Mr. Speaker, I am quite content to amend the resolution in the manner suggested by the hon. member for Maisonneuve (Mr. Lemieux). I do not think, and I did not think, that I could do much more at this time than ventilate this question in the House. The resolution expresses an opinion that I have had for many years; and the more deeply I have studied this question, the more convinced I have become that the proposal to place every head of a household in this country in possession of his own house and lot is good, sound public policy. I scarcely expected that the Government would have $10,000,000 to appropriate off hand for this purpose, and perhaps I may be accused of having a good deal of assurance in presenting such a suggestion; but I feel satisfied, Mr. Speaker, that that amount of money could not be expended by the Government to better advantage than in the way that I suggest, and I will at least endeavour to show why a broad policy on this question should be adopted.

In the past, Mr. Speaker, the accepted function of a government was to build railways in the West, and wharves in the Maritime Provinces, and, occasionally an armoury building in the province of Ontario. Such will always be an important part of national administration. As the country develops construction must proceed, and I am not arguing that there should be any cessation of expenditures that are necessary for such purposes. But we have reached a time in the history of the world when the common people look for something more from the Government than the construction of roads and public buildings. Some people say that the war has brought this about. My judgment is that it was coming years before the war; it may have been accelerated by the great conflict but was not caused by it. Slowly, during the past generations, a conviction has been growing in the minds of the common people that the needs of the masses demand more attention from those who administer the affairs of the nation. The first manifestation of this is to be found in municipal government, as far as my experience goes. Fifteen years ago there was a great awakening, Mr. Speaker, among the thoughtful men and women as to the responsibility upon the part of government for the amelioration of the conditions of life among the least fortunate portion of the community. We find this exhibited in the new method adopted in all progressive states and provinces for the treatment of those who have been incarcerated in prisons for violations of the law. Not so long ago the one idea in handling criminals was their punishment; to-day the dominant idea in dealing with them is to bring about their reformation. I mention this as one of the outstanding developments of a more intelligent study of human needs that distinguishes this generation. I might follow it in many directions, because the same spirit is displayed in dealing with defectives of all kinds, and in providng for those who lack opportunities for self-development, physically, mentally and morally. The underlying motive of all this is the betterment of the people—the betterment of the common people, and by that term I mean the great majority of our population who must always be employed as wage earners. Those who have the organizing ability and business capacity to become employers do not need financial assistance from the Government to provide the ordinary comforts of life or to make provision for old age. In every country, however, these constitute but a fraction of the total population; the majority will always be in the ranks of the artisans, labourers, and clerks. It is the welfare of this large class of citizens on whose behalf I am trying to say a word to-day. They are not paupers, they are not looking for charity; but in my judgment they have a right to expect from the Government such reasonable asistance as will enable them to properly organize their homes and so secure for their children places to which they can look back in later years with happy recollections.

There are many thousands of industrious citizens in this country who have not been able to acquire owership of even the most modest house and lot. They have striven to educate their children and to maintain their families in a state of decent comfort, and this has absorbed their entire earnings and deprived them of the opportunity of saving enough to purchase homes. On the other hand, Sir, it is true that there are many thousands who, by sacrifices, known only to themselves, have secured a start in this direction and by slow degrees have extin-

guished the mortgages they had to assume and carry over a period of years. This class of people are the very salt of the earth. They have uncomplainingly and, as a rule, cheerfully, submitted to domestic economies that no man or family makes from choice; they have submitted to those economies with their eyes on the future.

With every year that passes it becomes more difficult for a man to make such a start. In most of our cities and towns the price of house property has advanced to such a point that the initial payment necessarily demanded by builders is beyond the capacity of the average workman. Consequently the difficulties have increased so enormously that the need of

4 p.m. assistance is greater now than at any time in the past. Moreover, the cessation of building operations during the war has left this country with a shortage of homes, estimated by officials of the Trades and Labour Congress of Canada at between 45,000 and 50,000 houses. The result is that two or three families are compelled to live in one house which was designed to accommodate one small family.

It must be apparent to hon. members that heroic measures are justified to relieve such a situation. It is that kind of thing, Sir, that leads to dissatisfaction, intensifies unrest, and awakens in the individual a sense of injustice, making him an easy prey for radical and revolutionary agitators. An industrious man with a family crowded into inadequate space becomes a disheartened and careless citizen. Every man needs some incentive to inspire him to make the best of his opportunities and to properly develop his talents, but such personal development is impossible without wholesome and happy home surroundings, and unfortunately these cannot be obtained by many thousands of artisans in the towns and cities of this country. Let such conditions prevail over an extended period, and we will establish here some of the most deplorable features characteristic of urban life in Europe. Those are the conditions that breed communism and anarchism; whereas the individual home where one family can live in privacy with a reasonable degree of comfort inevitably produces a better type of parent and a better type of child. So I take the ground, Sir, that all governments should be concerned with the material and moral welfare of those they govern.

The problem of housing has become so acute that the need for extraordinary measures must be apparent to every observant person. As I have already stated, officials of the Trade and Labour Congress of Canada have declared that there is a shortage of 45,000 houses. We find that the situation has become a matter of deep concern to the provincial legislatures, for I see by the press that legislation to place restrictions upon landlords has been suggested in the Legislature of Quebec, while in the province of Ontario the exorbitant rents charged by landlords, due entirely to the shortage of houses, has led the Government of that province to introduce a bill to establish a fair-rent court. This surely is an extraordinary measure and one which a few years ago no one would have dreamt of suggesting.

Addressing the Town Planning Convention at Toronto on February 17 last, Archbishop McNeil, said:

> There are few of the six-roomed houses in Toronto that have not got two families in them, and sometimes lodgers besides. * * * Last year we had 7,784 marriages in Toronto, and at least 5,000 houses at reasonably low prices were called for. How many such houses were erected? Only 61. And we find that 116 houses were pulled down during the year, while 79 dwellings were converted into business places. So, you see, we have been progressing backwards.

I think I need go no further in elaboration of my argument of the necessity for a vigorous programme of house building in our towns and cities. The condition is so obtrusive that it is scarcely possible for any person to be ignorant of it.

It will no doubt be argued that the responsibility for improving housing conditions rests with the provincial governments. I admit the force of this argument, but it seems to me that this Parliament, being the chief legislative authority in the Dominion, might well undertake, in co-operation with the provincial and municipal authorities, a programme that would relieve conditions which are so unsatisfactory and which must tend towards the degeneration of our people. I appreciate what this Parliament has done in appropriating $25,000,000, of which $10,000,000 has been expended through the provincial authorites. However, that does not seem to me to go far enough. While the British North America Act may impose upon the provinces the responsibility of settling social questions of this kind, I do not think that that entirely absolves this Parliament of responsibility to take cognizance of, and to provide remedies for, conditions of so unsatisfactory a nature.

The germ of my proposal in this resolution is not to provide any temporary expedient, but rather to create a permanent

body that would constantly be available to prevent the intensification of this problem and to work in the direction of assuring to every man an opportunity to acquire his own home, providing he will make any real effort himself. This is not socialism, Mr. Speaker, it is individualism. It is not giving our people something for nothing. It is putting them in a position where they would be encouraged to exercise thrift, to develop industrious habits and thus steadily to liquidate the indebtedness that they must incur to become their own landlords.

The possession of real estate, no matter how small a portion, has a peculiar effect upon a man, and it is an effect that is shared by his family. It raises his standing in the community. It gives him a sense of dignity. That is one of the strongest incentives to self-development that any person can have. He becomes deeply interested in the good government of his municipality because he is a direct taxpayer, and this interest in municipal affairs inevitably leads to closer study of all other branches of government that we have. He follows the course of political discussions. He applies more intelligent methods in reaching dis decisions as to his political future. He feels himself to be an important unit in the body politic. Who can estimate the value to the country of converting the easygoing, rent-paying artisan into an earnest, property-owning citizen? The effort to acquire a home in this way arouses in the average man an ambition to develop every talent that he possesses. We have all through this country manufacturers and employers of labour who owe their present position in business to the thrifty habits acquired by the purchase of a home in their early years. It develops all that is best in a man, because he is not actuated by purely selfish motives; the welfare of his wife and family is the dominant idea in his mind. Thus the finer impulses of his nature are stimulated; he takes a pride in his little property because it is his, no matter how large the mortgage may be. A spirit of emulation causes him to employ his spare hours in making improvements and keeping his little property in the best condition he can. And, Sir, the effect upon his family is proportionate to that upon himself. His wife is as deeply interested in and is as proud of her ownership as her husband. Upon her falls a great deal of the necessity for thrift, and she benefits in every way by the responsibilities which she carries in common with her husband. The children in such a home are necessarily taught industrious and frugal habits, and such teaching in childhood has its effect throughout life. The very obligations assumed by the parent are shared unconsciously by the children; at a tender age they learn to understand the value of economy, and ultimately see its reward in the liquidation of the indebtedness on their home and the better conditions under which they live. These things cannot be taught in school; it is only by the everyday experiences in the home that a child can be made to understand that self-denial in the small things is necessary for the accomplishment of a purpose which makes for the permanent welfare of the family. Such lessons as forming a part of the child's education should not be lightly regarded. So that for the man, for the woman, and for the child there is educational and moral value and the development of civic virtue in the ownership of a home.

Contrast the conditions outlined by Archbishop McNeil, where two or more families live in a six-roomed house, with the occupancy of a house by one family. A whole speech might be made on this phase of the housing problem. It is essential to the proper care and training of children that there should be privacy in the domestic circle. That makes for obedience to parental authority; it enables parents to bring up their children in their own way and without the dangers through associations beyond their control. The house with two or three families in it can never be dignified by the name of home. It may be a place in which to sleep, but all the wholesome influence of home that men cherish throughout their lives and which restrain them from excesses of all kinds are absent from those habitations where two or three families are herded together in six rooms. We make complaints about the inefficiency of the churches, and then we allow conditions to be created that render all the wishes of religious teachers to care for the spiritual welfare of the people difficult if not impossible of accomplishment.

In my judgment, Sir, the time has come when the state must do all that it reasonably can to restore the home to the place of power and influence which it ought to occupy and which in times past it did occupy; for to its occupancy of that place we are indebted to-day for the morality of our people and the stability of our institutions. We are now going through a crisis in this world as the aftermath of the great war, but it is a crisis that never would have arisen, I venture to say, if the common people of all the civilized nations had

been in possession of their own property. Ownership of real estate makes a man a steadier citizen. Having made the sacrifices inseparable from the acquisition of a home his whole interest lies in maintaining it. He is not fuel for agitators or revolutionists; on the contrary, he is an impediment to the agitator; he is the most desirable force in the country for orderly government and constitutional procedure. I take an ilustration from my own city, Sir, a community of half a million people. The extremes of wealth and poverty are to be found there, in a form quite as acute as in any city of the Dominion. Looking at it upon the surface, it would seem to be fertile ground for communist activity, but it passed safely through that period of unrest which affected similar communities in this country more seriously. What is the explanation, Mr. Speaker? It lies in the fact that forty-seven and one-half per cent of the houses in Toronto are occupied by their owners. Roughly speaking, one-half of our population have a deep sense of responsibility for good gevernment and the maintenance of order, to a degree that would not be possible if they had not been influenced by the possession of small properties which to them are as great as the plants of the wealthiest manufacturers. Is it not worth while, Mr. Speaker, for this Parliament to take cognizance of such a situation, and even to take extraordinary measures to bring about, by degrees, that state of affairs in which every man will have the same incentive to be an industrious and thrifty citizens? These periods of unrest will recur, we have not seen the last of them in Canada; and I submit that the best means that can be adopted to prepare to deal with such crisis is to develop to the highest degree that we can those qualities that make for sobriety of temperament, steady observance of the law, and intelligent co-operation for personal and community improvement.

We have been fortunate in this country in that we have so few large cities, and so many cities of from ten to thirty thousand population. I wish that the two or three large cities we have could be reduced one-half in population, and that the other half of their population could be spread throughout the smaller communities. I am sure that this would produce a much more wholesome state of affairs. My own province of Ontario is the best example that we have of the existence of few large cities. There are in that province scores of flourishing communities of a population of from ten to thiry thousand, where workmen have their half-acre to cultivate and their own little cottage,where contentment and ideal domestic conditions prevail. There are cities like Kitchener, Guelph, Stratford, St. Thomas, and a score of others that ilustrate the point I am trying to make. In these places strikes are almost unknown, for employer and employee live together in harmonious relations, and in the last analysis, Mr. Speaker, It will be found that this state of industrial harmony can be traced to the ownership by the operatives in the factories of their own homes. They are better workmen because they are contented with the conditions under which they live, the most important factor of which is domestic felicity. They are good neighbors to one another because of the influence of happy homes. Let illness overtake one family in such a community as I am trying to describe, and from all sides will come assistance and sympathy and helpfulness, because they have been welded into one great family by long associations and intimate relationship.

Nor can we overlook the importance of a permanent abode in the life of a man and his family. Those who are at the mercy of landlords may live a year in one place and a year in another. Continual changes of residence are costly to the family; they lessen the ability of parents to own their own property, while they have a sad effect upon the children.

The ownership of a house and lot is insurance against unemployment and old age. In great Britain large sums of money are paid out in old age pensions and unemployment doles and there are advocates of like measures in this country. I do not entirely disagree with their view, but I look upon such payments as a form of charity that self-respecting men must accept with repugnance. It is better for the people, and for the State, to preserve the finer sensibilities of our citizens by putting them in a position to meet such emergencies by their own efforts. One who has not rent to pay monthly can get through a period of unemployment much more easily than one who must raise a definite amount for a landlord as the months roll by. The payment of rent has been the most difficult feature of the unemployment situation with which we have had to deal in our city during the last few months. The fear of eviction, added to the anxiety of enforced idleness, has intensified the distress of many a family. With that obligation eliminated, it is astonishing how

long a family can carry on with small means, and in most cases it is possible to get through several months of unemployment. Unemployment usually occurs in the fall and winter months when the need of shelter is imperative. As spring opens up in this country, work is resumed in many lines in which it is impossible during the rigorous winter season, so that if we could put the masses of our people in a position to tide over the few months of unemployment, which will always be an inevitable feature of Canadian life, we would accomplish a great deal for the wage earner.

Ownership of a home would also act as a provision for old age, and it would be more effective provision than the small dole which is the best any country can pay to the aged and infirm. Given a home in which to live, an old couple will require but little additional assistance to maintain them. That little, in nearly every instance, could be provided by the children who might share the home belonging to their aged parents. The amount which they would pay in rent would meet this obligation; or if the children have homes of their own, the rent their parents could receive from their own home—and there will always be a renting class—would be sufficient for the modest needs of the parents, so that the possession of house property, of a home, by a man and his wife, forms, to my mind, the most self-respecting provision that can be made for unemployment or old age.

An appropriation provided for this purpose would be, not an expenditure, but an investment, and one more certain of return than the vast sums which we are providing for the railways. The experience of loan companies in Ontario is that not one per cent of men who purchase homes on the instalment plan fail in meeting their obligations. Their first care is to meet the interest and principal payments, and they submit to economies of the most drastic kind when that is necessary to protect their little properties. Therefore, it must be conceded that there would be no losses to the treasury from such an undertaking.

I have proposed in the resolution that returned soldiers should have the preference in the expenditure of moneys appropriated for such a purpose. We owe that to them at least; we owe to the returned soldiers a great deal more than we ever can pay; many of them have come back and have not been able to settle down in homes and are still at the mercy of landlords. The services that they rendered to us overseas require us to see that, whether they are living in the country or in the city, unusual measures are taken to bring about their re-establishment both in their occupation and in all the other phases of civil life. In fact, this is part of the re-establishment of the returned men. Those who live in the cities receive their gratuities, those who are able to go on to the farm receive a good deal more; and I think something more might be done than has been done in the way of re-establishment for soldiers having their domiciles in the cities or the country. This is one way that would prove effective and, I think, desirable, from their standpoint.

Perhaps the greatest criticism that can be brought against a proposal of this kind is: How would the fund be administered? The resolution suggests the creation of a Housing Board. My idea is that that should be composed of permanent officials, at least one of whom should be from the Department of Public Works, and that that Housing Board could, on behalf of the Government, enter into arrangements with loan companies now in existence and doing business in the Dominion of Canada. Those loans companies have had long and successful experience in conducting exactly this kind of transaction, and I have no doubt that arrangements could be made with such companies to take this money and lend it out under their direction, control and responsibility. We would then have a responsible local body, assuring to the purchaser of a home that it would be properly built; that when a contract was let to a builder, there would be such inspection as would ensure that all the specifications would properly be carried out. The money would not be paid to the builder except in proportion as the work went on, and the great profits made by speculative builders would be eliminated. At the present time the speculative builder buys a lot; he puts up two or three houses; he puts what money he has into them; he borrows what the loan company will lend on them, and then when he sells them he takes second mortgages for all he can get. Under the plan I suggest, the prospective house owner would apply to the loan company; he would have the benefit of the advice of that company; and the profit of the speculative builder—and in many cases that is a considerable item—would

be saved to him. Another feature that is important in a plan of this kind is the collection of periodical instalments. If a Government board undertook to do that work, it would have grave difficulties, but that work can be done through loan companies which would be financially interested, both in the building and in the collection of the accounts, and which would give the business the personal attention of a large and experienced staff. In that way the borrower would not be liable to the Government and could not come making a poor mouth; he would be liable to and would be required to deal with a business organization in a business way.

The reason why so many people desiring homes are unable to get them is that they must be prepared to pay down a sum equal to at least 40 per cent of the value of the property. Loan companies will lend about 60 per cent as a maximum. My proposition would be that a man should be able to get a home if he can pay down 10 per cent. If the Government were so deeply interested in the matter as to provide money, they could stand behind the loan company to the extent of 30 per cent. The man buying the house would be required to pay down at least $300 or $400—let us say $300, for the sake of illustration—on a $3,000 house. The Government would stand behind 30 per cent of the remainder, and the other 60 per cent the loan company would stand behind. It is certain that if we do not make it easier in the future than it has been in the past for men to own their own homes, the housing shortage will not only continue but will be aggravated, and conditions that are so bad now will become very much worse with almost every year that passes.

Mr. GEORGE BOYCE: Did my hon. friend ever know a person who got out of the hands of a loan company after getting into them?

Mr. HOCKEN: I have known a great many people who have got into the hands of a loan company and got out satisfactorily. I got out myself once; that is the best answer I can give my hon. friend. I thought I had cleared up that point when I said that not one per cent of the people who buy houses from loan companies fail in meeting their obligations. That looks as though they got out and got out quite satisfactorily.

Under this plan it would be possible for groups of workmen to get together who have not the capital to form companies of their own, and then take from the loan companies contracts to build these houses. I think if that were done you would get more efficiency from the builders than you have been getting in the past. During the past year brick layers were laying 700 to 800 bricks a day, and in some cases down to as low as 500. But if two or three bricklayers had a contract to put up a brick house they would lay from 1,500 to 1.800 bricks a day. As a matter of fact, on the new King Edward Hotel being built in the city of Toronto they laid 1,400 bricks a day this winter, while last summer they were laying only 600 to 700. I think if you got a group of carpenters, bricklayers and painters to co-operate, drawing their money as the work went on just as they would their wages, you would get a standard of efficiency in house building that has not been possible in the past and is not possible under any other conditions.

My idea is that the Housing Board would prepare a certain number of plans of six-roomed houses, and perhaps five-roomed, and even up to eight-roomed houses. These plans could be accepted and materials standardized. I think in the standardization of materials for the construction of such houses, and perhaps the purchase on the credit of the Housing Board of large quantities of such materials, enormous savings could be made. Each man building a house would be able to get his materials, or the greater part of them, through this Housing Board and would thereby effect a very substantial saving—and economy is an essential feature of a programme like this.

I have not attempted to work out all the details, Mr. Speaker, because that can only be done from experience. I do not think any man could to-day lay down a plan that would not require considerable adjustment in future, but experience will enable us to make those adjustments. The point I want to lay before the House is that we are faced with a tremendous need in this country, and it is a need which if not filled will make for more difficult, and perhaps disastrous, conditions in the country. On the other hand, if the need is met and filled, we shall have entirely the opposite condition. Shall we attempt to solve this matter as a great social problem, or shall we say it is beyond our power? To say the latter would be, to my mind, the counsel of timidity. There are obstacles, of course, in the way of carrying out such a proposition, but we are here to overcome such obstacles. We are elected to look after the welfare of the people of this country, and

if we are incompetent to overcome these obstacles, that should only be decided after we have made an earnest attempt to find a solution. What is needed, Sir, is vision and courage. I believe that the bonds for such a purpose as I suggest would be taken up by our own people, and the money to meet the interest would be provided year after year as the work went on. I know there is a disposition not to increase the debt of this country, but this is not a debt, it is an investment. It is a form of social legislation that is already being practiced in some places where conditions have been allowed to grow up that made legislation absolutely imperative. The British government has carried out large housing schemes. Why? Because they had to, because conditions got so bad there was nothing else for them to do. If they had started fifty or a hundred years before living conditions in Great Britain would be very much better than they are to-day; and if we go on another forty or fifty years as we are doing, and the Government does not take any cognizance of the difficulties of the average workman and artisan of the country, conditions will grow up in our great cities similar to those in the great cities of other countries. To my mind that would be deplorable.

I do not think the need can be met by private capital. I think that has been demonstrated by our experience of the last year or two. To get a real solution there must be governmental assistance. So, in view of the urgency of the need, and of the enormous benefit that would accrue from the successful carrying out of the idea, I believe this is a matter that should enlist the sympathetic consideration of the Government, and one that warrants unusual methods on the part of this Parliament.

Mr. EDWARD WALTER NESBITT (North Oxford): Mr. Speaker, I agree with my hon. friend from West Toronto (Mr. Hocken) in his remarks on the benefit to citizenship that comes from men owning their own homes. No better illustration of that could be given than conditions in the smaller cities and towns throughout the country, to which he pointed, where nearly all the working men own their property. That is the ideal situation for the community, because it makes these people take an interest in all that goes on in the community, and at the same time take an interest in their country. These men are very intelligent voters. There are seldom any strikes or troubles between labour and capital in the smaller cities and towns of this country. These men, however, in the past have been able, without any assistance from the Government, to acquire their property, and in a great many instances have been able to pay for it, either through private loans or through loan companies or corporations of that kind. No matter how they acquired their property, they have acquired it. They have saved, and in so doing have shown their character. They have been able to buy their own properties and in a great many cases they live just as comfortably as anybody else in the land. I perfectly agree with all my hon. friend has said along that line. It would be a very desirable thing if we could get everybody in this country to own their own homes, and to take an interest not only in their local community but in the country at large. But he proposes that the Dominion Government should go into the loaning business. Now, I do not agree with my hon. friend when he says that where three families live in a six-roomed house, that is perhaps a good place in which even to sleep. I think the opposite. I do agree, however, with his statement that the possession of real estate has considerable effect on a man. I have experienced the truth of that several times, but the effect is perhaps not the same as that implied by my hon. friend. The effect has been a very undesirable one sometimes, so far as I am concerned.

Mr. HOCKEN: You had too much of it.

Mr. NESBITT: I had too much of the kind. This question Mr. Speaker, came up before the Re-establishment Committee in the fall of 1919, and I think it is one that should go to the Re-establishment Board which is operating now. It came up before them and they submitted it to the Re-establishment Committee of this House, who considered it very carefully and reported against it because they thought that it was too dangerous an experiment for the Dominion Government to undertake. I should like to see every man own his own property, as my hon. friend suggests. He pictures the very happy condition that would exist if that were the case, and I agree absolutely with all that. But as to the Dominion Government undertaking to go into the loaning business, my hon. friend knows, as does everyone in this House, that there seems to be a peculiar feeling throughout the country that when any moneys can be got from the Government it does not matter very much whether they are repaid or not. For that reason I cannot share his confidence that the Government would not lose money by the proposal he makes. A few years ago, if I mistake not, we

passed a Bill in this House, authorizing the loan of $25,000,000, guaranteed by the provinces. I understand that most of the provinces have not availed themselves of that offer, although Ontario has to a certain extent; and I know that in some places in that province the scheme will entail a great deal of loss, because they are building houses which they cannot sell for anything like what it cost to put them up. I know whereof I speak, at least in one instance. In my judgment, while the hon. member who introduced the resolution is perfectly right in all he set forth this afternoon as to the desirability of people owning their own property, and on that account taking an interest in the country, and so forth, if there is any one outside of the corporations or private individuals who is going to lend money it ought to be the municipality. The municipalities have the means of knowing exactly the character of the borrower, and in the loaning of money, years of experience have taught me that a great deal more depends upon the character of the indivadual who borrows money then frequently upon the nature of the security itself. You can safely loan money to certain people with very little security, while you cannot loan it to others who offer what would apparently be good security, because, as we all know, securities depreciate very much sometimes. I have known them to go down fifty per cent in the course of ten years. And especially do securities in housing depreciate very materially through lack of care taken of the property. Some people take such excellent care of their property that after they have occupied it ten or fifteen, or even twenty years, it is in as good condition as it was when built, if not better. On the other hand, occupied by some other people, it would not, after such a period, be worth twenty-five per cent of what it originally cost. Let me repeat, that if there is any one going into the loaning business it should be the municipalities, for, as I say, they are able to obtain accurate knowledge as to the character of the borrower, and can judge accordingly. The municipality can lend money just as well as the Dominion Government, and they would know, by the character of the borrower, exactly whether they were running any risk in making a loan. My hon. friend suggests another commission. In my opinion, we have quite enough commissions already. I am opposed to another commission.

An hon. MEMBER: Call it something else.

Mr. NESBITT: A rose by any other name—you know the rest. After all, it would be a commission, and it would have to be paid for the work it undertook. They would have to be paid by the Government, or else take their expenses and their salaries out of the people to whom the loans were made, and that would not be beneficial to the borrower. Now, I am not going to take up much more time. I must, however, reiterate that I am absolutely opposed to the Dominion Government going into the loaning business.

Mr. BALDWIN: Mr. Speaker, I rise for the purpose of saying—

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order. The hon. member (Mr. Nesbitt) has not yet concluded his remarks.

Mr. NESBITT: I would commend to the mover of the resolution the suggestion I offer, that the municipality should take hold of the question, if it is a pressing one, in the city of Toronto. I know that the municipality from which I come will not ask the Dominion Government to loan them money. If they think that loans should be made they will look after this themselves.

Mr. W. K. BALDWIN (Stanstead): It is not often that I agree with the mover of the resolution, but in one respect he is right in the principle that people should own their own property. Times have changed wonderfully in my day. Forty years ago practically every one was trying to get a piece of land on which to build a home, but since that time there has been a continual exodus to the cities and now there is more land for sale and there are more deserted homes in the country than there were, say, twenty years since. People seem to want to shirk responsibility. Very many young people will spend exorbitant sums in immoderate wedding presents, and often there is more money involved in the outlay of a wedding than would buy a small farm. People do not want to shoulder the cares and responsibilities of rural life and are therefore flocking in large numbers to the cities, where there seems to be the greatest frivolity. One has only to look at the picture shows, the candy shops, and other attractions, to see the inducement that is held out for country people to come to the city. I think that the Government, instead of helping people to own their own homes in the cities, should do something to retain the rural population on our farms. Any assistance given by the Government in the way of helping people to build homes, should be

given with the distinct understanding that the occupants will be kept busy producing something or other. Everything can be said for the person who owns his own house on a plot of land, however small, from which he derives an honourable livelihood. In my opinion, the Government will have to put a tax on a good many things if they want to keep people from leaving the country and coming into already overcrowded cities. What is needed more than anything else in my section of the country just now is good roads. I made an offer, through the public press, of from $20,000 to $40,000 to the township I live in towards the construction of stone and gravel roads. I could not get them to accept my offer even though I proposed to in that way bear one-third of the cost of the entire work that needs to be done.

Now, with respect to what the Government has done in the way of helping the returned soldier let me say that from my observation a great many soldiers who have gone upon the land have made a success of it, but still a large number of the farms that were taken up for this purpose have been thrown back again on the hands of the Government. And I believe it can be taken for granted that in the first place the Government paid for these farms far more than they were worth; in other words many of these farms could have been bought for fifty per cent less than was paid for them had the purchase been conducted in a businesslike manner.

The principle of the resolution is in the right direction but how are you going to carry it out? If you go into the rural sections of the country you will find in every township vacant houses. Surely it is not proposed to build more houses in the cities in view of the fact that the urban centres are already full of people that cannot get work. I read a short time ago that in the Niagara district they were running the great industries there at only twenty-five to thirty per cent of their capacity. While there are vacant houses in the country districts some steps should be taken to induce people to live in those houses and cultivate the soil. While the idea of everybody in the country owning their own house is a good one, and while there is not the least doubt that in the people who own their own dwellings you have the finest force of constabulary that you can possibly have, I do not think it would be wise to embark upon such a large expenditure of public money as the resolution contemplates.

[Mr. Baldwin.]

Mr. WILLIAM GARLAND McQUARRIE (New Westminster): I should have been much better pleased if the mover of this resolution had asked for a further grant under the scheme which the Federal Government adopted in 1918, whereby it advanced money to the provincial governments, and the provincial governments in turn advanced money to the municipalities for the purpose of making loans to soldiers to enable them to build their own homes. So far as my experience has gone that plan worked out very well indeed, and I think the dwellings which were built were very much needed. In my opinion the building of those houses was a very good thing for the returned soldier. The object of that scheme has not yet been fully attained. The conditions still exist which would warrant the building of more houses for returned soldiers, and I think we might very well now ask that further grants be made under similar conditions. Before I left home I was handed a memorandum by the Great War Veterans' Association of New Westminster. The memorandum sets out certain arguments in favour of a further grant which I think are perfectly sound. These arguments are as follows:

1. The object of the first appropriation has not been attained, viz; the alleviation of the shortage in housing accommodation. Rents are as high or even higher than in 1918 and the same shortage of houses exists.

2. It is universally admitted that a community of people owning their own homes is a much greater asset to the state than a community of rent-payers. The ownership of a home creates a spirit of civic pride and fosters an interest in public affairs and community welfare which acts as a sedative to the present unrest and discourages the irresponsible agitator.

3. To the returned soldiers, many of whom have only since returning from overseas assumed the position of head of a family, the scheme is of paramount benefit. The settling of these men in their own homes, where their tenancy is secure and they are not subject to exorbitant rents, and which puts within their reach a substantial dwelling which they would probably be unable to acquire otherwise, is one of the most effective means of turning a soldier into a fully re-established citizen.

4. The continuation of building operations at the present time would tend to relieve the present unemployment situation.

5. The inauguration of a building programme at this time would necessitate large purchases of lumber and other supplies. This would have a stabilizing effect on the lumber market and would benefit the lumber mills which are now preparing to resume operations after a period of depression and uncertainty in the lumber trade. The purchase of other supplies from dealers in different trades would also tend to keep money in circulation and prevent stagnation in business during a trying time.

Now the member for North Oxford (Mr. Nesbitt) has said that if any one is going

to loan money for the purchasing or building of houses it should be the municipalities. Well, that is exactly what this scheme contemplates. The Dominion Government, as a matter of fact, only finances the provinces and they in turn finance the municipalities, so that the municipalities are really the ones who assume the responsibility for the indebtedness. The Dominion Government has a perfectly good security when it has the bond of the provincial governments, and the latter have a perfectly good security when they have the backing of the municipalities. My hon. friend from North Oxford also said that the municipalities could borrow the money just as well as the Government could. In that view I am afraid he was mistaken. My hon. friend, of course, has a good deal of knowledge in respect to financial matters, but I am inclined to think he made that statement without giving the matter much thought; it is well known that a municipality cannot borrow money on such good terms as a government can do; and the security of the Dominion Government is much better in the markets of the world than that of any municipality. The hon. member for North Oxford said furthermore that in his town they would not think of asking for any loan of this kind. That fact does not need to affect the situation in any way. My hon. friend's town does not necessarily have to take advantage of this plan, neither does any municipality which does not deem it advisable to go into the loaning of monies under this scheme. The municipality has to decide on the applications which are made, and if it considers it is not advisable to proceed with the scheme there is no obligation on its part to do so. It seems to me that the plan to which I have referred is a good one and should be continued. I know there are a large number of soldiers who find themselves more or less homeless and who would gladly take advantage of the opportunity of borrowing more money under the scheme which has been in force. Therefore, Mr. Speaker, I would urge upon the Government the continuation of the former scheme of lending money for the purpose of helping our returned men to build homes.

Mr. F. S. CAHILL (Pontiac): Mr. Speaker, I was opposed to the legislation passed in 1919 permitting the Government to loan money to the provinces, to be in turn loaned to the municipalities; and I am also opposed to this resolution. I am not a socialist, nor do I believe in paternalism in government. We have had entirely too much of that form of government in recent years, and we have loaned money so freely that the credit of the country has been jeopardized in every way that any hon. member opposite could think of. We have come to the time when our national credit is more or less strained, and when every hon. member should be aiming to devise ways and means for economizing in our expenditures and conserving Canada's credit.

My hon. friend from West Toronto (Mr Hocken) is fairly consistent with the average Ontario Tory—he is quite willing to get something for Ontario. The opinion seems to prevail among most of the people in that province that the other provinces exist solely for the purpose of spoon-feeding Ontario. They must have protection for their manufactured goods—ploughs, for instance; they must jeopardize the national credit in order that they may be able to sell those goods to foreign countries that will never repay the loans we have advanced them; and they must have at every session special legislation in support of the peculiar industries of their province. I see in the Public Accounts ending March 31, 1920, that under the $25,000,000-loan proposition Ontario got $8,750,000, while the other eight provinces availed themselves of the loan only to the extent of $2,990,000. In other words, Ontario got two and a half times as much money from this Government as all the other provinces combined.

5 p.m.

Mr. HOCKEN: That was the fault of the other provinces.

Mr. CAHILL: The "fault" of the other provinces was that their credit was better than the credit of the Dominion in some instances and better than the credit of Ontario. The province of Quebec availed itself of that $25,000,000 loan only to the extent of $60,000, because their credit was better than the credit of the Dominion; they could borrow money cheaper themselves. They did not believe in special legislation, and they did not believe in paternalism in government.

At the present time the business of this Government is not socialism, its business is to take care of the wants of all the people. This country offers sufficient opportunities to men of enterprise and energy to make their own way without being spoon-fed by the Government; perhaps there is no country in the world that offers such ample opportunities to every-

one. And yet we are called upon from day to day to pass special legislation taxing one citizen to enable other citizens to live in comfort and, in many cases, in idleness. Let each individual stand on his own feet. Let the Government legislate for all the people instead of giving special privileges to particular classes, and let the Government not interfere with trade unless that trade interferes with the rights of any of our citizens. Then we will have a country that will attract the best class of immigrants, because they will recognize that their success depends on their own initiative and resolution. Let us give all our people an equal standing. No man wants anything more; no man is entitled to anything more.

Mr. SPEAKER: It chanced that I was absent from the Chamber when the mover of the resolution concluded his remarks. Had I been in the Chair my intention was to put the question to the House whether it would concur in the amendment suggested by the hon. member for Maisonneuve. I hope the House will concur, because then there will be no question whatsoever about the propriety or form of the resolution. The proposed amendment is:

That the words "the sum of ten million dollars should be appropriated annually for a period of five years" be stricken out, and the words "an annual appropriation should be made," inserted in lieu thereof.

Is it the pleasure of the House that the hon. member shall have leave to amend his motion accordingly?

Some hon. MEMBERS: Carried.

Mr. GEORGE BOYCE (Carleton): Mr. Speaker, I did not expect to say anything on this resolution, not knowing that it would come up to-day, but I was a little taken aback by the hon. member for Pontiac (Mr. Cahill) indulging in his usual hard knocks at the province of Ontario. Now, I did not think that this resolution had anythink in particular to do with the province of Ontario, but that it related to the whole Dominion. Although this resolution comes from a gentleman of very great ability, still, I consider it a very dangerous proposal, for several reasons. It would mean that the cities would take advantage of the proposed appropriation, as the country places would have no occasion to avail themselves of it—but of course they would have to do their share toward finding the money. Further, if this resolution became law we would have to organize a new department at great expense, and by the time we had paid the salaries of an architect and other officials to carry out the regulations a large sum of money would be spent apart altogether from that devoted to encouraging the building of homes. No doubt as long as the Government would do the building there would be any number of people ready to take the houses; and there is no question that there would be a very small return on the money loaned. But, apart from the heavy expenditure this proposal would entail, it would have the further disadvantage of taking away from our young men any incentive to exert themselves to provide their own homes—and we all know that in times past we had to work very hard to become our own landlords. And where is this going to end? We have old age pensions, we have soldiers' pensions, pensions for unemployment are going to be proposed, and I do not know what other suggestions of a similar kind. Any legislation to help our soldiers I am heartily in accord with, but legislation such as this resolution suggests would not enure to the general advantage of the country, and the Treasury cannot afford it. Our national debt stands at the stupendous figure of over $2,000,000,000, and with our other financial commitments I think we ought to be very slow to build houses for those who do not intend to work for themselves. But I think if one stipulation had been inserted in this resolution it would be very beneficial to our young men, namely, that the picture shows and theatres be closed so that what those young men earn during the day they may not spend at night. Then they might be able to save some money to build homes of their own. I think we would do well to restore to as great an extent as possible that free and independent spirit that prevailed in Canada among the early settlers in connection with their getting themselves established and building up homes in a new country for themselves and their families. I am against the resolution for the reasons which I have stated, although I support the idea that we should do all we possibly can for those deserving people who are in poor circumstances and cannot own their own homes. But as for encouraging the younger man or any man to waste his time or to indulge in habits of idleness in making him the offer of a house under the terms suggested, I will vote against it every time.

Mr. HUME CRONYN (London): Mr. Speaker, I agree with the general remarks of the mover (Mr. Hocken) of the resolution. I believe, as I think we all do, that the home is the foundation of character

and the foundation of our country, and coming as I do from a city the majority of whose inhabitants own their own homes, I know the value to a community of a home-owning population. If, therefore, I attempt to criticize some features of the suggestions made, I do not do so from any desire of decrying the main idea.

In the first place, it has been suggested, not by the mover but by a subsequent speaker, that the Government might enter the lending business. That, I think, would be a grave mistake. In 1914, and early in 1915, the Government saw fit, under extraordinary circumstances, to make large grants to certain of the farmers in the West—grants which in the majority of cases resulted in a wonderful return both to the men themselves and to the country at large. I believe that—speaking from memory—out of about $12,000,000 advanced for seed grain, fodder and relief at that time, there is still owing on account of principal, not taking interest into consideration, something like $2,000,000. It is difficult to persuade borrowers from a government to repay, as they will and must repay a private corporation. I was much struck by a speech delivered in Moose Jaw not long ago by Mr. Dunning, the provincial treasurer of Saskatchewan, in which he was reviewing the operations of the Saskatchewan Farm Loan Board. He pointed out that in respect of loans made over a period of some three years—I do not think the board has been operating longer than three years—amounting to about $6,000,000, there were now $300,000 of interest in arrear. Mr. Dunning said in the frankest way, as is his wont: "When a man borrows from the government, about the last thing he seems to think it necessary to do is to repay, and I tell you gentlemen, unless our borrowers change their methods, our whole scheme will break down."

However, the mover has suggested that instead of the Government entering the lending business, money should be advanced, as I understand it, by Government through loan corporations who would be entrusted with the lending of the money and with the perhaps more arduous task of collecting repayments. I do not know that that is impossible, but it could hardly be done free of charge. I have been able to go into calculations as to the cost only since the resolution was moved this afternoon, and I am afraid that difficulties might be produced which are not in the minds of hon. members. Take the case instanced by the mover, of an investment in a property of $3,000, ten per cent being provided by the borrower and the balance, $2,700, being obtained by him through loan. I take it that the amount mentioned, $3,000, was supposed to be sufficient to pay for both lot and building, otherwise the loan would have to be larger or the borrower would have to put up more money. Well, if we assume that the lot and the building would cost $3,000—and I am afraid that the cases in which both could be obtained for that amount are somewhat rare—we have first to agree what rate of interest would be paid; nothing was said about that. I have to guess the rate; I place it at seven per cent,—that is distinctly below the present market rate in a good many of the provinces. The Government could hardly borrow to-day any considerable amount of money in Canada at less than six per cent. Then, the company charged with the supervision of lending and collecting would have to get about one per cent per annum, and even at that rate they would not be too well paid if the work were properly done. With interest at seven per cent; with taxes at an average rate of thirty mills; with an assessment at the rate of ninety per cent of the value of the propery; with insurance, and with a certain amount by way of repayment on principal, a payment of about $400 a year would be required from the borrower of $2,700, at least for the first few years,—his interest bill would, of course, decrease as his principal was reduced. Now, I leave it to the House whether the average borrower who put up ten per cent, or $300, at the outset, could fairly be counted upon to supply $400 per annum with which to carry on. Much would depend, of course, upon his occupation, his rate of wage, and his success in finding work throughout the year.

It is quite true, as was said by the mover, that the number of foreclosures or sales by loan companies, at least in Ontario, has been very small. That has been due, perhaps, to two causes. In the first place, prices, both of real estate and of building, have generally been rising, and if the original borrower were unable to pay he could always find some one to take over his bargain—some one, perhaps, in a better position to meet the debt and finally pay it off. In the second place, we must not lose sight of the fact that while, in the pre-war days, loan companies were prepared to lend up to, say, sixty per cent of the value of a house as established by an independent person, I doubt very much whether they would agree to-day to lend more than fifty per cent, having regard to present values and prices. Nor is it diffi-

cult to understand why, because in the February issue of the Labour Gazette, page 250, the index number on the first of January of this year relating to the wholesale prices of building materials—the prices of forty-eight different kinds of materials in various sections of the country being taken as a basis—was 347.1, as compared with 140.6 for January, 1913. In other words, building materials have increased in cost nearly two and one-half times in the last seven years. I happen to know that some companies, while they are prepared to lend half the value of real estate, limit their loans on buildings to 33⅓ per cent of their present cost. If under the plan suggested we are to make a loan of 90 per cent of the present cost and to insist upon repayments of principal—and this is the only safe method of conducting such a business—we have an entirely different situation from that confronting loan companies lending 50 or even 60 per cent of the cost. I for one would fear that in many cases there would, of necessity, be default, and if the loan company were compelled, as I presume it would be, in carrying out its bargains with the Government, to take proceedings, too often the original builders or owners would lose such money as they had put into their homes. There is a vast difference between an owner who has an equity of 40 or 50 per cent in his home and one who has an equity of 10 per cent. Something was said, I suppose jocularly, to the effect that you never get out of a loan company's hands. The last thing in the world a loan company wants is to get property on its hands; that is not its business. I can only speak for the mortgage company with which I am connected, and I can say that for thirteen or fourteen years at least, we have had no property on our hands. As a matter of fact, while twenty years ago, we were lending to farmers and others in the immediate vicinity of our offices millions of money, we are to-day borrowing from those same men an equal or greater amount which in turn we lend to others who are starting in life as they did. We are lending it out very largely to western farmers who, I have every belief and hope, will repeat the experience of their Ontario brothers and be, before long, in the market as lenders rather than as borrowers.

One word as to the soldiers. We have, as has been said, considered this question more than once. To my mind, the great difficulty arose from this question: If we are to have a scheme for allowing a soldier to build a home, and if we are to advance to him 80 or 90 per cent of the cost thereof, what can we say to the soldier who has a mortgage already on his home? Must we not make an advance to him if we can get that money at a lower rate? What can we say to the man who wants to buy out a business? Must we not advance money to him to enable him to establish a business? Is not that essentially re-establishment? And are there not many other proposals equally deserving, equally of advantage to the country, to which we could hardly say "no," if we start in the business of advancing money to soldiers for any other purpose than that one now in force, namely, agricultural settlement?

Mr. H. M. MOWAT (Parkdale): Mr. Speaker, I think we are indebted to my hon. friend and colleague in the next constituency to mine (Mr. Hocken), for bringing this matter before the House, and I desire to say a word or two in support of his resolution. He has pictured in a very lucid manner, and apparently as a result of much thought, a condition of domestic life which is not attended by proper comfort and safeguards. His experience for many years as controller and mayor in a large city has enabled him to speak with authority on these matters. I have been told by others, and I know myself, that in large cities now the housing situation is becoming so acute that something must be done, because the congestion makes a squalor which is bound to have an evil effect upon families and, indeed, one might say that it affects the morality of the people. A condition where there are three or four families in a seven-roomed house with a community of kitchen arrangements, and that sort of thing, cannot but have an evil effect and get us into the same condition which has been fought now for fifty or sixty years in the slums of the large cities of Europe. England and Scotland have known that, despite all the arguments against such a proposition from an economic standpoint, it is not the theory of economics that must be considered, but the condition that exists that must be met. That shows the importance of dealing in a serious manner with the resolution which is now before the House.

It is quite true that many of the remarks which fell from the lips of the hon. member for Oxford North (Mr. Nesbitt) may be agreed with, and yet dissented from on the ground that this is a condition of affairs which is fast becoming desperate. The remarks of my hon. friend, whose advice on

these matters is always listened to with attention in this House, should not have too much effect upon hon. members, because of the very careful, cautious manner in which he deals with a business proposition. The result of his remarks was to throw a wet blanket, so to speak, upon an admirable proposition. You cannot look at these things solely from a business standpoint at the present time, because with the return of the men from the war and their inability to cope with conditions of life on account of either mental or physical derangement, such a situation has been produced that the country must step in and, to some extent, be paternal in its efforts. I think the lending of money in the Northwest for grain is a totally different category from the present idea. Lending on wheat is lending on personal property, making a personal loan, and if some of that—only $2,000,000 as it appears—has not been repaid, that is unfortunate, but it is due to the condition that it is personal property and you have only the personal promise of the individual. But erecting buildings by Government, financing and keeping as security the buildings which you erect, means a loan which must be listed, in a totally different category. There is the building and the lot which cannot be removed, and you have not merely the personal promise of the occupant, but the building and the land themselves. Therefore, the security is infinitely better, and I do not think the House should be influenced to frown upon a motion of this kind where the security always seems to be in hand and not dependent altogether on the personal character of the borrower. It is true a careful loan company will get reports on the personal character of those to whom it proposes to loan money, and if it finds that the applicant is reckless or a spendthrift it will not lend to him—but that is largely for their own convenience because they do not wish to have to take over land on which they have loaned money.

The great advantage in a scheme of this kind, of building many houses, is that the cost is made so much less because of the standardization of the different parts, and because of the wholesale purchase of materials. Bricks and lumber, for instance, could be got wholesale from the manufacturers instead of each man buying individually, and by standardizing window frames and other articles you would get a very much cheaper general cost.

My hon. friend from London (Mr. Cronyn) has put in a word of caution against going into a scheme of this sort as an aid to returned soldiers, on the ground that it may be demanded that the scheme be extended to men who wish money to start up in business, to men who already have houses on which there is a mortgage and which they ask to be relieved from, or to men who wish to obtain their money at a cheaper rate. These difficulties no doubt exist, and the demands may be made, but if you have a clear-cut proposal in the first place for the building and financing of houses in order to alleviate the dreadful condition in some of our cities, I think we can look with equanimity on what is likely to happen in the way of demands from other sources. If it is not possible for us to go further than this particular scheme, let us say so, and not refuse to go into a good scheme simply because other and further demands may be made.

Mr. BALDWIN: It has been said that these houses would not be removable, therefore, I presume they would be of fire-proof construction. But if not fire-proof, who would pay for the expense of insuring the building, and for repairs, and so forth?

Mr. MOWAT: My idea is that each different item—taxes, insurance, rent, and so forth—should be paid in one instalment, so that the man would know exactly what he would have to pay.

Mr. BALDWIN: What would you think the overhead charges would be? Some one would have to look after the repairs, insurance, and upkeep generally.

Mr. MOWAT: My idea on that is very clear. This scheme cannot be put through except in a community or block, and every community should run its own business affairs. Overhead expenses and depreciation should be provided for jointly by the community and the householder. Of course, I speak now more with reference to the scheme referred to by my hon. friend from North Oxford (Mr. Nesbitt) with regard to block communities near large cities, meant chiefly for returned soldiers who are not able to obtain housing accommodation under present conditions. My hon. friend is mistaken if he thinks that matter is not before the Pensions and Re-establishment Committee this year as it was before. I have not pressed it very hard because I have had in mind that the people of this country have not yet appreciated what has been done in the Old Country and the United States along these lines. When we think of the immense increase in the value of property in the model villages in the Old Country,

owing to scientific management, architectural design, and beauty of landscape, we need not be alarmed at all as to any losses occurring. I am told that properties in Letchworth have increased by one-third in appraised value, just because of the popularity of the life which these model villages afford. This refers to a model village or block town near to a large centre. Undoubtedly, despite the protest of my hon. friend from Carleton (Mr. Boyce), these are meant for the town man. We have already looked after the farmer, or those who can become farmers, by our Soldier Settlement plan. But there are other men who are in the most unfortunate position of having given up their little business or trade in the town when they went to the war, and who find when they come back that they are not able to make their way. Now those men should be looked after by the country just as much as, if not more than the men who can go on the farm and make a success of it. While the object of the motion is to provide these residences in towns, for city men, I do not think the people of this country will dissent from that at all, because they know of so many men who have been unable to make their way and provide proper housing for themselves and their families. The man from the city who comes back from the war and finds that he cannot get back the business he practically sacrificed is in a dire plight. He may by vocational training, perhaps, learn to make his living in some other way, yet he has not the money to house his family properly, and this is a scheme, not to give him the money, not to provide any dole or charity—because the instalments to be applied on purchase should be rigidly insisted on—but to assist him in getting a home for himself and his family. Of course, if you are going to play the game of giving in to every man who cannot pay his instalment, who makes a poor mouth and writes letters to the paper, and gets ill-advised people to fight for him, the scheme will fail. The commission must rigidly insist on the terms of purchase being complied with; And if that is done, the country will be at no loss. On the other hand, these little communities will increase in value and will greatly contribute to the happiness and content of a vast number of people, and will prevent many from slipping into slum life and becoming degraded both in morals and living conditions generally.

Mr. W. F. COCKSHUTT (Brantford): Mr. Speaker, I am not able to agree with my two estimable friends from Toronto,

[Mr. Mowat.]

for, contrary to the expectation of my hon. friend from Pontiac (Mr. Cahill), I am not one of those who believe the government should go into a housing scheme on a wholesale scale. I have had a little experience in houses myself, and if the Government want to lose money I would recommend them to go into a housing scheme on a large scale. I do not think we are in a position to risk the finances of our country in such a scheme as my hon. friend from West Toronto (Mr. Hocken) has laid before us. The reason houses are scarce to-day is because it does not pay to build them; that is the reason pure and simple. If you can make housing a profitable investment, capital will be found to build houses, but under the conditions which now obtain in the building trade it is not possible to buy land and build a house in any of our towns and cities and make 5 per cent clear. That has been my experience, and I think I am well within the mark. I believe one would make a good deal less than 5 per cent. After the local taxation is paid, and after insurance repairs, burst pipes, and all the rest of it, are attended to, owners of houses will find that their rental bill has dropped very materially, and I leave it to any hon. gentleman who has experience in the renting of houses—I am speaking of those that rent at a moderate rate—whether it is not a very poor-paying business, and one that brings endless trouble to owners. I want to point out that if the Government is going into the housing scheme, it is going to drive out individual effort along that line. That fact should not be forgotten, and that is precisely why fewer houses are being built to-day than should be the case. Private investors have become afraid that the Government is really going into building as a business. I have just made a rough calculation that there are probably 2,000,000 homes in Canada, that is, allowing about four and half to five persons per home—and I think that is a moderate estimate. Suppose twenty-five percent of these required government help to house them properly—that would be a fair proposition. That would leave 500,000 homes to be provided. Take these at the moderate price of $3,000 each and you have $1,500,000,000 invested in homes for twenty-five per cent of the people, or a proposition about equal in magnitude to the nationalization of the railways of Canada. Now, if the Government is going to take the place of the private investor, it ought to take the whole field, because the private investor who has to pay 7 per cent for

his money cannot compete with the Government, or with government-aided houses that are paying 5 or 6 per cent. Private investors, under such circumstances, will not enter the field. I have seen some very good articles in British reviews lately on this question. Lady Selborne, I think, has written two or three articles, after very close consideration of the housing scheme, and she gives an analysis of the question with which the British Government is faced, the situation there being very much more acute than in Canada; and she points out that if the Government implements the scheme it has under consideration, it will tax the national financial capacity to its utmost. Surely, in the present state of the finances of Canada, we do not want to embark on a scheme that will cost as much as I have stated, and not $50,000,000 as this resolution suggests. Why, $50,000,000 could be consumed in the city of Toronto alone.

Mr. LEMIEUX: Hear, hear.

Mr. COCKSHUTT: And in the city of Montreal there would have to be spent a considerably larger sum. Every town and city in Canada would also call for some expenditure, if the Government took hold of the proposition on a proper scale. In the finality, the scheme practically amounts to the nationalization of the homes in Canada, by which I mean those houses which people cannot afford to build for themselves.

Now, the returned soldier is in quite a different position. If he wants help, I say by all means let him have it, whether it is to build a home or to establish himself in business, or on a farm. For that I hold up both hands, if the country can afford it. But if any great industry—and I speak now as one who is somewhat interested in industry—finds its own men are not properly housed. I say that it is the duty of the manufacturer to put up houses, to see that his employees are housed as they should be. I stand for that; I believe it is a sound principle. I think that some manufacturers in Canada have done this, and all model factories that want to look after their hands properly know that one of the first considerations in the problem of maintaining stable help is to have employees well paid, and well housed, as far as possible, in fairly close proximity to the works. Of course, it is not possible to house them too close to the factories, but accomodation could be found for them away from the smoke and annoyance of their work and yet within easy walking distance. That is possible in all our smaller towns and cities, although it is out of the question in Toronto, Montreal, and two or three of the larger centres. My contention, in brief, is, that the sum required for housing the people of Canada should not be spent for any one city, but for all our cities, and for the country as well if the people there require it. I say, house every one if you are going to enter into this business at all. If you are going to lend money to builders of all houses that are required, I believe my figures will be found to be fairly conservative, and I estimate that it will take about $1,500,000,000 for the initial expense of a housing scheme at present. Building material is at present out of sight, so to speak, and you will not get houses to-day for $6,000, which five or six years ago you could build for $3,000. The present, therefore, is not a good time at which to embark on the building business on a large scale, because the man who builds to-day on 5 per cent money may find that within two or three years his margin of 2 per cent on interest will have shrunk to such an extent by the falling market, which I expect in the near future in building materials, and possibly in labour, that this $6,000 house will have shrunk to $4,000. So that if he had a margin of safety of $2,000, that would be wiped out under existing conditions of building. If he built a $4,000 or $3,000 house he ought to have from $30 to $35 per month for it, and that is a large rent for a working man to pay. It is more than he should be called upon to pay, but it is not more than is demanded in all our towns to-day. People are asked to pay from $30 to $35 and even more per month. Therefore, with all deference to my hon. friend from West Toronto, I hope he will not try to induce the Government to embark on a scheme of such magnitude as this would undoubtedly be. It cannot be undertaken on a small scale if it is to be equitable, and as the scale it calls for is out of the question, I trust that the House will not sanction this proposal involving an expenditure of $50,000,000, because it would not settle the question. This sum is a mere bagatelle to what is required, and would not be of any benefit to those who borrow money and build to-day, because they would lose on their proposition by the shrinkage I have pointed out. And as the resolution stands, it calls for something which this Government has never been asked to do before. Let the cities, and the manufacturers particularly, look after the housing of their own people, and if the soldiers require homes, as I think they do, then that should be looked

after by the committee that has been appointed, and which will probably bring in a recommendation on the subject. I trust the motion will not be seriously considered by the House.

Mr. G. W. ANDREWS (Winnipeg Centre): I have listened with a great deal of interest to the many arguments in this debate, and I am still firmly of the same opinion as at the outset, namely, that there is a great shortage of houses in Canada. I am under the impression that if our health by-laws were properly enforced in Winnipeg, we should have somewhere in the neighbourhood of 20,000 people without homes at all. This is a state of affairs that has to be met some time, somehow, and if we are not competent to meet it, I have not the slightest doubt that some other bunch of legislators will come who will be able to deal with the matter. People have to live in decent houses, and, as I say, by some means or other, this problem must be faced. I was somewhat annoyed by a remark of one hon. gentleman who said that he was not in favour of this Government going into schemes of this kind, because he believed in people standing on their own feet. I feel compelled to point out to that hon. gentleman that there are many citizens of Canada who have not two feet to stand on; they lost them in the war. My particular object in rising now is to refer to that phase of the subject.

The hon. member who moved the resolution referred particularly to the returned soldiers. Now, we already have a Special Committee sitting which is empowered to investigate their affairs, and as it is very apparent to my mind,—as I am sure it will be the wish of hon. members—that if any class at all should receive consideration it should be this class, and bearing in mind the fact that they undoubtedly would be the first class to receive such consideration, I think the debate has reached the stage where we might well pass the subject on to the Soldiers' Committee. Under the circumstances, with the permission of the House, I would move the adjournment of the debate.

Motion agreed to.

At Six o'clock the House took recess.

After Recess

The House resumed at Eight o'clock.

PROPOSED RIGHT OF MINISTERS TO SIT IN EITHER CHAMBER

Hon. RODOLPHE LEMIEUX (Maisonneuve) moved:

[Mr. Cockshutt.]

That, in the opinion of this House, it is in the interest of good government, that Ministers of the Crown should be permitted to sit in either Chamber, whenever measures and policies are introduced affecting their respective departments.

He said: Mr. Speaker, I regret that the Government benches are practically empty. In the good old days ministers were in their seats betimes, but after having passed through so many embarrassments of late perhaps the tardy attendance of the members of the present ministry is not to be wondered at. At all events, Mr. Speaker, I shall proceed with my resolution. I have brought it forward with a view to expediting the business of the House, believing it to be a reform well worthy of adoption by this Parliament.

At Confederation we adopted the bi-cameral system. I know there are some people in the country, and perhaps in this House, who think that we should be satisfied with one chamber; but I believe that there is a large body of public opinion which stands for an upper chamber. No doubt our upper chamber might with advantage be reformed in certain respects, but I am confident that I am in the right when I assert that the mass of the people are in favour of the continuance of the bi-cameral system.

Personally, I am in favour of an upper chamber. First, because it was instituted for the protection of minorities in our Confederation. Second, because the representatives of certain of the provinces which united to form the Dominion feared that the predominance of the larger provinces in Parliament might perhaps prejudice the interests of the smaller ones, and they therefore insisted on the establishment of an upper chamber. Third, because I have an ingrained respect for the pact of Confederation itself. That pact is sacred to all the provinces, and their representatives should see that no encroachment is made on our constitution. And then, as Sir John A. Macdonald said, when he pleaded in favour of an upper chamber at the time of the Confederation debates:

A second chamber has been recognized in all democratic countries as a check against ill-considered and hasty legislation.

If this was true under normal conditions, it is still more so to-day when the world is passing through a crisis and as an aftermath of this great war there is in all parts of the world an agitation for reconstruction. The term " reconstruction " may cover many iniquities, and in order that we in this country may have the advantage of

a real reconstruction—a reconstruction which will be in the best interests of the country and which will be carried out in a spirit of respect for the constitution and for the rights of all classes of the community—I believe that an upper chamber is perhaps even more necessary now than under normal conditions.

And Sir, much as the upper chamber might be criticized, I believe that on many occasions it has given evidence of real independence of thought and action. Not later than two years ago many senators, appointed by the present Government, were not afraid to cast their votes against what I believed was ill-considered and hasty legislation, a legislation which may perhaps very seriously involve the future of Canada itself. I refer to their vote on the very important issue of the acquisition of the Grand Trunk Railway system.

I do not say, Mr. Speaker, that there is no room for Senate reform. For instance, I believe that there should be an age limit, and perhaps a change in the mode of selection of the gentlemen who occupy seats in the upper chamber. I have always thought that the election of senators might in itself be a very good reform—election by legislatures, boards of trade, universities, and such public bodies. Of course, that is another question; I simply mention it this evening because I do not wish it to be thought that this resolution means something which it does not mean. Some of my friends on both sides of the House have thought that perhaps I was favouring the appointment of Cabinet ministers to the Senate. Mr. Speaker, we cannot afford to allow the upper chamber to be without representatives of the Government; we must face the situation that there will always be at least a leader representing the Government in that body, and occasions will arise when it will be necessary to have Cabinet ministers in the Senate. I do think, however, that mostly all Cabinet ministers should occupy seats in the popular chamber and that the less there are in the upper chamber the better for the Government and better for Canada. At all events, if any Cabinet ministers have to sit in the upper chamber, it is to be hoped that the Government, whether Liberal, Conservative or Agrarian, will always see to it that ministers in charge of spending departments sit in the popular chamber. I think that is a sound principle.

In England we have the time-honoured House of Lords; several ministers of the Crown sit in that chamber. I do not know how many members of the present British Government sit in the House of Lords, but I know that certain of them do, and not the least important of them, at that. In England there have been cases where even the Prime Minister sat in the upper chamber; I recall the names of Lord Beaconsfield, Lord Salisbury, Lord Rosebery. But in all those cases, which were exceptional cases, the Government was represented in the popular chamber by most brilliant and distinguished men who really carried public opinion with them,—Gladstone, Balfour, Asquith, Lloyd George; and I could name several others. But I believe that in England the day has gone by when prime prime ministers shall sit in the upper chamber. Though tradition means much in that country, yet with the new wave of public opinion and with the reforms which have come gradually—indeed, the constitution itself is made up of precedents which come slowly down from year to year—I believe that the force of public opinion in England will not now stand for that practice and in days to come the prime minister, representing public opinion, representing the new democracy, will have a seat in the popular assembly and there propound the policies of the government. Of course, the government will always be represented by some very eminent minister in the upper chamber.

The Commons, Mr. Speaker, has been and is to-day the great inquest of the nation. To the Commons belongs the most important problems of government. To the Commons must be announced the policies of the government. Indeed, the House of Commons is the great lever of the British constitution. True it is that no Bill, no Act of Parliament, is perfect or complete without the sanction of His Majesty the King; all measures are sanctioned by His Majesty the King, the House of Lords and the House of Commons. But everybody feels that the great driving power in matter of legislation belongs to the House of Commons, and it is right that it should be so.

Now, Mr. Speaker, though I am a traditionalist—and I am not ashamed to say that I am a traditionalist—the realities of life will perforce bring some radical changes. Of course, as I have intimated, as long as we have the bicameral system—and I hope we shall maintain it—the government of the day must be represented in some way in the Senate.

But I do not see why a minister sitting in the upper chamber or in the House of Commons should be debarred from appearing in the other chamber, without having a right to vote. I do not see why a minister of the Crown sitting, for instance, in the upper chamber, should not have a right to appear before the House of Commons to explain the policies of his department and to answer questions when the Estimates of his department are scrutinized in the House. Nor do I see why the gentlemen who occupy the Government benches in this House should not be allowed to appear in the upper chamber to give there such explanations as may be required of them. There is nothing new under the sun. This system which I am now propounding is the system followed in France, where it is not necessary that a minister of the Republic should even be elected by the people, and I suppose that would suit many of my hon. friends who have, at the present moment, cabinet aspirations. This happens very often. But presently, M. Briand is a member of the Chambre des Députés. The old tiger, M. Clemenceau, was also a member of one of the two Houses, I forget whether it was the Senate or the Chambre des Députés. M. Leygues, who was defeated a few weeks ago, is a member of the Chambre des Députés. The ministers at all events are not necessarily members of the French Parliament, and ministers in France can be summoned to appear on different occasions before either the popular assembly or the Senate. Last year I was a very close follower of the sessions of the French Parliament, and I could see one afternoon, for instance, a minister of the Republic appearing before the popular assembly, giving explanations, answering questions and passing from that assembly to the Senate sitting at the Luxembourg Palace. It is simply common sense that ministers of the Crown in Canada should have the same privilege. Both Houses should have the same right, because I claim as a right, on the part of any member, that when a policy is presented to the House, if the minister who has prepared, laid out, planned and initiated that policy, sits in the other chamber, he should be amenable here to explain that policy, to answer questions, to accept amendments. When the budget of such a minister's department is being debated before this House—and this is the only branch of Parliament which can discuss and debate at length the budget of a department and move for its reduction at the request of a member. I think it is simply commons sense that members of this House should have the right to summons the minister whose policy is questioned or whose budget is criticized. I stated a moment ago that in such an occurrence I would not give to the minister, belonging to the other chamber and appearing before this House, a vote; but he would speak freely in the House; he would explain as many times as necessary, and he would, therefore, help in framing the legislation and in directing the policy of the Government which, in the final result, becomes the policy of Parliament.

Mr. MACLEAN (Halifax): Would the hon. member allow a minister sitting in a chamber other than the one to which he belongs, to make a motion?

Mr. LEMIEUX: That, of course, is a question of detail which might be framed in the amendment which would be necessary to the rules of the House; but at first sight, I would say: No. I would say that he could suggest to one of his colleagues, or to any other member of the House, the main features of the motion, and he would be allowed to speak in support of it. I would not give him more power than he is entitled to. We, the members of the popular branch of Parliament, are vested with special powers; our rights, so to speak, are sacred. We hold those right directly from the people; we have a right to discuss; we have a right to condemn; we have a right to amend; we have a right to denounce, under certain rules. My object, it seems to me, is a common sense one. I will give some concrete examples of what trouble can be caused by the absence from this House of ministers who have seats in another chamber. My object is to bring ministers sitting, let us say, in the Senate, before the House of Commons, to explain their policies, to defend their Estimates and to accept whatever amendments are suggested by the House. At the present time, three ministers of the Crown have seats in the upper chamber, the Minister of the Interior, the Minister of Labour and the Postmaster General. The Minister of Labour is, it seems to me, essentially a representative of the people. I perhaps can understand why the present incumbent is in the upper chamber. I certainly will not minimize the ability and, I believe, the honesty of purpose of the present Minister of Labour I had some dealings with the hon. gentleman when he was president of the Telegraphers' Union, and I was Minister of

Labour in a former administration, and I wish to say openly and publicly that my official relations with him at that time were certainly of the best, and undoubtedly in the interests of labour. I am sure you will appreciate, Mr. Speaker, that the place of the Minister of Labour is essentially in the House of Commons. He represents the labouring masses of this country, among whom we know there is at present quite a feeling of unrest. We may be called upon at any moment to pass legislation directly affecting the labouring masses. In fact, the most important legislation to come before us, the tariff legislation, affects labour to a very considerable degree. It therefore seems to me that the Minister of Labour ought surely to be in the House of Commons, but the Government, in the exercise of their right, have chosen to appoint him with a seat in the upper chamber.

Leaving aside for the moment the publication of labour statistics and the Labour Gazette, let us consider only one phase of his work, the administration of the Industrial Disputes' Act. The wise administration of that Act, affecting as it does, all public utilities in Canada, is certainly of the utmost importance to the country. Last year, my right hon. friend the leader of the Government (Mr. Meighen) was in charge of a Bill initiated by the Labour Department, amendments were sought affecting the Industrial Disputes Act, and my right hon. friend with all his ability, with all his astuteness, had to report progress on two or three different occasions because he was not sufficiently informed on the matter. Now if there is a man in the House whose legal acumen is admitted by all, it is certainly the leader of the Government, but on that piece of legislation I well remember that he was obliged to report progress in the dying days of the session in order to confer with his colleague the Minister of Labour. There was a case which I think shows the necessity of an amendment to our rules so that the minister would be in a position when legislation affecting his department was before the House to come and explain his policies to the House.

Take the case of the Minister of the Interior. If I mistake not, there has been grafted upon the Department of the Interior the Department of Soldiers' Civil Re-establishment. Now, every member of this House, and nearly every family in the ridings which we represent, is deeply interested in the civil re-establishment of our soldiers. Then as to the Department of the Interior itself, it is a vast department affecting the whole of the Northwest Territories, with its wonderful, potential natural resources. It would not be too much to say that the future of Canada lies, in great measure, in the wise and safe administration of that department. My right hon. friend the leader of the Government, who presided over the Department of the Interior for a few years, knows that it is certainly one of the most important departments of the Government. Well, it so happens this year that the minister in charge of that department is the leader of the Government in the Senate Chamber. Is it fair, Mr. Speaker, that this House should be deprived of the ability of that hon. gentleman, for he is certainly one of the ablest men I have met, and of the benefit of his explanations when matters affecting his department are under discussion? Is it fair that he in turn should be deprived of the benefit of the constructive criticism that we sometimes have to offer to the very involved legislation that from time to time is initiated in connection with his department? I think every one will admit that if the Minister of the Interior had a seat in this House instead of in the upper chamber, it would be far better for the country. But it so happens that he sits there and I again put the question I put a moment ago: Does not common sense dictate that we so amend our rules as to bring that minister into this House whenever legislation affecting his department is under consideration here?

I now come to the Post Office Department. Here is a large spending department, which affects every constituency, every city, every town, every village, from the Atlantic to the Pacific ocean. The Postmaster General not only looks after the administration of his department here in Ottawa, but from my own experience I know that the reports from the various inspectors come directly to him and that no post office is opened in even the smallest village in Canada without the matter first coming under his survey. One can see by the questions that are put on the Order Paper, and by the motions for the return of papers, how the administration of that department concerns every member of the House of Commons. The Postmaster General sits in the upper chamber; and I know that for many years, because of the absence of that minister in another House, we have not been able to have even a proper debate on the huge expenditures of the Post Office Department.

This is not satisfactory; it is not fair; it is not just. And if the Government will persist in keeping the Postmaster General in the Senate, which is contrary to common sense, and against the best interests of the people, surely my resolution ought to be adopted, because of all ministers the Postmaster General should, on occasion, be able to appear before the House of Commons and give those explanations which are required of him. Now, he has not only the administration of the post offices in his purview. A few years ago we adopted rural mail delivery, and I claim some credit for that reform, Mr. Speaker. It was under our Government that the system of rural mail delivery was established in this country, and it has created a revolution in rural Canada, having brought the farmer closer to the city and more in contact with the markets than heretofore. In the organization of rural mail delivery, naturally the electors will call upon their representatives to explain why one route was selected in preference to another. And we know, also, that the revision of the mail contracts makes for an enormous pile of correspondence with members of the House of Commons. Therefore, not only as regards the Postmaster General, but so far as the Minister of the Interior, and the Minister of Labour are concerned, I think that my resolution fully applies and meets the case.

I do not wish, Mr. Speaker, to make this a party resolution. I am speaking as an old parliamentarian, very anxious to expedite and facilitate the business of the House, and I believe that my resolution can be construed as having only that object in view. But speaking about the Postmaster General, does it not strike you, Sir, that the Government is somewhat in the wrong? Obviously so. The Postmaster General was a candidate at the last general election in two constituencies: he stood for election in Champlain and also in Laurier-Outremont. In both constituencies he was defeated, horse, foot and artillery. He was defeated hopelessly, but the Government waited for a few months and then appointed him to the other House. The minister did not even resign; he remained in office, and finally, on the eve of a session, the Government, against all British precedent, and against all parliamentary tradition, appointed him to the Senate. Let us draw a contrast between the British system of Government, and the Canadian Tory system. In England, the other day, the Secretary for Agriculture, Sir Arthur Griffith-Boscawen, was defeated, and defeated largely on a Canadian issue. He was a member of the Government and ran in the constituency of Dudley, where he was defeated. Do you think the Right Hon. Mr. Lloyd George would take upon himself to appoint Sir Griffith-Boscawen to the House of Lords? No, because there would be a revolt in public opinion if that were done in England. Sir Griffith-Boscawen will run in another constituency, and the whips of the Unionist party in England are at present looking for a riding where he may run as a candidate with a view to becoming Secretary for Agriculture. I have just read this despatch in one of the papers:

London, March 14.—Col. Denis Boles has offered to resign as member of Parliament for the division of Taunton, in order to give Sir Arthur Griffith-Boscawen, the recently appointed Minister of Agriculture, who lost the by-election in Dudley, another opportunity to find a seat.

It seems to me that another opportunity should be given to the present Postmaster General to be elected by his peers. My right hon. friend would probably say: Well, they appoint ministers of the Crown in England to the House of Lords. Yes, they do. I notice in this morning's papers that a peerage has been offered to Mr. Bonar Law, but he has declined it. I can understand that a gentleman who has served his country brilliantly and with distinction, as he did for several years, may be offered, as in the case of Mr. Morley, a seat in the House of Lords. There can be no objection to his taking that honour. But, generally a public man does not take it with a cabinet portfolio. If he does, it is exceptional, and the department over which he presides is not an important one which would come under the everyday survey of the House of Commons.

I expressed the hope that my right hon. friend, who I know is British at heart, having at least said so during the last elections, and, indeed, having always lived up to British ideals, will in this matter maintain British tradition. I appeal to him and say: Be British! Here is a concrete case in which you have an opportunity to show your love of British tradition. You have the county of Yamaska, where my hon. friend, the present Postmaster General was born and brought up. That constituency is open at the present time, and there is a chance for him to appear before his peers, and get a mandate from the people. However, as I said a moment ago, this is not a party resolution; this

suggestion is only an aside, and I say it in all candour. I should like the members of the House on both sides to consider the feasibility of the application of my proposal. I move the resolution because I believe that, if adopted, it will facilitate and expedite the business of the House. It will demonstrate that the Government has some regard for the popular chamber. Above all, if the resolution is adopted, it will be an object lesson that in Canada we are in accord with the principles of responsible Government; and it is above all on that principle of responsible Government that I appeal to the House and ask it to support my resolution.

Right Hon. ARTHUR MEIGHEN (Prime Minister): Mr. Speaker, when I first observed this resolution on the Order Paper it struck me as one of the most interesting and striking suggestions that I had seen on that paper for many years. At the time I had not heard that a change in our system had previously been suggested. But on referring to the records of both Houses for years gone by, I found a discussion of the same question taking place in the upper chamber in 1908. At that time the Government of Sir Wilfrid Laurier was in office. I am not aware how many ministers of that Government sat in the upper chamber, but not less, I believe, than two; and it was a matter of comment that so few ministers found their seats in the upper chamber, and a matter for a very general expression of regret, particularly in that chamber itself.

My hon. friend in urging this motion assumes, by way partly of an aside, that there are too many ministers of the present Government in the Senate, and particularly those who are at the head of the departments that should be especially responsible to, and in intimate association with, the House of Commons. I know that an argument to that end is not to the purpose of the resolution, but it might be worth while to refer to his contention in this regard for a moment. It is noteworthy that in the debate that took place in the Senate in 1908, a resolution was moved by a supporter of the Administration of that time, the Hon. Mr. David, a supporter indeed of the same party to-day, and in that resolution he expressed regret at the smallness of the number of ministers in the upper chamber. The resolution then proposed by Hon. Mr. David was as follows:

That the Senate, while not desiring to pronounce finally upon the numerous and various projects of reform which have been proposed and discussed in connection with the Senate, yet in view of the differences of opinion on this subject, and until these projects have had time to mature, believes it opportune to declare that it is desirable in order to increase the efficiency of the Senate, that more legislation be initiated in the House, that more ministers of the Crown have seats therein, and that any minister personally may introduce and defend Government measures in both Houses.

That was moved by way of amendment to a resolution of the Hon. Mr. McMullen, and a further amendment was moved to this resolution. A debate ensued, but it must be admitted that the discussion of the proposal brought forward was by no means so thorough or so interesting as that which the hon. member has been able to present to-night. Anyway, the reference I have made indicates that there was manifest at the time, and the debate shows it pretty definitely, a regret that there were not more of the ministers of the Crown in the upper chamber, and that more legislation did not initiate there. Nor was there any comment, in the course of that debate, on the subject of the special portfolios that might be held by ministers who had their seats there.

9 p.m.

I followed closely the argument of the hon. member. He contended, with much emphasis, that it was unfair to Parliament that ministers of important departments, and particularly spending departments, should have their seats in the Senate and not in the House of Commons; but my perception must be wrong if there was anything in the argument which he presented that would not apply to the minister of any department in the service of the Crown.

Every department is a spending department—some, of course, much more so than others. The largest spending departments are by no means the three that now are served by ministers in the upper chamber; but in so far as the spending of money is concerned that all comes before the Commons and the Commons alone. The Commons and the Commons alone must vote each and every individual item; and therefore, in that regard the power of consideration and criticism is vested in this assembly and its opportunity for that is ample. From that standpoint I am not able to appreciate the difference between the wisdom of having a minister at the head of a department sitting in the Senate and of having a minister sitting here—the difference between a minister sitting here and the minister of another department sitting in the other House. I know not what department may be chosen to which the argument of the hon. gentleman would not, in the main, apply. If

we take for example, the Department of the Secretary of State and the Department of the Minister of Justice; these are not great spending departments, but they are large and important ones. They are departments having to do with the administration of affairs of vital and prominent concern, affairs in respect of which the representatives of the people must be in close and intimate touch from day to day; and there is no argument the hon. member has presented against the Postmaster General being a member of the upper house, that would not equally apply to show that the Secretary of State, or that the Minister of Justice, should not be a member of that House.

Mr. BUREAU: What about the Solicitor General?

Mr. MEIGHEN: The Solicitor General is not in the Commons a duplicate Minister of Justice. The Solicitor General, at all events since I occupied the office, has functions and duties in which, in no sense, does he review or come into direct contact with the work of the Minister of Justice himself. He takes a special line of work. I know what it is. That work he discharges; but that does not bring him into contact with the work discharged by the Minister of Justice nor with the superintendence of the various services over which the Minister of Justice presides. It seems to me that, while we have the bi-cameral system, there must be a number of ministers in the upper chamber, or the upper chamber cannot serve even that share of the public duties which it now serves; minor, I must say, in very many respects to those served by this chamber; it cannot serve even those, if we are ever still further to reduce the representation of the Government in that House. The hon. member argues, and argues well, that the bi-cameral system has many supporters in this country, has a very large proportion of public opinion behind it, and argues still more forcibly that whatever that proportion may be, it is very likely to continue in this country, in some form, for many years and decades to come. It is rooted in considerations that go to the protection of minorities —considerations that are particularly applicable to conditions in this Dominion. Consequently, though its functions may not be as important as was anticipated by the Fathers of Confederation, nevertheless it is bound for many years to come to remain one of the three estates of this country.

Coming to the real logic of the resolution, it seeks to have this House affirm that ministers of the Crown in this chamber should have the right to pass to the other chamber "whenever measures and policies are introduced affecting their respective departments" and speak thereon, and, similarly, that ministers of the Crown in the other chamber should, under like conditions, come here and enjoy the same privilege. I must say that much for which the hon. gentleman contends appeals to me, and I can see a very great deal of advantage indeed in such a system as he urges. On the other hand, there is very much to be considered before we launch definitely on any such scheme. One point was raised by the hon. member for Halifax (Mr. Maclean). For example, if a minister of the Crown in the Senate is to be allowed to come to the Commons to speak in relation, say, to his own Estimates, but not to make a motion or to vote, he virtually cannot conduct his Estimates through this House at all, because every discussion in the passage of Estimates arises on a motion, express or implied, that a certain vote appearing in the Estimates be made by this House. He cannot make that motion, consequently it must be assumed to be made by some one else. He is here to discuss it. But many discussions arise in this chamber where it would be very difficult to decide just whether it affected sufficiently the department over which presides the minister having a seat in the Senate to warrant that minister coming into this House and taking part in the debate. I presume it would be for the Speaker to decide just what the relationship was between the discussion and that department. But it would seem to me that if you go a certain length you must go all the way, and you must admit that a minister in either House can speak in the other House in relation to any subject that he desires to discuss. I think there would be very many practical difficulties in drawing a line and saying, "On subjects within a certain line you may come into the other House and address the Chair and the members thereof; but upon subjects beyond that line you must stay where you are." Anyway, I do not know that there would be very much to be feared if a minister were permitted to come into this House from the Senate and discuss any topic that is before us; or, vice versa, that a minister might go from this House to the Senate and discuss any topic that is under discussion there. In practice it would be availed of only in such cases as seemed to call for the attention of the minister in question in the other House. Very likely it

would work out in that way and there would be very little abuse of the privilege.

There is, though, this point that I should like to raise. The resolution, of course, only affirms a principle and does not in any way indicate how it is to be carried out. It would occur to me questionable indeed, whether this House or the upper house could, by its own resolution alone, enable one of its members to come into the other House and to take part in its proceedings as is intended by this resolution. Is it within the power of this House of Commons by resolution to enable a member of the Upper House to come and take his seat among us and to exercise in debate his influence upon the votes and decisions of this assembly? If that is to be done, must it not be done by amendment to the constitution itself? And if that is the proper procedure, then an Address from both Houses to the British Parliament would of course be the appropriate action leading to that end. It was suggested in the debate in 1908, I think by the Speaker of the Senate at that time, that there was power in either assembly by resolution to give this right to ministers sitting in the other House. But no argument was presented in favour of that contention, and its mere assertion did not appeal to me as sound. Anyway, I apprehend that neither this House nor the other House is going to take a step so important as this—because it is a very important step—after only one discussion, however thorough. It is naturally a question that should be debated not only in the two Houses of Parliament, but by the people, through the press, before we launch upon such a course. The debate which we have had will serve the purpose of bringing the question before the people, and I for one am very glad indeed that this resolution has been introduced by the hon. member who has just taken his seat, for he is well qualified from his historic knowledge and his parliamentary experience to debate the subject with profit to us all.

Hon. A. K. MACLEAN (Halifax): Mr. Speaker, I think that probably the House will be disposed to agree with the right hon. the leader of the Government (Mr. Meighen) in his view that the House could hardly be expected to adopt the resolution at the present time; and I fancy that that was scarcely the intention of the mover of it. To a certain extent I am disposed to agree with the principle enunciated in the resolution, that members of the House of Commons who are members of the Government should be permitted to go to the Senate and there take the direction and control of measures which originate in this House. Speaking generally, it has in the past, I think, been the practice to have but one representative of the Government in the Senate. It is true that on certain occasions there have been two or more, and at the present time there are three members of the Government sitting in the upper chamber. I remember, however, when for a considerable time there was but one minister sitting in the Senate, and that was the leader of the Senate, Sir James Lougheed. The practice of having as few members of the Government as possible holding seats in the Senate has always been adhered to, and I think it reflects the spirit of our Constitution. Support of this view will be found in the fact that during our whole history the major portion of every ministry have been members of the House of Commons. That practice is true of the British Parliament as well. There are very many reasons why this practice should prevail, but it is not my intention to detain the House in discussing them.

Coming back to my statement of a moment ago, that ordinarily but one or two members of our Governments have held seats in the Senate, that is easily accounted for by the fact that there would be but one minister available there for actual work, as has occurred on many occasions. It is utterly impossible—perhaps I should say unfair—to expect one member of the Government to handle in the Senate all the Government business originating in this House. I remember when the whole direction of Government business in the Senate was entirely in the hands of Sir James Lougheed, the present Government leader in the Senate. It was a marvel that he was able to take care of that large volume of work and those numerous parliamentary duties as he did, in such a very excellent manner. I think it is hardly fair to Parliament or to the country that such a vast amount of business should be laid upon the shoulders of one person. Should there be but one member of the Government in the Senate it is not difficult to imagine that on occasions he might be ill or incapacitated for one or more reasons and unable to handle Government legislation. It does seem to me, therefore, that it is quite a rational suggestion that members of this House who are members of the Government should have the privilege of going to the Senate and there taking direction or control of

Government legislation, or at least assisting the Senate in the consideration of it. For that reason I would think that such a proposed amendment as is incorporated in the resolution of the hon. member from Maisonneuve is a rational one and in the public interest, and to that extent I desire to express my hearty approval of it.

Now, it may be asked if I approve the resolution to that extent, why should I not go further and say that members of the Government holding seats in the Senate should be enabled to come to this Chamber. Well, I think if that were permitted, abuses might very easily creep into our parliamentary practice. For instance, if a government were very weak it might have the major portion of its membership in the Senate, contrary to the spirit of the constitution and probably against the wishes of the people. That, I think, would be one serious objection. Then, the reasons in favour of the suggestion that senators who are members of the Government should come to this Chamber do not apply to the proposal that members of the Government sitting in this Chamber should go to the Senate. There usually are sufficient members of the Government in this Chamber to handle expeditiously the Government business or the public business, whereas, as I have pointed out, that condition might not always prevail in the Senate. So that the reason for my suggestion is stronger than the reason that may be advanced for the broader suggestion contained in the resolution.

I am not disposed to agree with the suggestion made by Mr. McMullen, a former member of the Senate, referred to by the right hon. leader of the House, to the effect that there was not sufficient representation in the Senate of members of the Government. I do not know that we can ever get much enlightenment from former debates on any abstract resolution. It might happen that a Government would be in the minority in the Senate and I doubt very much whether the Senate would be bound to respect Government legislation introduced by a member of the Government in a body where his party or his Government did not hold a majority, as they would be bound, I think, to respect legislation coming from the popular chamber where the Government was supported by a popular majority. I think upon this ground one might urge very substantial objection to the suggestion which was made in the Senate in 1908 as indicated by the extract from the Senate proceedings just read to the House by the Prime Minister.

I have nothing further to say, Mr. Speaker, except to repeat in a word, what I have already said: that the suggestion that members of this House who are members of the Government be permitted to go to the Senate is eminently a proper and a rational one, and I trust that at some time in the early future an amendment to our parliamentary practice will be made or the necessary steps taken to enable that to be done. On the other hand, I do not think that reasons so strong can be advanced for permitting members of the Senate who are members of the Government to come to this Chamber.

Hon. C. J. DOHERTY (Minister of Justice): Mr. Speaker, I do not rise to express a settled opinion upon the proposal that has been made. It is certainly a most interesting one, and while I would be prepared to concur in the view that practical advantages might result from its being carried out, I think it is one which calls for careful consideration before arriving at a final decision and, above all, before taking action.

There is one phase of the matter to which I would like to direct the attention of the hon. gentleman (Mr. Lemieux) who made the motion, and the attention of the House generally. It seems to me that the proposal involves a fundamental change in our system of government and, really, in the British Constitution. Our parliamentary system is based upon the conception of the existence of two distinct bodies deriving their authority, if I may use that word—their right of action, from two totally different sources. We have the peoples' Chamber, and then we have the other Chamber which does not derive its authority directly from the people, which under our system is composed of nominees of the Crown, and which under the original British system was composed largely of representatives of a particular class of the people who sat there because they belonged to that class. Now, resulting from the different sources from which these two bodies derive their authority, there has grown up a system under which particular things belong specially to these two bodies. Take, for instance, everything that touches the voting of money; that belongs to the popular Chamber. It has been suggested that there would be advantages in a minister, being a member of the Senate, coming into this House and discussing his Estimates. What quality would he, as a member of the Senate, have in the discussion of the moneys that the people's representatives

ought to vote? Is it not consistent with the spirit of our Constitution that the people's representatives should act absolutely independently of any other influence when they are dealing with matters of that kind, matters which pertain specially to them; matters in regard to which it is for the people through their chosen representatives to speak? It may be said that it is not suggested that that member of the Senate should vote. So far, so good; but the deliberation is, I think, at least as important as the vote. Can you conceive of this popular assembly being guided, in a matter pertaining to the voting of the people's money, by a gentleman who is not a representative of the people at all, a gentleman whose role in the parliamentary work of this country is to be and act as a member of a body, constituted, after all, to exercise a species of supervising and, perhaps it might not be a mistake to say, moderating influence upon the actions of this chamber? On the other hand is it proper that into the deliberations of this body constituted for the purpose of exercising that supervising and moderating influence, a body which in consequence, ought to approach the measures that come to it from this assembly in a—I do not think it would be a mistake to say—quasi-judicial frame of mind, there should be interjected a member or members of this House whose action, in a general sort of way, those who are responsible for the constitution, thought it desirable should be submitted to the reconsideration of a body not so directly, as this body is, under the immediate influence of the popular feeling of the moment. I do not say that these reasons are, perhaps, conclusive against this proposal, or some proposal along these lines, being adopted at some time. But I would invite the House to consider these things that I have pointed out, and to realize that if, in its wisdom, it should decide that it is desirable to recommend a change of this kind, it is recommending a very fundamental change. If this proposal is adopted, we shall have a new system of parliamentary government. We shall have brought into combination two bodies which, up to the present time, the constitution has looked upon as absolutely distinct bodies called upon to exercise absolutely distinct functions, the one to be the immediate or direct mouthpiece of the people of the country, the other, a body that may serve, when need may be for that, because such things happen, as a species of moderating, supervising body, a body which, therefore, should approach matters with which it is called upon to deal, in the frame of mind that belongs to people who are taking up the action of others, to consider whether it was wise or not.

I, perhaps, may stop there because my purpose really is only to call attention to what seems to me to be the very fundamental nature of the proposal. But looking at it from a practical point of view, might we not have very undesirable situations created, if you have a member of this House taking part in the deliberations of the supervising body and, perhaps, feeling himself called upon to act as a sort of advocate for this House of Commons? It does not seem to me that that would be a desirable situation. I am not quite sure that it would be conducive to the perfect free play of the functions of the two bodies or to the maintenance and preservation of the harmony, whether they agree with regard to particular measures or not, that it is certainly most desirable, should be preserved between the two bodies. I would earnestly invite the House, before coming to a conclusion upon this matter, to give most serious thought to just what is involved in the change that is proposed.

Mr. W. D. EULER (North Waterloo): Mr. Speaker, my only excuse for intervening very briefly in this debate arises from the fact that, in the session of 1918, I moved a resolution dealing in some degree with the same subject, and it has always interested me since then; so much so, that in 1919, I had on the Order Paper another resolution dealing with the matter, which resolution, however, never came to debate. The resolution that I had on the Order Paper in 1919 read:

> That in the opinion of this House all members of the Cabinet holding portfolios should be members of the House of Commons or become such within three months after their appointment.

That is somewhat different in principle from the resolution moved by the hon. member for Maisonneuve (Mr. Lemieux). I will admit that the proposal made by my hon. friend would effect some improvement as compared with the present condition, but I do not think it goes far enough, or that it is the correct solution of existing conditions. Briefly, my opinion still is what it was in 1918 and 1919, and it is this, that it is not in accordance with the principles of democratic government, to which we all say that we adhere, to have senators in charge of portfolios. All the port-

folios in the Cabinet should be held by members of the House of Commons, for the reason, that the spending of money and the framing of policies should be definitely in the hands of men who are the chosen representatives of the people of Canada. When I say that, I have no reflections to make upon the Senate as a body, nor upon senators as individuals. I am quite prepared to say that there are men of wide practical experience in the Senate and men who, although they were appointed as partisans, may now have a sufficiently detached frame of mind to look upon public questions without prejudice. I think that is rather unlikely; but after all, we have this condition prevailing, that members of the Senate are not representatives of the people and, in some instances —and we find it exemplified in the present Cabinet—they are men who are exactly the reverse. In at least one case, that of the Postmaster General, there is a gentleman in charge of a portfolio who was rejected by the people of Canada as a member of the House of Commons.

All of the arguments that have been adduced by the hon. member for Maisonneuve (Mr. Lemieux) are good; but I would attain the result that he desires, not by bringing members of the Cabinet who are senators into this House by permission, but by ensuring that all members of the Cabinet are members of this House, so that they, by right, may appear here to make such explanations of their Estimates and policies as may be necessary.

The argument has been advanced that the privilege which the hon. member for Maisonneuve seeks for members of the Cabinet to appear in both Chambers obtains in France. That may be all right so far as it goes. Perhaps I am radical when I say that the mere fact that a certain condition or practice obtains in another country is not altogether conclusive, to my mind, that it is proper in this country. In Great Britain, they still have the House of Lords. To some extent, our Senate corresponds with the British House of Lords, but I should like to point out that only two sessions ago we decided in this House that we were not in favour of hereditary titles or offices or anything of that kind. So we are bound by the British practice in that case in any sense whatever.

We have at the present time in the Cabinet three ministers who are not members of the House of Commons, but members of the Senate. I should like to impress upon the House that at least one of these portfolios is of such importance that it should not be administered by any other than a member of this House; I refer to the portfolio of Labour. Again I say, I have no reflection to cast on the hon. gentleman who holds the position of Minister of Labour. I believe he is a very capable, very earnest, and very sincere man, but I do think he should be able to come into the House of Commons direct as a representative of the people. He will have a great many important problems to deal with in the days to come. The League of Nations embodies certain principles in connection with labour matters that will be of direct interest to us, and call for action, by this House—such matters as are mentioned in the speech from the Throne—unemployment insurance and old age pensions; also the eight-hour day, unemployment insurance, equal pay for equal work, abolition of child labour—all these things are embodied in the compact of the League of Nations, and if this country is going to live up to its position in the League, and the position that is claimed for it, we are in duty bound to deal with these subjects. But can we do so to the best advantage if the man directly in charge of labour matters in Canada has not the privilege of coming into this House? Instead, therefore, of saying that the senator who is a member of the Cabinet shall have the privilege of coming into this House, I would say: So arrange it that members of the Cabinet shall be members of this House, and have the inherent right to be here, because they are elected by, and represent the people.

I believe that there is some force in the argument that there should be some connecting link between the Commons and the Senate so long as we have a Senate. Personally, I believe the Senate might be abolished, but so long as we have the two Chambers I would say, let us have one or two members of the Senate in the Cabinet, but not holding portfolios. I say that when it comes to a portfolio, the minister in charge of that department, and who is spending the people's money, should be a member of this House, a representative of the people, chosen by the people. I have nothing further to say on that, except that I want to go on record as being directly opposed to the placing of men at the head of the spending departments of this Government who are not members of this House. When I brought my resolution up two or three years ago, the then acting Prime Minister, still supposed to be the member for Leeds (Sir Thomas White) took exception to my resolution on the

ground that it would involve a great constitutional change, perhaps an amendment to the British North America Act. I do not think that is necessary. The Prime Minister this evening has stated that in order to carry out the purpose of the resolution that has been offered, it might be necessary to amend the British North America Act, but if the Government followed my humble suggestion nothing of that kind would be required. If Parliament declared itself in favour of an unwritten law, that only members of this House shall be members of the Cabinet holding portfolios, no constitutional change would be necessary. It would simply be a matter of acting in accordance with that view—a view which I believe will meet with the wishes of a great majority of the people of Canada.

Mr. F. B. STACEY (Fraser Valley): Mr. Speaker, I have only a few words to add to the discussion. I wish to say that I am in full accord with those hon. gentlemen who have expressed themselves in sympathy with the idea that ministers of the Crown should have a seat in this House. With very much of the argument adduced by the hon. member for Maisonneuve (Mr. Lemieux) I am in full accord, I think it is evident to every private member that all matters affecting Estimates can be discussed as a rule, more intelligently, at any rate, with greater satisfaction upon the representations made by the minister in charge of the department than when presented by any other person.

The Minister of Justice (Mr. Doherty) has stated in the course of his address that the resolution if adopted suggested, if not demanded, constitutional changes inasmuch as the Senate was not representative of the people. Sir, that gives me my clue. The right hon. the Prime Minister (Mr. Meighen) also said that in his judgment, if the adoption of the resolution did not involve a constitutional change, at any rate it would be better to have the matter thoroughly discussed throughout the country, in the press and elsewhere, before such a radical change were brought into effect.

Now I have one criticism to offer, and I am speaking as private member, neither as a friend nor as an opponent of the Government, for in this matter, I take it, there is no partisanship whatever. It appears to me Sir, that neither the motion as submitted by the hon. member nor any remarks so far made have gone quite far enough. I believe that the country at large is more concerned about another phase of this question than as to whether or not ministers of the Crown who are in the Senate should have seats here. I believe that the great body of the people of Canada are thinking seriously about the best method of selecting senators if the upper house is to continue. I cannot bring myself to believe that it can much longer continue to be the right—it may be the legal right—but I cannot bring myself to believe that it is the moral and democratic right of any government to decide who shall constitute the senate of this country. I am convinced of this fact, that if it is desired to give the senate a stronger hold on the sympathy and the confidence of the people of Canada than it has to-day, the best way to bring that about would be to have the people themselves choose or elect the Senate. The method of so doing is not for me now to discuss, or even to suggest. It might be by some system of grouping constituencies by which the electorate of the country could determine who should constitute the Senate of this Dominion. Personally, I think we shall have two Houses of Parliament for a long time to come, perhaps always. But at this period in the history of Canada it occurs to me that it is a most opportune time for the country, for the press, for the Government, and for Parliament, to consider whether or not some such change should be made in the British North America Act. Is it not advisable to give to the electors of Canada the right to say who shall represent them in the Senate? I believe that the Senate should represent the people rather than the Government of any day. I think the Senate should be elected for a stated time; not perhaps, for such a short period of four or five years, but for a longer specified time; and they should be responsible to, and be elected by, the people. If that were done, the principle involved in the resolution would not perhaps present insuperable difficulties. While I admit that a change was suggested by the hon. member for Maisonneuve (Mr. Lemieux), I had hoped that he would develop it more fully, and I have ventured to express at least my own opinion, and what I believe to be the opinion of a very large number of the people of this country, namely, that the time has come when the Parliament of Canada should consider the advisability of taking such steps as are necessary in order to give to the people the right to elect, not merely the members of the House of Commons, but also the members of the Senate of Canada.

Hon. W. L. MACKENZIE KING (leader of the Opposition): There are broadly

two points of view from which the resolution of my hon. friend may be considered and from which indeed, it has been discussed this evening. In the first place, there is what would be involved in the way of constitutional change should the resolution go into effect. The other point of view is the practical purpose of the resolution itself,—which I take to be the discovery of more effective channels of information between the two Houses of Parliament where matters of great public concern are under consideration. To discuss at this moment what may be involved in the way of constitutional change, seems to me apart from the question, because the extent of constitutional change will depend upon what practical steps may be necessary to give effect to the resolution which my hon. friend has proposed.

In listening to the right hon. the Minister of Justice (Mr. Doherty), I was struck by the fact that he dwelt at considerable length on the fundamental change in the constitution which would be involved in allowing ministers who have seats in the other chamber to guide legislation in this House. I do not see that the resolution, as drafted, pre-supposes any such privilege or right on the part of ministers in the other chamber. All that it suggests is that ministers of the Crown should be permitted to sit in either chamber. I do not wish to play upon words. I presume my hon. friend in introducing the resolution, intended that such ministers should not merely have seats, but should also be permitted to speak. But there is a difference between ministers on the one hand, answering questions asked from one side of the House, and giving the House information, and, on the other hand, attempting to guide legislation. My hon. friend had no thought in his mind of allowing ministers from the other chamber to attempt to influence this House in the guiding of legislation. What on the contrary, I think he has in mind, and what all of us on this side of the House have felt very much the need of, is discovering some means of getting full and explicit information in regard to matters that form the subject of discussion here.

We on this side of the House have been finding it increasingly difficult to get information touching questions of great public concern and policy, not only in regard to those departments which are not represented here by ministers, but even in regard to departments that are ministerially represented in this House. Take one of the departments, that of Railways and Canals. I suppose more questions have been put on the Order Paper this year with respect to the expenditures of that department than with respect to any other department, and more motions have been made for the production of papers and correspondence regarding that important branch of the public service than of any other. No department of the Government has involved the country in such vast expenditures, expenditures colossal in amount. Yet, whenever we on this side of the House request information on these matters, we are told that they are under the control of a board of directors of the railways, and that the ministry has practically freed itself of all responsibility in the matter of giving information to Parliament. Take the Department of Marine and Fisheries. Since the Mercantile Marine has been established, some $70,000,000 has been spent in the creation of the Merchant Marine. We on this side of the House have tried to get information as to how the money has been expended, how much has been spent in this particular direction, and how much in that. But we are told that this is not to be given to the people's representatives because the control of the Merchant Marine is in the hands of a board of directors for that particular purpose. In other words, the Government frees itself from what is, or what ought to be, its first obligation to the Commons, namely supplying the fullest information possible on questions of great public interest and concern.

As has been stated by my hon. friend, the departments that are in some respects among the most significant, are the Department of Labour, the Post Office Department, and the Department of the Interior. When we come to discuss matters of legislation affecting these departments, these matters are taken up by some of the hon. gentlemen opposite, and if they are not informed, they tell us that they regret they cannot supply the information off-hand, and as sometimes happens, the debate is adjourned to another day.

I am sure it has been the experience of everyone on this side of the House, who has tried to take part in any debate on questions pertaining to those departments, that it has been very difficult to obtain the information required to enable hon. members to proceed intelligently. Is it not conceivable that some plan might be devised whereby a minister who has a seat in the other chamber might be permitted at least to sit beside the minister in this

House who is giving information to Parliament in regard to the subject under discussion? or that would permit him to answer the questions that are put in regard to his department? At the outset if thought advisable we need not go so far as to permit him to speak. But he might be present to give necessary information to some other minister who is in the chamber and who has the right to answer questions. As we are circumstanced at present, there being no one here who has the knowledge to speak with authority for ministers who are in the other chamber, the power of this House to get such information as it needs is circumscribed to that extent. I think my hon. friend has had in mind in his resolution, the necessity of in some way restoring to this chamber the right of the people's representatives to the fullest possible information on all matters that are of public importance, not merely with respect to measures that are introduced, but also with respect to all expenditures and matters that come up in the Estimates and others that are of public concern. The need being what it is, it seems to me that my hon. friend is rendering a public service when he suggests to the ministry the absolute necessity of discovering some means whereby this House can be more fully informed on all phases of questions which it is considering. Information is the basis of all intelligent legislation. It is information that we from this side of the House have been seeking and which we are getting in less and less measure from hon. gentlemen opposite. It is to remedy that tendency that my hon. friend has made the suggestion which is embodied in this resolution, and I think, looking at it from that point of view, we can all strongly endorse the object he has in view, though we may well agree with hon. gentlemen opposite in admitting that once some plan has been decided upon, we should carefully consider what may be involved in the way of fundamental constitutional change in giving effect to the resolution.

Mr. LUCIEN CANNON (Dorchester): The resolution before the House has been introduced by an hon. member who is eminently competent to discuss it in all its bearings. The hon. member for Maisonneuve is a constitutional student whose parliamentary experience is long and ripe, and I think that of all the members of this House, he might be considered probably the most competent to introduce and intelligently discuss a question of this nature. The manner in which the hon. member has discussed this resolution shows that my estimate of his qualifications is fairly good. The question is one of great importance; and as the Prime Minister said it is a matter in which the House should move very slowly before coming to a final decision. My hon. friend from Maisonneuve has made historical comparisons. He has spoken about the French constitution, and the British constitution, and he slightly touched on the American constitution. Well, Mr. Speaker, if you examine these three constitutions you will conclude that it is pretty difficult for any student of constitutional law to arrive at any satisfactory decision in this matter, because the constiutional conditions in all these countries vary. As far as the Senate in France is concerned, for instance, we have to bear in mind that first the members of the Senate are elected by the people. The senators are representatives of the people in the Senate of France to exactly the same degree and to the same extent as are the members of the Chamber of Deputies. The only difference is that the senators instead of being elected for a short period, are elected for a much longer time and one-third of them are replaced after an interval of three or four years, if I am not mistaken. Therefore the senators of France, being representatives of the people, are entitled to receive from the members of the government all the information which must be given to the deputies.

Still the French senators do not stand in the same position as do the senators in the Canadian Senate who are not representatives of the people but have been chosen by the Government.

Another consideration we have to bear in mind, Mr. Speaker, is that in France responsible government as it exists in Canada is not recognized. In Canada the Government is responsible to Parliament. Not only is that the case, but each minister bears a joint responsibility with all the other members of the Cabinet—which means, for example, that should the House of Commons to-day vote non-confidence in the Minister of Militia or in the Minister of Justice, all the other ministers would have to interpret that vote as being a vote of non-confidence in the whole Cabinet, and the Cabinet would have to resign. But in France, the chamber may reject one minister and the rest of the Cabinet remain untouched. Therefore, when we consider these two great differences between the French constitution and our own, it makes

it difficult to accept the French system as being as effective in Canada as it might be in France. Another great difference, which was demonstrated by my hon. friend from Maisonneuve, was that in France not only does ministerial responsibility not exist, but the members of the Cabinet have not to be members of either the Senate or of the Chamber.

Taking the American constitution, we see that the representatives of the people, both in the Senate and in the House of Representatives, are under no compulsion to listen to the members of the Cabinet—that is to say the ministers at Washington have not the right to appear before either House. Nevertheless, if you examine the workings of the Congress at Washington you must come to the conclusion that legislation there is fairly good at times, although none of the ministers have seats in either chamber. When they do give information to Congress it is by appearing before one of the various committees, either of the Senate or of the House of Representatives. Hence, the example of our neighbours to the south shows that government can be carried on very satisfactorily, even though the ministers there are not elected representatives of the people and cannot appear in either House. If now we compare the Canadian constitution to that of England, we again meet with very great difficulty from the fact that the House of Lord is not a chamber whose members are elected by the people or appointed by the government. The gentlemen who sit in the House of Lords in England sit there by virtue of an hereditary right.

Mr. McMASTER: From the accident of birth.

Mr. CANNON: It may be the accident of birth. Some might consider it a very happy accident, while others might deem it a very unfortunate accident. Nevertheless, the members of the House of Lords are there in accordance with rights which they possess as members of the nobility. Again, in England you have certain ministers sitting in the House of Lords. Very few do so, the vast majority of the ministers sit in the House of Commons; but I think that all hon. gentlemen here will agree on one thing—that the British system of government as it is carried on to-day is probably the best in the world. I have not studied the question as thoroughly as some other hon. members may have done, but I do not think the question of having ministers given the right to appear and speak before both Houses has ever been raised in England. The system as it exists to-day is somewhat similar to our own, and seems to have given satisfaction. The hon. member for Maisonneuve has stated that if his resolution were carried into execution it would give very satisfactory and profitable results. One of the results which the hon. member pointed out, and rightly so in my humble opinion, is that the members of both Houses of the Canadian parliament would be given better and more complete information concerning departmental matters. I do think, Mr. Speaker, that it is a great inconvenience, for example, when matters relating to the Department of Labour, or the Department of the Interior, or the Post Office Department are before the House and the heads of these departments are absent. On the other hand, Mr. Speaker, we have again to bear in mind that every minister is responsible for the policy of these departments; and therefore every minister in the House ought to be sufficiently well informed to give the proper information desired by hon. members. If in former years satisfactory information has not been given to the House, as it might have been given, I contend that it is not the fault of our actual constitutional system but it may be the fault of the actual government. Every minister in the Cabinet, being responsible for the policy of every department and for every act of his colleagues—decided upon within the Council Chamber—ought to be in a position to present better information than that which is given to the House by the Government in many instances. It might be that the adoption of the resolution would result in expediting the business of this House, but if, on the other hand, it were permitted to a member of the Senate to come into the popular chamber and enter into discussion with the members here on an equal footing, we would have the rather extraordinary spectacle of a man who is not a representative of the people, a man who has not been elected by them, but has been simply chosen by the Government, coming into the House of Commons and discussing matters with those who represent the people and who possess rights and privileges that that senator does not possess. I think, too, that if we had members of our House who are members of the Cabinet crossing over to the Senate Chamber and there discussing with those who are not the elected representatives of the people, legislation initiated in this Chamber, we would be giving to the Senate an

10 p.m.

importance that should not belong to that body. The value attaching to legislation originating in the House of Commons arises solely from the fact that that legislation is adopted after having been considered and approved by the representatives of the people, and if the senators were given the privilege of discussing openly with the ministers elected by the people, matters of legislation, the Senate would then have as much importance in the country as the House of Commons now has, and I think that would be a great danger. And my contention, so far as that is concerned, is borne out I think by what has happened in the United States. When the Fathers of American Independence framed their constitution the important body was to be the House of Representatives, but on account of the ministers not sitting in that House, and on account also of the Senate in that way having about the same influence as the House of Representatives, after a certain length of time the Senate became the important body, and to-day legislation of great importance is always originated in the Senate. I do not think we can compare the two bodies of the American legislative machinery, because one has very great influence and the other is of only secondary importance in the working of the constitution.

This is a very important resolution, and the question arises: Should such a radical change be introduced, would it be for the good of our Constitution? I cannot say. But I venture to offer this suggestion, that a solution might lie in a middle course. We might adopt the system which is followed in England. When ministers of the different departments are members of the House of Lords, under-secretaries represent them in the House of Commons and act as the representatives of those departments in giving information or in discussing legislation connected therewith. Or else, as was suggested by my hon. friend from North Waterloo (Mr. Euler), a happy solution would be that all ministers holding portfolios should sit in this House, and then all the inconveniences mentioned by my hon. friend from Maisonneuve (Mr. Lemieux) would disappear. The only province where the dual system exists is the province of Quebec.

Mr. FIELDING: And Nova Scotia.

Mr. CANNON: I beg your pardon, Mr. Speaker; and also Nova Scotia. I do not know what custom is followed in Nova Scotia, but in our province the ministers sitting in the Legislative Council are as a rule ministers without fortfolio, and those who hold portfolios sit in the elective chamber. As the hon. member for Waterloo represented, this does away with nearly all the inconveniences mentioned by the introducer of this resolution.

The right hon. Prime Minister (Mr. Meighen) has asked, how this change, if it were to be introduced, would be put into effect. Could it be carried out simply by a resolution of this House and of the Senate? Or would we have to follow the usual procedure indicated in our Constitution, that is, go over to England with an address to the British Parliament to amend the British North America Act? This brings me, Mr. Speaker, to the subject of our powers to amend our Constitution. I regret that this question has not been more fully discussed in Parliament. It is a very important question, and I hope before the Prime Minister leaves for London to meet the Prime Ministers of the other Overseas Dominions an opportunity will be given to this House to discuss it. Should we in the future do as we have done in the past, apply to the British Parliament; or should we take upon ourselves the power of amending our Constitution the same way that other dominions have assumed that power? That is a momentous question, and one that this House ought to be called upon to discuss either by a member on this side or by a member of the Government, so that the Prime Minister will have an expression of opinion thereon before he leaves for London.

Mr. H. M. MOWAT (Parkdale): Mr. Speaker, the objection to the present method and the inconveniences incident thereto seem to divide themselves under two main heads: the first being that the information given by proxy in this House by a minister who is a member of the Senate is not of a sufficiently satisfactory character; the second being something that very often looms up in this House, the suggestion that the Senate is inferior to the House of Commons because it is not composed of direct representatives of the people. It seems to me that this latter suggestion is mainly the reason for any dissatisfaction that has been expressed. If one looks back at the discussion preceding Confederation, it will be noticed that the point as to whether the Senate should be an appointed or an elected body was ably discussed, and that the two old parties did not at all divide on political lines. The chief opponent of an elective Senate was the principal Liberal representative from Ontario, the Hon.

George Brown, who was most emphatic in his arguments that the Senate should be an appointed body. His principal reason, as I remember, was that the senators being a smaller body, great inconveniences would arise in that they would have to represent districts, and that as Canada was not then well settled and consisted of very extensive electoral divisions, it would be too much of a burden upon any senator to present himself for election. Mr. Brown's arguments prevailed; the majority of the Quebec conference were in favour of an appointed Senate, and that is the system that has prevailed ever since Confederation. The question arises, is not the country now in favour of a change to an elective system? I am informed that a very large number of the members of the other House would be in favour of such a system.

Mr. BELAND: After they are dead.

Mr. MOWAT: The opinions of individual members may differ. I do not feel, however, that the Senate is given, in the minds of the people, the position to which it is entitled. The whole question raised by my hon. friend from Maisonneuve would, it seems to me, be settled if the charge was not so continually made that the senators do not represent the people. I am of the opinion that the desirable end could be brought about by gradually making the Senate an elective body; if necessary in order to bring that about, an amendment to the British North America Act could be petitioned for. As there are a limited number of senators, each senator would necessarily have to represent groups of constituencies. In Quebec no doubt they are nominated for districts, but not so in Ontario, and very often we find that two senators come from some district, perhaps from one small town, while hundreds of miles of territory adjoining is without senatorial representation. If we could agree on this very simple expedient the difficulty which this resolution has in mind would largely disappear. Each senator now in the upper chamber would be nominated to represent a certain district comprising either a number of constituencies or blocks out of the several provinces. The senator would then be known as the senator from such-and-such a district, and when he resigned or died the vacancy would be filled by election. The term should be for, say, twelve years, so that you would hold out to a man who was desirous of serving his country in the Senate the prospect of twelve years of legislative life, and if he could not make a name for himself; if he could not give good service during that twelve years in his country's behalf, it would be almost irrefutable evidence that he was not qualified for the position. Under the plan proposed there would be no disturbance of the hon. gentlemen who are at present in the other Chamber, but gradually the Senate would become an elective body.

It may be said that the objections urged by Mr. Brown at the Quebec conference are valid now as they were then. But that is not altogether so, because with the construction of railways and the building up of the country a man who is well known in his district is likely to be well known in the districts around about. He would be a prominent man; he could not expect to be elected unless he were a well known public man. Being elected for twelve years and knowing that he would be a member of the Senate during that period without cavil and without interference, he would be an independent representative and would be in a position to command a great deal more respect and honour than he is now able to get from the country. We would then have a system very much like the American system, where in some of the states the senators are elected by direct vote of the people and in others by the state legislatures. If a senator did not properly fulfil his duties; if he did not seem to be representative of the growing life of the country, somebody would be put in his place at the expiration of his term. It should be a long term; a senator should not have to go back frequently for election as we do, because the burden of representing and conducting frequent elections in a very large district is too great for the ordinary man to have to bear. But under the system which I propose the Senate would gradually assume a position infinitely superior to that which it now occupies and would be very much more satisfactory to the people. If this were done and we lived for twenty-five or thirty years to see the desirable reform accomplished, we would not have, because we were representatives of the people, a constant feeling of, might I say jealousy of those legislatures which had not that advantage. I sincerely hope that this proposal, which I have advocated for years and which I have written about, will be adopted. It may be a little beyond the exact wording of the resolution before the House, but it has been taken up by other hon. gentlemen during the course of the debate, and that is my excuse for offering it to the House at this time.

Mr. A. R. McMASTER (Brome): Mr. Speaker, I did not have the pleasure this afternoon and this evening of listening to all that was said by the member from Maissoneuve (Mr. Lemieux). This I regret, because I know that to a question of this kind the hon. gentleman brings the research of the student, the mind of the statesman, and the experience of a parliamentarian of many years standing. I have, however, listened with a great deal of enjoyment to speakers on both sides of the House, and it would appear to me that this is a question of a very abstract nature because it has been surrounded by much sweet reasonableness from both sides of the House.

We have been referred to British precedents in regard to this matter. As I recall it, Mr. Speaker, down to the middle of the last century even cabinets organized by Mr. Gladstone contained as many members of the upper House as, if not more than, they did of the lower House; that is an example to be avoided in this country. The British people have, indeed, only apparently a bicameral system. There were two Houses operating or functioning in the British Isles when the Liberal party was in power, but when the Tory party was in power the House of Lords was a mere registry office for registering the legislation passed by the Tory majority in the House of Commons. That is another thing which we wish to avoid.

I am at one with the member for Maisonneuve in his desire that when we are discussing Estimates or legislation for which a department is responsible, the minister in charge of that department should be in this House. Where I differ from my hon. friend is in that he desires to bring the minister temporarily from the other chamber; I say that the minister should not be in the other chamber at all. I rise, therefore, to support the attitude taken by the hon. member for North Waterloo (Mr. Euler). I would, however, make one exception; I think it would be reasonable that as, under our system, a minister without portfolio has no emolument and as the leadership in the Senate demands the full attention of the member, not only during the session, but between sessions, the Government of the day should be allowed to have in the upper house one man holding a portfolio and that one man should be a Government leader in the upper house. But I would not have that one man in charge of what I would call a great popular department. The Prime Minister (Mr. Meighen) stated that all departments were spending departments. That, of course, is true; but they differ so much in degree that there is a distinction in fact to be drawn between a great spending department, such as the Department of Railways and Canals and the Department of Public Works, and lesser departments which spend hundreds of thousands of dollars where the larger departments spend millions. It is nothing short of a scandal that, in a democratic country like Canada, the Ministry of Labour should be represented in what amounts to our House of Lords. It is something which should be repugnant to our democratic institutions, and it is a great reflection upon the Government, because the Government should be able to elect a labour man in the country to support them if they really represent the working people of the country, and the fact that they take this worthy gentleman—I have nothing to say against him for the moment—and place him in the upper chamber, is as unconstitutional under our democratic practice as it is ridiculous. The idea that the Postmaster General, beaten in two constituencies, should be taken and placed in our House of Lords to misrepresent the views of the province from which he comes, in spite of the emphatic protest of the electors of two constituencies in both of which he lost his deposit, if I mistake not, is, to my mind, unconstitutional.

Mr. EDWARDS: That is not correct.

Mr. McMASTER: Perhaps he lost his deposit in only one constituency and nearly lost it in another.

Mr. EDWARDS: That is not correct.

Mr. McMASTER: I know that in one constituency, that of Champlain, the minister in question received a few hundred votes against thousands that were given for his adversary. As regards the other constituency of Laurier-Outremont, I have not the figures under my hand at the moment.

Mr. SPEAKER: I hope the hon. gentleman will not pursue this phase of the subject too far, because it is not really germane to the subject at issue.

Mr. McMASTER: I agree with you, Mr. Speaker, and I find that, as regards the constituency of Laurier-Outremont, I was wrong, and I hasten to withdraw the statement. He was beaten there by 1247. The hon. member for Parkdale (Mr. Mowat) stated that we might get rid of the question by having the Senate elected, and one hon. member from British Columbia, who

spoke in this debate, was very strong for an elective Senate. The question of an elective Senate is certainly a very interesting one, and it seems consonant with our practice and our constitutional outlook, if I may use the expression, that the Senate should be elective. If I mistake not, the old Legislative Council in Upper Canada prior to confederation was elective.

An hon. MEMBER: In its last years.

Mr. McMASTER: Yes, and I think there is a good deal to be said for an elective Senate. Of course, it must be remembered that there is a kind of man who is capable of serving the public well and who has a desire to serve the public, who is nevertheless not a good candidate, who has not the popular graces that are required to ingratiate him with the public, and there is something to be said for placing in the Senate a certain number of those men. I would keep the number very small, but the matter is worthy of consideration. I will say this for the House of Lords, that, in recent years, the utterances of a number of members of the House of Lords on international questions, have been in terms which have found an echo in every liberal-minded heart throughout the civilized world. We may find liberalism in very unexpected places at times. But will an elective Senate get rid of the difficulty? I do not think so. If you had two elective bodies, in both of which were ministers in charge of portfolios, with similar rights of initiating and explaining legislation and directing policies, you might very easily have deadlocks. The House of Commons, that House which is closest and which would be closest to the people even under our electoral system, whereby senators were elected for a longer term in rotation, say one-third of them retiring every four or five years, is the chamber in which the spending departments should be managed and in which those responsible for the spending departments should take and have their seats.

Is it wise to do what the hon. member for Maisonneuve (Mr. Lemieux) suggests? Is it wise to bring into this Chamber men from the other Chamber? Is it wise to do what one of the members for Halifax (Mr. A. K. Maclean) suggests, namely, that we should take our members from this Chamber into the Upper House? If we opened the door to a practice of that sort, that is, bringing in men from the Upper Chamber into this House, what would a Government, having lost the confidence of the people like the present Government, do, supposing some of their members were taken from them? We all hope they will not be; but supposing a calamity of any nature overtook some of them; for instance, supposing four of them were riding in an automobile and the automobile overturned and they went to their reward sooner than they expected. The portfolios would be left although the ministers were taken, and it would be necessary for the Government to fill those four portfolios. What would a Government like this do? It might very possibly, very improperly, of course, choose four senators and give them the portfolios; and then if the plan of the hon. member for Maisonneuve had been adopted, when we said: "It is not right to have these portfolios held in the Senate; we should have an opportunity to have these men face to face with us in the House of Commons," the answer would be: "You are beating the air; we have a right to have these men come when their Estimates are under discussion; we will lead them into this Chamber and you will ask them questions and then afterwards they will go out to their safe seats in the Upper Chamber." That might be the reply of a ministry constituted as is the present ministry because, of course, a ministry firm in the confidence of the people would have no difficulty in filling such portfolios by elections in the usual manner. Therefore, I am afraid that what the hon. member for Maisonneuve suggests would be, not to treat the wound in a scientific manner, but rather just to put a plaster on it, and all doctors will say that if you put a plaster on a wound, you may cause gangrene to set in. What I want to do is not to bring ministers from another House temporarily into this Chamber. I want to have a general election, and to have a Government which has the confidence of the people elected. Then I want that Government which has been elected by the people to choose its members from members of the House of Commons, with perhaps one minister in the Senate for the purpose of transacting the Government business that has to go there.

Mr. BELAND: Without portfolio.

Mr. McMASTER: I would give him a portfolio with salary. I would be just as generous to my political enemies as to my friends. There is another thought which has been expressed by the Minister of Justice with which I agree. I think it is wise to keep portfolios out of the upper house in order that it may retain that quasi-judicial character which an upper house should have. I agree with the hon. member for North Waterloo (Mr. Euler) that

it is not often that we get that attitude of mind, but it is an attitude of mind that should be cultivated by an upper chamber. I feel that I have detained the House sufficiently long, and I will now take my seat.

Mr. J. EDWARDS (Frontenac): Mr. Speaker, I had no intention when I entered this chamber of taking part in this discussion, and I shall not now occupy very many minutes. I think the resolution moved by the hon. member for Maisonneuve (Mr. Lemieux) is one that deserves very serious and careful consideration. In general it commends itself to me as a reasonable proposition to be made to this House.

In regard to certain changes which have been suggested in the Senate, it seems to me it would be a good idea if every person appointed to the Senate were to vacate his seat upon reaching the age of seventy. I think the Senator who has reached the age of seventy, after being actively engaged in political life, should step down and out and devote the rest of his life to preparing for the next world.

I do not agree with the hon. gentleman who has just taken his seat (Mr. McMaster) in regard to a member of the Senate occupying a seat in this House. Conditions may arise in this country, and have done so, where it would be advisable to have a gentleman appointed to the Cabinet who could only be appointed by giving him a seat in the Senate. We had an example of that in the last general election. In the province of Ontario we all know that the tide ran very strongly in one direction. We also know that in the same election the tide ran just as strongly in the opposite direction in the province of Quebec. If my memory serves me correctly, sixty-two out of sixty-five constituencies in the province of Quebec elected opponents of the Government, but there were thousands of votes polled in the province of Quebec by people who thought just as the majority of the people in Canada thought; there is no question about that. They did not succeed in getting their candidates elected to this House, but there were thousands of people in the province of Quebec who did give an expression of opinion in favour of the policy laid down by the Government. Now there was no way of giving those thousands of people representation in this Government except by electing one of their number to a seat in the Senate, and that was done. The hon. gentleman has referred to the hon. the Postmaster General, as he has on former occasions, as misrepresenting the province of Quebec. Once more allow me to call his attention, and that of certain other gentlemen in this House who have on former occasions made similar allusions, to this fact: It is true the present Postmaster General ran in two constituencies. It is true that in one constituency he lost his deposit. In the other constituency he succeeded in polling 6,196 votes. That was not sufficient to elect him, but it was an expression of opinion from 6,196 people in the province of Quebec, and that was more than twice as many people, yes, more than four times as many, as expressed themselves in favour of the hon. member for Brome (Mr. McMaster).

Mr. DuTREMBLAY: How many votes did the Postmaster General receive in the province of Quebec, without counting the soldier vote?

Mr. EDWARDS: If the hon. gentleman refers to the civil vote, the Postmaster General polled 4,855 civil votes, in addition to that, there were polled in the province of Quebec 208 soldier votes. That makes over 5,000 votes polled by the Postmaster General by people residing at that time in the province of Quebec. While I am at it, I daresay it would be of interest to the hon. gentleman to know how many votes were polled in the province of Quebec by the hon. member from Brome. He succeeded in pulling down altogether 1,913 civil votes, and succeeded in getting 5 soldier votes; that is, he received less than 2,000 votes altogether in the province of Quebec. Yet the hon. member for Brome would be horrified if any person were to hint for a moment that he did not represent the people of the province of Quebec or of his constituency, yet all told only 1,926 people said they wanted the hon. member for Brome to have a seat in this House, while 6,196 said they wanted the Postmaster General to have a seat in this House. Let me give my hon. friend a little more information. Let me tell him that there are thirty-five hon. gentlemen sitting on the other side of the House elected from the province of Quebec who polled fewer votes in 1917 than did the hon. the Postmaster General. Yet I daresay every one of those hon. gentlemen thinks he represents the sentiment of the province of Quebec.

Mr. McMASTER: How many civil votes did the hon. gentleman receive in Frontenac?

Mr. EDWARDS: I cannot say offhand, but I know I received within seventeen of a two thousand majority. There is no doubt,—

Mr. SPEAKER: I regret to interrupt the hon. member. I felt it was his right to reply to the reflection implied in the question of the hon. member for Brome, but I do not think it would be wise to pursue the point further because it bears no relation to the question before the Chair.

Mr. EDWARDS: Mr. Speaker, I was endeavouring to answer the statement of the hon. member for Brome, that the Postmaster General misrepresented the province of Quebec, and should not have been appointed to that position. The hon. member said further that it was wrong for any man to have a seat in the other House as a Cabinet minister. With that I do not agree, and I have cited as a reason for that opinion the course the election took in 1917. There was no opportunity for tens of thousands of voters in the province of Quebec to be represented in the Cabinet, except by giving a seat in the Government to a man who could sit in the Senate. That is the point I desired to make, and I certainly think that under the circumstances it is a wise provision that a man who occupies a position in the Cabinet may have a seat in the Senate. I agree at once with those who say that it is inadvisable that very many members of the Cabinet should sit in the Senate. I will go further and say that it would be advisable, if possible, to have all Cabinet ministers sit in this Chamber. Now, it seems to me that the resolution proposed by the hon. member for Maisonneuve is one which touches this very point. I did not have the pleasure of listening to his remarks, but I believe he appreciates the fact that circumstances might arise in this country wherein the only way in which representation might be given to an important class in the community would be by giving a seat in the Cabinet to a man who is a member of the Senate. It is not advisable to carry that principle further than the point of absolute necessity. What objection can be raised to a Cabinet minister, who sits in the Senate, coming into this House when his Estimates are under discussion? He is the one who should know more about those Estimates than any one else. For my part, I can see no reason why he should not occupy a seat in this House when his Estimates are under consideration or when matters particularly affecting his department are before the House. As it appears to me, therefore, the resolution is one which should receive very full and careful consideration by the Government, with the object of putting it into practice. I see no reason whatever why it should not be implemented, and there are a good many reasons that suggest themselves to me why it would be generally advantageous if the suggestion contained in the resolution were given effect to.

Hon. Mr. LEMIEUX: Just one word before I withdraw my motion, because I only brought it forward in order to elicit as much information as possible from both sides of the House and to place the question before the public at large. I believe, from what I have gathered this evening, that a general sentiment exists in favour of some amendment to our rules for the purpose of obtaining from ministers of the Crown, sitting in either Chamber, such information as is necessary to carry on the affairs of the country in a business way. The debate has been most interesting, and I have personally learned a great deal from what has been said by hon. members on both sides. The discussion, however, has wandered somewhat from the main object of the resolution. I did not intend to discuss this evening the constitution of the upper Chamber, nor did I wish to raise the issue of the reform of the Senate. That is another question which might well be discussed on some other occasion. But I have no hesitation in saying that I stand for the upper Chamber, with perhaps a reform as regards the age limit, and perhaps election in the second degree,—election by public bodies such as universities, boards of trade, and provincial legislatures, or even, as it has been suggested, on one occasion, the selection of senators by both the leaders of the Conservative and the Liberal parties, appointing representatives in the upper Chamber under a certain procedure which was elaborated, I believe, the last time we discussed this question on the motion of Mr. German, the ex-member for Welland.

I have listened with great attention to the able argument of the right hon. Minister of Justice. He seems to be under the impression that there is involved in this resolution some constitutional change. Far be it from me, Mr. Speaker, to suggest that we should constitutionally change our system of government. I regret that my resolution was not framed in such a way as to appeal more clearly to the mind of my right hon. friend. I did not intend

at all to change our system of government. I did not have in view any change in the powers of either Chamber. What I had in mind, however, is the establishment of more modern and more practical channels of communication between the two Chambers. That, I think, would involve only an amendment to our rules. But I never had in mind having a joint address presented by both Houses to the Imperial Parliament seeking to amend our Constitution. Such an object can be read into my resolution. I simply wish to find means of conveying more information, because under our system of government there will always be some ministers sitting in this Chamber and in the upper Chamber. I do not share the optimism of my good friend from Brome in the matter of the appointment of minister in the upper Chamber. We are all human, and so long as our system endures I believe that the Conservative party, or the Liberal party will as things come and go on, always appoint some faithful to the upper Chamber occupying a Cabinet position. It has always been so since Confederation, under Macdonald, under Laurier, and under Borden. It is so to-day under Meighen, and it will be so in days to come, unless we abolish the Senate, deciding that it has lost its usefulness, which I do not believe.

The Senate may have lost some of its ininfluence, it may not have been, of late years, the great factor it was after Confederation and even at the time when I entered Parliament. I remember long before I entered this House that one would approach with awe and reverence the precincts of the Senate. There were great men in the Upper Champer formerly—men of unusual ability, men who had occupied the highest positions in their own province, and in this House. That there has been a change within a few years, and that some appointments of to-day may not be what others were twenty-five or forty years ago, is quite possible. But at all events the Senate is there as an institution. I said a moment ago it is liable to be reformed; but taking it as a fact that the Senate will remain as it is for many years to come, I wish to improve the relations between the two chambers. It is a matter of procedure, and at the same time it is a matter of common sense, that we should have the opportunity of exchanging ministers whenever occasion arises. Let us suppose an important Bill is drafted by the present leader of the Senate. It may be a measure concerning the civil re-establishment of our soldiers, the administration of his department, or the natural resources of Northwest provinces—the oil resources for instance, to mention only one important feature of his administration. The policy is planned by him, but the Bill is introduced in this chamber by another minister who has not been able to study the question as much and to master it as thoroughly as the drafter of the Bill who sits in the other chamber. What objection is there, Mr. Speaker, that that minister should, through some amendment to our procedure, be called upon to explain the new policy to the House, or even to defend his estimates when they are scrutinized and criticized in this chamber? So once more le me say, Mr. Speaker, that the main object of my motion is not to bring about a constitutional change. I simply wish to amend our system of procedure and facilitate the exchange of ideas, and the explanation of policies as presented in both Houses. I shall withdraw my resolution, Mr. Speaker, and I thank the House for the attention it has given to the discussion of this question.

Motion withdrawn.

On the motion of the Right Hon. Mr. Doherty for the adjournment of the House.

Mr. FIELDING: What business will be taken up to-morrow?

Mr. DOHERTY: We expect to take up the Estimates, including those of the Department of Trade and Commerce, the Department of Labour, and the Department of the Interior.

Mr. SPEAKER: Carried.

Mr. MACLEAN (Halifax): Mr. Speaker, before that motion is put—

Mr. SPEAKER: The motion is not debatable.

Mr. MACLEAN (Halifax): I do not desire to debate the motion; I wish to ask for the unanimous consent of the House to refer to a former order for the purpose—

Mr. SPEAKER: Unless the Minister of Justice is prepared to withdraw his motion it is not competent for the hon. member to do so.

Motion agreed to and the House adjourned at 11 o'clock p.m.

Tuesday, March 22, 1921

The House met at Three o'clock.

COMMITTEE ON RAILWAYS, CANALS AND TELEGRAPH LINES

Mr. J. E. ARMSTRONG (Lambton East) presented the first report of the Select Standing Committee on Railways, Canals and Telegraph lines.

REPORTS

Detailed Statement of Remissions of Customs Duties and the refund thereof for the fiscal year ended March 31, 1920.—Sir Henry Drayton.

Annual Report of the Secretary of State of Canada for the year 1919-20.—Sir Henry Drayton.

VACANCY—MEDICINE HAT

Mr. SPEAKER: I have the honour to inform the House that I have received a notification of a vacancy having occurred in the Electoral District of Medicine Hat, by the decease of the Right Honourable Arthur Lewis Sifton, sitting member therefor. I accordingly issued my warrant to the Chief Electoral Officer to make out a new writ of election for the said Electoral District.

CANADA SHIPPING ACT (PUBLIC HARBOURS)

Hon. A. K. MACLEAN (Halifax) moved for leave to introduce Bill No. 40, to amend the Canada Shipping Act (Public Harbours). He said: The purpose of this Bill is to enable the Governor in Council to increase existing penalites for the pollution of harbour waters by the discharge of waste oil from oil-burning steamers.

Motion agreed to, and Bill read the first time.

WEDNESAY EVENING SITTINGS

Right Hon. ARTHUR MEIGHEN (Prime Minister) moved:

That on Wednesday, the sixth of April, and on all subsequent Wednesdays to the end of the Session, the House shall meet at Three o'clock, p.m., and that the sittings on such days shall, in every respect, be under the same rules provided for other days, and that Government Notices of Motions and Government Orders shall have precedence over all business except Questions by Members and Notices of Motions for the Production of Papers.

Hon. W. S. FIELDING (Shelburne and Queen's): There is already on the Order Paper a motion standing in my name, dealing with the question of the hours of meeting and closing our business on Wednesdays. I regret that the Prime Minister, in this motion, is abandoning at once the Wednesday evening recess. There are strong reasons which can be urged in favour of continuing that recess. I am confident it makes, not only for the comfort and convenience of members, but for the efficient administration of the business of the House. If members know that they will have one evening a week on which they are free to make engagements, they will adapt themselves to that; but if they have no evening free in which they can make engagements, they will take an evening off whenever it suits them, and there will be a lack of attendance. As, however, the whole question will come up again on the motion that stands in my name. I do not know that any good purpose can be served by continuing the discussion at this stage.

Motion agreed to.

FRENCH TREATY

On the Orders of the Day:

Mr. JOSEPH ARCHAMBAULT (Chambly and Vercheres): Mr. Speaker, I wish to draw the attention of the Government to an item which appeared on Saturday in the Montreal papers regarding the commercial treaty with France. The item states that the commercial treaty with France, signed on behalf of Canada by the Minister of Trade and Commerce (Sir George Foster) in the month of January last, will become effective on the 27th of this month. I might say that I have on the Order Paper a motion for the production of that treaty. When the motion came up on March 4, the Prime Minister asked that the motion stand, and on March 7, the same answer was given. Is it true that the treaty was signed on behalf of Canada in the month of January, and that it will become effective on the 27th instant? Why is the Government keeping the people at large, the manufacturers who wish to do business with France, and members of Parliament, unaware of the contents of that treaty until it becomes effective?

Right Hon. Sir GEORGE FOSTER (Minister of Trade and Commerce): Mr. Speaker, I will answer the last question first. The Government has not been keeping the contents of the proposed agreement secret to the detriment of manufacturers

or any other business men of this country; rather the opposite was the point held in view. It is true that an agreement was come to, and that it was signed by myself when I was on the other side in the month of January, and it was signed by the then Minister of Commerce, Mr. Isaac. But it is also true that a little after that a change of Gevernment occurred in France, and consequently the signature by the preceding Minister of Commerce was not effective. The measure had itself to be examined and agreed to by the succeeding ministry, so that there was no treaty that was effective, either in esse or in the future, until it became established that the succeeding Government was of the same mind as the preceding and would carry out the effect of the agreement. That was not ascertained until last week. Now, let me say a word as to why the treaty could not just at this moment be laid before the House. I signed for Canada the proposed agreement. Both copies of it were sent to the French Government through the British Embassy; and when the French Government were in a position to sign—and that would not be until the succeeding Government had approved the agreement—the two copies of the agreement were to be signed in Paris and one copy sent to the Canadian Government. So that really we have not the authoritative treaty or agreement until we receive that signed copy which belongs to us and which is now on the way from France.

Hence, if I had give out the contents of the agreement as made between Mr. Isaac and myself, I might have been misleading the whole people of Canada, because it might never have gone into force. At the present time I have what I believe to be pretty close to an exact transcript of the agreement as it now stands after having been signed by the French minister, and I am going to take the responsibility of laying that before the House at an early date—with the remark that there may be some slight deviations, not very important, in respect to the articles of the agreement as a result of its examination by the minister in France who succeeded Mr. Isaac.

Mr. ARCHAMBAULT: Is it true that the treaty will become effective on the 27th of this month, that is, at the end of this week?

Sir GEORGE FOSTER: That is the contents of the telegram that I have received from Mr. Roy.

Mr. FIELDING: Can it become effective in Canada until it has been approved by this House?

Sir GEORGE FOSTER: Yes.

Mr. ARCHAMBAULT: A commercial treaty?

Sir GEORGE FOSTER: Yes.

Mr. CURRIE: When did this House authorize the making of the treaty with France? Are members of this House not to be consulted at all in these matters? I have a distinct recollection of one government in Canada being defeated on that very question.

Mr. SPEAKER: Order.

Mr. CURRIE: I should like an answer.

Mr. BELAND: May I ask the Minister of Trade and Commerce if there is any special reason why communication with the French Government should be made through the British Embassy, instead of through the Canadian High Commissioner in Paris?

Sir GEORGE FOSTER: It has always been the custom that these trade agreements that are made are made through the privity and through the medium of an official of the British Government. I sent the copies which I myself signed through the British Foreign Office. They reached the French Government through that medium, and I expect they will be returned through the same medium.

Mr. BUREAU: That was prior to our becoming a nation.

Sir GEORGE FOSTER: Oh, no. It is said that Canada became a nation a long time ago, during Sir Wilfrid Laurier's time.

BOOK ON PARLIAMENT BUILDINGS ARCHITECTURE

On the Orders of the Day:

Mr. H. C. HOCKEN (West Toronto): In view of the fact that this magnificent building is full of historic carvings and that almost the whole period of Canada's history is represented in it in some form or other, is it the intention of the Government to have the architect write a book descriptive of the building before his duties are discharged?

Right Hon. ARTHUR MEIGHEN (Prime Minister): I am not aware Mr. Speaker that any pressure has been brought to bear on the architect to write a book. I am always very slow to write books myself,

but I can assure my hon. friend that this matter will be brought to the architect's attention.

CIVIL SERVICE BONUS

On the Orders of the Day:

Hon. RODOLPHE LEMIEUX (Maisonneuve): May I ask my right hon. friend if anything has yet been decided regarding the bonus to be paid to the Civil Service this year?

Right Hon. ARTHUR MEIGHEN (Prime Minister): I expect to be able to make a statement on that matter tomorrow.

INCOME TAX FORMS

On the Orders of the Day:

Mr. W. F. KAY (Missisquoi): I should like to ask the Minister of Finance when the new forms for income tax returns will be issued.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON (Minister of Finance): My understanding, and I think the fact, is that the forms are already issued.

Mr. KAY: I tried to get some last week at my post office, but could not do so.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: Where is that?

Mr. KAY: In the county of Missisquoi.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: And the post office?

Mr. KAY: Philipsburg.

LAKE OF THE WOODS CONTROL

On the Orders of the Day:

Mr. JACQUES BUREAU (Three Rivers and St. Maurice): May I ask the Prime Minister whether he or any member of the Government has received any communication from the International Joint Waterways Commission with reference to control of the waters of the Lake of the Woods either since or prior to November last?

Right Hon. ARTHUR MEIGHEN (Prime Minister): I am not aware of any being received from the International Joint Waterways Commission since November last.

Mr. BUREAU: Or from any branch, American or Canadian?

Mr. MEIGHEN: I would not say that no communication has been received, but I cannot bring to mind at the moment any received since that date. Perhaps the hon. gentleman would put his question on the Order Paper.

Mr. BUREAU: I just want a yes or no answer.

Mr. MEIGHEN: I will make a note of my hon. friend's question, and have it answered tomorrow.

THE AUDITOR GENERAL'S REPORT

On the Orders of the Day:

Mr. JOSEPH ARCHAMBAULT (Chambly-Verchères): As a member of the Standing Committee on Public Accounts I should like to ask the Minister of Finance when he expects to lay on the table of the House the fourth volume of the Auditor-General's Report.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON (Minister of Finance): I expect it will be tabled at the end of the month.

INQUIRIES FOR RETURNS

On the Orders of the Day:

Mr. J. H. SINCLAIR (Antigonish and Guysborough): I should like to ask the Secretary of State—I presume we have a Secretary of State, although I do not know who he is—when returns may be expected to some thirty motions that were passed at the last session of this House for the production of papers, and which orders of the House have not yet been complied with.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON (Minister of Finance): I shall have very great pleasure in looking into the matter. Perhaps my hon. friend could facilitate matters by letting me have a list of these motions.

SUPPLY

CANADIAN NATIONAL RAILWAYS—AMQUI STATION

On the motion of Right Hon. Sir George Foster for Committee of Supply:

Mr. F. J. PELLETIER (Matane): Mr. Speaker, if I am in order I should like to ask the Government one or two questions before the House goes into Committee of Supply. My attention has been called to certain conditions existing on the Intercolonial Railway at Amqui station. May I ask my right hon. friend the Prime Minister whether he received on or about the 10th day of March a communication from Mr. J. E. Beaulieu, Registrar of Amqui, asking why certain changes pertaining to the night and day agents at Amqui station had been made. I understand from a copy of this communication that the day agent

at Amqui station goes on at eight o'clock in the morning and leaves at five in the afternoon, and that the night agent goes on at eight o'clock in the evening and leaves at four in the morning. This leaves the station without an agent between the hours of 5 p.m. and 8 p.m. and between 4 a.m. and 8 a.m. Mr. Beaulieu states that during the time neither agent is on duty trains Nos. 32, 33 and 34 pass through Amqui, and the people are not in a position to get their freight or express on account of there being no agent there at that time. Any merchandise on No. 32, for instance, is carried on through to Campbellton, and does not return until the following day on another train, and vice versa. If the people of Amqui wish to express goods in the opposite direction they have to send their goods out to Mont Joli, to be returned later. I should like to ask my right hon. friend whether he has referred this matter to the proper department, that is, if he has received the communication. A copy of it was sent to me and I wrote to the General Superintendent enclosing him a copy, but I have not yet received an answer from him. Whether it is because officials of the road are instructed not to answer communications or not I do not know. It seems rather strange now that when we ask on the floor of the House for certain information we are not able to secure it. May I ask my hon. friend whether he has also received a copy of the resolution adopted by the Council at Amqui, complaining of the same thing, and if so, whether he has given the matter his attention? We trust that this matter will be taken into consideration.

Mr. SPEAKER: I may point out to the hon. member that if he has any further remarks to make, or suggestions to offer, he had better avail himself of the opportunity now, because he is limited to one speech on this motion. Similarly, the right hon. the Prime Minister (Mr. Meighen), in his reply, will be limited to one speech.

Mr. PELLETIER: Very well, Mr. Speaker. The resolution that was adopted by the Council at Amqui gave a wealth of details, showing that the village has a population of nearly 4,000, and that there are three other parishes east of Amqui itself. All the goods that have been shipped on the trains I have mentioned are loaded at Amqui for shipment. Now, these people certainly want to have the present condition of affairs remedied, and I sincerely trust that my right hon. friend will attend to this matter in the near future. He may have transmitted it to some other department, but, as I have stated, I have not been able to obtain any answer. I should be glad to see an agent appointed who would be at the station at all times. It seems unreasonable that these trains should pass by that station, which is an important one, without an agent being there. In the communication of which I spoke, of the 28th February, I mentioned the fact that the officials of the Canadian National Railways at Amqui had allowed certain people to pile lumber on the south side of the station in the yard, in the immediate vicinity of which there are quite a number of private residences; and I pointed out that the owners of these houses were obliged to pay the same rate of insurance as is paid by the lumber yards. I submitted this question to the superintendent of the district, but he informed me that he could do nothing. This lumber could just as easily be piled on the northwest side, where there are no buildings nearby; and there are sidings on that side of the yard as well as on the other. I should like to have a satisfactory answer from the Prime Minister, who I trust will give his best consideration to this matter.

Right Hon. ARTHUR MEIGHEN (Prime Minister): I should be only too glad to reply to the hon. member, especially as he very seldom addresses the House. I cannot do so, however, if what I say now is to be regarded as exhausting my only opportunity for speaking on this motion. The hon. member asks about a communication which he is informed was sent to me, and I rather gathered that he added later on that he had written me himself. Is that correct?

Mr. PELLETIER: No.

Mr. MEIGHEN: I must have misunderstood my hon. friend. Now, it may be that my office received the letter to which he refers. If it was received, it would be dealt with by my secretary without direct reference to me and would be submitted to the Railway Department for reference to the Canadian National Board. If the hon. member wrote me personally himself the letter would come to me direct, and I am sure I would have answered it by this time. I cannot recall having received that communication.

Mr. PELLETIER: There were two mailed.

Mr. MEIGHEN: I have no doubt they were received in my office, but they would

not come to me personally unless they were so directed. However, I shall look into the matter and see that proper steps are taken in respect of both.

CANADIAN NATIONAL RAILWAYS

MANAGEMENT—INFORMATION LAID BEFORE PARLIAMENT

Right Hon. Sir GEORGE FOSTER (Minister of Trade and Commerce) moved that the House go into Committee of Supply.

Hon. W. L. MACKENZIE KING (leader of the Opposition): I desire to move an amendment as follows to the motion which is before the House:

That all the words after the word "that" be struck out, and the following substituted therefor:

Subject to the reservation that in exceptional cases there may be documents of a confidential character which, in the public interest, may properly be withheld from publication, the House declares that it is the undoubted right of Parliament to demand and receive copies of all reports, accounts, correspondence and papers in relation to the management of every department of the public service including the affairs of the Canadian National Railways, whether operating directly under the control of the department, or under corporate form.

The necessity for this amendment, Mr. Speaker, is the attitude taken by the Government during the last session of Parliament, and which is being taken anew at the present session, of refusing to give hon. members of the House information with respect to the Canadian National Railways in answer to questions which are addressed to the ministry, and in response to motions for the production of papers containing information with respect to the affairs of the Canadian National Railways. It is further necessary, in view of the declaration made by the Prime Minister in this House on Thursday last, which was, if I do not misinterpret his words, to the effect that the Government would not give to this House information respecting the Canadian National Railways if by any chance that information happened to relate to correspondence held with the Board of Directors in charge of the management of the roads. In other words, the Government's position is this: It is one of government ownership of railways and government control and operation without government responsibility.

The Government of their own initiative, have created a nominal company to which they have assigned the management of the affairs of the Canadian National Railways. They have themselves of their own nominees constituted a Board of Directors who are to have a free hand in managing all the affairs of the railway system. But when it comes to the public, who are the owners of the system, and who are to meet the liabilities for any shortages occasioned by its management, we are told that the representatives of the people in Parliament shall not have the right to obtain information respecting essential matters of management and detail. We have had from the Minister of Railways and Canals (Hon. Mr. Reid), a statement as to the consequences of the methods which have been adopted by the Government in the management of its railways. We were informed on Thursday last that there is a deficit for the past year of something like $70,000,000 in the operation of the roads, and the Minister of Railways stated that the question had become so grave that he and his colleagues were virtually at a loss to know how to deal with the situation one way or the other. I say, Mr. Speaker, that when a government comes before Parliament and confesses its incapacity to deal with any situation, it is time for that government to resign and make way for some other body capable of managing the affairs of the country. However, altogether apart from that, the minister stated that the Government would be pleased to receive from the members of this House suggestions as to how the situation could be improved. Well, I think there are many hon. members who would be glad to make suggestions. But I would point out, Sir, that it is impossible for any hon. member to submit an intelligent suggestion unless he has information on which to base the suggestion which he may desire to make. We are all anxious to treat this great problem with the great care and caution with which it should be surrounded. We recognize that Canada has not been faced, except during the period of the war, with a situation that was ever quite as grave as that which is produced by the railway problem to-day. It is certainly the first question pressing for solution, it is in every way the most baffling problem with which the country has been confronted. But the only way in which a problem of such magnitude can be solved, if it is to be solved at all, is through the people's representatives in Parliament having the fullest information in regard to all its aspects.

Now, Sir, the reasonableness of the demand in this resolution, will, I think, be wholly apparent. All that the resolution requests, is, that as respects the Canadian National railways, which are a branch of

the Government public service, this House shall have the same right as it has in respect to all other branches of the public service, viz.—the right to the fullest information with respect to matters of great public concern. May I point out that the Government's attitude in refusing to give this House any information, is really placing a premium, so far as the management of these railways are concerned, on inefficiency and on incapacity, if not also on absolute dishonesty. Take the position of the members of the board of directors of the Government railways as it is constituted at the present time. They are virtually told by the Administration that they are to have a free hand in carrying on the affairs of these roads, that they may do as they please; that when the people's representatives in Parliament ask for information as to how the affairs of the national railways are being conducted, no information will be given. The directors may do what they please, but they will be screened in the matter of any unwise or unjust measures by a refusal on the part of the Government to give any information to the people in regard to the Government railways and their management.

I would point out, Mr. Speaker, that this attitude on the part of the Government is unfair in very many directions, as well as being very prejudicial to the interests of the taxpayers of this country. It is unfair to the labour that is employed on the railways of this country. Since the announcement has been made of this great deficit, there appears to have been an organized propaganda to create the impression that, in some way or another, labour, because it has been receiving high wages, is responsible for that deficit. How is labour to have its position properly put before the country unless the opportunity is given to the people's representatives in this House to find out whether there are not other causes—such as unnecessary service, unnecessary duplication of operations, waste, extravagance, inefficient management and the like—which are accountable for the large deficit with which the country is faced. Until we get the fullest possible information it is impossible to say what the real cause is.

I should also like to say that it is unfair to that large body of the public who are advocating a system of government ownership, that facts respecting the operation of these roads should be withheld from Parliament. This is not the time to argue the merits or demerits of public or private ownership; but it is just to all persons, whether they are advocates of private ownership or advocates of public ownership, that the fullest amount of information should be placed before Parliament, so that an intelligent public opinion may be formed as to which of the two methods is likely to prove more in the public interest.

The only argument the Government has urged against giving information is the specious one that for it to do so would lead to the affairs of the national railways being brought into party politics, that it would lead to a political control of these roads. Let me say, Mr. Speaker, that I think the direct opposite is the truth. The danger of the railway system of Canada being used for political ends lies in the fact that their operation is being surrounded by the secrecy with which the Government is surrounding it at the present time. The one and only safeguard against political interference and control is the frankest, freest, and fullest publicity in regard to all the affairs of these railways. I need not do other than quote from an authority, which hon. gentlemen will recognize as one that is friendly, to show that the present system is not regarded as in any way freeing the railways from political control. In an editorial in the Montreal Gazette of March 21 on the railway situation, will be found the following sentence:

> The pretence that these railways are now free from politics deceives nobody.

Nothing could be clearer than that. The impression that the public entertains today in a word is this: that the Government has constituted a board of directors, nominees of its own, friends of its own, gentlemen who have connections with other large industrial enterprises, and has left them a perfectly free hand to use this vast railway system of Canada as a great instrument for furthering business interests in which the country may be interested, but in which they themselves may also be interested. In other words, the fact that Parliament is denied a full and free knowledge of every fact surrounding the situation, is leading to the impression throughout the country that our national railways are being converted into a gigantic political machine for the purpose of furthering the interests of the Government and its friends. Now, Sir, there is only one cure for that impression, there is only one way in which that impression can be removed, and that is by the Gov-

ernment giving to Parliament the fullest information with respect to any questions which hon. members care to address to the ministry in regard to the national railroads.

Let me just say this further word: If public opinion is to be formed in an intelligent manner on this important question it can only be so formed by having before the country the fullest available information on which to base opinion, and that information is possible only by the Government supplying it through the medium of Parliament. I think the amendment is so reasonable on its face that it requires no argument for its support.

I would draw the attention of the House to this one feature in conclusion—while the amendment does assert the right of Parliament to full information, as one of the fundamental rights of a body such as this—which is representative of the people at large and with respect to a great property which is owned by the people themselves—it says nothing as to the form in which that information is to be supplied. It is customary in this House to have information given in answer to questions addressed to the ministry, or on motions for the production of papers; and sometimes the information is given through special committees. Nothing is said in this amendment as to the particular form in which the information is to be given; that is for the Government to decide; but it does assert the undoubted right of Parliament to the fullest information in respect to any property that is owned by the people of Canada, the management of which is in the hands of the Government and for which the people, as taxpayers, become liable, especially when, as in the present instance, there are gigantic deficits to meet.

Right Hon. ARTHUR MEIGHEN (Prime Minister): Mr. Speaker, I have to thank my hon. friend (Mr. Mackenzie King) for extending to me the courtesy of notice that this motion would be brought before the House to-day. He did not, however, err on the side of generosity, as the first intimation of it came to me half an hour before the debate at 2.30 this afternoon. I am glad, though, that the motion embodies a subject that is well worthy of the consideration of Parliament, and I shall take the opportunity later to invite, through a fitting channel, expressions of opinion from both sides of the House after the pros and cons are laid before hon. members as fully as is possible during the course of this debate.

When the railways of this country were assumed as a national property, the question at once confronted the Government as to what system of management would be the best, having regard to the public interest for the operation of those roads. The Government, two or three years ago, found itself in possession of some 17,000 miles of railway, with all the appurtenances that go with a great railway system in these times, and with the tremendous staff of employees and all the subsidiary activities that circle around anything of the nature of the Canadian Northern or, as it is now, the Canadian National Railways. Until then this country had never faced such a problem. We had for many years operated a railway between the Maritime Provinces and the city of Quebec, and later the city of Montreal—the Intercolonial railway. That railway was constructed and operated not exclusively as a business enterprise. It was constructed in large degree for laudable political purposes, and in its operation through all the years under the Department of Railways and Canals undoubtedly regard was paid to the fact that it was so originally constructed, and there was general consent that it was not being conducted on the hard and fast business lines that would be essential were it treated solely as a business enterprise. But even though there was that reason for the operation of the Intercolonial railway under the Department of Railways and Canals in the manner in which I have described, it cannot be said that the results of that operation were anything like wholly satisfactory to the people of Canada, or that the experience of that operation was such as to warrant the adoption of the same methods were another system to come into our possession. Much less was the experience of that operation such as to permit the Government seriously to contemplate the operation under the direct control of the Department of Railways and Canals—in other words, under direct political control—of a system of the immense magnitude of the Canadian National railways.

I cannot conceive that any Government that had first concern for the well being of such a railway system, or of the country that was the owner of that system, would for a moment think of undertaking the operation of that system—the largest in point of mileage in the world to-day—merely as a departmental activity, as we

operate other services under the Crown. The conclusion then arrived at all hon. members know. It was decided to try the plan of corporate operation; to give this system the same chance to succeed as a business enterprise that other rival or corresponding systems had the world over; and to see what success that system could have under the best conditions that could obtain.

That decision having been arrived at and having been approved by Parliament, the question then presented itself, as to how far it was consistent with the operation of our Canadian National Railways thereunder, that questions concerning only the relations of the operating board to the patrons of the road should be subject to the daily review of Parliament—in a word, to that summons, review, and control of Parliament that undoubtedly Parliament historically has exercised, and must exercise, in relation to services directly under departments of the Government. Well, if it has not been manifest to hon. members not so closely associated with the work as those of us in the Government, it must at least be manifest to those who come closely in contact with operations, that if all matters between the board of directors and the patrons of the road—all things connected with its operation—are to be subject to motion in this House and to disclosure by the production of documents and papers from day to day, the same as any activity of a department of Government, we are right back where we were with the Intercolonial; we are under political control. And we reach a position that to my mind seems to be anomalous, and wholly inconsistent with the corporate management of the road.

While there is corporate management, there remains the answerability and responsibility of the Government for the success of the system. That we cannot dispute. But there is no immediate accountability for the day to day procedure of operation. If there is to be then our officers subject to our direction must operate the road; but our officers subject to our direction are not so operating. The board of directors is independent of Government control and direction; and that being so the Government from day to day cannot be answerable for details of operation, or for what takes place in the ordinary routine of operation between the operating directorate and the patrons of the road.

Now, let us assume that the Government should demand from the directorate, and bring down to Parliament from day to day, all correspondence that takes place between the directorate and patrons of the system having relation to, say, the price of coal purchased at one point or at another point; or in relation to the situation of a pile of lumber in a little village, or as was instanced already this afternoon, whether that pile is on the northwest or the south side of the track; or in relation to details of purchases; or in relation to details of contracts—let us assume that these are exposed in Parliament, say, and attacked by the Opposition. In that event, is the Government in a position to defend? Those matters did not take place under the direction of any officer subject to our control, they took place under officers subject to the board of directors, for whose general conduct of the system the Government must be answerable, but for the details of whose conduct from day to day those directors are answerable as the directorate of the system. Therefore, there would be no one in a position to defend, there would be no one who could possibly be in possession of information that would enable him to defend.

But even a greater absurdity than that would arise. Owing to the immensity of the system it would be wholly impossible for Parliament to do its work, if it were to attempt from day to day as part of its duties to review the operations of that system, and if the Government were called upon from day to day to account for this or that action of the board of directors in matters of daily operation of the road. Consequently, a position from both those points of view would be taken which could not be sustained—could not be sustained, on the one hand, because the time of Parliament could not be directed to it, could not be absorbed in the effort, and, on the other hand, because it would result in holding the Government responsible from day to day for that which, unless it exercised direct political control from day to day, it could not possibly assume the responsibility.

There is another consideration, too. This system is in daily competition with the greatest railway system in the world, the Canadian Pacific railway, a system with a mileage somewhat less than ours, but which, in the various activities that come under it and in the immensity of its operations, is as yet the greater; a system perhaps the best managed of any very great business enterprise in the world to-day. Now, our system is in competition with that system. In the great body of its activities, it must,

in order to have work to do, in order to get a paying business, perform services in competition with the Canadian Pacific Railway system. I want to put it to this House: how is the Canadian National Railway directorate going to make a success in that fight for business, going to make a success of its efforts to compete with the Canadian Pacific, if every day it is subject to having every action of the board of directors and of its agents and officers disclosed to the public and to its competitor while on the other hand the competitor need disclose nothing at all?

In that connection, the hon. gentleman has said: Unless you are ready, in some form or other, to bring down all the information concerning the operation of the road—and I am good enough, he says, not to tell you the form in which it should be brought down; I do not know what difference the form makes; if it has to come down it has to come down and this is the only way to get it down—unless you do as you did with the Intercolonial, answer in the House for, and expose to Parliament, every detail of operation, then the system will be generally suspected in the public mind as being merely a great instrument or engine of political patronage. That is the only way, he says, in which you can preserve this road from the suspicion of being a politically controlled organization. Well now, is that the fact? The Canadian Pacific Railway Company would refuse to any man or to any parliament the disclosure of business that is its own; it knows that it cannot conduct the administration of that great enterprise and at the same time disclose to everybody just what it is doing from time to time. Not that what it is doing is wrong, but every business enterprise knows that it is impossible successfully to conduct a business, impossible to get the advantages which every business must get if it is to succeed, if everybody doing business with that enterprise and the public generally is to know all its moves on all parts of the chess board from morning till night and from day to day. But because the Canadian Pacific does not have to do that, is it shrouded in mystery? Not at all. Why should it be shrouded in mystery any more than any other business? Why should the Canadian National Railway system be shrouded in mystery any more than any other road? Or why should it be enveloped with the suspicion that because it conducts its affairs in the way any other enterprise must conduct its affairs, it is merely an engine of political patronage? Again is that the fact? The hon. member reads from a newspaper—a newspaper which, I regret to say, though quite within its right, has always opposed the absorption by the Government of these roads, notwithstanding the fact that no thinkable alternative presented itself except the one we adopted; a newspaper which doubtless still takes that attitude. But has the hon. member brought anything forward to support the conclusion arrived at by that newspaper? What is there in the way of evidence that the Canadian National directorate are to-day merely the spokesmen, the instruments of this Government for political purposes? Everything in the way of evidence shows exactly the contrary. The manager of that system is on record time and again, the last time not later than a few weeks ago, as saying that from the hour that he took control of that system as manager there has not been an effort or the shadow of an effort to influence him politically one way or the other. Whatever may have been the success of that system under Mr. Hanna and the board of directors that now control, one thing is certain, that nothing in the way of failure can be attributed to influence brought to bear by this Government or by this Parliament. The Government has given them every opportunity to make the road succeed under the business conditions that prevailed. There has been no political control; there has been no patronage of any sort. No one connected with the road, from the bottom to the top; no one on that directorate, would to-day say that there has been any attempt whatever to influence him or to influence the directorate in the control that we said in the first place would be theirs if they took the responsibility of managing the system. Consequently, there is nothing whatever in the contention—I care not from what source it comes, whether from Montreal, from Toronto, or from anywhere else in this Dominion; whether from low or high estates—there is nothing in the contention and nothing whatever in the suspicion, nor does the suspicion generally exist, that there has been anything in the way of political interference with the management of the Canadian National Railways.

I think it will be obvious that if the Canadian National directorate are to be compelled to answer to resolutions, which by the dozen may be put upon the Order Paper of this House every day, calling for copies of correspondence, for the disclosure of every fact and of every deed con-

4 p.m.

nected with the operation of the road, they will be put under a disability that their great competitor is not under at all. Should we do that they might well say: You shackle us in the management of the road; you refuse to give us that latitude and freedom of management that every successful business must have; you therefore will have to take the responsibility of failure—we do not. That would be the position they would logically assume. I venture to say that no board of directors, no president and general manager who would be big enough for the tremendous task of operating that system to-day, would undertake to assume such responsibility under conditions that would be brought about were this amendment to be adopted.

I am quite aware that there is to be said from the other standpoint much that is plausible and much that is more or less difficult to answer. I know that it is a fact that the board of directors of the Canadian National railways are dealing virtually with the funds of the people of Canada. I know that Parliament, and Parliament alone, is responsible to the people for the disposition of the moneys raised by taxation; consequently I know that there must be ample facility for the exercise of the control that goes with and is inseparable from responsibility. The difficulty has been to envolve a line up to which you can go in disclosing to Parliament the affairs of the system and beyond which you cannot go if the system is to succeed. Just where that is to be it is very difficult indeed to say. We have brought down certain particulars in relation to the management of the road. Some questions have been answered where it appeared to the Government quite certain that the answering of them or the furnishing of the return to an order of the House could not prejudice the position of the company. I do not think that as yet any very clear principle has been evolved. It is true that the report of the board of directors comes down from year to year, and it is true that that shows what the board of directors of a private system discloses to its shareholders. I do not know that it is impossible to go further than that; I would not like to assert that it is wholly impossible. I know there must be such information at some time as will enable Parliament properly to judge as to the general management of the sytsem and to say whether or not the board of directors that we have put in charge have, in the main, properly discharged the responsibility placed upon them. That information must be given; but if this resolution passes, it is certain that much that is unfortunate will happen, but very improbable that what is most desirable will actually result. This resolution means simply a return to the old system of political control; it stops nowhere short of that end. Pass this resolution, and you put the system under political control. What is to be done? It has occurred to me that if Parliament set to work, say, through a committee of this House, to study this specific question in order to evolve some rule that could be followed, looking to the discharge of the obligations of Parliament, it would likely result in something definite and concrete. That committee could bring before them those who have to do with the operation of the system, the officers of the road, the president of the road, and if they so desired, touching the subject committed to them they could bring as well officers of the competing road or of other business enterprises of this country. Having done so, they would clearly see just what it would be impossible to do, and I think likely they would be able to evolve something that it would be possible to do, and that would be amply sufficient to put Parliament in possession of all the information that Parliament would require to come to an intelligent decision on those issues that Parliament alone can decide. It is said: "This resolution states that anything of a confidential nature need not be brought down, but that everything that is not confidential must be brought down." What is there that in its nature is confidential?

For example, suppose the Canadian National railways has been engaged, as it is, in the purchase of coal; suppose it buys at one price at one point and at another price at another. Its competitor does that. Now, it takes twenty cents out of every dollar of the earnings of the road to pay for its coal, so coal is a great factor. Its competitor is able to buy just as cheaply as it may at that point or at this. At some points its competitor can get its coal cheaper than at others. If the Canadian National Railways is to compete on anything like even terms with its competitor, it must be able to do the same.

Mr. CLARK (Red Deer): Is there any duty on coal used on the railways in this country?

Mr. MEIGHEN: 53 cents a ton. In the West they are using Alberta coal.

Mr. SINCLAIR (Antigonish and Guysborough): Will the Prime Minister say that the price of coal is not public property at every point in Canada where coal is sold? Is the price not known to everybody?

Mr. MEIGHEN: I am informed very definitely that it is not, and I think that will be the conclusion of the committee if one is appointed. Under the old system, though, that was the case; the very fact that the disclosures had to be made to Parliament from day to day resulted in the system having to pay the very same, and that meant the very highest, price at every point all along the system. It is possible, if we pay the price, to do that with the Canadian National Railways. Put it under political control, and that is one result that is going to occur. But that does not put it in a position to compete with the Canadian Pacific, or to conduct its enterprise with those attributes of success which are the property of every business enterprise that gets along at all. That is only an illustration; but could it be said that the price of coal or the correspondence relating ot the purchase of coal is a confidential matter? There is nothing confidential about it that does not appertain to virtually every matter connected with the operation of the road. Therefore, the reservation that is embodied in the resolution is no reservation at all; That reservation would not protect the resolution, because it would not protect the system; it would not allow to the system anything at all of the latitude it must have, unless it is to be so shackled and bound down that a success cannot be made of it. Consequently, it seems to me impossible that the resolution, as drawn, can be accepted. I need not refer to the obvious fact that, moved in amendment to Supply and particularly moved as it was by the leader of the Opposition in terms of criticism of the course which the Government has pursued in this regard, it is a motion of want of confidence as well.

I want to say this as well in relation to it. The senior hon. member for Halifax (Mr. Maclean) has on the Order Paper, if I am in order in referring to it, a resolution in which he calls upon the House to establish a Select Standing Committee on Canadian National Railways and Shipping. That resolution has not yet come up for discussion. It has been suggested—and the suggestion appears to me to be one well worthy of sympathetic consideration, that when the resolution comes up, it might be well for the House to consider whether or not the first duty with which that committee, if it is appointed, should be charged, should be the determination of this very subject that is launched in the resolution now before the House. I think I have said enough to convince hon. members on both sides, especially hon. members who have had to do with business matters, and particularly in connection with great business undertakings, with such closeness as to make them see what is going to result if the resolution passes, that a resolution in such terms cannot receive the favour of Parliament, because the carrying of it out is a reversal of the policy which this Parliament has adopted; it is a reversion to a policy which, applicable to one very small system, failed, and which, applicable to a system of the immensity of that which we are now responsible for, must result in little less than chaos.

Mr. CRERAR: The leader of the Government (Mr. Meighen) has referred to a resolution standing on the Order Paper in the name of the senior member for Halifax (Mr. Maclean). That resolution is considerably down on the Order Paper and, in the ordinary course of events, it might not be reached. Might I ask my right hon. friend if he will give an opportunity for the discussion of that resolution so that it may be considered?

Mr. MEIGHEN: I have, of course, no right to postpone the time of any member in relation to his deciding when he will move a resolution standing in his name; but the Government would be pleased if this resolution came on to-morrow.

Hon. W. S. FIELDING (Shelburne and Queen's): Mr. Speaker, the speech of the Prime Minister (Mr. Meighen) is, in one sense, like a lady's letter, the pith of which is generally found in the postscript. I find that my right hon. friend, while arguing for a time in the spirit of what I suppose he thought was sweet reasonableness on the merits of this question, a moment or two before he sat down suddenly cracked the party whip and said: "This is a vote of non-confidence." If my right hon. friend had felt strong on other grounds, he would not have introduced that at the last moment. A motion of this character is only a vote of non-confidence when the Government sees fit to treat it so. It is quite possible, I understand, in our Parliamentary institutions, to present a motion of this kind which will

not be a motion of non-confidence and which should not be treated as such. There are many precedents, if time permitted one to cite them, in which motions made in amendment to Supply are accepted by the Government because they assert some sound proposition which the Government do not wish to oppose. There have been many such cases. In my own experience as Minister of Finance I have voted for amendments moved to Supply, if my memory is not mistaken, and I think myself that when my right hon. friend insists on making this a party issue he is not acting wisely. I would personally have been very much better pleased if he had said: "Why, this asserts one of the first principles of free parliamentary government, and I am going to accept it and stand by it." That, I think, would have been the wiser policy, rather than to have told his friends that they must vote against the amendment because it is to be deemed a vote of want of confidence. There is unfortunately a tendency in parliamentary government, perhaps everywhere in these modern times, to move perhaps towards autocracy. It is complained even in England to-day, in the Mother of Parliaments to which we look for guidance and direction, that there is a tendency for the government there to take to itself too much power and make members of parliament, even those supporting the government, feel that after all there is not very much for them to do. If that tendency exists there, certainly it exists in a more marked degree in Canada. It has been a just cause of complaint that hon. gentlemen opposite have again and again resorted to government which ignores parliament. I do not want to go back to the days of the war. They had to do many things then by Order in Council which I approved of, and I am not censuring them for that. But in these days the tendency of this Government from day to day is to undertake to do things and be absolutely indifferent as to what Parliament thinks about it. Why, the right hon. the Minister of Trade and Commerce (Sir George Foster) comes here to-day and tells us that he has made a treaty with France. He has not told us up to this very moment the exact terms of the treaty, he has not even told us who signed it, except that he signed it himself. Then, a little later, he said that it was customary to do these things through the British Embassy, but we do noe even know whether the British Ambassador signed it. My right hon. friend coolly tells us that he will bring down a document which he thinks will be something like the treaty, and lay it on the Table, and in the meantime he is going to put the treaty into operation at once. That is the way hon. gentlemen opposite treat Parliament. That has not been the custom in the past, and every hon. gentleman in this House, no matter on what side he sits, should resent such a tendency, and show his disapproval of the growing autocracy of the Government.

We had another case in connection with the luxury taxes. This House spent many days, and properly so, in assisting my hon. friend the Minister of Finance to prepare a system of luxury taxes;—I am not criticising his bringing down those taxes, but I say we spent a great deal of time considering them. He received the help of Parliament; there was no adverse criticism; on all sides he was helped. Then one day in the middle of the Christmas season he coolly steps in, and by Order in Council abolishes the tax. We are always told about Christmas time that we ought to buy early. The shopmen say they hope we will buy early, that we should have regard for the hard-working clerks, and that it is to our own advantage to have a large field to select from. All wise men, I suppose—and that would include members of parliament and their families—observe that principle and buy early. Last Christmas, after they had made their purchases, my hon. friend the Minister of Finance stepped in at the eleventh hour and abolished the tax; so the late comers did not have to pay the tax at all. It is undoubtedly the right of the Governor in Council to reduce taxation, while they have not the power to increase it, but I question the wisdom of a sweeping change of that kind made by Order in Council, even in the direction of reducing taxation.

These are illustrations, I say, of the tendency of this Government to play the part of the autocrat and to ignore Parliament, and never have they ignored Parliament in a way that was more open to criticism than in the case that was presented to-day when with respect to the great railway service of this country, involving an admitted loss last year of $70,000,000, we were told we have no right to ask for information, for that is really what it means. My right hon. friend the Prime Minister said that if we had all these details, Parliament never could attend to them, the time of Parliament would not permit. That would have some force if the right hon. gentleman were right in his assumption that all

these details were going to be brought before Parliament. We have the right to-day to bring all the details of the Department of Public Works, for examples, before Parliament, but nobody does it. There is here and there a case in which information is asked for and brought down but we do not burden Parliament with all the details of the Department of Public Works. It is the same with the Department of the Interior, a large department that spends great sums of money; we have the right to ask for all the details in connection with that department, but we do not do it; we ask only for certain details on matters of prominence, matters which have been questioned by somebody, or matters of particular concern to some section of the country; and we get the information. If we were to carry out with respect to all the departments what the right hon. gentleman implies we are trying to do with regard to the railways, we could not carry on business at all. My right hon. friend raises this ghost of massed details which we could not handle when he knows perfectly well that if we had the right to get all these railway documents we would not demand the full details at all. What is the difference, as a matter of principle, between the details of the Department of Public Works or the Department of the Interior and the details of the railways? I have not seen any explanation of that. If we have the right to ask the Government to lay on the Table a return in regard to an expenditure in the Department of Public Works, or the Department of Militia and Defence, or the Department of the Interior, by what principle can it be wrong if we ask for similar information regarding the railways of Canada? The only difference is this: In the one case they are spending a good deal of money, but in the case of the railways they are spending such tremendous sums that they are getting beyond the comprehension of the people of Canada, and we are practically told by the right hon. gentleman that with regard to this immense railway business we have only one privilege and that is to step up to the captain's office and settle when the Minister of Railways tells us he is $70,000,000 behind. That is the position to which he would reduce Parliament. He will not permit us to get any information, but we can have the glorious privilege of paying at the end of the term. My right hon. friend takes exception to our reservation. The reservation is made in conformity with the general principle we desire to assert. It should be a simply elementary principle in this House that Parliament has the right to demand and receive the public documents in relation to every dollar of public money expended, no matter how expended. My right hon. friend says that that would be making politics of the railways. I do not see what ground there is for that. I do not want to discuss the principle of public ownership; there are some things we ought to discuss to-day,—and some things we had better lay aside for a later date; there are some things we ought to discuss and some we ought not. We are not called upon to-day to discuss the general principle of public ownership. We are not called upon to-day to discuss the wisdom of appointing a committee to deal with the railways; that is on the Order Paper and we will reach it in due course. We are only called upon to consider this one question: Is it the right of the representatives of the Canadian people in Parliament assembled to receive an accounting of every dollar of public money that is spent from the treasury? That is the principle; that is all the principle. But "Oh", they say, "this is going to make politics of the railways." Sir, there are different kinds of politics. Politics is not necessarily a mean business; politics is the business of the people, and, using the word in its proper sense, I want to see politics in connection with every administration of the public affairs of Canada. It is not going to frighten us to say that this will make politics out of the railways. Wherever you have a dollar of public money expended, in connection with that you will have politics, using the word in its proper sense; and any attempt that is made to withdraw that expenditure from what you call politics means to withdraw it from the consideration of Parliament and to deny yourselves the criticism of the public expenditure, which is the first and most essential right of the Parliament of Canada. I shall not be afraid of politics of that kind, and if, as my hon. friend apprehends, we shall have it, then I say the more of that sort of politics we have the better it will be for the country. You cannot, Mr. Speaker, take these roads out of politics,—using the word, of course, in its better sense. Politics, I say, when it means the safeguarding of the rights of the people and the proper care of their business, is

desirable, and wherever you have the expenditure of the people's money, you should of necessity have politics in that better sense, which means the right to inquire into matters and to be given information as to how public moneys are expended.

I do not desire to discuss the principle of public ownership to-day. It is not in issue at all. But I am going to make this statement concerning that question, that if public ownership can be maintained only by a policy of secrecy; if it can be carried on only by suppressing from Parliament the information to which the people, through their representatives, are unquestionably entitled; if it can exist only by the practice of dark-lantern methods, then I say unhesitatingly that that is enough to condemn it. Why, says the right hon. gentleman, you cannot make these things public. Nonsense! In nineteen cases out of twenty, what my right hon. friend describes as a mystery is nothing but a dream. He declares that dreadful things would happen with regard to coal if disclosures were made. Well, the Intercolonial bought coal for a great many years, and for a time I had something to do with that matter when acting minister of the department. I know the tendency of the coal people to get good prices, and in that respect, let me say, they do not differ from people in other lines of business. But that is a question which you can always meet. And when there was a combination of the coal companies it was always in the power of the Government to overcome that situation and get coal at a fair price. What prices do we pay to-day? Why, Mr. Speaker, who thinks that we are going to get coal cheaper by hiding in the dark and pretending that we are going to pay less for it than is demanded? And there is no mystery about the rates. The rates, which concern the public, are fixed by the Railway Commission; and the purchase of coal, as well as of various other supplies, presents no more difficulty to the Railway Department than the purchase of supplies does to my hon. friend the Minister of Public Works. There is not a single argument advanced to support the supression of information on this subject which would not apply quite as well to the suppression of information regarding the Department of the Interior or the Department of Militia and Defence, or of any other department of Government. The principle should be recognized in this instance, as well as in every other, that the people have a right to the fullest possible information on matters so vitally affecting their interests, and if my right hon. friend pretends that you cannot carry on business in that way; if he cannot conduct affairs without recourse to this secrecy; if he is going to build up a system of public ownership based on the suppression of facts and the refusal to inform the people of matters in which they are greatly concerned;—if public ownership is to be carried on in this way, then I say that every man interested in the question should stand up to-day and demand that the whole system be brought into the light of day and that things be properly done. Let us confine ourselves to the point under consideration. We are not considering the principle of public owernership or the appointing of a committee, or the probability of any vote of want of confidence; let us ignore all these herrings drawn across the trail and recognize the one fact that in this motion we are dealing with the right of the Parliament of Canada to be fully informed regarding the expenditure of the people's money. That is the question upon which this House is asked to vote.

Hon. T. A. CRERAR (Marquette): If we were considering this question in the light of an ordinary department of Government, then frankly, at once, I should have no hesitation whatever in supporting the amendment moved by the leader of the Opposition. But it does seem to me that this question is not at the present time in the category of an ordinary department of Government. It is a time-honoured principle, universally recognized in British Parliaments, that in the matter of departmental expenditures the people have the right to the fullest and most complete information regarding the details of expenditures. But when that principle was first adopted, or put into practice, it was under conditions where the whole expenditure was outgoing and there was no corresponding income. Now we are faced with a different situation. I quite agree with my hon. friends that this is not a proper time to discuss the principle of public ownership. In view of the statement presented by the Minister of Railways the other day, what this House has under consideration now is the question, how we can best handle a difficult, perplexing and very discouraging situation. Now, there is a great deal of force, I think, in the argument advanced by my right hon. friend who leads the Government (Mr. Meighen). If we take the stand that every detail of expenditure in connection with our na-

tional railways shall be placed before the House at the wish of any hon. member, in what position do we place the management of our national system of railways in competition with, for instance, the Canadian Pacific Railway? It is an elementary principle of business that a good business man, one who conducts his affairs successfully, never discloses the full and intimate details of his business to his competitors; and it does seem to me that that is the position in which we should be placing ourselves if we adopted the amendment moved by the leader of the Opposition. At all events, the Government, as I interpret the amendment, would be committed to bring down any information that was asked for, saving such information as might be of a purely confidential character. Now, information of a purely confidential character in connection with the administration of our railways would probably be confined to a very narrow field. At the same time, however, I recognize that the people have to foot the bills in connection with the deficits on these roads, and that does place upon Parliament, in connection with the administration of the national railways, a responsibility which we cannot evade. The whole question is one filled with difficulty at the present time. In my judgment it is one that should be approached in a spirit free from any taint of partisanship, and for that reason I am quite in accord with the suggestion, as I understood it, that came from the Prime Minister that a special committee selected from the House, should take into its consideration the whole scheme of operations of the railways, and all matters that might be submitted to the House in the interests of efficiency and success in the management of the roads. We have on the Order Paper, as my hon. friend has pointed out, a resolution to be moved by the senior member for Halifax (Mr. Maclean). Now, it does seem to me that the spirit of that resolution is the best approach to the consideration of the question at the present time. If we are going to discuss in a partisan way across the floor of the House the success or failure in the management of these railways, attributing blame here, finding fault there, defending in one place and explaining in another, how much progress shall we make towards a satisfactory and sensible solution of the question? I, for one, Mr. Speaker, am profoundly anxious to see the consideration of this difficult problem removed, if possible, to the atmosphere of the committee room. I have observed in my experience in this House that when hon. members consider questions in committee, we can get a clearer and fairer consideration, a more intimate discussion, and a more unprejudiced exploration into the facts of a case, than we can possibly obtain in the House, where it is natural for us to divide according, shall I say, to our party views upon any matter. And this being a perplexing question, a question fraught with great difficulty and involving immense consequences to the country, I for one should like to see us approach the consideration of it at the present time without any partisanship.

Now I am quite free to say that I am in hearty accord with my hon. friend from Shelburne and Queen's (Mr. Fielding) when he states that this should not be regarded as a motion of want of confidence in the Government. Let me say at once that if I considered it purely a motion of want of confidence, I could not vote confidence in the Government. But I do not consider it as such. I am endeavouring to approach this question from the point of view of what will afford, or offer, the most satisfactory solution of it. In what way can we approach the question and discuss and consider it, free from partizanship, that will afford the greatest possibility of finding a satisfactory solution for the difficulties we are in in connection with it? For these reasons, Mr. Speaker, I shall feel bound to vote against the amendment of the leader of the Opposition.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: The hon. gentleman has intimated to the House that he is favourable to the resolution standing in the name of my hon. friend from Halifax (Mr. Maclean) which is that these matters might be referred to a select committee. Is it my hon. friend's understanding in that connection that such a committee shall have the right to ask any question with respect to these railways that may be thought in the public interest and have it answered?

Mr. CRERAR: If I am in order in answering the question, Mr. Speaker, I would say that I certainly think so. In that connection I may add that such a committee could bring the president or the management of the road before them, and secure intimate and direct information in a way that cannot be secured when a motion is made asking that an ordinary return be brought down to the House. In that way you can explore the whole situation, you can get full information, you can have the opportunity of estimating the efficiency and the ability of the management of these

roads in a way that is not at all possible by moving for the production of correspondence regarding the purchase of coal, the selection of a station site, the purchase of lumber, or anything else. It certainly does seem to me that this is the sensible manner in which to approach this proposition.

Mr. FRANK S. CAHILL (Pontiac): I would advise the Prime Minister to peruse the report in regard to the railway situation presented the other day by the Minister of Railways. The Prime Minister this afternoon talked of success as though the government railway undertakings were a success. As a matter of fact, the people are called upon to pay the sum of $70,000,000 for a failure not for a success. The right hon. gentleman also advanced the argument against the amendment that information with respect to the national railways could not be brought before Parliament in the regular way. Now, I understand that the Intercolonial and the Transcontinental railways are subject to audit by the Auditor General's department. I would ask the Minister of Railways if that is not correct?

Hon. Mr. REID: They are subject to audit by the Auditor General's department, but I may say for the information of the House that the Intercolonial and the Transcontinental railways are being managed by the Board of the Canadian National Railways.

Mr. CAHILL: That is my understanding. So it is a fact that all expenditures on the Government railways, outside of the Canadian Northern, are subject to audit by the Auditor General's department. I would like to draw the attention of the leader of the Agrarian party to this fact. I learn by the report presented by the minister on March 17 that operating deficits on the Canadian Government railways increased thirty-eight per cent, and operating deficits on the Canadian Northern increased 151 per cent. Now the Government railways still subject to the audit of the Auditor General's department consist of about one-third of the total mileage of what my hon. friend wishes to call the Canadian National railways. That one-third of the total system makes a better showing because its accounts are submitted to the Auditor General's department. My hon. friend, I think, does not get the point.

Mr. CRERAR: Oh, yes, I get it.

Mr. CAHILL: One-third of the system at the present time, that is the Intercolonial and the National Transcontinental Railways, are subject to the audit of the Auditor General's Department, and the deficit on that one-third increased, according to the minister's statement, by 38 per cent, while the deficit on the remainder of the government system, under the dark-lantern method as conducted in Toronto, increased by 151 per cent. That would naturally indicate that there must be some information that should be brought to the attention of Parliament. If one-third of the system, operated under the old method, shows better results than the railways operated under the new method, it would be natural for members to inquire into the cause. For that reason we should have questions in reference to the government railways answered in Parliament. The Prime Minister in discussing the old method of management on the Intercolonial deplored the conditions under that method. I have the report of the Department of Railways for the year ending March 31st, 1920, and it shows—

Hon. Mr. REID: What page are you quoting from?

Mr. CAHILL: Page 103. My hon. friend will find by a reference to that part of the report that the operating deficits in the year 1912 amounted to, in round figures, $40,000; in 1913, to $47,000; in 1914, to $160,000; in 1915, to $330,000; in 1916, to $450,000. Then the new method of management was introduced and in the following year the operating deficit was $1,200,000. The following year it was $6,000,000; in 1919, $5,800,000; and in 1920, $6,800,000. So I do not see that the old method of operation was so very bad, so far as results go, compared with the present method; the expenditures now are three, four and five times greater than they were under the old method. It is just possible that a part of this deficit is due to bad management without control. It is just possible that if the management were responsible to Parliament a better system would be followed, and that they would be more careful in their expenditures.

As to secrets in connection with the operation of the Canadian National Railways I do not believe there is one thing that goes on in connection with that operation from one end of Canada to the other that the Canadian Pacific are not familiar with twenty-four hours after it goes into effect. Let us consider the operation of trains on the Grand Trunk Pacific between Winnipeg and Saskatoon. They have a

train leaving Winnipeg at six o'clock in the evening, and another one leaving at nine o'clock, three hours later, and both trains arrive at Saskatoon within an hour of each other. How are the management fooling the Canadian Pacific in that regard? Why, the Canadian Pacific know what bad business it is to have two first-class trains arriving at Saskatoon one almost on top of the other. The management of the Government Railways are not fooling any person by that class of methods. Neither do they fool any person in the matter of the purchase of their ties. The Canadian Pacific go into the market to buy their ties, so do the Canadian Northern and the same with the rest of the national railways. There is nothing to be gained, but very much to be lost by this method of secrecy. Yesterday I thought when the Minister of Railways (Mr. Reid) came in with the fore-runner of his resignation that he would not have been here to-day to continue this discussion. The hon. minister said to us that he had no solution, and that he would like the co-operation of Parliament. The Government through the minister, is responsible for the administration of the affairs of the Canadian National Railways. They come to Parliament year after year asking on an average for over $100,000,000 annually to sink in this undertaking. The minister says that he has no hope of any better prospects for this railway system. Under those circumstances the logical thing would be for the minister to hand in his resignation, and for the Prime Minister to accept it. But under existing conditions the leader of the Government could not replace him, for there is no constituency that he dare open; therefore the minister is left to muddle along in the same old way. He has no solution, the Government has no solution. There is only one solution, and that is the resignation of the Government. If they acknowledge their inability to deal with matters coming before them, they should resign; and if the succeeding administration are not able to cope with the problems of government they in turn should resign, until finally we do get men who are able to administer the affairs of the country in a businesslike way. Otherwise government is a farce; it does not mean anything. The members of this administration acknowledge that they cannot handle the questions coming before them for solution, yet they hang on to office for dear life.

My hon. friend in his wonderful statement the other day gave some more or less inaccurate details. At page of 1052 of Hansard he stated:

> In a word, out of every dollar earned we had to pay 75 cents for operating wages, and 20 cents for fuel, leaving 5 cents for all other requirements which totalled 29 cents.

The minister was referring to 1920. I am quite satisfied that his statement is accurate, because he took good care to read it, and I am sure he had some assistance in the preparation of it. Now, if he will turn to the report of the department of Railways and Canals for the year ended March 31, 1920, he will find this sentence on page 19:

> It is of interest to note that for every dollar earned in the last year the railway had to pay out over 75 cents in wages.

That was in 1919. Now, the minister comes down here and tells us that in 1920 he had to pay 75 cents in wages, and he proceeded to show by implication that the increase in wages is at the root of all the trouble. He stated:

> Rate increases have been given from time to time in an effort to meet increased cost of operation under the McAdoo and United States Labour Board awards, under which the average wage per employee of the Canadian National system in now $1,850 as compared with $700 before the war. The result is the operating pay roll last year was $83,505,072 as compared with $40,606,170 in 1917.

That would lead the public to believe that there had been an enormous increase in wages. Well, if my hon. friend will turn back to page 11, of his annual report for 1919, he will find, under the heading of Wage Increases that the total wages paid in 1919 were $73,000,000. So that the total wage increase, acording to his own statement, is only $10,000,000. And on top of that is given a table of the number of employees on the road, showing that they have been increased by 3442. According to his own statement the average wages would amount to more than $6,000,000, so that the employees of 1920 apparently are only getting about $4,000,000 more than they did in 1919, which is not a very great difference. But his operating deficit has increased $12,000,000; his earnings have increased $13,000,000, leaving a difference of $25,000,000 in that item. There is only from $4,000,000 to $10,000,000 taken up in wages, and yet my hon. friend would attempt to lead the country to believe that the whole difficulty is caused by excessive wages.

Now, we have asked from time to time for particulars, and we have also asked to be informed of the policy of the Government. This afternoon the Prime Minister

said that the Government was responsible for the management. I agree with him. There is no question about that; the Government must be responsible. But his general manager on the question of rates said just a few weeks ago, as reported in the Pembroke Observer of February 3:

I made this statement, that if you would give us in Canada the same rate as South Australia (I am speaking of the whole National system) I will pay 5½ per cent on the Government debt of 2½ billion dollars and 5½ per cent on another billion dollars, and then I shall have 100 million dollars to spare to play with.

Mr. CURRIE: Who said that?

Mr. CAHILL: Mr. Hanna, the general manager. He advocates an increase of three times the rate.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: I do not rise for the express purpose of interrupting the hon. member who is now speaking, but to draw the attention of the House to the fact that when an amendment has been made to a motion that Mr. Speaker do leave the Chair for the House to go into Committee of Supply, the discussion must be strictly relevant to the amendment until it has been voted upon or otherwise disposed of. The amendment presented by the hon. leader of the Opposition declares, that it is the undoubted right of Parliament to demand and receive copies of all reports, correspondence and papers in relation to the management of every department of the public service, including the affairs of the Canadian National railways. In my opinion this amendment does not open the door sufficiently wide to enable hon. members to discuss in detail the administration of the Canadian National railways.

Mr. CAHILL: Mr. Speaker, I was just going to point out that there must have been some correspondence between the minister and his general manager on this subject of rates, although there is this apparent conflict between them. It is all in line with our argument asking for information. The general manager makes one statement, the minister makes another. We want to have particulars of the correspondence between them. In his statement the other day the minister said:

It is impossible for British Columbia to grow and ship fruit and lumber at the present high rates of freight. The Prairie Provinces must live from the products of the soil. They cannot produce wheat and other products of their farms and ship it to foreign markets if these high freight rates are to continue indefinitely.

The minister apparently is in favour of decreased rates; his manager apparently is in favour of increasing them threefold. I merely point this out to show the necessity for giving members of this House some information on which to base a fair judgment on the operation of this railway system. It is impossible to arrive at any conclusions if the ministry insist that they cannot give us information from day to day. I do not think there has been any question put on the Order Paper asking for information that could be considered as strictly confidential, but the minister has replied day after day with his usual stereotyped form that in regard to this service it is not in the public interest to furnish the information desired. I think the Government would be well advised, at this time, when the people are looking to them for a solution of this railway problem, to take the House into their confidence in every detail of the operation of our national railways and to give us the fullest information possible.

Mr. MICHAEL CLARK (Red Deer): Mr. Speaker, in saying a very few words upon the resolution before the House I should desire very much to avoid what I am bound to call the unwonted heat of my hon. friend from Shelburne and Queen's (Mr. Fielding). That unwonted heat seemed to me to go so far as to blur my hon. friend's memory. He declaimed against the dragging of red herrings into the discussion, and he himself did a good deal in the way of dragging red herrings in—amongst others, the luxury taxes, which had no immediate connection with an amendment regarding railways on going into Committee of Supply. His memory in regard to the luxury taxes, I am quite sure, is not the same as that of my hon. friend the Minister of Finance (Sir Henry Drayton), when he says that no adverse criticism was offered to the luxury taxes at the time of their introduction. My recollection is that a good many hon. gentlemen sitting very close to the hon. member for Shelburne and Queen's passed a good many criticisms upon those taxes. I was under the impression that I had criticised them somewhat myself. Now, I object to the proposition that is put forward by my hon. friend from Shelburne and Queen's that every view not consonant with his on either the railway question or any other question is a "red herring." We must all have the right to express ourselves honestly and sincerely on various public questions that arise.

On first sight there seems to be a good deal in the contention of my hon. friend who leads the official Opposition that the

Government have brought this motion on themselves because through their Minister of Railways (Mr. Reid) the other day they appealed to every member of the House for assistance in the solution of the railway question. It would appear to be a little difficult to give full assistance without full information, but that is only at first sight. A great many general considerations in regard to the management of railroads can surely be discussed in this House that the accounts in regard to the railroad have no bearing upon whatsoever. Apart from that, however, I do not know that my hon. friend the leader of the Opposition offered any argument, except perhaps the old argument that Parliament ought to have full control of the money affairs of the departments of the Government. There is the crux of the whole question. These railroads, for better or for worse, were taken out of the hands of a government department and put under corporate management. I think that the motion of the leader of the Opposition is, to say the least, premature, having regard to the fact that, in the first place, we are going to have at a very early day a general discussion, I understand, upon railroad matters following the statement of the Minister of Railways; and, in the second place, that the tendency of the resolution before the House this afternoon is to prejudge the whole question of Government ownership and damage the experiment of this country in that direction.

5 p.m.

I should have thought that before bringing up what I have ventured to call this premature resolution the mover of it would have had some information to give the House as to what is done in regard to roads managed by the government in other nations of the Empire and in other nations of the world. No information of that kind has been given either by the hon. leader of the Opposition, or by my hon. friend from Shelburne and Queen's. All that was contained in either speech was a general statement of principle with which everyone in this House agrees—the principle that government departments in their expenditure should be supervised by Parliament. Now, I am not in a position to give the information about what is done in other countries where government ownership has been adopted, but I am trying to put the case that this motion is premature and meant to damage government ownership, and I judge that that view is supported strongly by the source from which the motion comes.

[Mr. Clark.]

I think my right hon. friend the Prime Minister (Mr. Meighen) gave a view to the House that was very strong and very much calculated to impress people who are impartial upon this subject. It had an evident effect upon my hon. leader (Mr. Crerar). If all the information usually kept by a business company from a competing company is to be given by the officials of the government road to the officials of a private road which is in competition with it, is it not obvious that the government road is at once put in a position of disadvantage as compared with the competing road? I think that there is no getting away from that proposition. But the ground I want to take is simply this: that Government ownership was undertaken under financial conditions with regard to these roads that bristled with difficulty and that certainly were not the creation of any one party in the state and certainly not specially the creation of the party at present sitting opposite to me in this House. I want to impress this further consideration: that confronted with these difficulties the nation, through its Parliament, has made a new departure on a colossal scale, and if that departure is to be successful it must have a reasonable chance, it must have common justice meted out to it. Therefore I consider that the resolution before the House is premature and not supported by the information which we should have had before it was brought up at all.

I distrust any attitude on this great question which is obviously born in an atmosphere of suspicion. I prefer very much to approach this question in the spirit of the helpfulness and co-operation which are absolutely necessary not only among the various political parties in this country, but among the people of this country, if we are to make this great railway system the success which we have faith enough in Canada to believe it can be made.

Now, I would not like to use stronger language than I can justify, but what is the meaning of the talk about "dark lanterns" in this connection? One would suppose that every hon. member who does not jump up in a state of great heat and support a resolution brought at very short notice before this House has burglarious intentions upon the assets and the good things of this country. That is the only attitude of mind which can dictate the use of such language as "dark lanterns". Personally I resent that suspicion as far as it pertains to myself. I have had no experience in burglary and I am not carry-

ing a dark lantern. I am approaching what is the greatest public question of the day, I repeat, in a spirit of helpfulness and co-operation, and that spirit I shall maintain until I see better reasons to discard it than I have seen in anything that has been advanced this afternoon.

I do not think the question of parliamentary control of the public purse is, strictly speaking, germane to this discussion, or that it should weigh with any hon. member in giving his vote. This is a new departure. I do not say that, if Parliament is still sitting next year, I should not vote in a different way from what I do now upon this question. It may be that the committee that is to be appointed will disclose matters that will change our views. The hon. member for Chateauguay-Huntingdon (Mr. Robb) laughs at the idea that I might vote differently next year from the way I do now on a public question. That only shows his hide-bound partisanship and my openness of mind. They say that the man who never changes his mind has no mind to change, but I would not apply that for a moment to my hon. friend. I do not see that the principle of parliamentary control arises. We are facing a new departure. The Government, as far as I can see, have been open and above-board in their appeals upon this question. I have a firm conviction that the Prime Minister (Mr. Meighen), who is a young man and who has a political future before him, is engaged in an honest, straightforward and sincere attempt to give this great question fair play, to give a fair trial to the principle of government ownership in regard to our railroads which had got into an intolerable mess and a condition of bankruptcy. As long as that is the spirit which animates my right hon. friend and his Government, he can rely upon my support.

Mr. F. L. DAVIS (Neepawa): Mr. Speaker, I can understand the difficulty of men who have seen an attempted cross between responsible government and co-operative management, and who have been in doubt which of the parents this hybrid creature most resembles. But I am not going to pursue that line of thought; I will simply say that it explains, perhaps, much of the confusion of mind in which many numbers of the House may rest.

I want to deal with just one side of the question. I am quite sure that the great solution of our trouble is in economy; that the people of the country have not yet recognized the necessity for that economy. That can be effected only by a reduction of many train services from daily to tri-weekly or twice-a-week services. As regards taking trains off, the other day I went down to the commission and asked them for certain figures. I found that the train which runs from Moncton to Campbellton was earning about 52½ cents a mile one way and about 65 cents a mile the other way, whereas it costs $2.50 a mile to run a passenger train in this country. That train had been on for years running over a route on which two other trains ran. Are you going to ask this House to decide whether—

Mr. SPEAKER: Order. I must direct the hon. gentleman's attention to the circumstance that the motion before the House, the amendment, has to do with the production of documents, and the question of the operation of the railways, as such, is really apart from the main question. There is, perhaps, no objection to a reference to the railways, but a discussion of the railway problem in general is certainly not the main subject.

Mr. DAVIS: I think, Sir, had you allowed me to finish, you would have seen the pertinence of the illustration, because that is all that I am making. That train has been on, as I said, for years. Are you going to submit to this House every decision of the management with regard to the taking off of a train or the making of economies? It is those particulars that the House would attempt to review rather than those which the Prime Minister (Mr. Meighen) presented this afternoon as to the purchase of coal or supplies, and the railway's dealings with individual customers. The House will take up cases where a train runs through, perhaps, three or four constituencies, and where the constituents are up in arms against what the management considers must be done for economy. Those constituents bring the case to Parliament, and it is a case of "You scratch my back and I'll scratch yours," to use a very vulgar expression. One member says, "I am going to have this very same trouble; support me, and I will support you." In other words, this is not the forum in which to consider such questions as that. Consequently, I say: Let us try out the question of co-operative management and see whether that will get results. I am very much in the position of the hon. member for Red Deer (Mr. M. Clark). If that method does not succeed, I am prepared to change my mind

about it, but I do not see any prospect of success at present by going out on the lines which we followed in connection with the Intercolonial and getting a repetition of the very evil results we got there.

Mr. J. A. CURRIE (Simcoe North): Mr. Speaker, I very much regret that the official leader of the Opposition (Mr. Mackenzie King) has not couched his amendment on sufficiently broad grounds, so the whole question of the administration of the public railways of this country could now be discussed. I realize clearly that the whole House is seized of the fact that the resolution has been placed before us more in a partizan than in a public spirit, and for that reason, I do not see that any member on this side of the House will have any difficulty in voting it down. It is extremely unfortunate, at this stage in the discussion of the railway question of this country, that we should start playing politics with it, because it is a great issue, and we are going to destroy this country entirely unless the wisest heads in this House on all sides get together and discuss this question soberly and honestly, as the leader of the Agrarian group (Mr. Crerar) has done to-day—give our best judgment and arrive at some conclusion. Because I must confess that, so far, I see nothing ahead but failure. I am one of the members of this House who were strongly in favour of bringing about the nationalization of our railways. I am in no sense a believer of communistic theories or of socialism. I believe, however, in Ruskinism. John Ruskin was the first to advance the theory of government control of public utilities. He went no further, and that far I am prepared to go. It is quite evident that it is not enough that we people who put up a few cheques for income tax can look around and say: "Well, we have contributed one-half, or one-fourth of the railway deficit." With all our trouble to contribute to the income tax, we contribute only about 50 per cent of the losses on the national railways. Something must be done. It is a matter of regret that this resolution was not broader so that we could discuss the whole question. The only thing that we can discuss in reality is the question of the production of papers. That resolution brings us back to the old control that we had before we took over the Canadian Northern, the Mackenzie and Mann road. I am not one of those who believe that the Intercolonial was badly managed under government control; the Intercolonial railway was well managed under government control. I have travelled upon it many a time, and I know that its trains were just as good as those on any road in America; even the New York Central or the Illinois Central did not have better trains or better service; they were not better managed. The road was in as good or in better condition than any other road at that time in the United States or Canada. As a matter of fact for many years until recently the railway has shown a profit on its operating expenses.

Now what are we going to do on this question? Are we going to sit back and twirl our thumbs and say there is nothing than can be done, and go back to the old idea of management and have all the old troubles? Or are we like sensible men going to discuss the question here dispassionately without regard to politics? This is a time I say when there is a great industrial war on, and we should all get together the same as we did when any other war was on. Unless we on both sides of the House divest ourselves of our partisan minds on this question, the people of this country are going to sweep out of this Parliament every man who plays politics on this grave issue; for the people look with horror upon these terrible deficits that the railroads are showing. I confess that under this resolution I cannot enter into any discussion as to what causes these deficits, the only thing I can say is that certain documents should or should not be brought down. The question of whether we should have a committee or not will be discussed under another resolution. The idea to my mind is a splendid one but I cannot give any reasons in favour of it under this narrow resolution that has been brought in to-day which is an extremely partisan one and was intended for partisan purposes. I expected that we were to have a broad resolution and a continuous debate over some days on this railway question when we could openly discuss everything in connection with the roads. This is no time to talk about autocracy. The hon. member for Shelburne and Queen's (Mr. Fielding) says that we have autocracy in this Government. As a matter of fact while there may be a little bit too much autocracy in government, yet the members of this House have shown a self-denying spirit in the matter of railways, for we put this railway question entirely out of our hands. We have placed it in the hands of an independent body with a view to eliminating entirely parliamentary partisanship and patronage from the management. I say that was self-denial, the entire opposite

of autocracy so far as we are concerned. Whether the question was approached by us in the proper way or not I cannot say. I do not quite agree—I did not at the time—with the method by which the Government put the railways in the control of this directorate. I pointed out at that time that it was a very great mistake for the Government of this country to sign a blank cheque to any Board of Directors in charge of any large work of that kind. I said it would prove fatal to government control of these roads if there was no supervision and that it was wrong in principle. At the same time I did not push the matter further, but the results have demonstrated that there is no control whatever over the management of this road. The directors who have been appointed do not control the management; they do not know what is going on there at all. It is entirely wrong to put a business man in charge of a railway enterprise. Of course, I know there are a lot of business men and professional men running all over the country who can tell you more about railways in five minutes than could Lord Shaughnessy, for instance; they know it all. I say this is a question for specialists in railroad operation. To my mind, the people who should have been put in charge of the road should have been the best expert operators in their particular line that could be found in America. We should have had on the Board the best specialist in freight traffic, the best specialist in passenger work, the best specialist in engineering, and so forth. If we did that, we should have exactly the same condition that prevails on the Pennsylvania road, and on the New York Central in New York state, two great systems that will compare with the Canadian system. These roads, instead of putting business men on their directorates and making them vice-presidents, appoint the men who know how to operate a road, and make them responsible to the shareholders. The idea of the guinea pig director so far as the management of large enterprises is concerned, this idea of putting rich men on the directorate, is entirely wrong and antiquated.

As I said, the question before us is whether or not we are going to revert to the old system. I agree with the hon. member for Red Deer (Mr. Clark); I have not made up my mind on any of these matters. I want to see the whole question discussed; I want to have the facts and the figures. It may be correct for us to vote for this resolution, but if we have all the facts before us, we may find out that it would be wrong to do so. For that reason, I intend to vote against the resolution, and I do not think there is anybody on this side of the House within sound of my voice but would agree that it would be dangerous for us to take any decided stand on this question until we have all the facts before us. The question is such a serious one that we must approach it with an entirely open mind, and give it our very best consideration. The best business minds in the House, the best legal talent, the best thinkers must give this matter their personal consideration, and we must approach the question without any party spirit at all. Otherwise, we are liable to lead this country into bankruptcy, and we are mighty close to it now.

As to what happens at a little railway station, well, I have had information handed to me about these railways that would shock hon. members. I have heard rumours of hundred-dollar doors being put on woodsheds and that sort of thing. I cannot say whether those rumours are true or not. I do not know whether our roads pay more for coal than they should or whether they take on three hundred men immediately after the Canadian Pacific dismissed them. But rumours of that kind are floating around, and I feel satisfied that the proper thing for this House to do—and the Prime Minister has hinted that he is going to do it—is to appoint a committee to go into this whole question and discuss it dispassionately without politics entering into it at all. Let a committee composed of the three groups in this House discuss the whole question, with power to call for witnesses and papers, and take evidence under oath; I am sure that a committee of that sort that went into the whole question thoroughly would reach a conclusion very easily. I have never seen a committee of the House fail to come to a wise conclusion, if left alone, on any great public question. Take the question of the soldiers' pensions. No country in the world has found a better solution of the pension question than has Canada, and it was largely due to the fact that there was a wide-open committee of members of both sides of the House which went into the whole question.

There is no doubt that there is a tremendous war on between the Government railway and the railway controlled by the Canadian Pacific shareholders and directors. It is a matter for very much regret, because if that war continues, it is going to pull both roads into the hole, and I think

the shareholders of the Canadian Pacific are reaching that conclusion when we see the great fall there has been in the securities of that road. This is a condition that should not exist, because Canadian Pacific shares are one of our premier securities, and it should never be thought by the people of this country that we as a people or as members of Parliament have any idea of destroying the interest or undertaking of that large corporation. If any such a thing should occur it would be destructive to all our securities in this country. There is no doubt that there is a certain amount of jealousy and fighting between the officials of the two systems, and something should be done to stop it. I am satisfied, however, that the lesson has been learned by both managements, and that after we have had this matter thoroughly discussed by a committee of this House and the question has been fought out here, some sensible conclusion will be arrived at. This is a time when we should be more patriotic and desirous of helping our country than of keeping up the political war mind. The question is too serious. The deficits of these railways alone are as great, almost, as the total expenditure of the Government when I came into this House; and when I think of that fact I am shocked and appalled. People cannot think in these millions. We must get down to business. If there are too many trains running we must discontinue some of them, if there are too many men employed for the work to be done, we must make necessary reductions. I have considered the facts as disclosed by the Minister of Railways. The hon member for Pontiac (Mr. Cahill) seems to think the only test that can be applied to discover what is wrong in the railway system is the amount of the operating expenditures. The actual test is the cost per ton train mile. We have not reached that point in the argument and the figures have not been disclosed. The expense per train ton mile will doubtless show that the percentage of expenses this year are much greater than last year. If the tonnage has not gone up in proportion to the expenses but has rather gone down, then something must be wrong with the management, because if tonnage goes down and expenditure increases, it is obvious that we are employing too many men or spending too much money in the operation of the railways.

[Mr. Currie.]

Mr SPEAKER: I hope that hon. member will bring his remarks more closely to bear on the subject.

Mr. CURRIE: I shall do so, Mr. Speaker. I regret very much that the motion was not framed in wider terms, because I think there should be an open discussion in this House of the management of the railways. That, however, has not been done, and I can only say that I cannot see my way clear to vote for the resolution, and I think that any man of independent mind will reach the same conclusion.

Mr. L. J. GAUTHIER (St. Hyacinthe): I desire to go on record on the amendment of the leader of the Opposition. To my mind it serves no other purpose than to becloud the issue that faces the country to-day. Why is this resolution before the House? Public opinion, stirred up by the newspapers of the country in consequence of the statement delivered to the House by the Minister of Railways, is now in a frenzy of unrest. Is the motion a solution of the problem? Is it a cure, a remedy? What is the situation? We are actually controlling 17,000 miles of railway under government ownership, and when the Grand Trunk Railway system will have been acquired we shall own, 22,500 miles, the greatest railway system in the world. When the Government of the day decided to go into the ownership of railways, it was on certain conditions and in the face of certain opposition. I for one have opposed public ownership. I believe that it is not sensible in view of the competition of privately owned companies. But there are some people in this country, as there are members in this House, who have faith in the principle of public ownership; and there is a Government that went on record as being confident in its soundness. Therefore it is the duty of members in this House to give to everyone who believes in public ownership an opportunity to prove whether or not it is feasible and profitable.

Mr. McCREA: How long a time do you require to prove that?

Mr. GAUTHIER: I am willing to discuss the railway situation whenever the question is under consideration. But I claim that the submission to this Parliament of every bit of correspondence, and every communication relative to the railways, will not provide a remedy for the situation. The evil is in connection with the management,

and you cannot eradicate it by any ventilation of all this correspondence in Parliament. You must have an up-to-date management; you must have supervision; you must have the strictest economy and the highest efficiency. You will not find this in Parliament; you will find it in the management which you will secure for the roads. And I hope that the Government of the day will be strong enough to give to all those who favour public ownership an opportunity to show whether it can be made a success or not. In taking that position I do so against my own opinion. But I believe in the rule of the majority. The majority has decided that we should undertake the experiment of public ownership. Then let the majority rule; let them have a chance to show whether or not public ownership will be profitable. Do not try to becloud the issue; do not try to stir up feeling against those people who believe in the theory. I say, give them a chance, and when the question of public ownership of railways is brought before the House, then everyone will be at liberty to suggest any remedy which, in his opinion, is capable of solving the problem which confronts Canada to-day.

Mr. LUCIEN CANNON (Dorchester): If I rightly understood the remarks of the last speaker, the hon. member for St. Hyacinthe, there may be some doubt as to his position on this question. He is in favour of private ownership; he does not favour public ownership; nevertheless, he is willing to change his opinion at the expense of the country.

Some hon. MEMBERS: No, no.

Mr. GAUTHIER: I rise to a point of order. The hon. member has no right to put into my mouth, for the purpose of bolstering up his argument, words which I never used.

Mr. CANNON: The interpretation I have given the speech of my hon. friend I honestly base on my understanding of his remarks. The hon. gentleman said most explicitly that he did not believe in public ownership, but that nevertheless he was willing to alter his views—

Some hon. MEMBERS: Not at all.

Mr. GAUTHIER: I never made such a statement.

Mr. SPEAKER: The rule is very clear, that if an hon. member makes a statement, it must be accepted by the House. On the other hand, however, it is quite competent for an hon. member to give his own interpretation of the remarks of any other member and base an argument thereupon. The remarks of the hon. member for St. Hyacinthe will appear in Hansard and will stand as he stated them.

Mr. CANNON: I do not want to be unjust in any way to the hon. member for St. Hyacinthe. He has delivered his speech and it is open to interpretation by every member of the House. Now, coming back to what I was saying. I say that the hon. gentleman declared that he was opposed to public ownership, but nevertheless would vote against this amendment so as to allow the Government to run the railways of this country in the way they have been running them for the last three years—and we know what results have attended that administration. The question before the House is much wider, broader, more general, than hon. members, including the member for St. Hyacinthe, have seen fit to consider it. The stand taken by the Opposition, Mr. Speaker, is that the Government of Canada —no matter whether it is a Liberal, a Tory, a Farmer or a Nationalist Government—cannot spend the public moneys of this country without rendering due account to the people's representatives. The amendment is not simply to be narrowed down to the railway issue in Canada—the issue is the very general one as to whether this Government is responsible to Parliament. The railway issue has been discussed. We might also discuss the matter of the Canadian Mercantile Marine; we might discuss every expenditure made by this Government for the last three or four years. The Opposition says to the Government: "If you wish to have money for the coming year then before these moneys are voted, you must do what every other Government in a constitutional country does—render proper accounts to the members of this House." This has not been done. Whenever information is sought, whenever information is demanded, the members of the Government—for some reason or other—have always refused to give us that information with respect to many matters of vital importance to the Canadian people.

Referring briefly to the side issue of railways, and putting aside the very general issue of the responsibility of the Government to the House of Commons, I say we have reached a stage in Canada where the railway situation has to be discussed openly, frankly and sincerely. I agree

with all the members who have spoken on either side, that the issue is so big, so vast, that it is not to be discussed in a partisan way. I, for one, do not intend to so discuss it. But the Government cannot run away from its own record, and the Government is responsible for the situation as it exists to-day. Who took over the Canadian Northern railway, who took over the Grand Trunk railway, who took over the Grand Trunk Pacific? This Government, or its predecessor; and the financial situation we are facing to-day is the direct result and consequence of the policy adopted by it. This is one fact that we cannot ignore. Another fact is that, in the light of the present unfavourable financial situation, if we had the facts put before the House, if the officials of all the public departments would give to us the information to which we are entitled, we would come to the conclusion that the East once more is paying for the West; and every business man in the eastern provinces is realizing to-day that on account of western demands they are facing a situation that cannot last much longer. I have not been surprised at the attitude taken by the Agrarian group on this question. It is in the interest of that group, it is in the interest of the western farmers at large, to see that the eastern people, or rather the population of the eastern provinces, do not realize exactly the liabilities and the obligations put on their shoulders by the situation that exists in the West. I do not wish to insist much longer on this phase of the question, but I say that it does not matter whether you belong to the Liberal party, whether you belong to the Tory party, or whether you belong to the Agrarian party—some day you will have to solve the whole financial and the whole railway problem in Canada. Then the eastern provinces will demand from the Government whether they are to continue paying for the western provinces, and much will depend on the answer that shall be given. Those who say that this question should not be discussed from a political point of view are absolutely right. It must be discussed from a national point of view, and in the correct solution of the issue will be found the settlement of the question of our national unity in the future. The East has done very much for the West. The West has been built up by the East. And it seems, Mr. Speaker, that the East must continue to pay for the West, and the West will refuse to pay anything for the East. These are very grave questions and I think they should be discussed thoroughly, either before the House itself or before committees appointed for that purpose. I shall support the amendment presented by the leader of the Opposition because it embodies the high constitutional principle of parliamentary responsibility, and I say that this Government has no right to spend public moneys without giving to the representatives of the people that information to which they are entitled.

Hon. CHARLES MURPHY (Russell): From time to time there has been criticism of the acoustic properties of this Chamber. To whatever defects may exist in that regard I must attribute some of the speeches we have listened to this afternoon in opposition to the amendment moved by the hon. leader of the Opposition (Mr. Mackenzie King). Let me, Sir, supplement the efforts that you have made to keep speakers to the question before the House by again repeating the material part of that amendment. It is in these words:

> —it is the undoubted right of Parliament to demand and receive copies of all reports, accounts, correspondence and papers in relation to the management of every department of the public service including the affairs of the Canadian National railways, whether operating directly under the control of the department or under corporate form.

Now, Mr. Speaker, there is nothing in that declaration to justify the more or less open charges that have been made against the leader of the Opposition, that in moving that amendment, he was actuated, either by opposition to public ownership or by a desire to introduce politics. As a matter of fact, Sir, if any politics has been introduced this afternoon that introduction was made by the Prime Minister, who, after discussing the amendment and several other things besides, turned to his followers and stated that this amendment was a motion of want of confidence, and he asked his followers to vote it down. Now right here, I am going to ask my hon. friend from Marquette (Mr. Crerar) which horn of the dilemma he prefers to be impaled upon. The hon. gentleman said that if this was a want of confidence motion, as he had no confidence in the Government he would, of course, vote for it, but that he did not regard it as a want of confidence motion, and therefore he was going to vote against it. But, Sir, may I point out to my hon. friend, with all respect and in all friendliness, that the hon. gentleman in thus interpreting the amendment was assuming, a little before the proper time, the

role which, it is likely he may in the course of time, fill in this House. But at the present moment he is not the Prime Minister. The interpretation to be placed upon this amendment rests, after all, with the Prime Minister leading the House. That right hon. gentleman has interpreted this amendment—improperly, I submit— as a want of confidence motion; and therefore my hon. friend the member for Marquette, to be logical, should vote for the amendment to carry out his own profession of lack of confidence in this Government.

Mr. MEIGHEN: Will the hon. member permit me a question? Does he contend that every amendment moved in this House, no matter what its terms, which becomes a motion of want of confidence must be supported. Irrespective, I say again, of its terms, by any who have not confidence in the general policy of the administration?

Mr. MURPHY: Mr. Speaker, with all respect to my right hon. friend, I have been too long in this House, and I have crossed swords with him too often, to be drawn into any argument of that kind. If I were to remind the House to-day of the resemblance that the right hon. gentleman bears to the famous character pictured by Butler, it would not be the first time that I had done so, because on a former occasion I likened him to Hudibras of whom Butler said:

He could distinguish and divide
A hair twixt South and Southwest side.

Now, Sir, following your endeavours to keep hon. members to the amendment before the House, I desire to run over briefly some of the arguments that have been advanced in opposition to this amendment. As I have said, the only politics that has been introduced was introduced by the right hon. gentlemen himself. All that is said in this amendment is, that if you are going to discuss it from the standpoint of the Canadian National Railway system, then, as that system is a public undertaking, we, as the representatives of the people, are entitled to the fullest possible information regarding that undertaking. That is all this amendment says, and less than that we could not say if we are to discharge properly our trust to the public who send us here. Then, Sir, I object to the insinuation, no matter from what quarter it comes, that anybody on this side of the House, any more than any other hon. gentleman sitting in any other quarter of this chamber, is actuated by a desire to introduce politics or to discuss the merits or demerits of public ownership. These questions do not enter into this amendment, and I decline to discuss them. The amendment should be discussed simply in accordance with the language in which it is expressed.

In his speech this afternoon my right hon. friend, following the example set by the hon. Minister of Railways a few days ago, invited expressions of opinion from hon. members on both sides of this House. That invitation we on this side have responded to, and when we do respond, the charge is made against us, either that we are opposed to public ownership, or that we are introducing politics. The invitation, Sir, I am bound to say could only relate, having regard to the language and attitude of my right hon. friend, to a discussion of the latter part of the amendment dealing with the Canadian National Railway system. But as pointed out by the hon. member for Dorchester (Mr. Cannon) and by my hon. friend who sits to my right (Mr. Fielding) this amendment raises a much wider question than that. It goes to the whole root of responsible government, and it brings directly in issue the question of ministerial responsibility to a parliament representing what is supposed to be a free and democratic people. That is what this amendment is designed to bring before this chamber, and not what has been discussed by the majority of the hon. members who have spoken in opposition to the amendment.

Now, let me run over briefly some of the things that were said by my right hon. friend the Prime Minister. In the course of his remarks he admitted that the Government was responsible for the success of the Canadian National system; but he said that they were not immediately accountable for day-to-day operation. Well, Sir, that may be useful perhaps as an admission, but it does not go to the root of the matter raised by this amendment, and the only observation that I desire to make upon it at the moment is that in view of what the right hon. Prime Minister admits, that the Government is being responsible for the success of the system, therefore the Government must also be responsible for the failure of the system—a failure that was put forth the other day by the Minister of Railways and Canals in terms that have staggered the whole Dominion.

Further, the right hon. gentleman said that if details of day-to-day operation were to be given the business of Parliament would he held up and made impossible. But here may I point out to the right hon. gentleman and to the House

that neither in the amendment itself, nor in the speech supporting it delivered by the hon. leader of the Opposition, was any specific method mentioned as to how this information, to which the representatives of the people are entitled, should be given to Parliament. That question was left entirely in the large, and I submit, Sir, that acceptance of the terms of this amendment would not at all have the effect which was foreshadowed by the right hon. Prime Minister.

Then the right hon. gentleman went on to point out that in his opinion, if information were brought down as requested by this amendment with reference to the Canadian National Railway system, that would operate to the injury of the Canadian National Railway system, for the reason that such information would become the property of its great competitor, the Canadian Pacific railway. Well, I have only to repeat what my hon. friend from Pontiac (Mr. Cahill) and other hon. gentlemen have said, namely, that there is nothing done by the Canadian National Railway system or by its board or by any of those connected with its management that is not known within a very few hours to the management and directors of the Canadian Pacific railway. The Canadian Pacific railway is, as has been stated, one of the most successfully operated and best managed transportation systems in the world, and no amount of information that might be brought down in this House or before any committee of this House would add anything to the information of those who are charged with the duty of managing and operating the Canadian Pacific Railway Company. Therefore I dismiss that argument, and so will any practical business man, without any further consideration.

The right hon. gentleman also asked if the Canadian Pacific railway was shrouded in any mystery, and he answered his own question in the negative. That answer was correct. But then he added that neither was the Canadian National Railway system shrouded in any mystery. Well, that is just exactly where we join issue with him. We say it is shrouded in mystery, and the proof of our assertion is that whenever information is asked for from this side of the House it is denied on the ground that it would not be in the public interest to bring that information down. That is where we say the shrouding in mystery comes in in regard to the Canadian National Railway system. But there is also another difference to be pointed out in this regard, namely that there is no necessity for shrouding the Canadian Pacific railway in mystery. That road, as I have already said, is a successfully managed road and produces dividends; the reverse, according to the Minister of Railways and Canals, is the case with the Canadian National Railway system. And there is this further difference, that the Canadian Pacific railway, if it did make deficits, would not, as is the case with the Canadian National Railway system, come to this House from time to time and ask the representatives of the people to vote moneys to make up those deficits. Then the hon. gentleman proceeded and asked, what is to be done? I took down his exact words. He said: "If Parliament set to work through a committee of this House to evolve some rule that could be followed, it would evolve something definite and concrete." Now, Mr. Speaker, just mark that sentence, and at once you trace the resemblance to the historic character with whom I compared the right hon. gentleman a few moments ago. Let me read that again: "If Parliament set to work through a committee of this House to evolve some rule that could be followed, it would evolve something definite and concrete." In that you have the right hon. Prime Minister's solution of this whole railway question.

Then the right hon. gentleman expressed a preference for a committee—at least, he seemed to do so. I should not make any very definite statement with regard to anything my right hon. friend says or does; I have known him too long and too well to do that. But the right hon. gentleman, following the sentence that I have just quoted, seemed to indicate some interest in any event in the resolution which stands on the Order Paper in the name of the senior member for Halifax (Mr. Maclean) and intimated that if the committee provided for by that resolution were appointed, parties could be brought before it and all necessary information given there by officials connected, not only with the Canadian National Railway system, but with other roads as well.

At six o'clock the House took recess.

After Recess

The House resumed at Eight o'clock.

Mr. MURPHY: Mr. Speaker, just before you left the Chair at six o'clock, I had mentioned that the Prime Minister had based one of his objections to the amendment moved by the leader of the Opposi-

tion, on the fact that the senior member for Halifax (Mr. Maclean) had, standing in his name on the Order Paper, a motion providing for the appointment of another standing committee in addition to those already appointed by the House. The right hon. gentleman spoke in approving terms of the proposed new committee, and in the course of his observations with reference to it, he said that it might well be considered as likely to meet the situation raised by the amendment of the leader of the Opposition. That language evidently appealed to the hon. member for Marquette (Mr. Crerar), as in the course of the remarks that he made following those of the Prime Minister, my hon. friend also expressed his approval of the creation of this new standing committee, and in answer to a question addressed to him by the leader of the Opposition, the hon. member for Marquette said that he thought that any question could be asked and the answer could be obtained before this new standing committee. That reply seemed to me to be based on an erroneous idea of the scope and powers of a standing committee of this House. Let me point out to my hon. friend in the first place that, when such a committee is appointed, it remains an inert thing; it does not function; it remains just so many names on a piece of paper until something is referred to it by this House for inquiry or investigation or report. Even when that has been done, in order that it may discharge the function which, it seems to me, the hon. member for Marquette had in mind it would perform as a matter of course, it must also receive from this House authority to send for persons, papers and records. Besides that, it must receive authority to examine witnesses under oath, and then under an Act it has power to administer oaths to such witnesses. In order to accomplish what the hon. member for Marquette seemed to think this new committee would accomplish, all that I have mentioned would, in the first place, have to be done. In the next place, as I have stated, something would have to be referred to that committee, and in order to get the information that my hon. friend thought such a committee would get, the whole railway situation as it affects the Canadian National Railway system at this time, would have to be referred to the committee and the committee would have to be invested with the powers and jurisdiction which I have just outlined before any information worth having could be obtained. If the hon. member for Marquette can have that done, or if there is a possibility that such a thing would be done by the Government, I admit that the hon. gentleman would have some ground on which to base his argument. But if that is not done,—and I have very grave doubt that any such thing would be done,—with all respect I would point out to my hon. friend that his argument along that line and on that point proceeds from an error with regard to the facts.

Now, if such a committee were appointed, let me direct the attention of the House to the fact that my hon. friend and those who argue with him would then be impaled on either horn of another dilemma. My hon. friend, following the lead of the Prime Minister, had urged very strongly, against the amendment moved by the leader of the Opposition, that in the getting of the information which they seemed to think would be got by the adoption of this amendment, information would be given to the great rival of the Canadian National Railway system, and that the giving of such information would operate to the injury of the government-owned and operated railway. If the suggestion of the hon. gentleman be followed, if this committee be appointed, and if this committee is not to be a body conducting its investigations after the manner of a star chamber, if this committee is to sit in public and to examine publicly persons, records and documents, then the information that will be elicited will be information, not only for the Canadian Pacific railway, but for all the world. So I ask my hon. friends who were urging against the amendment of the leader of the Opposition, the argument that to adopt it would mean the giving of information to the Canadian Pacific how they are going to get away from the greater volume of information that would be given by holding sessions of such a committee as that. They are impaled on either horn of that dilemma, and I leave the hon. gentlemen to select which of those horns they prefer.

Let me deal with this matter very briefly from another and, perhaps, a more important point of view. The Minister of Railways and Canals (Mr. Reid), a few days ago, and the Prime Minister this afternoon, invited discussion and suggestions, and hon. members who spoke from this side, and, indeed, from all quarters of the House, expressed their willingness to ac-

cept the invitation and to give such assistance in the solution of the railway difficulties that confront us as they would, in the exercise of their best judgment and their greatest diligence, be able to give. Some doubt was cast, without any reason whatever, upon the bona-fides of statements of that kind emanating from the Opposition. Without going into that, let me point out that in order to discuss a thing, you must know what that thing is. If we are to discuss the railway situation, we must know all the facts that produced that situation. If we are to discuss the conditions which have brought about the situation with which the country is confronted to-day, and for being the cause of which I, in any event would not think of blaming hon. gentlemen who now sit opposite—if, we are to discuss that situation and if we are to suggest the remedies which, in our judgment, should be applied, to change that situation, to put an end to those huge deficits and to put the railway system, owned and operated by the Government, on a proper basis, surely it is elementary that before we can do that, we must have before us the facts relating to the whole situation.

Let me point out a few things bearing on the proposition which I have just laid down and which, I submit, cannot be successfully refuted. On the 14th of the present month, the gentleman who at present occupies the position of chairman of the Board of Railway Commissioners of Canada delivered a speech before a club in this city. I refer to the Hon. F. B. Carvell, whose speech on the occasion to which I have referred attracted nation-wide attention. In order that I may not transgress the rules of the House, and for the purpose of keeping strictly to the amendment that is now before us for discussion, I will quote just two sentences of the speech as bearing on the subject at issue. In the Ottawa Journal of March 15, there appears a report of the speech in question, and Mr. Carvell is represented as having made these statements:

> The Government railway losses last year were far greater than recently reported. They are very much more than what has appeared on the surface.

I am not going to comment upon those statements, but I am going to draw the attention of the House to what was said a day or two later by one of the leading journals in this country with reference to those statements. In the Toronto Globe of the 17th instant, there appears an editorial, the title of which is "Are these charges true"? Again, in order to confine myself strictly to the amendment, I will read just those portions of the editorial which bear upon the matter which we are discussing. In the course of that article the Globe said, referring to the statements which I have just cited as being made by Mr. Carvell:

> If words mean anything, Mr. Carvell charges the board of management of the Canadian National railways or the Minister of Railways, or both, with making false representations as to the condition of the people's railways. The losses, he asserts, are very much more than what has appeared on the surface. Is Dr. Reid content to let this imputation of deceit and concealment rest upon him?

Those are not my words, nor do I associate myself with them at the moment. Later on in the editorial there are these further observations:

> Are the figures false, and presented to Parliament with the intent to deceive? If they are, Mr. Carvell will do the people of Canada a service by stating wherein they are untrue.

These are the comments of one of the leading newspapers of Canada upon that portion of the speech of the Chairman of the Board of Railway Commissioners to which I have just drawn the attention of the House. Certainly no more serious comment could be made upon that statement than those that are made in that editorial of the Globe, and if for no other reason than to place himself right, my hon. friend the Minister of Railways and Canals, and the Government of which he is a member, should, I submit, welcome the earliest possible opportunity, and any method that offers itself, to place all available information before the public so as to disprove the gravity of the charges contained in the speech delivered by Mr. Carvell.

Now, the speech itself was not alone the only serious statement that went forth to the Canadian public. A statement made in this House a day or two later by the hon. the Minister of Railways and Canals, in disclosing the railway situation as it exists in Canada at the present time, has stirred several journals supporting the Government to give expression to their views in very plain terms. I am not going to quote from them at any great length, nor in fact will I refer to any but one, and in doing so I will again confine myself to that part of the article which is germane to the subject under discussion.

The Ottawa Journal in its issue of the 15th instant, in referring to the disclosures made by my hon. friend the Minister of Railways and Canals in this House in presenting the statement to which I have alluded, said this:

The people appear willing to assume the burden, and that attitude would justify the utmost frankness upon the part of the Minister of Railways. At the moment they are asking for full information as to the exact volume of the burden involved, and that is a reasonable desire. The burden itself neither swells nor shrinks under the light of truth. To say that "this total does not include fixed charges on the Intercolonial and the National Transcontinental" falls short of meeting the popular desire for information in a spirit of perfect candor.

That language, Mr. Speaker, is not the language of a Liberal. That language is not the language of any hon. member sitting on this side of the House. That language, Sir, is not the language of an opponent of this Government. That language is the language of a journal than which there is no stronger supporter of the present Government in the whole Dominion of Canada, and surely, Sir, the Government will take notice of this statement of the Journal, speaking of the people that—"At the moment they are asking for full information as to the exact volume of the burden involved, and that is a reasonable desire." Mr. Speaker, that language applies aptly to the terms of the amendment introduced by the hon. the leader of the Opposition, and in support of which I am citing this editorial for the information of this House. Then how true it is as the Journal states further: "The burden itself neither swells nor shrinks under the light of truth." And how well deserved this reproof is in the concluding part of the extract in which the language used by the minister is quoted, when the Journal observes: "To say that 'this total does not include fixed charges on the Intercolonial and the National Transcontinental' falls short of meeting the popular desire for information in a spirit of perfect candor." Now, Sir, I submit that from this source, from this newspaper favourable to the Government, comes the very strongest endorsation of the position taken by the hon. the leader of the Opposition in his amendment.

But, Sir, there are a couple of other incidents that illustrate the need for information to which I might with propriety allude before I resume my seat. Occasionally we do get some information from the Government, but no sooner do we get it than one of two things happens: either it is pointed out the next day that the information is erroneous, or, as happened with reference to two statements made by the Government on different occasions, there is such a direct conflict of fact that further information is absolutely necessary. Now, to illustrate the first point, I need only remind the House that a short time ago my hon. friend, the Minister of Railways and Canals, in replying to a question asked by the hon. member for Lunenburg (Mr. Duff) with regard to the number of locomotives built by the Montreal Locomotive company for this Government since the year 1917, and replying to a further question as to the value of these locomotives, gave an answer to the House one day saying that the value was $1,300,000 odd. On that day he also stated that his colleague, the Minister of Marine and Fisheries, was a director of the locomotive company which manufactured these locomotives. Then, Sir, on the following day, my hon. friend, the Minister of Railways and Canals, rose in his seat and corrected the figures that had been given to him to present to the House the previous day, and said that the value of the locomotives built by this company since the year 1917, this company of which his colleague, the Minister of Marine and Fisheries, is a director, instead of being $1,300,000 odd was thirteen millions and some odd thousand dollars. Now, Mr. Speaker, in the light of errors of that kind in information furnished by the Government itself, and directly bearing on the railway situation in this country, surely we are entitled to the fullest possible information as to the whole series of contracts given this locomotive company,—as to the type and size of locomotives they built, as to the comparison of costs between these locomotives when built by that company and the same locomotives when built by any other company. Further, I submit, we are entitled to another comparison, a comparison of the cost of these locomotives, and locomotives of the same type and size when built for a private-owned and privately operated company. Further than that, we are entitled, I also submit, to this additional information: we ought to know how much locomotives of the same type and size cost in the United States as compared with the cost in Canada.

I am only citing these as one branch, and a very small branch, of the inquiry that ought to be made and of the information that ought to be given before any hon. gentleman in this House or any citizen of this country can intelligently approach the discussion of what is generally referred to as the present railway situation.

One other illustration and I have done. At the time the Estimates were brought down in this House a statement was given

to the newspapers by the Government in explanation of the appalling state of affairs disclosed by these Estimates. In that statement reference was made to the amount of operating loss, and the amount that was then mentioned was a few days later proved to be quite incorrect and much below the actual figure when the hon. the Minister of Railways and Canals made his official statement in this House. This incident, illustrating the unreliability of the figures given to this House, and illustrating further, the fact that the hon. the Minister of Railways apparently cannot depend upon those who are responsible for furnishing him with this information was dealt with in a communication to the Montreal Star. from which I intend to quote a few sentences. The Star has begun the publication of a series of articles on the railway situation contributed by Mr. J. L. Payne, a gentleman who under this and former Governments occupied the position of Chief Railway Statistician for the Dominion of Canada. The first of these letters appeared in the Star of Saturday last, and a supplementary letter was published yesterday. In this supplementary letter Mr. Payne makes reference to the discrepancy to which I have just alluded, in the following terms:

The newspaper figures—

that is to say, those handed out by the Government concurrently with the introduction of the Estimates in this House.

—had placed the operating loss at $21,250,000 from which I deduct 5,000,000 on account of probable net operating earnings by the Grand Trunk; but Dr. Reid showed that the loss for the past year from operation had been $36,842,-9'0.17. To the extent of the difference between $21,250,000 and that sum, the deficit for the current year may be taken as having been increased.

So that whether we are denied information, or whether we get information which is immediately afterwards proven to be incorrect, it is quite evident that neither we in this House, nor the citizens of the country at large, are in a position even to approach the discussion of the railway situation until there is available a far greater volume of information than that which we and the people now possess, and until that information is obtained through sources upon which we may rely as being absolutely correct.

My hon. friend from Red Deer (Mr. Clark), in discussing the amendment presented by the leader of the Opposition, took exceptions to it upon two grounds. In the first place, he said it was premature; and besides that, he contended that it was not supported by information which we should have had before the amendment was introduced. Well now, I submit to my hon. friend that not only is this amendment not premature, but that the time has arrived—indeed that the time has passed—when this House should take a stand, such as that proposed by the amendment, to assert its rights and privileges with regard to information to which members of Parliament are entitled as representatives of the people of Canada. I cannot for a moment admit, therefore, that the amendment is at all premature. As regards the argument that the amendment is not supported by information which we should have had before it was brought forward, I confess that I do not quite understand this contention of my hon. friend. It is quite unlike him. He is usually remarkable, not only for clarity of speech, but also for clarity of thought. But without labouring that point, may I draw his attention and the attention of the House to the fact that his objection is baseless. He says that the amendment should be supported by information which we ought to have had before it was brought into the House. Well, Sir, we tried to get information and were refused it, and to-day we are seeking the very thing which the hon. member says we should have got. From that point of view, therefore, I invite my hon. friend to revise the opinion he expressed this afternoon, and to be logical, as he usually is, by voting with the members of the Opposition in suport of the amendment.

Hon. A. K. MACLEAN (Halifax): The question involved in the amendment of the leader of the Opposition (Mr. Mackenzie King) is not without difficulties, and I desire to say a word or two thereon before voting upon the question. Notwithstanding your very excellent voice, Mr. Speaker, which usually covers this chamber to the satisfaction of every hon. member, I am sure it is not to be presumed, upon a single reading of a motion, that it has been clearly followed by hon. gentlemen, and I should like to read the amendment again for my own satisfaction, and possibly for the information of the House. It is as follows:

That subject to the reservation that in exceptional cases there may be documents of a confidential character which, in the public interest, may properly be withheld from publication; the House declares that it is the undoubted right of Parliament to demand and receive copies of all reports, accounts, correspondence and papers in relation to the management of

every department of the public service, including the affairs of the Canadian National railways, whether operating directly under the control of a department or under corporate form.

After a reading of that resolution, and a careful observance of the text, it may be that hon. gentlemen are not far apart, even accepting the views already expressed to-day as being the judgment of the House generally. The amendment uses the term "confidential," which is the qualifying portion of the resolution; and I think it of some importance to inquire just for a moment as to what that word means. I assume that the leader of the Opposition, in incorporating that term into his amendment, did not wish thereby to imply that the only documents that were to be withheld from Parliament were those merely which had been marked "confidential" by the writer, or which had been so considered by the recipient of the letter. I assume—in fact I hope—that he did not intend to use the word in that restrictive sense. I should think that he meant that if the Government considered that any special document asked for by Parliament should not be disclosed to the House or to the public, because it was against the public interest, therefore it would be a confidential document. If I unfairly interpret the hon. gentleman's use of that particular word I trust he will correct me. The Canadian National Railways, of which the people of Canada are the shareholders, is a business institution and, as has been pointed out by several speakers during the course of the debate, it has its competitors. As every hon. gentleman knows, there is in all business affairs a great deal that cannot be divulged to the public. This, I think, is regarded as a safe principle which is always followed by corporations and their shareholders, who usually protest against the disclosure of facts to the public, except through the medium of shareholders' meetings. This principle is regarded by private individuals as a sound one, and it is one that is usually observed. Therefore, when I say that in all business affairs there is much that is confidential and must not be disclosed to the public. I think I am stating what is axiomatic and which will be accepted by every hon. gentleman in the House. If I am right in my interpretation of the qualifying section of the amendment I would say that if upon a motion for documents, the Government believe that disclosure or publication of the same would be against the national interests, would be against the interests of the Canadian National Railway system, they would refuse to divulge or publish the same on that ground and therefore those documents would be regarded as confidential. It is true that the Government must take the responsibility of determining what information shall be given to the public, what documents relative to the administration of the Canadian National railway system shall be divulged. It may be that the opponents of the Government might differ from them in their view as to what was confidential and what was not confidential, as to what information should be divulged and what should be maintained as purely for the guidance of those interested. In that event Parliament would have to judge as to who was right and who was wrong; and ultimately it would be the right and duty of the public, who are the proprietors of the railway system, to determine as to whose position was correct—that of the Government or that of their opponents. If my interpretation of the amendment of the leader of the Opposition is correct—and it does seem the proper one, it does seem the natural and obvious interpretation—so far as I am concerned I cannot see any objection to it. It expresses a principle which it seems to me would be very dangerous for this Parliament to oppose or to deny. After all, it is within the power of the Government to determine what information they judge to be in the public interest to divulge and what they deem not proper to divulge. I therefore fail to see upon what principle the amendment should be denied by the House.

I should be reluctant to oppose the amendment upon another ground. A few days ago the Minister of Railways presented his annual statement upon the railways owned and controlled by the Government, and I think the statement as to form was a very excellent one. Upon reading it, subsequent to its deliverance, I find that not only is it in splendid form, but it gives a very great deal of information. The minister stated there would be a deficit of $70,000,000 this year in operating and fixed charges. He also estimates that for the current year there will be a deficit of $50,000,000 for operating and fixed charges. When one reflects upon the world-wide conditions to-day, when one recalls the commercial and financial conditions in all the leading countries of the world, he might be pardoned if he did say that the deficit in the current year would probably be as large as it was last year. Now this deficit, Mr. Speaker, must be made up by the people of

Canada in the form of taxation. There is no royal road by which we can secure that amount of money to square the accounts of the Canadian National Railway system, except by obtaining it through taxation upon the people of the Dominion.

Mr. CLARK (Red Deer): We might save on the railroads.

Mr. MACLEAN (Halifax): That would lessen the amount to be taken from the people by taxation, but the principle would not be varied by the difference in amount. It being true that this enormous deficit must be made up through taxation from the people I, at least, shall be very reluctant to give adherence to the principle that Parliament must not, in the general sense at any rate, be afforded the fullest information that it deems necessary in connection with the operation of that railway system and which goes to make up a deficit for which the people have to be taxed. It is quite true that a great deal of information might well be denied Parliament and the public by the Government and by the management of the railway system, but speaking in the general sense, I say, they are entitled to all information. The exceptions can only be determined as the cases arise, and when they come before us in a concrete form. Then, and only then, I submit can we determine what information should be refused the public and Parliament by the Government and by the management of the railways, and all one can do at the present time is to either affirm or deny the general principle embodied in the amendment which is now before us for consideration. Very much has been said this afternoon in connection with the operation of the National railway system that is commendable. For the present at least we are the proprietors of these railways, the mileage of which will be enlarged when the Grand Trunk system is acquired. It does not follow from my remarks, or from the fact that we are the proprietors of this National railway system, that members of Parliament should ask all sorts of questions, and move for the production of all sorts of documents, without discretion and without discrimination. Many questions are asked, I think, which are not informative to anybody, which are not perhaps in the national interest, and which are not perhaps in the interest of the railway system itself. I admit, Sir, it is sometimes difficult to determine, as a matter of fact, what questions are relevant, what are important, what are informative, and what are or are not in the national interest. The answers to some questions, it has been suggested by some hon. gentleman this afternoon, may be quite satisfying to curious and inquisitive people outside of Parliament, but it does not necessarily follow that it is in the public interest that such questions should be asked, and only questions that are in the public interest should be asked. Nor does it follow that because some persons, whom some of us in this House represent, desire questions to be asked, the time of Parliament should be taken up either in the asking or in the answering of them. It was inevitable, Mr. Speaker, that the issue involved in this motion should have arisen. I assume that every hon. member felt that when the policy of government ownership and control was adopted, this very issue was bound to be projected into Parliament. It is one of the difficulties incident to and inherent in Government ownership, and we must make the best of it. It may be true that the privilege of asking questions and demanding the production of documents has not up to the present been abused. I am hardly in a position to state that it has been. Probably we will acquire a better standard as to what should be required in this connection by having no rule whatever rather than attempting to regulate it by standing orders or by rules. But I am sure we will all agree that having accepted the tremendous responsibility of becoming the owners and operators of 17,000 or 18,000 miles of railway, that railway should be given a fair trial, and it should not in any way be prejudiced by the attitude taken by hon. gentlemen.

Now I have admitted, Mr. Speaker, that Parliament is entitled to a great deal of information. If the people are to be taxed to meet large deficits in future, as they will be, it naturally follows that they will expect a great deal of information from Parliament. But while the people and Parliament are entitled to this information, still we should contrive some method by which such information should reach Parliament and the people other than through the Order Paper or the ordinary channels. Reference has been made to my motion now upon the Order Paper asking for the establishment of a standing committee upon Government-owned railways and shipping. I am not going to discuss that motion, but I propose to debate it at the earliest opportunity. I might say, however, that one of the reasons which moved me to place that motion upon the Order Paper was the hope

that this committee would work out some method by which Parliament and the people might be kept better informed in future on railway affairs. I also entertained the hope that some regulations or standing orders might be set up which would in some way control the means by which Parliament and the people would be kept informed, thus saving much of the time of Parliament.

In connection with our railway questions, I think I am uttering but the simple truth when I say that Parliament and the people require information. During the past fifteen or twenty years, at least during the time that I have been a member of this House, it seems to me, reflecting on the years that have gone by, that Parliament has abdicated its functions, particularly in relation to railway matters. We were not informed thereon, and it would appear that we did not take care always to be informed; too blindly did we follow the Government's view of or perhaps some section of public opinion. But I submit that we have reached the time when Parliament should become informed upon this great national issue, in which is involved a problem that will confront us for many years to come. In the absence, however, of an alternative method of informing Parliament upon that problem and of dealing with the very issue raised in this amendment, I think the amendment does contain a principle which should be affirmed, though in practice it should perhaps be strictly qualified, and therefore I propose to support it.

Right Hon. Sir GEORGE FOSTER (Minister of Trade and Commerce): Mr. Speaker, without attempting to throw blame on any one in particular, the thought strikes me that it would have been better in so far as the aim of the discussion was to really accomplish something which would be profitable in the way of understanding the present railway situation, and, after understanding it, to take measures to improve it, had a more opportune moment been chosen when the discussion would have been placed upon a somewhat wider plane and would, I think, have issued in better results. My hon. friend the leader of the Opposition (Mr. Mackenzie King) knew very well that the motion which was placed on the Order Paper by the senior member for Halifax (Mr. Maclean) would probably be reached within a day. Why was it necessary then, by injecting a motion in amendment to the Government's motion to go into Supply, to bring up the question on a narrow basis, rather than approach it as a whole House from both sides in the only proper spirit in which it can be approached—an entire negation of any desire to make party capital on one side or the other, and a full purpose in a very solemn and a very careful way to front the problem than which no more important problem has been before the Parliament of Canada since Confederation? If there is anything that should make a parliament sober and earnest and honest with itself, it is a situation such as that which confronts us to-day.

I do not think that men on this side or men on that side of the House, if they are going to arrive at a proper solution of this problem, have any time to waste in throwing boquets one at the other as to who was the way-back cause of the present situation. I think it should make some of us very humble in our criticisms if we let our memories go back to the antecedent times during which the bases were formed which have eventuated in the situation confronting us to-day. I for one do not propose to go into ancient history as to which particular party or government was in part or in whole to blame. The fact is that we have a very serious proposition before us upon which the economic and financial and national progress depends in a very essential way.

That is my view of the situation and the way in which we should approach it, and my hon. friend the leader of the Opposition does not appear to me to have taken the best course in the light of that broad, general interest by interjecting this amendment on the motion to go into Supply. He will take my criticism as a kindly criticism. I could have hoped that we should have been spared this and should have come to the discusion of the situation on broad, general lines.

My hon. friend, the senior member for Halifax (Mr. Maclean), has endeavoured to define the amendment moved by the leader of the Opposition. I tried to follow his definition, and it seemed to me that he took about three different positions in that regard. I followed him sympathetically in the first; I then had to reverse the engine and follow him sympathetically in the second, and so with the third, and I got confused and troubled about it. I think I shall have to have some further light from my hon. friend before I can exactly see the point towards which he was going. My hon. friend who leads the Opposition knows the English language and the meaning of its words; he knows not only the colloquial meaning but also

the official meaning of the word "confidential." Looking through his vocabulary, without having to go to the dictionary—because I am sure he has a vast choice of words—my hon. friend chose that one word "confidential," and put it into his motion, and it is an essential part of that motion. If the word "confidential" meant what the member for Halifax read as its meaning in his first interpretation of it, the leader of the Opposition would have been just as well up in business, just as far up in the line, if instead of putting into his motion something about confidential information he had incorporated in it the affirmation that as a rule the sun rises every morning and sets every night—a self-evident truth. If "confidential" means what the member for Halifax had in mind, what kind of information will my hon. friend get, and those who vote for his amendment, if the amendment carries? Exactly the information which the Government chooses to give him in the light of the public interest and no more.

Talking about the privileges of the House and the different disposition of powers of government and claims of justice to members of Parliament, has anybody ever taken the position that as this chamber votes the money, so this chamber has the right to know to the last dollar how it has been expended? I have not heard that position taken in this House, but if it is true, it is equally true that a government is a mere automaton and has neither the right nor the power of existence in fact if it does not face every now and then the question as to what information it is in the public interest that it should give out. If the Government thinks it is not in the public interest that information should be given at a certain time or on a certain line, it is not only the right but the absolute duty of that government to withhold the information. One principle is just as necessary in government as the other; one is just as strongly entrenched in the constitution and in the general division of powers as the other. So that I would like to know the answer of my hon. friend the leader of the Opposition as to his coincidence with interpretation number one given by the senior member for Halifax. Is that the meaning of his resolution? If it is, my hon. friend from Halifax will vote for it; if it is not, can he vote for it? There ought to be some finality about this, or a vote may go astray. To some members of Parliament it does not matter much whether a vote goes astray or not, but for either the leader of the Opposition or my hon. friend from Halifax to have a vote go astray is a matter of some importance. Will these two gentlemen please settle between themselves what is the meaning of the word "confidential" and so inform us? We shall gain a vote or we shall lose a vote according as there is agreement or otherwise between them.

Let us look at it a little further. Two kinds of confidential documents are envisaged by my hon. friend; not all confidential documents are to be withheld by the Government, but only that division of confidential documents which it would be against the public interest to bring down. All other confidential ones are to be brought down. We must keep that in mind: only those documents are to be refused the production of which would not be in the public interest. In a word, "confidential" having its general meaning and its special meaning, if the amendment is carried and becomes imperative, you will leave as it is now, in the discretion of the Government, the decision in all special cases whether a paper or document may or may not in the public interest be brought down, and you will have a standing battle between the Government and the Opposition or the seeker of the information on the question whether the Government is right in its interpretation or whether it is assuming autocratic or plenary powers and exercising great liberty in the production of information asked for. What I want to make plain is this: if the leader of the Opposition confines himself to confidential documents you will have to proceed then upon the division, first, into confidential documents the bringing down of which would not be prejudicial to the public interest and, second, confidential documents the bringing down of which would be prejudicial to the public interest. How will my hon. friend find those confidential documents? In a government department you find them easily. The minister or officer who indites a document or a letter marks it "confidential" or does not so mark it; if he marks it "confidential" he puts a seal upon it and it remains in that category. But in the case of a person or a corporation or a railway company carrying on business, how many of the documents or letters, how much of the correspondence, how many of the transactions, are initialled as confidential by the only one who can initial them as such? Not one per cent of them, I venture to say. So that if my hon. friend's amendment passes he will be able to ask for nearly every document, every

9 p.m.

item of correspondence which exists in connection with the administration of a great railway. I think there is no getting away from that. Well, when it comes to that I think we are up against a very important problem.

My hon. friend from Shelburne and Queen's (Mr. Fielding) got a little excited this afternoon, I think, and used naughty words—very naughty words for a man of his age and wisdom, but they got the better of him this afternoon, for a moment, and he used them. He used the word "autocracy" and threw it at us with very great vim and very great energy. He then used the "dark lantern" illustration, as if we were a band of professional burglars in this respect and were going around with dark lanterns looking for our neighbours' goods to appropriate them to our own advantage. There is no need of using hard words when you come to the contemplation or discussion of a question as important as this. But the fact that they were used just illustrates my objection of a few moments ago that the hon. member for Shelburne and Queen's (Mr. Fielding) got off the broad road of facing a great situation and discussing it in a cool and deliberate manner, and got on to the little, narrow road, not the narrow road which the Bible deals with, but the little, narrow road which is known to party politics, and he slid along it with more than his accustomed celerity and quickness. He would not have used those words if he had come up to the discussion of the question in a broad general way. But the words "autocracy" and "dark lantern" do not lend weight to an argument; they rather mark a divergence from the path along which you proceed to a reasoned and cool discussion of a subject, to the narrow path of which I spoke where you approach the subject from traditions of partyism and from tendencies towards partyism.

But that is not the way in which we will settle this question. My hon. friend compared a public department with the operations of a great railway system under corporate management. My hon. friend, if he comes to think of that for a minute, will see that there is no parallel between those two. The Department of Public Works is not in competition with any other agencies, private or corporate or public, along the same line of work. It receives a certain amount of money from this House; it has indicated what it wants that money for; it is for the public service, and this House has a right to the last dollar to have an explanation of that expenditure, and the Public Works Department within its own domain, is engaged simply upon the outlined, delineated public services which this House authorizes it to carry on. How the hon. member for Shelburne and Queen's could, for a moment, be led into the assertion that there was a parallel between the Department of Public Works and a great piece of enginery for the administration of eighteen or twenty thousand miles of railway in this country, I cannot understand; but the House can easily see that those are not parallel. While I agree with him up to the last in his assertion that the House has a right to have a full explanation of all those departmental expenditures, and that it must have them; when it comes to the other point, there are big interests upon which we have embarked; we have made a decision, that after these roads came to us—and they came to us; they pressed themselves upon us; they were taken in hand—they should not be carried on by government agency; that they should be in the form of corporate management, and we thereby divested ourselves of their direct management. Someone, with the usual lack of thought which the best of us sometimes may suffer from, has made the assertion that this great system of railways, as it exists today, is nothing more nor less than a party political machine. I am quite sure that the hon. member who made that assertion did not quite think how far it went. Is it a party political machine? Has it been so used? Is it a hot-bed of patronage? I quite understand what patronage means, and I have my friends behind me—

Some hon. MEMBERS: Oh, oh.

Mr. CAHILL: 24,000 census enumerators.

Sir GEORGE FOSTER: The very mention of the word "patronage" puts joy on the faces of hon. gentlemen opposite.

Mr. COPP: We like to hear the admission.

Sir GEORGE FOSTER: When we refer to patronage, oh, joy, joy!—hon. gentlemen opposite are thinking of the time when they will hold the reins of power. That is why we hear such cheers and clapping from the other side of the House whenever the word "patronage" is used. It is like a sweet morsel that they roll under the tongue, of infinite gratification to them. Do they want to come in and have its trials

as well as its joys? I know what patronage means.

Some hon. MEMBERS: Oh, oh.

Sir GEORGE FOSTER: From the time that the Intercolonial and the Canadian Northern shortly afterwards went out from the line of patronage, I have seen, and I have lived partly, in a different atmosphere. From the time that the new organization took hold, although I have been sometimes asked to get this man and that man and the other man a place within the administrative staff of that railway, I have never succeeded in doing so and I have never attempted to do so. There is no man, either outside of the ranks of those administrative officers or inside of them, that can controvert that statement with reference to myself. What does that prove? It proves that the Government, having laid down its policy, divested itself from the patronage in connection with the railways and held the management liable for the administration, the appointment of its staff, the promotion of its men and the general working out of the system. I have never interfered, and I think what is the fact as stated by myself would be the fact as stated by my colleagues as well. I will tell the House what I have heard. I have heard a good many pretty bitter remonstrances that in the old times it was possible to apply to a minister and get a man into a position, but now since the administration has been changed, that period has passed away and no one can seemingly get in by that path. But for a man to make in this House the statement that the whole of it is simply under a political patronage system and being run in that way, marks him, I am afraid, as a little bit thoughtless or a little bit reckless, whichever he may take as being the softest epithet to apply to himself.

I think I have stated all that it is necessary for me to state. There is but one thing more, and this bears out what the right hon. gentleman who leads the party has stated. I think that we members of Parliament, on both sides of the House should get as closely together and as quickly together as we possibly can, and try to find a solution for the situation which lies immediately in front of us. I think our reputation as members of Parliament depends upon that. I think that the country is looking to see Parliament come to some solution of that kind. They send their representatives to Parliament, those representatives are paid their emolument in Parliament, and are supposed to do their duty in Parliament, and I submit that it is the duty of this Parliament and succeeeding Parliaments to let bygones be bygones and partyism be partyism in the past, to be resumed in some dim and distant day in the future, if it is ever resumed, and for the time being to approach at least this one question with a sincere desire not to bother any one, but to get at the roots of the question—better still, to get at some sensible, sane method for solving the problem. We will not solve it by declamation nor by chucking words one at the other, whether it be "dark lanterns," "autocrats" or anything of that kind. We have enough brain, good will and business ability in this Parliament to settle upon a solution which, though it must be gradual, will be effectual and pull us out. I agree with the sentiment uttered by my hon. friend from Red Deer (Mr. Clark). I am not pessimistic enough to think that Canada, with her future prospects, cannot draw herself out from this difficult railway situation of today and, with courage, persistence, and hopefulness, carry on and carry through for one, two, three, maybe several years more, until the development of the country comes even with the splendid facilities of transport that we have provided for it, and when, as a consequence, the revenues of these roads will approach the supporting point and some day or other pass it and perhaps become feeders of our revenues. But we will not get to that situation without the most careful thought and without a union of effort mental and moral, of both parties and both sides of the House towards obtaining the solution of one of the most important questions that ever devolved upon a parliament.

Mr. D. D. McKENZIE (Cape Breton North and Victoria): I had not intended to take part in this debate, but the temptation to participate in a discussion which has been honoured by the right hon. the Minister of Trade and Commerce (Sir George Foster) taking a part in it. is perhaps a little too strong for me to resist. I wish to make a few observations on the motion before the House, and possibly a few remarks upon the speech which has just been made by the right hon. gentleman.

Ever since I have had anything to do with public speaking either in this House or out of it, I have always tried to cull some material from the speech of the man who was talking against me, to use in my own speech. I have listened to the speech of the right hon. gentleman with all the

attention I could bring to bear for material, but—and I say this with all respect—beyond hurling half a dozen dictionaries across the floor I know of nothing substantial that the right hon. gentleman has said. He was very much bothered about the definition of "confidential"; that word bothered him very much. He almost committed himself, however, to this, that if we on this side of the House agreed upon what "confidential" meant, and if it was the same as the amendment, possibly he would vote for it. I am prepared to tell the right hon. gentleman that those of us who have been in this House for the last sixteen or twenty years know what the practice of Liberal and Conservative governments have been in respect to withholding matters that they considered confidential, and bringing down matters that they did not deem confidential. In the seventeen years I have been in this House I never heard of a motion from either side, Liberal or Conservative, finding fault with any government or minister for having to refuse to bring down documents on the ground that they were confidential and that the bringing of them down was not in the best interest of the country. It was always left to the judgment of the minister and the Government as to whether or not they should be brought down. There might perhaps be a little fault finding but never within my memory has there been any motion censuring a government or minister for deeming such and such matters to be confidential.

There is not the slightest question about what is meant by this motion. The motion allows for the exercise of discretion on the part of the Government as to what shall be deemed confidential, and therefore to be withheld. That certainly was the purpose of the language of the motion; otherwise, it would have had no meaning at all. I absolutely agree with the definition given by the senior member for Halifax (Mr. Maclean), who called upon the leader of the Opposition to correct him if he did not agree with him. There was no correction and the hon. gentleman went on with his speech. Consequently, I submit to the right hon. gentleman that the leader of the Opposition agreed with the position taken by the senior member for Halifax (Mr. Maclean) and that the amendment as put forward bears the meaning and intent which the senior member for Halifax puts upon it. That being the case, I will call upon the right hon. gentleman to support this amendment, and to advise his friends to support it, because according to the view I take, it is left largely, if not altogether, to the Government as to what shall and shall not be brought down.

The attitude that some wise men take is peculiar. The right hon. gentleman says that this amendment is premature. He says that we should not move this amendment until we have the information. Suppose we had not moved it until we had information. Then he would have said we were ridiculous for moving for information which we then possessed. What shall we do with gentlemen of that kind? We are moving for this information at the psychological moment, as my right hon. friend would say. How could we move for information of this kind except on a motion for the House to go into Committee of Supply? What is the object of this rule, which obtains both in Great Britain and here, that there must be a motion made before Mr. Speaker leaves the Chair for the House to go into Committee of Supply? This House goes into Committee of the Whole on public and private Bills and a host of other Bills, but it is only in the case of the House going into Committee of Supply that a motion must be made that the Speaker do leave the Chair. Why is that? Because the Government are coming to the House and asking for the expenditure of the people's money, and it is the right of the House to say whether or not they have put themselves in such a position as justifies the granting of that money. Now, the idea of this amendment is that the whole circumstances in connection with the expenditure of moneys in the Railway Department shall be thrashed out. I am here representing a certain number of people, and when I go back to my constituency, they will naturally be anxious to know something about this $70,000,000 deficit in connection with the Government Railways. I shall say that I do not know, that we were just told there was a lump sum, and, having asked the Prime Minister for information, were informed that it was not in the interests of the country that we should have that information, the railways being under the control of some incorporated company, and that we should therefore refrain from asking anything about them. Well—this is what my constituents will say—did you ask anyone else for information? Yes, I will reply; we asked the Minister of Railways, but he just parroted out the same words as uttered by the Prime Minister, to the effect that it was not in

the public welfare that the people should be told anything about the railways. My electors, if we did not introduce such an amendment as this, would then want to know why we voted for the expenditure of these moneys in the blind way in which this House is called upon to do. Why should the House be expected to play "blind man's buff" in matters of this kind? Why, Sir, seventy or eighty millions of the people's money is at stake, and we desire to be able to tell the electors that we did all we could to induce the Government to submit the facts, dividing the House upon the question, even though there might be a majority on the other side to vote us down. This is the kind of Government we have to-day, in the face of the situation with which we now have to deal; and my right hon. friend finds fault with the hon. member for Shelburne and Queen's (Mr. Fielding), because that gentleman in his opinion, uses strong words! I do not quite understand this Sunday school simplicity of my right hon. friend.

Sir GEORGE FOSTER: A simple mind.

Mr. McKENZIE: From the superficial knowledge which we can gather of this Government, it is not only hard words that they need. They need that instrument which a better man than the hon. member for Shelburne and Queen's made use of; someone should take hold of the cord and whip them out of their seats. That is what should be done, and my right hon. friend should be thankful that he has not been brought into contact with some more material, more drastic and more painful instrument of persuasion than mere words and allusions to dark lanterns. Now, we are told by the Prime Minister, in his most solicitous and attractive tones, that he is very anxious to give us information. He wants to tell us everything about the expenditure of moneys in connection with the railways, but the Department of Railways is not to be trusted; we cannot get it through that department. But, he says, the senior member for Halifax (Mr. Maclean) has found a remedy for all these evils; he is going to appoint another fifth wheel to the coach and add to the many standing committees we have now. He is going to appoint a standing committee before which—says my right hon. friend—you shall go and drink in abundantly all the information you require to your heart's content, and the public will know nothing about the matter. Did anyone ever hear a more childish proposition than that? I have been attending committees in this House for the last 17 or 18 years, and, Mr. Speaker, I never saw a committee sitting behind closed doors. I never saw a committee on any business of importance where we did not have rail-birds all around us, representing every newspaper in the country, gobbling up every sentence worth hearing. Does the right hon. gentleman think that when this great carcase is produced and thrown into open daylight, these same rail-birds will not again be on the scene? I think he is presuming too much if he thinks that their curiosity is so satiated with the deliverance of the Minister of Railways that they will not be on the qui vive for further trade. My belief is that they will, and, as the immortal Burns puts it, if they get any information, they will "prent it," and the country will know exactly what this great concern is doing.

If we are to have information, why not let us get it through the proper channel? I submit that the Department of Railways is the legitimate, proper and constitutional source from which to get information about every dollar of money expended in connection with the railways in this country. Neither I, nor the members supporting the Government, nor any other member of this House, should be charged with the responsibility of chasing around after witnesses outside of this House in order to get information. We are maintaining a department of railways with a large staff. If that staff is not adequate in order to supply this House with such information as is absolutely necessary, I am willing to accord them whatever assistance they require to obtain that information so that we may have it in the constitutional way, from the mouth of the responsible minister at the head of the department.

The floor of Parliament is the place to inquire for and obtain information concerning every department, for the benefit of the people. That is the position we take, and I think it can be supported before any intelligent audience, either in this House or outside. I am very much surprised that any earnest, intelligent member of this House should think of voting against the amendment. We have in this country nineteen or twenty different departments, every one of them a spending body. The right hon. gentleman said there was no legitimate comparison in the matter of expenditures between the Department of Railways and Department of Public Works. But, Mr. Speaker, is it not entirely a question of degree? One spends more money than the other, undoubtedly, but they both

spend money. If one spends ten millions and the other three hundred millions, are we not just as much entitled to information in the latter case as in the former? If the people of the country are entitled to know what moneys are expended in the Public Works Department, are they not, logically, equally entitled to be informed as to the expenditures in connection with the Department of Railways? I urge these arguments upon all sane men in this House representing the people. We have the following departments: Public Works, Militia and Defence, Marine and Fisheries and Naval Affairs, Interior, Agriculture, Immigration and Colonization, Finance, Mines, Justice, Labour, Post Office, Soldiers' Civil Re-establishment, Customs, Trade and Commerce, the Department of the Secretary of State, the Department of the Solicitor General, the Department of External Affairs, and the Railway Department. There we have seventeen departments apart from the railways. Now, this amendment says that we are entitled to get an accounting of every dollar spent in every department in connection with the Government. Suppose we leave out the Railway Department, we say, in effect, if this amendment is not adopted, that in connection with seventeen departments, spending millions of money, we are not entitled to any information; and I gather from the attitude of the right hon. gentleman and those supporting the Prime Minister, that they contend, and will so vote, that we should have no accounting at all from any of these departments. When the members supporting the Government go back to their constituencies they will be questioned about the expenditures in the different public departments, and they will be asked "Did you vote that the House should have the information asked for?" They will have to reply truthfully "No, we voted against the amendment of the leader of the Opposition," and the people then will realize that they are not to have any information at all as to these matters.

Mr. BUTTS: I would like to know whether or not my hon. friend is arguing for a reduction in the workingmen's pay?

Mr. McKENZIE: I do not think my hon. friend could have been in the House when the amendment was read, or he would fully understand that it has nothing whatever to do with the increase or reduction of the workingmen's pay. When my hon. friend reads the amendment itself he will find that my version of it is absolutely correct. Now, Sir, I pointed out that we have this large amount of money to spend in nineteen or twenty departments, and we have hon. gentlemen sitting in this House, and we have a Government who tell us that we are not to have any information whatever about that expenditure except what the Government, in their graciousness and good nature, may possibly bring down. We are to be something like the woman who said that she would be perfectly satisfied by feeding on the crumbs that fell from the table of her lord. We are therefore to recognize the right hon. gentleman who has just addressed the House, and his confreres in the Government, as lords of that type. We must sit down at their feet and wait for some little crumb of information to be thrown to us which they may regard as worthy of our acceptance. That is the attitude taken by the Government, and that is the position in which we are placed.

I am astonished and surprised at the stand taken by my good friend from Red Deer (Mr. Clark) who has come to us in this country, from the very feet of Gamaliel and who is telling us occasionally, and almost all the time, that he imbibed his Liberalism from the great Gladstone himself. Now if there is anything that Gladstone taught more strongly than another it was the principle of the people ruling and governing, of the people being placed in full possession of every item of information that was necessary for the proper carrying on of the business of the country. I am surprised, therefore, that my hon. friend should lay himself open to the chage of sinning against the light; that he should come here evidently prepared to cast in his lot with the scribes and pharisees on the other side of the House who are willing to shut out every particle of information from Parliament. I think we have demonstrated beyond all question, Sir, that we are entitled to proper information about the moneys that have already been spent, and the moneys that are to be spent in the current year. What becomes of the argument that secrecy must prevail about the business of this Government? We are satisfied to get the information that is to be found in the Auditor General's Report with respect to every department, and we should not expect to go any further. That report deals with business that has been done and finished with nearly a year ago. Is this secrecy to last forever? If railway ties or locomotives have been bought and paid for, if millions have been spent on betterments for the

national railways, and the transactions are finished and closed, surely the information with respect to them can be brought down to Parliament? Could anything be more absurd than to say that the policy of secrecy and exclusiveness is to last forever, and that after a transaction is closed and everything with respect to it is done, we in this House cannot find out how it was carried out and what has become of our money? Surely, as I have already said, what is true about accounts that we find in the Auditor General's Report should also be true, and the same practice followed in connection with the Department of Railways.

I lay down the principle, and I am not laying down aything new, when I say in regard to every department of Government that we cannot in this House depart from the principle of ministerial responsibility to the extent of one inch. We cannot do it; there is no safe ground outside a firm maintenance of that principle. The moment you abandon the principle of the responsibility of ministers in connection with the expenditure of public money you have no safe ground upon which to stand, and the people are deprived of responsible government in this country. The moment you switch the responsibility for all kinds of expenditures to any corporation, or any body of men, who are not called upon to come before Parliament and, through the proper channels, explain the situation in which they stand and the way in which they have expended public money, that is the situation with which you are faced. The Government is not simply coming to us to-day to make good the amount of $70,000,000, although that itself is a very large amount. Somebody, during the debate, spoke about it as being more than the entire expenditure of the Dominion of Canada some twelve or thirteen years ago. When the right hon. gentleman, who a short time ago was Prime Minister of Canada, issued his manifesto in 1911 he told the people that the expenditure of eighty-seven millions of money was in itself evidence of recklessness and corruption—that it evidenced that money had been mis-spent in this country. We are close to that amount to-day in the deficit in one department of Government, and yet we are told that we must shut our mouths and have nothing to say about it. What would my right hon. friend say if things were reversed, and he was standing on this side of the House and supporting the present amendment? There would then be no dictionaries thrown around; the missiles would be hard rocks and they would be hurled at us in such a way that the life of nobody in our ranks would be safe. But now the right hon. gentleman is suave and calm and finds fault with any man who writes his name in black letters on white paper because it might look like "a dark lantern," or something which reflected on the character of the saintly gentlemen who sit on the treasury benches. Not only are we asked to make good this sum of $70,000,000, but any person who looks at pages 34, 35 and 36 of the Estimates will find that in connection with railways alone we are called upon to vote in the vicinity of $165,000,000, which money will have to come out of the hard earned wages of the poor people of this country. Yet we are to sit here and accept the general statement of the Minister of Railways, which gives us no information at all upon which a right conclusion could be reached. Finally, let me say that we are asking for nothing but what is fair and reasonable when we demand that Parliament and the people be given the fullest possible information about expenditures in every department, including the Department of Railways.

Mr. BUTTS: Will my hon. friend allow me just one question? Who are the members of the dark-lantern brigade?

Some hon. MEMBERS: Order.

The House divided on the proposed amendment of Mr. Mackenzie King, which was negiated on the following division:

YEAS

Messrs.

Archambault,	Gervais,
Baldwin,	Gordon,
Béland,	Gould,
Boivin,	Halbert,
Bourassa,	Hunt,
Boyer,	Jacobs,
Brouillard,	Kay,
Bureau,	Kennedy (Glengarry
Cahill,	Kennedy (Glengary
Cannon,	and Stormont),
Cardin,	King,
Casgrain,	Lanctôt,
Chisholm,	Lapointe,
Copp,	Lavigueur,
d'Anjou,	Leduc,
Délisle,	Léger,
Demers,	Lemieux,
Denis,	Lesage,
Desaulniers,	Maclean (Halifax),
Deslauriers,	McCrea,
Duff,	McDermand,
Euler,	McDonald,
Fafard,	McGibbon (Argenteuil),
Fielding,	McKenzie,
Fontaine,	McMaster,
Fortier,	Marcil
Fournier,	(Bonaventure),

Marcile (Bagot),
Mayrand,
Michaud,
Molloy,
Murphy,
Pacaud,
Papineau,
Parent,
Pedlow,
Pelletier,
Power,
Prevost,
Rinfret,
Robb,
Ross,
Savard,
Séguin,
Sinclair (Antigonish & Guysborough),
Sinclair (Queen, P.E.I.),
Stein,
Thomson (Qu'Appelle),
Trahan,
Truax,
Turgeon,
Verville,
Vien,
White (Victoria)—79.

NAYS

Messrs.

Allan,
Anderson,
Andrews,
Argue,
Armstrong (Lambton),
Armstrong (York),
Arthurs,
Ball,
Best,
Blair,
Bolton,
Bonnell,
Borden (Sir Robert),
Bowman,
Boyce,
Brien,
Bristol,
Butts,
Casselman,
Chabot,
Chaplin,
Charters,
Clark (Bruce),
Clark (Red Deer),
Clarke (Wellington),
Clements,
Cockshutt,
Cooper,
Cowan,
Crerar,
Cronyn,
Crothers,
Crowe,
Cruise,
Currie,
Davidson,
Davis,
Doherty,
Douglas (Strathcona),
Douglas (Cape Breton S. & Richmond),
Drayton (Sir Henry),
Edwards,
Elkin,
Finley,
Foster (Sir George),
Foster (York),
Fraser,
Fripp,
Fulton,
Gauthier,
Glass,
Green,
Griesbach,
Guthrie,
Halladay,
Harold,
Harrison,
Hartt,
Hay,
Henders,
Hocken,
Hughes (Sir Sam),
Keefer,
Kemp (Sir Edward),
Knox,
Lang,
Long,
MacKelvie,
Mackie (Edmonton),
Mackie (Renfrew),
MacNutt,
McCurdy,
McGibbon (Muskoka),
McGregor,
McIntosh.
McIsaac,
McQuarrie,
Maharg,
Martin,
Meighen,
Merner,
Middlebro,
Morphy,
Mowat,
Munson,
Myers,
Nesbitt,
Nicholson (Algoma),
Paul,
Peck,
Porter,
Redman,
Reid (Grenville),
Reid (Mackenzie),
Sexsmith,
Shaw,
Sheard,
Simpson,
Smith,
Spinney,
Stacey,
Steel,
Stevens,
Stewart (Hamilton),
Stewart (Lanark),
Sutherland,
Thompson (Weyburn),
Thompson (Hastings),
Thompson (Yukon),
Tolmie,
Tremain,
Tweedie,
Whidden,
Wigmore,
Wilson (Wentworth),
Wilson (Saskatoon),
Wright—117.

Messrs.

(The list of Pairs is furnished by the Chief Whips).

PAIRS

Mewburn,	Pardee,
Charlton,	McCoig,
Manion,	Johnston,
Calder,	Gauvreau,
Nicholson (P.E.I.),	Devlin,
Blake,	DuTremblay,
Lalor,	Ethier,
Scott,	Tobin,
Boys,	Lafortune,
Ballantyne,	Déchêne,
McLean (Royal),	Proulx.

Mr. JOHNSTON: I was paired with the hon. member for Fort William and Rainy River (Mr. Manion). Had I voted I would have voted for the amendment.

Hon. Mr. MEWBURN: I was paired with the hon. member for West Lambton (Mr. Pardee). Had I voted I would have voted against the amendment.

Motion agreed to.

SUPPLY

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

Trade and Commerce—Salaries, $371,612.50; contingencies, $22,000.

Mr. CAHILL: Before the minister explains this item I wish to ask the Government if it is their intention, if this item passes, to go into Supply on any other department.

Mr. MEIGHEN: I am not aware of any reason why the question should be specially answered. The Government intends to go on with Supply according to the announcement of last night—such Supply as we can reach within a reasonable time.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: Then my hon. friend intends to proceed with the Estimates of another department?

Mr. MEIGHEN: Yes.

Mr. CAHILL: I want to get an answer to my question because I understand it has been customary in this House, at least since I have been here, for one item to be taken at a time—I mean, one department—unless with the consent of the Opposition. If my hon. friend wishes to follow out the contention he made the other day that he has the right to go into Supply in any department, he may mention one day, all the departments and then the next day go into all departments, taking one item at a time, thus preventing the Opposition from proposing any resolution on the motion to go into Supply. It is not fair; if the attitude taken by the Government

on the first items of Supply is to be followed out and it is their intention to take up two or three items in one night on one motion to go into Supply, the only protection the Opposition has is to prevent the Government from passing the first item of Supply until they tell us how many items, or how many departments they wish to go into at the one sitting.

Mr. MEIGHEN: I think I see the point the hon. member has in mind. He has not expressed himself, though, correctly; he says "items" when he means "departments." Certainly we intend to pass such items as the committee feel they can fairly consider. As to the departments, I see the point the hon. member has in mind; it is that if we take up more than one department to-night we are permitted on Thursdays and Fridays to enter those departments without the consent which the rules call for. That he wishes to avoid, and I can see that there is some fairness in the contention. I would think a fair interpretation would be this: if hon. gentlemen opposite will advise us that they desire to move a general resolution against any department, I think it would only be fair on our side that we should not go into that department except on a day specially appointed so that the resolution could be moved. On the other hand I do not think it is right that the Government should deny itself the privilege of going into more than one department on the same day; otherwise, I do not see how we are going to get on with the Estimates; the House will be delayed too long. The rules of the House permit it. If on Tuesday—for quite a time—the only day available for that purpose—we take only one department at a sitting we shall be going into only one department per week, and if we do that the session will be insufferably long. We have no desire in the world to avoid a motion in amendment on going into Supply if the Opposition wish to challenge any department in that way, and if they will name the particular department they wish to challenge we shall see that a motion to go into Supply, directed chiefly to that department, is made. That seems to me to be fair.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: I may point out to my right hon. friend that we may wish to discuss other matters than simply those relating to one department. There are a good many subjects we would like to discuss on going into Supply. My right hon. friend knows that he can cut us off in the matter of discussion by passing from one department to another in the same night. What we are trying to reserve to ourselves is the right of discussion, not to be cut off in discussion as we have been cut off this afternoon, for example, in the matter of information. My right hon. friend was hardly fair to the member for Pontiac (Mr. Cahill) when he intimated that the hon. gentleman had not expressed himself in a way that could be appreciated. I put the question specifically to my right hon. friend as to departments and he answered that he intended to go into other departments if possible. Why does he say to my hon. friend who has just spoken that he has not presented the matter intelligently?

Mr. MEIGHEN: Because he mentioned items instead of departments and items do not mean departments.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: I mentioned departments.

Mr. MEIGHEN: I know my hon. friend did, and I expressed the intention of the Government. But I do not intend to exercise that intention against the right of the Opposition to challenge a department. I think that is as fair as any government can possibly be. I do not know that the Government is bound to be giving opportunities all the time, aside from the rules of the House, to the Opposition to talk about anything at all. But I do think it is fair on the part of the Government to afford opportunities to the Opposition to challenge any department, notwithstanding that we have full power under the rules to pass from one department to another. I can see that we could abuse that power, but I do not intend to do so. But surely we are fair in saying that if the Opposition will only name the department or departments that they purpose moving resolutions against, we are ready to give them an opportunity to do so by going into Supply on the department concerned. I do not think any government has ever gone that far; I am pretty sure no government will ever go further.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: Why should we be confined to the departments?

Mr. MEIGHEN: That is the purpose of the saving clause in the rules providing that we may not go into Supply on Thursday or Friday save on some department that we have been on before—so that in relation to that department a motion can be made: We do not intend to violate either the letter or the spirit of the rule.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: We might wish to discuss the civil service, for example, which is not a department. Why should we not have that right?

Mr. MEIGHEN: It can be done; there is nothing to prevent it.

Mr. CURRIE: I suggest that this whole discussion is out of order. It is purely hypothetical.

Mr. BUREAU: The discussion is not out of order. I raised the point the other night when the Minister of Justice (Mr. Doherty) wanted to call the estimates for his department. What we wanted to avoid was being debarred from making a motion against that particular department simply because it had been called on that particular night. Just about the time I raised the point the Prime Minister left the chamber and I suggested to the Minister of Trade and Commerce (Sir George Foster) that there be some understanding in the matter. During the twenty years that I have been here it has always been the rule that just before the House rose, the Prime Minister or the minister leading the House would tell the Opposition what particular business and the Estimates of what particular department would be taken up the next day. On the night before, the Prime Minister had said: "Any department which the Government might see fit to take up" or something to that effect. I have not the exact words, but it was repeated the next day, and I called it vague. I thought it was an answer that we did not deserve; that it was an answer that lacked courtesy. I stated at that time that, as a matter of courtesy, it had always been the rule of this House that the Opposition be informed of the work to be taken up the next day, and that the answer of the Prime Minister left the door open by him to taking up, during the discussion of Supply in Committee as to-night, items of the Estimates of more than one department thus debarring the Opposition from making a motion on Thursdays and Fridays.

Mr. CURRIE: I again ask for a ruling that this discussion is out of order. No question is now before the Committee.

Some hon. MEMBERS: Order.

Mr. CURRIE: I ask for your ruling, Mr. Chairman. We are night after night discussing the same question, and under this item a discussion of this question is out of order.

Mr. BUREAU: May I correct a statement I made?

The CHAIRMAN: The hon. member for North Simcoe (Mr. Currie) has risen to a point of order. If the hon. gentleman desires to say anything on the point of order, I would be glad to hear him.

Mr. CURRIE: I will speak to the point of order. For several nights, this House has been entertained with a discussion on this question, which is purely hypothetical. If the Prime Minister makes a motion to go into Supply required by another department the question might properly arise; but that question is not before us now at all, and a discussion of that question is altogether irrelevant to the matter which is before us and which is an item of supply. As regards the matter of discussing what is to come before us, I have sat in this House for a long time, and I have listened to the right hon. gentleman who led the House previously and also to the present hon. member for Shelburne and Queen's (Mr. Fielding) discussing this very question. I notice that when the answer was given to the question, the leader of the Government of the day did not confine himself to one department; that many times as many as four departments were mentioned, and then followed the statement "any other matters that might come before the House." Apart from that altogether, I claim that a discussion of this kind is purely hypothetical, and that there is before the committee nothing that we can discuss this question on.

Mr. BUREAU: I want to correct what I said just now. I said that we could not make a motion on Thursdays and Fridays. What I meant to say was that we could not discuss the point.

Mr. CURRIE: The hon. member is not discussing the point of order.

Mr. BUREAU: My hon. friend has talked about past governments. All that I am saying now is in regard to what has happened within the past week.

Mr. CURRIE: We have heard enough.

The CHAIRMAN: I would ask the hon. member for Three Rivers (Mr. Bureau) to remain within the rule and to speak to the point of order.

Mr. BUREAU: According to your ruling, if this item passes, any minister may call an item of another department, and then on Thursdays and Fridays, we will go into their estimates automatically.

Mr. CURRIE: That is not the point of order.

Mr. BUREAU: That is the point of order. There is nothing else before the Chair. I submit the point of order is not well taken.

Mr. CANNON: We have heard a military man explaining the law; I will try, as a lawyer, to discuss the point of order as I understand it. I understand, when the Government moves to go into Supply, the rule is—

The CHAIRMAN: The point of order now before the Chair is whether or not hon. gentlemen have a right to discuss the point of order to which the hon. member for Dorchester (Mr. Cannon) is about to refer.

Mr. CANNON: I was just going to explain that I have a right to discuss the point of order just mentioned, and I wish to discuss it. The point of order is whether we can be precluded by the Government from moving an amendment to the motion to go into Supply if items in connection with more than one department are discussed at one sitting. If this is not the point of order, I think it about time that the Chairman should explain to the committee what the point of order really is.

Mr. LAPOINTE: (Translation.) Mr. Chairman, if I may be permitted, I should like to discuss the point of order. The question submitted to us seems to be this: Have we the right, before discussing the first item that has been submitted to this committee, to know beforehand from the Government whether or not they intend to proceed with the Estimates of any other department.

I am very glad, indeed, to have been able to find out what is the real question put before you. I think we have that right, in order to avoid such a misunderstanding as we had last week. It is important for the Opposition that this question be settled once for all. It is true that we are entitled, I believe, even after discussing a few Estimates of the various departments, to introduce resolutions on the motion for the House to go into Supply, barring Thursdays and Fridays, but we could not move concerning a particular department after the Estimates of that department had been previously considered.

Mr. MORPHY: Mr. Chairman, will the hon. member allow me a question?

Mr. LAPOINTE: Certainly.

Mr. MORPHY: What is the point of order?

[Mr. Currie.[

Mr. LAPOINTE: The point of order is to know—as I have stated previously—whether, before taking up the Estimates, we have the right to secure from the Government a statement to the effect that they will not consider to-night the Estimates of any other department. I believe that the point of order raised by the hon. member from Simcoe (Mr. Currie) is not well taken and that we are entitled to proceed with that discussion.

The CHAIRMAN: The hon. member for North Simcoe (Mr. Currie) has risen to a point of order which has been fully discussed by the hon. members for Dorchester (Mr. Cannon) and for Quebec East (Mr. Lapointe). The point of order raised by the hon. member for North Simcoe is whether or not any hon. member has the right to question the leader of the Government concerning his intentions in regard to the passing of Estimates and the number of departments which are to be taken up at the present sitting. The question now before the Committee is item No. 21 which provides for the salaries and contingencies of the Department of Trade and Commerce. Strictly speaking, the point taken by the hon. member for North Simcoe is well taken, as the question asked is not relevant to that item. The Chairman would, however, hesitate to rule that a question concerning the conduct of the business of the Committee could not be asked at any time with a view to securing a better understanding between the two or three parties in the House, and thus expediting the business of Parliament. The question asked while it was not relevant, was a very reasonable one and the answer having been given, I will now ask hon. members to return to a discussion of the item under consideration.

Mr. BUREAU: I notice an increase of about $9,000 in the item for salaries.

Sir GEORGE FOSTER: The amount asked for is $371,612.50 for salaries, and $22,000 for contingencies. The total number of employees provided for 1921-22, as will be seen by the details, is 278, for which the total annual salaries amount to $371,612.50. The original Estimates for 1920-21 provided for 221 employees at $291,089.50. To that there has been added by the transfer of 57 employes under P.C. 2958, $49,763. That Order in Council provided that permanent temporaries employed in the different departments who came in before a certain date, and whose services were efficient and satisfactory,

should be put upon the permanent list by the Civil Service Commission. Instead of these transfers being carried by outside votes, they have been transferred to civil government. That accounts for $49,763. Then the reclassification raised the salaries to the amount of $20,862.50. Adding these together we get the Estimate for the coming year of $371,612.50. For 1921-22 the staff remains at 278 employees, exactly the same as it was before. The net amount required for salary increases is $9,897. So we have in the whole service exactly the same number of employees, the increases being due to transfers and reclassification.

Mr. VIEN: What are the duties of the Director of Commercial Intelligence?

Sir GEORGE FOSTER: The present Director of Commercial Intelligence is one of the oldest and most experienced of our trade commisioners. He commenced service in South Africa, was afterwards in South America, and afterwards went to the war where he served two or three years. Then he was sent on a mission of inspection of trade commissionerships throughout the world. He has now taken the position of Director of Commercial Intelligence Service. He has under him the whole staff of trade commissioners. He has also the direction of the whole staff of Commercial Intelligence, which includes instructions to our commissioners in different parts of the world, the reception of reports therefrom, their examination, their editing, their publication in the Weekly Bulletin, and all the correspondence with business men in Canada who have more or less trade in connection with these different countries in which our trade commissioners exercise their functions. He is, in fact, the head of that very large and important branch.

Mr. JACOBS: Where is he now?

Sir GEORGE FOSTER: In the office here in Ottawa. He has returned from his visit of inspection. He was promoted to his present office after competition.

Mr. JACOBS: How many trade commissioners are there altogether?

Sir GEORGE FOSTER: I could answer that more fully on a more appropriate item, but I might say we have between twenty and thirty trade commissioners.

Mr. VIEN: Has the Director of Commercial Intelligence the duty of organizing trade agencies abroad? Does he advise the minister on the organization of such agencies?

Sir GEORGE FOSTER: Absolutely so.

Mr. VIEN: Has he recommended any trade mission or agency in the United States?

Sir GEORGE FOSTER: No.

Mr. VIEN: Has he studied that question?

Sir GEORGE FOSTER: Perhaps I might give my hon. friend a short statement which would bring that matter up in a better way. We have not as a policy instituted trade commissionerships in the United States. We have none there now; we never have had.

Mr. VIEN: Why?

Sir GEORGE FOSTER: Before the war, I commenced to study with my officers the question of the advisability of extending the service to the United States and considerable progress was made in the examination of the whole question. The war, however, intervened and it was not carried through. After the armistice I took up the question again, and since then the matter has been pretty thoroughly examined. We have not as yet adopted the policy of extending our trade commissionerships to the United States, but the matter is now under consideration, and I hope we shall arrive at a decision in respect to it before the close of this session, because if it is decided to extend them to the United States we shall have to have legislation providing therefor.

Mr. JACOBS: I would suggest that they be called "truck-and-trade" commissioners.

Sir GEORGE FOSTER: My own view from the first has been that there was not the same necessity for a system of trade commissioners in the United States as in more distant countries. The United States lying alongside of Canada for a distance of 3,000 or 4,000 miles, having the most intimate relations both as regards our resources and the demand and supply of both countries, with the best facilities for quick travel to and fro, with an intimate knowledge of markets and market possibilities, with the numerous interminglings commercial and otherwise between the United States and Canada, the knowledge that existed was so much greater and so much more widely distributed with reference to the United States than to other countries that there was not the same necessity for trade commissioners. Besides,

we have taken up this matter of trade commissioners in a gradual way, and the expenses in connection therewith are, of course, proportionate to the distribution. If we undertook to put commercial agents in the United States, it would be very difficult to avoid placing a large number of them there. The United States covers a wide territory, and our commercial activities extend from one coast to the other, and from the forty-ninth degree down to the southern limit of the country. All these considerations have contributed to delay and have been the reasons why the department, under former governments as under the Government of the present day, has not thought fit to extend the system to the United States.

Mr. VIEN: I do not wish to be—

Sir GEORGE FOSTER: Perhaps the hon. gentleman will allow me to interrupt him. I might say to him that if we agree to bring up these matters when we come to the votes for them, I think we should be able to expedite the business of the committee.

Mr. VIEN: I beg to remind my right hon. friend that I am strictly within the purview of the vote.

Sir GEORGE FOSTER: I am not raising any question as to my hon. friend's right to put questions, and I will answer him. I am, however, just suggesting that we proceed from item to item in an orderly way. I have an item of two or three hundred thousand dollars for trade commissionerships and trade extension, and in connection with that, I think we can discuss to better advantage the matter which my hon. friend is now dealing with. I just put that to my hon. friend.

Mr. VIEN: I put a question to the minister a moment ago: Has the Director of Commercial Intelligence the duty of recommending to the minister the organization of trade commissions abroad? The right hon. gentleman said; yes. Then I put another question: Has the minister received any suggestion from that official as to the establishment of trade commissions in the United States? The minister replied in the negative. He said: No, he has made no such suggestion, but I have myself, with the assistance of my expert on that question, studied the matter, and thus far, owing to the war and other prevailing conditions, we have not deemed it advisable to establish such trade commissions in the United States. Now, I say that the item which is now before the committee is a proper one in connection with which to discuss the policy of establishing trade commissions in the United States, because according to the answer given by the minister, it is within the scope of the duties of the Director of Commercial Intelligence to suggest such organizations and appointments. I must offer to the minister a humble suggestion, not in the way of drastic or destructive criticism, but for the purpose of assisting him. He is of opinion that the time is not opportune to establish trade commissions in the United States; but that time may arrive before this session is very much older, and then it will mean a vote of a large amount of money to provide for such commissions.

Mr. CURRIE: May I ask the hon. member what he means by "trade commission"? I fail to grasp his meaning, although I have been waiting patiently to gather the significance of his remarks.

Mr. VIEN: A trade commission is an institution, and the trade commissioner is the officer who discharges the duties appertaining to that commission.

Some hon. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

Mr. CASGRAIN: Listen and learn something.

Mr. VIEN: My hon. friend no doubt receives the weekly bulletins issued by the Department of Trade and Commerce, and he should know what a trade commission is, and what are the duties of a trade commissioner. By the way, may I congratulate the Department of Trade and Commerce on the publication of these weekly bulletins, which are extremely interesting and which should be of value to the trade and commerce of Canada generally. Unfortunately, in my opinion at any rate, they are circumscribed in their application, because we have no trade commissioners in some parts of the world where we should have them. The minister says that up to the present time there has been no necessity for them in the United States. On the contrary, I contend that we should have had them there for some time past. Our proximity to the United States is absolutely immaterial to the question which we are now studying. The purpose of establishing trade commissions, and appointing trade commissioners in the United States, is to open new markets in that country for Canadian industries. The situation is not

affected by any question of space, for the same distance separates us from each other. Yet the American Republic have consuls in Canada, being represented in almost every town. What are these commissioners doing in Canada?—because these American consuls accomplish here what our trade commissioners do abroad. They collect information as to the openings that exist in Canada for their manufactures, and they send that information to their State Department and keep their industries posted on opportunities that offer in Canada. The right hon. gentleman says we need not have any trade commissions in the United States because of our proximity thereto.

Sir GEORGE FOSTER: Perhaps it might be of some importance to say that I did not say that.

Mr. VIEN: That is what I understood.

Sir GEORGE FOSTER: Then my hon. friend went further than my words would warrant. What I did say was that up to the present time none had been appointed. I did say also that under all administrations no appointments had been made, that I had taken the matter up before the war, had suspended it, and then took it up again after the armistice, and that it was now being very carefully looked into. I gave my own opinion as I viewed the matter in the light of the past. I then said that the government was considering the subject, and that their policy would be announced before the close of the session.

Mr. VIEN: The right hon. gentleman said that but he also said a minute ago that we were so close to the Republic to the south.

Sir GEORGE FOSTER: I did and I said so because it was an argument why, to my mind—and it seems to have been an argument which commended itself to the department—as matters stood it was less necessary for us to have trade commissioners there than in other countries.

Mr. VIEN: On the contrary to my mind it was much more imperative that we should have trade commissioners there.

Sir GEORGE FOSTER: That is all right; my hon. friend has a perfect right to his opinion.

Mr. VIEN: And it is a right which I am now exercising with due respect to the right hon. gentleman. To my mind it is more imperative to establish trade commissioners in the United States because we trade more with that country. The American Republic did not hesitate, nothwithstanding the close proximity of the United States to Canada, to appoint American consuls here. What was the net result? The net result was that they have developed an export trade to Canada of nearly $900,000,000 a year. Our lack of organization has, to a great degree, prevented the expansion of our export trade to the United States. Such an organization would have been a great assistance in the development of Canadian trade with the United States. These trade agents, established in numerous centres of the American Republic, would have opened the eyes of the Trade and Commerce Department of the Dominion to the business openings which offered to Canadian manufacturers, and in turn that department could have kept our manufacturers posted with respect to those opportunities. Then we probably could have developed an export trade with the United States which would have offset, to a certain degree at least, the present adverse trade balance which is so injurious to the credit of Canada. I think, Sir, that the time has come, in fact it is long overdue, when we should pay closer attention to our relations with the United States with a view to developing our export trade to that country. That opinion must have been entertained by the present Government when they brought down legislation creating the position of Canadian Ambassador at Washington. When they did that they contended that the time had come when a Canadian representative should reside in Washington and look after Canadian interests. I do not share the opinion of the Government as to the method they then suggested. I think that our representative in Washington should by no means be linked up with the British Embassy. He should not be the vice-ambassador of the British Empire in Washington, he should be absolutely untrammeled and should represent Canadian interests exclusively: If we pay for a Canadian representative at Washington, or for Canadian trade agents in that country, it is only fair that they should work for Canada first. If we send a representative to Washington who will be attached to the British Embassy the results of his work will be compiled and will be available for the benefit of those in whose interest the British Embassy is established. We know that England does not send financial agents, or trade commissioners, or consuls, or consular agents, to the United States to produce a wider market for Can-

adian manufacturers. They are live wires, they look out for British manufacturers and they act wisely in so doing. If Canada wishes to develop her trade with the United States her duty is not to reply upon other representatives, whether they be British consuls, vice-consuls, or consular agents. Canada should see to it that Canadians who have only Canadian interests at heart are appointed. They should work for Canada. They should not report to the British Ambassador, but report directly to our Minister of Trade and Commerce for the benefit of Canadian industries. Who could blame the British Embassy at Washington for collecting and sending to British manufacturing the information that the trade agents of England collect in the United States? Nobody could blame them; they are appointed for that very purpose and they are paid out of the British Exchequer. If we want to develop our export trade to the United States we should imitate England's example. We should not put our Canadian representative under the guidance and control of the British Ambassador, but place him under the exclusive control of the Canadian Government. To my mind this is one of the steps which this Government should take and I humbly offer the suggestion to my right hon. friend, adding that in my opinion it was imperative to have done that long ago but more imperative than ever to-day.

Mr. CURRIE: I am very much interested in the remarks which have fallen from the hon. gentleman, and I would like to ask him a question before we pass from this topic. He is indulging in what he himself calls constructive criticism. Following that line I would ask him in what particular line of manufactures we could increase our export to the United States to a greater extent than we are now doing?

Mr. VIEN: In all kinds of manufactures.

Mr. CURRIE: My hon. friend is merely speaking in general terms.

Mr. VIEN: Let my hon. friend wait a minute. We have in Canada a number of manufacturers, but what is the prevailing condition? Canada is a narrow strip of four thousand miles in length and only sparsely populated. We have in Quebec city, for example, a manufacturer of boots and shoes. What must he do to market his goods? He has to travel three thousand miles to find a mere handful of customers in Vancouver or Victoria. The closer he is to the consumer the better. Now across the international boundary line, only fifty or one hundred miles away from his factory, there is a population of millions who could use the boots and shoes which he manufactures. There is a great market at his very door, but he has not trade commissioners to assist him in obtaining it. He has not developed that market, and yet boots and shoes enter the United States duty free. If instead of catering for a handful of customers in Victoria and the other cities of British Columbia he tried to organize his market to the south of the boundary line, although he would have to meet competition there, yet he would have equal chances with his American rivals, because he can produce just as cheaply as they can.

Mr. STEVENS: May I ask my hon. friend a question? Why could not that manufacturer send a traveller fifty or one hundred miles south, as my hon. friend suggests, just as easily as he could send him 3,000 miles west without a trade commissioner shepherding that traveller?

Mr. VIEN: We are now discussing trade commissioners, and if the argument of my hon. friend is sound it would apply to our trade commissioners all over the world.

Mr. STEVENS: Not necessarily.

Mr. VIEN: We have trade commissioners in England, Holland, Denmark, France and other European countries. Why should not the Canadian manufacturers send their agents over there—as so many do—and dispense with our trade commissioners? That would be the argument of my hon. friend.

Mr. STEVENS: I did not make an argument; I simply asked a question of my hon. friend.

Mr. VIEN: Make it a suggestion, then. That suggestion of my hon. friend applies as well to the trade commissioners that we have already established in every country as to trade commissioners in America.

Mr. STEVENS: Not at all.

Mr. VIEN: The Department of Trade and Commerce is established, not to supersede the activities of our manufacturers, but to help them out. And if it has been found a happy medium to develop our trade in other countries, why should it not be an equally happy medium to develop our trade in the United States, where we do such a great volume of business? That is the reason why I say that trade commissioners established in the United States would be able to give valuable assistance

to our manufacturers in developing export business there.

Mr. CURRIE: I have no desire to delay the item, and I regret very much that the suggestion of the right hon. gentleman (Sir George Foster) was not accepted in order that we might have a more thorough discussion of trade commissioners at a future date. Evidently the hon. gentleman who has just sat down is of the opinion that the business men and manufacturers of Canada are not wide awake to the American market.

Mr. VIEN: That is quite true.

Mr. CURRIE: He is entirely mistaken.

Mr. VIEN: You are correct.

Mr. CURRIE: If there is anything going on in the United States in the way of business, or if there is any market opening for any of the products of the factories of Canada, our manufacturers are quite ready to do business. In fact my hon. friend will find that the very item he has referred to—shoes—is exported to the United States by our manufacturers. The functions of the commissioners operating in the United States as compared with the functions of the American consuls are entirely different. The American consul gets information, but I never yet saw one in Canada shepherding a bunch of American commercial travellers through the country. If he did so we would very much resent it.

Mr. VIEN: I may tell the hon. gentleman that I have come in contact with American consuls trying to help their manufacturers to find a market in Canada.

Mr. CURRIE: I must have been particularly unfortunate, for I have never seen any of them. The principal thing they do, so far as my knowledge of them goes, is simply to take a fee when you make an affidavit before them and draw big salaries. They are not functioning any more than the British ambassadors are in the way of finding markets. They supply information, of course, to their government, but they are not going around looking for orders.

Now, I will say this for the Department of Trade and Commerce: In my personal experience of world trade I can safely say that no finer lot of business men could be sent to foreign countries than have been sent by the department within the last four or five years. The Canadian manufacturers owe a deep debt of gratitude to the young men who have been sent, for instance, to China, India, Japan, Australia, New Zealand and South America. They take great pains to establish connections with our manufacturers here and to instruct us as to what line of goods we can sell there to advantage, and millions of dollars worth of Canadian goods have been sold in those markets through the instrumentality of those men. Nothing more useful has been done for Canada in fifty years than the work these men have accomplished in the last five or six years, when we needed markets badly, and when the markets of the world were open to us because German and other foreign competition was withdrawn. The fact that Canadian factories have taken the place of the factories of the Entente and supplied millions of dollars worth of goods to those countries is largely due to those clever young men sent out by the Department of Trade and Commerce. I wish to bear testimony to the very effective work they have done, and to say that this country can do nothing that is too good for them. Of course, occasionally a square peg gets into a round hole, but that has not occurred very often recently, and the work of these commissioners must commend itself to every Canadian who has had anything to do with them.

Unfortunately, for the moment our trade with Australia and New Zealand, which had reached very large proportions, is now cut off, largely due to the fact that those two Dominions have no credits with Canada. I do not wish to trespass on the rules of the House, but I would suggest that the Government should seriously take into consideration the granting of credit to Australia and New Zealand so that that trade may be continued until such time as those two countries have reached the point where normal conditions might be said to have been re-established.

Mr. VIEN: What is the nature of our shipments to those countries?

Mr. CURRIE: All kinds of manufactured goods.

Mr. McMASTER: That is general.

Mr. CURRIE: No, it is not general in Australia, but I say that we have displaced Germany and England in the Australian market for most lines of manufactured goods. The depression, as the hon. gentleman has said, is general so far as those two Dominions are concerned, but that condition of affairs does not extend to China, India and Japan; their credit is ample here, and they can pay for anything they buy from us. Unfortunately, how-

ever, Australia and New Zealand have not the funds now to pay for goods that they would very much like to purchase from us. They would buy millions of dollars worth of manufactured goods from us in the next five or six months if some form of credit was arranged whereby they could pay for those purchases.

Mr. VIEN: In what particular lines?

Mr. CURRIE: Every line of manufactured goods—for instance, textiles and hardware. We have sold millions of dollars worth of hardware in Australia and New Zealand. They require all kinds of goods such as we use in the ordinary carrying on of business here, and which we manufacture. There is a good market for those goods in Australia and New Zealand, but we cannot fill that market at the present time.

I might say also in the same connection that the Government must seriously take into consideration the question of export freight rates. If we are going to do business in those countries we must have lower freight charges. There is no use for our trade commissioners to go to those countries and get thousands of dollars' worth of business while our freight rates compare so unfavourably with the freight rates, for instance, from Philadelphia and from Pittsburg. The rate from Pittsburg to Hong Kong is now about $27, and the Canadian rate will run to $37. You cannot do business under those conditions. The last hoist given to Canadian freight rates has cut away all our foreign trade; the decline in Canada's foreign trade during the last three months is entirely due to that fact. It was freight rates that gave Germany the benefit of the markets of the world. A manufacturer in Munich would get a through freight rate to Smyrna just as a manufacturer in Hamburg could, and that rate was at least two-thirds less than from Liverpool or from London. If we are to maintain our foreign trade we must nurse it along. But I must bear testimony to the young men who have been employed by this department as trade agents. From all quarters of the globe—Argentine, Brazil, South Africa—they send communications stating that so-and-so wants to sell certain lines of goods; that Canadian goods are known in that district and that an interchange of business is desired. Reverting to the United States, the question has been discussed of establishing Canadian chambers of commerce. It would be of vast benefit to this country if Canadian chambers of commerce could be established in all the large centres of the world. The offices set up in this connection would be a centre for all the Canadians carrying on business in a particular locality, a place in which our agents might have a desk when they went there, and where they could consult with the trade commissioner. I am satisfied that the foreign trade of Canada would be enormously increased if such chambers of commerce were established. As to the necessity for our having trade commissioners in the United States, I may point out that the Canadian manufacturers are wide awake to everything that is going on there, and, as the member for Red Deer would say, it would be sending coals to Newcastle to assume that we could carry on a greater trade than we are now carrying on with the United States in manufactured goods. Practically every line of business in Canada, with the exception of pulpwood and grain, is largely carried on in the United States and for that business there is a large foreign market as well as a large home market. If you go into their home market with your carloads of goods, reports will very quickly be sent to Washington of what you have been doing, and obstacles will be thrown in the way of your export trade.

Mr. CANNON: Would the hon. member recommend that we renew our trade with Russia and send our trade commissioners to that country?

M. CURRIE: I was not discussing Russia for the moment. I was emphasizing the point that the establishment of chambers of commerce in such large centres as New York, Boston, Chicago, San Francisco and other places of that kind would result in our buyers going to these points and also in an increase of our sales. Now, with reference to an extension of our trade with Russia—

Sir GEORGE FOSTER: May I prevail upon my hon. friends on both sides to leave these big questions until we come to the big votes and to get through some of these smaller things first?

Mr. CURRIE: I agree with the minister, but as these matters are sometimes brought up without some of us being able to discuss them, I am endeavouring to entertain my hon. friends opposite with a

few remarks on the subject so that when the matter comes up again they will have a greater knowledge of it and will be able to discuss it intelligently.

Mr. ROBB: We have done a reasonable day's work and perhaps at this late hour we might make some progress and adjourn. I am sure that the minister would prefer being comfortably at home to sitting here discussing these items.

Sir GEORGE FOSTER: I am ready to sacrifice myself on the altar of my country for a few hours.

Mr. ROBB: So far as the member for Lotbinière (Mr. Vien) advances the idea that we should have trade agents in overseas countries, I am with him. I think that trade agents in overseas countries and a much better display than we have now of Canadian products in the cities of the British Isles might be of great advantage to Canada. But so far as establishing a number of paid agents in the United States is concerned, it seems to me that having regard to the present financial position of our country there is much to be done before we undertake a work of such questionable value. Now, I am satisfied that the shoe manufacturers of the city of Quebec have their travellers on the road out as far as British Columbia, a point much more distant than the larger markets of the United States. If they are able to send travellers out to British Columbia to look for business I am sure that these manufacturers or any other manufacturers in Canada would rather trust to their own trained help than to a government agent of doubtful business capacity. The business men of this country are just as able to go out and look for business in the United States as they are to go out and look for it in British Columbia and the western provinces, and I am satisfied that they can do it with greater advantage to themselves and to Canada than a government official can. For these reasons I am not prepared to follow the member for Lotbinière in his argument in favour of trade agents in the United States. I do think, however, that any money spent in the display of Canadian goods in overseas countries will produce profitable returns and I shall be willing to support the minister in any appropriation that he may require for that purpose.

Mr. PARENT: The hon. member for Simcoe (Mr. Currie) has stated that Canada has an export trade in shoes. Would he state what particular brand of shoes are being exported to the United States, what their trade-mark is, and where they are manufactured?

Mr. CURRIE: I have no idea what their trade-mark is. All I know is that the United States trade returns two or three years ago showed quite an import trade in shoes from Canada.

Mr. PARENT: The Slater shoe was exported for a while, that is all.

Mr. CANNON: I see in the details concerning this appropriation certain items with respect to motion pictures and officials connected with that branch of the department. The right hon. gentleman went to Paris last year and I think he was there the year before as well. During his stay in the capital city of France, he probably acquired very artistic tastes. I notice, for instance, that amongst the officials of the department is an artist who is receiving a rather good salary. Who is this artist, how are his or her services hired, and what are exactly his or her duties in the department.

Mr. PARENT: Would the minister, at the same time, kindly give an explanation regarding the Director of Commercial Exhibits?

Sir GEORGE FOSTER: It will be quite within the knowledge of members of Parliament that for the last three or four years, the Department of Trade and Commerce has been availing itself of films as a means of educating and informing the people of other countries of the resources of Canada, what we produce, the processes of production, and certain scenic qualities of the country as well, all going to make up a propaganda of film production and exhibition. This has enlarged from year to year, and it has proved one of the most profitable investments that we have made; as being one of the most appealing methods of distributing information amongst large bodies of people. In that work, we have developed a staff which is of excellent ability and which turns out work which, I think, is not surpassed by any company or aggregation that works along those lines. You must have, in the taking of those negatives, an artist who is able to pose the situation, so to speak, so as to get your results, if it is a scenic effect, from the best possible angles, so as to produce the most catching and attractive form of what you are producing. That explains what the artist is for. He is not a painter of pictures, nor

anything of that kind. How we obtain him is through the Civil Service Commission by advertising the nature of the work and then selecting from those who apply the one who appears to be best fitted for that work. We had, as our chief director, Mr. Norrish, for two or three years. We lost him about a year ago, or a little less, because he was taken from us by the Canadian Pacific for exactly the same kind of work, but at a much larger salary than we were able to give him. There is, therefore, a staff which is employed in taking those negatives, in developing them afterwards and in distributing them. As to the distribution, I am sorry I have to take this on an item of an officer rather than when we come to the main vote for this work. Perhaps the information which I have given now will do for this particular thing, because when we come to that item, I should like to deal with it a little more at length, so that the House may know what we are doing along that line.

Mr. VIEN: We were told by the Chairman that the details of the appropriation which is now before the committee are given at page 105 of the Estimates, and this is taken from page 105.

Mr. CANNON: If I understand the matter aright, the minister is willing to give all the details in connection with officials whose names appear on page 105, but there is another item as regards distribution, and the right hon. gentleman would rather give the explanation when that item comes up.

Mr. VIEN: What is that item?

Sir GEORGE FOSTER: The large item from which we pay the expenditures for this work.

Mr. SINCLAIR (Antigonish and Guysborough): I would suggest to the minister that when he comes to deal with the question of films and the distribution of them, if it were possible for him to give us a moving picture of the 24,000 census enumerators, that would make a very interesting show for the House and the country.

Sir GEORGE FOSTER: It would cost a very large sum of money to do that, and I doubt if the object gained would be worth the expense in trying to satisfy my hon. friend's curiosity.

Mr. VIEN: It would be a fine collection of Tories, and maybe the last one.

[Sir George Foster.]

Sir GEORGE FOSTER: It would I hope be a collection of very intelligent men and women.

Mr. PEDLOW: It would be an excellent exhibition of the "No patronage system" as carried on by the Government. I would like to have some information regarding the item: "Chief, foreign tariffs division, $2,610."

Sir GEORGE FOSTER: One part of the work of that branch—and that comes again later, although this is the salary for the chief officer—is to keep track of all the tariffs of all countries in the world. We must know in the department at Ottawa, in order to answer questions which are constantly put to us, the tariffs which rule in all the countries in the world with which we do business, and that is practically with all countries of the world. A tariff is passed at a certain time; but according to the different countries, you have modifications of that tariff by regulation, and you have to keep track of all of those. You have frequent legislative changes in the tariff, and you have to keep track of all of those. If my hon. friend wants to know the tariff upon any article in any of the principal countries in the world—and I think I may say in any of them—that information is at his disposal in the department; we are constantly being asked for that information, and we are constantly distributing it. It would be a sorry department if we did not have that part of it up to date.

Mr. PEDLOW: That is a very important work to perform, but is all that work performed for the sum of $2,610?

Sir GEORGE FOSTER: That is the salary of the chief, and you will find some others of the staff along through the list. One man does not quite do all the work. It is a piece of work that one man could not perform by himself.

Mr. PARENT: I notice that on page 105 there is the position of Director of Commercial Exhibits. This would lead one to believe that we have commercial exhibits, and a director of that service. What are the duties of this officer?

Sir GEORGE FOSTER: He is in charge of two different things. We have an exhibit of commercial articles gathered from a great many countries in the world with which we do business. Our trade commissioners in these different countries get samples of the goods which are largely

in vogue in those countries. These are brought to the attention of our commercial men in Canada. A selection is made by our trade commissioners; they do not send us samples of everything that is used in these different countries, but discriminate and try to send samples of goods Canadian manufacturers might very well supply. We have an exhibit of these things in our Commercial Museum on Bank street. That is one part of the Director's duties. Then our trade commissioners have partial exhibits that they use in their offices. The Director of Exhibits has all this under his charge, their collection, their distribution, and all the information with reference to that.

Mr. PARENT: Does that include Canadian manufactured products?

Sir GEORGE FOSTER: No, articles manufactured in other countries, but which our Canadian manufacturers might very well be able to supply. If they visit this place on Bank street they will see exactly the types and forms of these articles in common use in these different countries, which it would be worth while for them to undertake to supply. If my hon. friend has been a reader of the Bulletin he will see that our trade commissioners when sending in their reports, if the article itself cannot be sent, send a diagram of the article. That appears in the Bulletin, and manufacturers can see exactly what is wanted and tell whether it is worth while for them to try and supply that particular article. That has proved very useful indeed, and much of the increase in our foreign trade has been due to that kind of representation, and the representation of the article itself.

Mr. SINCLAIR (Antigonish and Guysborough): Do the manufacturers themselves take an interest in these exhibits and co-operate with the department in making them a success I notice by the British newspapers, for instances, that the manufacturers have no less than four large exhibitions running in Great Britain at the present time for the purpose of showing the British people that British manufacturers can beat any others in the world, and that is therefore no use for the people to buy their goods outside. The British manufacturers are willing to compare their goods with those of any other manfacturers in the world. I should like to know the attitude of the Canadian manufacturer in this matter. Does he assist in making these exhibits a success? Does he co-operate at his own expense to some extent?

Sir GEORGE FOSTER: The Canadian manufacturer is doing exactly what the British manufacturer is doing. He is trying by exhibit of his goods, sometimes by car exhibit, sometimes by local exhibitions, and in every other way possible to show to the people of Canada that he can manufacture the goods they need just as good as anybody outside. We do not help him in that; he does the whole of it at his own expense. If my hon. friend has ever had the good fortune to go to the Canadian National Exhibition, as it is called, in the city of Toronto, which is held in the last week of August and the first week of September, he will have seen there a most wonderful exhibit of the products of our manufacturers, to speak of only them for the time being. They have the latest and most up-to-date equipment there, and their own representatives on the spot, able to give out information, distribute literature and so forth. Although that is the largest exhibition, there are others in a smaller way throughout all of Canada. That is the business of the manufacturers; we do not help them in that. What we help them in is in getting them samples of goods that are largely used in other countries, and which we think the Canadian manufacturer might very well make. When they see these samples they can make up their minds whether they will fill the bill in those countries in respect to that particular form of manufacture. To that work we bend our energies, and ask the Canadian manufacturers to take advantage of the exhibits we make for that purpose.

Mr. PEDLOW: It might be interesting for the committee to know that on Thursday last a gentleman by the name of Mr. Halladay, a brother of the hon. member for Bow River, addressed a small gathering in the Railway Committee room. This gentleman had travelled around the world representing a Canadian company, the Canada Cycle and Motor company, and his address was, I think, one of the most interesting and illuminating I have ever listened to. During the course of the year he had travelled over 41,000 miles. He had started out from his headquarters in Canada, crossed the Pacific to Japan, travelled extensively through Japan and China, gone down to the islands of the Pacific, Sumatra and Java, then to Australia and New Zealand, India, South Africa, and back home again. One interesting fact he brought out was that during the war Japan had built

up an enormous foreign credit balance. The result of that was that the merchants of Japan were buying largely outside of their own country. That had an adverse effect on the manufacturers of Japan, so the government of that country stopped foreign credits in an endeavour to compel the citizens of Japan to purchase from their own manufacturers. Their attitude in that respect was very much like the attitude of those in this country who try to prevent the Canadian people from buying merchandise outside their own country, even though they can buy to better advantage. The hon. member for North Simcoe (Mr. Currie) spoke of some obstacles in the way of Canadian manufacturers obtaining trade outside of this country. In my judgment, you cannot hope to make a success of foreign business in this or any other country unless you buy from the country where you sell. You cannot expect to sell to any great extent unless you buy from that place. That means, in my judgment, that the tariff in this country which prevents importations will also limit exportations to foreign countries. I am sorry there was not a larger number of members present to listen to the very excellent and instructive address of Mr. Halladay. His remarks were certainly interesting and illuminating. A point he made clear was that all the goods sold by his concern outside of this country were sold at a profit. It is held that goods sold by Canadian manufacturers outside Canada are sold at cost of production or at a loss sometimes to keep factories going. His claim was that the goods sold by his concern in foreign markets were sold at a profit and that their goods were sold to the consumers in Canada at higher prices than abroad.

Mr. MAHARG: I want some information on item 4, at page 105, regarding the expert in grain chemistry. Who is this expert at the present time?

Sir GEORGE FOSTER: This has reference to the grain laboratory in Winnipeg. Dr. Birchard is director. My hon. friend knows that we have been carrying on through that laboratory certain experiments, for instance, in regard to the conditions of wheat, as respects moisture, and how they affect the keeping of wheat in transport and storage. A very important part of the work of that branch has been the experiments in connection with milling and baking, which have been carried on now for two or three years. And we are publishing each month bulletins which give the results of the milling and baking tests. Experiments are made in regard to different kinds of wheat and how they pan out in these processes. Dr. Birchard is director, and has a staff of three who, with him, carry on that laboratory.

Mr. McMASTER: Monsieur le President—

Mr. MAHARG: Does this official report directly to the department or to the Board of Grain Commissioners for Canada?

Sir GEORGE FOSTER: He works in connection with the Board of Grain Commissioners and also report to the department. He is estimated for in the civil government, and is, as my hon. friend will see, an officer in the department, being under its instructions. But there must be in all these matters of experiments, etc., strict collaboration between himself, the Board of Grain Commissioners and the inspector in Winnipeg.

Mr. McMASTER: Monsieur le President—

Mr. MAHARG: Does he submit his reports to the Board of Grain Commissioners first, and after they are dealt with by the Board, are those reports passed on to the department?

Sir GEORGE FOSTER: My impression is that he reports to the department direct, and sends a copy of the same report to the Board of Grain Commissioners. I know we keep records here.

Mr. McMASTER: Monsieur le President—

Mr. MAHARG: There is a considerable doubt in the minds of some people as to how that works. We are looking for good things from that laboratory in Winnipeg, but so far as we are concerned, there seems to be little information available, and what there is to be obtained is difficult to get at. Some people are under the impression that he reports to the Board of Grain Commissioners, who censor those reports and then pass them to the department. That is the point upon which we desire to be clear.

Sir GEORGE FOSTER: That is not so; we do not get censored reports, but the original documents. I would call the attention of my hon. friend to this fact, which he will realize the moment I mention it. With regard to tests of grain as to moisture conditions and their influence on either transport or storage, and so far as the quality of grain is concerned for milling or testing purposes, it is im-

possible to set a laboratory to work and expect results within the first year or two. The best results cannot be obtained for several years, because of the differing conditions from year to year. You must get a series of experiments over a wide area and extending over a reasonable period in order to strike the average result. During the first years of experimentation there was very little distribution of information. Now that period has passed and the director has got upon more solid ground. There is a wider basis for deductions and recommendations, and these brochures or bulletins are being now issued regularly with an authority which they could not have in the more experimental stage. If my hon. friend has not experienced any good results from the work that has been carried on, I can assure him that we have numerous and very strong commendations of what has been done.

Mr. McMASTER: Monsieur le Président—

Mr. MAHARG: I do not want to be understood as saying that we have received no benefit from this work, for such is not the case. We are, however, of the opinion that we are not receiving the benefits which we should expect. One of the principal things which we anticipated would be the determination of a reasonable spread between different grades of grain, but we have not seen any action in that direction so far. The spread between different grades is as wide this year as ever, if not wider.

Sir GEORGE FOSTER: My hon. friend will admit that there is a wide difference between the application of what may be considered as knowledge, absolute or concrete, of the qualities of different grades of grain, and the devising of means by which that knowledge will be put into practice in the actual process of buying, because the process of buying depends upon so many other considerations than the quality of wheat, that the spread is sometimes very large, often much larger than it ought to be. It is very difficult to find out how to apply scientific knowledge to buying in the market towns.

Mr. McMASTER: Monsieur le Président—

Mr. MAHARG: I should like the minister—

Mr. McMASTER: Are you through?

Mr. MAHARG: I desire to finish the point I am discussing.

Mr. McMASTER: Monsieur le Président—

Sir GEORGE FOSTER: Mon honorable ami (M. Maharg) a la parole.

Mr. McMASTER: Mais qu'il achève.

Mr. MAHARG: If I understood the minister correctly, he said that this chemist determined the amount of moisture that grain should carry in storage, or words to that effect. Has the present chemist anything to do with determining the amount of moisture that grain should contain in order to enter a certain grade, say, No. 1 Northern grain? Does he determine the amount of moisture it should carry?

Sir GEORGE FOSTER: I do not think that element is considered in the grading of grain. Whether it is possible to do so or not I do not know, but practically it has never been done up to the present time. It may be that in time we may add to the tests for the grading of grain, which are now largely mechanical, some scientific principles, which have been ascertained by results in the manner suggested; but up to the present time the mechanical methods, of touch and sight have been those used for determining the different grades.

Some hon. MEMBERS: Carried.

Mr. MAHARG: I quite appreciate the anxiety of hon. gentlemen to get away at this hour of the night, but this is one of the matters that we in the West are largely interested in.

Mr. CANNON: I rise to a point of order. The hon. member for Maple Creek voted earlier in the evening against the Government giving information, and therefore I cannot see why he should insist upon obtaining information now.

Mr. MAHARG: If I desired to enter into any discussion of the point that my hon. friend has raised I could give him a very apposite reply. The point that we would like to be clear on is—who does determine the amount of moisture that grain shall carry to permit of it entering into the different grades?

Sir GEORGE FOSTER: I am not an expert in the business, but in so far as I have seen it carried one, the grading is done by the inspectors or the graders after having taken a sample from the car. The grain is placed on the table of the examiners and they grade it according to its plumpness, or otherwise, and its color. That is done either by the eye or by touch.

As to making a moisture test of each grade I judge that is not done. However, I am not an authority on the subject and I would have to ask my officers for information in respect to it.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: We are within a few minutes of midnight. Does not my right hon. friend think we have been discussing these matters long enough?

Sir GEORGE FOSTER: It is true that we have been discussing them at some length but we have not made any progress. I cannot conceive of such an intelligent body of men as I see before me spending all this time upon an item and leaving without adopting it.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: If we pass this item will it satisfy my right hon. friend?

Sir GEORGE FOSTER: I am entirely in the hands of hon. gentlemen opposite. Of course the progress of the business depends very largely upon them and if they do not want to hurry matters I am in their hands.

Mr. VIEN: In the closing days of last session the right hon. gentleman himself, in almost the last words uttered by him at that time, criticized us because we passed a lot of his Estimates without studying them sufficiently. He made reference particularly to the Estimates of the Department of Justice saying: "You discussed a few legal questions, but when you came to the Estimates themselves you rushed them through, and you did not even discuss a few which to my mind were objectionable or at least questionable." Well, Sir, to-night we have studied to the best of our ability the Estimates which have been submitted to us. The details of the item which is now under consideration cover more than a page, and I think it is only reasonable that we should now adjourn so that we can give to the item the attention which it demands. My hon. friend from Maple Creek (Mr. Maharg) is seeking a lot of information from the minister and I shall do my best to assist him in getting it. I support very heartily the suggestion that we adjourn.

Sir GEORGE FOSTER: The hon. gentleman has supported the item for the last hour and a half, and I am sure we will never have any lack of questions so long as he is in the same state of mind that he is to-night.

Mr. VIEN: I have a lot of questions to put when the minister's estimates are again taken up.

[Sir George Foster.]

Mr. McMASTER: (Translation.) It seems to me that if I appeal to the Minister of Trade and Commerce in the language in which he is now a master, he will accept my suggestion. It seems to me that we have done a good day's work. The minister himself, during half an hour, endeavoured to arrive at a definition of what is and what is not confidential. He has wasted half an hour of the hon. member's time on this subject. The Deputy-Speaker has settled most difficult questions of order in a very satisfactory way for himself and perhaps for the House. I do not think it necessary that I insist on the matter. We were interested witnesses of the minister's acrobatic feats, and pyrotechnical dialectics, and I think we may request this from him because he is a wise man, a man of experience, a man who attends to the country's business; he must be in favour of the eight-hour day; if he is not, he deserves that all good labourers in this country vote against him at the next elections, and there will be enough electors voting against him in the next election contest to oblige him to give the labourers some encouragement. I am not here to make a speech; it is midnight, time for us to disappear, let us finish.

The Right Hon. Sir GEORGE FOSTER: (Translation.) Mr. Chairman, I have listened with close attention to my hon. friend's suggestion. He has discussed—yes, he has discussed, and discussed, yet, I do not think he has shown any good reason for an adjournment. There is no necessity, because it is twelve o'clock, that the committee adjourn without having passed a single item. After such a varied and eloquent debate, we should pass a few items and then we could enjoy a good sleep on a peaceful conscience.

The CHAIRMAN: Shall the item carry?

Mr. DUFF: Before the item carries I would like the Minister of Trade and Commerce to repeat in English his French speech of a few minutes ago. I did not understand one word he said, and I think it is his duty in regard to these items to give the information which he imparted in French to us all.

Sir GEORGE FOSTER: It is not necessary that every member on that side of the House should understand French.

Mr. DUFF: The Estimates of the Department of Trade and Commerce are perhaps one of the most important set of

Estimates that this House has to consider, and it seems to me that at this early hour of the morning—it is one minute past twelve—the minister should not ask us to pass an item of over $390,000 for salaries, especially in view of the fact that so very few Government members are present. It is quite evident that those gentlemen are carrying out the wish they expressed to-night when they voted for no information. There is a great deal of information which we would like to have, and although I might, of course, move that the Chairman do now leave the Chair, which motion would carry because we have more members present on this side than are now in their seats on the Government benches, I do not wish to take that course, and I respectfully ask the minister to report progress.

Sir GEORGE FOSTER: I have no desire to press these Estimates unduly, but I think we should pass this item. If any information is required I shall be very glad to give it.

Mr. FOURNIER: As my right hon. friend has proved his love for the French language, I would ask him to publish his weekly bulletin in French. That is a most desirable and necessary improvement.

Sir GEORGE FOSTER: I will take it into the most sympathetic consideration.

The CHAIRMAN: Shall the item carry?

Mr. CANNON: Before the item carries or the committee adjourns, I would like to tell the minister that the Canada Year Book published by his department is most incomplete in regard to the educational institutions in the province of Quebec. Some of our most important colleges are not even mentioned as educational institutions, although many of them have been active for over a century.

Sir GEORGE FOSTER: I am very glad my hon. friend has called attention to those omissions, and when we come to the item provided for the Canada Year Book I shall have the information for him. These educational statistics have only been attempted within the last two or three years, and if any lack of information is noticed it is certainly a kindly act on the part of any member to call attention to it.

Mr. CAHILL: There is an item here for the Dominion Statistician. I asked the right hon. minister yesterday for information about the census enumerators in the county of Pontiac, because previously I had written to the Chief Commissioner and he told me that the appointments had not been made. I understand that the Government endeavoured to make appointments, but as some Ontario men were appointed I have no doubt the ministers representing the province of Quebec objected. The minister told me that the appointments had been made, but I have not been able to ascertain the names of the commissioners. Would the minister be good enough to give me those names now?

Sir GEORGE FOSTER: I have not the names at hand now. When I answered my hon. friend yesterday I told him that the appointments had been made; that is correct.

Mr. CAHILL: That is, permanent appointments?

Sir GEORGE FOSTER: Yes. The chief trouble was in reference to the geographical situation in the county of Pontiac. In the end we divided it into three parts of one division. Temiskaming is the most populous part and as it would be necessary for one of the proposed appointees to travel two or three hundred miles to take up the work there, I have made arrangements whereby a resident of Temiskaming shall act for that part of Pontiac.

Mr. POWER: Would the item under consideration include the Dominion Bureau of Statistics?

Sir GEORGE FOSTER: That would include the Civil Government employees, but not the work of the statistical department; that is a separate vote.

Mr. CANNON: Does that include the salaries of the remaining employees of the Board of Commerce?

Sir GEORGE FOSTER: No.

Mr. CANNON: Is there a special item for those salaries?

Sir GEORGE FOSTER: Yes.

The CHAIRMAN: Shall the item carry?

Mr. CAHILL: No. Mr. Chairman. There are several items here that we would like to have some information on. What is "Chief Transportation Division?"

Sir GEORGE FOSTER: The Statistical Department has a very wide field of work, and amongst other things it has to prepare statistics of the different transportation systems, which was formerly looked after by the department of Railways and Canals. The Statistical Branch of that department has now been merged

with the General Statistical Department, and this is the officer who attends to that branch of work.

Mr. PARENT: (Translation.) Mr. Chairman, at page 105 of the Estimates there is an item as to a "lecturer," which can be translated by the word "conférencier." Could the hon. minister say whether or not that lecturer gives lectures in both languages and whether or not he is qualified to give them in French and in English?

Sir GEORGE FOSTER: In the first year and part of the second year during which we were commencing and perfecting the preparation of films we put on a series of exhibits of these films and visited about sixteen or eighteen of the principal cities of the Dominion, commencing at Halifax and passing through Westmount. The pictures were explained by a lecturer and they formed, I am sure, a valuable contribution to the information of the people generally as to what we are doing in the department. They were received with apparent satisfaction, the tributes offered in that connection being very numerous.

Mr. PEDLOW: I find on page 105 the following item: "1 chief, division of demography, $3,960." What class of work is demography?

Sir GEORGE FOSTER: It is really the taking of the census. The word comes from the Greek "demos," the people, and "graphn, " a writing.

Mr. POWER: Is the Dominion Statistician, who is at the same time Census Commissioner, also chief of the division of demography?

Sir GEORGE FOSTER: No. The chief of the division of demography works under Mr. Coats.

Mr. POWER: What is his name?

Sir GEORGE FOSTER: E. S. Macphail. He is one of our older civil servants in that department, and a most efficient man.

Mr. POWER: As I understand it, the Dominion Statistician collects facts with reference to men and women and things, whereas the chief of the division of demography would collect only facts with reference to human beings. Am I right in that?

Sir GEORGE FOSTER: I do not quite see the distinction between men and women and human beings.

[Sir George Foster.]

Mr. POWER: The minister misunderstood me. I said men and women and things—inanimate things.

Sir GEORGE FOSTER: Oh, I think the Dominion Statistician does more than that. He is director of all the varied activities of the Statistical Department, which are not confined to simply counting men and women and inanimate things and tabulating them. He has under him a very large staff.

Mr. POWER: Mr. Macphail is actually in charge of the taking of the census?

Sir GEORGE FOSTER: Yes.

Mr. POWER: Then where does Mr. Coats fit in?

Sir GEORGE FOSTER: Just as the director of a large business establishment fits in over numerous branches and divisions of the business controlled by him.

Mr. PEDLOW: In the Auditor General's Report Mr. Coats' salary is given as $4,000, while on page 105 of the Estimates it is given as $4,800 for 1920-21, and $5,100 for 1921-22. Will the minister explain the difference?

Sir GEORGE FOSTER: Probably it is due to reclassification.

Mr. POWER: The same thing applies to the demographist.

Sir GEORGE FOSTER: And the same reason would apply.

Progress reported.

PRIVATE BILL

SECOND READING

Bill No. 38, to incorporate La Compagnie de Téléphone Québec Union Electrique (The Quebec Union Electric Telephone Company).—Mr. Power.

On motion of Right Hon Mr. Meighen the House adjourned at 12.20 a.m. Wednesday.

Wednesday, March 23, 1921

The House met at Two o'clock.

RAILWAY ACT AMENDMENT

Mr. H. H. STEVENS (Centre Vancouver) moved for leave to introduce Bill No. 41, to amend the Railway Act.

He said: Very briefly, the object of this Bill is to amend certain sections of the Railway Act in which reference is made to the matter of discrimination in rates. In the Act as it now stands the word

"discrimination" is invariably preceded by words such as "unreasonable", "undue", "unfair", and such like. This Bill proposes to remove these words, thus making the question of discrimination an absolute one, rather than one that is subject to these modifications.

Motion agreed to, and Bill read the first time.

LAKE OF THE WOODS' CONTROL

On the Order "Questions" being called:

Right Hon. ARTHUR MEIGHEN (Prime Minister): Mr. Speaker, this being Private Members' day, it seems improbable that the Orders of the Day will be reached, and consequently I shall not be able to take the usual opportunity of fulfilling two or three promises I made to the House yesterday. I would, therefore, crave the privilege of making a statement.

Mr. SPEAKER: Is it the pleasure of the House that the right hon. gentleman should have unanimous consent to make his statement?

Some hon. MEMBERS: Carried.

Mr. MEIGHEN: I undertook to reply to-day to a question of the hon. member for Three Rivers and St. Maurice (Mr. Bureau) as to whether communications had come from the International Joint Commission with reference to control of the waters of the Lake of the Woods, either since or prior to November last, or from any Branch, American or Canadian. The answer is, No. The last communication was some time in March 1916. I know that that is outside the period that the hon. member had in mind.

CANADIAN NATIONAL RAILWAYS—AMQUI STATION

Right Hon. ARTHUR MEIGHEN (Prime Minister): The hon. member for Matane (Mr. Pelletier) asked as to communications which I should have received, but which he complained were unanswered. The first one referred to, dated March 10, was received and acknowledged. The second one, dated March 15, was also received and acknowledged. I will hand the answer to the hon. member. I only mention it now because I promised to do so.

CIVIL SERVICE BONUS

Right Hon. ARTHUR MEIGHEN (Prime Minister): I also promised to make a statement to-day with regard to the bonus granted to the Civil Service. The House, of course, knows that this bonus has been given to meet the abnormal increase in living costs. This addition to civil service salaries amounted, for the fiscal year just closing, to some $12,500,000, running the total appropriation for remuneration of the Civil Service for the year to something over $66,000,000. The Government has decided, in view of the increases following re-classification, and of the diminishing cost of living, and having regard also to the imperative necessity of retrenchment wherever possible, to reduce this bonus, commencing with the ensuing year, by 25 per cent.

QUESTIONS

(Questions answered orally are indicated by an asterisk.)

Mr. A. D. GEORGE

*Mr. BROUILLARD:

1. Has Mr. A. D. George, solicitor, of Fort Frances, Ontario, been retained recently in any cases by or on behalf of the Dominion Government?
2. If so, in what cases, and for what purposes?
3. Is the said A. D. George the individual who was concerned in the purchase of a Post Office site in Fort Frances through a clerk in his office several years ago?
4. Was it established by investigation before a Parliamentary Committee that the site in question had been purchased for a sum much below that at which it was sold to the Government?
5. If so, what was the difference between the said purchase price and the price at which the site was sold to the Government?
6. Why does the Government continue to employ the said A. D. George in preference to other solicitors at Fort Frances?

Sir HENRY DRAYTON:

1. No.
2. Answered by No. 1.
3, 4 and 5. No information.
6. Answered by No. 1.

BERTHIERVILLE TELEPHONE

Mr. GERVAIS:

Is the telephone line between Berthierville and Ile St-Ignace and Ile du Pas the property of the Government?

Hon. Mr. McCURDY: Yes, and it is operated under agreement by the Bell Telephone Company.

STEEL PLATES FOR SHIPS

Mr. DUFF:

1. At what date did the Government make a contract with the Dominion Iron and Steel Company to supply steel plates for ships?

2. What was the total quantity contained in that contract and which were to be delivered by the said company to the Government?

3. What was the price per ton agreed upon?

4. How many tons have been delivered so far and where delivered?

5. Has the contract since been cancelled?

6. If so, what damages did the Government have to pay the said Dominion Iron and Steel Company?

7. If not, has the Dominion Iron and Steel Company made any claim against the Government? If so, how much?

Hon. Mr. REID:

1, 2 and 3. The original contract with the Dominion Iron and Steel Company, Ltd., was authorized by Order in Council dated March 26, 1918, and was dated April 2, 1918. That contract provided for the erection of a modern 110 inch steel plate mill by the Dominion Iron and Steel Company, Ltd., the Government undertaking on its part to purchase 50,000 gross tons of plates per annum for a period of five years at a price of $4.15 per 100 lbs. base f.o.b. cars Sydney or f.o.b. steamed Sydney or Louisburg. A modification of this contract was authorized by Order in Council of July 26, 1919, and the modified agreement under the terms of that Order in Council is dated December 10, 1919. This agreement provided for a reduction of the price to be paid the Dominion Iron & Steel Company, Ltd., from $4.15 per 100 lbs. to $3.65 per 100 lbs.

4. 40,400 gross tons delivered f.o.b. Sydney.

5. Yes.

6. The Government has paid no damages.

7. No.

THE PRINTING BUREAU

Mr. HOCKEN:

1. How many men have been taken on the staff of the Printing Bureau since February 1st, 1921?

2. Under what authority were they taken on?

3. What are their names?

Sir HENRY DRAYTON:

1. 36.

2. Civil Service Commission.

3. Alexander Fraser, William Potter, John Hanna, Eugene Edouard Bédard, William Caswell, Miss Alice Mailhot, James Ambrose Kavanagh, George Archibald Lacombe (since resigned), Robert Harker, George McCann, George Drewer, Alexander Brown, Thomas Patrick Morrissey, Frank Charles Rünge, Alfred Lee, John Arthur O'Neill, Hugh Henry Borthwick, Oscar Lemieux, Charles Frederick Bruer, Joseph Patrick Milloy, Thomas George Patterson, Alexander Benn, Francis Gilbert Robert, Horace Philip Benedict, Joseph Arthur Bureau, Thomas Carroll Boucher, John S. Ball, Charles Anderson, Simon O'Meara, Miss Edmée Riendeau, Louis A. Choquette, Miss Sarah McKeever, Michael Ernest Fagan, Henri R. Robert, Hubert Emmett McCarthy, Joseph Philias Lajambe.

DOMINION NOTES AND GOLD RESERVE

Mr. THOMSON (Qu'Appelle):

1. What is the amount of Dominion Government Notes issued for circulation?

2. What portion, if any, of this amount has been circulated by the Government, and how?

3. What amount, if any, has been loaned or advanced against approved securities to individuals or corporations other than banks, to whom and on what terms and conditions?

4. What is the total amount of Dominion Government Notes supplied to Canadian banks, under what terms and conditions as to security and rate of interest?

5. Have Dominion Government notes been accepted in lieu of gold for deposit in the Central Gold Reserve? If so, to what amount?

6. What is the actual amount of gold now in the Central Gold Reserve?

7. What other amounts of gold are held by the Dominion Government and for what purpose?

8. What other amounts of gold were there in the hands of banks, trust companies, etc., on December 31, 1920?

9. What is the total amount of bank notes authorized to be issued under sub-section 3, Section 61, or amendments thereto of the Bank Act?

10. What was the average amount of bank notes in circulation during the first, second, third and fourth quarters of the year 1920?

Sir HENRY DRAYTON:

1. February 28, 1921—$290,194,519.92.

2. $10,000,000 under Order in Council confirmed by Chapter 4-5 George V.

3. $10,000,000 to Canadian Northern Railway Company and $6,000,000 to Grand Trunk Railway Company both confirmed by Chapter 4-5 George V.

4. $87,115,075. Of this amount $56,457,000 was advanced against the security of Imperial Treasury Bill Certificates at 3½ per cent; the balance being advanced against Dominion of Canada Treasury Bills, Dominion of Canada War Loan Bonds, Provincial and Municipal Securities, Grain Receipts, and other approved securities at five per cent.

All securities are taken at the present market value less a margin determined by the Treasury Board having in view the nature of the securities deposited.

In addition $50,000,000 has been advanced to the Imperial Government against the deposit of securities approved by the Treasury Board.

5. Yes—Under sub-section 4, Section 61 of the Bank Act. Amount deposited February 28, 1921—$76,900,000.

6. February 28, 1921—$11,502,533.33.

7. On February 28, 1921, the total gold held by the Dominion Government was $103,022,079.99 of which $3,872,550.35 was held as a reserve of 10 per cent on Dominion Government Savings Bank deposits and the balance as security for Dominion Note Circulation.

8. Current gold and subsidiary coin held by Canadian Chartered Banks December 31, 1920 in Canada and elsewhere $82,687,-559. No record of gold held by Trust Companies.

9. January 31, 1921—$218,162,696. Under sub-section 14 of Section 61 of the Bank Act, which provides for the additional issue of currency during the season of moving the crops, an additional amount of $39,270,563 could be issued as of January 31, 1921, making a grand total of $257.-433,259.

10. 1st quarter, $221,946,442; 2nd quarter, $225,832,673; 3rd quarter, $230,000,-994; 4th, $237,421,406.

DISABILITY PENSIONS

Mr. GRIESBACH:

1. Is it a fact that disability pensions paid to the C.E.F. in respect of the great war are equal from the rank of lieutenant to the rank of private, including their dependents?

2. Is it a fact that disability pensions from the rank of captain upwards, including their dependents, are unequal and are based upon the rank of the pensioner or person with respect to whom pension is granted?

3. What was the total amount paid with respect to C.E.F. disability pensions for the year ending December 31, 1920?

4. What was the total number of persons so pensioned on December 31, 1920?

5. What was the total number of persons of the rank of lieutenant to the rank of private, including their dependents, so pensioned on December 31, 1920?

6. What was the total number of persons so pensioned of the rank of captain and upwards, including their dependents, on December 31, 1920?

7. What is the percentage of (a) persons referred to in (5) above and (b) persons referred to in (6) above?

8. What is the total amount of money paid as pension to persons of the rank of lieutenant and down to the rank of private, including their dependents, for the year ending December 31, 1920, for disability?

9. What is the total amount of money paid as pension with respect to persons in the rank of captain and upwards, including their dependents, for the year ending December 31, 1920, for disability?

10. What is the percentage of the money so paid to the whole, with respect of (a) persons referred to in (8) above, and (b) persons referred to in (9) above?

11. If the sum paid with respect to the above pensions were equalized throughout all ranks, by what amount per year would the pensions of lieutenants to privates and their dependents be increased?

Hon. Mr. REID:

1. Yes, with the addition of the bonuses payable during the year commencing September 1, 1920.

2. They are based primarily upon the extent of the disability as in other cases, but vary in accordance with the rank held when the disability was incurred.

3. $18,212,506.16.

4. 55,084.

5. Disability—pensioners, 53,854; wives, 26,913; children, 37,373; total, 118,140.

6. Disability—pensioners, 1,230; wives, 730; children, 993; total, 2,953.

7. (a) 97.55 per cent; (b) 2.45 per cent.

8. $17,713,913.16.

9. $498,575.00.

10. (a) 97.26 per cent. (b) 2.74 per cent.

11. $1.71 per annum.

EXPENSES OF LEAGUE OF NATIONS—CANADA'S SHARE

Mr. PREVOST:

1. What share has Canada to assume towards the expenses of the League of Nations?

2. What are the costs of representation incurred by Canada for the year 1920 in respect of the League of Nations?

3. Is the Canadian Government paying any salaries whatsoever to a staff in connection with the League of Nations?

Sir HENRY DRAYTON:

1. The Dominion is assessed as a contributor of the first class and the proportionate share of expenses to be paid is 25/478 of the total expenses of the League.

2. Assessment 523,000 gold francs on basis of 5.1826 francs to the dollar.

3. No payment other than assessment as above stated.

POST OFFICES IN CANADA

Mr. RINFRET:

1. What is the total number of post offices in the Dominion.

2. What is the number by provinces?

3. What is the number of boxes in use for rural delivery (a) in the Dominion, (b) by provinces?

Hon. Mr. DOHERTY:

1. 12,216.

2. Ontario, 2,576; Quebec, 2,284; Nova Scotia, 1,839; New Brunswick, 1,133; Prince Edward Island, 136; British Columbia, 832; Manitoba, 796; Alberta, 1,183; Saskatchewan, 1,411; Yukon, 20; Mackenzie River District, 6.

3. (a) 192,733; (b) Prince Edward Island, 8,490; Nova Scotia, 6,031; New Brunswick, 7,972; Quebec, 37,846; Ontario, 117,927; Manitoba, 3,488; Saskatchewan, 3,135; Alberta, 4,233; British Columbia, 3,611.

CREDITS TO ROUMANIA AND GREECE

Mr. KNOX:

1. What credits have been extended by the Canadian Government to Roumania and Greece?
2. What portion of these credits have been used?
3. What goods have been purchased therewith?
4. Did the Government supervise the placing of the orders for such goods?
5. Were all the goods supplied made in Canada?
6. If not, what were the exceptions and where were the foreign made goods produced?
7. Has Roumania ordered any locomotives in Canada on these credits?
8. If so, from whom, how many, and at what prices?
9. Are these locomotives being made in Canada?
10. If not, where are they being made, by whom and at what price?
11. At what price will deliveries of any such locomotives be made to Roumania?

Sir HENRY DRAYTON:

1. Roumania $25,000,000 by agreement dated March 6, 1919. Greece, $25,000,000 by agreement dated March 21, 1919.

2. As of February 28, 1921—Roumania $22,571,227.23, Greece $7,475,073.59.

3. In the case of Roumania—Wheat, churns and butter workers, binder twine, bags and twine, agricultural binders and parts, paints, varnishes and brushes, roofing, rails, edged tools, steel rails and accessories, pig iron, cotton yarn, cotton textile, woollen goods, men's suits, shirts and overalls. In the case of Greece—Blankets, dubbin, revolver holsters, curry combs, wax candles, brushes, belts, boots, sweaters, braces, men's clothing, leather, military cloth and equipment and denim.

4. All purchases supervised by the Canadian Trade Commission.

5. Yes.

6. Answered by No. 5.

7. No.

8, 9, 10 and 11. Answered by No. 7.

DISTRIBUTION OF PURE-BRED ANIMALS IN SASKATCHEWAN

Mr. REID (Mackenzie):

1. What is the name of the official in charge of the distribution of pure-bred animals in Saskatchewan, where does he reside, what salary is he being paid, and how long has he been in the employ of the Government?
2. How many assistants does he employ, what are their names, where do they reside and what wages are they being paid?
3. How many pure-bred sires have the Government distributed in Saskatchewan, what is their average age, what is the average price paid for same and what breeds are used?
4. In what districts are said pure-bred animals distributed?
5. What disposition is made of pure-bred sires when considered valueless for breeding purposes?

Hon. Mr. TOLMIE:

1. Dr. J. P. Creamer,* Qu'Appelle, Sask.; $2,000 per year; since July 1, 1913.

2. Dr. Creamer personally employs the following parties temporarily as required in connection with the shipment and removal of sires: J. Atkinson, T. Freer, Wm. Harris, Wm. Plumb, all of Qu'Appelle. They receive $6 per diem when so employed, they paying their own living expenses.

3. Sires distributed in Saskatchewan to December 31, 1921, comprise:

Bulls—Shorthorn, 521; Hereford, 51; Aberdeen Angus, 34; Holstein, 26; Ayrshire, 7; Red Polled, 4; total, 643. Age at time of purchase, from 18 to 30 months; average price, $161.

Rams—Shropshire, 5; Oxford Down, 4; Leicester, 4; total, 13. Average price, $30; age at time of purchase, ram lambs and yearlings.

Boars—Yorkshire, 25; Berkshire, 40; Poland China, 9; Duroc Jersey, 11; Tamworth, 1; total, 86. Age at time of purchase, 6 to 12 months; average price, $33.

4. These animals are distributed in outlying and backward districts where pure-bred sires are not available.

5. An animal that has outlived his usefulness as a sire is disposed of for meat.

*In charge also of distribution work in Manitoba.

MR. SYDNEY SMITH

Mr. EULER:

1. What is the name of the person who replaced Mr. Sydney Smith in the Post Office Department?
2. Is the said person a British subject?
3. If so, is he so by birth or by naturalization?
4. If by naturalization, what is the country of his birth?
5. How long has he lived in Canada?
6. When was he naturalized?

Right Hon. Mr. DOHERTY:

1, 2, 3, 4, 5 and 6. The position occupied by Mr. Sydney Smith has been abolished as has also the position of Purchasing Agent, and the duties of the two have been joined under the title of Superintendent of Equipment and Supplies, and Mr. J. H. Lewis has been temporarily appointed as acting head. Mr. Lewis is a British subject by birth and has resided in Canada during the last 38 years.

EXCISE TAXES ON TOBACCO

Mr. GERVAIS:

1. On page 512 of the Canada Year Book, 1919, one of the items in the Canadian Excise

Tariff reads as follows: "Tobacco, per pound . . . 20c." and another reads: "Canadian raw leaf and unstemmed tobacco, per pound . . . 5c."

2. In what cases do each of the above excise taxes apply?

Hon. Mr. WIGMORE:

1. 20 cents per pound on manufactured tobacco in all cases as provided per section 279 of the Inland Revenue Act as amended May 24, 1918.

2. 5 cents per pound on unstemmed Canadian raw leaf as provided per section 328a, paragraph 3, of the Inland Revenue Act as amended May 24, 1918.

CANADA HIGHWAYS ACT

Mr. FRIPP:

1. For how many highways in the province of Ontario has a project statement been approved by the Minister of Railways for Federal grants under the Canada Highways Act, chapter 54 of the Statutes of Canada, 1919?

2. What are the highways in respect to which agreements for Federal aid have been reached between the province of Ontario and the Minister of Railways?

3. Have any sums been paid to the province of Ontario for the new Ottawa-Prescott road?

4. If so, what is the total amount up to 31st of December, 1920?

5. Has any understanding been reached with the Ontario Government respecting the surface finish of this highway; whether it is to be concrete, water-bound macadam, gravel, tarvia or other material? If so, what?

6. What is the estimated amount of Federal aid to the Ottawa-Prescott road?

Hon. Mr. REID:

1. 17.

2. Ottawa-Point Fortune; Ottawa-Prescott; Prescott-Brockville; Brockville-Kingston; Kingston-Belleville; Belleville-Whitby; Yonge Street, Toronto-Bradford; Dundas Street, Toronto-Hamilton; Queenston Road, Hamilton-Stoney Creek; Stoney Creek-Queenston; Hamilton-Jarvis; Hamilton-Bradford; Brantford - Woodstock; Woodstock-Ingersoll; Ingersoll - London; London-St. Thomas; London-Stratford.

3. Yes.

4. Nothing had been paid up to December 31, 1920, but under authority of an Order in Council of February 25, $74,320.31 was paid by cheque on March 15.

5. Surface finish, cement concrete or bituminous macadam.

6. 40 per cent of the amount which in the opinion of the minister is the actual necessary and reasonable cost. The Highway Department of the Ontario Government estimates the cost at $1,790,879.

TAXATION FORMS—REVISION BY DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE

Mr. TOBIN:

1. Were the forms of the Taxation Branch, Department of Finance, submitted to the Department of Justice for revision before being printed and issued?

2. Did the Department of Justice concur in Form T 4, 1919, and particularly the following sentence: "Amount paid into Retirement Fund under the Civil Service Superannuation and Retirement Act must not be deducted from income of members of the Civil Service?"

3. Under what authority does the Commissioner of Taxation refuse to recognize the claim of Civil Servants that deductions from their salaries under Section 27, Chap. 17, R.S.C., are not susceptible to income tax?

Sir HENRY DRAYTON:

1. No.

2. No.

3. "Income" as defined by section three, subsection one: "Annual—gain—as being wages, salary or other fixed amount—directly or indirectly received by a person from any office or employment."

See Smyth vs. Stretton (1904) 90 L.T. 756.

INTERNATIONAL FINANCIAL CONFERENCE

*Mr. TRAHAN:

1. Who represented Canada at the International Financial Conference at Brussels held in that city fro. September 24 to October 8, 1920?

2. Have these representatives presented a report to the Government?

3. Is it the intention of the Government to communicate the said report to the House and distribute copies of same to the members?

4. If so, when will this be done?

5. If not, why?

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: The gentlemen who represented Canada at the International Financial Conference at Brussels were the hon. the Minister of Militia and Defence, (Mr. Guthrie) Mr. G. C. Cassels, and Mr. J. H. Gundy. A report has been made by the conference and has been tabled. In answer to the question whether it will be distributed, I may say that it is not the intention to do so as the report is too voluminous to print.

CAPTAIN HENRY C. ADAMS

Mr. CURRIE:

1. Has the attention of the Government been drawn to the following press despatch published in the *Ottawa Citizen* of the 16th instant,

Capt. Adams Did Not Rebuke Canadians.
Report of His Speech at Vancouver Wrong

Vancouver, March 15—In a despatch sent out last night, Captain Henry C. Adams, of the Canadian naval squadron, was incorrectly reported to have said in a speech at the Canadian Club luncheon that England was paying $17 a head for maintenance of the navy, an-

that it was time that Canada stepped into the breach and assumed her fair share of the burden. This remark was made by Gordon C. Jackson, secretary of the Dominion Navy League.

2. In view of the aspersion cast upon Captain Adams by an honourable member of this House, based upon the erroneous information referred to in the foregoing despatch, as reported in Hansard of the 15th instant, will the Government take measures to ensure that Captain Adams is publicly exonerated from the reflections thus made upon his discretion as a Naval Officer?

Right Hon. Mr. MEIGHEN: The remarks which the question intimates constituted an aspersion consisted in a question to the Government as to whether its attention had been drawn to certain remarks attributed to Captain Adams in a newspaper, and whether, if such remarks had been made, any disciplinary action was contemplated by the Government. As appears from the question which the hon. member has done us the service to put on the Order Paper, the remarks were not made. There does not appear to be any aspersion, at all events any which the Government has power to remove.

QUESTIONS PASSED AS ORDERS FOR RETURNS

Mr. WRIGHT:

1. What number of cars, locomotives and rolling stock generally, were ordered by the Government during the calendar years 1918, 1919 and 1920?

2. What was the value of these orders?

3. From whom was this equipment purchased, and what was the value of each contract?

Mr. CANNON:

1. Who are the medical officers employed at the head office of the Board of Pension Commissioners at Ottawa?

2. What are the names and what has been the medical experience of each?

3. How many of these medical advisers have completed their university course, and (a) What are their names; (b) How many have obtained their diplomas permitting them to practise; (c) Have any among them obtained their license to practise in recognition of their war service?

4. What is the military record of each of these officers?

5. What is the salary of each?

6. What are their respective duties?

7. Have these medical advisers the medical experience sufficient to decide on technical questions for the Board of Pension Commissioners and are they well qualified to change the decision of local medical officers?

8. Are the Commissioners obliged to concur in the decision of their medical officers?

9. If not, why?

UNOPPOSED MOTIONS FOR PRODUCTION OF PAPERS

Mr. MURPHY:

For a copy of all reports made by Arthur Young and Co., and Griffenhagen and Associates, and of all communications sent by the said firms to the Civil Service Commission relative to the Department of Public Printing and Stationery, and of all correspondence between the Civil Service Commission and the Department of Public Printing and Stationery, or any official thereof, relative to such reports and communications.

Mr. DAVIDSON:

For a copy of all letters and correspondence exchanged between professors or officials of Acadia University and the Department of Mines since February 1, 1920, to date, relative to the employment of students of the said University by the said Department during the summer months?

GRANTS TO AGRICULTURAL SHOWS

Mr. JOSEPH ARCHAMBAULT (Chambly and Verchères) moved:

Whereas, the regulations of the Department of Agriculture provide, in connection with autumn shows of domestic animals and poultry, that agricultural societies which have spent a minimum amount of $3,600 of their own money in their preceding show for the granting of prizes to the above classes of exhibits, will be entitled to a minimum grant of $2,500 from the Department of Agriculture.

Whereas, in fixing a sum of $3,600 as a minimum of expenses for the obtention of a grant the department does not encourage in any way the small local fairs held in counties which as an average distribute about $500 in prizes for aforesaid classes of exhibits.

In the opinion of this House it is expedient to amend the present regulations by reducing the minimum to $500, and by entitling the said fairs to the two-thirds of the amount expended in the previous year, this fraction being given as a grant providing that the amount expended was at least $500.

He said: Mr. Speaker, the object of this resolution is apparent as the motion speaks for itself, and it is my intention to be very brief in the remarks which I purpose to make in support of it. In passing, I may remark that this is another non-partisan resolution. Its purpose is to encourage local and county exhibitions of domestic animals and poultry. As the regulations of the department now stand, it is provided that, in connection with the autumn shows of domestic animals and poultry, agricultural societies which have spent a minimum of $3,600 of their own money in their preceding show in the granting of prizes to the above classes of exhibits shall be entitled to a minimum grant of $2,500 from the Department of Agriculture. Now, there are no local or county shows of domestic animals and poultry which have ever spent as large an amount of $3,600 as a minimum for prizes, and I understand that this year the minimum has been raised by the minister to $4,000. I have a list here of the counties surrounding my district, with the respective sums distributed last year in prizes. In the

county of La Prairie the amount was $600.05; in the county of St. John, $441.25; in the county of Napierville, $414.50; in the county of Rouville, $597.20; in the county of Chambly, $741.45; and in the county of Verchères, $801.

These regulations may be all right for provincial and regional exhibitions, but the fixing of a minimum of $3,600 or $4,000 altogether precludes the local or county exhibitions from any share of the grants made by the Federal Government to agricultural societies. To prove my contention, I may say that I am informed by the department that last year in Canada there were only twenty or twenty-one exhibitions or shows of the kind which got the Federal grant. In my province there were only five. These were the exhibitions at St. Scholastique, Sherbrooke, Three Rivers, Ormstown, and Quebec. The exhibition at St. Scholastique is a regional exhibition in which practically four, five, or six counties participate. At Sherbrooke it is an industrial exhibition, that place being a city. At Three Rivers it is the same. At Ormstown the show is a regional exhibition and at Quebec it is a provincial exhibition. I surmise that in the other provinces the same thing occurs—that no local or county exhibition of that kind ever gives prizes to an amount as high as the minimum fixed by the department.

Mr. EDWARDS: Does the provincial government of Quebec give grants to these smaller fairs on the basis of the prize money paid out?

Mr. ARCHAMBAULT: The provincial government gives prizes but not on the basis of the prize money paid out. I believe the grants are given on the basis of the number of members belonging to each agricultural society in the proportion of two dollars for one. Nevertheless, Mr. Speaker, I believe that the Federal Government should also encourage these local and county exhibitions; I submit that they are much more deserving of support than are the regional or provincial exhibitions. My reason for making that statement is that: in the local and county shows a keen rivalry prevails between the exhibitors or farmers of the district or riding. They can go to these shows, compete against each other and have a chance to win prizes. At the regional or provincial exhibitions the awards are nearly always carried off some wealthy corporation or breeder possessing the means to purchase prize cattle and so secure the prizes. This is one of the reasons why the local shows should be encouraged. Furthermore, the farmer of ordinary means will not exhibit at the regional or provincial shows because it means too much expense to him. These shows generally last five or six days, and the farmer, if he wishes to exhibit at them, has in the first place to lose that period of time. Then he has to make provision for travelling expenses to the place of exhibition, which is generally situated at a distance from his farm. He has also to incur the expense involved during the five or six days that he is attending the exhibition. On the other hand the county fair, or the local show, is generally held at a place which is in the centre of the county and very close to the farmer's home, and it lasts but one day. The farmer gets up very early in the morning, goes to the local show, spends the whole day there and returns to his home the same night. I see my hon. friend from Frontenac (Mr. Edwards) laughing, but that is what happens in my county.

Mr. EDWARDS: The farmer always gets up early.

Mr. ARCHAMBAULT: That is true, but on the morning of the local exhibition he gets up even much earlier. As I said before, the local exhibitions should be encouraged to a greater extent than the regional or provincial shows because they result in much benefit to the farmer of ordinary means. Another reason for their encouragement is this: The regional or provincial shows require extensive buildings for exhibition purposes, while the county or local shows practically do not require buildings of any very great value. A still further reason for the encouragement of the county shows is because they are entirely agricultural in their character. You do not find at the local shows—at least it is the case in the province of Quebec and I presume the same conditions prevail in the other provinces—"midway" attractions and shows which if not of an immoral character are certainly vulgar, to say nothing of the crowd of fakirs, such as are witnessed at the provincial or regional exhibitions. Attractions of this kind very often deprive the farmers of their money, and they allure young people who would otherwise be examining the respective exhibits of the exhibition proper and deriving an educational advantage therefrom. The object of my resolution is not to do away with the grants to regional or provincial exhibitions, but simply to give more encouragement to the local and county shows. The only objection which

might be urged to its adoption, is that it would involve some additional expenditure. Well, out of the 235 counties or ridings in Canada there are about 54 urban constituencies, leaving 181 rural ridings. If I take $600 as the average amount of the prizes given in each county for these local shows, which would entitle the counties to get two-thirds, or $400, it would only involve an expenditure of $72,400. Even if I increased that average and placed it at $900, which is a pretty high figure for prizes for these shows, the two-thirds would amount to $600, and 181 counties at $600 would only represent a total of $108,600. I submit, Mr. Speaker, that the Minister of Agriculture who is a practical man and has devoted himself with great earnestness towards promoting the welfare and development of agriculture, should agree to my resolution, for it would be a great boom for the agriculturists of this country and be decidedly to the advantage of the farming community.

Mr. THOMAS VIEN (Lotbinière): I beg to support the motion of my hon. friend from Chambly and Verchères (Mr. Archambault). The other day, when discussing the estimates of the Department of Agriculture, I pointed out to the minister at the head of that department the importance of stimulating the development of agriculture through the medium of these country fairs. In the county of Lotbinière we have the good fortune of having one of the finest country fairs in our section of the province. We have a permanent building in which are exhibited every year the products of the farmers of the county, and it is encouraging to see the zeal which the farmers display and the keenness with which they compete for the prizes which are offered. But it is not possible to offer to these farmers in the one county the sum of $4,000 which is the minimum fixed by the Department of Agriculture entitling an exhibition to a grant. If this minimum were lowered to $500, as suggested by the resolution of my hon. friend from Chambly and Verchères, these farmers could obtain from the department a grant which would materially assist them, and would be of greater benefit to the development of agriculture than are those regional exhibitions which, as my hon. friend has just said, are more of the character of a circus than of an agricultural fair. For this reason, Sir, I think that if the hon. minister can see his way clear to get the necessary money to encourage these country fairs, he will advance the interests of agriculture in a most practical way.

I do not wish to repeat what I said to the Minister of Agriculture the other day when discussing his Estimates, but I can assure him that I give my heartiest support to the resolution. And I cordially invite him to attend the agricultural exhibition at Lotbinière next September, when he will see the progressive character of the farming population in that district, and will be convinced, I think, that the grants will be convinced, I think, that his grants have been taken full advantage of.

Mr. EMMANUEL D'ANJOU (Rimouski): (Translation.) Mr. Speaker, I wish to say a word in support of the motion introduced by the hon. member for Chambly-Verchères (Mr. Archambault). It is certainly one of the most interesting resolutions which have been submitted to the House during the present session.

I would not like to hurt the feelings of my hon. friend the member for Lotbinière (Mr. Vien), but I believe that we have country fairs in Rimouski which are as fine as any in his country. Two years ago, in the county of Rimouski, county fairs were started, and all who have taken part in these agree in saying that most certainly there are none better. They are not a meeting place for amusement, a circus, they are only an exhibition of all the agricultural products which the farmers of the county may bring. If the motion introduced by the hon. member for Chambly-Verchères were passed it would assuredly be an encouragement to our farmers who have such great sacrifices to make; such as loss of time and loss of money, in order to enter into competition in these fairs.

The district of Rimouski is certainly one of the important agricultural districts of the country, one of the most progressive. Our farmers are model farmers; they are attached to the earth and do their best in every circumstance to prove that they are experts in agriculture.

I do not wish to insist further, but I think that all the hon. members, and especially those who represent agricultural counties, should strongly support the resolution moved by the hon. member for Chambly-Verchères and urge the Government to accept it. This would enhance the interest attaching to our country fairs, and besides, would encourage our agriculturists to increase production, which we so urgently need at the present time.

[Mr. Archambault.]

Mr. J. W. EDWARDS (Frontenac): Mr. Speaker, I think the general principle of this resolution, the principle of encouraging the production of better live stock, should be supported. But the function of this Parliament is not provincial, and it seems to me that some duty falls upon the provincial authorities to encourage these smaller fairs. In the province of Ontario such fairs are encouraged by grants from the provincial government, based upon the amount of money paid out in prizes by the several fairs. It seems to me that the sponsor of this resolution should not expect the Federal Government to go any further than the provincial governments are prepared to go in assisting these smaller fairs. For my part, I would be prepared to support a motion to the effect that the Government contribute an amount equal to the amount given by the several provincial governments in the way of grants to these fairs.

A good deal can be said in favour of the hon. gentleman's statement that the larger fairs are patronized by the wealthy stock breeders who make a business of exhibiting prize animals. I have had some little experience in connection with the smaller fairs, having been the secretary and manager of one for a number of years, and I may say that some fairs are open to this criticism, that very often, because they are only one-day fairs, somebody will drive in every animal he has on his farm, whether he ought to be ashamed to exhibit them or not, for the sake of getting some kind of prize. Therefore, in connection with making grants to these fairs I think it should be stipulated that expert judges be engaged, especially as our agricultural colleges are providing us with first-class men who are available for these duties. If we are to pay out federal money to encourage the production of first-class stock, we should have judges who are capable of passing an expert opinion upon that stock, and not merely some local man who will award a prize to any grade of animal, no matter whether it is worthy of a prize or not. If animals are not up to a certain standard no prizes should be given. A conscientious judge drawn from the locality in which the fair is held will often exact that high standard, but I must say, speaking from my own experience, a local judge is more apt to be influenced by his friends in the neighbourhood and to say, "Well, this animal is not quite up to the standard, but we will give it a prize anyway." I do not believe that the indiscriminate awarding of prizes encourages the production of good stock. I am in favour of some help being given by the Dominion Government to encourage the breeding of good stock, but such help should be supplemented dollar for dollar by the provincial authorities.

Mr. LEVI THOMSON (Qu'Appelle): Mr. Speaker, I share the opinion of other hon. members that our country fairs should be encouraged in every reasonable way. But I am afraid I cannot go so far as even the hon. member for Frontenac (Mr. Edwards) in saying that the Dominion should give grants to these smaller fairs, even as supplementary to the grants given by the provinces, These smaller fairs are purely provincial or local, and this House has about enough on its hands just now without branching out into anything of this kind. I cannot agree with the hon. gentleman who introduced the resolution that so small an amount as he suggests would be required. I think I could point to as many fairs in our province as he suggests altogether; many agricultural societies there would pay out from $500 to $1,000 in prizes if they could get two-thirds of it from the Dominion. In my constituency alone there are twelve or fourteen agricultural societies. Putting it at ten and multiplying that by say two hundred constituencies in Canada, you have two thousand fairs.

Mr. VIEN: Does my hon. friend understand that we speak of one fair per riding and not of agricultural societies, of which we have a number in each riding?

Mr. THOMSON (Qu'Appelle): I am dealing with the resolution as I find it. You may call them "fairs" or "autumn shows," whichever you like—"a rose by any other name would smell as sweet." I do not think the name has anything to do with it. We call them all "agricultural societies" in our country; and we do all that sort of work through these societies. I do not think the resolution is confined to one exhibition or show for each riding; I think it would be absurd to suggest that any one agricultural riding can support only one fair of that kind. I have a good deal more faith in the progressiveness of the farmers of Canada than to believe anything of that kind.

Now, we have our agricultural fairs in Saskatchewan, and to these the province gives some assistance, as do municipalities in many cases. We have no counties

in the provinces of Saskatchewan and Alberta, so my hon. friend's remark would not apply. We have rural municipalities, and they are disposed to treat fairly the smaller exhibitions. But even at that we find it very difficult to keep these exhibitions going, and I am very sorry that is the case, because I believe that the small agricultural exhibition properly handled is very beneficial to the country. But I do not think that this House or this Government should undertake, as finances are at the present time, to give assistance in cases of that kind. To do so would take not the small sum mentioned by my hon. friend, but in the neighbourhood of a million dollars, if the thing is to be done properly. I do not think that the Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Tolmie) has a million dollars at his disposal for any purpose of that kind. I do not want to discourage my hon. friend in his desire to secure the expenditure of money for the benefit of the farmers or in support of agricultural exhibitions or shows—he may call them what he likes. It is desirable that these smaller shows should be encouraged. However, I cannot join in the request that such an expenditure be made by the Dominion because, as I have said, I do not think we should spend money in that way, at the present time, at least.

Mr. PETER McGIBBON (Muskoka): Mr. Speaker, I have a great deal of pleasure in supporting the principle of this resolution, and one of the reasons why I do so has just been mentioned by the hon. member for Qu'Appelle (Mr. Thomson). That hon. gentleman says that the attendance at smaller fairs is falling away. This we all know to be the case. These small exhibition organizations have great difficulty in keeping up their prizes; and that is particularly true of all the small fairs, I think, in the province of Ontario. Many things contribute to this condition. The principal reason, I think, is found in the more general use of the automobile. Most farmers get into their cars and drive to the fair to see what their neighbours are exhibiting, while their neighbours, like themselves, have brought nothing, because it does not pay them to do so.

We know, too, that along with the progress of fairs has gone the development of stock. That is quite easily proved, especially in the new parts of the country where the small fall fairs are carried on. The improvement in the class of stock thus brought about is the result, largely, of competition; nothing will induce improvement in the class of stock like keen competition among neighbours in small municipalities. This does not apply to the same extent in the case of larger fairs, but if you want to improve the condition of the stock in the rural and backward parts of a province I do not know of any one thing more conducive to that end than to bring about an improvement of the calibre and the class of the fall fairs—an improvement which in itself hinges largely upon the extent of the prize list. In nearly all cases the prize list is too small to recompense a man for the trouble incidental to the exhibiting of his stock at a fair. I think, therefore, that if Parliament could see its way clear to grant —I would not say a few hundred thousand dollars; I would not restrict it to a million, because I think it would be an investment that would be productive of splendid returns to the people of this country—if, I say, we could spend a million or a million and a half along these lines, the results during the next five or ten years would be of an extremely beneficial character. I agree with the member for Frontenac (Mr. Edwards) that anything of this kind must be worked out on a sound basis. His suggestion that the assistance to be given by the Dominion be based on the provincial grants, which, in turn, in the case of Ontario at least, are based on the amount contributed by the municipality, is a fair one. You there have some finality of responsibility; you there have a just basis upon which to build up your prize list. I do think that if this country is going to make progress and if it is to pay off its national debt, nothing will hold out such a favourable prospect in that direction as the development of our stock raising industry, and that, in turn, must be based upon the building up of higher grades of the different breeds of stock. For these reasons, Mr. Speaker, I have very much pleasure in supporting at least the principle of this resolution, and I hope that the minister may be able to carry into effect the substance of the suggestions incorporated in it.

Mr. GEORGE PARENT (Quebec West): Mr. Speaker, a short time ago, when the Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Tolmie) had his Estimates before the House, at a late hour in the night we on this side, feeling that the minister had been kind enough to answer a good many questions, felt that we would like to give him a chance to pass a few items. Just about that time, Sir, he made the affirmation that in British Columbia a certain kind of hens had been

laying three hundred eggs per year. I take it that on a resolution of this kind, involving the discussion of exhibitions and fairs in connection with which poultry would be exhibited, we may fairly ask the minister to state to the House what kind of hens he was speaking about. I think everybody would be glad to know something more about hens that would lay three hundred eggs per year.

Mr. A. M. DECHENE (Montmagny): (Translation.) Mr. Speaker, may I be allowed to add a few words to this discussion, now drawing to its termination, regarding the resolution introduced by the hon. member for Chambly and Verchères (Mr. Archambault). The object of our rural agricultural exhibitions seems to be somewhat ignored or to have gone out of sight. In our departments of agriculture, there seems to be a particular tendency to encourage poultry and cattle breeding, without taking into account the fact that agricultural exhibitions in rural districts include every one of the farm products. For instance, there is held in the district of Montmagny one of the largest country fairs in this Dominion, an exhibition that at times will last as long as three days.

The capital required for the buildings necessary for this exhibition is considerable. It is difficult to determine exactly what is the sum spent to encourage poultry and cattle breeding, and to separate it from the sum given in general as prizes for all agricultural products. The farmers who represent the mass of Canadian farmers, go in for general farming and do not specialize in any one branch. He really represents the national agricultural asset, and I believe, as was said just now by one of the hon. members on the right, that he deserves more attention than any other class of agriculturists. The one who goes in for stock-raising exclusively is usually a rich man who does not require the stimulus of these exhibitions to lead him to improve his products in quality and quantity. The large exhibitions which are now encouraged by the Department of Agriculture really serve almost any end, but that intended. The large breeders who show their animals at these exhibitions do so not so much to win prizes as to let other breeders, and farmers in general, know the quality of their products and in so doing create a market for them. This does not encourage them to breed a better quality of animals, since they take part in these public shows simply to sell and advertise their stock. When you go to the rural fair, the district exhibition, you meet there the general farmer with all kinds of produce, who in a real spirit of rivalry tries to show that he can do better than his neighbour. His interest is not strictly commercial, nor his aim money-making. It is rather a matter of pride. He wants to show that he can do better than his neighbours, and to earn the reputation of being a model farmer in his district. I believe that this is the spirit which should be encouraged in the farmers; we should urge them to attempt to surpass each other. We would thus attain the aim of these exhibitions, which is to better the breed of our herds and poultry generally. With the present system, it is only the largest regional exhibitions which are subsidized and the people who win the prizes are not those needing encouragement. This is why the motion of the hon. member from Verchères is doubly praiseworthy, since it tends to encourage those who really need encouragement and in bettering the agricultural output, would thus add to the asset of our country.

We have in our rural districts several kinds of agricultural exhibitions. These exhibitions count usually upon the generosity of members of Parliament, municipal councillors, priests, and they are practically dependent upon charity for the recognition of the work exhibited. To mention but a few, besides the big country fair, we have that of the farmers' gardens, in which the competitors are often young boys or children who work a small plot of land, or who raise a few chickens or animals, hoping to win prizes furnished by generous doners in the parish. These youths, rather than farmers on a large scale, deserve to be encouraged. From their earliest years they work on the farm and try to improve their parents' stock, thus learning how to carry on this industry when they will be working for themselves. These youths will to-morrow be the men at the head of the agricultural industry, and nothing is being done to encourage them except through the friendly interest of those about them. There are exhibitions of this kind in all the parishes of our counties. We have exhibitions of domestic produce which depend also upon the goodwill of the people of the locality. Under these circumstances, I am tempted to go further than the hon. member from Verchères, and to

ask the hon. Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Tolmie) not to limit his patronage to the large breeders of poultry and cattle, but to bring its benefits within range of all the agricultural exhibitions, in giving them, for instance, a percentage of the sum which their management offer as prizes, the amount could be fixed at 25, 30 or even 50 per cent. This would not cost the country much, would help to maintain these exhibition concerns, and would have the double advantage of giving more prizes to the exhibitors and of fostering the increased agricultural production, so necessary for the payment of our indebtedness, thus contributing to the general welfare of the country.

I understand that our friends from the West, who have immense herds and numerous horses for breeding purposes on a large scale, are not very enthusiastic over the motion of the hon. member for Chambly and Verchères, for this motion might result in decreasing, to the benefit of the great mass of farmers, the subsidies from the hon. Minister of Agriculture and in diverting perhaps a large part of what they now obtain. I noticed, the other day, when the Estimates of Agriculture were under discussion, that nearly one half of these Estimates went to the encouragement of breeding and the care of our herds. There was a special item of one million dollars for breeding; there was an item of nearly one million dollars towards maintaining the health of the herds; all this, Mr. Speaker, in the interest of the large breeders; but the poor farmer, who has but twenty-five or thirty head of cattle, who has but eight or ten horses, who has but a more or less modest poultry-yard, derives but little benefit from these large subsidies. I believe that if the motion of the hon. member for Chambly and Verchères were adopted the mass of farmers would be largely benefited thereby and I therefore am very happy to support it.

Mr. JOHN BEST (Dufferin): Mr. Speaker, if this resolution passes, every fall fair and many school fairs in Ontario will also get this grant. The resolution states that if any fair contributes $500 toward prizes, the Government shall make a grant of two-thirds. In this way it would pay the management of every fair to add a couple of hundred dollars or whatever was necessary to reach the minimum amount of $500 and if they received a grant of two-thirds of that amount, that would mean that they would get $333 or in other words, that they would have to pay really only about $167. Therefore, it would be good financing for the management of every fair to do this in order to get the two-thirds grant.

While I believe that every encouragement should be given to these autumn fairs and to the production and improvement of stock of every kind, when municipal councils and provincial governments are making grants, there is too much of a duplication. During the past two years the present Government has been duplicating too much of the work of provincial governments, and I cannot see the benefit of that. Why should we take money, which the people in each and every province have to pay into the Dominion treasury, and hand it over to the different provinces and municipalities? Such action is all right when the work is on a broad scale such as that of our experimental farms; but if we are going to contribute to local fairs, we might as well begin to contribute to township fairs and to do township work, and if we did that I believe we would be making a mistake. No man in this House is more anxious than I am to promote agriculture in every way, but I do not think this is a wise step to take towards that end. If I interpret the resolution aright, there is no doubt that every fair in Ontario will benefit, but I understand that is not the intention of the mover of the resolution.

Mr. ARCHAMBAULT: May I ask the hon. gentleman a question? What I mean by my resolution is that there should be only one grant for each riding.

Mr. BEST: That would create rivalry and do harm in a constituency where there were two or three fairs. Why should the people of the Dominion of Canada be asked to contribute to one fair which is picked out and not to another? In my constituency I do not know which of the three fairs is the best; some years, one is better than the others. I think it would be unfair to ask the people belonging to one fair to subscribe towards a grant for another fair in the same constituency. I agree with the hon. member that it probably would be better if there was only one fair in each constituency; in many cases there are probably too many, but at the present time in many constituencies there are two or three fairs, and it would be very unfair to say that one fair in a particular constituency will get the grant and the other two or three will not get it.

Mr. ARCHAMBAULT: There is one agricultural society—

Mr. SPEAKER: Order. The hon. member's last question turned out to be an assertion of his own. I point out that when he closes the debate, he will have ample opportunity to reply.

Mr. BEST: The resolution says "fall fairs." They are all fairs in Ontario, and, therefore, I cannot see how the grant could be honestly given to one and not to another.

Mr. E. W. NESBITT (Oxford North): Mr. Speaker, in what has been said by all the members of the House, there is a great deal with which I am in accord. If the Government could afford the money, the grant might benefit certain people who show cattle, pigs and chickens at country fairs, and it might, as the hon. member for Muskoka (Mr. McGibbon) said, encourage competition, although that has not been my experience to a great extent. I might suggest that a way in which the Government could easily encourage agriculture in this country more than by making grants to country fairs, would be by reducing the cost of transportation. For fear that the minister might think that everybody in this House was, at the present time at least, in favour of granting moneys to country fairs, I just take the opportunity to say that I think the country will worry along this year and perhaps next year without any additional grant to country fairs put into his Estimates, and I hope that he will not attempt to add that expense to his Estimates.

Mr. J. F. JOHNSTON (Last Mountain): Mr. Speaker, while I agree that everything possible should be done to assist in the development of agriculture and also in the improvement of our flocks and herds in this country, I cannot see any virtue in this resolution along that line. As pointed out by the hon. member for Qu'Appelle (Mr. Thomson), in Saskatchewan, country fairs or agricultural shows receive assistance from our provincial Department of Agriculture. That department is presided over by a practical farmer who, I am sure, will see to it that everything of a provincial nature is done for the advancement of agriculture in that province. The hon. gentleman who moved this resolution has said that he wants it to apply just to one fair in each constituency. In the constituency of Last Mountain there are twelve of these small fairs, and I would not like to be the one to select the particular fair which was to receive this grant. For that reason, and for the one big reason that I think this Parliament and Government should practise the strictest economy in all lines of expenditure, I am opposed to the resolution.

Hon. S. F. TOLMIE (Minister of Agriculture): Mr. Speaker, I have listened with a great deal of interest to what hon. gentlemen have had to say with regard to the granting of money by the Federal Government to small exhibitions. In the Department of Agriculture, we have adopted a policy of making grants to interprovincial and national shows rather than to the smaller shows. We have always felt that the small show comes within the purview of provincial Governments which are well able to take care of such shows. We feel that the provincial Governments should do their share, and that the work of handling the small shows belongs more to a Provincial Government than to a Federal Government. I do not want for a moment to speak in any slighting way of the work that these small shows are doing. They are rendering a very valuable service to agriculture and act as feeders to the bigger shows. We are giving aid to agriculture and particularly to the livestock industry in many ways. Amongst such policies might be mentioned:

Federal aid to horse breeding	$125,000
Distribution of pure bred sires	155,000
Record of performance for dairy cattle	25,000
District field work re cattle	45,000
District field work re sheep	35,000
District field work re poultry	60,000
District field work re hogs	20,000
Total	$465,000

This does not by any means exhaust the list of our activities in connection with the livestock industry. Our other work includes the co-operative marketing of livestock, wool and eggs, the replacement of scrub sires, the organization of committees to promote better business methods in production and marketing, assistance to boys' and girls' clubs in connection with the production and marketing of hogs, the supervision and operation of stock yards and stock yard exchanges, the issue of daily, weekly and yearly livestock market reports, the inspection and grading of wool and eggs, financial aid in connection with the registration of live-

stock, and the presentation of educational livestock exhibits at our different exhibitions.

Comparing the small fair with the big fair, one of the previous speakers said that the big fair did not fill a valuable niche in the progress of our livestock industry, or something to that effect. Now a breeder of pure-bred cattle in a back country district may successfully exhibit his stock at a local fair and win year after year, until finally he begins to think that he has quite a good line of cattle or some other line of livestock, but when he goes to the big fair that is assisted by the Federal Government, and where big enough prizes are offered to enable the poor man to take his stock, he meets with real competition and soon finds out that to win there he must have very much better cattle than he possesses. He is able to see a very large display of livestock there, and purchase such animals as he might think necessary to improve his herds. It is not always the big man that wins at the big show, as has been stated. In fact, these shows have been the means of bringing out young breeders who are anxious to produce cattle of good quality, but who did not know how good their cattle were until they took them to the big shows and competed with the big breeders. There are many cases where the success of these men with their cattle at these exhibitions has been the foundation of very much greater successes in subsequent years.

I notice also that some of the bigger shows were criticised for having attractions at the show. To operate a show successfully you must have the attendance through the gate, or some other source of revenue. An exhibition that is run for a week or ten days must have a varying programme to attract all kinds of people. A great many people who go to shows are not very much interested in some of the agricultural lines, but a show in Toronto or some other big city draws people by attractions of different kinds, and the managers must take advantage of the general population that patronize these shows by having such attractions as will bring them through the gates. Once having received that money through the gates, they are able to distribute it among the stock breeders and other lines of exhibitors, to the advantage of agriculture in the long run. I have pointed out the policy of the Government in this connection. We feel we have drawn the line at a safe figure. It is our intention to assist the inter-provincial and national shows, leaving the smaller shows to be taken care of by thep rovinces, which I think, are well able to undertake that responsibility. On these grounds, I must oppose the resolution.

Mr. ARCHAMBAULT: Of course, it is not my intention to press this resolution to a vote, though I felt when I brought it in, that it would be of such help to the farmers that the minister would probably accept it, and I still hope that after he has had time to investigate the matter properly, if I come back next year with the same resolution, he will agree to it.

I will now try and answer some of the objections that have been made by some hon. members. My hon. friend from Frontenac (Mr. Edwards), who I was very glad to see supported the resolution, raised only one objection. He stated, and the Minister of Agriculture raised the same objection, that the provincial governments should do their share in supporting the local exhibitions. That is true, and if it is the same in other provinces as in the province of Quebec, they do support these local exhibitions. My hon. friend from Frontenac stated that he would support my resolution if it was couched in such a way as to provide that the Federal Government would contribute the same amount that the Provincial Government did. I would agree to that, because I believe it would mean the counties would get a larger grant than they would under my resolution. I believe, and I think I can prove, that the Provincial Government grants more to the county and local shows than they would get under this resolution, which provides for only two-thirds of the amount spent in the preceding year. I do not know how it is in Ontario, but in Quebec the Government grants $2 for each member of the agricultural society. In answer to my hon. friend from Qu'Appelle (Mr. Thomson), I may say that there is only one agricultural society in each county in the province of Quebec. We have an agricultural society in the county of Chambly, for instance, and another in the county of Vercheres. There is only one in each county, to which practically all the progressive farmers belong, and as the Provincial Government grants $2 for each member of the society, I think if the suggestion of my hon. friend from Frontenac were followed, these shows would receive more than they would under the resolution now before the House.

I was greatly surprised to hear the speech of my hon. friend from Qu'Appelle.

It has been said very often that the Agrarian party was in favour of class legislation. Well, I think we had proof of that assertion this afternoon. My hon. friend is not in favour of grants to poultry and animal exhibitions, because in the West the farmers grow only grain and care only for that, practically speaking. If my resolution asked for a grant for grain exhibitions, I am sure my hon. friend would support it. He also stated it was an absurdity to think there was only one small exhibition in each rural riding. He probably did not understand that the shows mentioned in my resolution are shows only for domestic animals and poultry. Of course, we have other agricultural fairs in the province of Quebec at which grain and all kinds of cereals, and industrial products, are exhibited, but we have only one fall fair for domestic animals and poultry.

My resolution would not call for such a very large expenditure, Mr. Speaker. According to my calculations it would not amount to more than $108,600, supposing the average expenditure on the previous show to be $900. We are spending this year $19,000,000 for Militia and Defence, Naval Service and Mounted Police; then we have an item of $16,000,000 for miscellaneous. These expenditures, I think, might very well be curtailed in order to encourage the farmers in the development of agriculture.

I do not need to explain to my hon. friend from Dufferin (Mr. Best), that in the province of Quebec—I do not know whether it is the same in Ontario, but judging from the hon. gentleman's remarks, I do not suppose it is—there is only one agricultural society for each riding; so that it would not be hard for me to decide which society in my riding should get the grant. My hon. friend the Minister of Agriculture (Hon. Mr. Tolmie) has given us a statement which, in my opinion, reinforces my resolution. He has said that the attractions which we see at large fairs are necessary in order to bring money to those centres. That is true, and it is exactly why I desire the Minister of Agriculture to grant some money to the purely agricultural shows, which are deficient in the kind of attractions one sees in provincial or regional exhibitions. As I said before Mr. Speaker, I do not intend to press this resolution to a vote, but I trust that the Minister will take into consideration either my suggestion or that of the hon. member for Frontenac (Mr. Edwards) regarding these shows, because I am convinced that what is proposed is in the interests of the formers of the country. For the moment I desire to withdraw my motion.

Motion withdrawn.

FUEL SUPPLY PROBLEM

Mr. MICHAEL STEELE (South Perth) moved:

That, in the opinion of this House, the future fuel supply of Canada should be considered by Parliament, and that a Special Committee of the House of Commons should be forthwith appointed to inquire into all matters pertaining thereto, with power to send for persons, papers and records, to examine witnesses under oath and to report from time to time.

He said: When people begin discussing fall fairs it is a sure indication of the approach of cold weather, so that I take it that this a very opportune time indeed to introduce the resolution which I have placed in the Order Paper relating to the future fuel supply of Canada. Canada's climate requires the consumption of fuel for seven months of the year. Nearly every pleasure and comfort of life which we have in this country is entirely dependent upon fuel. Fuel is one of the three essentials of life, of which the other two are food and clothing. It is not only essential to the comfort and the very existence of our people in their homes, but it is absolutely indispensible to industry. Our country cannot prosper without power. The wheels of industry stand motionless and production ceases if power is not available. Power for our industries generally cannot be obtained without fuel, and Canada cannot have sufficient fuel for her needs without coal. After the interesting and enlightening discussion which took place in this House last week in regard to the natural resources of our country, it is hardly necessary for me to make much reference to the coal supplies of Canada, but I may be permitted briefly to recall to the House a few facts relating thereto. In Canada we have coal in the east and in the west, but none in the central portion of the country, so that the provinces of Ontario and Quebec have to seek elsewhere for their supplies of fuel.

Mr. LEMIEUX: We have "white coal" in Quebec and Ontario.

Mr. STEELE: Yes. In Nova Scotia and New Brunswick we have large areas of bituminous coal of good quality, while in Saskatchewan, Alberta, and British Columbia, there are immense deposits of lignite and bituminous coal and semi-anthracite. I should like to place on Hansard a state-

ment if our coal reserves, actual and probable, in the various provinces of the Dominion. In Nova Scotia the reserves amount to 10,691,000,000 tons of bituminous coal; in New Brunswick, 166,000,000 tons of bituminous coal; in Ontario, although I said we have no coal, we have, at the south of James Bay, a deposit which is estimated to contain 27,500,000 tons of lignite; in Manitoba there are 176,000,000 tons of lignite; in Saskatchewan, 65,793,000,000 tons of lignite; in Alberta, 1,180,000,000,000 all told, of which 845,900,000 tons is semi-anthracite, 217,918,000,000 tons, bituminous coal, and 932,053,000,000 tons of sub-bituminous, with 29,095,000,000 tons of lignite. In British Columbia there are 77,923,000,000 tons of bituminous, and 5,715,500,000 tons of lignite. In the Yukon there are 275,000,000 tons of bituminous, and 5,159,000,000 tons of lignite, while in the Northwest territories there are 5,280,000,000. And even in the Arctice islands we have immense deposits aggregating 6,600,000,000 tons of bituminous coal.

With such immense quantites of coal in this country, aggregating 71 per cent of all the coal in the British Empire, people who have not much knowledge of the subject may well inquire how any portion of Canada can possibly suffer from a scarcity of coal. Coal is used in this country chiefly for the purposes of domestic heating and power, but it is of no use in these immense deposits unless it can be removed and transported from the mine to the range or furnace in the home, and to the boiler of the factory. From these immense coal deposits, it may be interesting to inquire for a moment, how much is being produced. In 1920, the bituminous coal produced in Canada amounted to 16,623,598 tons. Of this 2,558,174 tons were exported, leaving in this country, of Canadian production, 14,065,784 tons. Perhaps it would be interesting to give the production by provinces. In Nova Scotia, we produced in 1920, 6,395,545 tons, at an average cost of $4.44 per ton; in New Brunswick, 161,164 tons at an average cost of $5.81 per ton; in Saskatchewan, 349,860 tons at an average cost of $2.38 per ton; in Alberta, 6,859,346 tons at an average cost of $4.40 per ton; in British Columbia 2,856,920 tons at an average cost of $5.61; or a total of 16,623,598 tons costing on an average $4.65 per ton.

Knowing the production, it may be interesting for us now to learn what is the annual consumption of coal in Canada. In 1920 we consumed 14,065,424 tons of Canadian coal, and 18,742,542 tons of imported coal, or a total of 32,807,966 tons, costing at the mines $157,345,552. This shows an increased cost over 1919 of $54,000,000, and an increased consumption as compared with 1910 of about fifty per cent. We may ask where does the balance of our coal come from? We consume only 43 per cent of Canadian coal; where does the other 57 per cent come from? It comes entirely from the United States. In 1920 the imports were, as already given, 18,742,542 tons costing $98,033,598 or an average of $5.32 per ton. We find that our imports are very rapidly increasing. In 1910, as I have already stated, we imported only 10,597,000 tons, of which 3,266,235 tons were anthracite and the balance of 7,331,747 tons bituminous. Last year our imports had increased to 18,742,542 tons. Imports of anthracite in the intervening years had increased to 4,881,313 tons, or almost fifty per cent, while the import of bituminous coal had increased 13,861,229 tons, or eighty-nine per cent over the imports of 1910.

These being the sources of our coal supply, let us look for a moment at the cost of coal to the Canadian people, and after all that is the question that is largely affecting our people to-day. The production of coal at the Canadian mines for 1920 was valued at $76,326,853, of which coal to the value of $18,014,899 was exported coal leaving for home consumption coal to the value of $58,311,954. Of the imported coal, anthracite had a value of $36,773,351, and bituminous a value of $61,260,247 or a total import value of $98,033,598.

Mr. BELAND: Was that for the year 1920?

Mr. STEELE: Yes.

Mr. BELAND: Did we not import more coal from the United States last year than we produced in Canada all told, that is bituminous and anthracite?

Mr. STEELE: Yes, we imported last year fifty-seven per cent of our coal and produced only forty-three per cent.

Mr. BELAND: I understood the hon. gentleman to say we produced 57 per cent.

Mr. STEELE: No we produced 43 per cent. The coal which Canada consumed in 1920 cost at the mines $156,345,552. Let us see how this cost compares with that of previous years. In 1910 the average cost of imported anthracite coal per ton was $4,51. In 1920 the average cost per ton was $7.53. In 1920 the initial cost of

the coal consumed in Canada—that is the cost at the mines—was $116,000,671, more than it was in 1910. But the greater part of that increase, or at least a very large part of it, was due to the great rise in the price of coal between 1919 and 1920. The increased cost in 1920 over 1919 was $59,786,303. If we calculate the increased cost last year on the retail price paid for it, we will find that the Canadian consumers paid in 1920 approximately $140,000,000 more for coal than it cost them in the preceding year, and about $240,000,000 more than it cost them in 1910. This, as I am sure the House will appreciate, is an enormous additional burden laid on the Canadian people for their supply of fuel, a larger burden than is imposed probably for all taxes levied by the federal Parliament.

Let us see how this affects the people? It not only entails a very large direct burden, which amounts to from $50 to $125 per family more than the previous year, upon the people for coal for domestic purposes to enable them to live in comfort, but it adds enormously to the cost of industrial production. Every article produced in Canada last year cost the consumer more owing to the higher price of coal. Many factories in Canada paid out in 1920 from twenty to fifty thousand dollars more for coal than they did the previous year, and many of the larger factories paid out from fifty to two hundred thousand dollars more for coal last year than they did the previous year. So that while our manufacturers and business men may complain of the Business Profits Tax and of the Income Tax, probably the heaviest burden they are bearing to-day—if we may call it a tax—is due to the increased cost of their fuel.

Mr. PARENT: May I ask the hon. gentleman if that position still exists to-day?

Mr. STEELE: The condition is not quite so extreme as it was a few months ago, the price of coal having been considerably reduced in the last few months. Let me give the House an illustration of how the high price of coal affects our industrial concerns. From the annual report of the Canada Cement company, I take this reference to the coal supply:

> For several months the company was unable to secure an adequate supply of coal to keep it running to the required capacity and earnings suffered severely. The president in his address said that the inability to obtain coal was greatly responsible for the smaller business. There was an increase of 540 per cent in coal cost over the year 1914.

That is a reliable ilustration of the increased expense which our industrial plants are subject to on account of the enhanced cost of coal. The higher freight rates and the exchange also add enormously to that cost. In the portion of western Ontario which I represent, three years ago the freight rate on a ton of coal was $2.90; to-day it is $5.29, plus exchange of $1.60, or practically $4 more than three years ago. This means for a town of 4,000 people an additional outlay of from $15,000 to $20,000 per year, most of which goes into the pockets of the United States coal operators and railways. But this is not the only difficulty which our people are experiencing at the present time; there is the additional difficulty in getting their coal at any cost. That there was a real scarcity there is no doubt, but this was partly owing to decreased production and increased demand, not at all to the diminution of our resources. It has been said that for every ten per cent increase in pay granted to the United States coal miners there was a lessening of production to the extent of ten per cent.

We in Ontario—and I am speaking now especially of Ontario—are entirely dependent upon the United States for our fuel, both for our domestic and our industrial needs. The scarcity affects the very foundation of our industrial life, and it seems to me essential that Canada should at once adopt a policy which will make us independent of any foreign country for our fuel supply and encourage the development of our own coal resources. The scarcity of coal of recent years has been attributed to various causes, principally to labour unrest at the mines, with the tendency among the miners to reduce their output as their wages increased. The lack of cars and motive power on the railways is also a contributing cause. This scarcity of coal will undoubtedly continue for another year at least and will recur at intervals in the future. Let me read an extract from a recent number of the Coal Age, which is generally regarded as a reliable authority on the coal situation in the United States. It says:

> The coal companies are figuratively sitting tight and tightening their belts. The spot market is quotable more because of the prices offered by shippers than by business closed. There seems to be a very general feeling—possibly founded on hope—that the buyer is going to stay out of the market until the last minute, and then when he does start to buy the rush will produce another sharp upswing in prices, and that next fall will witness another repetition of serious car shortage.

I believe that that opinion is shared very largely by the coal dealers of this country, based possibly on their experiences of last year, and possibly on their fears regarding next year's supply. What did we find last year? In July coal was being offered retail in western Ontario around $15, and $15.50 a ton; three or four months later it was selling at $22 a ton and almost impossible to be obtained at that price. We all know there was no legitimate reason whatsoever for that substantial increase. But what is supposed to have been the real cause of that sharp advance? It was the scarcity of coal in Canada, especially in Ontario, due to the causes which I have already given. Our people had to have coal, and our dealers felt that they had to pay whatever prices would secure them the coal. While the straight line coal companies were unable to supply our dealers, the independent coal companies, who control a very large percentage of the output in Pennsylvania and the other coal fields of the United States, took advantage of the demands from Ontario and possibly from other parts of Canada also, and would sell coal only when they secured the maximum price offered by any dealer who was urgently in need of coal.

Now, as I have said, that scarcity will return, with all the distressing incidents which we experienced in 1917 and 1918. We all remember those heatless days which were necessarily imposed upon us, when we had to submit to restrictions on the amount of fuel in certain industries, when we were permitted to have only a certain minimum of coal in our cellars, when we were obliged to use bituminous coal instead of anthracite, when we were forced to use wood whenever obtainable, and when even we had to practise the strictest economy in the consumption of gasolene. Those distressing days are sure to return, perhaps not next year or even the following year, but the conditions surrounding our fuel supply are certain to result sooner or later in a recurrence of the 1917 and 1918 inconveniences.

With such abundant resources, and with such urgent need, we should prepare to meet the issue unflinchingly and effectively. And now is the time to do it, not when we are looking for a supply of coal for our furnaces as the cold weather comes on. Now is the time to prepare, not for next winter merely, but for five years from now, when conditions will be more acute, and for ten years from now, when they will be still more acute than they are to-

day. In time of peace prepare for war. In time of plenty prepare for scarcity.

Let me make some further references to the situation in Ontario. One of the substitutes for coal is electric power, and to-day Ontario is using about 1,000,000 horse power of electric energy. It is estimated that each horse power takes the place of about ten tons of coal. Therefore if Ontario were not using that 1,000,000 horse power she would require an additional 10,000,000 tons of coal for her industries. Let us suppose that that was the situation. With the knowledge which we have to-day of transportation conditions on our railways and on the American railways, how could those railways possibly handle that additional 10,000,000 tons? It would be an absolute impossibility. But some people may say, "Oh, well, we have 1,000,000 horse power of electric energy and we do not need to worry about that." No, we do not need to worry about that. But let us look ahead for another ten years when Canada will require at least 50,000,000 tons of coal instead of 33,000,000 tons as at present; how are we going to provide for that additional 16,000,000 tons? To-day it requires about 1,000 locomotives and 23,000 freight cars to handle our coal supply, which is one-fifth of all the freight transported by our railways. To handle another 16,000,000 tons would necessitate an increased equipment of about fifty per cent. Are our railways prepared to do that within ten years? Is the Government prepared to increase on our national railways the equipment for coal hauling purposes to the extent of fifty per cent within the next ten years? That is the problem which we have before us if we are going to supply the people of Canada with their necessities in the fuel line ten years from now. Again I say it is time that the Canadian people and this Parliament representing the Canadian people should give serious thought to the problem of our fuel supply in the future.

I have shown that there is an abundance of coal in Canada. Now I come to speak particularly of the needs of Ontario and Quebec, within whose boundaries no coal exists that can be used for commercial purposes. These two provinces, however, are the largest consumers of coal, and sometimes we are almost forced to the belief that in this matter nature seems to have made a mistake. British Columbia, Alberta, Saskatchewan, Nova Scotia and New Brunswick have no difficulty in obtaining their supply. Manitoba has had some difficulty; she has suffered in the past, but

with Alberta coal being shipped there in increasing quantities, it would seem that that province has solved its fuel problem. I would point out that in 1920 Manitoba took 516,198 tons of Alberta bituminous coal, 200,000 tons more than in the previous year. As only 98,629 tons of Alberta coal were consumed in Manitoba in 1916, it is evident that the people of that province are giving the preference to Alberta coal. This is as it should be. The freight rate to Winnipeg on Alberta coal is $5 a ton, and no exchange, a much lower cost than that incurred by the Ontario people when they import American coal. As the Alberta mines have a capacity to produce 12,000,000 tons yearly and as they now produce only about 6,000,000 tons, there is no reason why Saskatchewan and Manitoba need worry about their fuel supply in the near future. The briquetting of Saskatchewan lignites offers another relief, and it may be that these briquettes will in time be commercially available as far east as the upper lakes of Ontario.

As I have said, Ontario and Quebec are the two provinces which are faced by a real fuel problem. Ontario is the one province of the Dominion entirely dependent on the United States supply. Quebec, by water transportation, was prior to the war able to secure Nova Scotia coal as far west as Montreal. While this traffic was arrested during the war, there are indications that it will be resumed and in this way even Quebec may be able to supply herself with Canadian coal. Ontario alone seems at present completely isolated in respect of her fuel supply —the largest consumer and the most completely cut off from the coal-producing provinces. We consume in Ontario about forty per cent of all the coal used in Canada. The reasons for this are our large population, the gradual exhaustion of our wood supply, and the extensive and numerous industrial plants in the province. I would like at this stage to read some extracts from a letter which I received from a very prominent retail coal merchant in western Ontario, a director of the Retail Coal Association, in which he outlines the difficulties more clearly than I can. I will read part of his letter. Speaking for the retail coal dealers, he says:

4 p.m.

> We have learned to our cost that we are entirely at the mercy of the United States wholesaler, both as to the quantity of coal which we can secure, and also as to the quality and price of the product shipped during times of great scarcity. This has been the universal experience of all the coal merchants throughout the country.
>
> The price on Pennsylvania anthracite ranged all the way from $8 to $17 per ton at the mines according as the necessities of the coal merchants might compel him to pay, and if a merchant made a trip to the mines, he found others there ahead of him and the coal was in fact auctioned to the highest bidder.
>
> Moreover, the middlemen were not the only offenders. These prices were actual mine prices from independent mine owners. Ordinary mine run bituminous coal also varied in price during the past season from $3.50 per ton to $12.75 (in extreme cases) per ton at the mines. It was an absolute holdup by the United States operators and the prices demanded from Canadian importers largely fixed the price for the United States citizens themselves, and as a result, a very serious effort was made to have shipments to Canada cut off altogether. You can readily see how absolutely helpless our people would be in such an emergency. This condition, it may be urged, is largely a case of manipulation on the part of the United States operators, but whether this is so or not, the results are exactly the same. Had this winter been a severe one, untold suffering would have undoubtedly followed, as shipments have not been nearly so heavy as in other years. During last fall and summer, when the situation continued so threatening, we endeavoured to get a price on Canadian coal from Alberta, but the best all-rail rate of freight which we could get was $20.50 per ton which, of course, precluded any private individual or company from taking any chances in connection with the undertaking.

Mr. MORPHY: Can the hon. member give the price of coal, mine run, in Alberta at that time?

Mr. STEELE: Four dollars and forty cents at the mine. So that a real problem exists in Ontario. Now, the question comes to us, how can this problem be met? I admit at once that there is difficulty in finding any satisfactory solution. We must have coal. How are we to get it when we need it, and how can we reduce the quantity consumed, are the two questions which I think we must consider.

Mr. MACLEAN (South York): Or the question of a substitute.

Mr. STEELE: The question of reducing the quantity consumed would include that of employing substitutes. Undoubtedly, the most promising source of our supply apart from the United States is Nova Scotia, but at present our railways cannot transport coal from that province as cheaply as the railways can carry coal from Pennsylvania, a much shorter distance. What are the possible remedies, then? First, to conserve coal. This is a remedy for many evils, a remedy which the people are slow to take advantage of. But I may be permitted here to suggest some reasons why coal should be conserved, thus limiting as much as possible the amount required.

It is generally assumed that there is enormous waste in the consumption of coal, both for domestic and for industrial purposes. The United States Bureau of Mines say that thirty-five per cent of the coal is wasted up the chimney in the average boiler plant, in some cases much more than that. Even in our homes there is vast waste through the people not having an intelligent understanding of how to fire their furnaces and ranges. A great saving can be effected by a campaign of education among our people along these lines. Another thing which I think might be done to conserve our coal and to reduce the quantity required is to have coal sold by test. Almost everything that we buy or sell nowadays is sold subject to test or according to certain standards; why we should pay the mine owners of Pennsylvania for ash and slate, pay transportation, say, to Ontario, carry that ash and slate into our cellars and from there into our furnaces and then carry it out to the ash heap, is a matter which I cannot understand. I believe the day has come, owing to the scarcity of coal and the efforts of coal miners to sell the whole output without grading it at all, when our Government should protect our people, if possible, by having the coal which is imported in Canada and that which is produced in Canada sold according to test.

Another way and one of the most important ways in which we can reduce the quantity of coal required is by waterpower development. Ontario uses about 1,000,000 horsepower of electrical energy annually, and this is a substitute for about 10,000,000 tons of coal. Therefore, the more electrical energy that we utilize, the less coal we shall need. With the completion of the Chippawa-Queenston power canal, in Ontario we shall have enough power from hydro-electric sources, it is estimated, to supply practically every plant west of the Trent valley system. The quantity of power required in eastern Ontario and not yet provided for is perhaps comparatively small when compared with that in western Ontario; but possible power development along the St. Lawrence is quite sufficient to meet all needs. While all the power that can be developed there may not be required—

Mr. PARENT: When the hon. member mentions "all needs", does he mean for industrial purposes or for heating purposes?

[Mr. Steele.]

Mr. STEELE: Only for industrial purposes. I think it is recognized that for heating our homes, electrical energy is not at all suited. It is estimated that about five horse-power would be required for each individual, and that would make electrical energy for heating very expensive. The surplus electrical energy, which could be developed along the St. Lawrence and which would not be needed for industrial plants, could very well be used in the electrification of our railways. Our railways are using about 25 per cent of the coal which is consumed in this country. Every horsepower of electrical energy which can be used on our railways dispenses with the transportation of about ten tons of coal, and that is a very considerable item in our transportation problem. If we can electrify our railways, we reduce the quantity of coal which will be required and also the quantity of transportation service which we are demanding of our railway system. Another consideration which we must not lose sight of is that, as the days go by and as a greater development takes place, electrical energy will undoubtedly be lowered in price, while the price of coal will, undoubtedly, increase. Therefore, it seems time that we should be giving attention to the substitution of electrical power for coal wherever that is found to be practical or possible. As regards the supply of anthracite in the United States, let me point out that Ontario and Quebec have no other source of anthracite available than the United States. It is estimated by the Geological Survey of that country that their anthracite resources will be exhausted in fifty years, and long before that time we can well understand the people of the United States will insist on their anthracite coal being reserved for their own purposes, and probably export will be prohibited. Another possible means of reducing the quantity of coal required is by adopting central heating plants. While I am not prepared to say very much about that at the present time, on enquiry I find that engineers estimate that, by the adoption of central heating plants in the centres of population, the cost of heating our homes and business blocks can be reduced by 50 per cent, so that this is a matter that is well worthy of consideration by our larger municipalities. Another remedy, and one which the Government can, perhaps, do much to apply, is the supplying of sufficient cars to ensure that

the people of Canada will have their coal transported from the mines to their homes. It is generally acknowledged that much of the scarcity of recent years has been due to car shortage. I am not familiar enough with all the details of that to be able to explain why there should be a shortage; but undoubtedly there has been a shortage, and if it were possible for the Government and our railways to see that there are always sufficient cars at the mines to get the supply of coal which is demanded for our needs, shipped from the mines, very much would be done to relieve the shortage of next winter, and the time to take that action is in the next three or four months, not next fall. As I have said, 33,000,000 tons of coal were consumed in Canada last year, and that was practically all handled by our railways for a greater or less mileage. When I point out that the total number of tons of freight handled by the Canadian National railways last year was only 27,504,000, that gives an illustration of what a tremendous problem it is for our railways to handle our coal supplies. If the Canadian National railways had done nothing more last year than handle the coal of Canada, they would have handled over 5,000,000 tons of freight more than they handled of all freight on their whole system. The railways consumed 7,400,000 tons of coal in 1919, or 38 per cent of the total; our factories consumed 8,000,000 tons in that year.

I was going to say a few words as to the substitution of oil for coal, but, perhaps, we are not ready in this country at the present time to think of that. It is a substitute for coal as fuel, but the oil scarcity on this continent is even more acute than the scarcity of coal. It is estimated that within five years from now the United States will be purchasing 500,000,000 barrels annually from the British Empire. They are to-day importing about 100,000,000 barrels over and above their own production. Their consumption is increasing at the rate of 100,000,000 barrels a year, so that we can see what a tremendous scarcity there is likely to be on this continent.

None of the remedies, however, which I have suggested, meet the urgency of the immediate future. What is concerning the Ontario people at this moment is their supply of coal for next winter. We need 16,000,000 tons of coal within the next twelve months. How are we going to get it at a price that will not be too oppressive? Are we to be forced to contribute another $100,000,000 to American interests, while our mines are idle and our railways incurring a deficit of $70,000,000 a year from lack of traffic; or are we going to take such steps as can be taken to ensure that our people will get the 16,000,000 tons of coal, and at a price which will be as reasonable as it is possible to obtain the coal at? To my mind, we, as a Parliament, should make every possible effort to see that our people are not overcharged for their fuel supplies, even by American producers, and if it is necessary that the coal should be transported from Nova Scotia to Ontario at the cost of transportation I think our Government railways at least should be utilized for that purpose. If that be impossible, if there is no remedy available, the only thing that remains is that the Ontario people will have to be burdened with this enormous cost of our fuel supply for a few years to come, and the burden will gradually become more oppressive. I would just like to raise my voice at this moment in this House in requesting that this question be given the very best and closest consideration. No problem has ever arisen for which a solution has not been found, and if we cannot find a solution for this one, let it not be said that a solution was not found because we did not make an effort to find it.

I have included in this resolution a request that a special committee of this House be appointed to take this matter into consideration. I think that is a wise request. Let us look into the matter; that is what Parliament is for; let us see what information we can get, so that we may be in a position to advise Parliament as to what steps are possible. Then we may expect that these steps, if such are found, will be taken.

Mr. D. L. REDMAN (East Calgary): Mr. Speaker, I wish to second the resolution which has just been brought in by my hon. friend from South Perth (Mr. Steele), but before speaking in support of it I feel that not only myself but the House generally should congratulate the hon. member for having brought up this important subject and especially congratulate him for the very great care which he has taken in looking into the subject, and in amassing and putting before the House in such excellent order for the use of hon. members all the information which he has given.

I need say nothing, after the speech of the hon. member, as to the general importance to Canada of this question. I presume that practically the question is this: How far, and to what extent, can we make the supplies of coal which lie more or less at the two extremes of Canada come towards each other with a view to meeting, as far as possible, the requirements of Central Canada? Whatever the interest of the province of Alberta may be in the general question, I think it would be quite true to say that its interest will be greater in regard to the question of how much coal it can sell to the rest of Canada.

I need not say anything to this House, because the information is already in its possession as to the almost unlimited quantities of coal which we have in that province, nor as to the quality, because we have there all qualities of coal. It is entirely a question, therefore, of the area within which that coal can economically be marketed. In the last few years the market for Alberta coal has been extended through Saskatchewan and Manitoba. We have not yet completely captured the Manitoba market, and many improvements must be made by us in our methods of production, and some improvements in transportation facilities, before that market is entirely ours; but we have proven that our coal can economically compete with Pennsylvania coal in the province of Manitoba, and I think that when we get proper production methods and proper transportation arrangements it will be proven that our coal can more than compete in Manitoba with the Pennslyvania product.

Then we come to the wider question, a question on which I am not going to have the temerity to-day to make any prohesies or to give any promises, and that is whether or not Alberta coal can come further east than Manitoba. We might, however, consider for a moment the factors which would influence such a result. In the first place, the question of the cost of production might well be looked into. It is a significant fact that while most of the fundamental products, grain, for instance, have been reduced in price during the last year, the price for coal has not only stayed up but has even increased. The Dominion Government has assumed and exercised a certain amount of supervision and control over the labour question in the Alberta mines, and that question is an important factor in the cost of production. In fact, the cost of production of Alberta coal, has almost doubled in the last few years. It is now given at something over $4. The coal itself, as far as the leases are concerned, has practically no value unless it can be sold, so the cost of production is simply the labour and the equipment which brings it forth. A committee of this House could well consider this question, as the Dominion Government has already assumed some control in regard to the question of the cost of labour that is involved in the production of our coal.

But the more important matter, in fact the real question in considering the market which our coal could reach, is the question of transportation. Here again, we find that transportation rates have not gone down this last year, and again we are met by the question of labour. Now whatever may be the relation of market transportation costs generally, I would like to say this: A proposal has been made from Alberta in the last two years that during the summer months, when the freight cars in Alberta and Western Canada are not being used in transporting the grain crop, and when there is not any congestion, when there is, in fact, not sufficient traffic to keep our railroads busy, these cars could be economically used in bringing our coal eastward at a considerably reduced rate as compared with the rate which prevails throughout the rest of the year. I think it has been proven that that can be economically done. It would cheapen the cost of production in that it would give labour all the year around to the miners; it would avoid congestion in the winter time, when the transportation of all products is more difficult, and when the grain is coming eastward. If some such arrangement as this were made, I think it would enable us perhaps to widen our market, and in any event deliver our coal more cheaply throughout the province of Manitoba.

Mr. MACLEAN (South York): Does my hon. friend mean to say that freight cars used for the transportation of grain can be used economically for the transportation of coal?

Mr. REDMAN: Oh yes, we do that out there. In fact, in Western Canada we use box cars more than any other kind for shipping coal. I have only to add that I think a parliamentary committee would be an excellent organization to consider such a subject as this. I can think of no argument why committees of this House should not consider more subjects than they do. I think myself, and I think other hon. members agree, that our time is often much

better spent in getting together in a committee and going to the root of some question, than in making or listening to general remarks in this House on many subjects.

So that, having regard to the importance of the subject, not only to-day but in view of future needs, I would seriously urge that the resolution brought forward to-day by the hon. member for Perth (Mr. Steele), be very favourably considered by the Government.

Mr. D. C. ROSS (West Middlesex): I desire to say just a few words on this urgent and important subject. The whole question has been so well discussed by the hon. member for South Perth (Mr. Steele) that there is little left to be said except perhaps from the Ontario viewpoint. The facts are plain, I think, to every hon. member who comes from that province. The question of fuel supply has become one of the most important and one of the gravest of all the problems that confront our people to-day. The situation is this. The wood supply in Ontario, particularly in the older sections of the province, has almost entirely disappeared. Electrical energy has not been developed to such an extent that it may take the place of wood, and as a consequence we are more dependent every day upon the supply of coal we get, not only for our industries, but for our homes as well. The difficulty of obtaining a supply of coal for these purposes is not only increasing, but increasing rapidly. To a large extent, it is true that our industries are in greater need of a steady supply of coal than are private citizens, but, on the other hand, there is an increasing demand for coal for domestic purposes for the reason I have already mentioned, namely, the depletion of our wood supply. Coal is being used to-day not only in our urban centres, but by the farmers as well. The farmers throughout the western part of Ontario are using coal to a large extent, and therefore a proper supply has become essential for three purposes: first, for use in the homes; secondly, for the purposes of industry; and thirdly, for lighting a great many cities and towns throughout the country. We are in an unfortunate position as a province in not having within our borders any natural resources such as are found in the East and in the West. That is our difficulty.

This is not the first time that this matter has been brought up in this House. Last session, the hon. member for Maisoneuve (Mr. Lemieux) brought it up some time in the month of June, and in reply to him at that time the Prime Minister of the day (Sir Robert Borden) remarked that the question was a most important one which we must look pretty squarely in the face. He declared that the then Government or future governments would have to look this matter squarely in the face. I do not know what the right hon. gentleman meant by that statement, but I do feel that the present Government and past governments as well have dallied with this question too long, and the situation has become too urgent and acute for us to leave it in its present state. I think, therefore, that the motion of the hon. member for Perth is most opportune. I am not going to go into details in regard to statistics on the subject. The mover of the resolution has already done that, but the fact remains that we import half as much coal as we produce, and as the late Prime Minister said, the questions seems to be to a large extent one of transportation. Not only from the standpoint of Ontario but from the point of view of the nation as a whole, I would urge the necessity of something being done at the present time in this matter. It is all very well to say that the question of transportation is so large —and undoubtedly it is—that we are having great trouble in connection therewith at the present time. But as a Parliament trying to serve the needs of the Canadian people, it is incumbent upon us to meet the difficulties that face us, no matter how formidable they may be. It is the duty of this Government, and if the Government fails to shoulder its responsibility in the matter, then it is the duty of Parliament, to find a remedy for this urgent problem.

What is our position? I contend that as a nation—for we claim we are a nation—we are most unfortunately dependent upon others for those things which we should provide for ourselves. We have 71 per cent of the available coal supply in the British Empire, and we have 11 or 12 per cent of the coal production of the world, and yet, in these two great industrial provinces, we are absolutely dependent on our neighbours to the south. The people of Ontario, therefore, and particularly the poorer classes, look not only with misgiving but with positive dread upon the advent of fall and winter. Eight or nine years ago they could buy coal for their homes at a price ranging from $6.00 to $6.50 per ton, but during the last winter we have been paying in Ontario, in the county of Middlesex anyway, as high as $23 and $24 for a ton of anthracite for heating purposes, and as high as $16 per ton for soft coal. Now, this state

of affairs should not be permitted to continue if we want to have a contented and prosperous people in Canada.

If we want peace and happiness, it is desirable that we reduce the cost of living, and this particular problem touches every home in the province of Ontario. But the difficulty lies not only in the question of price, although that is of exceeding importance. When the ordinary labour man has to pay $23 for a ton of coal to warm his little home and give comfort to his family, it is quite a slice out of his wages of, say, $15 or $25 a week, and one or two tons will not heat the ordinary home. As I say, however, the question is not only one of price; there is the prospect of our being absolutely debarred from getting coal at all. Any little difficulty occurring between us and our neighbours to the south would place us in a very hazardous situation. Should their supplies become depleted, as has been pointed out, or should a strike occur across the border, the result might be that these two great provinces would find themselves absolutely without coal for heating or industrial purposes. That is a most undesirable situation, yet it was the situation in which we found ourselves in 1919. I find in the report of the Minister of Trade and Commerce (Sir George Foster), for the year 1920 a statement in regard to the fuel supply of Canada in that year. That statement says:

> Almost immediately after a strike occurred in the bituminous coal fields of the United States. To meet this situation, the export of coal from Canada was prohibited except under license. The Fuel Controller, Mr. C. A. Magrath, did not have an organization to handle the situation, so the Canadian Trade Commission undertook the work, at the request of the Government, under the direction of Mr. Magrath.
>
> It was necessary to immediately ascertain what stocks of coal were in the country, the quantity available on wheels on Canadian railroads, and the minimum requirements of central Canada for the remaining months of the coal year.
>
> After investigation of Canada's needs, Mr. Magrath proceeded to Washington and succeeded in inducing the United States authorities to allow Canada a supply of one hundred and twenty-five cars per day, provided that the coal was distributed in accordance with priority ratings, established by the United States Fuel Administration.
>
> The arrangements made were quite satisfactory, although Canada never received the 125 cars per day, as promised: such industries, public utilities and institutions as were short of coal receiving sufficient supplies to keep them operating and heated. Fortunately the strike was settled about the middle of December and anxieties in regard to the coal supply for Canada were greatly relieved.

I think that the very reading of this extract from the report of the right hon. gentleman is a sufficient argument to justify the motion made by the hon. member for Perth. These things occurred in 1919; they may occur again this year, and the probability is that we should be absolutely without coal for either our industries or our homes. If such were the case, we should have to go hat in hand to the people of the United States and ask them, in their kindness of heart,—and I admit that they are large hearted—to give the Canadian people a sufficient supply of coal to keep them from freezing during the winter months and to ensure that the wheels of our industries would not be stopped.

These are the facts as I see them, and I do not wish to labour the point. Prices are every year going higher. This is a national question. It is not a question as to whether this government can supply the people of Canada with coal at a profit. Coal is an absolute necessity for the people of the provinces of Ontario and Quebec. They must have coal, and the Government must get it for them even if the getting of it by the Federal authority involves some expenditure. We do not usually, as a Government, undertake enterprises in oreder to make money out of them. We do not operate our educational systems in order to make money; we do not supply seed grain to the farmers of the West on a money making basis; we do not make grants to agricultural fairs in order to make money for the people of Canada, or rather to put money directly into the treasury; we are operating a system of publicly owned railways and we are certainly not making money out of those. If the public needs of the provinces of Ontario and Quebec—our two most important and most prosperous provinces from an industrial point of view—require that the Government should do something of a concrete nature, the Government should take the matter in hand in some practical way. An adequate supply of coal is an absolute necessity for the preservation and efficient conduct of our industries, and the maintenance of domestic and social life in the province of Ontario—almost to as great an extent indeed as the British navy is necessary to the existence of the British nation. And yet when this vital matter is brought up somebody wants to know whether it is not going to cost money. In my opinion the hon. member for South Perth (Mr. Steele) has presented facts which are absolutely beyond question; and even if it does involve an expenditure of public money some method should be pro-

vided whereby coal can be brought from our eastern and western mines to supply the needs of the Canadian people. What does the present situation mean in other ways? We are now paying out some ninety or one hundred million dollars to the Americans for coal. We talk about the adverse balance of trade, and the adverse exchange rate. Well, the Minister of Finance declares that we will be able to meet the indebtedness involved by our present national debt if we will only adopt throughout the country the slogan "Buy in Canada." Very good, here is an opportunity to carry out this slogan. Let us buy Canadian coal for our necessities and avoid the sending out of ninety or one hundred millions of dollars to the American people. Let us spend that money in the purchase of Canadian coal and thus help our own miners and labourers. I am not trying to advance any definite method of settling this problem because I do not know enough about the details of the situation. What I do contend is that we have to make a start somewhere, and I think the suggestion advanced by the hon. member (Mr. Steele) is a good one. Let a special committee be appointed to deal with this matter; let scientific men be brought before that committee and examined—technical men from the Department of Mines, miners, coal operators, railroad men;—and let us in consultation with them endeavour to reach some solution of this troublesome problem. I have very great pleasure in supporting the motion.

Mr. FRANCIS HENRY KEEFER (Port Arthur and Kenora): I want to join in the compliments which have been extended to the hon. member for South Perth for the labour he has expended in getting the data which he presented to-day and the very able manner in which he supported the motion. I do so with great sincerity knowing what work is involved in the preparation of such data. I think that the request made for a committee is one that should be supported by every member. I would like to join in the statement of the member for Calgary (Mr. Redman) that there is not enough use at present made of hon. members in connection with committee work. Very important subjects come before us that might very well be handled in committee by members of this House. We have seen the benefit of that in connection with the Soldiers' Pension Committee. The members of the House include men who are very able in their different professions or business callings; and, in my judgment, questions such as these could be better handled by these men getting together and considering them in committee, because of the time they could then devote to the work, than they could be handled by the Government, who from pressure of public affairs have not the time. After giving careful consideration to the subjects brought before them they could make their recommendations to the Government which could act upon them or not as it saw fit; but surely beyond all question some valuable opinions and suggestions might be obtained by adopting such a procedure. I sincerely hope the hon. member will be successful in obtaining a committee to consider the subject dealt with in his resolution.

The hon. member mentioned several possible solutions of the coal problem. To my mind there is only one solution of that problem for Ontario and Quebec and that is to burn Nova Scotia coal. There is no use in talking about bringing western coal to Ontario and Quebec—the source is too far away; the mines are situated eight hundred miles from Winnipeg and from that city it is four hundred miles to the head of the lakes, involving a journey of twelve hundred miles by rail to the lakeside ports. Before the war the freight rate on coal at cost was half a cent per ton per mile. That figure would easily be doubled now, so that the carriage of western coal for a distance of twelve hundred miles to Lake Superior would involve a charge of $12 per ton to start with. With such a handicap as that the carriage of western coal to the East is out of the question. But if we take Nova Scotia coal the situation is entirely different. From the mines of Nova Scotia to tide-water there is practically no rail haul, or a very trifling one. From a conversation I had with the member for Cape Breton North and Victoria (Mr. MacKenzie) I ascertained that a few years ago the Nova Scotia coal mines were only producing a small quantity—a little over half a million tons; but last year they mined ten times that former output. It is a strange fact that these mines should be shut down to-day. Why is that? One cannot understand it. Are there no orders, or is there some profiteering going on? What is the reason for the cessation of operations? Let us get at the facts. We know that there is a demand for this coal, and we know the demand is not decreasing in Canada; we

know that there is plenty of coal in Nova Scotia; let us ascertain why it is not available.

Take, for example, the city of Ottawa. The freight on bituminous coal amounts to $4.85 from the mines.

Mr. FIELDING: What mines?

Mr. KEEFER: From the mines in Pennsylvania. The nearest mines you can get soft coal from are located from one hundred to one hundred and fifty miles from Buffalo. In some cases, however, the coal comes from as far south as Maryland. After the coal has been brought to the St. Lawrence river it comes in over the Grand Trunk or the Canadian Pacific to Ottawa. By the time it reaches this city the rate amounts to $4.63. On top of that you have to pay the exchange on that American freight, and on the American price of the coal, and there is also a duty of fifty-three cents. So there you have five to six dollars which in part could be saved by using Nova Scotia coal. Now, we had Nova Scotia coal coming up to Montreal for ninety cents a ton and less before the war. While that great struggle was on the boats were all commandeered and the business temporarily dislocated. Prior to the war Nova Scotia coal was much in demand in Boston; I am told that city gets a large proportion of its coal from the Nova Scotia mines. Why cannot that coal come into our lake ports, why cannot it pass Montreal? The freight rate by water is very different from what it is by rail, let me give you an illustration. For years we have been taking coal from the lake Erie ports, carrying it to the head of the lakes for use by the Canadian Pacific or the Canadian Northern railway, at as low a rate as twenty-fice cents a ton, a distance of nine hundred miles. This low rate is feasible because of the return cargoes of wheat—thirty or forty cents was the normal rate on coal, but during the war it rose as high as a dollar. Now, however, freight rates are coming down. If you go up to the lakeside towns you will see immense stock piles of coal annually made by the three railways.

Mr. EULER: Will the hon. gentleman permit me a question? Can he say what proportion of the coal consumed in Montreal comes from the Maritime Provinces? Does it amount to any large per centage?

Mr. KEEFER: I have not the figures for Quebec, but so far as our water-borne coal in Ontario is concerned, I can give you some information.

Mr. EULER: That would be water-borne also, would it not?

Mr. KEEFER: It would be for Montreal. The water-borne coal brought to Ontario amounts to 4,614,000 tons bituminous—

Mr. EULER: Coming from where?

Mr. KEEFER: I take it that that would practically all come from United States ports. Of that about 1,000,000 tons goes up to the head of the lakes, for the Grand Trunk Pacific, the Canadian Pacific and the Canadian Northern railways. Then, 425,000 tons of anthracite is taken to the head of the lakes. The hon. member for South Perth has already given the total amount of coal coming in by rail and water; I need not repeat them. But the point I want to make is this: You can bring that coal from Nova Scotia up to Montreal for from fifty to ninety cents a ton. You can take coal from the Erie ports to the head of the lakes for forty cents a ton. Now, you have four or five dollars to play on. How is it that we cannot get that Nova Scotia coal anywhere in Ontario for at least a maximum freight of somewhere about a couple of dollars? One of the difficulties, of course, to-day is that these coal boats have to break bulk. That coal has to be elevated at Montreal and then reloaded in the smaller ships. I think that nearly every member of this House knows my views on this question of transportation. The solution is to allow those coal boats to come up through the St. Lawrence route as deepened and enlarged. When they can sail up to any port on lake Ontario and deliver their coal and thus be not far from any towns in the interior of Ontario, then you will get cheaper coal; but I doubt if you will get it until then.

When we have as a competitor a freight rate by rail for 150 miles that costs us practically three or four dollars a ton as well as the duty, there must be a solution of the problem of bringing this Nova Scotia coal to Ontario points, but it cannot, as suggested, be by rail. The distance is too great and you cannot get away from the per ton cost per mile on a railway.

This country has yet to awaken to what it is losing every year by not improving its water-borne transportation through the St. Lawrence. Our people do not yet realize what this means. The best minds in the United States have realized it, and

they have made the statement—which I am perfectly certain is true—that it would pay these two countries to build that canal and scrap it every year, throw away the capital cost because that is what we are expending as wasted for lack of that water-borne traffic in relation to various commodities. Of course, we are only touching coal to-day.

Now, we should quickly prepare to get some coal in. Our Canadian mercantile marine ships are built as bulk carriers, and some of them adapted to the size of the St. Lawrence canals, and to-day they may be looking for cargoes. It would be well to have this question considered in that way. There are other existing types of boats that could carry coal up through those existing canals to the Great Lakes. When you once are able to send coal right through you would have return cargoes of grain and other products of the West, and a low freight established. Few of us have any conception of the number of ships that are occupied all the year round bringing coal up to the head of the lakes from lake Erie ports even under present conditions.

Mr. STEELE: Might I ask my hon. friend a question? What cargo of coal can be carried through the present St. Lawrence locks?

Mr. KEEFER: Their present limit is 14 feet 6 inches draft. The Welland canal is being built to a draft of 25 feet, with 30 feet on the sills.

Mr. STEELE: What would be the cargo capacity of those ships?

Mr. KEEFER: With the locks eight hundred feet long a coal cargo boat of about 9,000 tons could be taken through. The present length of boat that is much used on the upper lakes is 500 feet with a draft of 21 to 22 feet.

Mr. STEELE: I was interested in the boats that could go through the present St. Lawrence locks.

Mr. KEEFER: There is no reason why coal should not even at present be brought up through the St. Lawrence locks, but as a lesser cargo would have to be carried at almost the same overhead cost the freight per ton will be greater. But even in that manner coal should be brought up at half the cost we are paying for the railway haulage from Pennsylvania. The canal boat that comes through the St. Lawrence is about 300 feet long. I do not know what she will carry in coal, but you can get the relation in grain. Her grain capacity is about 100,000 bushels. On the other hand, these big 500-foot lake boats will carry from 400,000 to 500,000 bushels of grain or about 8,000 tons of coal. Therefore the smaller boats ought to carry from 1,500 to 2,000 tons of coal, if I am right in my figures.

Mr. HOCKEN: Would it not be possible for each of these boats to tow two or three barges?

Mr. KEEFER: There is no reason in the world why the same scheme cannot be adopted as used to prevail in the old Welland canal, when we used to see barges towing two or three schooners behind them. But we are asleep on this question. We are being robbed every day, and it is time the people were awakened, and the only way you can really awaken them is through this House. One of the quickest ways is by means of a committee, just as we had a committee on the question of prices, and so give the matter publicity. There may be some system at work between the coal operators and dealers or others that has held up the price of coal. Why is it to-day that the Sydney mines are shut down for lack of business? And yet the data produced by the hon. member for South Perth show us that we should be very busy now providing for our fuel supply. I am therefore glad to urge that this matter receive the very careful consideration of the Government and that a committee be appointed to work upon it.

The electrification of the railways need not be taken up just now, but when it is a fact, as we have been told in this House, that out of every dollar of expenditure in operation of our railways twenty cents goes for fuel, and we have any quantity of white coal right alongside these railways running to waste, there is something wrong. We have three railroads practically alongside the St. Lawrence which could be supplied with white coal from that source, and have that quantity of coal that is now regularly and daily going up in smoke, saved for Canadian consumers elsewhere. That in itself would be a saving. That is a question which this committee could thresh out, and I would like to urge that such a committee be appointed immediately.

Mr. D. D. McKENZIE (North Cape Breton and Victoria): Mr. Speaker, I wish to join other hon. members in paying my tribute of gratitude to the hon. member for South Perth (Mr. Steele) for the great care and extensive research which he must

have bestowed upon the very valuable information which he has so clearly placed before the House on this very important subject. Such information is educative at all times, particularly in connection with so important a subject, and we should thank the hon. member for the service he has rendered the country generally and the House of Commons in particular.

Now, it has been abundantly shown that fuel is one of the prime necessities of our country, and I suppose it may be classed in the same category as food and clothing. When we talk of ourselves as a nation, as an independent entity among the nations of the world, it is desirable that we should be able to live largely within ourselves. I do not mean by that, Sir, that we should not have the fullest possible intercourse with the outside world, but I do mean that we should develop the essentials of life and the essentials of nationhood within our own borders. The people of the British Empire generally know that the basic industries of England and Scotland are coal and steel. These industries have been developed to the fullest possible extent, and the benefits and advantages common to such development have followed. A careful examination of the system of trade in Great Britain will show that Englishmen and Scotchmen are not fond of exporting raw material; they prefer to export the article in a fully manufactured state, and in that way the most is made of every product of the country, in all its stages of production and manufacture. We have coal in abundance in Canada; we have other products such as lumber, iron and steel, and it is of the highest importance that we should follow the example of our brethren in the old land and manufacture and use these products to the best advantage of the Canadian people.

I have spoken about national assets; and this phase of the question has been referred to by the mover of the motion. As a matter of safety first, if you like to put it on that ground, it is important that Canadians should be able to live by what they do in Canada for themselves. Accordingly, it is important that every Canadian citizen should be able to get fuel within Canada and of Canadian production as far as possible. An extraordinary condition exists to-day. The people of Ontario, particularly the western portion of the province, are in dread of cold weather, in dread of winter, because they have not the necessary supply of fuel—and the same condition exists in parts of Quebec. We have in Nova Scotia, as I read in the press and as I am told privately, ten thousand artisans out of employment, walking the streets, and alongside of those men are twenty-five or thirty coal mines capable of producing splendid fuel. It seems extraordinary that there should be such a demand for this article, such an abundance of it lying at hand, such a number of men out of employment who would be only too happy to work, and that nothing is done in order to have this coal taken out of the ground, at the same time giving these men employment and satisfying the demands of the people of western Ontario and other parts of the country for the necessary amount of fuel. The only thing necessary, it seems to me, is to find a practicable scheme under which this could be done. The hon. member for Port Arthur (Mr. Keefer) pointed out a moment ago that it is not a very difficult thing to get coal to Quebec and Montreal, though it may be difficult to store it and ultimately ship it further west by rail. That would mean, of course, a second handling of the coal, but it seems to me that coal shipped from the Maritime Provinces could be taken to Quebec and Montreal, whence it might be transported over the Government railway, a road designed for the purpose of carrying heavy trains at a small freight rate. If this were done, some if not all the demand of western Ontario for fuel would be met, to say nothing of enabling us to depend largely upon ourselves instead of upon a foreign country for our coal supply.

5 p.m.

Now, there is the business end of the matter to be considered. One of the problems of the West is the matter of enabling their grain to find its way to the markets of the world. First, it must get to the Atlantic. During nine months of the year, I think, navigation on the St. Lawrence is open. It is quite feasible that coal should be brought from Nova Scotia to Quebec or Montreal by vessels which could take on wheat for eastern ports as a return cargo. In this way a substantial reduction of the rate even that prevailed before the war in respect to the shipment of coal might be effected. I think, therefore, that if we as a people could go about this matter in earnest, we might be surprised by the beneficial results obtained.

Human nature, as a rule, is somewhat disposed to shrink from new duties and new undertakings; we are inclined to go along in the same old direction and let the other man do the new thing. But it seems to me that this is an opportunity for the Govern-

ment, if we can induce them to do anything at all, to make a start along this line and put something on the right side of the ledger, even if it is a death bed repentance. I would be glad to see them show that they have some sense of national responsibility and move forward in the direction of opening up these channels which are so essential to the proper development and unity of this country. It is a matter of great satisfaction that in Nova Scotia we have practically unlimited supplies of coal. Many years ago, we thought that we had discovered all the coal that was to be discovered; we have a history of coal fields in Nova Scotia, written many years ago by an English gentleman by the name of Brown. Brown's history is still an authority on the question of the mineral wealth, and particularly the coal wealth of Nova Scotia, and if you were to talk about finding coal outside of the sources mentioned in Mr. Brown's record and history, men would shake their heads and say: "There is no use talking; Mr. Brown knew what he did and what he wrote, and you will not find coal except the seams of coal which Mr. Brown discovered." It is, however, a happy development to find that within the last three months there have been struck, within the territory of the Dominion Coal Company, two magnificent coal seams which Mr. Brown knew nothing about. Therefore, coal is being discovered from day to day, and there seems to be no limit at all to the enormous quantities of coal of very excellent quality which we have in Nova Scotia, that is to say, within the Dominion of Canada. When we are talking about national questions, we name provinces simply as a means of designating where the national fortune is; and it is only proper for me, as a Nova Scotian and as an old coal miner, because I worked in the coal mines of Nova Scotia, and I know what it is to mine coal, to cut it and to bring it to the surface, to speak of the coal wealth of Nova Scotia. It does me good, therefore, to talk of this subject if it is to be of any benefit to my brethren of the coal craft in my native province. I hope the day is not far distant when our men will have plenty to do in mining coal, and when a constant, continuous market will be found for it within our own bounds aud outside of the bounds of Canada, so far as that may be necessary. Last year, we produced only 6,500,000 tons of coal in Nova Scotia, and that was done entirely by single-shifting, that is, by men working only one shift a day. There is no trouble in the world, when pressure is on, to double the shift, and with the openings that we now have in the coal seams, there would be no trouble in converting a production of 6,500,000 tons into twelve or fourteen million tons, if the necessary pressure were put on the production, and if the owners of the coal knew where it was to be sold. In that way, the cost of production would be very materially reduced. Any business man knows that overhead expenses in connection with 6,000,000 tons of coal are pretty much the same as overhead expenses in connection with double that quantity. As the market becomes certain and the quantity to be produced is sure and fixed, so from day to day would the expense of production be lessened and the price of coal accordingly cheapened.

I have much pleasure in again thanking the hon. member for South Perth (Mr. Steele) for the service which he has rendered to his country in bringing this matter so forcibly before the House. I trust those of us who will have some responsibility in carrying forward the idea which he proposes, wil not avoid or try to swerve from the duty and responsibility which we have in connection with this matter, and the Government of the day, which is responsible for the general policy of the country so far as government is concerned, should do what lies in its power in order to further the project outlined by my hon. friend.

Mr. H. C. HOCKEN (West Toronto): Mr. Speaker, the hon. member for Cape Breton North and Victoria (Mr. McKenzie) says that it is a characteristic of humanity to shrink from things that are difficult. We all know that. I have found, in legislative bodies, rather a larger number of men who shrink from taking up difficult questions. There is a disposition to go along in the ordinary groove; but when one is urged to get out of a groove and undertake something that has not been done before, there is great difficulty in getting a sufficient number to carry that out. I have discovered that in places other than the House of Commons.

Mr. JACOBS: What places?

Mr. HOCKEN: In the city council of Montreal, for example. For that reason, I have great admiration for a man like the hon. member for South Perth (Mr. Steele), who brings before this House something that is rather difficult of solution. The very difficulties make it worth while, and the obstacles in the way are, as the late

Sir James Whitney used to say, "for us to overcome." We all know there are obstacles in the way of providing an ample coal supply for the whole Dominion of Canada; but it is our duty, as men elected to look after the welfare of the people of this country, to find a solution for those difficulties and a means of providing those things that are necessary for a comfortable existence upon the part of our people.

The subject has been covered so fully by the mover and the succeeding speakers that I cannot do very much more than repeat what has been said. But when Canada has, within its borders, more than enough coal to meet all the needs of her people, and then we import $98,000,000 worth from the United States, there is something wrong with our business capacity. Although this coal is at the extremes of the country, the general advantage to Canada of having our people supplied with coal from our own mines is so great that one would think steps would have been taken long ago, at least to ascertain whether a solution of this question is possible. If we can succeed in keeping in this country $98,000,000 that we now send annually to the United States, we shall be contributing to that extent to the prosperity of the people of Canada, and to my mind, that is a very important consideration. A committee, such as is suggested by the hon. member for South Perth, seems to be the only means of solving this problem in an intelligent manner. That committee would have the power to make all investigations and examinations necessary to reach a decision; all the force of Parliament would be behind its findings, and if it is possible for any body in this country to secure the necessary information, it ought to be possible for such a committee as that which is proposed. Therefore, I think the hon. member for Perth South is proceeding along exactly the right lines.

The hon. member for Port Arthur and Kenora (Mr. Keefer) drew attention to the possibilities of providing, at least Ontario and Quebec, with coal from Nova Scotia. I remember the time when, as he said, you would see on the lakes a large steam barge towing two or three barges after it, really making the cargo which that steamer was drawing three or four times as great as if it went alone. I am at a loss to understand why that system could not be repeated in bringing coal from Nova Scotia to Ontario ports. If that should be done, I am quite satisfied that practically all the grain grown in Ontario that goes out for export could be taken out in the same way. That would reduce the cost both of carrying the grain for the farmer to the markets of the world and of bringing coal to the people of Ontario. That is a system of navigation that prevailed until they got the big whalebacks and those boats of 9,000 and 10,000 tons. Even with the canals we have at the present time on the St. Lawrence river, that plan should give very excellent results.

As to the coal of the West, I think that at least all the western country should be served by Alberta coal. If that were done it would enable many coal mines in Alberta to continue operations throughout the year, instead of shutting down, as they do now, for a considerable period. It would reduce the overhead expenses and mean cheaper coal to all the people of the prairies. I am not proposing any method to stop the importation of coal to the head of the lakes. That might not be a good thing for the railways, but certainly it should be possible, by specially constructed locomotives and cars if necessary, to supply as far east as Winnipeg at least, with Alberta coal. That is done to a considerable degree at the present time, but I think the distribution throughout the western provinces should be more complete.

I noticed by a document which came to my desk to-day, showing the mineral production of Canada, that the amount of peat produced in this country last year was 3,000 tons, at a valuation of $15,000. It seems to me the development of the peat beds of this province might be carried on more effectually and efficiently than has been the case so far. With coal at $6, or $7, or $8 a ton, perhaps it would be impossible for peat to compete, but with coal at $15 a ton peat at $5 a ton ought to be an efficient form of fuel for a considerable distance from the neighbourhood where it is obtained. In central and eastern Ontario there are large beds of peat, and I think a very large number of the cities and towns, and a considerable portion of our population, might be served with that fuel, which, while not equal to anthracite coal can be obtained at a lower price and be put on the market in competition with anthracite.

My hon. friend from West Middlesex (Mr. Ross) has said something with which I entirely agree—that it is going to be a question whether we can get fuel at any price. That has been pretty nearly the case in this country for the past few

years, and that situation will be intensified. I therefore think that all the fuel resources that the country possesses should be examined, to see whether it is not possible for Canada to supply its own fuel both for industrial and domestic purposes, and certainly the question of peat should be considered.

As to the conservation of coal, which to my mind is a very important phase of this question, my hon. friend from South Perth (Mr. Steele) has referred to the possibility of erecting central heating plants. I have thought for a number of years that that is something that ought to be done, and any pressure that the Government could put upon municipalities in order to have that done should be exerted. In my own city at one time a company was formed to do heating from a central plant. Their proposition was to heat all the houses in one or two or three blocks from one plant. To my mind, that it a very fine idea. They could use butiminous coal for such a purpose: that is always cheaper than anthracite coal, and only about half the quantity would be required. All the ash and dirt connected with heating would be eliminated by such a scheme. Unfortunately, the members of the city council regarded that as a very valuable franchise, and they refused to permit the company to go on with the work. The municipality itself refused to do it as a publicly-owned enterprise, and they refused to let the company do it that was willing to invest its own money. To my mind, that is one of the solutions of our fuel problem. In cities like Toronto, Montreal, Quebec, Hamilton and London that plan would mean a saving of millions of dollars and not only that, but the heating of houses and large buildings under very much better conditions than obtain where individual furnaces are used. I do not know what any committee could do to persuade municipalities to go into that, but perhaps the publicity that would be given to the plan from the work of such a committee as is proposed would have an informative influence upon the members of the various municipal councils, and bring about that method of heating.

I want to say just a word or two in support of what my hon. friend from Port Arthur (Mr. Keefer) has said about the development of electrical power on the St. Lawrence river. There is a tremendously valuable power there awaiting development. It is a work that I think the Governments of the United States and Canada might undertake with great advantage in the interest of transportation and the saving of fuel, especially in this country, but also in the United States. If we had had to supply all the manufacturers of Ontario with coal to produce their power during the war, it would not have been possible for us to have secured anything like the results we got from the factories operating during that period. Let us get another million horse power from the St. Lawrence, and if there is a demand for it for industry, let it go there; if there is not a demand for it for industry, let us run the Grand Trunk railway from Toronto to Montreal with the power so developed. While the initial cost might be very great, the ultimate cost spread over a period of 30 or 40 years would certainly mean a great saving as compared with fuel, because with fuel it is not only its first cost that has to be taken into account, but the transporting of it from point to point, which forms a very large item in the expenses of a railway.

I want to congratulate my hon. friend from South Perth upon bringing this matter up. I hope the Government will see its way to granting him a committee, and I hope that that committee will stay at work session after session until it finds a solution for this very serious domestic and industrial problem with which our country is confronted.

Mr. WILLIAM D. EULER (North Waterloo): Mr. Speaker, I think it is most appropriate that the hon. member for South Perth (Mr. Steele), coming as he does from the province of Ontario, should have introduced this resolution. I may say at the outset that I am heartily in favour of it, because as is generally known, we in the province of Ontario and perhaps, in a lesser degree, the people of the province of Quebec, are very seriously handicapped by reason of the fact that we have no deposits of coal in these two provinces. Yet, Sir, I have been somewhat surprised that the discussion has related practically to only one item of fuel, and that is coal, except that my hon. friend from Toronto (Mr. Hocken) discussed briefly the development of peat beds in the province of Ontario. I read an article a few days ago in one of the Toronto journals, which I am sorry I did not keep, because it was written in a very convincing manner. It was to the effect that we shall have in Canada, and

in Ontario particularly, other sources of fuel which will be available long before the supply of coal is exhausted. The writer referred to fuel oils which could be developed in this country, not merely from oil wells, but from the oil sands so plentiful in the West. He referred also—and this is perhaps the visionary part of it—to the undoubted possibility of manufacturing fuels by synthetic processes. That may look rather far-fetched to hon. members, and, as I say, it may appear to be somewhat visionary, but I believe there is a good deal to be said for the suggestion. Twenty-five or thirty years ago, if any man had said that the greater part of western Ontario would be supplied with power and light by current generated at Niagara Falls, he would have been considered a dreamer. Yet to-day that dream is true. That, however, is merely by the way.

I desire to refer briefly to one or two statements made by speakers who preceded me, and to make one point in particular, if I can. Most of the members have referred to the fact that the question of a fuel supply for Ontario particularly has to do with transportation. It is admitted, I think, that the western provinces and the extreme eastern provinces, are well supplied with fuel, and there is no serious difficulty so far as they are concerned. It is also admitted that they have enough fuel to supply Ontario and Quebec provided it can be distributed to those provinces at reasonable prices. The matter of transportation is undoubtedly one of the primary difficulties we have to contend with, but it is not the only difficulty in the supplying of fuel from the eastern and western provinces to central Canada. In the United States, from which we in Ontario get all the fuel that we use, both soft and hard coal, the people have at times been in just as serious difficulty as the people of Ontario, and have paid almost as high prices for their coal. They have found it sometimes almost impossible to obtain coal, just as we have found in the western part of Ontario. What is the reason? They have sufficient fuel in the mines of Pennsylvania, and yet the people of certain portions of the United States have suffered almost as severely as we in Ontario who have no coal at all. I remember reading, about a year ago or perhaps a little longer, that the United States Government itself had to pay $22 per ton for soft coal at the seaboard, delivered to United States war vessels, although it was clearly proven that that coal did not cost the producer more than perhaps $10 or $12 per ton, at the point of delivery. Yet the United States Government, for the maintenance of its warships, was obliged to pay a profit of some $10 or $12 a ton to the producers of the coal. That is the situation I wanted to point out. Private interests have a monopoly of this national necessity and use their power to extract unfair profits.

Even if we can provide for transportation from the Maritime Provinces, and can get coal from that part of the country into Ontario, I think it would be absolutely necessary for the Government of Canada to ensure that the coal deposits themselves should come under Government control. Otherwise, we should have a situation similar to that in the United States. I am free to admit that the United States people may possibly, at all times, be able to obtain coal, while on the other hand, we may at some time not be able to get any from that country, because, while they have treated us generously in the past, nevertheless, self-preservation is the first law of nature, and conditions may easily arise under which the United States might find it necessary to cut off the supply from Ontario. Practically the only reason why I rose was to make this statement, that coincident with the settlement of the problem of transportation must be the settlement of the control of our coal fields, whether in Eastern or in Western Canada. And while it may be a radical thing to say in this House, yet I for one believe that in regard to any of the great natural resources and public utilities of Canada, including such matters as transportation, where the people are dependent for their comfort and prosperity upon them, the Government has a real duty to discharge in seeing to it that these things remain under the control, if not the ownership and operation, of the people themselves.

Mr. W. F. MACLEAN (South York): I shall not take more than a few minutes. I agree with the previous speaker (Mr. Euler), that these public utilities ought to be controlled by the state. Who own the coal-beds in the United States? The railways themselves, which are private corporations. We are getting railroads in this country which will be a national asset, and we must take hold of our fuel problem. If the people of the United States are paying such enormous prices to-day for coal, it is because the railway monopolies made a monopoly of the coal mines;

and, as the previous speaker stated, we must avoid that. One thing I want to point out is the fact that transportation must be a matter of the electrification of our railways, and we can start with the development of the St. Lawrence powers. We can obtain power enough there, and also in Ontario, to carry cars up to the head of the lakes, and the coal supplies of the Maritime Provinces can be used to electrify the railways there by burning the coal at the pit mouth. They are coming to that in England, where they see great improvements in that direction. It is also possible, by the use of our river-powers, to get almost sufficient power to drive all the railways from one coast to the other. We should have more cars for transportation of coal. I think it is a good policy in connection with this question of coal to ascertain at the same time how much power we can get by the use of the water-power in our rivers, and also by the generation of power at the pit mouth in the mines. In that way we could get enough power to carry coal across the continent, and so avoid burning up 70 per cent of the coal we bring into the country in driving engines on the railways. The problem is a very wide one. It goes into the question of the use of electricity developed both from coal at the pit mouth and from power generated by the rivers, and it involves also the necessity of developing the greatest possible amount of power we can. Supposing we are dependent on the United States for anthracite coal, and particularly for coal for Ontario and Quebec, if we developed the electrical power which has already been referred to in this House, and obtained the highest possible amount of it, should the Americans be wanting power, we could trade our power for their coal, and in that way the balance of the account might be in our favour. So that all these questions must be taken up in connection with the fuel problem—the question of power, the question of transportation and the utilization of our surplus water-power—if we have a surplus of power, sending some of it to the Americans in return for a friendly supply of coal from them, thus relieving us from the necessity of having to beg it from them. So I commend to the consideration of the Government the proposal before the House. I hope the Government will appoint a committee of the character that has been suggested, that a full study of the whole question will be made, and that one result will be to ensure to the people of this country a plentiful supply of coal. Speaking of coal, I hope that the news coming from the Mackenzie Basin in the Northwest is correct. I trust a great supply of petroleum will be found there, and that it will help in the solution of the fuel problem of Canada.

Mr. H. B. MORPHY (North Perth): The afternoon is passing, and it is incumbent upon me to say a word or two in support of the motion of the hon. member for South Perth (Mr. Steele), a close colleague of mine territorially. I consider that his motion deals with a situation of great urgency. I have listened to the many speeches, all of the same tenor, which have been made in support of the motion, and the discussion has been very illuminating. The main value of to-day's discussion to the House, and I believe also to the Government and the country, is the publicity which will be given to the subject matter of the resolution. It is unquestioned that in the departments of government are vast stores of knowledge concerning the natural resources of Canada, but unless there is a discussion of this kind these sources of knowledge lie dormant there and are given no publicity. For that reason I think my hon. friend from South Perth deserves the thanks of the House for bringing this question forward in the way he has. The appointment of a committee is asked for, and it does seem to me that the Government should, upon this subject at least—notwithstanding the criticisms heard now and then that there are too many committees—hearken to the views of hon. gentlemen and, in view of the importance of the subject, grant the committee that is asked. It does not seem to me that there has been anything introduced in the House for a long time that goes as closely to the public needs as the subject dealt with in this resolution. I do not wish to reiterate the arguments showing the deplorable condition to which either Quebec or Ontario may fall as the result of arbitrary action on the part of those across the line who have the control of the fuel supply. It is time, however, that some executive action of a concrete nature should be taken by the Government along the lines of the resolution, and that a special committee of the House should be given the chance not only to try and solve this problem by recommendations, but also to let their work operate as an advertisement to the capital of the world, showing the immense possibilities, as to profit and public benefit, of the utilization of that capital in the development of this industry.

There is no question to my mind but that the Government should consider what its attitude should be in so far as the nationalization of the coal interests of the country are concerned. That matter was the subject of comment in the House on a prior occasion and I believe it is one as to which perhaps the Government has an idea other than nationalization. But I take pleasure in agreeing with what the hon. member for North Waterloo (Mr. Euler) has just stated—that this matter is of such grave moment, being a necessity of the greatest public concern, that I do not think members would be going very far out of their way in asking the Government to seriously consider the question of the nationalization of the coal interests of the country. I know that it looks like a great undertaking to attempt; but nevertheless I think that in ten or twenty years from now, it may be said here that the Government was very supine when it did not devote its best energies to the consideration of the question of the nationalization of the coal industry. The more the fuel supply of the public is kept out of the hands of private enterprise, the freer the Government will be to take measures which will prove of real value to the public at large. Apart from that, the work of the committee might reasonably influence private capital to enter the coal fields of the West and produce. The more coal there is produced, and over produced, the cheaper that fuel will be to the people; and it seems to me that if there was no other reason than that, the committee should be permitted to enter upon a study of this problem. As the hon. member (Mr. Steele) said a short time ago, we may be up against worse conditions next winter than we have experienced during the past three or four years. I do not know what the conditions were in Quebec, but I think the hon. member faithfully portrayed the difficulties, the expenses—yes, the extravagant expenses—and the deep privations to which the people of Ontario have been put during the last few years in connection with this indispensable necessity of life. For that reason the Department of Railways should take into consideration the suggestion of my hon. friend (Mr. Steele) that there should be Canadian cars stationed at the American mines to take coal and land it in Canada. There is no question to my mind but that the Government might reasonably take action along that line, and I commend the hon. gentleman for bringing the suggestion to their attention.

[Mr. Morphy.]

I would go even further than that if the conditions in future are to be as bad as they have been in the past. This country has given bonuses for the production of steel, it has given subsidies towards the construction of shipping—many bonuses have been given to aid enterprises which are not as nearly of as great concern as the fuel supply of the people. It might be all right, therefore, to suggest to the Government that they make a survey of the whole field of Western Canada, which is a veritable coal mine, and it might be worth while suggesting that this committee be asked to consider whether the bonus principle should not apply to the production of coal. I do not for a moment see why the question of a bonus for the production, or the over production, of coal should not be considered. I say "over-production" because you cannot produce too much of that necessity of life to satisfy the wants of the people and help to cheapen the price. I leave the matter there, in the hope that the Government will regard this motion not as an academic proposition but as a real problem which confronts this country and awaits solution. I hope the Government will consent to the appointment of a committee and let them get to work, thereby giving publicity to the extent and character of our natural resources. I trust further that our efforts in connection with this matter will lead to the development, either by private effort or by the Government itself, of our coal supply which is, if anything, as great a necessity as our supply of food.

Mr. W. D. COWAN (Regina): Mr. Speaker, the motion of the hon. member for South Perth (Mr. Steele) is very opportune, I think, particularly so in view of the action taken only last week by the Legislature of Alberta. That province, as has been said to-day, is vitally interested in the development of her coal mines, she having such enormous deposits of coal. During the past two or three years she has been devoting her energies very largely to developing those mines, the result being that she has largely captured the Manitoba market which was formerly supplied from the American coal fields. The Hon. Mr. Cote, provincial secretary, speaking only last week in the Alberta Legislature said:

> We have increased our total output to 7,000,000 tons, and we have largely captured the Manitoba market, but we cannot hold that market without a struggle, and I am informed that arrangements have been made by American interests for a strong attack in order that they may regain the ground they lost last year.

He added:

It is not the intention of my department to submit quietly.

I am very glad to note that the Alberta Government is not going to submit quietly, because I have always felt that once Canadians have demonstrated that they can supply the market of Manitoba, they should be encouraged in every shape and form to continue that work in order that we may lessen the importation of foreign goods, and thereby balance the difference in trade which is so much against us at the present time.

Hon. Mr. Cote also stated:

I am firmly convinced that we have hit upon the right plan to develop Alberta's coal industry and, incidentally, all of the other industries of this province that are allied with the coal industry.

That to me is a very important statement, because if there is anything I want to see in Western Canada it is a greater development of our industrial life. As soon as we have that development the agitation which has continued so long, and which has so often threatened to separate Eastern and Western Canada, will very largely cease. Therefore, it is up to us to do what we can to assist Alberta in her work.

Why is it, I said that it is particularly opportune that we should at this time appoint such a committee? Speaking on the same occasion the provincial secretary said:

The coal industry of Alberta is capable of great development, and during the coming year it is the intention to have the staff of the Industrial Research Commission, for which $38,000 was voted, devote its entire energies to studying the coal problem of the province in every feature from mining to marketing.

What more opportune time for this Government to do something to co-operate to see if we can solve what is probably the biggest problem we have in Canada to-day? Co-operation between this Government and the various provincial governments has been carried on to a rather large extent in the last two or three years with very great success, and I see no reason why we should not continue along those lines.

As an illustration of the result of that co-operation, let me draw your attention Sir, to what this Parliament did on the initiative, if I remember correctly, of the Minister of Trade and Commerce (Sir George Foster). Some two or three years ago we voted $200,000 for the establishment of a briquetting plant in southern Saskatchewan. It was agreed that we should co-operate with the provincial governments interested, and the Saskatchewan and Manitoba governments voted $100,000 each, which I think they have since increased, and the total amount now expended is about $600,000. The question was: Can we solve the coal problem of southern Saskatchewan and of Manitoba from the lignite coal of that area? What has the result been? I am going to read—and I make no apologies for doing so—an item which appeared in the Regina Leader only a few days ago, in which it is stated:

The first briquettes produced by the Government briquetting plant at Taylorton, to be tried out in this city, were to be seen burning yesterday in the grate in the Premier's office at the Parliament Bulidings. They were part of a sackful from the first output of the plant sent to Premier Martin last week.

The briquettes are about two inches square and shaped like a piece of children's machine-cut candy. They are very heavy and burn evenly, giving off a powerful heat. The residue is a fine brown ash.

Those who viewed the fire in the Premier's grate estimated that the heat-producing qualities of the briquettes were considerably greater than those of ordinary soft coal burned on the prairies.

The plant expects to place these briquettes on the market this summer.

To me that is exceedingly important. There are two features to be noted. First, is it possible to take this coal and briquette it scientifically and successfully? It is demonstrated that it can be done. Then the next consideration is—will it be a commercial success? I am fully satisfied that within the next month or two that will be fully demonstrated. The fact that by the initiative of this Government and of this Parliament the task of solving this problem in southern Saskatchewan was undertaken, and it is now an assured success. If we can solve one problem in that way why shold not we undertake the bigger problem for the whole Dominion? This particular news item in the Regina Leader would lead the public to believe that the Provincial Government was solely entitled to credit for this particular work, but I am satisfied that that was not the desire of the Premier of Saskatchewan. He has already enough to his credit and does not need to steal credit from anybody else. I wish to express as strongly as I can my appreciation of the course taken by this Government in starting that work and carrying it to such a successful conclusion.

There is no reason why we should not supply the whole Dominion from our own coal deposits. The hon. member for Port Arthur and Kenora (Mr. Keefer) to-day

said that it was quite impossible for us to bring coal from Alberta down to the province of Ontario. "Why," he says, "you have 1,200 miles of a freight haul." For the first time since I have been in this House I have to disagree with my hon. friend—and I think ninety-nine times of a hundred he is right. But what have we been doing? In the city of Regina a great many of us have for years been burning coal brought from Pennsylvania. That means a railway haul of three to five miles to the lake port, then the water haul to the head of the lakes, and again another thousand mile railway haul to Regina. That is, the Americans can sell their coal to us, notwithstanding a rail haul of over 1,200 miles. When it comes down to our doing the same in regard to Ontario it is suggested that we are quite incapable of handling such a proposition. To me a Canadian is just as good as any other man. We can do just as well as anybody else, and I am satisfied that if we attack the problem in a true Canadian spirit we can solve it.

Coal from Alberta does carry an enormous freight rate shipped eastward so also does Nova Scotia coal shipped westward. But let me point out that the more freight traffic you have undoubtedly the lower the cost of carrying that freight will be. Carrying only a limited quantity of coal over our lines as we are doing to-day, naturally the cost is very high indeed, and the very fact that we are carrying such a limited quantity is responsible for our enormous railway deficits. In the United States wherever they have coal-carrying lines those are found to be the most profitable. In fact, it is always profitable to carry coal. We are not doing it. Consequently we are not getting that freight, we are not getting the return that we should get on the freight, and we have operating deficits.

It seems to me that the only thing to do is to make up our minds that we are going to increase the amount of coal traffic on our railways, as a result of the decreased cost of operation due to the greatly increased volume of traffic, the Railway Commission, it seems to me, would be justified in ordering a reduction of the freight rate. Therefore it seems to me that the only thing for us to do is to make up our minds that we are going to tackle this problem seriously, and where we find the other governments, whether of Alberta or of Nova Scotia, ready to co-operate, we should show our willingness to co-operate with them. For these reasons, Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to support as strongly as I can the wish of the member for South Perth.

[Mr. Cowan.]

Right Hon. ARTHUR MEIGHEN (Prime Minister): Mr. Speaker, I exceedingly regret that I have not been able to hear much of this debate and to get the advantage of the discussion. The subject is one, of course, with which I came closely in contact during the three and one-half years that I was in charge of the Department of the Interior.

The motion of the hon. member (Mr. Steele) calls for the appointment of a committee in the hope that such a committee can contribute something supplementary to the efforts that have been made during the past number of years to bring about conditions under which a larger share of fuel consumed in Canada shall be of Canadian production. The fuel problem of Canada is one of our greatest problems. The very outstanding fact that of the money paid for goods imported into Canada, $80,000,000 is paid for coal alone, and that this coal comes entirely from the United States—a nation which, above all others, enjoys so tremendous a balance of trade as against us—that outstanding fact discloses the question as perhaps one of the most perplexing with which we have to deal.

Western Canada is replete with fuel potentialities, particularly with coal. Alberta has the largest deposits of coal, of course, on this continent—that is to say, of coal of all qualities. Canada itself, though it labours under the disability I have described, is second among the coal-containing countries of the civilized world. Western Canada, then, has its own fuel. The Maritime Provinces also are underlain with fuel. The central provinces, so far as has yet been discovered, are without great coal resources. The fortunate thing is that where coal is wanting, water-power abounds; in those portions of the Dominion where we lack the asset of the fuel resource in the form of wood or coal, we have it in the form of water-power. But the application of water-power for fuel purposes is a matter of slow development and cannot extend to such a length as will render it in any degree a solution of the fuel problem in the central provinces, for the reason that with the advancement of time and the development of industry the power that may be gathered from the fall of water will be more and more consumed in industries and manufactures. Now, though the

output of Alberta is today the largest of any of the provinces, and though that output has increased very appreciably, particularly in recent years, we do not yet supply Western Canada with fuel, and we cannot hope for some time, I fear, to carry the —fuel of the West, that is, of Alberta, further—at least to any extent worth bothering about—than the head of the lakes. It is a matter solely of the cost of freight; it is a matter of the relation of the cost of the imported coal to the cost of carrying the freight in Canada. We do to-day bring the coal of the East into the province of Quebec—it is even coming into Ontario—and the effort is to bring the Nova Scotia coal as far as possible westward, to occupy as large an area of the Quebec field particularly as can be occupied by that production. That as well is a question of freight, a question of the relation of the cost of carriage of the coal to the cost of the imported competing article. That is the whole problem. You cannot carry coal for nothing. You may make the rate nothing, if you will, but that does not mean you carry it for nothing; it means only that you carry it at the cost of the country, and if you carry it at the cost of the carriage of the commodities of course it comes out of the people. There is a certain inherent cost in the carriage of coal and no amount of bookkeeping is going to reduce it. Consequently the extent to which that relationship is a factor in the area that can be covered by the Canadian production of coal is not alterable by very much that this Parliament can do. We have endeavoured in recent years—and I think there has been very considerable application of the resources of government to the problem; more than is generally understood—to make the production of the lignite of Saskatchewan such that it could withstand exposure to the air and thus be made available for other portions of the West in particular. In that respect we have had a very considerable degree of success. I am glad to note the reference made by the hon. member for Regina (Mr. Cowan) to the success that has been achieved there. My information is—and it is very recent indeed from the Lignite Commission—that they are now at the stage where they feel that the element of chance is pretty nearly negligible and that they can be said to have succeeded in actually commercializing the briquetting of coal. They have succeeded in obtaining, and are satisfied with the results obtained from it, the best binder that can be got. They believe it is the right one, and the only element of chance, if there be any, is in determining whether or not the use of this binder and the methods of its use require such capital and such labour that the cost is really going to be low enough to warrant—to compel, indeed —the distribution of briquettes at least as far as the head of the lakes and generally over the eastern prairie provinces. I do not think they entertain very much doubt, if any at all, that that is going to be the case. They feel that they have made a success of the enterprise that has been entrusted to them, and I think their view in that regard has plenty of material to back it up; I do not think they are wrong.

In Eastern Canada, in Ontario here, the effort has been directed in two ways, one toward the making available of our peat resources, and the other to show that we have coal at least in the farther northern portion of the province. As regards the problem of peat, there, too, considerable success has been attained. A machine has been developed which produces on a large scale, and which they are ready to turn over to a company,—if indeed, they have not already done so—with a view to the production of peat on a purely commercial basis apart from government assistance. It was a matter merely of the development of machinery that could be put down at a cost, and do the work at a cost, that would enable the peat production to compete. That, I think, they have succeeded in doing. When I last inquired, they were working at another machine or a smaller size which they thought might be used successfully and would aid in the production of this article.

The information I have obtained lately is to the effect that in northern Ontario in the rivers leading to Hudson bay, and in one in particular, there are indications that coal exists in such quantities and of such quality that it is likely it will be of use, in the not distant future, for consumption in this p rovince. I cannot give the House very much information, not because there is anything to conceal, but because I have not as yet learned just what is the result of their investigations. I remember well, only a few months ago, arranging for a special investigation of that question, and from a memorandum which I received just the other day and which I cannot put my hands on at the moment, I gathered the impression that those who started on the investigation had rather more success than they expected. So much for that.

As regards what a committee might do, and as regards the wisdom of this House accepting the resolution of the hon. member for South Perth (Mr. Steele), there is this to be said. A committee could gather together in convenient form the information that now may be found in more or less scattered and inconvenient form. It could be of use in bringing to the attention, particularly of members of the committee and through them of the House, the real factors of the problem and especially of impressing how earnest and, I think, how systematic have been the efforts to solve that problem. If it succeeds in doing that the committee will be well worth while. The scientific board which has been at work for some two or three years has directed its efforts to this question. The committee will be able to gather much information from that board, and the policy which was foreshadowed in the speech from the Throne, and which it is intended to initiate this session will, I hope, enable that board more effectually to do its work and exert its energies in this as well as in other directions.

The hon. member for South Perth has undoubtedly contributed, not only to the interest of the afternoon, but to the usefulness of the day in launching this discussion, and I see no reason why the request he makes in his resolution should not be granted. Indeed, I see considerable reason why it should. I would like a committee of this House to give the assistance to the discussion of this subject in Parliament that they could give by a close and concentrated study of this question, and if they so give their time and energy to it, they will be able to assist very much in the discussions in this House, and the solution of the problem will be advanced. I think that is all that the resolution calls for, and that is the attitude that I have towards it. I understand other hon. members desire to speak and, consequently, it will not be possible to close the debate at this time.

Mr. J. C. DOUGLAS (Cape Breton South and Richmond) moved the adjournment of the debate.

Motion agreed to and debate adjourned.

BUSINESS OF THE HOUSE.

Mr. FIELDING: Before the House adjourns, I should like, if I am permitted, to put a question or offer a suggestion to the Minister of Finance (Sir Henry Drayton) touching the Budget. I do not wish to press him unduly, because I know the embarrassments and difficulties of that; but there are some matters bearing more or less upon something approaching the Budget, which some of us may desire to discuss, and if the Budget were to be delayed, we might find it necessary to deal with them separately. I would not ask my hon. friend for an answer now, but my suggestion is this: that if, when the House meets again after the Easter recess, he is able to give an approximate idea of when the Budget will come down, that will be helpful to the general business of the House. What business will be taken up on Tuesday?

Mr. MEIGHEN: The Government will proceed with Estimates. The Department of Labour and the Department of the Interior are prepared to go on. Should we get further than Estimates, I would intimate the likelihood of proceeding with the oleomargarine resolution and with the Lake of the Woods Control Bill.

At Six o'clock the House adjourned pursuant to rule.

Tuesday, March 29, 1921

The House met at Three o'clock.

PRIVATE BILLS

FIRST READINGS

Bill No. 43, to incorporate Standard Insurance Company.—Mr. Mowat.

Bill No. 44, respecting the Western Dominion Railway Company.—Mr. Morphy.

CONSIDERED IN COMMITTEE—THIRD READINGS

Bill No. 7, respecting The Montreal, Ottawa and Georgian Bay Canal Company —Mr. Fripp.

Bill No. 21, respecting The Oshawa Railway Company.—Mr. Smith.

Bill No. 22, respecting The Thousand Islands Railway Company.—Mr. Smith.

Bill No. 25, respecting The Kettle Valley Railway Company.—Mr. Green.

Bill No. 26, respecting The Manitoba and North Western Railway Company of Canada.—Mr. Lang.

Bill No. 27, respecting The Quebec Central Railway Company.—Mr. Béland.

Bill No. 29, respecting The Essex Terminal Railway Company.—Mr. Kennedy (Essex North).

Bill No. 30, respecting The Ottawa, Northern and Western Railway Company. —Mr. Devlin.

Bill No. 20, to incorporate The Mayo Valley Railway, Limited.—Mr. Thompson (Yukon).

Bill No. 4, respecting The Dominion Life Assurance Company.—Mr. Euler.

Bill No. 5, to incorporate Fidelity Company of Canada; title changed to "An Act to incorporate Fidelity Insurance Company of Canada," and when the French language is used to designate the company, the equivalent of the said name shall be "La Compagnie d'Assurance Fidelite du Canada." —Mr. Mowat.

FRENCH TREATY

Right Hon. ARTHUR MEIGHEN (Prime Minister): Mr. Speaker, I beg to lay on the Table a copy of the Trade Agreement between France and Canada,—the original, which is in French, as well as the translation in English.

Mr. FIELDING: Is the document printed?

Mr. MEIGHEN: No; it is typewritten.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: May we expect to receive printed copies?

Mr. MEIGHEN: Printed copies will be available in due course. I have just received this from the Deputy Minister of Trade and Commerce.

PORT OF QUEBEC

ALLEGED UNFAVOURABLE TREATMENT BY CANADIAN GOVERNMENT MERCHANT MARINE

On the Orders of the Day:

Mr. C. G. POWER (Quebec South): Before the Orders of the Day are called, may I ask the Minister of Marine (Mr. Ballantyne), whether he has received any complaints from the merchants of Quebec, or any person else on their behalf, with regard to discriminatory action against the port of Quebec by the Canadian Government Merchant Marine? If so, does he intend to take these complaints into consideration?

Mr. SPEAKER: It strikes me that this question is not of such a character as warrants its being put upon the Orders of the Day. It should be placed on the Order Paper in the usual manner. While it is undoubtedly important, it is very local in its nature and does not affect the country at large.

Mr. POWER: I submit, Mr. Speaker, that it may be a question of public policy. It may be a question as to whether or not the Canadian Government Merchant Marine is fulfilling the duties for which it was created.

Mr. SPEAKER: It may involve a question of policy, but the subject is not of sufficient urgency to be brought up on the Orders of the Day; notice should be given and the question asked in the ordinary way.

Mr. POWER: With all due deference to the Chair, I submit that the matter is of considerable urgency. Navigation is about to open, and it is of great importance to the merchants and others in the seaports of Canada to ascertain how they stand in this matter.

Mr. SPEAKER: If the minister desires to answer the question now, I will offer no opposition.

Hon. C. C. BALLANTYNE (Minister of Marine): So far as my knowledge goes, I may inform the hon. member that no communications of any kind have reached the Department of Marine charging any discrimination, on the part of the Canadian Government Merchant Marine, against the port in question. However, I will look into the matter, and if it transpires that any correspondence has reached the department, I shall be glad to inform the hon. gentleman accordingly.

TRADE WITH WEST INDIES

On the Orders of the Day:

Mr. J. A. ROBB (Chateauguay-Huntingdon): Recently in the Canadian press there has been an announcement that Bermuda has rejected the trade arrangement between Canada and the West Indies, and it has been intimated that this action might affect the agreement with the other Islands. Has the Prime Minister any statement to make regarding the matter?

Right Hon. ARTHUR MEIGHEN (Prime Minister): I cannot speak with finality, but from a conversation I had with the Minister of Trade and Commerce, (Sir George Foster), I believe Bermuda has rejected the arrangement so far as it concerns herself. That, however, does not affect the validity of the agreement as respects the other Islands. The attention of the Minister of Trade and Commerce has been drawn to the matter, and he will speak upon it tomorrow.

THE INCOME TAX

On the Orders of the Day:

Hon. RODOLPHE LEMIEUX (Maisonneuve-Gaspé): As notices are being sent out, or are about to be sent out, under the Income Tax Act, and as people are rather afraid that mistakes may be made in the computation of the tax, by which they may be liable to severe penalties, it has been suggested to me by several parties interested that the payment of the tax be made as heretofore,—that is, a statement should be made by the person liable and the amount of tax should be fixed by the Commissioner of Taxation. Many people are somewhat uneasy under this new regulation, and I should like the Prime Minister and the Minister of Finance to consider the matter seriously before applying the penalty clauses.

Right Hon. ARTHUR MEIGHEN (Prime Minister): The Minister of Finance (Sir Henry Drayton) is, unfortunately absent, being engaged this afternoon addressing an audience in the city. However, I feel safe in intimating—though nothing in the nature of a definite announcement can be made until his return—that the regulations have been under reconsideration, and I believe that the Minister of Finance has a method which he thinks of proposing that will not be open to objections of the nature suggested by the hon. member. I will call his attention to the matter.

Mr. BELAND: Last year an extension was granted until the last day of April for the handing in of the report. Is it the intention of the Government similarly to extend the time this year?

Mr. MEIGHEN: I cannot give an answer to the question, as I am not familiar with the subject. I am informed by the Minister of Public Works (Mr. McCurdy) however, that that is the law to-day.

SUPPLY—CANADIAN GOVERNMENT MERCHANT MARINE

GENERAL STATEMENT BY THE MINISTER

Hon. C. C. BALLANTYNE (Minister of Marine and Fisheries) moved that the House go into Committee of Supply.

He said: Before this motion carries, I desire to place before hon. members the particulars concerning the operations of the Canadian Government merchant ships during the fiscal year ended December 31, 1920. I thought it well to do so at this time in order that hon. members may be in possession of the facts. Hon. members will be in a better position, after a perusal of the Hansard report of my remarks, to ask whatever questions they may deem proper when the House is again in Committee of Supply. If it is agreeable to hon. members, I would suggest at the outset that they be good enough to allow me to finish without interruption whatever I have to say. When we are in Committee of Supply I will, to the very best of my ability, and with the greatest pleasure, give the fullest information to hon. members regarding the operations of the Canadian Government Merchant Marine.

Mr. Speaker, when, on April 4, 1918, I had the honour of announcing to Parliament the Government's shipbuilding programme, I gave the reasons which impelled us to enter upon such an undertaking. Although it may be a repetition of what I then said, I shall now briefly restate the reasons which caused the Government to create a Canadian Government merchant marine. During the spring of 1918 the war was at its most critical period, and losses in shipping tonnage throughout the world were very grave. Indeed, so serious was the situation at that particular time that it amounted to a race between the enemy submarines and the shipbuilding yards of the British Empire—in the one case to destroy allied tonnage as rapidly as possible, and in the other case to make good, as far as possible, that loss of tonnage. In the first place, therefore, this Government thought it wise to enter upon shipbuilding as a war measure. Before that decision was reached the British Government was utilizing our steel shipbuilding yards throughout the Dominion for the construction of steel ships for its own purposes, which ships were under British registry, the Canadian Government providing the necessary funds. However, as these vessels were being built for the Mother Land, and under British registry, the moment they were ready to be put into commission they would necessarily pass into the possession of the British Government to be utilized by it in the way it might deem best. The Dominion Government, therefore, came to the conclusion, and its decision received the unanimous approval of the House at that time, that it would be better for Canada in the national interests, seeing that she was financing the construction of these ships that were being built for the British Government, that we should build ships under Canadian registry and for the benefit of the Canadian people. Accordingly our first reason for entering upon the shipbuilding

programme at that time was the imperative need of providing shipping to make up the immense losses that were occurring almost hourly during the most critical period of the war. The second reason for embarking upon this policy was that the Government owned a large system of railways amounting to about 18,000 miles, and which will be increased to something like 23,000 miles if the acquisition of the Grand Trunk goes into effect. Having this vast system of national railways, the Government deemed it necessary to complete the chain of transportation by providing ships to carry the cargoes that would be transported over this immense railway system to our seaports for exportation. The third, but by no means the least important, reason for the construction of these ships was to enable Canada to expand her export trade; and as I proceed with my remarks hon. members will see that the Canadian Government Merchant Marine has performed a very great national work in opening up new trade routes and in helping to develop and expand the export trade of the Dominion. At this stage permit me to say, Mr. Speaker, that no new contracts for ships have been let since the year 1919. I have noticed from time to time that the press of Canada, and occasionally some gentlemen engaged in banking—the presidents of our large financial institutions—have called upon the Government not to construct any more ships, expressing the opinion that the time had arrived when shipbuilding by the Government in this country ought to cease. I find no fault with these financial gentlemen except to say that when they made such appeals they seemingly were not aware that the Government had not placed any new contracts for the construction of ships since the year 1919, but was simply carrying to completion its original shipbuilding programme. Some of those who made this demand were of the opinion that when the armistice was signed the Canadian Government should not have given any more contracts for ships. Now, I explained to the House last year, and I repeat the statement, that the Government's reason for continuing the shipbuilding programme was the serious labour conditions that existed throughout Canada at the time of the signing of the armistice, and which conditions prevailed through the year 1919. Thousands of skilled and unskilled workmen were out of employment in the Dominion; and as, at that time, hundreds of thousands of our brave men were returning from the front, the Government felt that it was its plain duty, to carry on shipbuilding and to give employment not only to the men then needed in the industry, but to others who were likely to require work, and especially the returned soldiers—that from the point of view of making provision for unemployment it would be a wise policy for the Government to continue its shipbuilding programme. I hope the House will pardon me if, from this point, I adhere somewhat more closely to my notes in order to afford hon. gentlemen that detailed statistical information which is so imperatively necessary in connection with this important matter.

The year 1920, as was generally anticipated, proved unsatisfactory to shipping interests the world over, more especially from the point of view of net earnings. The loss of tonnage that had been sustained during the war was more than overtaken, with the result that there had been throughout the year a surplus of available tonnage. The world tonnage at the commencement of the war was about 49,000,000 tons. The available world tonnage at present is about 65,000,000 tons.

The costs of operation that had reached abnormally high proportions during the war and to which reference will be made later, continued throughout the year. That taken in conjunction with the substantial decline in freight rates from those of the previous year, added very materially to the difficulties with which shipowners had to cope. During the year there was a very severe decline in freight rates from United Kingdom ports over well defined routes, such as those to India and South America. While the decline in trans-Atlantic rates to United Kingdom ports was not so acute, it was nevertheless very substantial, and had a marked effect on the earnings of vessels. For instance there has been a decline of 65 per cent in the rate on flour; on grain 61 per cent; on deals 55 per cent; on cereals 48 per cent; and on apples 41 per cent. On cargoes from Canadian ports to South American ports decreases have averaged from 17 per cent to 50 per cent. On cargoes to India there has been a decline of 20 per cent in the comparatively short time since the route was established. From British Columbia ports to Australia there has been a steady decline averaging between 15 per cent and 35 per cent. On the one article of lumber the decline over the rate for 1919 was, during 1920, at least 25 per cent.

Over all the principal trade routes, both transatlantic and transpacific, there has been a corresponding decline in freight

rates, and while shipping companies during that time had to contend with the highest operating costs ever known, they were also faced with the problem of smaller cargo offerings than had been the case for many years. As an indication of the enormous extent to which operating costs have increased in recent years, I would point out that the percentage of increases in the prices paid for the principal requirements as between the years 1914 and 1920 has been approximately as follows:

	Per cent
Coal	133
Provisions	100
Oils, etc	100
Paints	125
Rope	100
General deck and engine stores	100
Wages	300

So acute is the depression in shipping that for some considerable time there have been lying idle in different ports of the world a very large number of British ships, and at the present time there are lying idle 536 steel steamers of United States registry in addition to nearly 300 wooden vessels of the same registry. Under all these unusual conditions the Canadian Government Merchant Marine may well be considered to have had a very satisfactory year, the results of which I shall place in more detail before the House.

The next matter of interest I wish to bring before the House is the number of ships that the Government own. When I made my statement in connection with the shipbuilding programme to the House last session there were 24 vessels completed and in commission as follows:

7 ships of 8,300 tons each.
4 ships of 5,100 tons each.
4 ships of 4,500 tons each.
8 ships of 3,500 to 3,900 tons each.
1 ship of 2,800 tons.

The approximate tonnage of these vessels is 129,000 tons.

Since that time 23 additional vessels have been completed and put in commission as follows:

9 ships of 8,300 tons each.
4 ships of 5,100 tons each.
4 ships of 4,500 tons each.
4 ships of 3,500 to 3,900 tons each.
2 ships of 2,800 tons each.

These have an approximate deadweight tonnage of 131,000 tons.

There are therefore in commission at the present time 47 vessels of the following types:

[Mr. Ballantyne.]

16 ships of 8,300 tons each.
8 ships of 5,100 tons each.
8 ships of 4,500 tons each.
12 ships of 3,500 to 3,900 tons each.
3 ships of 2,800 tons each.

of an approximate deadweight tonnage of 259,783 tons.

There remain to be completed 16 ships of the following types, viz:

2 ships of 10,500 tons each.
9 ships of 8,300 tons each.
5 ships of 3,500 to 3,900 tons each.

These will have a deadweight tonnage approximating 114,470 tons.

The entire programme when completed will comprise 63 ships of the following types:

2 ships of 10,500 tons each.
25 ships of 8,300 tons each.
8 ships of 5,100 tons each.
8 ships of 4,500 tons each.
17 ships of 3,500 to 3,900 tons each.
3 ships of 2,800 tons each .

The approximate deadweight tonnage of all of those vessels when completed will be 374,254 tons.

Seven of these vessels are being equipped with oil fuel installation and thirteen of them will be provided with refrigeration spaces.

It will be recalled, Sir, that for the purpose of the shipbuilding programme the sum of $20,000,000 was voted for the present fiscal year. Of that amount there has been expended up to the present $14,684,513.99. It is estimated that before the end of the fiscal year a further amount of $650,000 will be expended, making a total expenditure for the year of $15,334,513.99. It therefore follows that, of the amount of $8,000,000 which will be required to complete the programme, $4,665,496.01 is a revote.

Now I come to the comparative cost of construction. The average cost of constructing all the vessels under the Government shipbuilding programme figures out at $191.95 per deadweight ton. The average cost of the vessels constructed by the United States Shipbuilding Board has been stated in a recent official communication to be about $215.00 per deadweight ton. So that on a much smaller programme our cost compares very favourably indeed with the cost of construction of similar steel vessels by our friends to the south, being nearly $24 per ton less than theirs.

With regard to the costs of operation, it will be found that a comparison of Canadian Government wage costs with like costs

of operating similar ships by Great Britain, the United States, Japan, Norway and France, is as follows:

The monthly wage cost of a Canadian Government merchant marine ship of 8,100 tons deadweight which carries a crew of 41, including 2 boys, is $3,705. Published figures from an authentic source—(bulletin issued by Dow, Jones & Co., of New York) show the monthly wage cost of foreign ships of similar tonnage as being, for British ships $3,924; American, $5,315; Norwegian, $3,378; and Japanese, $2,869.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I would like to give the House particulars of the number of officers and men employed on our Government ships at the end of the last calendar year. All told the number was 1,674, comprising:

Masters	48	
Officers	138	
Engineers	183	
Ordinary seamen, firemen, stewards, etc.	1,305	
Total	1,674	
Total number Canadian by birth or adoption—		
Masters	30	
Officers	57	
Engineers	129	
Ordinary seamen, firemen, stewards, etc.	652	
		868
Total number British—		
Masters	18	
Officers	81	
Engineers	54	
Ordinary seamen, firemen, stewards, etc.	653	
		806
Total		1,674

I think it will interest the House also to be given some information in regard to the routes upon which these ships are plying. They are as follows:

Fortnightly sailings Canada to Liverpool.

Fortnightly sailings Canada to London.

Fortnightly sailings Canada to Barbados, Trinidad and Demerara.

Three-weekly sailings Canada to Glasgow.

Three-weekly sailings Canada to Nassau, Kingston and Belize.

Three-weekly sailings Canada to St. John's, Newfoundland, via Charlottetown, P.E.I.

Monthly sailings Canada to Cardiff and Swansea.

Monthly sailings Canada to Pernambuco, Santos, Rio de Janeiro, Montevideo, and Buenos Aires.

Monthly sailings Canada to Havana, Cuba.

Monthly sailings Canada to Liverpool, via Sydney, C.B.

Monthly sailings Canada to Mediterranean, Straits Settlements, Java and India.

Monthly sailings Canada to Australia and New Zealand.

Monthly sailings Vancouver to Straits Settlements, Java and India.

Monthly sailings Vancouver to Australia (direct).

Monthly sailings Vancouver to New Zealand (direct).

During the year 1920 new routes have been opened up and allocations of steamers made as follows:

(1) Montreal-Glasgow service. Established January 23, 1920: Sailings every three weeks: Allotted three 4,300-ton steamers.

(2) Vancouver-Australia and New Zealand service. Established February 23, 1920: Monthly sailings: Allotted five 8,100-ton steamers: These steamers call, East and West bound, at Wellington, Auckland, Sydney and Melbourne.

(3) Montreal-Cardiff and Swansea service. Esablished July 3, 1920: Monthly sailings: Allotted three 4,300-ton steamers.

(4) Montreal-India and the Orient service. Established September 11, 1920: Sailings every two months: Allotted two 8,100-ton steamers.

(5) Halifax and St. John-Nassau, Kingston and Belize service. Established December 8, 1920: Three-weekly sailings: Allotted two 5,100-ton steamers.

In accordance with the trade agreement concluded during the year with the British West Indies it was decided to equip two of the 5,100-ton vessels then under construction with passenger accommodation, in consequence of which a regular service every three weeks has been established between Canada and the Bahamas, Jamaica and British Honduras. The delegates at the very important conference held in this city in June of last year—I refer to the conference in Ottawa held with a view to negotiating a preferential trade agreement between Canada and the West Indies—particularly the delegates from the Bahamas, Jamaica and British Honduras, claimed that they were very short indeed

of passenger services. I informed them, as your Minister of Marine, that the Government did not own or intend to build any passenger ships, but the delegates were very much interested in the matter and continued their pressure upon me and the other representatives of the Government, requesting us to equip, if possible, some of our freight ships with a limited passenger accommodation. I pointed out to them that I did not think it would pay to equip freight ships with a limited passenger accommodation and to operate them on such a long route as that of Halifax to the Bahamas, Jamaica and British Honduras and back over the same route in the winter, and from Montreal in the summer. The representatives from the West Indies then said that if it did not pay, the countries they represented would each contribute a certain amount. I am sorry I have not before me the amount that each of the Islands stipulated in the agreement that it would be willing to pay, but if my memory serves me correctly the amount in all would be about £13,000. We cannot tell at the present time whether or not this new route will pay, but judging from one or two voyages that the ships have made, it looks as if it might break even. I would not, however, be prepared to make that as a positive statement; we shall have to wait until the end of the fiscal year. While the accommodation provided is but for twenty-six cabin passengers on each vessel, it is of such an excellent character that it attracts a full passenger list for each sailing. Full cargoes also have been carried, and it is confidently expected that the regularity and character of the service generally will build up a profitable business in the interchange of the products of these British possessions and Canada. The first vessel on this route sailed from Halifax on January 25 last, with a full complement of passengers and a general cargo of flour, potatoes, oats, cement and general merchandise.

The House and the country generally, and the exporters of Canada in particular, will be interested to know what these ships are capable of doing in the way of expanding Canada's export trade. In this connection, Sir, I regret to have to express my dissappointment with the efforts so far made by the Canadian manufacturer and exporter. These ships have been equipped with one or two extra passenger cabins in order that Canadian business men might either go themselves to these British possessions and foreign countries, or send their commercial agents. While the showing of exports is not a bad one so far, I would like again to make an urgent appeal to the manufacturers and business men of Canada to reach out more aggressively for export trade. I said last year, and I say it again, that if Canada is to wipe out her immense war debt within a reasonable time, Canadians must not only look after the home trade but reach out aggressively for foreign markets. We have provided this magnificent fleet of freight ships and these new routes have been opened up. No, old-established steamship company would take the chance that the Government ships have taken in opening up one new route after another; these old companies would naturally hesitate and first try to ascertain whether or not it would be profitable to put ships on the various new routes to which I have referred. But these ships are Canadian ships, built in the national interest. The Government has never attempted, and, I hope never will attempt, to interfere in the management of these ships; all I have said to the management as the responsible minister was, that they should make all the money they could, at the same time keeping the national interest in mind and assisting the Canadian people in every possible way to export the products of fishery, forest, farm, mine, and factory. Canadians, therefore, have reason to be proud that they possess this immense fleet of new ships going to all corners of the world, and making a very creditable showing, to which I shall refer in a moment. But the great feature of a Canadian merchant marine is the fact that this country can say: We want this ship, or so many ships, run on whichever route we think there is a possibility of Canada obtaining trade and thus expanding her export business.

The principal exports of Canadian products by the vessels of the Canadian Government Merchant Marine have been:

From Atlantic ports to Malta, Barcelona, India, Ceylon and Java.

From Atlantic ports to Liverpool, London, Glasgow, Cardiff and Swansea.

From Atlantic ports to the British West Indies, Cuba and South America.

To Australia from Vancouver.

To Newfoundland from Montreal and Halifax.

The exports to Malta, Barcelona, India, Ceylon and Java consisted of iron and steel products, glass, furniture, agricultural implements, rubber goods, automobiles, grain, flour, etc.

To United Kingdom ports the exports have been grain, flour, cereals, canned goods, bacon, cheese, apples, pulp, paper, lumber, iron and steel, machinery, implements, etc.

To the British West Indies the products exported have been cement, flour, trunks, iron and steel products, paper, machinery, furniture, etc.

To South America the exports have been pulp and paper, malt, agricultural implements, dried fish, steel products, lumber, etc.

To Cuba exports have consisted mainly of pulp and paper, malt, flour, hay, lumber, fish, potatoes, whiskey, oats and cement.

To Australia there have been exported from British Columbia ports, lumber, paper, cement, fish, machinery, rubber goods, etc.

From Montreal and Halifax to Newfoundland, there have been exported flour, hay, oats, paper, cheese, cement, etc.

The importance of the merchant marine to Canadian trade cannot be too strongly emphasized. Canadian goods to the value of over $50,000,000 have been transported during the year in Canadian-built ships, each named vessel with its prefix "Canadian" being the best advertisement for Canada in the principal markets of the world.

I have now arrived at what, I presume, will be the most interesting part of my statement this afternoon, and that is: What results have been obtained from the operation of these ships during the past calendar year? I will, therefore, proceed at once to give this information to the House.

Mr. FIELDING: Is the statement for the calendar year or for the fiscal year?

Mr. BALLANTYNE: For the calendar year. This is the statement:

Operating Account for 1920

Cross Revenues closed voyages..		$10,027,442 77
Operating expenses..		8,733,917 22
Operating Profit Closed voyages.		$ 1,293,525 55
Deduct—		
Depreciation. $667,665.46		
Outstanding liabilities..	22,000.00	
Incorporation expenses..	5,400.00	
		$695,065 46
Net earnings closed voyages		598,460 09
Net earnings on voyages closed since January applicable to 1920..		183,000 00
Total net earnings.. ..		$781,460 09

I wish to point out that these net earnings are before providing for interest, and the above amount of net earnings, $781,460.09 is equal to 2.35 per cent interest on notes given to the Government for the full cost of the ships.

Mr. CAHILL: What does the Government pay for the money?

Mr. BALLANTYNE: As my hon. friend knows, the rate of interest varies, depending on the time at which loans are made. I might explain that when these Government ships are ready to be put into commission, they are turned over to the operating company and charged to that operating company at cost price, which I gave a few moments ago as $191.95 per ton dead weight. The operating company gives the Dominion Government its promissory notes for these ships.

The following is a statement of the assets and liabiliities:

Canadian Government Merchant Marine Limited and Subsidiary Companies

Consolidated Balance Sheet as at 31st December, 1920

Assets

Fixed Assets—			
Vessels at cost..$50,005,892.71			
Less depreciation reserve..	815,841.32		
			$49,90,051 39
Plant and equipment at cost..$	27,243.25		
Office furniture at cost..	29,128.66		
$	56,371.91		
Less depreciation reserve.	2,818.60		
			53,553 31
Total..			$49,243,604 70
Current Assets—			
Cash in banks and on hand.. ..$			426,816 02
Accounts receivable..			1,750,161 36
Advances to captains, crews and agents..			54,605 09
Adjusted losses due by underwriters..			67,860 82
Insurance claims, estimated amount recoverable..			686,805 51
Interest receivable accrued.. ..			4,583 33
Inventories of stores and supplies..			44,821 84
Dominion of Canada Victory loan 1934..			500,000 00
Insurance unexpired..			908,390 73
Total..			$53,687,469 40

Liabilities	
Captal Stock—	
Authorized 10,000 shares of $100 each $1,000,000, issued 4,709 shares of $100 each..	$ 470,900 00
Votes payable—	
Due Dominion Government secured by mortgages on vessels..	49,535,892 71
Current Liabilities—	
Accounts payable	1,712,803 03
Open Voyages—	
Balances of uncompleted voyages..	963,820 65
Surplus—	
Contingent liabilities (none ascertained)..	1,004,233 01
	$53,687,649 40

As regards current assets, hon. members will, I am sure, note with pleasure the strong liquid position of the operating company. No bank loans are shown, and the operating company is in an easy position financially.

Mr. VIEN: Are the boats insured?

Mr. BALLANTYNE: Yes. Insurance premiums alone for the past year amounted to over $1,000,000, and they are included in operating expenses. The ships are insured up to 80 per cent of their original cost.

Mr. VIEN: How is the depreciation calculated?

Mr. BALLANTYNE: I have the information here; but it is somewhat technical, and if the hon. member will be good enough to ask me that question again when we get into committee on the Estimates, I shall be glad to give him the details.

Mr. VIEN: When we come to that in the Estimates, will the minister be prepared to tell us the current value of the same type of ships in the markets of the world?

Mr. BALLANTYNE: I am quite sure that the figures I am giving to hon. members are absolutely correct. Not only have they been certified to by the company's auditor, but I asked a well-known firm of chartered accountants outside altogether of the operating company to give me the usual statement that appears when an annual balance sheet is issued. The certificate of these auditors, who are the well known firm of Marwick, Mitchell & Company, chartered accountants, reads as follows:

We have audited the accounts of the Canadian Government Merchant Marine, Limited and its subsidiary companies for the year ended 31st December 1920, and have obtained all the information and explanation which we have required.

We certify that the above consolidated balance sheet and relative operating and surplus accounts are in our opinion properly drawn up so as to exhibit a true and correct view of the state of the Company's affairs as at 31st December 1920, and of its operations for the year ended at that date, according to the best of our information and the explanations given to us, and as shown by the books of the Company subject to the explanation that no provision has been made in respect of accrued interest on notes payable due to the Dominion Government for the year 1920, as the amount of same may be subject to adjustment.

Now I just want to say a word or two in regard to the present outlook. While there is a business reaction throughout the world, I am under the impression that this is only of a transitory character, and that we can look for a considerable improvement in trade in the very near future. While freight rates may be expected to still further decline, this will be offset by much lower operating costs, and with the acquisition of the Grand Trunk Railway system, this additional mileage added to the lines which the Government now own and operate, will make in all 23,000 miles, and will act, I hope, as a constant feeder to the Government ships.

Now, just a word or two in regard to shipbuilding conditions. Conditions throughout the world are quite similar, owing to the lack of demand for tonnage. Canadian shipbuilders, therefore, are experiencing the same depreciation that is being experienced in other countries. Canadians have demonstrated that they can build ships equally as good and, during the past few years, at as low a cost as the old and experienced yards in the United Kingdom. Freight ships to-day of 8,400 tons deadweight corresponding to the Government's type would cost in the United Kingdom about £29.10 per ton, equal to $130 at the present rate of exchange. I have had no need to ask Canadian shipbuilders recently for a price to construct steel ships, but I have every reason to believe that the Canadian price would not be any more than $10 or $15 per ton higher than the United Kingdom price which I have just quoted.

Regarding the question of a subsidy as an aid to stimulate steel shipbuilding in Canada, the Government has this matter still under consideration, and it may be that an announcement in that connection will be made by the hon. the Minister of Finance when he brings down his budget.

As I have already stated, by July next all the Government ships will have been completed and placed in commission, and Canada will have reason to be proud of her merchant marine modern freight ships.

I first had the privilege of announcing the Government's shipbuilding programme in the House of Commons on April 4, 1918. The Government's shipbuilding policy at that time received the unanimous approval of Parliament, and I was particularly pleased on that occasion to receive such warm words of commendation from that distinguished statesman whose word carries such great weight in this House and throughout the country, the hon. member for Shelburne and Queen's (Mr. Fielding). My thanks are also due for the words of commendation uttered on that occasion by the hon. member for Maisonneuve (Mr. Lemieux) and the late member for Prince County, P.E.I., Captain Read.

The creation of a Canadian Government merchant marine has been warmly endorsed by people from one end of the country to the other, and even if these ships in the future are not able to continue to make the good showing that they have done so far, I am satisfied that I am expressing the majority opinion, not only of this House, but of the whole country, when I say that the policy of Canada owning and operating her own merchant marine is fully justified.

I have endeavoured to place before the House as briefly and concisely as possible the main features of the Government's programme, both from the construction and operating point of view. Before the end of the present calendar year all construction will be completed, after which the connection of the Marine Department with the programme will cease. The House will not need to be reminded that the programme of ship construction was much more extensive than anything hitherto undertaken by Canada. It was not to be expected that the work could be carried to completion without experiencing some difficulties and disappointments. I am able to report, however, that no serious difficulty was experienced. The aim of the Government throughout was to develop shipbuilding as a self-contained industry. It has been successful to the extent that the boilers, engines, pumps, winches and all the other accessories are nearly all of Canadian manufacture. The House will, I am sure, be glad to know that all these accessories manufactured in Canada, by Canadian workmen, have measured up to the highest standards of excellence and are giving results equally as satisfactory as could be obtained from similar accessories manufactured elsewhere by long-established concerns. It is no less satisfactory to know that while the price paid for the construction of ships may be regarded, in the light of present day conditions, as high, they have been substantially lower than those paid for similar work in the United States, where conditions more nearly resemble those in Canada.

There is a further consideration from which as the minister primarily responsible for the programme I derive some comfort, and that is that every contract made, every voucher paid, every letter and telegram exchanged between the Department and contractors is open for the fullest inspection of any member of the House who desires any further information.

It would be difficult, indeed, it would be impossible, to measure in any adequate way the national importance of Canada's Merchant Marine. I am firmly convinced that what these vessels have already accomplished in the way of marketing Canadian products in remote parts of the world is but an indication of greater successes along these lines in the years immediately ahead of us. Canada is no longer a stranger in foreign ports. The Maple Leaf struck on the House flag and on the funnels of vessels is becoming a familiar sight in the principal world ports.

In the design and construction of the vessels, British types have been adopted. Those in commission have splendidly met every requirement and have been commended by men competent to form opinions. The quality of the vessels themselves, as well as, in a general way, the types of men serving as officers and crews, are helping in a very special manner to establish for Canada and for Canadian business a favourable position abroad.

It would not be proper for me to conclude this statement to-day without expressing my deep appreciation of the technical officers of the Marine Department who shared with me the great responsibility of constructing this seventy-five-million-dollar merchant marine fleet for Canada. As I stated a moment ago, we had many difficulties to contend with. The war was at its height, material was high, and unskilled as well as skilled labour was hard to obtain. But we managed to build these ships in Canada, and the achievement is a great tribute to the Canadian workman and the Canadian shipbuilder; it is creditable to them that these ships have been constructed so well. The design, of course, was British; but, as I have mentioned, all accessories were made in Canada by Canadian manufacturers, and no serious complaints have reached the Marine Department either in regard to design, construction, or equip-

ment of these vessels, down to the minutest detail. In the circumstances, this House and the country generally may feel confident that, given equal opportunities, we can build ships in competition with the world and build them as well. I desire particularly to tender my thanks to the naval architect, Mr. Duguid, to my very able deputy, Mr. Alex. Johnston, and to all those who assisted me during these years in carrying to a successful conclusion, if I may be permitted to say so, the creation of Canada's large and splendid mercantile fleet.

Mr. ROBB: Before the minister leaves his statement, and in order to complete it, perhaps he might take the House into his confidence and say whether the rates are fixed on a joint tariff basis, or are competitive with other steamship lines operating on similar routes. That is one question which I should like the minister to keep in mind. I desire also to know whether any preference is given, in the export of Canadian goods, as between the manufactured product and raw material. I think the minister will understand in a general way what I mean. Further, is any preference given Canadian goods over goods of neighbouring countries in the matter of export, and are the rates on imports on the same basis as the export rates?

Mr. SPEAKER: I have no desire to interpose any objection to the question if the minister desires to reply. But privileges accorded one hon. member should be accorded all, and in that case I am afraid we should have a very irregular proceeding and one in contravention of the rules. It seems to me, therefore, that it would be much more fitting and desirable if questions on points of detail were withheld until the House is in Committee of Supply.

Mr. ROBB: I bow to your ruling, Mr. Speaker, but I thought that possibly the minister might think it advisable to complete his statement in the direction I have suggested.

Mr. BALLANTYNE: As I have already stated, government ships being vested solely in the operating company, I have no detailed knowledge as to the computation of freight rates. I am glad that the hon. member has asked the question, and when we are in Committee of Supply I shall be prepared to give with pleasure the information he seeks. As regards the preference given Canadian products, I do not think that question has arisen or is likely to arise, because our ships have never been in such a position that they could not take all the cargo that was available at any port and load it for the port of destination.

Mr. D. D. McKENZIE (Cape Breton North and Victoria): I am sure we have listened with a great deal of interest to the exhaustive statement of the Minister of Marine. It is difficult for the ordinary man not fully trained in business, to grasp the details so as to be able to say whether or not we are in a solvent condition in connection with the business of shipping. One thing that strikes a person at once is the fact that we have built ships, according to the statement of the minister, costing something like $191 per deadweight ton. These ships are not to-day worth half the money paid for them, but in making out his statement the hon. gentleman puts upon his balance sheet the value of the ships as if it were really what the ships cost in the first instance. They are probably worth less than half of what they cost, and the minister will find that possibly he could not sell any one of his ships to-day at one-third of the price he paid for its construction. Indeed, it is doubtful whether he could sell them at all; it is exceedingly doubtful whether he could give them away. It is therefore a grave question for the Canadian people whether or not the expenditure of seventy-five million dollars in ships, which certainly will not pay for their operation, and which we could not get off of our hands if we wanted to sell them, is a wise venture. That, of course, will be brought out more fully when we are studying the details of the minister's estimates, when we shall have an opportunity of going carefully into these matters. Perhaps it is interesting to know that it is just twelve years ago to-day when the present Minister of Trade and Commerce (Sir George Foster) moved his famous resolution involving the building of ships in this country. That resolution was moved on the 29th March, 1909, and the final action of the House, so far as the resolution itself was concerned, took place on the following day, the 30th March, 1909. The policy that was agreed to by both sides of the House at that time involved the building of a Canadian navy, and, incidentally, the building of merchant marine ships as they might be required for the general purposes of the country. It is unnecessary to say to-day that, if that policy had been adopted, when the war broke out we should have had warships at normal prices, costing about a fourth of what we

are paying for ordinary tramp ships today; and the prices of other ships would have been proportionate. But a change of government took place; new men came to the helm, and new policies followed, a policy of delay, a policy of do nothing, a policy in regard to shipbuilding which stood in abeyance for some years, from 1909 until the 4th day of April, 1918, as the minister has just announced. I would say to my hon. friend at once that when he came to parliament on the date referred to with a shipbuilding policy for the construction of tramp ships, of freight ships, that if it had not been for the war he could not have had a "look in" for this policy at all. But we were then suffering under the stress of war, and anything that would have a tendency to relieve the existing situation was likely to receive and did receive the support of both sides of the House. But I say to the minister, and I address my remarks also to the Government, that when that distressing situation ceased, when the armistice was signed—which I believe was on the 11th of November, 1918, a few months after the Government's policy was inaugurated—when the necessity for building ships for war purposes had disappeared, and he should have halted, he should have finished the construction of the ships then in hand and not have ventured any further into the business of shipbuilding. I am sure that if I had been in the House at that time, and I suppose I was, I would have given my assistance—at all events by a vote if that were necessary—to the establishment of the policy of building ships for purposes rendered necessary by the war; but I am not so clear that it was necessary, even according to the statement of the hon. gentleman, to step in and build these ships. He says that all the Canadian shipyards at that time were fully engaged in the building of ships for the Home Government for the purposes of the war; that we were supplying the money and the ships were being built as rapidly as they could be built. If that was the case I do not at all see the necessity why we stepped in. If there was a possibility of adding to the quantity of tonnage that was imperatively required, owing to war reasons, I would put up both hands for making a start; but when the armistice was signed there was no further necessity for the building of ships by this Government—not a vessel was then being torpedoed and we had plenty of shipping in this country for all practical purposes. Such being the case, I do say that from that moment forward the Minister of Marine and the Government have been following a policy which is absolutely wrong and absurd, as far as business principles are concerned, and have followed a policy that will be as bad for Canada as it has been in the case of the national ownership of railways. When we come to put a proper value on these ships, when another year comes and we get an honest statement from the Department of Marine, we will find that in proportion to the amount of money invested we are just as badly off as we are in connection with the government-owned railways. Therefore it is only a further evidence that governments should, as far as possible, keep their hands off private enterprises and allow private individuals, who are trained in these enterprises, to look after them—the Government should confine itself to looking after the administration of the affairs of the country generally. That is the position which I have always taken in connection with the railroads. Of course if, during the war, it was necessary for railroads to be built by the nation for war purposes I would have voted for such a policy and said that was the proper thing to do; but when the war ended I would certainly be opposed to any further building of railways for war purposes. In the same way I am opposed to the building of ships on any such ground.

I submit, Mr. Speaker, that if these ships are for the development of Canadian trade we should undertake that development where it is most necessary, and where it will be of direct advantage to the people of Canada. What is the matter, if the ships of the Canadian Merchant Marine are lying idle, with using these ships to develop the coal trade of this country? Last week the hon. member for South Perth (Mr. Steele) moved a resolution for an investigation into the coal situation, and in speaking in its support he declared that conditions in Ontario, particularly in the western part, were such that the inhabitants dreaded the approach of winter because they had no supplies of coal available. Well, there is an abundance of coal in the province of Nova Scotia and in the Maritime Provinces generally. Evidently, according to the minister, we have lots of shipping. In that case, seeing that navigation in open up to a point beyond Montreal, what is the matter with

using the ships of the Canadian Merchant Marine for the transportation of coal from the Maritime Provinces and having it stored at places inland where it would be available for our own people—in other words having Canadian coal carried by our own ships and by our own railways, if that is necessary, for the safety, protection and well being of our own people? Is it not much better to have our ships engaged in that way than for them to be swinging idly at anchor in the different harbours along our coasts, while in the meantime the overhead expense goes on just the same, the officers, the sailors, the engineers, and the firemen being paid just the same although they are doing nothing? Would it not be better if we had a statement from the minister that such a service as I have indicated was about to be put into operation? Would it not be better that, possessing shipping and facilities for transportation, we should get the benefit of them in our own country? But what, sir, are the facts? The minister made the remarkable statement that the Government is competing with itself in the matter of the carriage of freight. We have two ports on our Atlantic coast from which we send goods to Newfoundland. The terminus of the Intercolonial Railway, and of the National Railway system, is at North Sydney. From that port large quantities of goods—and we would like the amount to be very much larger—are sent to Newfoundland. Halifax is the only other Atlantic port from which we export goods from Canada to Newfoundland, so far as I know. Well, the minister has told us that he is competing at Halifax with the Government railway at North Sydney. That railway, to make money, must carry goods from North Sydney whence they go to Newfoundland. If these goods are taken off at Halifax and the Canadian Government steamships are employed in their carriage, thus operating in competition with the government railway system, we have the most aubsurd spectacle of a government competing against itself in the carriage of freight and cutting down its own profits. That is the situation as it is to-day.

I repeat, the minister should have called a halt when we reached the stage that there was no further necessity for building ships on account of war conditions. But he made the mistake of continuing in his policy, and now he finds that he has a white elephant on his hands in the shape of these ships. He cannot sell them to advantage and cannot operate them at a profit under present conditions. Of course the same cry will be raised by his department that was raised by the Department of Railways in regard to the railway situation: This is not of our choosing, these vessels are on our hands, what are we to do with them? That was the cry with the Department of Railways uttered with respect to the railways—these railways have been put on our hands, what will we do with them?—we will have to do something with them. And so it goes on and the people pay the piper every time. In conclusion, I wish to point out that if we are going to have these ships they should be used to the advantage of our own people and in improving trade conditions in Canada. The hon. member for Port Arthur (Mr. Keefer) pointed out, and he was backed up by hon. gentlemen opposite, that the only way to fully develop trade from the east to the west in this country, is by the opening up of the St. Lawrence route—at least it is one of the routes available and the most feasible one. Let me say to the minister that if he is going to have these ships on his hands he should make every possible effort to open up a proper channel, as far inland as possible in Canada, so that he will find a use for at least a few of these vessels. At present he has too many, far too many. Any person who has any sense of proportion, or any business capacity will invest his money in a trade in proportion to its development. The minister has gone far too fast in the building of ships in Canada and he will find that there is no work for these ships to do, that he has to compete with the world in the carriage of freight. He will not be in a position to get any business that will amount to a paying proposition. I hope that when we come down to details in regard to this matter the minister will be able to present us with fuller and better information.

I congratulate the minister upon his apparent willingness to throw the full flood of daylight upon the operations of his department. I am pleased to know that he is not following the Nicodemus-like practice of the Department of Railways and Canals; he is not moving in the night. He proposes by his open way of doing business to dispense with the secret manœuvres of the "dark-lantern brigade" operating our railways and which has to report to us a deficit of something like $70,000,000 or $100,000,000. So not only in business but in all other matters, we, on this side of the House at all events, will commend and encourage the most open methods, and we trust that before we are

through with the minister's Estimates and our discussion of his general policy he will find that we are quite capable of appreciating the situation. And he had better come here equipped with the fullest information that he can give the House in regard to this enterprise.

Mr. MICHAEL CLARK (Red Deer): Mr. Speaker, I should wish as far as possible to accede to any request so courteously made as the request of the hon. Minister of Marine (Mr. Ballantyne) that discussion upon the statement which he has presented to the House this afternoon should be postponed until we have had time to read it and are seized of the details of the very large question involved. But in that connection it occurs to me that the Government have not been well advised in bringing this matter before the House this afternoon. We had better look at this thing squarely without any camouflage,—to use the word which is so common on our lips and in our newspapers to-day. There is a great deal of talk about this shipping scheme in the press, there is a great deal of talk about it in the business circles of Montreal and other shipping points of the country, and there is a great deal of talk about it amongst serious citizens who are to any extent apprized of the grave financial position of this country. And while, I repeat, I should have desired to wait for details, I think the postponement might very well have been on the part of the ministry until we had a full House to discuss a question which is bulking so large in the public thought and is of such vital importance to this country. Not having any knowledge that this statement would be submitted this afternoon, and not having had time to peruse the speech of my hon. friend, I am a little at a loss to go into this whole question, but I should not have been doing justice to my own conscience as a citizen of Canada and as a member of this House, and I should not have been doing justice to a great public question, if I allowed it to pass without at least a word or two of comment.

My hon. friend from Cape Breton North and Victoria (Mr. McKenzie) does not seem quite content to have any part or lot in this shipping business at the present moment. Well, he betrays considerable agility in that respect in being able to turn a pretty sharp corner, Mr. Speaker, unless my memory fails me. I am not fortified with any more than my recollection of Hansard, but if my recollection is correct, my hon. friend the Minister of Marine might very well have thanked the hon. member for North Cape Breton and Victoria, as well as the hon. members for Maisonneuve (Mr. Lemieux) and Shelburne and Queen's (Mr. Fielding) for the initial support, at any rate, which was rendered to his scheme. As for me, Sir, my garments are clean. Any member of this House can read the debates in regard to the shipping programme that have taken place from the first day that my hon. friend brought his scheme before Parliament and he will find me on record as having warned the minister that he was embarking upon a scheme which was going to lead to financial disaster for the country —and I do not mind telling him very frankly that there are a good many of his own friends who know that that financial disaster, if not actually here, is very close at hand. My recollection about my hon. friend from North Cape Breton and Victoria is that this shipping business bulked very largely in his political career. I am not at all sure that it was not in a debate on shipping that he made his famous avowal of being a protectionist. If I am wrong he will correct me. I am nearly sure that it was in that debate. He was leader of the Opposition at the time, and naturally on a question of this size and importance being introduced he, as leader of the Opposition, had to stand up and tell the people what he thought, and he did not hesitate much about it. He said: I am a protectionist. I am all for selling steel plates as long as they are made in Nova Scotia; I am for building ships, if it furnishes a market for steel plates in Nova Scotia. I hope I am not misrepresenting my hon. friend. I am nearly sure that that is the substance which a reasonably good memory furnishes me with of what he said on that occasion.

Mr. McKENZIE: This is a case, Mr. Speaker, in which silence does not give consent.

Mr. CLARK (Red Deer): I did not catch what my hon. friend said. It was addressed in so low a tone and so exclusively to the Speaker that it could not possibly reach me at this end of the chamber.

Mr. McKENZIE: Mr. Speaker, I said that this is a case in which silence does not give consent.

Mr. CLARK (Red Deer): Well, Mr. Speaker, there are times when it is necessary to keep silence even from good words. But I do not know that my hon. friend

has any very good defence to make in any very good words, for I know his pugnacity is so great that that defence would be forthcoming at the point of the usual dagger which he carries so handy. I think that his silence certainly does give consent, and that he practically agrees that I am not misrepresenting what his attitude was on that occasion.

Now, we are not in any doubt about what the attitude of other hon. members was, because the minister, who doubtless has refreshed his memory for the occasion, has offered his thanks to the hon. members for Shelburne and Queen's and for Maisonneuve for their kind support to his scheme at the time, I think he said, of its initiation. Well, I have not misunderstood that point. That may account in some measure for what, I repeat, is a somewhat extraordinary line of procedure. I do not know why a statement of this importance should have been brought on the first day after the holidays when notoriously it is the general expectation that we have a small House, unless it was thought that it could be crowded through and no discussion take place upon it. I seriously hope there was no understanding of that kind in the House. I should be very sorry for parliamentary traditions and parliamentary practice if we had got to that point. But, I repeat, I should not have done my duty to myself and to the country if I had not stated where I stand in the matter and repeated the warnings that I have given before. I do not know how far my hon. friend the minister intends to go with this scheme. He now has not the leader of the Opposition to deal with apparently, but the ex-leader of the Opposition, in a very much chastened frame of mind compared with that in which he spoke about shipping in the early stages of this scheme.

Now, I just want to say this about this shipping measure as far as we have it before us this afternoon. I did not hear the minister's whole statement, so I do not know what he intends to do further in the matter. But I want to endorse what my hon. friend the member for Cape Breton North and Victoria (Mr. McKenzie) pointed out—that this is a scheme which in its magnitude is now almost as serious as the railroad problem which is exercising the mind of every thoughtful Canadian. I say that without fear of successful contradiction. The minister went into it with his eyes open, with warnings in front of him. He has gone into it by stages from year to year. At the time of the armistice—I rely upon public prints for my information, but if I am correctly informed, at that time an expenditure of only sixteen and one-half millions of money had been embarked upon in the carrying out of this scheme. Now, that was a considerable sum of money, but as my hon. friend from North Cape Breton says, these contracts were given in war time, for a specific purpose, when the whole country was behind any step that was necessary for the winning of the war. Our losses could have been cut to a very small proportion indeed if we had stopped this business at the time of the armistice—even if my hon. friend had stopped at the time I warned him he should stop; at the time I warned him that he was backing a "wrong 'un" for the people of this country.

Now, what is the condition of affairs? The same public prints tell me that including the contracts that were entered into with the Imperial Munitions Board, this country has embarked upon an expenditure up to date of no less a sum than $140,000,000 in connection with this shipbuilding scheme. These are very serious statements; they are statements which require an alert Opposition. One hundred and forty millions embarked upon; these statements are made in public. And what is the condition of the property? I have a recollection of recent statements, made, I think, last year; I have a recollection of my hon. friend the Minister of Marine saying that he could sell these ships for more than they had cost to build. Would he repeat that statement to-day? If he did he would correct the best business columns of the best newspapers in this country, because we are told what is in accordance with the shipping knowledge of everybody who has studied shipping at all, that the value of the ships has been cut in half. I question whether for any ship he has built the minister could get half of what it cost him to build it. That is a very serious matter, Mr. Speaker, for the people of this country. It is a very serious position for any minister of the Crown to be in in regard to a scheme with which he persevered in spite of warnings that he was going in the wrong direction.

What about freights to-day? Why, before coming east I read a statement issuing from the port of St. John from the man who is responsible for getting cargoes for the government ships, that cargoes were not to be had. I warned my hon. friend that it would be so. I told him from my own personal experience what shipping in Britain had paid during the Boer war and what it was paying within a year and a half after-

wards; percentages of twenty had shrunk to one and one and one-half, and the people holding the shares were glad to get it. He had these warnings before him. Despite his attempt to make a rosy story this afternoon, that is the position the Government of Canada is in with regard to these ships: The value of the ships is cut through the middle; freights cannot be had. Why, only the other day I read in the columns of the Montreal Star—a publication coming from a very good town, one which has a reputation for political leanings that would lead one to think it would be favourable, if it could be, to the Government in power and to the Minister of Marine—that some of the merchant ships of Canada were coasting along the shores of Scandinavia seeking cargoes, and that some of them have even been looking furtively to Germany for cargoes, until Canadian exports revive; a very interesting statement to me, and it ought to be a very interesting statement to my hon. friend the Prime Minister, because it contains the admission that Canadian exports at the present moment are in need of being revived. Last summer the right hon. gentleman was rather jaunty about the condition of Canadian exports, but now it seems that Canadian ships have to coast along the shores of Scandinavia seeking cargoes, "until Canadian exports revive." Yet one of the objects of the building of these ships, according to my hon. friend's statement this afternoon, was to promote the export trade of Canada.

Now, that is the position of my hon. friend's enterprise up to date, according to statements that are printed in almost every newspaper in the country. For some of this information I depend on what my memory recalls to me of what appeared not later than Saturday in the parliamentary correspondence of the government organ, the press supporting the Government in this city.

We had this scheme entered lightly upon —and I dwell upon this for a moment without wishing to extend my remarks— we had this scheme entered upon according to old, bad political conditions in this country. Such schemes are as common under a protective tariff as withered leaves in autumn. My hon. friend to whom I have referred took occasion to avow himself a protectionist, thereby, with very great courage, probably losing the leadership of his party. The scheme is very simple; it was very simple at the time; it was simple to carry it on. We traded upon the patriotism of the people—the Government did, anyhow. It looked so fine. "We have to help out the winning of the war"—we all agreed about that end of it. "It will be a splendid thing to build ships in Montreal and in Three Rivers"—I do not see my hon. friend from Three Rivers (Mr. Bureau) here, but Three Rivers, I think, was included. Then, of course, there was Vancouver, and where else were they built? I do not remember all the places, but the minister is an adept at that sort of thing, and he got fine support for his scheme from both sides of the House. He introduced it, the steel plates were sold, and the orders were issued. Why shouldn't they be? We were getting subscriptions to Victory bonds at the time by the hundred million. I have, in private and in public, expressed the opinion that the last victory bond issue in this country, subscribed to the tune of seven hundred millions, was a positive curse both to the Government and to the country. It indicated vast patriotism on the part of our people, but it put money by the hundred million into the hands of a government that did not know how to handle it. So you had your ship schemes and your housing schemes—thank God, in regard to that the provinces have used only half the money that was voted—and a hundred other channels were opened for the frittering away of the wealth of the people, until the finances of this country are in the condition they are in to-day and that every man from one end of the country to another who follows public affairs knows they are in. That, shortly, is the history of what happened after the war was over in regard to this shipping business.

Now, as I said in beginning, Mr. Speaker, I merely wanted to put myself upon record for, I think, the fourth time—at any rate, I have gone on record whenever my hon. friend has had the question before the House in one sense—that this was a financial escapade that was going to end in disaster for the country. On each occasion I warner my hon. friend that that was so, and while it is never any great line of conduct to say "I told you so," I would still confine myself to a warning and I would say to the hon. minister, for goodness sake, stop this thing now. You have had your eyes opened to the real nature of it; let us have the thing cease now; let us cut our loss as the stockbrokers advise us to do.

The project was carried out, I am sorry to say, with large support from the other side of the House—support derived from the old, bad system of looking at the needs

of the constituency rather than the needs of the country. If ever there was a scheme which should have been supported as a great national scheme, it was this, if there was anything in it at all; but, as I have said in this House again and again, it was looked at, as politics teaches us always to look at these measures, for its local value at certain points. So that the plates were sold at one place and something else was sold somewhere else; the ships were placed in various localities whether they were represented by Tories or by Liberals, and the result is that to-day, to the tune, according to some newspapers, of $140,000,000, we have "a painted ship upon a painted ocean." That is the scheme of my hon. friend up to date and I hope we have heard the last of any extension of it. The further one goes with it, the worse off this country will be. How we shall get out of our difficulties, the Lord only knows. We will get good help towards getting out of them when we get, to handle the finances of this country, people who have more sense of financial responsibility than, I am sorry to say, has been displayed in this shipping scheme that is—I endorse what the hon. member for Cape Breton North and Victoria (Mr. McKenzie) says—a white elephant only second to that of our railways themselves.

Hon. RODOLPHE LEMIEUX: (Maisonneuve): Mr. Speaker, as we have not before us the figures which the Minister of Marine and Fisheries (Mr. Ballantyne) gave to the House this afternoon, I will defer to a later date, when he brings down his Estimates, the general discussion and the specific discussion of some features of this venture. But in order that the House may understand at once my position in the matter, I wish to state that it is quite true that in 1918, during the war, before the armistice, I supported the shipbuilding programme of my hon. friend. Is that a crime, or is that an indication, as is suggested by the hon. member for Red Deer (Mr. Clark), of a dark association between both sides of this House in favour of some big interests? During the war, and because of the war, the Liberal party in the House of Commons stood for any sane and big national measure. From my seat in this House, I supported this shipping programme because we were officially informed that it was absolutely urgent that Canada should build ships in order to relieve the shipping situation of the Allies. I am not sorry in a way that the experiment should have been made. We were told not so very long ago that it was absolutely impossible to build ships in Canada; that we could hardly find riveters; that we could not manufacture plates; that we could not have men to man our navy. I, as a Canadian, had enough pride that, even although told by Mr. Winston Churchill, that we were not able to build ships, we were, indeed, able to do it.

If I was in favour of the shipping programme of the Government during the war, before the armistice, one must not infer from that that I stand in favour of this huge expenditure now that the war is over. I can only re-echo what all business men in the country have been stating during the last two years, namely, that a halt should be called to that carnival of expenditure. It is a well known fact that, since the armistice, and especially during the last fifteen or sixteen months, ships have been like a drug on the market in Great Britain, the United States and France. I have seen the figures; I have read the articles, and I have never understood why the Canadian Government and the Minister of Marine and Fisheries (Mr. Ballantyne) should have gone with such pig-headedness into this wild expenditure when they were warned from all sides, from all sources, that they were riding to a certain fall—because, from what I have learned this afternoon from the very attitude of the hon. gentleman, it is pretty certain that he is very gloomy as to the future of the Canadian Mercantile Marine Company.

I am glad, however, that he was able to state that Parliament could have access to all books, documents, even telegrams, which passed between the contractors and his department. His announcement is a justification of the attitude taken the other day by the leader of the Opposition (Mr. Mackenzie King) and this side of the House, when we pleaded in vain with the Government for access, not to confidential documents which might injure the Canadian National Railway system, but to documents to which Parliament is naturally entitled. I suppose my hon. friend has been warned by responsible people, by friends of the Government, that the attitude of the leader of the Government (Mr. Meighen) and of his party, as well as the attitude of the hon. member for Red Deer (Mr. Clark) the other day, was not in conformity with British traditions and institutions. Why should we have

freer access to documents concerning the building and managing of a Government-owned navy than to documents referring to the building and managing of a Government-owned railway system? the two cases are parallel. But the other day the Government thought, perhaps, that the motion made by the leader of the Opposition was inopportune and that they should, therefore, vote against it. They have found out since however, from their own friends. I have in mind two articles published by a leading paper in this country, the Montreal Gazette, strongly condemning the Government and their friends for the vote they gave in the House the other day on the question of the production of documents. Is it not, Mr. Speaker, one of the elementary rights of hon. members of this House, elected by the people, that they are entitled to have access to the books and documents concerning the administration of the affairs of the country? Our railway system, our merchant marine, are both parts of the administration, perhaps in an indirect way, if you please, of the affairs of the country, and why should we have been refused by the Government the right to have access to these documents and books? I am glad my hon. friend has learned better and has taken heed of the advice from his friends in Montreal who complained bitterly of the refusal given by the Government.

As to the Canadian Merchant Marine, the Government will learn on that question also they have lost the support of their best friends. My hon. friend the Minister of Marine and Fisheries said this afternoon that the bankers were not well informed when they dared criticise the administration of that branch of his department. Mr. Speaker, there are no two men in this country better informed than the President of the Bank of Montreal and the President of the Royal Bank, and they both condemn the Canadian Government Merchant Marine as an unwise enterprise which in the long run would bring disaster to the country and to the Government. I have not here the words of the President of the Bank of Montreal or those of the President of the Royal Bank, but I have read them. These gentlemen were only too well informed.

I speak to-day with some sense of pride, because I remember that just a year before the election, during a discussion on some of the branch lines of the Canadian Northern system, when I ventured to express the opinion that government ownership of railways would bring disaster to this country, what a howl of protest there was from the ranks opposite, and I remember well the lecture given me by the then Minister of Finance. Well, Mr. Speaker, who was right, and who was wrong? Government ownership not only as regards the railways but as regards the merchant marine is simply a mistake, if not a crime, and Canada to-day is facing the issue squarely. The country realize that for a passing whim the Government has sacrificed its best interests. I am not afraid, Mr. Speaker, to take the same stand to-day that I took two years ago, and especially after the admissions made this afternoon and the disappointment expressed by my hon. friend the Minister of Marine and Fisheries. If he could give us his honest opinion, if he could tell us his own intimate sentiments on the Government railway policy, I am sure he would be at one with me and would condemn the Government and his colleagues for the crime they have committed against Canada.

The time will come when we shall discuss in detail the pragramme of the Government with respect to the merchant marine. This afternoon I just wish to state that if in 1918 I supported the programme of my hon. friend, it was because Canada was then at war, and because the Mother Country, on account of the destruction of so much tonnage in the North Sea and elsewhere by enemy submarine raids was most insistent on receiving aid from Canada. I did not commit myself to any policy of a Government-owned Merchant Marine. On the contrary, I say that my hon. friend should have halted his programme immediately after the armistice, because, being a business man, he should have known that from that moment ships would be available at half price in the United States, in France, and even in the Mother Country.

My hon. friend the Minister of Marine and Fisheries says that the merchant marine has not been appreciated as it should have been by the business community, by the manufacturers of Canada. Sir, the merchant marine was not built simply for the manufacturers. It was built for the whole Canadian people—for the farmer, the miner, the fisherman, just as much as for the manufacturer. My hon. friend has said that he thought to expand the export business of Canada by means of the merchant marine. He will certainly have to revise his views on the tariff if he thinks

that by raising it "as high as Haman's gallows" he can develop any export business. My hon. friend may be able to develop an export business with the merchant marine if he invites the world at large to trade with Canada, but if when inviting the world, he at the same time raises a barrier to prevent any trading with this country, I am afraid his hopes are doomed to disappointment.

Mr. Speaker, once more I say I am glad that the ships were built in Canada, although as I said a moment ago, my hon. friend should have stopped building immediately after the armistice. We have taught John Bull that Jack Canuck is able to take care of himself. Some years ago, as my hon. friend will remember, in 1913, we were solemnly told by the right hon. gentleman who was then Prime Minister, that he had received a communication from the Right Hon. Winston Churchill that Canada, forsooth, could not build ships, and that we should be satisfied to rely on the Mother Country in that regard. Well, though it has cost several million dollars, Mr. Speaker, we have at least this satisfaction that we were able to demonstrate to the Right Hon. Winston Churchill that Canada can build ships.

Mr. EDMUND BRISTOL (Centre Toronto): The subject under discussion is one to which I have given some attention. I have listened with a great deal of care to the observations of hon. members and the criticisms which have been levelled at the policy of the Minister of Marine (Mr. Ballantyne). The objections seem to be two-fold: first, that the merchant marine should never have been built—which, I understand, is really the view of my hon. friend from Red Deer (Mr. Clark)—and second, the view of my distinguished friends of the official Opposition, that all shipbuilding should suddenly have been stopped when the armistice was declared. Now, it is only reasonable to view the situation in the light of the conditions that existed when the shipbuilding policy was adopted. What was the world-wide situation then? What was the world-wide cry? It was that every country associated with the Allies should build ships. Not only was that cry insistent, but the condition in the Mother Country showed the imperative necessity for ships. She was not only building all the ships which her own shipyards could contain, but she was straining every nerve on the continent of Europe, and was spending millions of dollars in this country building ships for which, as I understand, the people of Canada were lending her money, since they were anxious to have the shipbuilding programme carried on in view of the submarine menace. The minister, backed up by practically all the people of this country, except my hon. friend from Red Deer, thought that it was only fair, instead of allowing Great Britain to borrow money from Canada and build ships in this country, that Canada should assume that burden and put her own money into ships. What was the position in the United States? They took possession of every private shipyard. They took over, I suppose, at least a dozen large shipyards, and they have invested billions of dollars in ships which were constructed at the same time Canada was making her small effort in this direction. The fact of the matter is that there was not a country in the world that did not believe that shipping was going to be the best property any one could build, and they were all tumbling over one another to build ships. The belief of the people in every country at that time was that the building of ships was not only a good policy from the point of view of the war, but that it would prove good business. There was not a nation that was not anxious to build ships, and certainly no nation was more anxious than the United States. The American Government took over the orders of the Cunard and White Star lines in American shipyards because they said that the United States needed ships. Why, the paltry effort of Canada alongside of what the United States has done is a mere bagatelle; and, as I have observed, the position taken by every civilized people in the world at that time, was that it was the best thing to build ships. This was the conviction of everybody except my hon. friend from Red Deer, who, because of his belief that shipbuilding could be carried on in Canada only under a protective policy, is opposed to the building of ships in Canada.

Mr. MICHAEL CLARK (Red Deer): My hon. friend will allow me to say that I never said a word in public or private that could be construed as being in favour of a protective policy.

Mr. BRISTOL: My hon. friend misunderstands me. I suggested that his opposition to the construction of ships in Canada was because the work could be done only by virtue of a protective tariff, and his position was that it could not be done so cheaply here as in the Old Country. We

are all aware of that fact, and that was one of the reasons why last year the Government passed a shipbuilding Act to lend money for the building of ships in this country. But the point is that the world was shipbuilding crazy, and we had only the small end of the craze in Canada.

Mr. LAPOINTE: "Craze" is the word.

Mr. BRISTOL: There was no one who did not believe that it was a good policy and one that was ncessary in the exigencies of the time.

Now, to come to the armistice. What was the position then? The Government of this country had shipyards working overtime constructing ships. There were yards that came into existence that would never have been established but for our national shipbuilding policy that had been instituted during the war. There was some $250,000,000 invested in this industry in Canada, and practically 250,000 men, directly or indirectly dependent on it, besides some 50,000 who directly derived their subsistence from the building of ships. What was the Government to do? Were they suddenly to cancel contracts and turn every one of these men loose, with the resultant unemployment throughout the country? Such an action, in my humble judgment, would have been suicidal; it would have been adverse to the best interests of the country. It is strange that only to-day, for the first time, we hear this wonderful criticism of the whole subject, and suggestions as to what should have been done at that time. I fancy it is a case of foresight and hindsight; it is wonderful how wise one can be after the event.

My hon. friends say that these ships are worth only half of what they cost. Well, I venture to say that if our ships are worth only half of what they originally cost, the ships in the United States are probably worth two-thirds less than what it cost to construct them. Our ships were constructed very much cheaper than the ships in the United States, where the average price was something like $300 against our price of $185 per ton dead weight. Not only did we construct better ships than those built in the United States, but ours were vastly cheaper. Our neighbours to the south were building ships under conditions similar to ours, but conditions in Canada were worse because we had to import plates from the United States for a long time, until the Government adopted a policy of establishing a plate mill in this country, which made it possible for Canada to build every part of a ship and not be dependent on the United States. Before that policy had been adopted, we had to wait until the United States were good and ready to give us plates.

My hon. friends' complaint is that some of the ships are not earning money to-day; they say that the ships are tied up. Well, there are other ships than Canadian that are tied up; the ships of England and every other country are largely in this condition. To hear hon. gentlemen talking about ships being tied up in Canada, one would imagine that there was not such a thing as a worldwide cessation of trade since last November; one would think that conditions in France and Germany were perfectly settled, and that peace reigned throughout Russia. To hear the criticisms that are levelled at the minister on the ground of Canadian ships being tied up, one would suppose that conditions were normal in every country except Canada. That suggestion is ridiculous, because every one knows that there has been practically a worldwide cessation of trade, and the ships of England, good as they are—although they are no better than the boats built here—are equally as idle as Canadian vessels. Until our railways and the railways of the United States are on a stable basis; until there has been a worldwide readjustment of the rates of exchange; until trade is again normal; and until the situation in Germany and Russia, and elsewhere, is settled, no man can reasonably expect the business of shipping to resume its pre-war status. And my hon. friends would be helping the country much more if, instead of the destructive criticism which they level at the Government for a state of things, which is only similar to that existing in other countries, they would offer some patriotic suggestion of a constructive character in regard to the railway and shipping situation in Canada at the present time. The construction of ships is one thing, and their management in the future is another; and that is a fair field for discussion. But to go back and discuss now the question as to the date at which the Government's shipbuilding policy should have ceased to operate, and to criticize the Government because some of their ships are idle, when there is a similar situation throughout the world, is futile and is a waste of time.

Right Hon. ARTHUR MEIGHEN (Prime Minister): The intention of the Government in having this statement placed on Hansard to-day was to enable hon. members to acquaint themselves with the details of the operation of the vessels, in order that they might approach the discussion of the general policy later on, or of the Estimates having to do with that policy, intelligently in the light of the figures there presented. The occasion of going into Committee of Supply was taken in order that, if it was desired, there should be comment on the part of hon. members, particularly by the leader of the Opposition, as is sometimes the case when such statements as these are presented. I do not think the presence or the absence of a portion of the House to-day has any real bearing on the question. The intention was to give hon. members an opportunity to read the statement in print, because only by doing so could acquaintance with the actual situation be at all thorough or detailed. Consequently the day chosen was most appropriate for that purpose. I am sorry that, as things have turned out, hon. members opposite were found prepared for a very dismal presentation, whereas, as a matter of fact, the statement made by the Minister of Marine reflects anything but a disastrous situation—possibly it is not as rosy as many of us expected when the programme was launched, certainly not as rosy as there were just reasons for expecting at that time, but on the whole fair and satisfactory; and particularly so when compared with the experience of any other country not excepting Great Britain herself. In fact there is no country that to-day can show as creditable a record in the matter of shipbuilding, and in the results of shipbuilding and operation in the period of time which we have been in them as can this Dominion of Canada. It is important, and I think it is due to the House, that an opportunity should be given for the study of the details of operation by a perusal of the printed statement in Hansard; otherwise errors are very easily fallen into, errors such as we have had many examples of this afternoon. It is a good thing to study Hansard. It is a practice that I would commend to hon. gentlemen opposite, and, if I might specialize this afternoon, I would commend that practice to the hon. member for Maisonneuve. I believe if he will spend a night or two reading some of the good portions of Hansard—his own speeches above all, delivered on occasions when the Estimates for shipbuilding were under weigh—he would come to this House better prepared for the discussion of these matters, and would never fall into the mistake of making a speech such as he did this afternoon. I have some recollection of the eloquence with which my hon. friend applauded, not only the launching of the shipbuilding programme but every step taken in that programme from the date of its launching, and—so far as I am aware, and I venture to say with great positiveness—up to a year ago. Now the fact is that not one single ship has been laid down—that is to say not one contract has been entered into, no commitment has been made in regard to shipbuilding construction—for just the time he says we should have known it would be better not to build any more ships, just sixteen months. Would the hon. member say that as the armistice was signed on November 11, we should have thrown a ship into the ocean upside down that was perhaps two-thirds constructed at that time, or one-third constructed, or even twenty per cent constructed? Did the hon. member support this programme in the first place, or did any hon. member opposite support it, merely as a war programme? If that is the case my recollection is not very accurate. We supported this programme because we needed ships for the purposes of Canadian commerce. It is true that we needed ships to carry Canadian commerce during the war; but the vessels that carried Canadian commerce, and world commerce, were destroyed by the submarine and we needed them not only during the war but after the war period. It was known that when the war was over there would be a very serious shortage of ships, and each country vied with the other in an endeavour to catch up with that shortage and to give its own people the benefit of the industry that would be entailed in the process of catching up. In that effort Canada bore a creditable part—not a part as great relatively as the efforts of larger nations but a creditable part. The vessels constructed were creditable to this country, and the contracts for that construction reflected honour, not dishonour, upon the Department of Marine. We have the ships to-day and there has been nothing in the way of substantial complaint with respect to their construction; and in that particular regard, above all others, our experience compares most favourably with that of other nations.

The hon. member made, or at all events set out to make, a point on the reference

by the Minister of Marine to the availability to Parliament of all documents, letters, correspondence and papers relating to the construction of these vessels—

Mr. LEMIEUX: And telegrams also.

Mr. MEIGHEN: Certainly, telegrams form part of correspondence. The hon. member affected to see in that a recantation of the position the Government took the other day in relation to documents and papers respectng the operation of the Canadian National Railways, as well as the operation of the national shipping. The hon. member affected to see in it an inconsistency with the position the Government took at that time. His imagination led him on until he leaped to the conclusion that that inconsistency was due to the dictation of the Montreal Gazette and the financiers of Montreal, who had told the Government that it was all wrong on this question of correspondence on the subject of operation, and that it should right about face at once. I want to compliment my hon. friend on his imagination, but I cannot compliment him on his hearing. Actually what the Minister of Marine said what this—it happens to have been committed to writing and the minister read it directly from notes:

> There is the further consideration from which, as the minister primarily responsible for the programme I derive some comfort, and that is that every contract made, every voucher paid, every letter and telegram exchanged between the department and contractors, is open for the fullest inspection of any member of the House who desires any further information.

Every word of this is in line with what I uttered myself in stating the position of the Government in relation to the national railways—every single word. All correspondence with any department of the Government in relation to any subject at all is available to this House. That has always been the case, it is the case to-day. Were we, under a department of government, to construct railway cars, were we to make rails, were we to build anything at all, everything relating to the activities of that department and passing between that department and the contractor, or passing between the department and anybody else, necessarily is available and must be produced on an order of this House. That is true in regard to the construction of ships. But what has that to do with the operation of the vessels or of railways under a corporation?—That is a different thing altogether.

Mr. LEMIEUX: Are not the Canadian people the shareholders in the enterprise?

Mr. MEIGHEN: We know all that, but the difference is the same difference which I pointed out the other day, and I know I have convinced the hon. member that the position taken by the Minister of Marine is the position which I take myself. My hon. friend contends that there is no difference when the ships or railways are operated under a corporation. Well, the judgment of this House is that there is a great deal of difference. The judgment of the House, and it was pronounced very emphatically, is that we had to go very carefully in determining what in the nature of correspondence and details of operation should be producible in Parliament from day to day if we were going to make a business success either of the operation of our shipping or of our railways.

If we are going to get any man who is big enough and able enough to take in hand the tremendous responsibility of operating them, Parliament must proceed very carefully in deciding what part of his operations is to be exposed to his competitor and to the public from day to day. That is the principle I sought to enunciate then; by that principle I stand to-day; and from that principle the statement of the Minister of Marine makes no deviation whatever. The hon. member says it is too bad. It is too bad, because the whole basis of half his speech falls down.

The hon. member for Maisonneuve made some other statement to which I was anxious to reply. Before I do so, let me refer to the rather doleful lamentation of the hon. member for Red Deer (Mr. Clark). I readily accord to the hon. member full credit for consistency as regards the whole shipbuilding programme of this Dominion. On that score there is no fault to be found with him. But when he says that this Dominion is to-day in a state of appalling financial calamity, and that second only to our railway trouble is the great difficulty we are in with respect to our mercantile marine, I am afraid he rather exaggerates a dread that he has been harbouring for some years. Our ships, he says, are worth very little. Well, they are at least earning a good sum over operating expenses,—and you cannot make any trains do that over the Transcontinental railway, nor over the Grand Trunk Pacific railway. Those ships are at least earning some million odd dollars over operating expenses, and after allowance for depreciation and every other just allowance that need be made they are still able to pay a small percentage upon their actual cost, although they were built at a time—and it was essential to build

them then—when that cost was necessarily abnormal. Surely that is not a position wholly disastrous. If they were able to pay a larger percentage of interest it would be better, but having in mind the fact that their construction was essential, and that it was commenced at a time when the cost was necessarily high—keeping in mind those two factors, which are the very bases of the whole case upon which we are now proceeding,—surely the result shown by the statement of the Minister of Marine is not a cause for tearful lamentations. We can face the situation as to our mercantile marine; we can face the situation, too, precipitated by premature and expensive railway building, not at a time when it was needed, but at a time when it was not needed at all—we can face both those situations because we are a strong and virile country. But in facing them do not treat them as comparable. We can look upon one with nothing except pleasure at having undertaken a great enterprise, and at least with satisfaction that it has gone through without any great cause for discontent; but the other is something which we cannot contemplate without a very wholesome and unalloyed regret.

Hon. W. L. MACKENZIE KING (leader of the Opposition): Mr. Speaker, I shall not attempt to follow my right hon. friend (Mr. Meighen) in his remarks concerning the Canadian Mercantile Marine, because I agree with him when he says that for an intelligent discussion of the statement which has been presented to the House this afternoon by the hon. Minister of Marine and Fisheries (Mr. Ballantyne) it is obviously desirable that we should have before us for careful examination the various facts and figures contained in that statement. The whole subject is too large to be dealt with off hand; it is second only to that of the railway problem which we had brought before us the other day, and it is absolutely essential that we be fully seized of all the details before the public can be properly acquainted with their significance, I might say with their direful significance.

But, Mr. Speaker, there is one remark of my right hon. friend's which I would not like to pass unnoticed, and that is the reference to the statement made by the Minister of Marine as to the information which he was prepared to give to Parliament on matters pertaining to the Canadian Mercantile Marine. I do not think that my right hon. friend has strengthened either his own position or the position of the Government in what he has just told us as to the real significance of the utterance of the Minister of Marine. If I understand him aright, the right hon. gentleman makes a distinction between giving to this Parliament information concerning the administration of a great public enterprise where it is in the nature of correspondence with the department, and giving information where the administration is carried on by a corporation, so-called, although created for the purpose by the Government itself. For example, so far as our railways are concerned, the Government has formed, for the purpose of control and operation, what I might call a phantom corporation. When it suits the purpose of the Government to withhold information from the public, we are told that that information is part of the information of which this phantom corporation alone has knowledge and control. The only information that Parliament is to be acquainted with is the routine correspondence exchanged with the deputy head or possibly with the minister of the department himself.

Now we are told that the Government proposes to adopt exactly the same course in regard to the Canadian Merchant Marine. This is another colossal enterprise involving an expenditure of millions of dollars of the people's money, and yet, when it comes to accounting to the public for this expenditure, the public is to be told that they are to get no information whatever as the enterprise is being carried on by a corporation and this notwithstanding that the corporation is the creation of the Government itself. Let me say to my right hon. friend and to his Government that the people of Canada will hold him and his Government accountable for every cent of public money, whether it is expended directly by the minister in charge of a department, or by any corporation or other creature which the ministry itself may create for the purpose of carrying on its business. The public have to meet the bills in the shape of the heavy taxation which is being imposed upon them, taxation as regards the railways alone amounting to $169,000,000, according to the Estimates brought down for the present year, and taxation amounting to many millions of dollars for this merchant marine, according to the statement which the minister has just given to the House. It is impossible to imagine that the people of Canada will consent to pay the enormous sums which they are being called upon to pro-

vide by way of taxation for the conducting of these enterprises and will sit silent under the Government's refusal to give them any information as to how their money has been spent.

REPRESENTATION IN PARLIAMENT

FILLING OF VACANCIES—AMENDMENT TO SUPPLY

Hon. W. L. MACKENZIE KING (leader of the Opposition): That point, Mr. Speaker, is the only one to which I wish to refer for the moment with respect to the merchant marine, because I desire to pass on to another subject, which is of even greater significance, relating as it does to all matters that are likely to come up for discussion in this Parliament—the all-important question of the right of the people to representation in the Parliament of Canada. We have had this afternoon a denial of the right of the people's representatives in this House to information with respect to matters of public concern which are involving them in huge expenditures of public money. I wish to point out that the Government by its action is denying the people another of their fundamental rights, I should say the first of the political rights of the people under British parliamentary government, namely, the right to be represented in Parliament by members of their own choice. This right of representation involves the right of the people to participate in the making of their own laws, and in the control of taxation. These two rights might be expressed, as they are so frequently in the form of political maxims, that Government is carried on only by the consent of the governed, and that there should be no taxation without representation. May I say to my right hon. friend that the attitude which he and his Government have taken as respects the several vacancies which at present exist in this House is an open defiance of these two political maxims and of the fundamental rights of the people of this country. There are at the present time no less than six vacancies in this House of Commons. Let me read to the House a statement of the constituencies that are not represented at the present time and the dates at which the vacancies occurred in each case:

1. Yamaska, Qué., December 25, 1920.
2. York-Spunbury, N.B., January 7, 1921.
3. Medicine Hat, Alta., January 21, 1921.
4. St. Antoine, Montreal, Qué., February 14, 1921.
5. West York, Ont., February 20, 1921.
6. Leeds, Ont., July 9, 1920.

I think I am right in assuming that the vacancy in the constituency of Leeds, in respect of which no definite date has been given to the public, would be as of July 9, 1920, the date of the Order in Council under which the sitting member for that constituency assumed an office of emolument under the Crown. That means, Mr. Speaker, that no less than six constituencies are at present denied representation in this Parliament. From the nature of the replies which have been given by the ministry when questioned as to these vacancies, one is right in assuming that the Government evidently intends to adopt in respect to them the course which it adopted in respect to vacancies in the last session of Parliament. That course was, in cases where it was, primarily, a matter of consideration of the rights of the people, to ignore altogether the rights of the people, but in cases where the political, partisan ends of the Government might be served, to taks as quick action as the Government could find it possible to take. May I direct the attention of the House to the circumstance that in the last session of Parliament the constituency of East Elgin was entirely without representation, notwithstanding that a period of something like nine months elapsed between the day on which the vacancy occurred and the day on which it was filled? Let me contrast with that the case of two other vacancies which were created by the Government itself for its own purposes, and the length of time which elapsed between the creating of those vacancies and the day on which they were filled. The vacancy in East Elgin occurred on February 17, 1920; it was not filled until November 22, 1920. In the interval a session of Parliament was held. That is the point I would like hon. members to note particularly; that the vacancy occurred before Parliament met and was not filled until after the session was over, so that during the whole of that session the electors of East Elgin were without representation in this House. But take the other vacancies which occurred. In the city of St. John and Counties of St. John and Albert, and in Colchester, Nova Scotia, the Government itself created two vacancies on July 16, 1920, by the appointment of two ministers who had, of course, to resign their seats in the House. Now, these vacancies occurred on the 16th of July; they were filled on the 20th of September, within two

months, although Parliament was not in session at the time. In other words, where it suited the political and partisan ends of the Government, they were alert and ready to see that the representation was quickly made complete so far as this House of Commons was concerned; but where it was not their own political ends which were concerned, but rather the rights of the people to representation in this House, they were ready to ignore completely the fundamental right of the electors to representation.

Now, Mr. Speaker, it would seem that the Government purposes, in the case of the six constituencies I have just mentioned, to adopt a course very similar to that which they adopted in the case of the constituency of East Elgin; in other words, unless this House of Commons is prepared to express its opinion in no uncertain terms that every constituency in Canada should be represented in this Parliament just as quickly as possible, the Government in all probability will act in such a manner as to deprive the electors of these six constituencies of any representation during the present session of Parliament.

My right hon. friend may say that according to a statute which was passed by this Parliament on the 10th of November, 1919, the Government has a period of six months after a vacancy occurs within which to issue a writ for the filling of any vacancy. I would direct the attention of my right hon. friend to the wording of that statute. He will see that it was not drafted with a view primarily of affording the Government the latitude of running six months; it was framed rather with a view of putting a time limit on the period within which it would be possible for the Government to deny to the electors any representation. The Act will be found in the statutes of 1919, second session, being chapter 18, 10 George V, section 1, 11A. I quote:

> In the event of a vacancy occurring a writ shall be issued within six months after the receipt by the clerk of the Crown in Chancery of the warrant for the issue of a new writ for the election of a member of the House of Commons.

Note these words, Mr. Speaker: shall be issued "within" six months. That is the time limit imposed on the Government, but, as has been made apparent in so many debates in this House, the really important consideration in matters of public policy is not the letter of the law but the spirit of it, and the spirit of this enactment is that there shall be some restraint upon the Government with a view to preventing it from denying to constituencies the right of representation to which they are justly entitled. I contend, Sir, that the Government's attitude towards vacancies should be one of endeavouring to see that so far as can conveniently be arranged every constituency in Canada shall have its due representation in Parliament.

Let me say just a further word, Mr. Speaker, in regard to the attitude assumed by the Prime Minister in this matter. Hon. members of this House as well as the public have a right to expect from any hon. gentleman holding the high and dignified position of Prime Minister of this country something more than ordinary courtesy and consideration when matters of great public concern are brought to his attention. I think it would be impossible for anyone to read the replies which have been made by my right hon. friend to questions put to him in this House concerning its representation without feeling that he has been, to say the least, very cavalier in the nature of his replies. Let me quote, for example, the reply of my right hon. friend to a question which was put to him on March 3. I addressed the right hon. gentleman in what I thought was a courteous and proper way when I asked if in the opinion of the Government the hon. member for Leeds had not forfeited his right to a seat in this House by virtue of having accepted a position as one of the arbitrators on the board which is to value the stock of the Grand Trunk Railway Company. When I asked that question I was not asking it in order to obtain personal information. I was asking it as a representative of the people, to obtain from the Government a statement which the people might have as the expression of the Government's view on that all-important matter. I think that my right hon. friend, as Prime Minister, should have given to that question an answer befitting its importance and significance. What was the reply made by my right hon. friend? It is to be found in Hansard of March 3, page 505, and is as follows:

> Right Hon. ARTHUR MEIGHEN (Prime Minister): I do not know that the Government gives legal opinions, especially on the floor of Parliament. If the hon. gentleman will submit his question in the usual way on the Order Paper, he will receive an answer.

I might say to my right hon. friend that I did move in this House for an Address to His Excellency the Governor General:

> For a copy of the Order in Council of July 9, 1920, appointing the Honourable Sir Thomas

White as an arbitrator to value the stock of the Grand Trunk Railway Company, any subsequent Orders in Council having reference to this matter, and for all correspondence between the Government and the Honourable Sir Thomas White respecting such appointment.

On March 10 of this year the House voted that address; but up to the present time—and to-day is the 29th of the month—it has been impossible for any one on this side of the House to secure the papers on this particular subject. That is not treating Parliament with the courtesy which hon. members have a right to expect from the Government on matters of this kind. I regret to say this, but I feel called upon to do so.

Not only has my right hon. friend been very cavalier in the nature of the replies he has made, but he has lacked candour in some of the replies which he has given. If there is one thing above another which the people of the country have a right to expect from its first citizen, I think it is the utmost frankness and candour on any question of great public concern. Let me, in this connection, read to the House the replies of my right hon. friend in regard to the resignation of the hon. member for St. Antoine (Sir Herbert Ames). On March 3, I addressed the following questions to the Prime Minister:

Is the Prime Minister aware of the hon. member for St. Antoine (Sir Herbert Ames) having made any public declaration to the effect that he had tendered his resignation as a member of this Parliament? Has the Prime Minister or any other member of the Government received an intimation from that hon. gentleman of his desire or intention to tender his resignation?

Rt. Hon. ARTHUR MEIGHEN: I have seen no public declaration made by or on behalf of the hon. member for St. Antoine, nor have I received any communication that I can give to the House.

One may take that language and, by looking with a microscope at the wording, perhaps could say, as my right hon. friend, no doubt will, that literally he was stating the truth when he said that he had not seen a public declaration, nor received any communication which he could give to the House. But at the time that statement was made, the impression which it conveyed to the House and to the people of this country was that my right hon. friend was in ignorance of any resignation having been made by the hon. member for St. Antoine. If my right hon. friend was not in ignorance of that fact, he was in duty bound, as Prime Minister of this country, to have made a candid, frank and open statement to the House, to the effect that the resignation of the hon. member had been made.

But let me direct the attention of my right hon. friend and of the House to what actually were the facts. The reply which I have just read by my right hon. friend was made on March 3, 1921. On March 17, you, Mr. Speaker, presented to this House the declaration of the hon. member for St. Antoine respecting his resignation. What was the surprise of the House when it was discovered that the date of that resignation was the 14th February, 1921. These are the words of the declaration:

To the Honourable Speaker of the House of Commons:

I, Herbert B. Ames, member for the House of Commons of Canada, for the Electoral District of St. Antoine, Montreal, do hereby resign my seat in the said House of Commons, for the constituency aforesaid.

Given under my hand and seal at Ottawa this Fourteenth day of February, A.D. 1921.

HERBERT B. AMES. [L.S]

Witness, W. S. Middlebro.

Witness, Howard P. Whidden.

As the House well knows, the hon. member for Grey North (Mr. Middlebro) is chief whip of the Conservative party. It is inconceivable that the chief whip of that party had this information in his possession and gave no intimation of it one way or another to the Prime Minister; and if the right hon. gentleman had any intimation that there was any such resignation in the hands of the chief whip, he owed it to this Parliament, when he was questioned as to the resignation of the hon. member for St. Antoine, to reply to that question with the utmost candour. But let me direct the House to a further statement in regard to this question. On March 4, the following question was put by the hon. member for Charlevoix-Montmorency (Mr. Casgrain), and it will be found on page 608 of Hansard:

Mr. Casgrain:

1. Is it true that the member for Saint Antoine, Montreal, has sent in his resignation as a member of the House of Commons?

2. If so, when was it received by the Speaker of the House?

This was replied to as follows by the Speaker:

Mr. Speaker: The answer to the first question is, No. The second question is answered by the reply to No. 1.

It will be noticed that it was on March 4 that that question was answered by you, Sir, in this House. My right hon. friend must, however, take the responsibility for permitting the Speaker to answer that question. The question was adressed to

the ministry; the Speaker made the reply, possibly in the ordinary way, but this is the circumstance to which I wish to draw the attention of my right hon. friend. He was sitting in his seat, the chief whip, the hon. member for Grey North, and the other witness to this document, the hon. member for Brandon (Mr. Whidden), were both in their seats when the Speaker of this House made that statement respecting the resignation of the hon. member for St. Antoine. On March 4, you, Mr. Speaker, were permitted, in the presence of those gentlemen, to say that the hon. member for St. Antoine had not resigned his seat, and all the time there was in the possession of the chief whip the declaration of that hon. gentleman to which the chief whip had himself been a witness on February 14.

Mr. MIDDLEBRO: My hon. friend has made a misstatement. That resignation which was handed to the Speaker, I suppose, later on, was not in my hands more than two minutes. The hon. member for St. Antoine one day came to my seat in this House and presented me with that resignation, saying: "I am going overseas; I want to have my resignation witnessed; I am going to send it in later on." I know nothing more about it than it was sent later on. It was signed in blank; the date was blank, and he was to use it as he saw fit.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: What was the date when the resignation was handed to my hon. friend?

Mr. MIDDLEBRO: I do not know the date. He just came to me when I was in my seat in the House during last session. He came over to me and the hon. member for Brandon (Mr. Whidden) with it all drawn out; the date was left in blank; it was witnessed in blank, and he took it away.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: That only makes the case worse than ever. The statement we now have is that during last session of Parliament the chief whip received from the hon. member for St. Antoine his resignation.

Mr. MEIGHEN: Nonsense.

Mr. MIDDLEBRO: It was not left with me. He simply came to me and said: "I am going to resign."—he did not say when—"Will you and Dr. Whidden kindly sign this?" We sat down in a seat here and we signed it. It was in blank. I gave it back to him. It was the property of the hon. member to do what he pleased with it.

[Mr. Mackenzie King.]

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: Perhaps the hon. member will now explain to the House how the document came to be dated February 14—witnessed February 14 of the present year.

Mr. MIDDLEBRO: I suppose the hon. member for St. Antoine has a perfect right to date that document whenever he pleases.

Mr. LAPOINTE: And you to assert yourself as witnessing his signature on February 14.

Mr. MIDDLEBRO: My hon. friend knows better than that. He knows the date was blank.

Mr. LAPOINTE: But it is stated in the document.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order. I would remind hon. members that the leader of the Opposition has the floor.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: Let me direct the attention of the House to what is stated in the declaration of the hon. member for St. Antoine:

> Given under my hand and seal at Ottawa, this fourteenth day of February, A.D. 1921.
> Witness, W. S. Middlebro.
> Witness, Howard P. Whidden.

Now there is something false in that statement according to what my hon. friend has just told us. Either he did not witness that document on February 14, or he did. He tells us now that he did not witness it on February 14, but that he witnessed it last session. Now the question I wish to ask my right hon. friend the Prime Minister is this: Where was that document from that time until the day on which this Parliament opened? I say that my right hon. friend owes it to this House, when he gets up to speak in reply to what I am now saying, to clear away this mystery completely. He owes it to his own reputation, and to the honour of members of this House, and the honour of the hon. member for St. Antoine. This document is dated February 14. Now that date is significant. That is the day on which this Parliament opened, and when Parliament opened on February 14, how does it come that this document signed that day never reached the Speaker's hands until March 17? Will my right hon. friend tell the House in frankness and candour, when he rises to speak, where that document was in the meantime? Some one must know. The chief whip waives responsibility in the matter, but the Prime Min-

ister cannot waive it. He owes it to his position to tell the House where that document was in the meantime.

May I add this further. I am informed, and I believe credibly, that on the night of the division on the Address my hon. friend the chief whip on the Government side sought to have the member for St. Antoine paired with an hon. member on this side of the House, notwithstanding that he knew that that resignation was already signed by Sir Herbert Ames. I asked my right hon. friend the Prime Minister when I brought this matter up in the House, who was responsible for having withheld this important document from you, Mr. Speaker, for over a month, from February 14 until March 17?

The Prime Minister made no reply to that question whatever. He evaded it altogether, and confined his remarks to generalities respecting what in his view might have happened to the resignation in the meantime.

At six o'clock the House took recess.

After Recess

The House resumed at Eight o'clock.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING (resuming): Mr. Speaker, when the House rose at six o'clock we had been discussing the several vacancies existing in this chamber, and the lack of popular representation ensuing as a consequence. We were referring more particularly to the vacancy in the electoral district of St. Antoine, in the City of Montreal. I think I express the feeling of the House when I say that we had had the somewhat painful disclosure that on March 3, the Prime Minister had conveyed to this House the impression that the member for St. Antoine had not tendered his resignation as a member of the Canadian Parliament and further permitted that impression to be confirmed by you, Mr. Speaker, on March 4, by allowing you to state from the Chair as a positive fact, that the resignation of Sir Herbert Ames as the member for St. Antoine had not been tendered. There was the further circumstance that all of the time there was in existence, and in the possession of someone, a signed declaration by the hon. member, dated at Ottawa on February 14, in which the hon. member formally tendered his resignation as a member of this House. More remarkable still, Mr. Speaker, was the disclosure made, in the course of discussion, by the chief whip of the Government party to the effect that he, himself, together with one of his colleagues, witnessed the resignation of the member for St. Antoine as long ago as the last session of Parliament. That would bring the resignation, as made out by Sir Herbert Ames, to a date prior to July 1, 1920, when Parliament prorogued. Now what the Government whip has stated in that connection is borne out by the statement of Sir Herbert Ames himself which was read in this House during an earlier debate. Speaking in London, England, on July 21, 1920, before the Empire Parliamentary Association during an address on "The Dominion and the League of Nations," Sir Herbert Ames made this statement:

> Now, I have just returned from a hurried visit to Canada. Mr. Balfour has alluded to the double capacity which I occupied at that time, and for the moment still occupy. For sixteen years I have been the representative of Western Montreal in the Canadian House of Commons. My resignation is in the hands of the Speaker because I have found that my new work is quite enough to occupy all the time and attention that I am capable of giving to it.

In other words, Sir Herbert Ames made the statement, in London, on July 21, 1920, that his resignation was in your hands, Mr. Speaker. My hon. friend, (Mr. Middlebro) tells us that when Sir Herbert Ames visited this House during a preceding session—that is prior to July 1, of last year—he made out his resignation and it was witnessed by two hon. members of this House. Under these circumstances, we have a right to assert, notwithstanding any language that may be used by hon. gentlemen opposite in the way of evasion or trying to circumvent the real issue, that a vacancy has existed in the electoral district of St. Antoine ever since July of last year. Sir, the important point is not whether hon. gentlemen opposite did this or did that with a particular resignation which was placed in their hands, not whether the Government for its own reasons inserted a date which served its particular purpose—but the real question at issue in this matter is, the right of the people of the electoral district of St. Antoine to be represented in Parliament. They have been defrauded of that right by virtue of the action of hon. gentlemen opposite.

Mr. MEIGHEN: Does the hon. gentleman say that resignation was placed in the hands of any member of the Government?

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: I must leave it to my right hon. friend to explain the circumstances.

Mr. MEIGHEN: If the hon. gentleman does not say that, why does he assert that the electors were defrauded of representation by the action of any member of the Government?

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: My reason is that the hon. member who had been representing that riding made the public statement in London that he had tendered his resignation. Sir Herbert Ames himself was the one person who knew what his motives were and what he intended to do; and if Sir Herbert Ames—a man of the highest honour and integrity, I believe—said on July 21st, 1920, that he had tendered his resignation to the Speaker I, for one, believe that he intended his resignation to be in effect at that time or he would never have uttered the statement. I must leave it to my right hon. friend to extricate himself and his colleagues from the somewhat embarrassing, if not painful, position in which they have placed themselves.

Now what, among other results, is the effect, Mr. Speaker, of the action of the Government in this matter? The law, which I quoted a few moments ago, requires that elections must be held within six months after the resignation of a member is in the hands of the Speaker and His Honour has issued his warrant for the issue of a new writ of election. Had the resignation been tendered, as Sir Herbert Ames said he believed it had been tendered in July, 1920, an election would have had to be held in the St. Antoine division of Montreal before the end of 1920, and we would have had in Parliament, at the beginning of this session and at the present time, some one representing that constituency instead of the electors of the riding being unrepresented as they now are.

But there is another consequence, Mr. Speaker, which I think, in some ways, is even more serious and unfortunate than the one I have just mentioned. In view of the attitude which the Government has taken and of the evasions of my right hon. friend, what are we to believe in regard to any other vacancies that may be existing at the present time? There is now, we believe, a vacancy in Leeds. We have every reason to believe that the right hon. member for Leeds (Sir Thomas White), having accepted an office of emolument under the Crown and being an honourable man, has, in his own estimation, no longer the right to a seat in this House. Indeed, we know that ever since Parliament assembled the right hon. gentleman who formerly represented Leeds has not taken his seat here. I am right, I think, when I say that the former member for Leeds has been in Ottawa repeatedly during the time that Parliament has been in session—may I say that I believe he was in Ottawa to-day—but he has not entered this House or taken his seat here.

Under these circumstances, Mr. Speaker, we have a right to believe there exists in the mind of that hon. gentleman, just as there did in the mind of Sir Herbert Ames, the belief that his resignation should be given to this House, and that the electors of the constituency of Leeds as a consequence are entitled to other representation in Parliament. There may be in the pocket of some hon. gentleman opposite, handed to him by some other hon. gentleman to suit the partisan ends of the Government, the resignation of the hon. member for Leeds. We have a right to ask my right hon. friend when he speaks in reply to-night to state unequivocally whether in his opinion, as one holding the highest position of trust in the gift of this country, the constituency of Leeds is not entitled to have a representative in this Parliament at this particular session. In order that there may be no possible further evasion of the exact situation, let me quote the law on this subject. Section 15 of chapter 10 of the Revised Statutes of Canada, 1906, provides in part as follows:

> If any member of the House of Commons accepts any office or commission. . . . . or performs any service for the Government of Canada or for any of the officers of the Government of Canada, for which any public money of Canada is paid or to be paid,. . . the seat of such member shall thereby be vacated, and his election shall thenceforth be null and void.

The preamble of the Act for the acquisition of the Grand Trunk railway, chapter 13 of the Statutes of 1920 provides that one of the parties to the agreement is called the Government; and clause 6 of this schedule, which forms part of the Act, provides:

> That the value of the stock of the Grand Trunk Railway company shall be determined by a board of three arbitrators, one to be appointed by the Government.

And the first sentence of clause 21 of the schedule reads as follows:

> Each of the parties to this agreement shall pay its own costs of and in connection with the arbitration subsequent to the date of this agreement, including the remuneration of the arbitrator appointed by it.

I am informed that on July 9, 1920, the hon. member for Leeds, the right hon. Sir Thomas White, was by order in council appointed the Government arbitrator, to be remunerated by the Government for his services in that connection. As I mentioned to the House this afternoon, it has been impossible to secure from the Government any of the papers relating to this particular appointment, so that we on this side of the House are unable to tell the electors of Leeds whether they are legally represented in this Parliament or not. Under the circumstances, I say to my right hon. friend that he owes it to the electors of Leeds, he owes it to hon. members of this House, and he owes it to the people of this country to state unequivocally to-night whether the electors of Leeds are or are not at the present time unrepresented, and whether it is his intention, as the leader of the Government, to see that a by-election is brought on in that constituency as soon as possible, in order that their representation may be made good at the earliest possible moment.

That I may conclude with the several phases of this matter at this moment, let me say to my right hon. friend that we will not only expect him to make a statement in regard to the situation in the St. Antoine division in Montreal, and in regard to Leeds, which will be unequivocal in its terms, but that we will expect him also to state to this House whether or not he intends to allow the electors in the other constituencies where vacancies exist the right to have representation before the present session of Parliament is at an end. When, on March 3 of this year, I asked my right hon. friend about the vacancies in the several constituencies, I said:

> May I ask my right hon. friend if he can inform Parliament when the writs will be issued for by-elections to fill the vacancies that exist in the constituencies of Yamaska, Quebec; York-Sunbury, New Brunswick; Medicine Hat, Alberta; and West York, Ontario?
>
> Right Hon. Arthur Meighen: I am able fully to conform to precedent in that regard, and to tell my hon. friend that the writs will be issued in due course.
>
> Mr. Mackenzie King: May I ask my right hon. friend if the writs will be issued simultaneously, or at different times?
>
> Mr. Meighen: That will appear when the writs are issued.

As Prime Minister of this country my right hon. friend has a great responsibility and a solemn trust imposed upon him, and as part of that responsibility and of that trust it is his duty to take this House and the people of Canada into his confidence in very considerable measure, on matters of great public concern, and in this connection to state at the present time in a frank, open and straightforward manner what he intends to do in order to give these constituencies their rights to representation. I need not draw the attention of the House to the circumstance that virtually every answer that my right hon. friend has made this session in regard to this matter has been in the nature of an evasion. We expect from now on that he will take a little more care as to the manner in which he makes his replies to hon. members on this side of the House and that he will give the country through Parliament the information to which it is justly entitled.

I presume that when my right hon. friend does reply he will take refuge as regards the answers which he has made in a retort to the effect that having looked up previous records he finds that other administrations were not over hasty in filling vacancies from time to time. Any comparison made with the conduct of previous administrations has not a true parallel in the present instance. So far as I am aware there never has been a condition quite the same as that which now exists in this Parliament. I do not recall any government that has ever held on to office so tenaciously in violation of the pledges by which it had obtained power. Moreover, I think my right hon. friend will find on looking up the records, at least during the period of the Liberal administration, that there never was a time when the fate of the administration hung on the thread of the possible outcome of a series of by-elections, as I think is the case with his administration to-day. Nor, indeed, has there ever been a time in the history of the country when the problems demanding solution at the hands of Parliament were as vast as the problems which confront us at the present time. We have a series of problems arising out of the war as a result of which colossal sums of money are being asked for by the Government in appropriations amounting to almost $600,000,000. No previous administration, I think, prior to the time that hon. gentlemen opposite took office ever asked much beyond, if indeed, it came to a total of, $100,000,000 by way of annual appropriations. With these serious matters confronting Parliament it is of the utmost importance that every constituency should be represented in this House and that the best intelligence possible should be brought to bear on their solution.

In conclusion, let me say, Mr. Speaker, that the one fact above every other which is causing concern to the people of this country is how they are going to meet the vast expenditures which hon. gentlemen opposite are subjecting the country to. It is true that the Government has given us very little in the way of a legislative programme for the present session. Indeed, that programme is as sparse as it can possibly be, save in one particular, and there it is prolific enough. The particular to which I refer is the colossal amount of money which the Government expects this House to vote, and which the people will be obliged to bear in taxation during next year. When the Government is asking appropriations of $576,000,000, which will probably run into $600,000,000 or $700,000,000 before this session is over, if the Government bring down Supplementary Estimates such as they did last session—and that vast sum does not include a single cent set aside for paying off the war debt, amounting to a couple of billion dollars—when there is an appropriation for our railroads alone amounting to $167,000,000; when the Government proposes, as we are led to understand, further indirect taxation through the revisions that they are about to make in the tariff—there are, I think, Mr. Speaker, the strongest reasons why the electors in every riding should have the right to have their voice heard in this Parliament at this particular session, and for that reason I beg to move, seconded by my hon. friend for Shelburne and Queen's (Mr. Fielding):

That as respects the motion before the House all the words after the word "that" be struck out and the following substituted therefor: "The House is of the opinion that representation in Parliament being a fundamental right of the people, writs should be issued at once to fill the existing vacancies in the House of Commons, and that polls should be held at the earliest possible time so as to ensure representation of all constituencies during the present session of Parliament."

Right Hon. ARTHUR MEIGHEN (Prime Minister): Mr. Speaker, I am sure if any improvement of character or conduct on my part could be looked for as a result of the scolding from the leader of the Opposition (Mr. Mackenzie King), I rise very much chastened and purified by it. I recognize the privilege of being given lessons in candour and honesty and frankness at the hands of my hon. friend.

I would indeed profoundly regret if any default on my part were responsible for the rather unseemly bickering to which the House has been treated this afternoon.

I have read again the various reference to which my hon. friend has alluded. I have read the questions asked me, and the replies, and I say first of all that I am conscious of no error whatever, however slight, however negligible, as affecting the accuracy of a single reply, nor am I conscious of having withheld from him or from Parliament anything that it was my obligation, or even my right, to give as a member of the Government and of this House. The hon. member has chosen this occasion—it is very rarely if ever that the House is moved into Committee of Supply without some attempt being made to delay almost indefinitely the deliberations of Parliament in Supply—he has chosen this occasion, to move a resolution demanding that all vacancies be immediately filled by by-elections, but he has used it mainly to revamp some difficulties he finds in connection with the resignation of a private member of this House and to try to give rise throughout the country to the idea that the Government of Canada is responsible for the time or the method in which a private member of this House chooses to put in his resignation. The Government of Canada is responsible for the advice it gives the Crown in relation to public affairs; the time and the method of a resignation is the responsibility of the member concerned. Sir Herbert Ames was quite capable of discharging that responsibility, and he discharged it. He was capable of getting advice from any source he chose, and those giving it are responsible to him for that advice.

Now, the hon. gentleman complains that information misleading Parliament has been given. I have often been sorry that my hon. friend seemed utterly incapable of reasoning carefully on any set of facts. I do not presume he intends to throw out intimations to the House and to the country that are inconsistent with the facts. If he would reason carefully on the facts we would not come to these rather disagreeable incidents in this House,—there is no necessity for it. Much less would we ever reach the time when the accusation of falsehood would be lightly thrown across the floor of Parliament. I do not know whether it was his intention to create the impression that something I had given this House was false, but in the plainest language and apparently without even a moment of reflection he hurls at my hon. friend from North Grey an accusation of falsehood. I do not think that any hon.

member of this House on either side would even in his heart conceive the hon. member for North Grey capable of misleading Parliament or of uttering a falsehood to this House.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: I made no reference of any kind reflecting upon the hon. member for North Grey—none whatever.

Mr. MEIGHEN: Well, the facts are these: the hon. member quoted from the resignation and quoted from what he said was the assertion of the hon. member for North Grey as a witness to that resignation; he then referred to his statement in Parliament and said that one or the other was false. I do not know whether he conceives that that reflects on the member for North Grey. If he does not, it is only another illustration of what I referred to a moment ago,—my hon. friend's utter incapacity for reasoning on any set of facts.

Some hon. MEMBERS: Oh, oh.

Mr. MEIGHEN: What is bothering hon. gentlemen opposite? On what ground did the leader of the Opposition hurl that accusation across the floor of this House? He quoted from a resignation signed by Sir Herbert Ames dated February 14 of this year, a resignation witnessed by the hon. member for North Grey and the hon. member for Brandon, and, reading the attestation clause—"Given under my hand and seal at Ottawa this Fourteenth day of February, A.D. 1921," signed as witnesses to the signature of Sir Herbert Ames by Mr. Middlebro and Mr. Whidden—he asserted that it was false to affirm that that was signed on February 14. Now, the hon. leader of the Opposition has, whenever it has suited him, when he thought it would pander to the prejudices of an audience, been in the habit of complaining about too many lawyers elected to this House.

An hon. MEMBER: That is right.

An hon. MEMBER: Shame.

Mr. SPEAKER: Order.

Mr. MEIGHEN: One cannot help noting that surrounded as the hon. gentleman is in Parliament he very carefully refrains from making that complaint in this House. I have often regretted that the hon. member had not at least some little acquaintance with law; it would save him a lot of trouble. It would not require more than two days of the five years of the study of law required in most provinces for the hon. gentleman to acquaint himself with the fact that the signature of witnesses is a signature attesting the authenticity of the signature to the document. The witnesses by signing say that that is an authentic signature; they saw him sign. They do not attest the fact that it was signed on the day on which the instrument is dated.

Some hon. MEMBERS: Oh, oh.

Mr. MEIGHEN: Hon. members say "oh, oh"; and I heard a lawyer like the member for Quebec East (Mr. Lapointe), when the leader of the Opposition was on his feet, applaud him with a huzzah the utterance of that sentiment.

Mr. LAPOINTE: Yes, and I am sorry the Prime Minister of Canada is of another opinion.

Mr. MEIGHEN: Take, by way of illustration, the case of a legal document signed by two, three, or four parties, some of them living in different cities. Is there not one date to the document? Yet is it not essential that one sign on one day and another on another? Do the witnesses assert when they sign as of a certain date that the document was signed by all on the same day? Why, the merest tyro knows that is not the case.

Some hon. MEMBERS: Oh, oh.

Mr. McMASTER: No.

Mr. SPEAKER: Order.

Mr. MEIGHEN: What is the hon. member talking about? Does the hon. member for Brome (Mr. McMaster) wish to dispute that? Does he mean to assert that a witness affirms, when there is a date to a document, that it was signed on the date of the document?

Mr. McMASTER: Suppose a man signed as witness to a will dated as of a certain day. Does my right hon. friend mean to say that it is not important to have the date on it? It is a sort of dying request.

Mr. MEIGHEN: This will illustrate what the hon. gentleman's ingenuity amounts to. He knows that a will has a special attestation clause in which it is specifically asserted that the witnesses saw the person sign on the date of the will. Indeed, the law in our province calls for that, and I am pretty sure the law of Ontario does. But for hon. members to state in this House that a witness to a document is a witness to anything more than the authenticity of the signature is

to talk nonsense. Does the hon member say that it was the duty of the hon. member for Grey North (Mr. Middlebro), or the hon. member for Brandon (Mr. Whidden), to see that the date was filled in at the time they signed the document? The law does not call for any date at all.

Mr. McMASTER: They had a right to do so.

Mr. MEIGHEN: That is the business of Sir Herbert Ames. It is the business of Sir Herbert Ames to decide when his resignation shall come to Mr. Speaker, and the time he chooses and the method he chooses for doing so are matters within his own concern. It is for him to choose them, and in the choosing of them the Government of this country has no responsibility whatever. Sir Herbert Ames did not leave his resignation with any member of this Government. I told the House that he left it with a friend of his, and he did; but the resignation becomes a resignation when it reaches you, Mr. Speaker, as every hon. member knows. The hon. member for Prince, P.E.I. (Mr. Mackenzie King) would seem to think that Sir Herbert Ames was bound, the moment he wrote out his resignation, to tender it at once to you, Sir. He can choose the time he tenders it; he did choose the time; he chose the method; and whether or not the person to whom he confided it carried out his instructions is a matter between that person and Sir Herbert Ames. The hon. member asks me, as leader of the Government, to tell him what method Sir Herbert Ames adopted, to tell him what the custodian of Sir Herbert Ames' resignation did. That is a matter concerning Sir Herbert Ames, and I will so continue to tell my hon. friend as long as he asks the question. I am responsible for what I do as leader of the Government. The Government is responsible for the advice it gives to the Crown and for the conduct of public affairs. Sir Herbert Ames is responsible for the time he resigns and the method he takes for resigning, and if anybody, no matter who he is, were he a member of the Government or anybody else, advises him in that regard, for that advice no one is responsible and no one is answerable to the leader of the Opposition or to this House; the man is answerable to the person to whom he gives the advice. Sir Herbert Ames chose the channel by which his resignation should reach the Speaker, and he had a right to do so. My hon. friend reads a report—I do not know what it is from; I presume it is a newspaper report of a speech made by Sir Herbert Ames, supposed to have been made in London on July 21, 1920, in which he asserted that his resignation was in the Speaker's hands. I never saw the report; I do no know whether he made the speech or not.

Some hon. MEMBERS: Oh, oh.

Mr. MEIGHEN: Hon. members may think it clever to laugh. I do not know what is laughable about the matter. If the hon. member (Mr. Lapointe) has anything clever to say to this House, he will have an opportunity of standing on his feet and doing so when I am through. I know, if Sir Herbert Ames made that statement—I can scarcely think he made it, because I know he was aware of the fact—he made it before the date on which he handed his resignation to the custodian. I venture to give that information to the House. It was after that date that his resignation was handed to the custodian and limitations placed upon the time at which it would be handed to Mr. Speaker. I do not know what mystery there is about this matter. Has Sir Herbert Ames not the rights of an ordinary member? Can he not choose his agent, his time, his method? That right he had; that right he exercised, and for the exercise of it he is responsible.

Now let me come to the subject matter of this resolution. The hon. member says that six seats, are vacant, and he demands that before we go into Supply, the Government be instructed that all those writs must be issued, and right away, because very great harm is going to be done to the constituencies and to the country if those writs are not issued immediately.

Mr. EDWARDS: May I ask whether in the six seats he includes one of the two held by the hon. member for Gaspé and Maisonneuve (Mr. Lemieux)?

Mr. MEIGHEN: The hon. gentleman is very silent on that. I may refer to that subject later. No, he referred to the seat held by the hon. member for Leeds. Although he reviled lawyers, he was not at all the first to stand in the House and argue, as a matter of law, that that seat was vacant. I do not know how far his legal opinion will be accepted by hon. members; but at all events, he gave it for what it is worth. Not only that, but he abuses me because I refuse to give my legal opinion. The hon. member has moved in this

House for the papers relating to Sir Thomas White's appointment as arbitrator in the Grand Trunk arbitration. That motion passed this House; those papers the hon. member has a right to; those papers he shall have. Necessarily, in the preparation of that file—because this is only one of a great number of resolutions that pass Parliament—some time must be taken. Only a little over two weeks have passed since the resolution was passed by this House; it will not be very long until the papers are brought down; and I may tell the hon. member now that, when that correspondence is brought down, it will contain the opinion of the Department of Justice as to the tenure of the seat by Sir Thomas White. It is the opinion of the Department of Justice by which this Government is governed, and that will be known to Parliament in the usual way by bringing down the papers. That will be of more value to the House than any opinion of any individual member, however eminent in law he may be.

Mr. JACOBS: Will it be more valuable than the opinion of the Minister of Justice himself, who is a member of this House?

Mr. MEIGHEN: The Minister of Justice is head of the Justice Department; but the law officers under the Minister of Justice are the officers that are followed in public business, and it is their opinion, not necessarily that of the Minister of Justice, to which the House in answer to that motion is entitled.

The resolution states that a writ must be issued immediately for each of the vacancies that now exist, applicable only to the five that undoubtedly do exist, the constituencies of Yamaska, Quebec; York-Sunbury, N.B.; Medicine Hat, Alberta; West York, Ontario, and St. Antoine, Montreal. The first observation I wish to make is this: Two sessions ago this Parliament altered the law with regard to the issue of writs for by-elections. Prior to that time, under the law of the land, it had been left entirely to the Government of the day to determine when it was in the public interest that by-elections should be brought on and writs issued, and no limitation at all was placed upon the discretion of the Government in that regard. In the session of 1919, Parliament altered that by special statute, by which Parliament declared that writs should be issued within six months after the receipt by the Clerk of the Crown in Chancery of a warrant for the issue of a new writ for the election of a member of the House of Commons. That is to say, the discretion that Parliament had theretofore granted the Government, an unlimited discretion, was specifically limited to six months after the receipt by the Clerk of the Crown in Chancery of the notification of a vacancy. Why Parliament so acted, the debate at the time pretty clearly shows. It appears that the subject matter of the Bill had been referred to the Committee on Privileges and Elections. The committee reported the Bill in this form: it limited the discretion of the Government to six months in the case of all vacancies occurring otherwise than by resignation, but they took the view that it would not be well to limit the discretion of the Government at all in relation to vacancies arising out of resignation, because to do so would put it in the power of an individual member by the exercise of a mere idiosyncrasy or whim, to declare a seat vacant and bring on a by-election at any time he chose. Whether that recommendation of the committee was valid or not may be doubted, but at all events Parliament in considering it afterwards, came to the conclusion that there should be no exceptions, and enacted that the time within which the writ should be issued should be six months from the receipt by the Clerk of the Crown in Chancery of the warrant to issue a writ for the vacancy. That is the discretion now given to this Government and to all governments in this country. Does anybody know why the exercise of that discretion should be specially limited as regards this Government?

Has anybody heard any reason why, after Parliament had so decided, this same Parliament should alter an Act, which has passed all its stages, upon the mere resolution of the leader of the Opposition? That is the orbit of discretion given the Government of the country. By what process of reasoning is this Government to be denied the exercise of that discretion while other governments are to be accorded it? Oh, the hon. member says, there are special circumstances; you are hanging on, he says, by a thread. He has been imagining that thread for quite a long while now; he has been giving interviews about it, making statements about it, making speeches in this House about it, but the "thread" still hangs, and it seems a pretty substantial thread; there are at least 25 strands strongly holding it together. How does

that affect the case anyway? Even were it so, how is that relevant to the argument? Did Parliament make an exception and say that discretion should only be exercised when the Government had a large slavish and reliable majority? If that had been the intention of Parliament, they would have said so. But Parliament placed no restriction; Parliament intended no restriction. Now, the hon. gentleman is fearfully outraged about the poor electors of St. Antoine, and of Yamaska and of York-Sunbury being denied representation in the House this session, and he is seconded in this by the hon. member for Shelburne and Queen's (Mr. Fielding). He too is becoming very impatient, and is very anxious indeed that this process of non-representation, which in the longest case has continued for only three months, and in the shortest case for about three weeks be immediately stopped, or the fundamental rights of the electors are being ignored. Well, if the electors have fundamental rights to-day in this regard, they have had the same fundamental rights for fifty years or more in this country. They had the same fundamental rights when the hon. member for Shelburne and Queen's was a member of the Government, and when the hon. member for Quebec East (Mr. Lapointe) was its enthusiastic supporter. The fundamental rights of the electors have not changed between then and now. Let me ask the hon. member: how is it that he is scandalized to think that three months should have elapsed in the longest case that now constitutes a vacancy in this House, when he was quite content to support a Government that allowed a whole year and nearly two years to elapse?

Mr. LAPOINTE: Will my right hon. friend wait a few moments for an answer, or does he want it now?

Mr. MEIGHEN: I await it now—I took up his challenge, but he does not answer. Let me give the hon. member just a few cases. Starting back in 1897, shortly after hon. gentlemen opposite came into power, I find in the contituency of Champlain, Quebec—he will know about that—

Mr. BUREAU: The Government ought to know too.

Mr. MEIGHEN: Certainly they know about it. In that case three months elapsed. Next, three months elapsed in Colchester, Nova Scotia; four and a half months in the case of Témiscouata, at the time the present hon. member for that constituency was elected.

Mr. CASGRAIN: It was worth waiting for.

Mr. MEIGHEN: In that case the constituency waited from June 25, 1897, when the former member died, until the 6th day of November, 1897. Such was the outrage perpetrated on the people of Témiscouata, an outrage which hon. gentlemen opposite quite cheerfully assert was abundantly vindicated by the election of the present hon. member himself. I agree that my hon. friend is a creditable representative in this Parliament, and I know he will agree with me that the outburst of cheers of hon. gentlemen opposite at the assertion that it was all right to wait until he was elected is only another of a thousand proofs of the assertion that all their interest in this matter is politics, and party politics. It is not the electors of these constituencies they are concerned about at all: all they are concerned about is to gain some party advantage if they can, and it will only be a moment till I show you how they hope to gain it, if they are able to bring the House to their point of view at this time.

We go on to the case of Bagot, Quebec. Mr. Dupont died on March 12, 1898. There was no election in that county at all until December 14, 1898, or nine months and two days afterwards. What an outrage was perpetrated on the people of Bagot, an outrage to which the hon. member for Shelburne and Queen's the seconder to this resolution, was a party: Next is the case of North Simcoe, where the late D'Alton McCarthy died on May 11, 1898, and where the election was deferred until December 14, 1898, or for seven months and three days. We pass unto Montmagny, Quebec. There the election was deferred for five months and seven days. We pass from that to West Huron, Ontario, where Mr. M. C. Cameron was appointed Lt. Governor of the North West Territories on May 30, 1898. The election in that case was deferred until February 21, 1899, nine months and twenty-five days after the vacancy occurred.

The next case is Chambly and Verchères —and this outrage was not at all redeemed by the election of the present hon. member. There the Hon. C. A. Geoffrion died on July 18, 1899. The election did not take place until January 18, 1900; six months elapsed in that case. That is only half

as long as one I read a moment ago, but twice as long as the worst case which now outrages hon. gentlemen opposite at the present time.

Then I refer to the city of Winnipeg, which at that time was possibly the largest single member constituency in this Dominion, had the largest number of electors, and perhaps the greatest individual and property interests. There Mr. Jamieson died on February 31, 1899, but the election did not take place until January 25, 1900, or practically one year after the death of the hon. member for Winnipeg. The next case is Lotbinière, Quebec, Where five months elapsed. Then there is the case of Sherbrooke, Quebec, where six and one-third months elapsed. Passing on to subsequent years, there is the case of Antigonish, Nova Scotia, when four months elapsed. There is the case of West Lambton, Ontario, in the same year, when five months elapsed; the case of Wentworth, Ontario, in the same year, when nine months elapsed; the case of the resignation of Mr. Walter Scott in 1906 for the constituency of West Assiniboia, when five months and six days elapsed; the case of Saskatchewan, North West Territory, in 1906, when five months elapsed; and later on, the case of East Elgin in 1906, when ten months elapsed, the resignation of Mr. Ingram taking place on December 8, 1905, the election being held on October 4, 1906. Then there is the case of the Hon. Peter White, who died on May 3, 1906, having represented the constituency of North Renfrew, and for whom no successor was elected until October 9, of the same year. There is the case of Quebec county, Quebec, when there was a lapse of four and a half months. In the case of St. Mary, Montreal, in 1906, four months elapsed; in the case of Victoria in New Brunswick, when the Hon. John Costigan was summoned to the Senate, four months elapsed. In the case of St. John city and county, in 1907, six months and three days elapsed; in the case of London, Ontario, in 1907, six and a half months elapsed; in the case of East Northumberland in the same year, seven and two-thirds months elapsed; in the case of North Wellington, Ontario, in the same year, seven and a half months elapsed. And so on, down the list. I doubt whether there is one single year in the whole time that hon. gentlemen opposite were in power when there were not cases —or, numbers of cases—in which twice the time, or almost twice the time, elapsed that has elapsed in the most extreme case of which those gentlemen complain to-day.

The hon. member says: But this is a very important session; we must have a lot of money this session. Well, it is an important session. But it was not wrong at all in those days to deprive constituencies of representatives for a whole year; and I have a case here where they were deprived for a far longer time; indeed, where no election was held at all until the general elections came on. That was all right then, but for this Parliament it is a heinous political offence that any election should be deferred. But for this difference the hon. member gives the reason that this is an important session. Why, it is only a few weeks since the hon. gentleman was out on the stump, indeed since he spoke in this House, and said that we had no right to legislate at this session at all because this Parliament was defunct—

An hon. MEMBER: So it is.

Some hon. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

Mr. MEIGHEN: —and that it should not exist; so the reasoning of the hon. gentleman is that it is entirely right and proper to deny constituencies their representation in a good Parliament for a year or two, but that it is wholly wrong to deny them representation in a defunct Parliament for three months. Mr. Speaker, the fact is that this Parliament, except in the imagination of the leader of the Opposition, and perhaps in that of some other hon. gentlemen opposite, is in precisely the same position as all other parliaments. In this Parliament, precisely as in all other parliaments, constituencies have a right to be represented; the same right, no greater and no less. In this Parliament, the Government has the same discretion as to the issuance of writs as has always existed, save as restrained by legislation passed two years ago; and in this, as in every previous Parliament, the Government intends to exercise the discretion reposed in it by Parliament, subject only to the restraint Parliament has imposed, and not to the whim of any hon. gentleman, whether he be the leader of the Opposition or not. Now, there is another consideration that does especially weigh at this time. Parliament now in session has possibly two months more in which to sit, possibly longer. I believe it is the anticipation of hon. members on both sides that we may be able to get through towards the end of May, or early in June. Nothing will be done by the Government to hurry matters through, or in any way to constrain Parliament in the consideration of public questions. Nothing of that nature will be done

at all. But it is the common anticipation that Parliament will get through in the time I have suggested. An election called now could not be held until about the middle of May, under the law passed by this Parliament; and there would be but a very short time in which any candidate who might be returned could sit in this Parliament this session. But more than that, when by-elections are on it is the duty of hon. members on both sides to see that the case from their point of view is presented as fully as possible to the electors concerned Under present conditions what do we find? We find that hon. gentlemen opposite, within their legal right, have adopted the policy of refusing pairs. The courtesy of pairs is a tradition with Parliament, but it has been refused by hon. gentlemen directly opposite, not, I am glad to say, by hon. gentlemen of the Agrarian party. That is the course which hon. gentlemen opposite have pursued within the exercise of their right. Under the rules of this House hon. gentlemen may bring on a debate at any time on any subject of their choosing. They may precipitate a motion to adjourn; they may challenge the Government on motions that are not debatable, and which consequently may be brought on at any moment, in respect of which a decision cannot at all be delayed. Consequently they have the privilege of having their members present, by concert and agreement among themselves, choosing the time to suit their own convenience. Perhaps hon. gentlemen on this side might be away, necessarily engaged in the presentation of issues before the electors where a by-election was being held. But the courtesy of pairs has been refused, and while they refuse it hon. gentlemen opposite say to us: Go to the country with your by-elections; let your members go out there; and when they are away we will not give pairs, but we shall have our members away or here just as we want them. We shall choose the time for a vote, and by that means shall get a snap verdict and thereby obtain some glory throughout the country. That, I think, is what is in the back of the head of the leader of the Opposition.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: Bring on your by-elections and we will give pairs.

Mr. MEIGHEN: Now, these resolutions come on with a minimum of notice. Of this one I received notice forty minutes before the meeting of the House this afternoon; and another I received this afternoon I got half an hour's notice of. It is the privilege of hon. gentlemen opposite to take that course; but it is also the privilege of the Government to take a similar course. I have never pursued that course. Every evening before adjournment we have given the House a statement of what the Government intends shall be taken up the next day. We are not strictly bound to do that, we do it as a matter of courtesy, as advancing the interests of Parliament. I think hon. gentlemen opposite owe us the same courtesy, of giving us notice when these things are about to come on; and I do think that they should not pursue a course that is calculated to enable them to take the Government at a disadvantage when hon. members on this side might be away from the House. I do not think they should urge, under the rules of the House, the adoption of a resolution which is designed for the purpose I have stated.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: If my hon. friend will permit me, I might say that it was not until one o'clock to-day that a few of us who happen to be sitting side by side decided that this amendment would be moved this afternoon. As soon as that decision was reached, I wrote a letter with my own hand to my right hon. friend and sent it over by special messenger to his office. As a matter of fact, he was informed long before hon. members on this side of the House knew anything about the matter. Besides, this is the only day this week we have of presenting these matters.

Mr. MEIGHEN: Not at all. What my hon. friend says I do not dispute. He may have written me as soon as he knew of the decision to bring this matter up; but that does not help me in any way. Notice did not reach me until twenty minutes after two o'clock.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: It was sent to my right hon friend's office.

Mr. MEIGHEN: Very well; but it is when the notice reaches me, just as it is when a resignation reaches the Speaker, that counts. It would not be a very good answer for the Government to say when the House was adjourning at night: "We have not decided what to take up to-morrow. We will likely decide that to-morrow at 2 o'clock, and then we will send a notification to the leader of the Opposition as to what it is." My hon. friend would not regard that as a very good answer on my part.

There was nothing to hinder this resolution from being taken up any day after my

hon. friend had placed it on the Order Paper.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: My right hon. friend will permit me to say that when we adjourned for Easter—

Mr. SPEAKER: Order. The hon. gentleman has no right to the floor. He has already spoken, and I stretched the rule in his favour a moment ago.

Mr. MEIGHEN: All I am seeking to impress upon the hon. member is that these amenities work both ways, and that when we on this side observe them—and we try to do so to the best of our ability—we expect the same consideration from hon. gentlemen opposite. If this amendment were to pass—and I have not the slightest apprehension that it will because it is not at all fair—it is not based on fairness, or the idea of fairness—it would not only deny to the Government the discretion that Parliament gave it by statute, but the discretion that this Parliament intends that other governments shall exercise in the future. It would not only do that but it would compel a course which, in the conduct of the business of the House and under its rules as they stand to-day, would put the Government at a disadvantage which it does not deserve. Therefore it seems to me that the amendment should not pass. Why should such a motion be moved as an amendment to the resolution to go into Committee of Supply? Why cannot the amendment be placed on the Order Paper as a resolution the same as any other motion? This is a matter of general public concern. This is a matter that seeks to get the opinion of Parliament on a subject which Parliament has already dealt with through the regular process of a statute. Surely that is something that should be brought to the attention of Parliament in the regular course, and not by way of an amendment to the motion to go into Committee of Supply.

An hon. MEMBER: What is his reason for moving it?

Mr. MEIGHEN: Well, that is for the hon. gentleman himself, or some one on his side, to state. I can only leave hon. gentlemen to divine the reason as best they can. We all know what amendments to the motion to go into Committee of Supply are; and I have heard it stated by the leader of the Government before 1911, that though an opposition might move the Ten Commandments in amendment to the motion to go into Committee of Supply they could not expect that those Ten Commandments would be affirmed by the Government when they were proposed in such a manner. It seems to me that my hon. friend has chosen this method in order to get the advantage that would result from an amendment to the motion to go into Committee of Supply, because no amendment can be made to it—it must be taken as it is or not at all. I therefore appeal to hon. members to vote down this amendment in fairness to themselves, in fairness to the Government of the day, in fairness to the Government in future years, and in fairness to Parliament for all time.

Mr. ERNEST LAPOINTE (Montreal East): The right hon. Prime Minister (Mr. Meighen) said in his opening remarks that after the castigation administered by the leader of the Opposition (Mr. Mackenzie King) he was chastened and improved. I am afraid that his good resolutions were of short duration, and that he has quickly succumbed to his usual bad habits. Taking his last observation first, he complains that the notice of the intention of the leader of the Opposition to move his motion was only sent him at one o'clock this afternoon, or rather at two twenty o'clock. It is not the fault of the leader of the Opposition that the notice was not received by my right hon. friend until that hour, because the notice was sent at one o'clock. Although the right hon. gentleman complains about that proceeding, he himself at twelve o'clock sent to the leader of the Opposition a letter which reads as follows:

Ottawa, March 29, 1921.

Dear Mr. King,—Mr. Ballantyne proposes to make to-day his statement regarding the operations of the Canadian Mercantile Marine. He will make it on the motion to go into supply.

Yours faithfully,
ARTHUR MEIGHEN.

Now what is sauce for the goose should be sauce for the gander. Is it any worse for the leader of the Opposition to notify the Prime Minister that he intends to mave an amendment on the motion to go into Committee of Supply this afternoon, than it is for the Prime Minister to notify the leader of the Opposition that the statement as to operations of the Canadian Mercantile Marine will be proceeded with the same afternoon?

Right Hon. Mr. MEIGHEN: Will the hon. gentleman permit me a question? Does he not see the difference—

Some hon. MEMBERS: Order.

Mr. SPEAKER: The Prime Minister is distinctly in order in submitting his question, and if hon. gentlemen would permit the Chair to exercise its jurisdiction in maintaining order the results would be much more satisfactory.

Mr. LAPOINTE: I am quite willing to permit the right hon. gentleman to ask any question, but I am told he has just refused the leader of the Opposition the privilege of doing so.

Mr. SPEAKER: The hon. gentleman is quite in error. The leader of the Opposition rose for the third time to make a statement which he had no right to do; he did not offer to ask a question.

Mr. MEIGHEN: I was going to ask my hon. friend if he does not see the distinction between a statement as to the Canadian Mercantile Marine shipbuilding, a statement placed on Hansard so that hon. members may study it—just as in the case of the statement regarding the operations of the national railways—and a challenge to the Government by way of an amendment to go into Committee of Supply. To the first no study is needed on the part of hon. members.

Mr. LAPOINTE: The difference I see is that in the one case we are dealing with the Canadian Mercantile Marine involving the expenditure of many hundreds of millions of dollars, and in the other case with the holding of by-elections in this country. Now, I desire to read the amendment which has been offered by the leader of the Opposition. I wish to draw the attention of all hon. members to its language and to ask them if they can vote against the principle enunciated in it:

> The House is of the opinion that representation in parliament being a fundamental right of the people, writs should be issued at once to fill existing vacancies in the House of Commons, and that polls should be held at the earliest possible time so as to ensure the representation of all constituencies during the present session of Parliament.

I believe that this resolution should be accepted and I cannot see that any government, nor any parliament, can successfully challenge the principle which it enunciates —that it is the undoubted right of the Canadian people to be represented here during the present session of Parliament, as well as during other sessions. I think the constitutional doctrine in that respect cannot be successfully challenged. Parliament must reflect the sense of the whole country. Every citizen of Canada has the right to his share in the making of legislation—in the selection of his representative in Parliament and in the formulation of the laws of this country. This principle cannot be successfully challenged for it is the essence of responsible government. and when there are here and there throughout the country constituencies that are not represented in the House, the whole country is interested in having those vacancies filled, because otherwise Parliament is like a leaning tower—lacking foundation at important points. This, I repeat, is the constitutional doctrine. It is the doctrine of freedom, it is the doctrine of liberty, and for such a doctrine people have fought and shed their blood in days gone by.

This doctrine is recognized in all other countries. What is the law in Great Britain with regard to the holding of by-elections? There the Government has no say in the matter. When a vacancy is created a motion is made in the House of Commons by the chief whip of the party to which the late member belonged for the issuing of the writ. The writ is issued forthwith and sent to the returning officer, who fixes the date of the nomination and of the polling. In 1920 an amendment was enacted to the Representation of the People Act, chapter 35, of 10-11 George V, in which it is provided:

> The day fixed for nomination in boroughs shall not be later than the seventh day after the returning officer receives the writ. . . . The poll shall take place on such day as the returning officer may appoint, not being less than six or more than eight clear days after the date fixed for nomination.

The Government there has no choice in the matter. Further, it is enacted that any person who causes delay in the holding of a by-election is guilty of a misdemeanour. I wonder what my right hon. friend would do if he were guiding the destinies of Great Britain to-day?

And that doctrine has always been recognized in this country, of course. My right hon. friend resorted to the tu quoque argument. I was not surprised, for it is a pet argument with him. With all deference, let me tell him that the tu quoque argument at its very best is a despicable argument. It lacks in logic, it lacks in conviction, it lacks in good faith, it lacks in force. In a word, it is a worn out argument.

Mr. MEIGHEN: What is sauce for the goose is sauce for the gander.

Mr. LAPOINTE: I tell my right hon. friend that I am not using any tu quoque argument, nor do I intend to. I do not think that my hon. friend erred when he sent his notice this morning, no more than I think my hon. friend the leader of the Opposition made a mistake when he sent his notice to the right hon. leader of the Government. So I am not using any tu quoque argument. But let me tell my right hon. friend that the men and women of this country to-day are not disposed to make permanent a wrong simply because it has been in existence. The majority of our people are not disposed to believe that a wrong becomes a right when it is done many times by succeeding governments or succeeding bodies. I wonder how progress could be achieved or reform accomplished in this or any other country if this doctrine, so dear to the heart of the right hon. Prime Minister, was the final doctrine accepted by our people. I will tell my right hon. friend that he is wrong when he uses the tu quoque argument. In the cases reported I think I am right in making the statement that the vacancies were filled in every instance before the opening of the succeeding session of Parliament. My right hon. friend shakes his head.

Mr. MEIGHEN: There is no doubt about it.

Mr. LAPOINTE: There are no doubts about it in my mind; I am sure of my assertion.

Mr. MEIGHEN: There are cases of vacancies not being filled for over a year.

Mr. LAPOINTE: I have taken down the cases quoted by my right hon. friend, and in every instance the vacancies were filled prior to the succeeding session.

Mr. MEIGHEN: You did not take them all down.

Some hon. MEMBERS: Order, order.

Mr. LAPOINTE: My right hon. friend may discard that with a wave of the hand as he discarded the Ames matter the other day. He may shake his head in contradiction of what I say, but he cannot prevent the facts remaining facts. In the session of 1908—and this will serve to show that the doctrine I have just alluded to is the recognized doctrine in this country—the former Prime Minister of Canada, who was then leader of the Opposition, the present member for King's, N.S., introduced a bill to amend the House of Commons Act. I refer my right hon. friend to page 5226 of Hansard of the session 1907-1908.

Mr. R. L. Borden (Carleton, Ont.) moved the second reading of Bill (No. 66) to amend the House of Commons Act. He said: Mr. Speaker, the object of this Bill is to provide that writs to fill vacancies in the House of Commons shall be issued within a certain period, and in that way to avoid the prolonged disfranchisement of constituencies which has sometimes occurred. The Bill is framed on practically the same line as that which has been in force in Ontario since the year 1904.

Sir Wilfrid Laurier spoke as follows:

Mr. Speaker, I would like to ask my hon. friend (Mr. R. L. Borden) if he thinks, in view of the invariable practice that has been followed in this House since confederation, there is any necessity for such a Bill as this. If any vacancies have taken place during the recess these vacancies have always been filled before the ensuing session, and so far as I can remember no constituency has been left unrepresented, certainly not within the last ten or twelve years.

The member for King's, N.S., the then leader of the Opposition, did not deny that statement. He said:

If Parliament were to expire in a month or a few weeks, the House could be given power to direct that the Clerk of the Crown in Chancery should not in a particular instance carry this provision into effect. My recollection as to what has taken place is a little different from that of the right hon. gentleman, because I think the constituency of St. James, Montreal, was unrepresented for a whole session.

That was one instance.

Sir Wilfrid Laurier: Do you say St. James?

Mr. R. L. Borden: I am speaking from recollection, but I remember there was at least one constituency in which the writs should have been issued much earlier than they were.

So the leader of the Opposition of that day, without being sure about it, said that he could recollect only one instance in which the writs had not been issued before the ensuing session.

Now, as to the necessity of holding by-elections and having the vacant constituencies represented during all the sessions of Parliament, I shall quote from the remarks of the same gentleman, the then leader of the Opposition, at the same session of Parliament, 1908, as reported on page 7,862 of Hansard. The then government had introduced a Bill to amend the Elections Act and on the second reading of the Bill the hon. member for King's complained as follows:

There is no provision in this Bill for the holding of by-elections within a reasonable time, nor is it provided—

I desire to direct my right hon. friend's attention to these words of his former leader:

—nor is it provided that, where several by-elections are pending, they shall all be held upon the same day.

The member for King's was and is of an opinion quite different from that entertained by the present leader of the Government in that respect. Last year the House emphasized the necessity of having all constituencies represented in Parliament by enacting a measure compelling the Government to hold by-elections within six months of the opening of the seat. Public opinion forced that law upon Parliament. I remember that when the Bill was moved for second reading one of the hon. gentlemen on the other side, a whip—the member for Annapolis (Mr. Davidson) if I am not mistaken—moved the adjournment of the debate, which in the ordinary course would have had the effect of killing the Bill. But public opinion compelled the Government to afford another opportunity for the discussion of the Bill in the House. The Minister of Justice (Mr. Doherty) shakes his head, as if he had been the father of the Bill. He took great care last year to say on two or three different occasions that he was not responsible for the Bill; that the member for George Etienne Cartier (Mr. Jacobs) was responsible for it and that he, the minister, was simply giving an opportunity to the House.

Mr. DOHERTY: I gave to the hon member for George Etienne Cartier full credit for the Bill, but the hon. member for Quebec East will not deny that had it not been for the co-operation I gave, even when the member for George Etienne Cartier was not in the House, to the extent of taking the Bill up and putting it through, the Bill could not have been got through. The hon. member for Quebec East is too fair, if he knows these facts, to follow upon the lines he has just started to take: I appeal to the member for George Etienne Cartier if what I am saying is not the simple fact.

Mr. LAPOINTE: I am quite ready to admit that the Bill could not have been adopted without the co-operation of my right hon. friend, and without his willingness to let the Bill proceed as he did.

Mr. DOHERTY: And in the absence of the sponsor of the Bill I took it up and put it through.

Mr. LAPOINTE: Yes, but what I want to state is that my right hon. friend at the same time took the trouble to say that he was not responsible for the Bill; that his part in putting the Bill though was simply to let the House have the opportunity of dealing with it.

Mr. DOHERTY: Will the hon. gentleman read what I said? I did not repudiate responsibility. As I say, I was giving due credit for the Bill to the hon. member for George Etienne Cartier; I did not want to steal his thunder.

Mr. LAPOINTE: Very well. Then my hon. friend will say with me that it was the intention of the House that the by-elections should be held within a reasonable time after the vacancy occurred, and that the intent of the law was not as stated to-night by my right hon. friend the Prime Minister, who asserted that the provision in the Act for a delay of six months entitled the Government to delay the full extent of that period and to ignore the rights of a constituency to representation in Parliament, even though the by-election could have been held much sooner.

When that Bill was discussed in committee it was argued that the provision for a delay of sixty days which had been inserted originally in the Bill by the member for George Etienne Cartier was too short; that it had better be changed to six months in order that there might be sufficient time for the preparation of the lists. So the intention of Parliament was that the elections should be held immediately, or as soon as they could possibly be held, and the provision for a delay of not more than six months was inserted in order to obviate any possible objection in connection with the preparation of the lists.

There is another matter to which I wish to refer very briefly, the question of the resignation of the former member for St. Antoine. The Prime Minister said he was not aware that the member for St. Antoine had made a public statement in London in the month of July last to the effect that he had tendered his resignation. The right hon. gentleman said that this was probably a newspaper report, and expressed the belief that such words were not uttered by the former member for St. Antoine. Well, that "newspaper report" is the printed report of his speech; I hold it in my hand, and it is at the disposal of the right hon. Prime Minister. It is published by the Empire Parliamentary Association; surely the Prime Minister of Canada knows what the Empire Parliamentary Association is. The first stage of that pamphlet reads as follows:

Confidential. The Dominions and the League of Nations. An address by Sir Herbert Ames, M.P., (Canada), Financial Director in the Secretariat of the League of Nations, delivered at a Private meeting of Members of the Empire Parliamentary Association in the Home and Dominion Parliaments, in the Rooms of the Empire Parliamentary Association, Westminster Hall, on July 21, 1920. The Right Hon. Arthur J. Balfour, O.M., F.R.S., M.P., Lord President of the Council and Chairman of Executive Committee of the Empire Parliamentary Association (United Kingdom Branch), in the Chair. Issued under the Authority of the Empire Parliamentary Association (United Kingdom Branch), Westminster Hall, Houses of Parliament, London, S.W.I.

I suppose it is not necessary for me to read the names of the officers of the Empire Parliamentary Association as given in this pamphlet. Then, the reading matter preceding the report of the address is as follows:

A private meeting of the Empire Parliamentary Association was held in the rooms of the Association, Westminster Hall, on July 21, 1920, when Sir Herbert Ames, M.P. (Canada), Financial Director in the Secretariat of the League of Nations, delivered an address upon "The Dominion and the League of Nations." The Right Hon. Arthur J. Balfour, O.M., F.R.S., M.P., (Lord President of the Council and Chairman of Executive Committee of the Empire Parliamentary Association) occupied the chair, and there was a considerable attendance of members of the Association in the Lords and Commons and of visiting members of the Association from Dominion Parliaments.

The chairman, Mr. Balfour, introduced the speaker. I suppose it is not necessary for me to read his remarks; but I wish to read again this part of the speech of the former member for St. Antoine, and I shall now ask my right hon. friend whether he believes those words were uttered by Sir Herbert Ames or not.

My resignation is in the hands of the Speaker because I have found that my new work is quite enough to occupy all the time and attention that I am capable of giving to it.

Some hon. MEMBERS: What is the date?

Mr. LAPOINTE: July 21, 1920. I shall be pleased to hand the book to my right hon. friend.

Mr. MEIGHEN: I have never seen it. I have no doubt my hon. friend is reading it aright. All I have to say is that if Sir Herbert Ames said that, he was manifestly mistaken.

Some hon. MEMBERS: Shame.

Mr. LAPOINTE: My right hon. friend is modifying his position.

Mr. MEIGHEN: Not at all.

Mr. LAPOINTE: My right hon. friend said a few minutes ago that he did not believe the hon. member for St. Antoine had made the statement. I took his words down at the time. Now he says that he has no doubt that those words were pronounced, but that Sir Herbert Ames was mistaken.

Mr. MEIGHEN: I did not say that.

Some hon. MEMBERS: Order.

Mr. MEIGHEN: I intend to state a point of order, notwithstanding the noise. I state that the hon. member has no right to misquote what I said, especially a moment after I said it. I said that I did not know whether he made the statement or not; I could scarcely believe that he did. I know the authority is very good. I said that I did not doubt the hon. gentleman was reading correctly; but there is on record the Speaker's word, which I do not think hon. gentlemen intend to challenge, to the effect that if the statement was made, it was a manifest error. I do not know what hon. members are trying to make out. If they believe that there was any breach of honour on the part of any member of the Government in this respect, let an hon. member, on his responsibility as a member of this House, make that statement.

Mr. LAPOINTE: Everything I state in this House is on my responsibility, and my right hon. friend may be sure that I continue to have that responsibility for everything I shall say to-night. Can the right hon. gentleman say that a gentleman of the standing of Sir Herbert Ames, who has represented St. Antoine, Montreal, in this House for so many years, who has been appointed by this Government as a chief officer in the League of Nations, could have made such a statement without the statement being true? That gentleman stated that his resignaion was in the hands of the Speaker. I have no doubt that it was not in the hands of the Speaker; but there was certainly an error, or a mistake, or call it what you like, somewhere, and that is what we would like to find out—

Mr. MEIGHEN: You had better ask Sir Herbert Ames.

Mr. LAPOINTE:—especially under the circumstances which have surrounded the whole procedure. I do not want to dwell long on this question, although it is very interesting. I quite understand the right hon. gentleman cannot speak again, but I

should like to ask the hon. gentleman who is going to follow me: who is the party who kept that resignation against the will of the hon. member for St. Antoine, because he expressed his formal will in that statement that his resignation should be in the hands of the Speaker. He said that it was in the hands of the Speaker. Who is the party who kept that resignation against the will of the hon. member for St. Antoine, while that hon. member was under the impression that his resignation was in your hands, Sir? I will ask and call the attention of the House to this second point: how is it that the resignation should have been signed before the chief whip of the Government party and announced a few days later in the city of London by the hon. member who had written the resignation? In all this, of course, I am quite willing to accept, and I do accept, the statement of the Prime Minister; but it seems a queer organization in the great Conservative party, that the chief whip should have witnessed the resignation of an important member; that this member should have announced his resignation publicly in the city of London, and that the leaders of the party should know nothing about it. I will ask further: How is it that the gentlemen who signed that resignation as witnesses have certified that such resignation as witnesses have certified that such resignation was written on February 14? The Prime Minister, in his very clever game of splitting hairs said that those gentlemen witnessed only the signature and nothing else, and everything was right. He does not see anything irregular in the matter. I will call the attention of the House to the language of the Statute. Section 5 of Chapter 11 of the Revised Statutes of Canada reads:

> Any member of the House of Commons may resign his seat,—
>
> (b) By addressing and causing to be delivered to the Speaker a declaration of his intention to resign his seat, made in writing under his hand and seal before two witnesses.

And so on. Not only must the signature be affixed before the witnesses, but the resignation must be made in writing before the witnesses. Does my right hon. friend say that the date is not an important part of that writing?

Mr. BRISTOL: Will my hon. friend say, as a lawyer, that that section of the Act requires the date to be in the document at the time it was signed?

Mr. LAPOINTE: I certainly say that as a lawyer.

[Mr. Lapointe.]

Mr. BRISTOL: I do not think so.

Mr. LAPOINTE: I am quite willing to discuss this with my hon. friend, even before the courts of Toronto. It is so clear that it does not require discussion. I am surprised that the Prime Minister of Canada should say, on his responsibility as a public man, that there is nothing irregular in that proceeding. I am surprised that he should allow that statement to go broadcast in this country of ours. He may say that he is not responsible for the irregularity; he may say that he did not know anything that occured concerning that resignation; but I am at a loss to understand how the leader of the Government and the chief citizen of this country can say that everything is regular with regard to that.

There is another point which I desire to bring to the attention of the House. My right hon. friend was quite indignant at the language of the leader of the Opposition with regard to the answers of my right hon. friend to questions put in this House by hon. members on this side. What my hon. friend the leader of the Opposition said was that there was a lack of candour. On March 2, I read in this House, in the presence of my right hon. friend, the words of the former member for St. Antoine as I have read them tonight. I stated then—I had the pamphlet in my hand, and it was at the disposal of my right hon. friend—that this statement had been made by Sir Herbert Ames before the Empire Parliamentary Association in the month of July last. On March 3, in reply to a question put to my right hon. friend as to whether he was aware of any public declaration having been made by the hon. member for St. Antoine, he said as reported at page 506 of the unrevised Hansard:

> I have seen no public declaration made by or on behalf of the hon. member for St. Antoine, nor have I received any communication that I can give to the House.

Surely my right hon. friend knew on March 3, that there had been a public declaration made by the hon. member for St. Antoine. I had read it on the preceding day, and my right hon. friend was here when I read the very words that I have read again to-day. Surely my right hon. friend will not deny that he was here facing me all the time when I spoke on the Address. Does he deny that?

Mr. MEIGHEN: Well, the hon. member may have read it, and I may have been pretty busy. I did not hear him read

it. If he thinks that is a matter of very great consequence, I think he is magnifying a trifle. If he read it, all right; but I did not hear about it until the leader of the Opposition spoke. But what in the world is the difference?

Mr. LAPOINTE: May I refresh my right hon. friend's memory? Does he remember that at the conclusion of my speech —the right hon. gentleman was then in his seat—Mr. Speaker rose and stated that in view of the statement I had read he felt it necessary to say that he had not received the resignation?

Mr. MEIGHEN: I remember that.

Mr. LAPOINTE: Now, Mr. Speaker could not possibly have said that if I had not repeated the statement of the hon. member for St. Antoine. Another queer circumstance in this matter is this: How is it that February 4 should be recognized as the binding date on that document? How is it that this document having been in the hands of somebody on the other side of the House was kept for three or four weeks after the alleged signature on February 14, and especially until after the division on the Address in this House?

Mr. FIELDING: It was St. Valentine's Day.

Mr. LAPOINTE: These are all circumstances which have not yet been explained. Even the reasoning of my right hon. friend the leader of the Government has not cleared away any of what he himself has called the mystery. Now, Sir, by-elections, apart from giving representation to the people of this country, as is their constitutional right, have this other advantage, that they demonstrate whether the Government of the day still possess the confidence of the people of the country. They are very important in that respect, and as I showed the other day, governments in other countries have resigned because of the trend of public opinion against them as demonstrated in by-elections. Perhaps I should not use that argument here, because it is the very reason why my hon. friends opposite do not want to hold any by-elections. At the present time there are vacancies in various parts of Canada. There is a vacancy in the West of Medicine Hat, there is one in York, Ontario, there are two in the province of Quebec, and there is one in the Maritime Provinces, not to speak of the vacancy in Leeds. In most of these constituencies, the Government, and even the Conservative party, have always won by big majorities; they are considered safe Tory constituencies. Why should the Government be afraid to take the plunge and give the electors of these ridings the chance to be represented in this Parliament? They have the right to be represented here. In the Speech from the Throne itself we are told that matters of supreme importance to the people of this country will be brought down to the House this session. It is announced that there will be a revision of the tariff. We are confronted with a railway situation which is most serious. Surely the people of Canada have the right to be heard in the solution of these problems. Take the case of the St. Antoine division in Montreal. Nobody will say that it is a Liberal constituency. I do not think it ever was represented by a Liberal member in this House. Now the electors of St. Antoine have strong views on certain questions which are now before the country. You may read letters in the Montreal Gazette every day discussing the railway situation in Canada at the present time, written by supporters of this Governemnt, electors of St. Antoine. When this matter is discussed in the House these electors of St. Antoine have the right to have their views expressed on the floor of this House. They have the right to demand that they should be represented when those questions are discussed. They have the right to demand representation when the tariff policy of this country is settled by this Parliament. The electors of these five or six constituencies that are not represented here to-day have the right to be heard on the Imperial problems which are going to be discussed at the Conference to which my right hon. friend desires to proceed in the month of June. All these questions will be discussed during the present session, and the electors of St. Antoine, West York, York-Sunbury, Yamaska and Medicine Hat have the right to have their representative in this House to speak for them when these matters come up.

There is the subject that was introduced this afternoon when the Minister of Marine (Mr. Ballantyne), made his statement to the House. That is another big question. It is a most important question, and the electors of St. Antoine have pronounced views on the policy of the Government in regard thereto. They have the right to have those views expressed on the floor of the House, and what reason in the world can there be to prevent the Government from holding the by-elections in these various ridings? Why can they not trust the people? An evasion of that responsibility

implies that the Government do not trust the people of this country, and do not trust themselves. They are afraid that they have not the confidence of the people and consequently do not want an expression of this distrust at the polls. Let me say in conclusion that the more delay there is in this matter the worse will be the fate of the men who are responsible for that delay. The day will come when the people shall have the right and the opportunity to express their views and give their vote, and when that day comes we shall hear a different story from that told to-night.

Mr. MICHAEL CLARK (Red Deer): I wish in a very few words to tell the House how I am going to vote, and why, on this question. My first reason for voting as I shall vote is in a measure explained when I express the hope that whenever it is desired to impugn the policy of the Government, or to carry a vote of censure upon them, we shall not have too large a rehash of the very prolific amount of campaign oratory which we had last fall. There is one thing which I think my hon. friend, the leader of the Opposition (Mr. Mackenzie King), has by this time got thoroughly into the minds of the people of this country, and that is that he wants to have an election. There cannot be any doubt about that if one is to do what I do most fully and freely, that is, to give the utmost credit to him for sincerity in the various speeches which he has made upon that question. We had a resolution which was a vote of confidence or no confidence, and which I think the country looked for in connection with the speech from the Throne. It was proper that at the beginning of the session there should be a show-down in the circumstances which the country found itself in. In that resolution, to all intents and purposes, my hon. friend demanded an election. Well, the sense of Parliament was against his views at that time; and now he in effect says that if we cannot have a big election we will have several small ones. He is in favour of elections.

May I say to my hon. friend, in all sincerity, that an election is not a policy. It has no bearing one way or the other upon what my hon. friend and his supporters would do in regard to any one of the great problems before Canada if he came into power. It is the means of putting a policy into operation, if indeed a policy be the possession of those who might be put into power. Something has been said about evasion and I think my hon. friend himself used the word in another connection. But this reiterated demand for an election, to my mind, almost amounts to an evasion on his part of his undoubted duty to tell the country what he is going to do if he becomes Prime Minister. In the debate on the Address my right hon. friend the Prime Minister (Hon. Mr. Meighen), and his Government put the policy of protection right in the centre of the stage. He did that following a pointed question which he had put to my hon. friend all over the country: What is the position of the leader of the Opposition on the principle of protection? Did my hon. friend answer that question?

Some hon. MEMBERS: Oh, no.

Mr. MICHAEL CLARK: He has never answered it, and I want to express the opinion—I do so in all humility, but it is my opinion, and so long as I am here I have the right to express my views—that at this moment from east to west the people of Canada are far more concerned to know what is the hon. gentleman's exact position in regard to that principle of protection than they are concerned about any resolution such as he has brought before the House. That is my honest opinion, and I should like him to see if there be anything in it, and clear it up, because otherwise he will inevitably come under the suspicion of a desire to get a blank cheque from the electorate without having avowed any policy upon this matter of protection. What the country would like is not an election cry raised again and again, but a policy that is to be carried out after an election. There is a long session in front of us, and I trust my hon. friend will lay to heart what I am saying in perfect good faith and friendliness.

That brings me to the second reason why I shall vote against the resolution of my hon. friend, the leader of the Opposition. This very day an excellent opportunity was offered my hon. friend and his supporters to bring in a resolution which would have been a vote of censure, and could not have been mistaken for anything else, upon a question on which the whole debate rests. What happened in the House this afternoon? Two of the leading supporters of my hon. friend, in effect, charged that the very Estimates that are before the House, of the Minister of Marine, had been inflated to the tune of millions upon millions of dollars of the people's money since the armistice, in a way which was contrary to the public good, contrary to public policy, contrary to the best interests of the country. Now, I want to ask the members of

this House and the people of this country; could there have been a straighter chance of taking a vote of the House upon a great principle of policy? My hon. friend talks of great problems. Is not that a problem? On the showing of my hon. friends from Maissoneuve (Mr. Lemieux) and Cape Breton North and Victoria (Mr. McKenzie), is not that a problem of enormous size, bigger than the question of six vacant seats? But again, I say that my hon. friend runs away from that problem and brings in a resolution which, after all, has no earthly connection in logic with the Estimates of the Marine Department, and certainly has no earthly connection with the waste of millions of the people's money upon the building of ships which are worse than useless, according to the showing of the hon. gentleman's own friends.

I quoted a figure myself this afternoon. I am not going into the details of the shipping question as I should be out of order if I did. I merely quote the figure again to illustrate my point. I said it was freely stated in the newspapers of this country that up to the time of the armistice only sixteen and a half millions of dollars had been spent by the Government on a merchant marine. The figure now reaches to pretty nearly seventy millions. That is to say, according to the showing of my hon. friend's followers, fifty millions have gone wrong since the time that this policy should have been given up. Then why have we not a resolution of confidence or no confidence in the government on the very question which logically is before the House—that is the estimates of the Minister of Marine? These are two of the reasons why I shall vote against the amendement of my hon. friend. The third reason is this, that what my hon. friend has submitted, is in the first place, a proposal to reverse what has been the procedure of the Parliament of Canada from Confedration to this moment. What has been that procedure? The procedure has been that the laws of Canada, made in the wisdom of our forefathers, have left the discretion as to the calling of an election in the hands of the government of the day. That is the principle and there is no getting away from it, that has been the principle of the procedure of the government of Canada until the Act of a couple of years ago. The proposal of my hon. friend is that we reverse that procedure which, I repeat, has substantially existed from Confederation to the present moment.

But what is the second element in the proposal? The second element in the proposal is that it asks us to reverse the law of the land by a resolution in Parliament on this particular question. My hon. friend from Quebec East (Mr. Lapointe) has said very truly that they have a definite law in Britain on this question of by-elections, and he has told the House what that law is. The law has entirely removed the discretion from the government of the day in Britain and put it in the hands of the Speaker. Every by-election there takes place automatically within a certain time, but we do not have an hon. gentleman—whether he be leader of the Opposition or whatever position he occupies in the British House—rising in his place, after an hour or an hour and a half's notice to other members of the House, and proposing that the law of Britain shall be overridden, the law which settles the method of calling by-elections. Well, I respectfully submit to my hon. friend from Quebec East and to my hon. friend the leader of the Opposition, that we have a law here and that as law-abiding subjects of the British Empire we are as much concerned in obedience to the law in Canada—whatever that law may be—as they are in Britain to the law over there; and my hon. friend's argument from the case of Britain, so far from helping him, is absolutely opposed to his point of view. Their law is different from ours— made by their Parliament, as our law was made by our Parliament. They carry out their by-elections according to law. To be logical, —and not only to be logical but to be constitutional, and to show the proper regard which Parliament always should show for the laws of the land—we surely ought to live according to this law. And when was it carried? The law under which by-elections of the Canadian Parliament are now carried out was adopted two sessions ago by this very Parliament, constituted of the very personnel that constitutes it now, and it was adopted on the initiative of an hon. gentleman who sits behind, and is a supporter of my hon. friend the leader of the Opposition.

Mr. EDWARDS: And carried unanimously.

Mr. CLARK (Red Deer): Yes, carried unanimously; both sides agreed to it. But the strong point is that it was carried on the initiative of an hon. member for one of the divisions of Montreal who, I think, has

earned the gratitude of the whole country by trying, at any rate, to limit the time during which the discretion of a government shall be allowed to operate in this particular direction. Now, Mr. Speaker, constituted as I am—with the desire to be logical, and with the desire to obey the dictates of the constitution and the law of the land—for the life of me I cannot understand how hon. gentlemen get over the argument that I have just presented to them. If the law is wrong—and that would be a frightful admission for my hon. friend from Montreal because he applied his acute legal brain to the drawing of it—if he says that he made a mistake in drawing that Act and the whole Parliament of Canada made a mistake in passing it—what is our logical duty? What is the logical duty of any Parliament to-day with a bad law? It is not to bring in a resolution to override that law; it is to alter it. That is the manifest duty of the citizens and legislators of Canada. It is true if the law happens to be a tariff one it is bad; it is true that it is our duty to express our opinions upon tariff laws and every other law here; but for the purposes of an Act like this surely our manifest duty, if the law is wrong, is to alter it. For my part I will simply close by saying that I cannot conceive of any greater indignity being placed on this Parliament—and I use the words with deliberation and forethought—I cannot conceive of any greater indignity being placed on this Parliament than to ask it—by means of a resolution dictated largely, I fear, by sheer party expediency—to override by its own act a solemn law which it placed on the statute book only two years ago.

Mr. JOHN WESLEY EDWARDS (Frontenac): I would like to make one or two observations in regard to this matter, and I do not think it will be necessary in noting the salient points to occupy as much time as did the hon. member for Quebec East (Mr. Lapointe) in his ponderous effort of a short time ago. The hon. member waxed very indignant over the fact that there were certain constituencies in Canada which are not at present represented in this House. He declared, as every person will admit, that it is the right of every constituency in Canada to be represented in Parliament; and he went on to talk about the people who had fought and the blood that had been shed, to gain the people the great boon of being represented in Parliament. The hon. gentleman, however, conveniently passed over a situation which exists in regard to a certain constituency in Canada which it seems to me should have occurred to him, to say nothing of his associates. I agree with the hon. gentleman that it is the right of every Canadian constituency to be represented in this Parliament, but let me ask this question: what about the two constituencies represented at the present time by the hon. member who sits immediately to the right of the official leader of the Opposition? Why is it that that hon. gentleman has not resigned one of those seats and given its constituents an opportunity to elect a representative to this House? The hon. member for Quebec East (Mr. Lapointe) complains that certain constituencies have been deprived of representation for a period of two or three months, but it does not seem to affect him in the slightest degree that one at least of the two constituencies I have referred to has been deprived of direct representation for a period of four years. Why does not the leader of the Opposition prevail upon the hon. gentleman who sits to his right to vacate one of those seats and give opportunity for an election either in the constituency of Gaspé or in the constituency of Maisonneuve? I think the reason was suggested by the hon. member for Red Deer. The hon. leader of the official Opposition has taken part in certain by-elections, it is true, and he has figured in one part of the country in one way and in another part of the country in another way. I believe if the truth were known and we got at his real reasons for not bringing on an election in either of those constituencies it would be that he is afraid to test the opinion of the electorate there.

Some hon. MEMBERS: Oh, Oh.

Mr. ARCHAMBAULT: Let us have a good laugh.

Mr. EDWARDS: It is the privilege of hon. gentlemen opposite, Mr. Speaker, and especially of my hon. friend from Chambly and Verchères, to laugh. He is so beautiful at all times that he cannot add to his beauty even when he cracks his face in a laugh. But when the hon. leader of the Opposition taunts the Government with being afraid to bring on elections in certain constituencies, it is obvious that if he has a right to draw that conclusion, I certainly have a corresponding right to draw my conclusion as to why de does not prevail upon the hon. gentleman who sits to his right to vacate one of his two seats and test the opinion of its constituents. I have stated my opinion that he is afraid to test the feeling in one of those

constituencies which is largely interested in manufacturing; and in the other, which, I believe, is largely rural, he is also afraid to test its opinion, just as he has shown himself afraid to test the opinion of his followers in this House by a straight tariff resolution, as evidenced by his naked amendment on the Address.

But, Mr. Speaker, let us consider for a moment as to why it would be unreasonable to expect any person in this chamber, excepting the hon. leader of the official Opposition himself, to vote for the resolution which he has moved. I think I am right in saying that he was not a member of the House in the session of 1919 when the Bill was passed fixing the time when elections must be held at six months. If he was not then present, we cannot hold him responsible for that piece of legislation. But the hon. member for Shelburne and Queen's was a member at that time, and in seconding this resolution he is casting a reflection upon the wisdom of the vote which he gave when that Act was passed. Is it reasonable to ask me or any other member to vote for a resolution worded as this resolution is when two sessions ago a law was unanimously enacted placing the discretionary power in the hands of the Government at six months in regard to the holding of by-elections. If that law is wrong, and six months is too long a time to allow, the law should be amended; but so long as that statute remains in force, then the discretion of the Government is within that six months, just as its discretion was unlimited before that legislation was passed.

I contend that no hon. member who voted for that law two sessions ago can logically or reasonably vote for the amendment which has been moved by the hon. the leader of the Opposition this afternoon.

Mr. LEVI THOMSON (Qu'Appelle): Mr. Speaker, this resolution states that the House is of opinion that representation in Parliament being a fundamental right of the people, writs should be issued, and so on. There can be no doubt whatever that that fundamental right should be given to the people as far as it is reasonably possible, and if we are to look upon this resolution as merely a pious declaration of opinion, there can be no question of what we ought to do in regard to the first part of it. But the question may arise as to what we should do in view of the fact that we believe that all persons should be represented in this House, and that some are not so represented. As has been pointed out by the hon. member for Red Deer (Mr. Clark), we passed a law a short time ago providing for cases of this kind, and I think it was well that we did so. There may be some ground of complaint as to that legislation, and if it were proposed to amend it by limiting still further the power of the Government in regard to the time within which to hold by-elections, I think it would be disposed, as I feel at present, to support a motion of that kind. That, however, is not what we are asked to do here. As has been stated by the last two speakers, we are asked practically to ignore that law, and to act now in a way different from what we decided should be done when we passed that legislation. I do not think that is the proper way to go about it. In doing the right thing we should do it in the right way.

Something has been said about the resignation of a former member of this House, Sir Herbert Ames, and although I was not present during all the discussion, it seems to me, in the absence of some better explanations that I have heard, that there is an element of suspicion about that matter, and it should be cleared up.

Our law provides that a writ must be issued for a by-election within six months of the issuing of your warrant, Mr. Speaker. But so far as I can read the Election Act, there is no time fixed within which the polling must take place, and it seems to me that perhaps the law is rather weak in that particular. I think we depended on the government of the day to deal fairly in that respect. Whether this Government have dealt fairly or not in regard to it, I have been advised, whether rightly or wrongly, that the writ was issued for the East Elgin election some three months before the election was held. If the Government hold off by-elections through the power which they have of fixing the date on which the polling is to take place, then we might as well not have any date fixed for by-elections at all. I think we should deal with this weakness in our present legislation in the way I have suggested, that is, by amending that legislation rather than by bringing in resolutions to overcome the defect. From the reports I have received in regard to the East Elgin by-election, there appears to be an element of suspicion surrounding it, and I think we ought to have some explanation. But the

mere fact that there is some suspicion in connection with certain things the Government has done does not in my opinion, justify our passing a resolution by which, in effect, we are asked to ignore the law of the land and to condemn the Government for not doing things which the law of the land does not require them to do. For that reason I shall feel myself justified in voting against this resolution. Not only do I feel justified, but I feel it my duty to do so and I have made these remarks in order to explain my position.

I am fully in accord with the sentiment expressed in the beginning of the resolution, that every part of the country should be represented in this House, and if the law is such now that the Government can prevent any part of the country having proper representation we should amend the law accordingly. But I do not see how we would gain very much even if the resolution were accepted by the Government and they took the necessary steps to at once issue writs for elections to fill the existing vacancies, for I hope this session will not last so many months that we shall be kept here long enough for the successful candidates of those by-elections to take their seats. At any rate I do not think any good purpose is served by introducing new members during the last few days of the session when we are rushing business through and trying to get home.

Hon. W. S. FIELDING (Shelburne and Queen's): Mr Speaker, the question has been so fully discussed that I can hardly hope to add anything material at this late stage; yet there are two or three thoughts to which I should like to be permitted briefly to call attention.

In the discussion that occurred a few days ago I ventured, presuming, perhaps upon my long experience in this House, to say to my right hon. friend the leader of the Government (Mr. Meighen), that I thought he would have been wise if instead of cracking the party whip and treating the amendment then offered as a non-confidence motion he had accepted it, because it simply asserted one of the vital principles of parliamentary government. From what has occurred since, from the discussion in the press and from reports that have reached me as to the views of hon. gentlemen in this House, privately expressed in general conversation, I am going to hazard the opinion that my right hon. friend rather regrets to-day that he did not adopt that view. I may be mistaken, but he probably thinks it would have been wiser had he accepted the motion. Well, at the risk of repeating myself I am going to express regret again that my right hon. friend does not see the wisdom of accepting the motion that is now before the House, because it is simply the assertion of one of the very first principles of our parliamentary government. When my right hon. friend says that this amendment also must be treated as a non-confidence motion, I again protest that he is not representing the matter fairly. I am speaking from memory, but I am quite sure I am safe in saying that there are precedents and good precedents under all governments in Canada for the acceptance by the Government of an amendment to supply when it contains within itself nothing obnoxious when it asserts something that is admittedly sound and right, which ought not to be voted down simply because it is an amendment to supply. I have not looked at authorities, but my recollection will, I think, justify my saying that. If it should turn out upon later inquiry that I am mistaken, I shall be the first to make correction, but I am pretty certain that I am right. It is not a conclusive argument, therefore, to say that this motion must be voted down because it is an amendment to suply; if it asserts something which is true and right and reasonable, then the House should accept it. I am afraid my right hon. friend is putting a strain upon the loyalty of his friends when he asks them to vote down propositions so simple, so vital to the administration of public affairs in accordance with the institutions of British parliamentary government.

Now, a word or two with regard to the question of notice. I would like to remind the House that under the rules of comparatively recent years, under a rule which, if it be not offensive, I might call a parliamentary strangulation, and for which my right hon. friend the Prime Minister is probably more responsible than anybody else, under the restrictions that are now placed upon discussion in this House, this is the only day in this week when we can challenge the action of the Government by a motion of this kind. There are three days for Government business this week, Tuesday, Thursday and Friday. On Thursday and Friday the Speaker leaves the Chair without any disucssion and we would have no opportunity on those days to submit such a motion. Therefore, unless we brought forward our motion this day, Tuesday, we could not bring it forward for another week,

and that, I think, is sufficient reason. But let me say to my right hon. friend that beyond that there is a reason. We have been having a few holidays; members are scattered throughout the different provinces; many of them have not yet returned. If we were to avail ourselves of this opportunity of bringing the motion before the House, then we had to have a hurried consultation this day after some of the members had returned. In these circumstances—circumstances from which my right hon. friend cannot entirely absolve himself, because he had a large part in making the rules—we were precluded from dealing with the matter unless we brought it forward as we did to-day on the motion to go into supply. My right hon. friend will see, therefore, that we were justified in proceeding as we did. I know that the intention of the leader of the Opposition was to give my right hon. friend all the notice that was possible. I quite agree that it is desirable that in these matters reasonable notice should be given. I would like to feel that he has all reasonable opportunity of meeting anything that we bring forward.

The right hon. gentleman had much to say about the practice of old times. If my hon. friend made a study of Hansard for the purpose of these references I am sure he must have found quite a number of occasions upon which he and his friends took a view very different from that which they take to-day. I have no doubt he will find on examining the old records that on many an occasion he and the former leader of the Government, the member for King's, N.S. (Sir Robert Borden) and others when they were in opposition were very vehement in demanding that there should be no delay in the issuance of the writs. However, I do not attach much importance to that. If the cases stated by my right hon. friend were as strong as he presents them—and I assume for the moment that he has presented them truthfully—if there was such delay in the holding of the by-elections as he describes, then I say I do not care under what government it was done, it was wrong and it is time we corrected it. But suppose I admit for the sake of argument that the hon. gentleman's contention is correct. Suppose he makes a point against my hon. friend the leader of the Opposition; suppose he makes a point against me as a member of the ministry of former years, what answer is that to the people of Canada? Is it any answer to them to say that I did wrong many years ago, if wrong it was? Surely two wrongs, as the old adage goes, do not make a right, and instead of going back to what hon. gentlemen claim to be the errors of former days it would be far better for them to stand behind their own record of these days and demand that these faults, if they were faults, should no longer continue. What answer is it to the elector down in St. Antoine to be told: Oh well, we had this up in the House some years ago; Mr. King and Mr. Fielding discussed it on that occasion, and their attitude then was inconsistent with the attitude they take now. But, says the elector in St. Antoine, what have I do with the leader of the Opposition and the member for Shelburne and Queen's? I have my rights as an elector of Canada; I have a right to be represented. What answer is it to the electors of Yamaska? What answer to the electors of York-Sunbury? What answer to the electors in any part of Canada? When these electors say: I have the right to be represented in Parliament, the right hon. gentleman replies: Some years ago Mr. Fielding and Mr. King had different views, and we are going to stand on that. It is a poor argument; the world is moving to-day.

> New occasions teach new duties,
> Time makes ancient good uncouth;
> He must upward still and onward
> Who would keep abreast with truth.

Instead of relying on the practice of the olden days, how much better it would be to move forward with the times and stand for the right of the people to be represented in Parliament. That is the rule that my right hon. friend should follow; that is the procedure he should adopt, rather than talk of what we did many years ago. It is a fact that hundreds and thousands of the young men of this country who are prepared, whenever they have an opportunity, to vote, had no opportunity of so voting when these things occurred. I am not indifferent to the records of the past; we may learn much from them; but the world is moving, and if the principles set forth in this amendment are sound and reasonable, we should be prepared to accept them. They are sound and reasonable. What reasons can be given for not accepting them? None has been given to-day.

Yes, my right hon. friend (Mr. Meighen) said: We have the six months' rule. The nature of that rule has not been fairly stated; it has been quoted here in a manner

which would imply that the intention was that an election need not be held for six months. It is preposterous to say that that was the intention of the Act. It was not the intention of the Act. When you give the Government power to issue a writ within six months, it is absurd to say that they are entitled to take the full benefit of that law, because that would shut out a number of constituencies from representation for a whole session of Parliament. Put aside the question A, B and C; put aside the question of consistency or inconsistency; put it as a simple question of representation. What right have the people of Shelburne and Queen's to representation and the people of St. Antoine to be denied representation? What right have any of the members of this House to represent their constituencies here and at the same time to tell the people of Yamaska and York-Sunbury that they have not a right to be represented? The point is that we ought to be ready to give these people early and prompt elections. I cannot see that my hon. friends opposite have given us a single argument other than the old story of what we did many years ago. I have not investigated that, but I have no doubt that in many of those cases, perhaps in all of them, good reasons could be shown. I am, however, going to assume, for the sake of argument, that we were wrong, and I say, unhesitatingly, that if the cases were as described by my right hon. friend, if we deprived any constituency of an election for years—I do not know who did so—that was wrong, and instead of defending the wrong, it is high time we came to a better understanding in regard to the situation. That is the whole question.

No reason in law or argument can be advanced against the motion of my hon. friend, and it ought not to be treated as a vote of want of confidence. Hon. members of this House who read that motion calmly, when they leave this House to-night and go home and have their constituents read it, will see that no good reasons have been given why the motion should not prevail. It is in the interest of prompt elections; it is in the interest of every section which has the right of parliamentary representation. There is no reason for this hocus-pocus on the part of the Government. Why should there be this monkey business over the resignation of the hon. member for St. Antoine? Why should the hon. member for North Grey (Mr. Middlebro), for whom I have the highest esteem, be led astray by this hocus-pocus business and get into trouble by being induced to sign documents which, on their face, as an hon. gentleman said, are somewhat suspicious? As regards my much respected friend, the hon. member for Brandon (Mr. Whidden), I have more than a kindly interest in his welfare; he is a son of an old political opponent, but an old friend, with whom I crossed swords many a time years ago in the legislature of Nova Scotia. I am sorry to find that estimable gentleman has been dragged into this miserable business by which suspicion, which the hon. member for Qu'Appelle (Mr. Thomson) has spoken about, surrounds that resignation. All that shows the simple reason for accepting the motion of my hon. friend. Why not give the people of these respective constituencies an opportunity to have an election?

I forgot one reason my right hon. friend advanced. He said: "If you did have these by-elections, what would happen? We would have to go off to the constituencies and defend our cause; those gentlemen would not go, they would not grant pairs, and therefore, we would be at a disadvantage." My right hon. friend has paid us the compliment that if there were by-elections, he and his friends would have to go and fight them, while we could stay at home and win.

Mr. MEIGHEN: I do not think it is quite as bad as that. I did not say that at all. I did not say that hon. gentlemen opposite would not go; much less did I suggest that they could win, because they have won scarcely anything that I remember. I said that they could go; but that as the rules put it in their power to challenge the Government by a motion that was not debatable, they could bring on a motion at a time that suited them, but we could not do the same thing. I pointed out their advantage under the rules.

Mr. FIELDING: The right hon gentleman's comment was in regard to pairs. He said that we would not grant pairs.

Mr. MEIGHEN: Certainly.

Mr. FIELDING: If we did not pair, we would be in Parliament.

Mr. MEIGHEN: Yes.

Mr. FIELDING: Therefore, my right hon. friend clearly implied that if there were by-elections, he and his friends would be obliged to go away and fight them; that we would not do so. We would have an advantage. I am going to make a suggestion to my right hon. friend, if that was

a material point in his argument, and it was about as strong as any argument he used. If he is afraid of that, let him bring on the by-elections, and we will give him all the pairs he wants. I think the facts and the principles involved are so plain to every thinking man that I am amazed that any extensive argument should be deemed necessary. The whole question is this: Have the people of every part of Canada a right to be represented in Parliament? If they have, why not give it to them? No shadow of reason has been advanced why the constituencies of St. Antoine and Yamaska should not be given the privilege of representation at the earliest possible moment.

Right Hon. C. J. DOHERTY (Minister of Justice): Mr. Speaker, I am not quite sure whether there is adequate reason for me to intervene in this debate; but we have sat so long listening to arguments in support of a motion for which there was manifestly no adequate reason, that I am overcome by the evil example and led to add reasons where reasons are not required. We have been accustomed in this House to the leader of the Opposition (Mr. Mackenzie King) making "much ado about nothing;" we have not as yet become accustomed to that line of action on the part of the hon. member for Quebec East (Mr. Lapointe), nor, may I add, on the part of the hon. member for Shelburne and Queen's (Mr. Fielding); but this evening they seem to have been overcome with the conviction that their leader had not had his usual success in making "much ado about nothing," or at all events, that he had not made as "much ado about nothing" as this particular "nothing" in their eyes required, and, therefore, they felt obliged to come to the rescue. The hon. gentleman who spoke last, (Mr. Fielding), to take him first in order, felt impelled to support this motion by representing it to be absolutely the most harmless thing in the world. Why, it did not mean anything at all; it was just the affirmation of a principle which nobody doubted and nobody disputed, and why on earth should we not affirm it? Why should it be suggested that this motion was a motion of want of confidence? The hon. gentleman's proposition amounts to this, that every time the Government comes to this House asking for Supply, this House may properly be stopped in order that we may affirm, for instance, that the sun stands in the firmament, and we must not go into Supply; we must strike out all the words after "that," and substitute the indisputable declaration that the sun is in the firmament, and then hon. gentlemen will rise in indignation and will say: Why do you call this a vote of want of confidence? Why do you ask this House to refuse to affirm what is self-evident to all the world, namely, that the sun is in the firmament? Oh, ye unreasonable men!

Does the hon. gentleman ignore the fact that there are two portions to the motion? Before you come to affirm these perfectly innocent, harmless propositions, you ask this House to say to the Government's motion to go into Supply: No, you won't get your Supply. Why? Because it is essential that we should affirm so and so. Can there be any suggestion of utility in a performance of that kind if it is not implied that the conduct of the Government is in some way violating this principle which the House is called upon to affirm? And yet hon. gentlemen are amazed because we treat this as a want of confidence motion. I have no doubt of the sincerity of the last gentleman who spoke (Mr. Fielding), but I am puzzled to see how, in view of his sincerity, he conciliates his affirmation, on the one hand, that this motion is no motion of want of confidence, with the declaration in his next breath that if they had not made this motion to-day they would have had no opportunity this week to affirm this principle. Why, Mr. Speaker, if they wanted merely to affirm a principle, the Order Paper is open to them as it is to every hon. member of this House. They might have put this resolution on the Order Paper for to-morrow or the next day, and might have debated it to their hearts' content, but that would not have served their purpose; that would not have served the purpose of the people who are amazed that we think this is a motion of want of confidence. Why would it not have served their purpose? Because it would not have carried with it the censure that the refusal of this House on the Government's motion to go into Supply implies and carries with it, and because it would not have had in it the sting that if it were carried tonight they would point out tomorrow to be in it—the sting of the imputation that this Government has not lived up, in the letter and in the spirit, to what is the real principle with regard to representation in this House. So much for the pretension of the hon. member for Shelburne and Queen's

that we are not face to face with a vote of want of confidence. So much for the pretension that all that is wanted is a declaration of this abstract principle of the right of everybody to representation. Now let us see the other nothings about which we have had so much ado to-day.

Mr. BUREAU: You are getting quite Shakespearian.

Mr. DOHERTY: A little Shakespeare might not do hon. gentleman on the other side any harm at all.

Mr. BUREAU: A little Molière and Corneille would do a lot of good to the Government side.

Mr. DOHERTY: It might, and therefore we have recourse to them. I steer clear of the Scriptures, however, since my experience the other day. I would not for all the world resurrect once more the two scriptural familiars of my hon. friend from Cape Breton North and Victoria (Mr. McKenzie),—his friends Pontius Pilate and Judas Iscariot. My hon. friend from Three Rivers (Mr. Bureau) will have to pardon me if I should bring back to his memory by the allusion I have made to the title of a play, the memory of Shakespeare, which I hope he keeps alive in his heart, and by whose teaching I hope he will endeavour to profit.

To pass to some of the other nothings with regard to which we have had much ado, in the first place we have had a fierce denunciation of the tu quoque argument, and hon. gentlemen have seemed to take it that because the right hon. leader of this House ventured to refer to some past actions of their own he had no argument to make except that "we are bad, and you are worse." Now there is a purpose for which it is sometimes salutary to look back into the history of the past, even though it may not afford an argument to justify or condemn the particular action of to-day. If it were not for my dread of getting on scriptural ground and my respect for the preserves of the hon. member for Cape Breton North and Victoria, I might remind hon. gentlemen opposite that it is written in a certain book that it is well for those who live in glass houses not to cast stones.

Mr. McKENZIE: That is not in the Bible.

Mr. DOHERTY: The hon. gentleman says it is not in the Bible. We will not insist on its particular biblical situation, although I think I could satisfy my hon. friend on that point. However that may be, perhaps it does not do hon. gentlemen any harm, when they wax warm in the heat of their indignation, to recall to them that perhaps a little of their heat is due to the fact that people living in glass houses are apt to find themselves in hothouses, and are therefore apt to get a little overheated about the shortcomings of other people; and perhaps a little dose of past history may do no harm in the way of calming them, even if their glass construction should escape destruction.

Of course, we all admit that two wrongs do not make a right. Of course they do not, but where is the wrong that has yet been established? Where is the wrong of to-day? Why, in most of these cases, it is a matter of a few weeks. Hon. gentlemen may say what they like but, as one of them did say, the legislation of 1919 fixed a reasonable delay. Parliament sat here and considered what was a reasonable delay, and Parliament fixed that reasonable delay at six months. Now I do not suggest that that means the Government must not hold an election until the end of six months; but it is the solemn judgment of Parliament that within a period of six months it is proper that the Government of the day should exercise its discretion as to when an election ought to be held. And what are we here asked to vote?—to pass an order by this House to issue the writ in all these cases tomorrow. Well, now, Mr. Speaker, the representation of the people of the country in this House is important, and the choice of their representative is important, and because those two things are important, it is important that elections should be conducted in such a manner as to give every opportunity to the electorate to exercise calmly their judgment and pronounce, after fair discussion and calm consideration, upon the issues that are submitted to them.

That takes time, and it depends largely upon local conditions as to whether one particular moment or another is the time when you may get the proper judgment of the rural people. Take this very proposal that is urged upon us to-night. If we issued these writs to-morrow we should be holding elections in certain rural constituencies—in Medicine Hat and Yamaska—in view of the delays that must necessarily intervene, just at the time when these rural populations will be actually taking up the important work of their seeding and when they will be very loath and averse to being called away from it to engage in the determination of important political questions that are to be dealt with and to follow up

that by an election. I just point that out to show the wisdom of Parliament when it confided to the government of the country a reasonable period of time within which to select the proper moment when the people will have the best opportunity of providing themselves with the representation to which they are entitled. If the importance of that is realized, I submit to you, Mr. Speaker, and to the common sense of the House, that a month more or less in the time that elapses, within the six months to which we are limited, is a matter of very little consequence indeed, and I am quite justified in describing all this fuss as "much ado about nothing."

As to the motives imputed to the Government in this connection, it is hardly necessary, I think, that I should point out that this is the first government in the Dominion of Canada that has submitted itself to a Parliamentary rule restricting the time to which it might suspend elections; and to impute gratuitously to a government whose action made that rule possible, any desire to abuse the discretion, so limited at its own instance, in order to defeat the rights of the electors, is a proposition which, I must say, with all respect to the hon. gentleman who moved this resolution, and the hon. gentleman who seconded it, they will, on reflection, realize was more than ungenerous—was absolutely unfair.

Now, I do not want to take up time with the smallest of the nothings about which there has been so much ado. But there is the matter of the resignation of my very good friend Sir Herbert Ames. I am sure Sir Herbert will be cut to the quick when he reads the report of the address of the hon. member for Shelburne and Queen's (Mr. Fielding), and finds that he has been charged with being a party to a hocus-pocus in regard to his resignation.

Mr. FIELDING: Oh, no; I did not make any charge against him.

Mr. DOHERTY: Oh! Then the hon. gentleman made no charge against the only person in the world who had control of that resignation! Who was it that approached the hon. member for North Grey (Mr. Middleboro), and the hon. member for Brandon (Mr. Whidden), and asked them to sign this document? Sir Herbert Ames, the gentleman who, my hon. friend would not for one moment suggest, would have anything to do with hocus-pocus. But what was the hocus-pocus that took place? It was the witnessing of the signature of Sir Herbert Ames, at the instance of Sir Herbert himself, by the hon. member for North Grey and the hon. member for Brandon; and my hon. friend almost weeps over the unfortunate condition in which those two gentlemen find themselves in having been mixed up in this disgraceful proceeding. But Sir Herbert Ames, at whose instance they signed the document as witnesses, stands immaculate, unconnected with the hocus-pocus. For him the hon. gentleman has no word of condemnation; and in that let me say that I join most heartily with him; I have no word of condemnation for Sir Herbert. But I cannot follow the hon. member in his commiseration, if not condemnation, of the two other gentlemen who did what Sir Herbert asked them to do. I cannot agree with my hon. friend in his views in regard to this awful offence, and the falsehood imputed to those who signed the document as witnesses because the date was not on it; nor can I admire the learning and the legal lore to which we have been treated this evening upon this question of the necessity of witnesses certifying to the dates of documents. Hon. genltemen are positive about it. Why, it is so clear to them that there are not in the English language words lucid enough to do justice to its clarity. For common mortals who read the statute, however, I submit that what they find there is that there must be but the signing and sealing before a witness. There is not a word in the statute to require the date in the document, and hon. gentlemen read into a prescription that does not require such a provision at all, a witnessing to the date of a document. I will not undertake to speak for other provinces, but some of the lawyers who spoke are distinguished members of the legal profession in my own province, and I think that they would be satisfied with the sufficiency of a witness to a signature who does not witness to the date at all, if they turned up the civil code of the province of Quebec, wherein they would find, in regard to probably the most solemn document to which only two witnesses are required—that is, one of the forms of will in that province derived from the laws of England—that it is in so many words declared to be sufficient that the individual should exhibit his signature,—not write it in anyone's presence but exhibit a signature written previously, possibly on some date the witnesses knew nothing of—and then they sign to attest the signature. What is important about this document is the signature of Sir Herbert

Ames, and that is what the witnesses attested.

Now, we have all this talk and this reading of the speech in the Empire Parliamentary Association's Report, in which it is stated that Sir Herbert said that his resignation was in the hands of the Speaker; and hon. gentlemen are exercised as to whether people do or do not believe that statement, while all the time they run away from the perfectly manifest fact that, unless the veracity of the speaker be put in question, the very most that can be said is that Sir Herbert made a mistake in speaking. Now, I do not know in whose hands he left the resignation. I do not know what reason he had at that time for being under the impression that it had already reached the hands of the Speaker. I do not know whether he did or did not change his mind, or whether he had been under the impression that he had taken steps to send it to the Speaker or not. I simply do not know anything of this; I have no explanation to offer, and I have no responsibility so far as all this is concerned; nor has the Government any responsibility or obligation, or explanation, for it. Sir Herbert is an honourable gentleman; hon. members profess their confidence in him. He has the key to all this, and if they are curious about the relations between Sir Herbert and his trusted friends, I can only suggest that they apply to him, in whose honour I have the same confidence as they have, and I have no doubt they will get ample satisfaction for their curiosity. But, after all, what is it but empty curiosity? If they will read their statute they will find that a resignation is an effective document only from the moment it reaches the Speaker's hands. Just as a promissory note, so long as the maker keeps it in his own hands or in the hands of his own agent, binds him to nobody and to nothing, so that resignation has no binding legal effect until it has passed into the hands of the Speaker. And if whoever was the custodian of it, had chosen to tear the document to pieces before it reached there, he would have been responsible to Sir Herbert Ames and to Sir Herbert Ames alone. Until that document reached the Speaker, Sir Herbert Ames was as fully a member of this House as any of us who sit here to-night.

I am not going, except for the purpose of correcting one or two statements, to refer to the past. I deem it to be only proper, however, that the hon. member for Quebec East (Mr. Lapointe) should be corrected in his statement that never up to the time referred to had there been a period when the session went by without a constituency being represented in Parliament. Let me just mention one case that my eye falls on, and it is a startling one—the case of West Durham where, in the general elections of 1900, by reason of some irregularity, no return was made of the election that took place in that year, and no by-election to fill the vacancy occurred until January 15, 1902—that is to say from November, 1900, till January, 1902—and most assuredly it will not be suggested that there was not a session during that period.

Mr. BUREAU: Was there a proceeding before the courts in reference to that election in the meanwhile?

Mr. DOHERTY: There had been no election; the returning officer did not return any candidate as elected. There was nothing before the courts because no return had been made.

Mr. BUREAU: Then there was no proceeding of any kind before the courts?

Mr. DOHERTY: I cannot see on what such a proceeding could have been based.

Mr. FIELDING: What was the evidence of a vacancy?

Mr. DOHERTY: The best evidence of a vacancy was that in the general election a writ was issued for an election in West Durham as well as everywhere else, but the return day went by and no return came.

Mr. FIELDING: That might not be technical evidence of a vacancy; there might be reasons for that.

Mr. DOHERTY: There was no evidence of any body being the member. The vacancy occurred when a general election was called, and the vacancy continued to exist until somebody was returned to represent that constituency. Ordinarily somebody does get returned for a constituency and the vacancy in that riding results from his disappearance. Here the vacancy was not the result of the non-appearance of anybody; the vacancy had existed since the House had been dissolved and continued to exist. There is also the case to which my hon. friend from Frontenac referred. We have had, sitting in this House ever since the general elections of 1917, an hon. gentleman who occupies two seats and thereby excludes one of these ridings from representation.

Mr. FIELDING: They both have representatives; they both have the man of their choice.

Mr. DOHERTY: I would say that one has a representative or else neither has. My hon. friend from Maisonneuve and likewise from Gaspe—the gentleman who comes from opposite directions at the same time—is a man of fairly goodly proportions, but I fancy that if you divided him between the two counties neither of them would have a complete member.

Mr. JACOBS: He would be dismembered.

Mr. DOHERTY: Yes, as the hon. gentleman suggests, in the operation the member becomes dismembered, and the constituency is deprived of a member.

Mr. JACOBS: Is the right hon. gentleman aware that one of these seats has been contested and that it is impossible for the hon. member in question to resign while the case is before the courts?

Mr. DOHERTY: I have heard it so stated. I am not of an overwhelmingly suspicious turn of mind, but when I am told that an hon. member has been for a period of four years the object of a fierce onslaught on the part of a determined opponent insisting on driving him from his seat and leaving him with a broken heart because that inconsiderate action deprives him of resigning one seat or the other, may I confess that notwithstanding the high respect I entertain for my hon. friend the dual member for Gaspé and Maisonneuve I cannot keep out of my mind a certain suspicion—I wonder what the hon. member for George Etienne Cartier (Mr. Jacobs) thinks about it—a certain suspicion that if the contestation was not more likely to keep the hon. gentleman in two seats than to drive him from one, it might probably disappear. While we are on the question may I say that the thought has very frequently occurred to me—how did that contestation come about? There was a great reproach made to the legislation with respect to elections which preceded the last general election, the reproach being that as the law operates the thirty or forty days within which it was essential to file a petition in contestation of an election, actually expired before we got the return. Consequently it was said—and apparently was recognized in every constituency in Canada except the one of the two in which the petition now referred to was filed—that there was no opportunity to file a petition.

Mr. POWER: May I suggest to the right hon. gentleman that if there is any abuse in the administration of justice in the province of Quebec, or elsewhere, it is the duty of the Minister of Justice to see that it is corrected.

Mr. DOHERTY: I have not suggested that there is any abuse.

Mr. POWER: Or suspicion of any?

Mr. DOHERTY: May I gently intimate to the hon. member for Quebec South that if the Minister of Justice should take upon himself to attempt to direct or control the administration of justice in the province of Quebec he would be very promptly and very politely asked by the Attorney General of that province to mind his own business. The hon. gentleman shares a misapprehension that is very common in this country, a misapprehension that the Minister of Justice has some control or direction of the administration of justice, a matter which our constitution confides, and confides exclusively, to the provinces. That being the case, I can only recommend the hon. gentleman to carry his suggestion to his very good friend the Attorney General for the province of Quebec, who, no doubt, will give it every attention.

Mr. POWER: And then have it referred back to the Minister of Justice in order that he should amend the law about which he complains.

Mr. DOHERTY: But you have not complained about the law. I am sorry the hon. member for Maisonneuve and for Gaspé (Mr. Lemieux) is not here this evening. I would suggest to him in the most friendly way that it would be wise on his part to let the world know who the petitioner is in that contestation, and in what court that petition is lodged, so that it may be open to inspection by the general public, who may be less confiding than I am, to satisfy themselves of its actual existence.

Mr. JACOBS: Why not appoint a royal commission?

Mr. DOHERTY: Hon. gentlemen who are so resourceful might perhaps themselves find out for the benefit of the general public. However, it cannot leave one unmoved to observe the absolutely unperturbed condition of the hon. leader of the Opposition and the hon. gentleman who seconds this motion in face of the depriva-

tion of the people of one or other of those constituencies of Gaspé and Maisonneuve of representation in this House; and the contrast is somewhat remarkable.

Now, Mr. Speaker, with apologies for having myself contributed anything to this "much ado about nothing," I think I may safely resume my seat, feeling that I have no anxiety that I have not said all that could be usefully said, my only regret being that I should have wasted so much time over matter calling after all for so very little serious consideration.

Mr. F. F. PARDEE (West Lambton): Mr. Speaker, the closing sentences of the hon. Minister of Justice (Mr. Doherty) were, it seems to me, hardly consistent. He apologised to the House for taking up so much time on a matter that he thinks of so little importance; but if he thinks it of so little importance why did he waste the time of the House? It did appear to me in listening to his opening and closing remarks that the government benches having debated this matter in solemn form during the afternoon and the first part of the evening, apparently decided to put up a joker at the end in the hope of overwhelming the resolution with ridicule. That would appear to be the only conclusion to be drawn from the speech delivered by the Minister of Justice.

But, taking up the last part of his address first, he referred to the hon. member for Gaspé (Mr. Lemieux) and made some jocular remarks to the effect that if the hon. gentleman could be divided into two he might represent both Gaspé and Maisonneuve. Let me say to the minister in all seriousness that the fact remains that my hon. friend was elected by both of those constituencies. He stood for the verdict of the people, and that verdict said that he was their choice to represent them in this House. Now let the Government go and do the same thing in these constituencies which have been without representation for many months. That is what we are complaining about, and it is what the Government shrink from doing. The Minister of Justice says, to quote his own words, "It appears to me there is very much ado about nothing. Why should this House stop and debate the question, if it so seems fit to hon. members of the Opposition, whether or not the sun stands in the firmament? "Now, Sir, as to there being much ado about nothing, let me bring this phase of the matter to the attention of the House. Does the Prime Minister or does the Minister of Justice think that to complain, as we do, of the disenfranchisement of 200,000 people for several months is much ado about nothing? If there is one thing we ought to have in Canada it is responsibility of government, and responsibility of government rests with the people. If the government of the day has decided that the people shall not be trusted—and apparently they have so decided—well and good, let the Government say so. But why does a minister holding one of the most important positions in the Government stand up and say to the House and the country that this motion is only being brought forward at the whim of the leader of the Opposition? Let me say to him and to the other members of the Government and their supporters that if they will only put their ear to the ground for a few moments they will find that this motion is not brought forward to satisfy the whim of the leader of the Opposition, but rather to satisfy the whim of the people of this Dominion.

The right hon. Prime Minister (Mr. Meighen) said this afternoon, if I understood him aright, that the question of the right of the hon. member for Leeds to hold a seat in this House he would have to refer to the Department of Justice. Has anybody the temerity, Mr. Speaker, to stand up in this House and say that when a man is being paid a fee of $100,000, as has been reported, for conducting the Government's case in an arbitration as appears to be the case from the Act passed for that purpose, and which was cited by the hon. leader of the Opposition this afternoon, that he is not within the pay of the Government and does not infringe the provisions of the Independence of Parliament Act? Do you need any opinion of the Minister of Justice, Sir, on that point? You need the opinion of no one. The right hon. Prime Minister knows, every member on the Government side knows, and the people of this country know, that Sir Thomas White, the hon. member for Leeds to-day, has no more right to sit in this House than the man in the street.

How many people have been disfranchised for months? In the constituency of Leeds there are 36,753; in Medicine Hat, 24,481; in Yamaska, 20,387; in York, Sunbury, 30,780—and in passing let me ask this question: Do I understand that your warrant, Sir, has been issued in the case of York-Sunbury? If it has it is a most significant circumstance, and it has, I be-

lieve, been issued for one reason only, while writs for elections in the other constituencies that were vacant long before York-Sunbury have not yet been issued. The only reason is that York-Sunbury, the Government believe, is the one constituency in which they have the slightest hope of carrying a by-election. The constituency of West York has an electorate of 33,306; St. Antoine 34,794; making a total of 187,501, or in round numbers 200,000 people that to-day are disfranchised by the action of this Government.

When, Sir, the Act was passed that by-elections should be brought on within six months of the vacancies occurring, did any one who discussed or voted for that measure believe for one moment that the whole period of six months was to run? No, the intention was that just as soon as possible writs were to be issued. That was the spirit of the law, and it is in that spirit that I ask the Government to live up to to-day.

This, Sir, is not an ordinary session, this is not an ordinary Parliament. It is, perhaps, one of the most extraordinary Parliaments that ever sat in this Dominion. This feature has been brought up before during this session, and I do not propose to rehash it now, but I have said before, and I repeat it now, that irrespective of all precedent or anything else, there was a distinct promise that at the conclusion of the war this Government would appeal to the country. But, Sir, leaving all that aside, what do we find? We find after reading the statement of the Minister of Railways (Mr. Reid) that we have the most appalling railway deficit in the history of our country—a defiicit of ten dollars for each man, woman and child in Canada. We have before us that most contentious question of the expenditure of millions upon the mercantile marine, a statement in connection with which was made to-day by the Minister of Marine (Mr. Ballantyne). In view of these facts, and of the fact that all constituencies are not represented, can it be said either in this House or out of it that this Parliament has the right to go on with a willy-nilly policy? I say that the only fair thing to do is to let every constituency be represented before these important questions are taken into consideration with a view to making radical changes. Every constituency has the right to be represented, and I ask the Government to see that that right is acceded to.

There is one question I would like to ask of my friends in the far end of the chamber. especially the member for Red Deer (Mr. Clark). I ask it in no spirit of controversy, but the matter is of some interest. The question came up in the House the other day of practically an investigation of the railway systems of Canada. In other words, it was simply this: that the people of Canada, the shareholders in the publicly-owned railroads, should have the right to know whence their money was coming and whither it was going; the right to know how that money was spent and where the vouchers were; the right to speak absolutely as shareholders of a company. The people who are being taxed for these roads have been denied the right to know whence these moneys came and whither they went. When this question is discussed the hon. member for Red Deer and a number of the other members of his party absolutely vote against any such investigation. Why I know not, but I should like to know. I am asking these hon. gentlemen—for whom the old parties were hardly good enough—I am asking them in all seriousness—why they take that attitude. The hon. member for Red Deer says that the by-elections should not be brought on except at the will of the Government. In other words he says: We do not want investigation; we do not want representation. It is a nice point; I ask the question out of curiosity. There are many farmers in my constituency and I want to tell them; they are looking for enlightenmen. When the hon. member for Red Deer stands up and in that vehement manner which is characteristic of him, says in trumpet-like tones to the farmers all over this broad Dominion, says to the members of this House, says, indeed, to every man, woman and child in Canada: We want neither representation nor investigation—I ask the hon. member for Red Deer where he and his party get off?

Mr. CLARK (Red Deer): Mr. Speaker, may I as a matter of order tell my hon. friend that I get off by saying that I did not say what he says I said?

Mr. S. W. JACOBS (George Etienne Cartier): Mr. Speaker, I have been waiting all evening to hear some explanation from the two witnesses to this famous document. As the House is about to have the question put, and nothing has been heard from these two witnesses I merely rise to express my surprise that these gentlemen, whose names have been bandied

about so freely both inside the House and out of it during the last two or three weeks, have not considered it necessary to offer to the House and to the country some explanation as to what became of this document between July 21 and March 18. Sir Herbert Ames on July 21 stated that his resignation was in the Speaker's hands. Some time during this month you, Mr. Speaker, formally stated to the House that the document was not in your hands and that you had not received it, and following that statement the famous resignation was forthwith placed in your hands. Now, where was it during that time? The Prime Minister (Mr. Meighen), who is supposed to know something about the doings of his party, said that he knew nothing whatever concerning it. The Minister of Justice (Mr. Doherty) knew nothing about it. No one knew anything about the document. May I suggest that it was perhaps in the dead letter office? It would have been wise if the Postmaster General had been a member of this House in order that he might have said something about that part of his department which is dead.

Another suggestion, Mr. Speaker, I might offer is that when Sir Herbert Ames said his resignation was in the Speaker's hands, possibly he meant that, as he was the speaker, the resignation was in his own hands at the time. The whole matter is enveloped in so much mystery that the chief whip on the Government side, the hon. member for North Grey (Mr. Middlebro) and the hon. member for Brandon (Mr. Whidden) might give us some explanation as to when that document came into their hands and why it was not received by you, Mr. Speaker, until a few days ago. There must have been some reason for it. Were they acting on the instructions of Sir Herbert Ames? They certainly were not acting on the instructions of the right hon. Prime Minister. They were not acting on the instructions of the Minister of Justice, because we have the statements of these two gentlemen that they knew nothing whatever about the document. Were the two gentlemen who witnessed it acting on their own initiative? If so, we would like to know why. Was it in the interests of the country that they were so acting? Was it in the interests of Sir Herbert Ames, or was it in the interests of the Tory party? The country should know something about this. The whole transaction has all the characteristics of a slight-of-hand trick. Sir Herbert Ames states that he placed the document in your hands, Mr. Speaker, but you do not receive it; then six or seven months afterwards it is found in the hands of the chief whip of the party.

A word or two has been said to-night with regard to the Bill which I had the honour of introducing into the House a couple of sessions ago and which declared that elections should be held within six months from the vacating of the seat. The Prime Minister seems to think that that law gave the Government discretion; he says: "It is for us to say when we shall have these by-elections; it is for the Government to exercise its discretion." Well, I thought at the time I introduced the Bill that it was for the benefit of the people, not to suit the discretion of the Government, but I must have made a mistake. I was a new member at the time and naturally was deceived by the arts and wiles of the Government. They ought not to have taken advantage of a poor member in that way.

When this measure was originally drafted it provided that the by-election should be held sixty days after the seat was declared vacant. The Bill was sent to the Committee on Privileges and Elections, of which that astute gentleman the Minister of Militia (Mr. Guthrie) was chairman. Hon. gentlemen on the other side, with tears in their eyes, represented to those who were supporting the Bill, that it would be manifestly unfair to force the holding of a by-election within sixty days. I remember that the hon. member for Port Arthur (Mr. Keefer), whom I see before me, made use of that argument. He said: "Take my own district, which runs from somewhere around Lake Superior to Hudson Bay and is as extensive as a large part of Europe; it would be impossible to canvass the electors of that district; it would be almost impossible within sixty days to enable the people to hear the dulcet tones of my voice." The hon. member pointed out that a period of six months was a reasonable time in which everyone could hear him expound his views to the people. He said that it would take at least six months to prepare lists in that wild and unorganized district, the district which sends him to this House. We were soft-hearted people and we fell. We agreed with the hon. member and we thought that after all, half a loaf was better than no bread, and we accepted the six months. It never was contemplated at the time that this period of six months was to be given in order that, as the Prime Minister said, the Government in that time

could exercise its discretion as to when an election should be brought on. If that is the view which he takes, he certainly has distorted what we considered should be the law and were willing to agree to, when the matter came before the House after the committee had reported.

I heartily concur in the views expressed by the leader of the Opposition (Mr. Mackenzie King) as to the necessity for bringing on these elections now. It may not suit the convenience of the Government to have these elections brought on; but, as has been said by every hon. member on this side who has spoken in this debate, it is in the interest of the country that the people of these disfranchised constituencies should have a right to have their views expressed on the floor of the House on the highly important matters which are to be brought before us within a very short time. Only a few evenings ago we heard the Minister of Trade and Commerce (Sir George Foster) declare, in the most solemn way, that, with regard to the railway situation, we are facing one of the most important crises in the history of the country since Confederation. Surely, every element of this population, of this community, has a right to be represented in this House when those important matters are to be discussed. I consider that the Government are making a serious tactical blunder when they refuse to allow this resolution to go through. The temper of the people is such that they cannot stand, as the hon. member for Shelburne and Queen's (Mr. Fielding) said, very much further hocus-pocus business in this House. Their temper is such that they want to have matters fully discussed; they want to know the financial condition of the country, and every constituency be represented in this House at this crucial moment. I for one am very glad to cast my vote in favour of the amendment which has been moved to-night by the leader of the Opposition.

The House divided on the amendment of Mr. Mackenzie King which was negatived on the following division:

YEAS

Messrs.

Béland,
Bourassa,
Boyer,
Brouillard,
Bureau,
Cahill,
Cannon,
Casgrain,
d'Anjou,
Délisle,
Demers,
Desaulniers,
Deslauriers,
DuTremblay,
Ethier,
Euler,
Fafard,
Fielding,
Fontaine,
Fournier,
Gauvreau,
Gervais,
Gordon,
Hunt,
Jacobs,
Johnston,
Kay,
Kennedy (Glengary and Stormont),
King,
Lanctôt,
Lapointe,
Leduc,
Léger,
Lesage,
McCoig
McDonald,
McKenzie,
McMaster,
Marcil (Bonaventure),
Marcile (Bagot),
Mayrand,
Murphy,
Pardee,
Parent,
Pedlow,
Pelletier,
Proulx,
Rinfret,
Robb,
Ross,
Savard,
Séguin,
Sinclair (Antigonish and Guysborough),
Stein,
Tobin,
Truax,
Turgeon,
Verville—58.

NAYS

Messrs.

Anderson,
Argue,
Armstrong (York),
Arthurs,
Ballantyne,
Ball,
Best,
Blair,
Bolton,
Bowman,
Boyce,
Boys,
Brien,
Bristol,
Butts,
Calder,
Caldwell,
Casselman,
Charlton,
Charters,
Clark (Bruce),
Clark (Red Deer),
Clements,
Cooper,
Cowan,
Crowe,
Davis,
Doherty,
Douglas (Strathcona),
Douglas (Cape Breton S. and Richmond),
Drayton (Sir Henry),
Edwards,
Fraser,
Fulton,
Glass,
Gould,
Green,
Griesbach,
Guthrie,
Halbert,
Halladay,
Harold,
Harrison,
Hay,
Hocken,
Keefer,
Kemp (Sir Edward),
Long,
MacKelvie,
Mackie (Edmonton),
Mackie (Renfrew),
MacNutt,
McDermand,
McGibbon (Muskoka),
McIsaac,
McQuarrie,
Manion,
Martin,
Meighen,
Merner,
Middlebro,
Morphy,
Mowat,
Munson,
Nesbitt,
Paul,
Peck,
Redman,
Reid (Grenville),
Sexsmith,
Shaw,
Simpson,
Smith,
Stacey,
Steele,
Stevens,
Stewart (Hamilton),
Stewart (Lanark),
Sutherland,
Thompson (Hastings),
Thompson (Yukon),
Thomson (Qu'Appelle),
Tolmie,
Tudhope,
Tweedie,
Wigmore,
Wilson (Wentworth),
Wilson (Saskatoon),
Wright—89.

PAIRS

(The list of Pairs is furnished by the Chief Whips).

Messrs.

Davidson,
Mewburn,
Borden,
Copp,
Power,
Papineau,

Armstrong (East Lambton),	Fortier,
McCurdy,	Vien,
Chabot,	Lemieux,
Hughes,	Denis,
Spinney,	Maclean (Halifax),
Blake,	Archambault,
Nicholson (East Algoma),	Boivin,
Henders,	Molloy,
Cruise,	Duff,
Nicholson (Queen's P.E.I.),	Sinclair (Queen's P.E.I.),
Bonnell,	White (Alta.),
Fripp,	Devlin,
Cockshutt,	McRae,
Thompson (Weyburn),	Chisholm.
Lalor,	Lafortune.

Mr. BOIVIN: I was paired with the hon. member for East Algoma, (Mr. Nicholson). Had I not been so paired, I would have voted for the amendment.

Mr. POWER: I was paired with the hon. member for East Hamilton (Mr. Mewburn). Had I not been so paired, I would have voted for the amendment.

Mr. ARCHAMBAULT: (Translation.) I was paired with the hon. member for North Winnipeg (Mr. Blake). Had I not been so paired, I would have voted for the amendment.

Mr. DENIS: (Translation). I was paired with the hon. member for Victoria (Sir Sam Hughes). Had I not been so paired, I would have voted for the amendment.

Mr. McGREGOR: I was paired with the hon. member for Maple Creek (Mr. Maharg). Had I voted, I would have voted against the amendment.

Main motion agreed to.

SUPPLY

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

Civil Government—Interior—Salaries, including F. Clapp, Acting Secretary to Minister, at $2,400, $1,353,922.50; contingencies, $115,000.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: I would ask my right hon. friend if he does not think it is a little early in the morning to begin taking up Estimates.

Mr. MEIGHEN: I do not know how the business of the House is to be done if we are always to have an amendment to the motion for Supply, and then land up too late at night to do any work. It is pretty late to be commencing Estimates, but it is important that the Estimates be considered, and we are getting on very, very slowly. Although the Government has brought the Estimates on every day for quite a length of time now, we have scarcely anything through.

Mr. CAHILL: May I ask who is the Minister of the Interior at the present time?

Mr. MEIGHEN: If the hon. gentleman does not know, it is the Hon. Sir James Lougheed.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: I should like again to speak to the Prime Minister. I think it is perfectly proper that matters of general and great public interest should be discussed. We need not necessarily end this session at a particular date as my right hon. friend has intimated this evening and if there is public business to be carried on we are prepared to stay here in Ottawa for a considerable period of time until it is done satisfactorily, but we do not wish to discuss the business of this country after midnight. We propose to do it at a time when we can give to it all the attention that it demands.

Mr. CLARK (Red Deer): Some of us are quite a long way from home and want something to do. I have wandered about Ottawa for five days now with little to do. I am an older man than the leader of the Opposition, but I am quite prepared to go on with the business of the House now. I have been in this House when we carried on business continuously day and night. I helped to do it, with the co-operation of my hon. friends. I am sure my hon. friends are not so old that they cannot stay and work for a little while yet.

Mr. BUREAU: I do not want to stay here all night, and I do not propose to stay here all night. If the hon. member for Red Deer does not go home that is his misfortune, not my fault. Apparently he has had a better rest than those who went home. Some go for pleasure and others go for work. I have not the advantage of being a gentleman farmer, and when I go home I have to do something. Let us begin by getting a little information. I notice an increase in this item of $42,250. How is that accounted for?

Mr. TOLMIE: That is accounted for entirely by statutory increases.

Mr. BUREAU: I find by the details on page 81 that we are providing salaries for assistant deputy, publicity assistant, and custodian of survey equipment. I do not know that there is anything in the statutes

providing for increases for these men. Then there is a senior statistical clerk; statistical clerk, forestry; statistical clerk, natural resources and intelligence. I thought all this work of collecting statistics was transferred to the Department of Trade and Commerce to co-ordinate the work and save money to the country. I should like some explanation.

Mr. TOLMIE: These men are engaged in the compilation of statistics with regard to our natural resources, and they come under the Interior Department.

Mr. BUREAU: The $42,250 is made up of increases to those men for the coming year?

Mr. TOLMIE: Yes, the statutory increases for all these positions.

Mr. BUREAU: They are entitled to these increases by statute?

Mr. TOLMIE: Yes.

Mr. BUREAU: Does that include the bonus?

Mr. TOLMIE: No.

Mr. SINCLAIR (Guysborough): The item calls for salaries for four editors. What do these four editors edit?

Mr. TOLMIE: These editors are connected with the various branches of the department, such as the Astronomical Branch. They edit the publications that are issued by the various branches of the Department of the Interior.

Mr. SINCLAIR (Guysborough): What publications does the department issue?

Mr. TOLMIE: It issues monthly bulletins regarding astronomical questions and other matters that are dealt with.

Mr. PARENT: Where are they printed?

Mr. TOLMIE: At the Bureau.

Mr. CAHILL: Is it the intention of the Government again to amalgamate the Department of the Interior and the Department of Immigration and Colonization? It seems that at the time the departments were separated it was a more matter of convenience for the Government to make an appointment, and I should like to know whether it is the intention to amalgamate them again?

Mr. MEIGHEN: The amalgamation has not been considered by the Government. The importance of the Immigration Department is such that it takes considerable time itself. I would not say that amalgamation may not be possible later on, but it must be remembered that the Mines Department has also been placed under the Minister of the Interior.

Mr. FOURNIER: Is there any talk about amalgamating the Department of the Interior and the Customs Department?

Mr. MEIGHEN: Oh no; there is no talk of that. I think the hon. gentleman means the Inland Revenue Department and the Customs. They are being amalgamated.

Mr. SINCLAIR (Guysborough): I am not entirely satisfied with the explanation in regard to the editors. My hon. friend told me that these four editors of monthly bulletins were being paid over $9,000 in salaries. Now, in the town in which I live I know an old gentleman of over 70 who issues a paper twice a week all alone. He does the whole work and his paper is a bigger thing than these monthly bulletins. I hope the minister does not mean to say that these gentlemen are working a whole month on these little bulletins.

Mr. MEIGHEN: Perhaps I may be excused if I say something on this subject, because I have some familiarity with it. The hon. member must not labour under the impression that these are new appointments. These editors have been in the service for many years, I think prior to 1911. The Astronomical Branch, which has charge of the observatories in Ottawa and Victoria, would not be performing its functions as such at all if it did not issue publications recording its achievements and observations, and these publications must necessarily be edited by a man who knows the work of the observatories. I am sure that Dr. Klotz could give the hon. member a more detailed explanation than I can. His staff has been so very much reduced that if the hon. gentleman met him he would listen to a wail of complaints at the parsimony of the Government in not granting more money for his observatories. I do not think there has been any increase; in fact, there has been a reduction. It is, of course, essential to have someone to edit the publication of this branch, and the same is true in regard to the natural resources branch. Its business is to compile into systematic and readable form information as to the natural resources of this country, and well has it performed its task. The head of the branch is Mr. Lynch, one of the ablest of public servants, ap-

pointed long before the Government of Sir Wilfrid went out of office; and without an editor that branch could not do its work. The same can be said of the Geodetic Survey. That is one great survey that is being conducted in the Dominion, and in relation to it all other surveys take their place. It is the primary one, to which other surveys are related and to which they are more or less subsidiary. Necessarily, its work takes the form of publications which must also be edited, and these editors are retained for this purpose.

Mr. POWER: I notice on page 82 a junior law clerk at $1,680, and a senior law clerk-stenographer at $1,500. Now, I have always been aware that I belong to a very poorly paid profession, but I did not think that a kind and benevolent Government such as this could imagine that after having gone through three or four years of study in a law school, any one who qualified for the position of law clerk in the employ of the Government would be worth only something like $100 more than an ordinary stenographer. I do not desire to ask the Government to spend more money; they have spent enough, the Lord only knows; but I think it is most unfair to the members of the profession to which I belong, to give them what I might call starvation wages.

Mr. ARCHAMBAULT: What is the name of the junior clerk?

Mr. POWER: Am I to receive an explanation from the minister as to how it is that a barrister receives only $100 or so more than a stenographer? I presume this is a barrister, and it does not seem reasonable.

Mr. TOLMIE: These are both stenographers who are familiar with law terms, and this classification is made by the Civil Service Commission.

Mr. POWER. I see that there are really three law clerks, two at $2,040 and one at $1,800. Will the minister explain what their duties and qualifications are, who are the present incumbents, when they were appointed, and from what universities they graduated? I forgot to add that there was a departmental solicitor, and I should like to know something about his qualifications too.

Mr. PARENT: Is he still alive?

Mr. TOLMIE: The duty of these men is to draw up grazing and mining conveyances and leases in connection with the Department of the Interior, and to do the usual law work appertaining thereto.

[Mr. Meighen.]

Mr. POWER: What are their names?

Mr. TOLMIE: One of them is Mr. W. McQuarrie; I am sorry I cannot give the other names.

Mr. PROULX: I know one of these law clerks, who happened to be one of my classmates at the law school. He has been a lawyer for a number of years and is receiving only $2,040, while I see on page 8 a young lady clerk is receiving $2,400 a year.

Mr. ARCHAMBAULT: She has other duties to perform.

Mr. PROULX: Was her salary fixed by the Civil Service Commission?

Mr. ARCHAMBAULT: What is her name?

Mr. PROULX: S. Clapp.

Mr. TOLMIE: This young lady has been designated as "Assistant Private Secretary." She had five years experience in Toronto law offices before coming to Ottawa, on February 9, 1917, as secretary to Mr. S. A. Armstrong, formerly assistant Provincial Secretary, Ontario, then Director of the Military Hospitals' Commission, and afterwards Deputy Minister of Soldiers' Civil Re-establishment. Miss Clapp was employed in this capacity until Mr. Armstrong left the department in July, 1918, when she was transferred to the minister's office as assistant private secretary. She was thus employed until October, 1920, when upon Sir James Lougheed being appointed Minister of the Interior, she was transterred to the Interior Department. Sir James Lougheed is now minister in charge of the following: Department of the Interior, Department of Indian Affairs, Department of Mines, Department of Soldiers' Civil Re-establishment, Board of Pension Commissioners, Soldiers' Settlement Board and is Government leader in the Senate. The ministers' secretarial work in connection with the foregoing is carried on by two private secretaries and Miss Clapp as assistant private secretary. Miss Clapp's salary as indicated in the Estimates will not carry with it the usual secretarial allowance of $600 or any other allowances. Miss Clapp's transfer does not make any increase in the secretarial staff of the office of the Minister of Interior.

Mr. BUREAU: Dispense.

Mr. PROULX: One of these clerks, who has had eighteen years' experience, is only

getting $2,040 while acording to the statement of the minister this young lady, with five years' experience only, is in receipt of $2,400. I do not think that the discrimination is at all fair.

Mr. TOLMIE: This young lady is assistant private secretary.

Mr. PROULX: How many secretaries are there to the Minister of Interior?

Mr. TOLMIE: Two private secretaries and one assistant private secretary. But he administers, as I have already pointed out, the Department of the Interior, the Department of Indian Affairs, the Department of Soldiers' Civil Re-establishment, the Board of Pension Commissioners, the Soldiers' Settlement Board, and is leader in the Senate.

Mr. CANNON: A short time ago the minister mentioned that a bulletin was published by the Department of the Interior, which bulletin, if I am not mistaken relates to astronomy. I would like to know from the minister if it is the custom of the department to print that bulletin in both languages? If my information is correct it is not published in French, although the subjects treated of in the bulletin are most interesting and should be published in French and distributed throughout our provinces, a proceeding which would be productive of good results. In making this request I am not asking favour, but simply asserting a right. The publications by the Department of the Interior are official documents issued under the authority of the Federal Government. Now, as is well known, English and French are official languages and therefore if the Department of the Interior, or any other department, wishes to publish bulletins, or monthly statements of any kind, these publications should be issued in both languages. There is this further reason for pursuing such a course: There are already translators in the department and it would be very easy for the minister to see that in future all publications by the department are printed in both languages. Then the population of my own province, as well as the population of the English provinces, would be able to take advantage of these publications. I think it will be sufficient to draw the attention of the minister to the matter to cause him to see that the present condition of things is immediately remedied.

Mr. TOLMIE: Some of the publications issued by the department are now published in French, but I will be very glad to bring what my hon. friend has said to the attention of the Minister of the Interior.

Mr. McCOIG: There seems to be some discrimination shown in the matter of increases. Some officials are drawing salaries of $4,000, others $3,000, and others again $2,500, or $2,000. These seem to be the officials who are getting increases whereas the poor fellow who is only paid $1,000 does not appear to be receiving any consideration. It appears to me that the men in humble positions—who have families to raise and clothe and educate just as the higher salaried men have—are entitled to some attention. If increases in stipend are being given, surely those men who receive only $1,000 a year are as much entitled to an increase as are the higher officials who are paid three or four thousand dollars a year?

Mr. TOLMIE: The remuneration is not now arranged by the department but by the Civil Service Commission who fix these increases from time to time.

Mr. BUREAU: There is a very strange item at page 32 of the Estimates where I notice that salaries are being voted for two senior messengers and also for eight messenger clerks. What work is performed by the clerks of these messengers may I ask?

Mr. TOLMIE: There are two senior messengers, one in the Natural Resources Branch, and the other in the deputy's office. "Messenger clerks" is the new designation given by the Civil Service Commission to ordinary messengers.

Mr. BUREAU: I think that designation ought to disappear from the Estimates. It may be all right to have senior messengers but why do you want to have messenger clerks for them? With all due respect to the Civil Service Commission they do not, so far, seem to know very much about the duties entrusted to them.

Mr. TOLMIE: These men have to perform the duties of an ordinary messenger, but occasionally they are employed in doing some little office work that does not strictly belong to their duties.

Mr. BUREAU: In that case call them messengers, why term them "messenger

clerks"? I move that the word "clerk" be stricken out of the designation.

Motion agreed to.

Mr. PEDLOW: I notice there is still another grade of messengers and that is "confidential messengers". I would like to know what duties these confidential messengers perform, and why they are so designated?

Mr. TOLMIE: The confidential messenger carries cash from one department to another and handles cheques. He has a good deal of responsibility as compared with the ordinary messenger.

Mr. ARCHAMBAULT: The other day when we were considering the Estimates of the Minister of Justice he gave an entirely different definition of a confidential messenger.

Mr. CANNON: But there is no money handled in his department.

Mr. TOLMIE: I have explained the duties of these men in the Department of the Interior. I do not know anything about how they do their work in the Department of Justice.

Mr. CANNON: It appears that salaries are voted for officials who look after the Government lands. I suppose these must be the lands held by the Federal Government in the western provinces. Is it the intention of the Government to come to any decision as to those western lands? I saw in the papers a few months ago that a conference of Western premiers had been held in Ottawa, and I would like to hear from the minister if the matters then discussed have been considered by the Cabinet and any conclusion reached in regard to the natural resources which have been claimed by the western provinces since their creation by the Laurier government fifteen years ago.

Mr. TOLMIE: This has been a live question in the West for many years, and the various provinces have made efforts to secure these Dominion lands. A meeting was held here within the last twelve or eighteen months and the matter was discussed, but up to the present time the Government has reached no definite conclusion in regard to the matter.

Mr. PARDEE: On page 81 I notice 3 Chief Map Draftsmen, 12 Principal Map Draftsmen, 30 Senior Map Draftsmen, 26 Map Draftsmen, 1 Junior Map Draftsman, 2 Principal Draftsmen, 4 Senior Draftsmen, 6 Draftsmen—86 in all. What are these Chief, Principal and Senior Map Draftsmen?

Mr. TOLMIE: These are all classifications made by the Civil Service Commission and cover the making of maps for the Lands Department, the Natural Resources Department, the Mines Department, the Observatories, and the Water Powers branch. The definition of Chief Map Draftsman is: supervising the preparation of sectional, topographical, geological, geographical, and other maps, corresponding with surveyors and others in connection with map preparation. The definition of Principal Draftsman: is supervising the compilation and plotting of survey maps and plans from notes, and assisting in the examination and checking of plans submitted by various district engineers and contractors.

Mr. McMASTER: Although there is a very considerable increase in these Estimates, the minister in charge of the department has made no suggestion whatever as to the possibility of cutting down expenses. I think the minister who is now endeavouring to pass these Estimates must realize the position in which the country finds itself. It is very hard in a committee such as this to make adequate criticisms of various items; we can only do our best from the information which the mere Estimate places before us. But in view of the present financial situation and of the fact that immigration is proceeding at a very slow rate, surely there should be an opportunity of cutting down expenses in this department. It is quite impossible for any private member to say just what officer should be let out, or just what expense could be curtailed; but we have got to cut our coat according to our cloth, and the only way to reduce the expense of government is by cutting down a little here and a little there. I do not suggest for a moment, Mr. Chairman, that salaries should be cut down, but I want to see better service given. It seems to me that in many offices a smaller personnel could do the work as efficiently, and perhaps more efficiently, than those who are presently engaged there. And that is what we would like to have from the minister,—some plan for cutting down expenses. Of course, it is not quite fair to ask this minister to talk about a department with which, after all, his connection is merely to get the Estimates through this House. His ability and courtesy always impress us, but look at the striking difference between to-night,

when he seeks information from the deputy on every point and has to keep us waiting in answering questions, and the facility with which he answered questions when he was passing his own Estimates. At that time it was a pleasure to ask him questions, for the information, accurate and interesting, simply flowed from him. Now, why have we not a right to have the Minister of the Interior, of this great spending department, in this House to answer for his own Estimates? Could anything be more striking as to the fitness of the stand taken the other day by the hon. member for North Waterloo (Mr. Euler) and other members on this side that these great spending departments should have their ministers sitting in this chamber? That is something which I wish to strongly impress upon the Government. We realize that the minister in his courteous and able manner is doing the best he can with these Estimates, but how can he do justice to the situation when he has to have recourse to his deputy and practically read all the information he gives us. And I believe in an eight-hour day. I do not think you will advance the business of the country by insisting on proceeding in the small hours of the morning. However, if it is thought wise to go on, of course we will endeavour to do our duty in this connection. But let me make this suggestion. I have in my hand a pamphlet dealing with adjustment of geodetic triangulation in the provinces of Ontario and Quebec, publication No. 2. I presume this pamphlet has been distributed to every member of the House; at any rate, I made no special application for it yet I find it in my box. Now, I defy the minister, who belongs to a learned profession, to make head or tail out of this geodetic triangulation. It is all higher mathematics. The member for North Cape Breton asks me to explain some of the diagrams. I can no more do that than I can talk Gaelic; it is beyond me. My learned and hon. friend from Dorchester suggests that this pamphlet is published with the intention of bringing the two provinces together along geometrical lines. But the point I want to make in all seriousness is that although these pamphlets may be of interest to highly trained technical men, such as surveyors and engineers, to send them broadcast throughout even the House of Commons is a pure waste of public money. These are suggestions which I throw out for the time being, and if the minister who is in charge of the department can help us by suggesting how public money can be saved in the conduct of it, we will all gratefully listen to him.

Mr. TOLMIE: The pamphlet which the hon. gentleman has just referred to is for the use of surveyors and other professional men. These pamphlets are distributed in the various provinces and exchanged with other countries for similar publications. With regard to running this department in an economical way, I may say, the minister is at present engaged in a general reorganization with a view to effecting a substantial saving. There are no increases other than the statutory increases. He is retiring a number of employees who are getting up in years and he is combining a number of branches with a view to making a saving. I shall be glad to bring to his attention when he returns the fact that this matter was mentioned by the hon. member for Brome.

Mr. CANNON: Can the minister make such a reorganization of his personnel without the consent of the Civil Service Commission?

Mr. TOLMIE: By the combination of branches, I think he can move a considerable distance in that direction.

Mr. CANNON: But how far?

Mr. TOLMIE: Sufficiently to obtain very much better results through the combination of staffs in different branches.

Mr. CANNON: I would direct the attention of the committee to a most extraordinary condition of things. When hon. members ask for information in connection with railways they are told that the information cannot be furnished because the railways are managed by a body independent of the Government. If we turn to the Mercantile Marine we are told that it also is run by a separate corporation and that details and information will be supplied by that corporation and not by the Government. Then, when we put questions in connection with civil employees in other departments we are told that the Civil Service Commission, another body independent of the Government, is responsible, not the Government itself. This is a very serious condition and every hon. member should try to bring about a change. If we are to have responsible government in Canada, members are not to be referred to outside bodies when they ask for information; if so we might just as well abolish the House of Commons. Under our constitution the House of Commons is supposed to have the power of the purse, but I doubt very much whether we have that power. Hundreds of millions are spent every year on our railways and

hon. members cannot obtain any information in connection with them; the managing body can spend what it likes and the House of Commons has to pay. The same is true of the Mercantile Marine. Now, when we come to the civil service, if there is any body of persons who should be responsible to the representatives of the people it is certainly the civil employees. Even when the Minister of Agriculture was explaining his Estimates he stated on a number of occasions in answer to inquiries from this side: I cannot give the information; that matter is settled by the Civil Service Commission. I say that if this system continues, both the power of the purse and responsible government will disappear. The minister ought to be master of his department; if he is not, who is? If the ministers who compose the Cabinet are not masters of their various departments, it is about time we should know who runs this country.

Mr. BUREAU: The Civil Service Commission.

Mr. CANNON: Apparently the Civil Service Commission runs it so far as the Civil Service employees are concerned. The Toronto financiers run it so far as the railways are concerned, and as to who runs the boats we shall know that when the marine Estimates come before the House. The condition which prevails in Ottawa is unbearable, and unless there is protest from both sides of the House—because every member is interested—unless there is a strong and earnest movement to bring about the re-establishment of constitutional institutions in Canada as they existed before the war, we shall wake up and find that we have in this country not responsible government, but autocratic government. It is to be regretted that the head of this department we are now considering, in connection with which such a large amount of public money is spent, is not in the House to furnish the necessary explanations. He is replaced, it is true, by a very sympathetic minister; in fact I think the Minister of Agriculture was chosen purposely because his colleagues know how sympathetic he is to this side. We have confidence in the Minister of Africulture so far as his own department is concerned; we know that every cent we have voted for his department will be well spent. But the moneys which we give to-night, if we give any, will be spent, not by my hon. friend, but by another minister whom we do not know even by sight, for he sits in the Senate. My hon. friend is not in a position to give to the committee the information which it desires. The member for Brome asked whether it is possible to reduce the expenses of the department. That is a fair question, but the minister cannot answer it because he has not the information. Indeed, he could not do it even if he were the head of the department, because judging from the answer which he has just given he would have to apply to the Civil Service Commission before he could reduce the personnel of the staff.

The minister, in answer to a question which I put in connection with the Dominion lands in the West, told me that the matter was under advisement. That was a very diplomatic answer, but without discussing this question on its merits I would point out that the financial situation in Canada is very bad. Every hon. gentleman realizes the necessity for a reduction in expenditure with a view to the stabilizing of our financial condition and status. Why should not the Government cease giving vast sums of money to the different provinces for roads, technical schools, housing schemes, and other different things? Those grants are given, not because the older provinces need them. The older provinces are in a better financial condition than the federal government is. The credit of the province of Quebec is by far higher than that of the Dominion of Canada. Quebec does not need any of these federal credits; we do not want them; let the Government keep the little money they have. Some hon. gentlemen opposite might say: "If the eastern provinces do not need that money, maybe the western provinces need it." Instead of taking money that we do not possess in the Federal treasury and giving it to the western provinces, why not stop those grants and give to the western provinces their natural resources? They would then have large revenues that would meet their expenditures, and Manitoba, Saskatchewan and Alberta could carry on the government of these provinces without calling on the Federal Government for assistance. This is a very important question. I see some of my western friends in their seats, and we should, to-night, endeavour to secure from the Government a more definite answer on this all-important question of Dominion lands in the western provinces. These remarks are addressed to the minister in entirely good faith. I know he is not in a position to speak with full authority as regards the Department of the Interior; but next to him I see the Minister of Justice

1 a.m.

(Mr. Doherty), and I am quite sure that nothing of any great importance would be decided without that right hon. gentleman being consulted, so that if the Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Tolmie) cannot furnish the information, I am quite sure the Minister of Justice and the Prime Minister will do so.

Mr. MEIGHEN: I do not know that the subject of natural resources is connected with the Civil Government Estimates, but I shall be glad to make a short answer to the hon. gentleman. The question of natural resources has occupied the attention of government and of political parties for some time. I have no doubt the hon. member will recall a somewhat celebrated, but, I think, very often lamented convention that was held in the city of Ottawa in August, 1919, at which convention, amongst other resolutions—almost innumerable others—a resolution was passed referring to this very question. That resolution called for the transfer to the western provinces of their natural resources on terms that would be fair to the other provinces of Confederation. With the principle of that resolution, coupled with the condition—I have no fault to find. I might remark though, in passing, that the natural resources were reserved from the provinces of Alberta and Saskatchewan, initially by hon. gentlemen opposite, and the complications that are now involved in any question of the retransfer all arise from the fact that those resources were initially withheld.

Mr. McKENZIE: Were they not withheld from Manitoba in the same way?

Mr. MEIGHEN: They were withheld from Manitoba, I forget the year, but shortly after Confederation.

Mr. McKENZIE: But on the same principle when the province was created.

Mr. MEIGHEN: The same principle, I know.

Mr. CANNON: What about the extension of Manitoba?

Mr. MEIGHEN: When the natural resources were withheld from Manitoba and Manitoba requested to be put in the same position as Alberta and Saskatchewan, the same had to apply to the extension of Manitoba; there was nothing else to do. That is what Manitoba asked for; that is what Manitoba received.

Mr. SINCLAIR (Guysborough): The reservation was made first for Manitoba, and my right hon. friend says that we are responsible for Saskatchewan and Alberta. Who was responsible for Manitoba?

Mr. MEIGHEN: The government of the day that made the reservation.

Mr. CAHILL: Who were they?

Mr. MEIGHEN: I am not sure. My statement anyway is correct that hon. gentlemen are responsible in respect of Saskatchewan and Alberta.

Mr. McKENZIE: Following your precedent.

Mr. SINCLAIR (Guysborough): It is the same old tu quoque argument.

Mr. MEIGHEN: The hon. gentleman himself was jumping at it a moment ago; he should not despise it now. I am not making anything in the way of a tu quoque argument; I am simply stating the facts and the difficulties in the way of this question. They arise from the fact that the resources were reserved; that they did not pass to the provinces. Whatever the reasons were that moved governments of the day to reserve those resources, the fact is that they were reserved, and that public policy since then has adjusted itself to that situation, public policy in respect of not only subsidies but every policy that appertains to western Canada and, much more, appertains to eastern Canada. Scarcely a step has been taken in regard to administration and the laying out of lines of policy as to the west, that has not been dictated in part by the fact that those resources were reserved. For example, as regards railway policies, under the responsibility of the Federal Government lines of railway were projected, were entered into that probably would not have been entred into, but the fact that the resources were reserved. In respect of water-power, in respect of irrigation, obligations were undertaken that undoubtedly would not have been undertaken but for the fact that such resources were reserved. I could go from one thing to another; all these things have been incurred, and the proportion of outlay of the federal Government that is attributable to the fact that the resources were reserved is something that it is virtually impossible to ascertain. It is just like attempting, after a long series of years, to go back and under a process that is long and involved. An accounting will not do it; indeed, it is impossible to get at anything that can be said to be an exact return of justice to those provinces and, at the same time, fair

to the others. At every point of the process some difficulty arises that virtually involve the whole question and makes us determine what would have been done if such and such had not been the case, something that no one can, with any certainty, determined at all. Consequently, when a Government, however anxious it may be to solve this problem, to return the resources to the western provinces, sets about to get a solution based upon any principle at all, it is met with difficulties that are almost insurmountable when you take into account the fact that the other provinces must consider the solution fair. Hon. gentlemen opposite have acceded to the principle that a solution cannot be found which does not take into account the fairness that applies to the other provinces that have been parties to the subsidies the West has obtained arising from that reservation. We have attempted time after time to get a solution; we have not succeeded. We are still engaged in the effort, and we are sincerely anxious to obtain a solution. If hon. gentlemen were in power, I think they would be anxious to obtain a solution, but they would meet precisely the same difficulties which we have encountered. I do not think, however, we would find the hon. member for Antigonish and Guysborough (Mr. Sinclair) ready to accede to anything that western Canada would agree to. None of the western provinces has as yet agreed to accept any deduction from its subsidies, got in lieu of lands if the resources are transferred. They take the ground that the resources should be transferred and the subsidies retained, because they maintain that already sufficient resources have been alienated, as they express it, to make up for the subsidies. That is the position of the matter.

Mr. SINCLAIR (Guysborough): I happened to be a member of the House at the time the western provinces were organized, and I recollect distinctly the discussions that took place on that occasion. The decision that was arrived at was this, that it would not be wise at that stage of the progress of the Dominion to hand over to the western provinces the lands, because the immigration policy was in the hands of the Dominion Government and it was thought that the two should go together, so that when the Dominion Immigration Department found a good settler in Europe and brought him to Canada they should be able to place him on the land without any interference by the local legislatures of these new provinces. The Parliament of that day arrived at a solution by contributing a larger sum of money to the western provinces. That was regarded as fair by the representatives of the western provinces at that time, so the matter was settled in that way, and that large subsidy has been paid to the western provinces ever since that date. If they claim their lands now, it will be necessary, of course, for them to account for the money that has been paid to them during all these years since the western provinces were organized. That is only fair to the other provinces. I have no desire to inflict any injury on the western provinces; my only desire is to arrive at a fair solution. I should like to know whether my right hon. friend agrees with the decision that was arrived at by the premiers of all the provinces when this matter was dealt with, to the effect that the rights of the other provinces had to be recognized, and that the eastern provinces, as well as the western, have certain rights in this matter. Does my right hon. friend agree with the decision that was arrived at by the premiers of the various provinces? The position that has been taken by my right hon. friend and by some other gentlemen from the West for some years past, as I understand it, has been that the natural resources of the western provinces should be handed over to them now, the western provinces retaining the large subsidies that were given to them in lieu of their resources. Is that his position at the present time?

Mr. MEIGHEN: I do not know to what agreement between the premiers my hon. friend refers. I would be very much surprised if he can find what was agreed on by the premiers of the provinces of Canada.

Mr. SINCLAIR (Guysborough): My right hon. friend quoted it a moment ago. He said that it was to be done with regard to the rights of the other provinces.

Mr. MEIGHEN: I will refer to that in a moment. I understood the hon. gentleman to say that the premiers of the different provinces had come to some agreement in respect to this matter. If they have, I would be delighted to be informed of what it was. I do not think they ever agreed on anything, and I may possibly be permitted to express despair that they ever will. The hon. member says that if the western provinces get their resources, they must account for the moneys they have received ever since these subsidies were granted in lieu of resources. I under-

stand him to mean that they should pay that money back. I want to tell him right now there is not one Government of the three Prairie Provinces that would consider that for one moment. They have never agreed as yet, even to a deduction in any degree whatsoever from the subsidies payable in future in lieu of lands. I communicated with the premiers of all the provinces by letter, prior to our last conference, and told them that if any substantial progress was to be made they should let us know what they were ready to do. Were they ready to accept a deduction in subsidy in lieu of lands, or were they ready to wipe it out? I got no affirmative answer. They take this ground now. They say: You were trustees for us for these lands. Now we ask you to account for everything you have got, and not only everything you have got, but for everything you should have got; if you had a piece of land homesteaded, for instance, instead of selling it, you should pay us the amount you could have sold it for. You account to us as trustees, and we will account to you for the subsidies received. I pointed out that at every stage of the accounting the whole question would come into view at once as to what appropriations of this Parliament were made because the lands were reserved to us, and what were not. I do not think the wit of man could ever tell that. In respect to immigration, for instance, could it be told? Are you going to ascribe all the expenditure this Government has been put to for immigration in all these years to the fact that these lands were reserved, and reserved for immigration purposes? I do not think you should. It is true some of it was, but can any human being tell how much was? I do not think so. Nor could any human being tell what money was spent by this Government in respect of railways, in respect of water-powers, in respect of irrigation, in respect of many of these subjects arising from that fact. It could not be done by any process of accounting. You might make some rough attempt at a conclusion, but that is all it would be. I have urged upon the premiers of the different provinces that they should be ready to say just what they would be ready to do in respect to a deduction of the subsidy. If they are not prepared to accept any deduction at all, let them say so, and then we will say whether we consider it fair or not; but they have made no statement in that regard. That is the position at the present time.

Mr. GOULD: I should like to say a word or two on the question of natural resources, since it has come up. I recollect quite distinctly in the year 1905, members of the then Federal Government coming into our province to endeavour to persuade the electors that the subsidies to be granted to the provinces in lieu of our natural resources was the best thing that could happen to the provinces. Now, I am not yet prepared to admit that the electorate of the Province of Saskatchewan really believed the statements that were made to them at that time, although perhaps the vote in the elections might show that they did. I myself took the view at that time, as I do to-day, that the natural resources of the province of Saskatchewan rightly belonged to the province. While under that influence we accepted the subsidy, the question has always been a very live one in the West and we have made repeated requests to different Governments and Oppositions that our natural resources be given back to us. I was one of a committee of three that waited upon the leader of the Opposition in the year 1911 in the city of Weyburn, and when we made the request that the natural resources should be handed over to the province we received the very positive statement that immediately upon the accession to office of the Conservative party of that time our natural resources would be handed to us. We accepted that statement in good faith, but as soon as the party got into power other considerations entered in, and obstacles were raised. Up to the present time I do not know that there has been as much earnestness shown by the Federal Government as has been shown by the provincial governments in an effort to get what we claim is simple justice.

I do not wish at this time to discuss the natural resources, as the subject is somewhat foreign to the question before us, but I think a resolution on the subject should be brought into the House later on. Representatives of our group will have something to say on that question.

I wish to endorse what has been said by the hon. member for Dorchester as to the minister who is in charge of these Estimates not being in a position to make the positive statements that I believe the House should have. It is deplorable, from my

point of view at least, that we should ask for information and be unable to receive a positive declaration from the minister giving us the precise facts asked for. When his own Estimates were before the House he could give us positive and reassuring statements, but to-night, in answer to questions by hon. gentlemen, all he can say is "I think this" and "I think that," which I submit must be absolutely unsatisfactory to all hon. members who listen to the minister. I am sure that the minister himself must feel that in those circumstances he is handicapped in his efforts to give to the House such information as it has a right to expect. I do not know what to suggest in order to improve things, but I do think that almost any condition would be as good as the present. A large amount of money is being expended in this department, and I am sure the tax payers will demand some positive answers to the questions that are asked by hon. members. The older members of the House can perhaps suggest ways and means whereby we may be able to obtain the information we require. Personally, I think that it is certainly due to hon. members that definite answers should be made in reply to such queries as they put to the Government, and I do seriously submit that the present state of affairs is not satisfactory.

Mr. BUREAU: This is a large item and, as has been said, the Government has chosen for the purpose of putting it through an hon. gentleman who enjoys the greatest degree of sympathy on our side. Now, we are willing to show our sympathy by meeting him half way, and if it is agreed that we shall adjourn after the passage of this item, we will let it pass.

Mr. POWER: No.

Mr. BUREAU: We can let this item pass if the Government agrees to adjourn.

Mr. MEIGHEN: I should really like to have another department, that of Labour, entered upon, but I am prepared to accept the terms of the hon. member. We should surely get some more business done another night, however, and I sincerely trust that if another amendment comes on we shall be able to confine the debate thereon within reasonable limits.

Mr. CAHILL: I desire some information regarding the regulations appertaining to oil leases, which, I understand, are under the department. As these items are going through we find, from time to time, that it is impossible to go back in order to obtain information on subjects that have already been disposed of. The leader of the Government sometimes evinces a denseness in comprehending some remarks of hon. members on this side, and it is possible that when we come to some other item that may be in this department, we will find it convenient to press the Chairman to restrict the members on this side to the subject immediately under consideration. Now, there has been a great change in the regulations concerning oil leases in western Canada. The minister in charge of these Estimates may not be as familiar with the regulations as is the Prime Minister, who was previously in charge of this department. Will the right hon. gentleman inform me what led to the conclusion that the leases should not be allowed in future, as in the past, for prospectors to locate on Dominion lands with a view to prospecting for oil in Northern Alberta, or British Columbia, or elsewhere? I do not know whether there is any other item in these Estimates that might afford an opportunity for putting this question, and I am anxious to have this information, because the matter is of considerable importance to the people of western Canada at the present time.

Mr. MEIGHEN: There is no doubt as to the importance of the subject. The hon. member could undoubtedly bring up the discussion in several ways. He could introduce it under the item for Dominion Lands and Parks. That would be the proper item under which to discuss it, but of course it could not be taken up to-night; or he could have brought it up on a motion made some little time ago by the member for East Edmonton (Mr. Mackie), which was debated at some length; or on two or three other motions which are still on the Order Paper, if they are not disposed of, by the same hon. member. In the debate on the motion of the hon. member for West Edmonton (Mr. Griesbach), I went into the subject in some detail. I have no doubt the hon. member for Pontiac (Mr. Cahill) was not here—

Mr. CAHILL: Yes, I was, but no specific answer was given.

Mr. MEIGHEN: Oh my, yes; I gave a rather complete answer as to why the leases were changed.

An hon. MEMBER: What was it?

Mr. MEIGHEN: I am afraid I cannot give as complete a statement to-night as I gave on that occasion. At that time I had a memorandum on the subject. However,

I can give a little information regarding the matter. In the first place, I do not think there has been any material change in respect to the provinces my hon. friend refers to, that is, in respect to Dominion lands in Alberta, the Peace River belt, and the railway belt—the only parts we control —and Saskatchewan and Manitoba. From the best of my recollection, the only changes there, are in regard to the imposition of royalty, which it was thought was justified in the public interest, in order that the people as a whole might get some share of these resources, which are the property of the people of Canada. But there was a pretty substantial change in regard to the North West Territories lands, for the reason that it was felt that after the Fort Norman discovery, that field could be legitimately regarded, not as one for prospectors only, but as a proven field, where the existence of oil in quantity had been established, and consequently it was considered that the regulations should be altered so as to give that protection to the public interest that was justified, after the time of experiment had passed and the time of actually proven field had come. That is the reason for the change. It was felt that as oil in quantity had actually been discovered, it was not unjust that we should change the regulations so as to bring a larger share of the ultimate result to the treasury. Consequently, it was provided that only one section in four should be finally taken by the locator, the other three reverting to the Crown, and also that the royalties therein provided for, should be reserved to the Crown. Now, I have given the hon. gentleman the reasons. The matter is under consideration to-day. You may go so far in restrictions as to discourage exploitation, and it is under consideration whether or not some fair priority right to the other three sections, 640 acres, might not in fairness be reserved to the man whose courage and venture are responsible for the location of the first section. That is under consideration; I cannot intimate whether it shall be done or not. Now, I have stated concisely the reason why the change was made in these regulations; it was because of a change in circumstances. The field passes from one fit only for a prospector in the hope that oil might be found, to a field where oil has been found, or what is known as a proven field.

Mr. CAHILL: Have the regulations, since the passing of that Order in Council, been strictly lived up to, or have any filings been allowed since then?

Mr. MEIGHEN: So far as I know, they have been strictly lived up to. The Order as first passed had, I think, a certain retroactive effect which was afterwards removed. I am not sure that I can give the exact date or the circumstances. There were certain applications for leases which would have to be denied under the regulations as first passed, and on representations made by very many it was felt that that was unjust, and the retroactive effect was removed. Every regulation has been lived up to, so far as I am aware, and I would be very much surprised if the Minister of the Interior did not insist that they be lived up to.

Mr. CAHILL: I understood the Prime Minister to say that a man was now permitted to take in one whole section, whereas previously he could take in a tract not exceeding in all nineteen hundred and forty acres.

Mr. MEIGHEN: Nineteen hundred and twenty acres.

Mr. CAHILL: Was that the regulation and is it still in force?

Mr. MEIGHEN: I cannot say just how he was allowed to take it. Previously he was allowed to have 1920 acres, but now he can only have 640 under the regulations as they stand in the Territories. I explained in detail the other day how the area might be taken out. I think I can recall the explanation and it is this: He can take out as much as four sections, or 2,560 acres, in four rectangular blocks. That is, he can file upon four restangular blocks aggregating not more than 2,560 acres, but within a certain period after he has had time to determine what he wants, if he has paid rent on the whole thing for one year, he then must select a square block containing not more than 640 acres, and in respect of that alone he gets a lease, that is all he is entitled to. At present it is under consideration whether he should not have the same right to the remaining three-quarters, in priority to others who may come after him and share the advantage of the risk that he ran.

Mr. CAHILL: Could the Prime Minister tell us what extent of land was leased on the retroactive policy as enunciated by him? He says that there were some people who had made claims to leases, and that they were allowed a retroactive right.

Mr. MEIGHEN: I could not give the number of applications or the extent of lands to which they referred. I did hear the figures but could not now recall them. I think there were quite a number.

Mr. CAHILL: Could the Prime Minister give the names of the people who made these applications?

Mr. MEIGHEN: I do not think I could give the name of a single applicant.

Mr. CAHILL: Could the Prime Minister tell me whether a General Lindsay secured any lands under that arrangement?

Mr. MEIGHEN: I could not tell my hon. friend definitely, but I do not think so. The hon. gentleman's reference to General Lindsay must be in regard to another incident altogether.

Mr. CAHILL: That may or may not be the case.

Mr. MEIGHEN: If it is not then I do not know anything about it. I do not think General Lindsay had any oil lands at all. So far as I know he had none except to this extent: he had a lease, made while I was Minister of the Interior, in respect of a certain area of land upon which he had the right to perform certain experiments in order to discover whether or not oil could be commercially produced from th oil sands. That is what General Lindsay got. I remember revising that lease over and over again after it was submitted to me by the officers of the department, and it finally went through. Whether General Lindsay has made much progress or not in his experiments I do not know, but I sincerely hope he has. So far as I know, or have ever heard, General Lindsay took out no leases of oil lands beyond what this particular contract made with the department gave him a right to have.

Mr. CAHILL: When was that arrangement of which the Prime Minister speaks made with General Lindsay?

Mr. MEIGHEN: I will have to speak from recollection purely. I think it was about the spring of last year. I left the department in July and the arrangement was made, I would think, within six months of the time I left and at least three months before.

Mr. POWER: On page 81 I notice that mention is made of a gentleman who holds a very lowly position, having regard to the salary paid him. He gets a salary of $1,000 and occupies the position of cabinet maker. I would have suggested to the Prime Minister that when he left the Department of the Interior he should have brought his cabinet maker with him, or rather have brought a cabinet reconstructor. Had he done that it would have saved him a great deal of the difficulty which, I understand, he has experienced since he became Prime Minister. Had he brought with him a gentleman learned in the art of cabinet making when he succeeded to the position of Prime Minister I have no doubt he would have succeeded better and would not have to encounter the serious difficulties which confront him at present. All that by way of coming to the question as to what the cabinet maker does in the department. What are the duties of this cabinet maker, and what has he got to do with Dominion lands?

Mr. TOLMIE: The cabinet maker in the Department of the Interior repairs furniture. He also makes boxes for shipping or moving specimens about from one place to another, and is a general handy man in any work around the department that requires the use of tools.

Mr. POWER: May I ask the Minister whether the department has at its disposal the miniature natural resources cabinets which formerly were distributed to schools of a certain grade—cabinets filled, I think with specimens of the different minerals of the country? If so, I would like to know if these cabinets can now be obtained from the department?

Mr. TOLMIE: There are none in the Department of the Interior, but they may still be issuing them in connection with the Mines Branch. I will get that information for my hon. friend when we take up the Estimates of that branch.

Mr. PARENT: I am sorry that at this late hour we are obliged to let the item pass without having full information in regard to a good many details. For instance, I notice that on page 80 of the Estimates reference is made to an International Boundary Commissioner and a Surveyor General. I would like to find out whether the duties of the two gentleman are identical or not? I would also like to ascertain whether the Surveyor General has drawn a line showing the boundary between Labrador and the Province of Quebec, and what lands are possessed by Newfound-

land and the Province of Quebec, repesctively, in the Ungava district?

Mr. MEIGHEN: The Surveyor General and the International Boundary Commissioner are by no means the same man. The Surveyor General is Doctor Deville and the Boundary Commissioner is Mr. J. J. McCarthy. That is the answer to the hon. gentleman's first question. In reply to his next question as to the work of the International Boundary Commission, I understand all that the commission has to do is simply complete the preparation of the reports. The work has been tapering off for some time and, I believe, is now complete. As to whether the Surveyor General has delimited the boundary between Newfoundland and Canada on the Labrador coast, I have no doubt that that boundary is laid out in the main and can be located all right as it is placed by Canada. It should be located by Canada and the province of Quebec. The location, I believe, is now under way, though it has never been actually brought to a head. I have always felt that the province of Quebec is chiefly concerned in this matter, and that when it is brought to a head the province of Quebec and the Dominion should be specially represented by counsel. I do not know just what is delaying the matter now, but I am quite certain that if at any time the province of Quebec wishes to go ahead their wishes will be very carefully, and probably sympathetically, considered.

Mr. PEDLOW: I find that out of 822 employees in this department there are 524 clerks and clerk stenographers. I see there are 339 clerks and 185 stenographers, or 524 out of a total of 822 employees in this department. What class of work are these clerks and stenographers doing, and are they fully employed all the time? If they are not fully employed, is it the intention to reduce the staff and cut down expenses?

Mr. TOLMIE: These clerks are all fully engaged in the various departments, such as the mines department, the lands department, the natural resources branch, the mines branch, the observatories and the waterways. It is the intention of the minister to reorganize the various branches and to economize. He is already combining certain branches to lessen the staff; and while the Civil Service Commission makes the appointments and fixes the salaries, he has the right to dismiss any of his staff for whom he has no work. With the exception of the statutory increases this year, there has been no increase in this department.

Mr. CANNON: I see there is a small vote for the Commissioner of Dominion Parks. If my memory serves me right the Prime Minister last year introduced legislation concerning our Dominion parks. Have any new parks been formed under this law; if so, where?

Mr. MEIGHEN: I am informed that no new parks have been constituted. The Commissioner of Dominion Parks is Mr. Harkin, a very old public servant. I do not know that I have quite in mind the legislation the hon member refers to. Was it an Act providing for the creation of new parks?

Mr. CANNON: It was passed two years ago if I am not mistaken.

Mr. MEIGHEN: I remember something was done as to Point Pelee shortly afterwards. I have before me a list of all the parks: Rocky Mountains park, Yoho park, Glacier park, Revelstoke park, Kootenay park, Jasper park, Waterton lakes, St. Lawrence islands, Broder park—this park was created in 1919—Buffalo park, Elk island, Foremost Antelope reserve, Fort Howe, Fort Anne, Port Pelly park reserve, Point Pelee. Two of those parks have been created since the passing of the Act referred to by the hon. member.

Mr. PARENT: What are the duties of the superintendent of the Natural Resources Intelligence department?

Mr. MEIGHEN: That gentleman is Mr. Lynch, to whom I referred some time ago. The Natural Resources Intelligence department collects and distributes intelligence respecting the natural resources of Canada.

Mr. CAHILL: I noticed in the press a few days ago that two townships were to be taken out of the Riding Mountain park in the Dauphin district. My recollection is that that is a rolling country of a more or less sandy nature, and a few years ago it would not have been considered as at all fit for settlement. Are these lands of first class quality? What was the report of the surveyor general when he originally surveyed these lands?

Mr. MEIGHEN: The hon. gentleman is quite right as to the Riding Mountain park being rolling country and generally light as to soil. The Government was urged, according to my recollection solely by returned men, to open certain parts of that park that were suitable for farming. The Parks

branch usually resists anything being taken out of the parks, and the Forestry branch almost invariably resists. Consequently a survey was made by officers jointly, and as a result of that survey very small areas were authorized by Parliament to be taken out. I think that only part of what was authorized was taken out. The amount found fit for cultivation was relatively very small indeed.

Mr. CAHILL: The newspaper report mentioned two townships. I would think it would be impossible to get that area of good land in the Riding Mountain park. What was the area taken out, and was it taken in consecutive sections?

Mr. MEIGHEN: The exact area taken out can be obtained, and I will secure the information. I know, speaking from memory, there was nothing like two townships taken out, and I think the newspaper report must be in error in that regard. I think there were isolated pieces taken at three or four different points.

Mr. CAHILL: The newspaper report may have been in error.

Mr. MEIGHEN: It may have been right, but I do not think so.

Mr. CAHILL: I am quite willing to accept the Prime Minister's word as to that. I always accept his statements here when I have to. But I am not asking now for what may be nearly accurate, but for accurate information from the department, and I do not think the Prime Minister will attempt to argue that such a request is unfair. I presume that these sections or quarter sections of land were at least on the fringe of the reserve. I hope it has not been the custom of the department to go in and select portions of land in the interior of the reserve for settlers to take up. I do not think the minister could expect members of the Opposition to quietly sit down and allow the Government to dispose of all the parks without asking some questions, nor do I think that he should resent the asking of questions about any of our parks. Certainly the minister in charge of the Estimates should have information about this transaction. I think that he should be in a position to state what portions have been taken and under what conditions they have been taken—whether or not the land has been passed as good agricultural land. I can understand that there are Indian reserves and park reserves adjacent to settlement, in some cases close to railways, that a settler would take in preference to better land in a district further away from settlement or from railways, but whether it would be good business to allow such lands to be taken up simply because of their more desirable location is another question and a question for the Government to answer. If those lands are not first-class farm lands it is a question open to debate whether the Government should allow them to be settled on. The Minister of Agriculture had the experience in Kapuskasing in Northern Ontario of settling people on land where they could make no headway, and the Ontario Government has since taken them out of there. A similar condition might arise with respect to settlements on the western lands controlled by the Government. Unless the land will provide a living for the returned soldier, he should not be allowed to settle on it. I would like from the minister in charge of the Estimates a report of the surveyors—not only the recent report but the original report, because these lands were originally surveyed some forty years ago and in each case the Surveyor-General made an accurate report of the condition of the land. Is the minister prepared to take the responsibility of placing returned soldiers on this land whether they are experienced men or not?

Mr. MEIGHEN: The Act stipulated the land that was authorized to be taken out. When the Act was passed full information was given to the House as to why it was passed and as to the reports upon which it was based. I do not know whether or not all that was authorized to be taken out was taken out or what the area was; no minister and no officer would carry that in his head. I have said to the hon. member that the exact area will be given to him while these Estimates are before the committee.

Mr. CAHILL: The Prime Minister seems to imply that every member on this side should know of all legislation and every Order in Council that is passed and of everything that takes place in this House. It has been the custom for the Government to state each evening what business will be taken up in the House the next day. At the last sitting the Prime Minister said that certain Estimates would be brought up, and members who were not interested in those two items—perhaps I should say "departments", because the right hon. gentleman called me to order the other day for using the word "item" instead of "department"—members of the Opposition who were not particularly interested in the

departments which were to be taken up might not think it necessary to be in their places in the House. After giving us his assurance that two specific departments would be taken up, the Prime Minister came down to-day and moved to go into supply on an entirely different department. I thought I heard the Minister of Marine make a statement to the House to-day, and I thought I heard a letter read from the Prime Minister to the leader of the Opposition stating that the Minister of Marine wished to make a statement. During the discussion on that statement it was impossible for members of the Opposition to know whether it was the intention to go into the Marine Estimates or not; of course, if you went into the matter when the Estimates were up, the chairman would very properly tell you that you should not object to the principle of the Merchant Marine while any single item was being dealt with. If the Prime Minister will continue the practice which, I understand, has been in vogue for many years, of giving information in a straightforward way so that members of the Opposition shall have an intimation of what to expect on the following day, he will, perhaps, find not quite so much opposition to some of the things which he wishes to do. All hon. members on this side, I am sure, are quite anxious to oppose most of the measures of the Government because their measures as a rule are opposed to the principles of Liberalism. But there are some members on this side—I am not speaking for myself now—who have no desire to obstruct legislation or to obstruct Estimates, and if the minister in charge wishes to make such fine distinctions between words and terms and thinks that he is going to make any headway by criticising and lecturing members of the Opposition every time they ask for information, I think he will find that he is heading toward the bottom of the well, not toward the top.

Mr. MEIGHEN: What I stated to the House in answer to the leader of the Opposition was that we would take up the departments of Labour and Interior, and that immediately on getting into supply we would take up the Department of the Interior. That constitutes an answer to the hon. member. He refers to some lecturing that has been done from this side; I do not know who did it. I plead not guilty on behalf of all concerned.

Mr. CAHILL: I accept the Prime Minister's explanation, of course. He stated that the Department of the Interior would be taken up, but what better intimation could we have of what department is to be taken up than in the fact that a certain minister makes the motion to go into Supply or speaks to the motion when it is made? It has been the custom, at least since I have been here, for the minister to make a general statement regarding his department on a motion to go into Supply. If the Minister of Marine wished to make that statement—

The CHAIRMAN: I regret that I must call the hon. member to order. His remarks are certainly not relevant to the item before the committee. We cannot, without having a point of order before the Chair, enter into a discussion of customs and procedure and continue that discussion during the entire evening.

Mr. PARENT: How long has the present minister been in charge of the department; since he has been in charge how many employees have been dismissed from the department, and what are the names of those who have dismissed?

Mr. MEIGHEN: The minister has been in charge since July 10, 1920. There have been two or three dismissals. Several have been retired under the statute passed by the House and given the gratuity or allowance provided by the statute. That has been done in the interest of economy. If the hon. member wishes to have the names, I will secure them and give them to him while the estimates of this department are under consideration.

Mr. PARENT: I would imagine that the official in front of the Prime Minister would be able to furnish the information now.

Mr. MEIGHEN: He informs me that he has not the information here.

Mr. PARENT: What are the duties of the director of water-powers, and in what part or parts of Canada does he carry out those duties?

Mr. MEIGHEN: His name is Mr. J. B. Challies. He performs services in all parts of Canada, directly in the provinces where the resources are the property of the Dominion, through the Governments of the other provinces where the resources are not the the property of the Dominion. Arrangements have been made, I know, with New

Brunswick, Nova Scotia, Prince Edward Island and Ontario, and, I am informed, with Quebec. The services of that branch, which is under the charge of Mr. Challies, are in that way for the purposes of getting information for the use of the water-powers of all the provinces. If the hon. member will consult the Government of his province, he will find they are highly appreciative of the assistance given by that branch.

Mr. PARENT: According to the statement of the Prime Minister, the director of waterpowers has something to do with the province of Quebec, and he led us to understand that the Dominion Government and the Provincial Government had come to some understanding as to the duties of that man in Quebec. The statement of the right hon. gentleman may be correct; I would like to take it as such; if it is, we are entitled to more details so as to find out what has taken place between the Federal Government and the Government of Quebec as regards the director of waterpowers.

Mr. MEIGHEN: I am informed by the official who is in front of me that they have been doing work in Quebec, although I cannot recollect it myself. I recollect agreements with Ontario, Nova Scotia, New Brunswick and Prince Edward Island. I have letters from at least one or two of the members of those Governments appreciative of the work done. I do not know that any difficulty has arisen with respect to the Quebec Government. It may be that the information given to me is not correct. I have a recollection myself of negotiations with the Government of Quebec; but I will get the full details for the hon. gentleman, and when this matter comes up under the appropriation for Dominion lands and parks, which we are not taking up now, Mr. Challies will be present himself.

Mr. PARENT: It comes under the director of waterpowers.

Mr. MEIGHEN: That is just the salary of the director, but all information as to what he does and his branch does in the various provinces properly comes under the appropriation for Dominion lands and parks. Mr. Challies will be available and the very fullest information can be given.

Mr. POWER: I should like to obtain a great deal of information with regard to the director of forestry and details of what has been done by this department for forestry. I should like, if, at some future time when these Estimates are before the House, I might be allowed to discuss the question of forestry, to call the Government's attention to the fact that in the eastern provinces a large number of big trees are being destroyed by bud-worms and other worms and to point out that it is the duty of the federal Government to help the provincial governments to overcome these pests. It is true the hon. member for Dorchester (Mr. Cannon) says that the provinces do not need the federal Government money; but in this respect at any rate, I contend that the forests of our country are of such paramount importance that the federal Government should assist in every possible way to look after their conservation and preservation. I should like also, at the time that these other Estimates are brought up, to go into the question with the minister of what body is taking the place of the Commission of Conservation with regard, for instance, to losses that might be occasioned in our forests by fire. All this, I am led to understand, subject, of course, to correction, could be gone into when other items under this department are before the House.

2 a.m.

I should like, on my own behalf, to make this statement to the Prime Minister, that I think really we should begin our sittings about eight o'clock every evening. I notice that, as time goes on, as the hour grows later, the Prime Minister becomes more sweet tempered. This evening, and particularly in the last two hours, he has given us a remarkable example of how courteous and well disposed he can be. I would hope that the Prime Minister would be always so well disposed to give us information. I am sure, if such were the case, we on this side of the House would be able to assist him, as we have assisted him to-night, in laying the details of the various departments before the House and the country. Really, in the future, if the Prime Minister would show the same disposition and magnanimity which he has shown to-night, we would have reciprocal arrangements of some kind whereby the business of the House would be greatly facilitated.

Mr. CAHILL: Will it be possible for the minister at some other date to take up the question of the policy of the Government with regard to homesteads? I mentioned this matter to the minister before and at that time he seemed to intimate that the Government might institute a different policy with regard to homesteads; that is, they might adopt a policy of restricting homesteading to what might be

regarded as the railway area of the country and not allow settlers to take up homesteads in the more remote parts of Canada where they would have no chance of railway facilities and where, in a great many cases, they would be only taking hardships on themselves without being of any productive value to the country generally. Has any new policy been adopted by the Government, or has the Government considered the advisability of restricting homestead settlement to what might be regarded as the railway area of the country?

Mr. MEIGHEN: No new policy has been adopted, nor has a change been under the general consideration of the Government. The subject has been pretty fully discussed in the House on other occasions. There is a great deal to be said both ways; there is a great deal to be said in favour of doing away with homesteads altogether, but the Government has not come to that conclusion as yet. An opportunity for a discussion of the question, of course, will come on any of the remaining items, at least when those involving grants for Dominion lands are under review.

Item agreed to.

Some hon. MEMBERS: Report progress.

Mr. MEIGHEN: An hour has gone by since the suggestion was made by the hon. member for Three Rivers that if the item passed we would take up no other item and go into no other department. However, on this occasion I shall not press the point, but on another occasion when the hon. member for Three Rivers or any other member comes to an understanding I think it would be well that it be lived up to or that the Government feel themselves free to take such procedure as they may deem advisable.

Mr. MURPHY: I think we would make greater progress if the Committee rose now.

Progress reported.

On the motion of Right Hon. Mr. Meighen, the House adjourned at 2.12 a.m. Wednesday.

Wednesday, March 30, 1921.

The House met at Two o'clock.

PAPERS TABLED

Copy of Order in Council placing the office of High Commissioner under the Department of External Affairs.—Right Hon. Arthur Meighen.

Return—Statement of Deputy Ministers and heads of branches in the departments of Government on January 1, 1910 and on January 1, 1921.—Hon. Sir Henry Drayton.

Return—Statement of number of employees in the Civil Service for 1913 and 1920 respectively.—Hon. Sir Henry Drayton.

Return—Statement of number of Commissions created since the year 1911.—Hon. Sir Henry Drayton.

QUESTIONS

(Questions answered orally are indicated by an asterisk.)

STORAGE OF FOODSTUFFS

*Mr. CASGRAIN:

1. Is the Government aware that there has been considerable hoarding of foodstuffs in cold storage throughout the country?
2. If so, does the Government intend to take any special steps to bring down any legislation to prevent such conditions in the future?
3. If so, when?
4. If not, why?

Hon. Mr. TOLMIE:

1. The Internal Trade Division of the Dominion Bureau of Statistics publishes monthly the holdings of foodstuffs in cold storage throughout Canada. Late returns do not reveal anything that may be fairly interpreted as "hoarding". It is necessary, if the public is to be provided with many foods of seasonal production during the seasons of scarcity, that these foods should be carried somewhere and by someone from the season of flush production to the season of non-production. It is advisable that all perishable foods should be carried in cold storage and is absolutely necessary in the case of some, if they are to be preserved in the best condition and without waste.

2. The Government has already arranged for the publication of cold storage holdings of food products month by month. All the goods in cold storage are for sale at any time. If the returns indicate that there is a surplus over and above normal requirements the price is at once affected. There is no more effective regulator of prices. A large proportion of the foodstuffs held in cold storage is not owned by the owners of the warehouses but belongs to merchants, dealers, producers and consumers. In many warehouses none of the goods are owned by the proprietor of the warehouse.

3 and 4. Answered by 1 and 2.

CANADA WHEAT BOARD

*Mr. BLAIR:

1. How many telegrams, letters, petitions and resolutions did the Government receive from Manitoba, Saskatchewan and Alberta, between August 1, 1919, and January 1, 1920, (a) Approving of the Canada Wheat Board; (b) Disapproving of the Canada Wheat Board?

2. How many telegrams, letters, petitions and resolutions did the Government receive from Manitoba, Saskatchewan and Alberta between August 1, 1920, and January 1, 1921, (a) Approving of the Canada Wheat Board? (b) Disapproving of the Canada Wheat Board?

Right Hon. Mr. MEIGHEN:

1. (a) None; (b) Twenty-six.

2. (a) One hundred and forty-one; (b) None.

PRINTING BUREAU EMPLOYEES

Mr. TOBIN:

1. How many employees at the Government Printing Bureau are obliged to work overtime?

2. What proportion of their regular salary do they receive for this overtime work?

3. How many employees were dismissed from the Printing Bureau during the past two years?

4. Why have none of these employees been re-engaged?

Sir HENRY DRAYTON:

1. All employees, when necessary.

2. Classified employees are not paid for overtime. Employees on prevailing rates are paid for overtime as follows: First three hours, time and a half; thereafter, double time.

3. Retirements, 355; employees on Order in Council who died before retirement was effected, 3; positions declared abandoned by the Civil Service Commission, 5; charwomen transferred to Public Works Department, 51; employees transferred to Public Archives Department, 2; dismissals, 10; total, 426.

4. Six have since been re-engaged.

FORT GARRY HOTEL, WINNIPEG

Mr. MOLLOY:

1. What amount of fire insurance is carried on the Fort Garry Hotel, Winnipeg?

2. What amount of fire insurance is carried on the contents of the hotel?

3. Is there any stipulation in the wording of policy as to amount to be carried?

4. At what rate is the insurance written?

5. What is the number of years the insurance is written for?

6. What are the names of the companies writing the insurance?

7. Are they licensed in the Dominion of Canada?

8. What are the names of the brokers who placed the insurance?

Hon. Mr. REID (Grenville):

1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, and 8. The Fort Garry Hotel is insured for $700,000, and contents for $300,000. The following companies carry the insurance, viz: Western Assurance Company, London Guarantee and Accident, St. Paul Fire and Marine Insurance Company, Boston Insurance Company, Westchester Fire Insurance Company, all of which have licenses in the Dominion. The insurance was placed through Toronto Insurance and Vessel Agency.

GOVERNMENT STEAMER "LAURENTIAN"

Mr. COPP:

1. Is the steamship "Laurentian" owned by the Government?

2. If so, when was she purchased? from whom? and what price was paid?

3. Was said steamer out of repair and tied up at Saint John for five months or for any time? If so, for what length of time?

4. During the time said steamer was so tied up in St. John how many of the crew remained aboard?

5. What were the wages per diem of said crew during the time she was so tied up?

6. Was said steamer repaired? If so, when were such repairs made? by whom? and what was the cost of such repairs?

7. Was this steamer under charter with any department of the Government prior to purchase, and if so, with what department, and what was paid per year under said charter.

8. Was the steamer at any time owned or under the control of the Davie Wrecking Company of Quebec and by said company offered for sale to the Government? If so, when and at what price?

Hon. Mr. BALLANTYNE:

1. Yes.

2. The "Laurentian" was purchased in April, 1917, from the Canada Steamship Lines, Ltd., for $50,000.

3. Yes, four months.

4. Twenty-two.

5. $47.99.

6. Yes. Between May 29 and October 30, 1920. New Burrell Johnson Iron Co., Ltd., and others. Total $48,638.43.

7. Yes. Customs Department. The sums paid were: 1911-12, $7,043.24; 1912-13, $8,000.00; 1913-14, $7,300.00.

8. The "Laurentian" was offered for sale to the Department of Marine and Fisheries in 1911, by Geo. T. Davie & Son. No price named.

CANADIAN NORTHERN RAILWAY VESSELS

Mr. PAPINEAU:

1. How many steamships were owned and operated by the Canadian Northern Railway on the 1st of October, 1917?

2. What is the number of steamships now owned or operated by the Canadian Northern Railway?

3. What are their names and tonnage of each?

Hon. Mr. REID:

1. Four steamers and two barges.
2. Six steamers and three barges.
3. Germania, 105.90 gross tons; Sebastian, 102.8 gross tons; Canora, 3,382.66 gross tons; Dalhousie City, 1,255 gross tons; Garden City, 637 gross tons; Northumberland, 1,255.46 gross tons; barges—C.N.P. No. 1, 676.67 gross tons; C.N.P. No. 2, 676.67; C.N.P. No. 3, 676.67 gross tons.

CANADIAN POSTAL GUIDE

Mr. PAPINEAU:

1. Is it the intention of the Post Office Department to continue the publication of the Postal Guide?
2. Have the standing forms, which heretofore have been kept standing for the printing of this volume, been destroyed?
3. If so, by whose direction and for what purpose?
4. If the publication of the Postal Guide is to be continued, will the type have to be reset?

Sir HENRY DRAYTON:

1. Yes.
2. Yes.
3. The breaking up of this standing type is under consideration by His Honour Colin George Snider, Judge of the County Court of the County of Wentworth, in the province of Ontario, under a commission dated December 27, 1920, issued under the Inquiries Act, which has been amended and extended so as to authorize the said commissioner to inquire into the particulars of all material and equipment purchased, sold or otherwise disposed of, in or from the Printing Bureau since January 1, 1919.
4. The type for the publication of the Postal Guide has been reset.

CANADIAN NATIONAL RAILWAYS—TRAIN AGENTS

*Mr. LEMIEUX:

1. How many train agents are there on the Canadian National Railway system?
2. What is the salary of a train agent?
3. Is the train agent appointed to assist the conductor?
4. Since when were such train agents appointed?
5. Have the train conductors ever applied for the assistance of train agents?

Hon. Mr. REID: Assuming that by "train agents", ticket collectors are meant, the management reply as follows:

1. 25.
2. $150 to $175 per month.
3. No.
4. June, 1910.
5. No record of such application.

FARMERS AND FARM LABOURERS IN CANADIAN EXPEDITIONARY FORCE

Mr. GOULD:

1. How many men were in the Canadian Expeditionary force immediately prior to demobilization?
2. How many of these were farmers or farm labourers?
3. How many stated that they might take advantage of Land Settlement Scheme?
4. What was the average wealth of the discharged soldiers upon discharge, excluding war service gratuity or pensions?

Sir HENRY DRAYTON:

1. 334,996. (The official date of the commencement of demobilization is quoted as November 15, 1918.)
2. Not available at present.
3. No information on record.
4. No information.

CABINET MINISTERS AND POST OFFICE DEPARTMENT

Mr. DELISLE:

Are certain ministers or any committee charged with the conduct of the Post Office Department in spite of the fact that there actually is a Postmaster General?

Right Hon. Mr. DOHERTY: The answer is "No".

CIVIL SERVICE LIST

Mr. PROULX:

1. Is it true that the Editorial Committee, appointed by the Government, on the alleged ground of economy have discontinued the printing of the Civil Service List?
2. If so, in view of the vast number of reports and blue books of doubtful value still being printed, is not the cancellation of the Civil Service List somewhat inconsistent?
3. Is the Government aware that nearly all banks and stores depend on the Civil Service List for authentic information upon which to extend credit to the members of the service for the necessaries of life in the same way that they use Dunn's or Bradstreet's?
4. Will the Government consider the reissue of the List?

Sir HENRY DRAYTON:

1. No. The duty of preparing and publishing the Civil Service List was among the duties assigned to the Civil Service Commission by Section 36 of the Act of 1918, but was eliminated from the Amending Act of 1919, and the last edition was published in the fall of 1918 by the said Commission.

2. In the fall of 1918 the work of reorganization commenced, to be followed by a complete reclassification of the personnel of the service, and is now rapidly approaching completion. Obviously it was impossible during that period to publish any list of the employees of the service which

would have been of any practical value or utility.

3. No information.

4. As soon as the classification is completed it is the intention of the Civil Service Commission to recommend to the Government that a new edition of the Civil Service List be at once published.

CIVIL SERVICE BONUS

Mr. ETHIER:

Is it the intention of the Government to increase the bonus paid to civil employees, and in what proportion comparatively to the bonus granted in previous years

Right Hon. Mr. MEIGHEN: The answer to this question was given last week, when I stated to the House that the bonus was to be reduced twenty-five per cent, commencing the first of the fiscal year.

GERMAN GOODS—FIFTY PER CENT HOLD-BACK

Mr. RINFRET:

1. Is it the intention of Canadian Government to hold back from all payments made for goods purchased in Germany a sum of fifty per cent, as recently ordered by the British Government?

2. If not, is it the intention of the Canadian Government to inform the House immediately as to the matter and to advise accordingly Canadian importers who buy goods in Germany?

Right Hon. Mr. MEIGHEN: No decision to this effect has been come to. Inquiries are being made regarding the subject.

QUESTIONS PASSED AS ORDERS FOR RETURNS

Mr. REID (Mackenzie):

1. Of the 18,000 box cars ordered for the Canadian National Railways, when were the said cars ordered?

2. If ordered at different dates, what year and month were the orders placed?

3. What are the names of firms building same?

4. Were tenders called or are they being built on order?

5. If built on basis of cost plus percentage, what percentage or profit is allowed?

6. What is the cost of 1,000 box cars?

7. How many cars have been delivered, and on what dates?

8. How many new cars were put in grain carrying trade west of Fort William?

9. What is the maximum grain carrying capacity of said cars?

10. Are the said cars fitted with hopper bottoms for speedy unloading at terminals?

11. Are the 18,000 box cars above mentioned in addition to cars which were added to replace broken or worn out box cars?

Mr. SUTHERLAND:

1. Under what authority did the Department of Agriculture enter into contracts with elevator companies for the purchase of screenings from grain subsequent to the year 1911?

2. Was this authority given by Order in Council or authorized by Parliament, and on what date?

3. If by Order in Council, on whose recommendation to Council was the said order passed?

4. How many contracts for purchase were made, with what companies, on what dates, at what price and what is the total amount paid to each to date?

5. In what province or provinces were they disposed of, what quantity in each province both ground and unground and what price was received?

6. What was the cost of advertising the sale of these screenings?

7. What proportion of noxious weed seed contents were permissable under the terms of the contracts?

8. Have any purchasers of screenings from the Department refused acceptance of same?

9. If so, in how many instances; what quantity, and on what grounds?

10. How were the refused screenings disposed of and at what price?

11. How does the matter stand at present between the Department and contractors?

12. What company or companies have supplied screening not up to the standard called for in contract?

13. Have any refunds been collected from any company as a result of screening not being up to the standard?

14. If so, from what company and for what amount?

15. Is it the intention of the Department to take steps to collect from companies which supply screening not up to standard called for in contracts?

Mr. ARMSTRONG (Lambton):

1. How much money was expended by the Dominion Government, in each province in the Dominion, for road building purposes during the year 1920?

2. How much money was expended by the Dominion Government, in each province, for Technical Education under the Agricultural Instruction Act in the year 1920?

3. How much money was expended by the Dominion Government to assist agricultural fairs held in each province in 1920?

4. How much money was expended by the Dominion Government in the year 1920 in the various provinces in operating a selling organization for the purpose of disposing of livestock, etc.?

5. What was the total amount expended by the Dominion Government in 1920 towards assisting and developing agriculture?

6. What was the total amount expended in the year 1911 by the Dominion Government towards assisting and developing agriculture?

7. How much money was expended by the Dominion Government in the year 1920 in connection with the Housing Act in the respective provinces?

UNOPPOSED MOTIONS FOR PAPERS

Mr. CASGRAIN:

For a copy of Order in Council passed the middle of this month for the purpose of amalgamating the mail superintendent's department with that of the postal inspector's.

FRENCH TREATY

Mr. JOSEPH ARCHAMBAULT (Chambly and Vercheres) moved:

For a copy of the new treaty of commerce between France and Canada.

Right Hon. Mr. MEIGHEN: A copy of the treaty was placed on the Table yesterday, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. SPEAKER: Dropped.

Hon. Mr. FIELDING: Has my right hon. friend taken steps to have the treaty printed?

Mr. MEIGHEN: I am communicating with the Minister of Trade and Commerce (Sir George Foster). I rather expected he would be here to-day to move for printed copies.

Mr. FIELDING: The Government does not need to move for printed copies. The treaty ought to be brought down in printed form.

Mr. MEIGHEN: I understand a motion is necessary as to the number of copies to be printed.

Mr. FIELDING: Printed copies of many documents are brought down without motion.

Mr. MEIGHEN: The treaty will be printed.

TORONTO CUSTOMS OFFICIALS

Mr. ARCHAMBAULT moved:

For a statement showing the names of the examining officials of the Customs Department, Toronto, and the respective salaries of each of said officials.

Motion agreed to.

UNEMPLOYMENT—SUSPENSION OF IMMIGRATION

Mr. HERMAS DESLAURIERS (St. Mary's) moved:

Whereas the question of unemployment in our large cities has become a serious problem; whereas the Government is going to study this question; whereas in Europe this social problem is just as great a menace as here and such being the case Canada is exposed to the risk of receiving more or less undesirable immigrants; therefore be it resolved: That, in the opinion of this House, all immigration should be suspended until a normal condition of affairs is established.

(Translation.) First of all, Mr. Speaker, I wish to inform the House that I am taking the full and sole responsibility of this motion and it is as such that I intend discussing it.

It is not my intention to argue as to whether Canada is now facing the problem of unemployment, because it is a fact recognized by all including the Government who shall have to appropriate shortly a certain amount of money to that end. What I propose to establish is why the working class, the people who are hungry, are asking that immediate steps shall be taken by the Government who are largely responsible for this serious question of unemployment.

In 1919, the former Prime Minister (Sir Robert Borden) went to Europe accompanied by Mr. Draper, secretary of the Trades and Labour Congress with the object—so they claimed at the time—of protecting the interests of Canadian labour. The Government press highly praised our representatives for having supported article 427, paragraph 4 of the Peace Treaty concerning the eight-hour day or the 48 hour week. Since then nothing has been done by the Government. The workers are still being kept for many hours in unsanitary factories at a time when unemployment has reached an acute stage. I repeat that the Government have done nothing while they should have compelled the manufacturers to employ a larger number of men to have the same amount of work done within shorter hours and at the same rate of pay, which would have reduced the number of unemployed and bettered the general condition of the workingmen.

In 1919, a Housing Bill was passed by this Government granting $25,000,000 for the construction of tenements, but they introduced such impossible and impracticable provisions that even their own friends were unable to avail themselves of that legislation.

At that time the object was to afford to the labourers an opportunity to build houses for themselves and to avoid unemployment. The whole question was well organized camouflage and nothing else.

On the 1st of June, 1920, in this House, I had the privilege of suggesting to the Government several means to avoid unemployment, but they were not considered. I spoke then as follows:

> The chief cause of suffering in our cities is imputable solely to the Department of Labour, which refuses to enact the legislation necessary to prevent the present-day disorders through fear of displeasing the high protectionists. I am speaking of enforced idleness.
>
> This unemployment is caused by irregular work, mainly due to lack of organization, to business depression or to seasonal fluctuations. If we had a competent Department of Labour these problems could easily be solved by following the example of other countries. Could we not set up a well organized central labour exchange in our principal cities and enact a law forbidding the employer from hiring workmen at the factory gate and obliging him to apply to the labour exchange? There the worker

would have to give his name and his trade; each one by turn would be supplied with work and the salary paid would be that established by the labour unions. In this way we would get rid of the sight of hundreds and hundreds of workers anxiously waiting every morning at the factory gate for employment which never comes; these poor men waste weeks and even months in these vain attempts to find work, while their families are suffering the direst poverty.

An equitable distribution of Government contracts during periods of stagnation, would also help to overcome this problem of unemployment. Old people and children under eighteen years of age should have to work only during a limited number of hours. Every year the Budget should contain an appropriation for widows so as to oblige them to bring up their children properly and relieve them of the necessity of spending long hours in the workshop to earn a pitiful salary. In this way all labour would be absorbed and our economic distress forestalled.

Another method of overcoming this problem of unemployment would be insurance such as they have in several cities of Germany where it is coupled with medical attention in return for a reasonable contribution which the employer deducts from the worker's pay envelope. In several countries, especially in Belgium, Norway, Denmark and Holland, the Gand system is followed and seems to give satisfaction; under this system the public authorities on the recommendation of the Department of Labour, vote certain subsidies to the labour unions as a reward for services rendered the State; this ensures comfort for the workers and gives relief to the State by preventing just so much hardship.

Now, Mr. Speaker, none of these suggestions were taken into consideration. Why? Because the Government is not in sympathy with the labourer; they profess a systematic indifference for them. We were first apprised of it in the Speech from the Throne when the suggestion was made of pensions to old age and insurance against unemployment. This Government cannot deny that the present social turmoil comes from their war policy and they are altogether wrong when they shift their responsibilities on the municipalities or on the provinces. The labourer who sufferers today of privations knows what the policy of the Government means so far as labour is concerned; experience has taught him what a consideration by this House of the question of insurance against unemployment involves. He anticipates the appointment of a commisssion which will be, like all other empowered to hold meetings, congresses, where so-called labour leaders, intimates of the minister of Labour will be present, where resolutions learned by heart will be delivered and where, as usual, nothing will be done. Meanwhile, the people who have an immediate need of bread are entitled to claim that the conditions be not made more distheartening by dumping on our country a continuous flow of immigrants. They have a right to protest against the utterances of gentlemen like Lloyd George, Bonar Law and others who, on the floor of the British House of Commons say that, to solve their social problems, there is but one means and it is to send to the Dominions their undesirables.

Mr. Speaker, the labourers who are idle to-day felt very keenly the resolution adopted in March of last year at a banquet held in Montreal by the Manufacturers' Association to subscribe a million and more in order to maintain the present policy of the Government, namely, a policy of high protection in the interest of manufactures, which is the very cause of their sufferings, because since that time our workers were one after the other deprived of employment and they have the right to know when we shall see the end of this endless million and whether the Government will always be indifferent to their fate and will not change their so-called policy of moderate protection, which is but a policy of high protection, to another one which would promote a fair and just competition.

It is said by many that the unemployed are more numerous in our towns, but that, in order to solve that problem we have only to say to them: "If you have no work in the cities, there is a shortage of labour in the country, we have thousands of acres of arable land which is not under culture."

Allow me to say that this answer which is meant to solve the serious problem of unemployment, is merely a childish one. I do not hesitate to state in this House the the fact that there is a shortage of labour in the country, for it must be admitted, but this condition exists only during the crop season, that is, during two months or at the most four months, and during the other eight months of the year, the employer, in the country, may dismiss his hired man when he does not require his services any longer. It is quite exceptional to find a farmer who can afford to pay such fair wages as will allow a man to establish a home and provide food for it, during these two months of the year. Besides, if we should wish for proofs of this fact, we must not content ourselves with listening to street rumours, or the sayings of some person or other, but we must consult the official provincial reports. You have but to consult the provincial report for Montreal, and you wil find that the labour exchange has not been successful in placing in the country some of the unemployed, because the wages offered by the farmers

were hardly sufficient for a man to obtain his living.

I say that these wages are not sufficient, during two or four months of the year. Wages that are hardly sufficient for one man would certainly not be enough for him to establish a home and provide for it. Besides, Mr. Speaker, these men who are unemployed to-day have no savings, and they have none for the very reasons which are given by the *Labour Gazette*, because, during the war, the high cost of living, which was due to the profiteers did not allow them to put anything aside. And this is proven by the fact that the Government has now to appropriate money out of the public funds to support these people who have been reduced to beggary. I believe, Mr. Speaker, that it would be more practical to do away completely with the Public Works Department, in Ottawa, and all its subsidies which amount to over $1,500,00 and to utilize this in helping those who wish to return to the land.

Until now, particularly since the last two or three years, the Public Works Department has done nothing but a well organized camouflage, nothing else. These subsidies which are granted by a useless Department might easily be appropriated towards helping these people, who have no savings whatever and who wish to return to the land, by providing them with agricultural implements, horses and the necessary cattle for farm work, in a word with a sufficient grant to help them until they are able to harvest the fruits of their labour, instead of employing these subsidies in distributing the *Labour Gazette* which floods the country with useless statistics. Why prove to the people that the salaries are not in keeping with the high cost of living? Would it not be enough to unsettle the minds of the people? This Department, instead of helping the workingman interferes with them considerably. These people who, through force of circumstances, have been left without any economies, have to return to the city, when the crop season is over, and what awaits them there? They see shiploads of immigrants entering our ports, and these immigrants work themselves into our midst and take the place of heads of families at insufficient and sometimes ridiculous salaries, but to the entire satisfaction of the manufacturers. Such salaries would be sufficient for men without homes, who are packed in congested quarters and have no taxes whatever to pay, and often these men are most undesirable, nothing but adventurers or old offenders.

Allow me to read the following in support of my contention:

Recorder Geoffrion, a few days ago, sentenced to three months at hard labour, a man named Patrick Read, a South-African soldier, who had been a leader in a recent raid on the Child's restaurant by the so-called unemployed.

It has been discovered that Read is one of a number of immigrants that England sent us a couple of years ago. Upon his arrival in this country, Read decided to settle in the West, and first established himself in Winnipeg. But he was evidently not interested in agriculture. Neither was he very anxious to help in the work of reconstruction which Canada had to face after so many years of war.

Like so many other veterans who are a charge to England, Read thought that, as he had fought in the war, the country should now support him. And the mother country thought fit to get rid of him by sending him to the "colonies".

As soon as he arrived amongst the Western "colonials", Read visited the working classes, and he was one of the leaders when a general strike was attempted at Winnipeg.

Attracted, no doubt, by the announcement that those having no other calling now than being veterans of the Great War were playing an important part in the disorders instigated not by the unemployed, but on their behalf, Read came to Montreal and launched into the fray with the result which one knows.

Now is the time when those who govern us in Ottawa should remember that Canada is not a colony but a confederation enjoying home rule, and when the immigrants England send to our shores by ship-loads should be watched more closely. Downing Street has no right to send us Great Britain's undesirables.

If we do not want outsiders to come and sow trouble among our peaceful working classes, it is high time that the press of the country should remind the powers that be that there are people who, even if not plague-stricken, are no less a menace than the contagious or infectious diseases

Upon that score, I concur in the opinion uttered last year by Sir Andrew McPhail before the Canadian Club in Ottawa. This is what he said about those incoming undesirables:

Now I ask you to cast your minds back upon the public undertakings of this country for the last forty years, and you will observe that they were all intended for the benefit of the hypothetical immigrant. If a railway was built, it was intended to open up a country, to develop something, to carry immigrants; but the immigrants have not come. If they come, they come to the wrong place, to the cities.

It is quite true that we are scrutinizing the immigrant. It is also true that the immigrant is beginning to scrutinize us and to ask what we have to offer in opposition to other countries. For many years they have had this passion for what they called freedom. They came to this country expecting to achieve it. They are finding now, to their cost, that this country is perhaps not so free as they expected it would be. The shipload of undesirable im-

migrants which was sent back to Russia is a warning to the world that we do not propose that our civilization shall be overwhelmed as the civilization of Russia has been overwhelmed. We shall not, then, expect to attract people on that ground, because they have destroyed their governments in their own countries and they have there all the freedom they could possibly desire.

The workman, who nowadays undergoes hardships, knows by experience that the Government labour policy is a superficial one which consists in resorting to the camouflage year in and year out. The Government said many things as to that but they did nothing at all. They shielded the big interests, the moneyed men, the manufacturers, who are friendly to them. Mr. Speaker, I am amazed when I notice in the newspapers people who advise us to be patriots and who venture to state that Canada to-day is able to provide for herself, that she begets every thing she needs. That I think was the last opinion on that question uttered in Montreal by the hon minister of Finance. Now, let me say that to reprove is not all and that it is far better to practice what one preaches. It is useless to tell to the people: "You must buy all your goods in Canada if you want the war tax to be taken off." To give some value to such an advice one thing is necessary: that the producers set such a price on their goods as will encourage the consumer and keep him from going and buying out of the country.

Allow me to give a few instances in order to prove whether or not those preachers practice what they advocate.

L'Information of March 3, 1921, has this to say:

First instance:

The St. John "Globe" relates the following incident: "The owner of an hotel in this city wanted to buy an electrical machine for the washing of dishes. A Canadian firm was asking $190 for a machine of the required capacity. Proceeding with his investigations, the hotel-keeper was told that in the United States he could buy a similar machine for $100. Of course, the intending buyer came to the conclusion that the difference would be more than sufficient to pay the custom duties, the transportation charges and the exchange rates, and he brought in that machine from the U.S."

Second instance:

Following an exhibition of goods made in Canada, a manufacturer exclaimed before a group of newspaper men that after such an exhibition it would have been difficult not to buy only goods made in Canada. Among his hearers was a representative of the "Farmer's Sun" who pointed out to the manufacturer that he should himself have been the first to set the good example. The manufacturer having protested, some inquiries were made in order to know how far that newspaper man was right, and this is what that manufacturer was wearing: his hat, his shirt, his collar, his shoes had been made in the United States; his necktie, in Germany; his suit, in England; his gloves, in France; his socks and watch in Switzerland; even the trinkets he had in the pockets of his coat, such as pencils, penknives and so forth, had been imported, not to mention handkerchiefs and underwear which, without a single exception, all bore foreign trade marks.

Third instance:

A few years ago, let us say, at the beginning of the war, a great Canadian papermaker had sent out many thousand copies of a circular letter in order to remind his customers and the general public how important it was then more than ever to encourage the native industry and to use for all purposes only paper coming from Canadian establishments, from the fine writing paper, passing through wrapping paper, to the coarse coardboard used in the making of boxes. A reader wanted to make sure whether or not the manufacturer himself was setting the example.

He took the circular, and lifting it to the height of his eyes towards a window, he found that a commercial water-mark in the paper showed that the latter came from an American manufacturer; the envelope similarly tested also showed that it had been made on the other side of the line.

Now, Mr. Speaker, there is a conclusion to be drawn from these quotations. It is that if we wish to do away with Canada's war debt we must do otherwise than is done by these famous preachers of patriotism. Why should not the Government show themselves as practical as they were until last fall, when they so delighted in issuing Orders in Council? What they did in the matter of sugar, they could do again with regard to other staples, and the public would certainly not complain. But they will not. And why? Because they are prevented by their friends. These men, accustomed in war time to reap scandalous profits under cover of patriotism, these patriots who came and declared in an industrial conference that they are not working for prayers and that they are drawing dividends of 175 and 200 per cent; who do not want to abate their greediness and do not want to sacrifice anything for the sake of others; these men long in their hearts to see workmen on their knees soliciting famine wages, and they wish above all to reach and destroy the most legitimate unions.

As the representative of an electoral college of 70,000 souls—which means that I do not represent timber limits and thousands of prairie acres, but individuals, in this House—I do not hesitate to declare that the people have come to this that they will not any longer allow themselves to be fooled by words; they can still be for some time kept in want, even obliged to become

professional beggars. They can stand even more. At this moment, when these people have but the bare necessaries and are even reduced to mendicancy, every week in the hostelries of our large cities, great Balthasar banquets are organized where gorging is going on under their eyes, at the expense of the Liberal-National-Conservative party. The people look on, notice these; and some day they will enter these festive halls, and toil hardened hands shall write upon their walls the fateful words which you know well—Marie, Thecel, Phares—You have been weighed and found wanting. Then will be the hour of retribution, the hour of justice. No gold, nor silver will then have any effect on the soul, on the mind of these people; judgment shall be at hand and each shall be judged according to his works; the partisans of the Government may well clamour, as was done in 1896, that if the Liberal party should come back to power, it would spell disaster for Canada, ruin for the country; they may well exhaust their stock of mournful rhapsodies over smokeless chimneys, over silent looms, empty workshops, and so forth, these people, whose motto is "I remember," will remember Laurier and his policy; they will put their confidence in the personality of the leader of the Opposition, his colleague of yesterday and the standard-bearer of his policy. All those trickeries will come to naught, and once more, if Providence wills it, Canada shall see days of prosperity and happiness.

Mr. Speaker, we are told in the press, in pamphlets, we are told everywhere, that there is at present but one way of remedying the state of our finances, bringing in immigrants. I for one do not admit without discussion this proposition. There was a time, now gone by, when immigration was a boon to this country. Immigration is a question of business. Love of money, personal interest, hide under the cloak of love of man. I share the idea of Sir Andrew McPhail, that that time has gone by, and if we wish to preserve our institutions, it is time that we should put an end to the propaganda going on in the four corners of the world, emphasizing the liberty which we enjoy and which in reality is no greater than elsewhere. In the name of this liberty are drawn to our shores all immigrants without distinction. Any immigrant wishing to come to us should be made aware of what he must expect here. Beside the matter of mentality, the question of morality, there is one thing which must not be lost sight of. It is that every immigrant entering the country incurs obligations, is subject to taxation. I could on this subject bring forth the testimony of many eminent men whose authority would be recognized by this House, but I will confine myself to quoting a statistical statement of Sir Andrew McPhail. This is what he said in 1920 before the Canadian Club of Ottawa:

> And next in importance comes the question of the taxes and the obligations which the immigrant must assume; and for this purpose I have taken some pains to draw up a statement of the obligation in which a man immigrating to Ottawa would involve himself. I have drawn it up on the basis of a man, his wife and four children constituting the family. Coming from the Province of Quebec, I do not think that is an excessive estimate; I should say it was a minimum. I have assigned to this immigrant coming with his family to the City of Ottawa an earned salary of $5,000, which is not excessive; and not to trust to my loose memory, I should like to read to you precisely where such a man would stand.
>
> You invite to Canada immigrants of the best type—the type, for example, who could earn $5,000—the man with a wife and four children. Here is his budget in respect of capital obligations, of interest payable, and of taxes to meet expenditure. The per capita debt of Canada is $366; of Ontario it is $30; and of Ottawa it is $167; making a total of $563 per person. Multiplied by 6, that imposes upon your immigrant a capital obligation of $3,378. The annual interest payable on the Canadian debt is $18.25, on Ontario $1,65, on Ottawa, $9.20; making $29.10. His annual interest charge, then, is $1.74. Here is a recapitulation of the obligation which the immigrant who earns five thousand dollars a year is under. The Canada tax is $212.52, for interest and expenses; for Ontario, $45,90; the municipal expenses in Ottawa are $439.95; the Canadian income tax is $84; which gives a total of $782.37. If there is any person here present who draws so large a salary as $5,000, and has a family, this is his annual charge.

Mr. Speaker, according to me, those statistical data deserve consideration. In the past, we have witnessed the coming of different kinds of immigrants, but they often came to do some farming for a month and then to enter our cities. It might be said that on an average only five per cent of the incoming and prospective immigrants are desirable individuals because nowadays it must be reckoned that European nations are keeping their best citizens and sending us only those who do not answer their purpose. These are people who do not earn $5,000 a year; therefore, as they are earning less, the country is liable to have to provide for so many more individuals. Those statistical data are certainly quite valuable and worthy of our utmost consideration.

New we might let in undesirables. By noting what is going on in our courts, we

might easily satisfy ourselves that what I am asserting is perfectly true. Taking into account the difference in the rates of exchange between Austria and Canada upon $35 or $40, for instance, one may get $2,000 worth in Austrian securities. These people are coming to this country and in the course of a single night they can reap what would be a small fortune in their own country, and even the expenses of their deportation are settled by Canada. It is most important that such a case should be seriously considered.

Although my resolution seems to bear the stamp of some radicalism, I shall admit that the Government should pay regard to an immigration actually and not in appearance only agricultural. I was reading lately the opinion upon immigration matters of a prominent citizen who manages in a splendid manner the affairs of the Canadian Pacific Railway; I mean Mr. Beatty. Who is Mr. Beatty? He is the president of a great corporation owning a vast railway system, a large fleet of ocean liners and who heads a company of shareholders earning enormous dividends. Therefore I shall grant that, as a business man, the more freight he will be able to get for his company, the larger will be its surplus. His advice is that of an interested person and we, the members of this Parliament, should lay it by and pay regard only to the general welfare of the country.

Now, before concluding my remarks, it is my desire to let the House know that I had no intention of offending any nationality, neither French, English, Austrian, Hebrew, nor others. I oppose with all my might that mode of reasoning according to which, when a cup is full to the brim, the way to prevent its overflowing is to pour more liquid into it; and I would willingly make a reservation in my resolution for those who would be acknowledged highly qualified for farming or industry, chiefly for farming. However, I do not accept the contention of the president of the Canadian Pacific Company, that we need mechanical experts, because we have all we want for the Angus or other shops; but we should let in the following:—foremen and captains of industry, which is quite another thing.

Mr. Speaker, I am confident of having entirely covered the ground of my resolution which states that the Government ought to put a stop to immigration from the standpoint of common sense and in the interest of public order. I am also confident of having shown clearly enough that the policy of the Government as to labour matters is a downright camouflage; that the Labour Department should vanish out of sight as a department, and if the Government were willing to be frank, if they earnestly wished for the progress of the country, the amounts granted to that department ought to be given to agriculture or industry, chiefly to agriculture, as loans or credits judiciously apportioned.

I think my hon. friend the member for Prescott (Mr. Proulx) for agreeing to second this motion which made such a stir among the public, in the press and elsewhere, to such an extent that I would find every day in my letter box, correspondence about immigration and letters advising me in covert terms to withdraw my motion. If I am in parliament to-day it is a matter of conscience and patriotism which lead me here and not a question of money; and this being so, I sincerely believe that it was my duty to submit this matter to the House in the clearest possible way and with all the vigour I am capable of, in the interests of my constituents.

Mr. EDMOND PROULX (Prescott): Mr. Speaker, I am in accord with most of what has been said by my hon. friend from St. Mary (Mr. Deslauriers), but I would like to make certain reservations. At the conclusion of his remarks my hon. friend said he would not object to the admission into this country of a certain class of immigrants, especially those who would engage in farm work or settle on the land. But the present regulations of the Immigration Department permit the immigration into the country of farm labourers and domestic servants. We are not overburdened with this class of immigrants and I do not think we need anticipate any trouble through letting them come in. I am in accord with my hon. friend, however, in his desire to restrict the admission of the artisan class. There is much unemployment at present in the different cities and urban centres of this country, and that unemployment will become more serious if the present immigration restrictions are relaxed. I do not think there is a small town in this country which has not been affected during the last few months by unemployment conditions. We read in the press that thousands of persons of the artisan class are waiting in the European ports for the opportunity to come to this country. Well, I do not see why we should make our regulations less restrictive than those which the United States has applied to immigration into that country. Recently the United States Government imposed very stringent

restrictions. I applied not long ago for permission for one of my electors to go back to the United States; he had lived there some years ago and had married an American. He could not, however, gain admission to the United States, in view of the restrictions imposed. I advise the Minister of Immigration (Mr. Calder) to follow the example of the United States in this regard and to protect our own citizens. The best way to protect our workers or artisans is to keep for them the labour that is available in Canada. We should not encourage the immigration of French or Belgian or English people into this country at present; they are needed in their own countries to go on the land and to assist in reconstruction, especially in France and Belgium. We should render the people of those countries a very bad service if we carried on a propaganda to cause many of their number to leave and come here. Most of those who want to come into Canada are of the artisan class. I would strongly encourage the admission of those who want to go on the land, or work for the farmers or accept employment as domestic servants. The hon. member for St. Mary has said that the president of the Canadian Pacific Railway company strongly advocated a policy of immigration, saying that it would be the salvation of the country and of the railway companies if we could increase our immigration. I am sure that the president of the Canadian Pacific Railway company had in his mind immigration of the settler class. That is what opened the West some years ago and created prosperity there. But unfortunately we do not get the same class of immigrants now, especially from Europe, as we got some years ago. If we admit thousands of persons of the artisan class who will not go on the land but will stay in the cities and urban centres, we shall aggravate the unemployment situation to the detriment of our own people. There is one town in my county with a population of 5,500. The main industry there is a pulp mill. Well, that industry had to close down a few days ago, and may be closed for some months, affecting the employment of some seven or eight hundred people. You can see, Mr. Speaker, what the condition is if there are many other towns in this country in the same position. I was in Toronto last week, and I believe that the unemployment situation there is very serious. If we admit into Canada any more persons of the artisan class, it will become much worse. I hope, therefore, that the Minister of Immigration will not relax his restrictions, even if he is strongly urged to do it. I know there are some in this country—I do not know whether it is through generosity or tenderness of heart—who would like these restrictions relaxed so that a large number of artisans could gain admission into Canada. Well, we should protect our own people first; charity begins at home. Instead of being relaxed the restrictions should be made even more severe, at least for some time, until the unemployment situation becomes less acute. Having made these observations, I am pleased to second the motion of my hon. friend from St. Mary.

Mr. E. W. NESBITT (North Oxford): Mr. Speaker, I rise merely to ask the Minister of Immigration and Colonization (Mr. Calder)—if he is going to speak with regard to the resolution—if it would not be possible to have these proposed immigrants checked at the places where they originate instead of having them deported if they are not found satisfactory on their arrival in Canada. It must be a great hardship to these poor people to travel all the way across the ocean and then be rejected when they land in this country.

I have nothing particular to say with reference to the class of immigrants being allowed in, because I think the minister is perfectly alive to the situation in this country. As is suggested by my hon. friend (Mr. Proulx) we do not want in the cities and towns more artisans. We want men on the farms. In Ontario, at the present time, it is just as difficult this year as it was last year to get men to work on the farm; wages demanded last year by men who would work on the farm were more than the farmer could afford to pay and at the same time make a profit out of his business, and if wages were high last year, now that the prices of nearly all farm products have very materially decreased, I am quite sure that this year wages will be still more than the farmer can afford to pay.

I am not going to speak for the western farmer, because he can speak for himself better than I can, but I understand that farmers in the West paid wages as high as $10 and $12 a day last year for threshing and other farming operations. If that be the case, that is very much more than we paid in Ontario, and it must be that much more difficult for western farmers to stand. There is plenty of room in this country for certain classes of European farmers, such as those who have been successful in the United States, and who, I

believe, could be successful in this country. The type of immigrants that we do not want is the continual agitator who apparently was not satisfied with the country from which he came and who is less satisfied with the country to which he comes.

Mr. CLARK (Red Deer): Are there any of those in Woodstock?

Mr. NESBITT: But very few. I am glad to state that in Woodstock we are a very peaceable community; there is no unemployment; everybody who wants to work has work to do, so that I am not speaking on account of any local troubles. I know that what I have already said is correct, namely, that we cannot get men on the farm this year at any lower wages than we did last year; in fact, we cannot get, in any measure, the help that is required on the farm. Many people think that anybody can work on a farm, but there never was a greater mistake. The man who is city-bred entirely takes a long time to be of any use on the farm. In my experience a man raised on a farm can learn very much more rapidly to make himself useful in an ordinary factory than the ordinary city-bred man can learn to make himself useful on a farm. The boys on the farm —that goes into the old question of why boys leave the farm and I do not think I will touch that; I left the farm myself, and I am very pleased to get back on it any hour of the day or any day of the week that I can do so—

Mr. McMASTER: Especially Sundays.

Mr. NESBITT: Especially Sundays.

Mr. JACOBS: Is there a church there?

Mr. NESBITT: We have enough people in the community to hold a small church meeting if that is necessary, but I am afraid I am not an adept at that.

I still think that, if it were possible, it would be better to stop these prospective immigrants at the port of embarkation than at the port of debarkation. I think also that there are numbers of European farmers who could well be brought out to this country and who would be useful on the land now. But it is not wise to encourage artisans to come to Canada because, at least at the present time, we have plenty of that class to fill up all the factories and manufacturing industries we have in this country, men who are thoroughly acquainted with the country and who know the kind of work that is to be done.

Another class that we could very readily absorb is what is called the domestic servant class. I think that is a wrong appellation; perhaps we should call them "maids of industry"—cooks are now called "dietitians," so that I think we could well call the others "maids of industry." We could absorb many of them if we could get the right class.

I do not think immigrants should be brought to this country and then dumped at the port of debarkation, such as Montreal, Quebec, Toronto or any other place. Somebody who is capable, who knows the country and its necessities, should be on hand to take charge of them there. If women were amongst the immigrants, a capable woman should be available who could look after these women on their arrival and not lose track of them until they were established in some way. I can imagine going to some foreign country about which I was totally uneducated and arriving there in the night—or in the morning, no matter when. With nobody to tell me what to do or where to go, I would be practically lost. I often feel very sorry for the bunches of immigrants you see around city stations who apparently are wandering around without any knowledge of what they are going to do or where they are going. I want to impress on the minister that these people should be taken care of from the time they land in Canada until they are properly established in whatever walk of life they want to get into. I hope the minister will take that into his serious consideration.

Mr. S. W. JACOBS (Georges-Etienne Cartier): Mr. Speaker, I should like to draw the attention of the House to the wording of this resolution introduced by the hon. member for St. Mary division of Montreal. The resolution reads:

> Whereas the question of unemployment in our large cities has become a serious problem; whereas the Government is going to study this question; whereas in Europe this social problem is just as great a menace as here and such being the case Canada is exposed to the risk of receiving more or less undesirable immigrants; therefore be it resolved: That, in the opinion of this House, all immigration should be suspended until a normal condition of affairs is established.

In other words, he says as soon as a normal condition of affairs is established here, then Canada can receive all the more or less undesirable immigrants who are prepared to come.

> Whereas in Europe this social problem is just as great a menace as here and such being the case Canada is exposed to the risk—

I am afraid my friend from St. Mary has not given this subject the attention it requires. I rather think he is looking at the question with spectacles which will not permit him to see further than the St. Mary division of Montreal. I feel that if he had had the experience which some of us have had in this matter of immigration, he would not have introduced this resolution. I am glad to think, however, that with the possible exception of himself and the hon. member from Prescott (Mr. Proulx), who supported the resolution, no one in the House is in favour of it. I may say that I myself have introduced a resolution directly negativing, if I may so call it, the resolution of my friend from St. Mary, but it appears that his resolution having come up before mine could be reached, I shall be debarred by the rules of the House from discussing my resolution this session. I had prepared myself with a certain amount of ammunition which I intended to direct to the seat of the Minister of Immigration and Colonization (Mr. Calder), but, fortunately for the House and the minister, this ammunition is not in the House at the moment, and consequently the minister will have to possess himself in patience until the matter comes up again.

Sir GEORGE FOSTER: We are not in immediate danger.

Mr. JACOBS: There is no immediate danger. I entirely agree with what my hon. friend from North Oxford (Mr. Nesbitt) said just a moment before he resumed his seat. I made a note of his remark, and it was this: "I know little or nothing about the subject."

Mr. NESBITT: I did not say that.

Mr. JACOBS: I have a note of it here; that is the way it reached me. I would go so far as to say that my friend from St. Mary is in exactly the same position as the hon. member for North Oxford.

The immigration question is a great national problem. It has been said only within the last few weeks that in the solution of our national problems immigration will play a most important part. We have it from the mouth of Mr. Beatty, the president of the Canadian Pacific Railway, that if our national roads are ever to be a success it will only be brought about by fostering proper immigration to this country. That seems only reasonable. Here is a land without people. How are three transcontinental railways to pay if we have not the people along the line of these roads? The question seems to me not to require any discussion. We must have people if we are to make these roads pay. Yet we have gentlemen coming into this House and telling us that inasmuch as we have unemployment in one part of the country—because we have too many artisans in that part and too few in the other—therefore, we should suspend immigration, put a ban on it for a period of two years, and afterwards let down the bars and allow the tide of immigration to flow in its natural course. That, Sir, is impossible. If we discourage immigration by putting up the bars in that way, we are going to restrict it just when we need it. There may be a little unemployment in this country. I do not know what the figures of the Department of Labour show, but I fancy the condition is not serious. When I want some one to do work for me, I cannot find any one to do it.

Mr. CANNON: They know you.

Mr. JACOBS: I did not believe that I was so well known to all the unemployed in the Dominion of Canada. What I wish to point out is that, simply because of some temporary unemployment in certain particular lines, we ought not go so far as to put up the bars against all kinds of immigration. Ever since I have been a member of this House I have been in favour of the open door with regard to immigration—the open door with, of course, certain modifications. I would not permit a single person to come into this country if he were undesirable. But what is an undesirable citizen? A man is not an undesirable because he has no money in his pocket. If that were so, there would be a very large number of respectable people in the country who would be undesirable. Very often a man is desirable just because he has no money in his pocket, because that condition provokes ambition. Where a man comes to this country without any money, that ought to be no reason for debarring him. As a matter of fact, a very large percentage, I venture to say perhaps 90 to 95 per cent, of the people in this country who came here as immigrants came just because they were poverty-stricken—if they had been well-to-do in thier own country, they would not come to Canada. What would there be to induce a man to come here if he were well-off in his own country? They come here in order to bring up their families under the better conditions that we provide in this country; they come because similar conditions do not obtain in Europe. Yet when these people come we have all kinds of annoying restrictions

placed in their way. We have certain Orders in Council which were put into effect last fall, just previous to the winter season setting in, which further restricted immigration to this country. Only last week these Orders in Council were continued for an indefinite period. I would point out to the House that these restrictions were imposed in the absence of my friend the Minister of Immigration and Colonization. Now that he is back, when he finds out what has been done in his absence, he wil probably see to it that these restrictions are removed. It is curious that during the entire time he was here, not one step was taken to continue these restrictions, but when he was called away to the West the restrictions were imposed.

Mr. MACKENZIE: He left instructions to that effect.

Mr. JACOBS: I do not think he did, because I happen to know the minister very well. I have had business with his department for a considerable time, and I can testify to the intimate knowledge which he has concerning the whole immigration problem. I have from time to time brought to his attention cases of great hardship in the matter of immigrants landing on our shores, and I must say that he has brought to the solution of the cases which I placed before him in regard to immigrants a great deal of sympathy and a very intimate knowledge of the whole immigration problem. I know that at heart the minister would really like to see these Orders in Council and all the other restrictive regulations reduced to the minimum.

My hon. friend from St. Mary cited with a great deal of satisfaction this afternoon the opinion of Sir Andrew McPhail. I would like to ascertain from my hon. friend whether he is in agreement with all the opinions of Sir Anderw McPhail upon other subjects as well as immigration. Some one has said that necessity makes strange bed-fellows. Still, I was surprised to see my friend from St. Mary in agreement with Sir Andrew McPhail even on the matter of immigration. I remember some speeches delivered by Sir Andrew during the war. Is my hon. friend from St. Mary prepared to accept the views of Sir Andrew McPhail regarding the war? And if Sir Andrew was wrong in his views of the war, does not my hon. friend think he may also be wrong in these immigration suggestions of his? I would rather have the view of a man like Mr. Beatty, who intimately knows the whole question, than that of Sir Andrew McPhail, who, although he may be a very estimable gentleman, is at best a mere doctrinaire in the matter of immigration and is in the same class as my hon. friend from North Oxford (Mr. Nesbitt), and my hon. friend from St. Mary. My hon. friend from Prescott (Mr. Proulx) stated that the restrictions in the United States were very much more severe than those in Canada. Well, I do not think they are. I had occasion some time ago, when discussing the question of immigration, to remark that the United States makes a rule to-day and we follow it to-morrow; or, to put it differently, they take the snuff and we do the sneezing. That is the unfortunate part of the whole situation, Mr. Speaker. The United States and Canada cannot be compared in the matter of immigration. They have been taking millions of people into their country for a period of a hundred years, and in the report published only last week by the United States Department of Immigration it was stated that during the last century 33,000,000 people had entered the United States from Europe. To-day the descendants of those people constitute the United States. What are we doing? Absolutely nothing. While the Americans have over 110,000,000 people in their country, we, I venture to think, have no more than 8,000,000. So that we cannot possibly compare conditions in the two countries, and people make a mistake when they presume for a moment to do so. What kind of people come to this country?—people who want to improve their condition, and those who have not the means to set up in Europe on their own account. And there is another class of people who come to this continent, those who are obliged to leave their own countries in Europe by reason of religious and social persecution. Now, this country, it seems to me, should be the haven of rest for people of that kind, and we ought to have our doors wide open for all those who flee from persecution, social and otherwise, in European countries. During the war a great wave of sympathy went out from Canada and the United States to those people in Europe who were ground down under the heel of autocracy and other forms of persecution. At that time we were ready to say to them: "Come unto us all ye that labour and are heavy laden, and we will give you rest." But so soon as the war is over we close our doors against them and say: For our own protection, we will not permit you to enter. When speaking on the subject of immigration a year or two ago, I related

a story which, I think, was apropos to the matter under discussion. It was a story told by a Salvation Army officer of a man whom he saw in London piloting poor cripples from one side of the street to the other, jumping from one little island, as he put it, to another. The Salvation Army officer was touched by what he supposed to be the charity of the man, and expressed his pleasure accordingly. The man replied: Why, it is not a matter of charity. You see, I have no shirt on and I carry these people from one side of the street to the other to warm my back. Now, Mr. Speaker, that is exactly what we want these people to do in this country. We want them to come here to warm our backs, metaphorically speaking; because, God knows, we need it badly. If we go on much longer with our merchant marine and our national railways in their present condition, we certainly shall need someone to warm our backs, because we shall not have a shirt to our name.

My hon. friend from St. Mary, you will no doubt judge, Mr. Speaker, cannot have a very heavy foreign population in his division. I think that is a reasonable conclusion from his remarks; and I suppose, per contra, I must have a very heavy foreign population in my own division. But I trust that I am able to look at this question with a larger vision. If I felt for a moment that the advocacy of admitting large numbers of proper immigrants into this country constituted a danger to the country, I care not how many foreign or other people I have in my division, I would not advocate it. But it is because I consider that it is entirely in the interests of the country that I am in favour of the widest possible immigration, consistent, of course, with proper safeguards respecting desirability, etc., from the health and other points of view. My hon. friend from St. Mary and also the hon. member for Prescott, were evidently not aware of the fact that we have at present on the statute book, and in Orders in Council and other regulations, just such restrictions as they are asking should now be imposed by this Government. For instance, we have a regulation to the effect that no person shall be permitted to come into this country unless he is travelling from the place of his birth on a through ticket to Canada. If he comes from some of the Balkan hills where it is impossible for him to purchase a through ticket from that place to Canada, and he purchases his ticket in Antwerp, or Havre, or Liverpool, he is turned away from our shores immediately on his arrival. Surely that is a pretty severe restriction. Well, that is one of the regulations which the Immigration Department has imposed. Where it is an absolute physical impossibility for a man to purchase a through ticket, no matter what his qualifications for citizenship may be, and no matter what sum of money he may have in his possession, he is unable to land here because he was unfortunately not in a position to see to it that the Canadian Pacific Railway, or the White Star line, or some other company, had ticket offices in the town of his birth. It will be for the Minister of Immigration and Colonization (Mr. Calder) when he replies to me, to say what it is that prompted the department to put into force a regulation of that kind. To my mind it is like the peace of God—it passeth all understanding. Then we have another regulation to the effect that no person may land in this country unless he has in his possession the sum of $250. If he has $249.99 he is looked upon as an undesirable citizen and is not permitted to land on our shores. No investigation is made as to whether he is likely to become a good citizen; nothing is done to find out whether he has relatives in this country who are able and willing to look after him; no investigation can be made by the officers at the port of entry, because the regulation states that he must have $250. If he has $250 he can land, and when that money is exhausted for living expenses—and it can last only a month or two at the most—then this man may become a public charge. But the Government feels that it has done its duty when it has seen that he has $250. Why, the man may have relatives in this country worth half a million dollars who are willing to give bonds that he will not become a public charge; but all the Government cares about is to see that he has this required sum of $250. They pay no attention to the circumstances of the man's relatives who may have come out to this country previously and done well here. Now, I say that these rules are silly, that they are foolish, and that it is not in keeping with the dignity of a country like Canada to enforce them. It is true that we have a rule which says that farmers and domestic servants can enter the country freely. But what is there to ensure that if a man enters Canada as a farmer he will go on the farm? I venture to say that fifty per cent of the people who were on farms twenty-five or thirty years ago are to-day residents of the large cities. I

venture to say that the domestic servants who came here fifteen or twenty years ago are no longer domestic servants. What are we going to do about it? How can we guarantee that a person who was a farmer on the other side of the Atlantic ocean is going to remain a farmer when he comes to this country? How can we say that a person who was a domestic servant in some European country is going to be a domestic servant here? How can we say that a man who was an artisan in the Old Land is not going to become a farmer here? How can we make watertight compartments in this country and say to immigrants: "If you declare you are a farmer we will let you in to go on the farm, but if, on the other hand, you declare that you are an artisan, even though you are willing to go on the farm, we refuse to permit you to enter the country." I say again, Mr. Speaker, all these rules require to be revamped. We ought to appoint a commission to investigate the whole question of immigration into Canada.

Mr. McMASTER: Not a commission.

Mr. JACOBS: The reason I suggested a commission is because I know that such an idea will appeal to the Government. They may feel it is something that will cause the whole matter to be shelved and may thus readily grant it.

Mr. CASGRAIN: We do not want to shelve the question.

Mr. JACOBS: We will not shelve the question. I hope it will come to a vote this afternoon in order that we may take the opinion of the House as to whether the resolution of my hon. friend from St. Mary is in the interest of the country. What pleased me particularly was the assertion of my hon. friend from St. Mary that he was making this resolution entirely on his personal responsibility. Well, it is such an illiberal motion, it is a motion so contrary to all ideals of freedom, that I would rather have expected it to come from an hon. member opposite. I am somewhat surprised that my hon. friend, who calls himself a Liberal, who votes Liberal, and who, I trust, thinks as a Liberal, should introduce such an illiberal resolution as this.

What was it that made this country prosperous from 1896 to 1911? I submit, Mr. Speaker, that it was the immigration policy introduced by the Laurier government and carried out by it up to the very moment that it went out of power. I had occasion to say before in this House that Sir Clifford Sifton is largely responsible for the tide of immigration which came into this country after 1896. We may have different opinions and views respecting the character of Sir Clifford Sifton but I must say this—that at no time in the history of Canada, with the possible exception of the present Minister of Immigration and Colonization, did we have a man who viewed the question of immigration so clearly as did Sir Clifford Sifton; and we ought to consider ourselves under a heavy debt of gratitude to that man for having clearly seen what was to the interest of this country, and put into force an Act to forward our immigration policy which did so much to people the West and to bring prosperity to Canada. If we adopt such a resolution as this we are going to face a most serious crisis. I warn my hon. friend the Minister of Immigration and Colonization that he ought to go slowly in the matter of restrictions on immigration. There are in Europe to-day thousands and tens of thousands, yes millions, of people who would become desirable immigrants in this country; but once you make them understand and believe that Canada is only for a certain class, that although this country is one which can accommodate one hundred and fifty millions, it is going to be made a stamping ground for seven or eight millions merely, then you turn the eyes and thoughts of those desirable immigrants elsewhere, and we lose them for all time. This resolution, although it has been introduced by my hon. friend from St. Mary, who knows practically nothing of the whole question, will have served a very good purpose by promoting the present debate, and more especially if it should elicit from the Minister of Immigration and Colonization some tangible, concrete views on this highly important question.

Mr. GEORGE BOYCE (Carleton): I have listened with a great deal of pleasure to the hon. member who has just taken his seat. I regret very much that that hon. gentleman is not a farmer, because, judging from the opinions he has expressed, he would make a good one. I have heard a good many speeches in this House but I must say I do not think I ever listened to one which contains more sound common sense than the speech which my right hon. friend delivered this afternoon. There is no doubt that immigration is one of the

great questions to which we should give our most thoughtful consideration at the present time. In the great West there are boundless acres lying uncultivated for the want of men to till them. In New Ontario what do we see?—millions of acres, waiting for settlers to come and cultivate the land. The need is great for desirable immigrants to enter this vast country of ours and help to increase its production. For my part I do not see why we should place such a serious handicap as now exists on respectable persons who wish to enter this country and settle here. Why should an honest man who is willing to work, and who would probably make a better living than he did in his former home, be hindered from coming into this country? I think I am safe in saying that there are hundreds and thousands—I might almost say millions—of men in the Old Land who would be only too glad to be given the opportunity of coming to Canada in order to work here and earn an honest livelihood. I have had letters from two or three men now who are there and who would like to get back to Canada. They lived here before the war broke out, and then went across the ocean to do their part. After peace came they remained in the Old Land, but although they would like to return to Canada they have not the means to carry out their desire.

I am a farmer and speak with some little knowledge of agriculture and its needs. In the county which I represent I believe employment could be found for at least one thousand qualified men in the course of a few days. In the farming industry we have been labouring under all sorts of difficulties for years, trying to get along with only about one-quarter of the labour needed, and yet we know there are any number of men available for settlement in Canada if they can only be brought here. We often hear it said that in the cities there are great numbers of idle men. I have not the least doubt that such is the case. I have visited this city myself trying to get men to work in harvest time but without success, although there seemed to be any number of persons without any visible occupation. I know of one case where a man was asked to take a place on the farm and demanded $5 a day and his board. When this was promised him he said: "Will you take my two chums?" The farmer replied in the negative and the man then said: "Oh, well, I do not want to work on a farm." That is the type of man that is idle in our large cities. Such men as this do not want to work. I have been brought up in this country and have an intimate knowledge of the conditions here, and I say that no man who is willing to work need experience hard times—he can always get sufficient employment to keep him going and yield a little to spare. I trust that no serious monetary handicap against desirable immigration into Canada will be enforced.

How are we going to amount to anything if we stop immigration? We have heard several references to the United States. Would there be a population of 110,000,000 in the United States to-day if there had been any restriction on immigration there? Not a bit of it. If we put restrictions on immigration how long will it be before we have a population of even 50,000,000? We want men who are willing to work. It deos not make any difference whether they are farm hands or mechanics, if they are willing to work they will always find plenty to do. That is the type of men we want, and I hope we will do everything to encourage such men to help in the upbuilding of Canada, so that we may become one of the great nations of the earth and our land will be a blessing to millions who will make their homes here in years to come.

Mr. J. A. ROBB (Chateauguay-Huntingdon): Mr. Speaker, the pith of the resolution presented by my hon. friend from St. Mary (Mr. Deslauriers) is that Canada should suspend all immigration until normal conditions are established. In my judgment if this resolution was adopted, and the Government based their policy upon it, my hon. friend would be helping to delay the very conditions that he wishes to bring about, because the restriction of immigration would go far to retard the re-establishment of normal conditions in this country.

Our city friends have for some years been clamouring for a reduction in the cost of living and in rents, and they complain bitterly that foodstuffs and rentals have become dearer year by year. But what has contributed more to the advancement of rents in the cities, to the detriment of the workers, than the action of the workers themselves? They are not willing to work more than eight hours a day; but, after all, that would not be so bad if they were willing to give a good eight hours' work. However, the rule apparently is to do as little work as possible, and this in very large measure is responsible for the higher rents which they have to pay. While they are clamouring for a reduction in the cost

4 p.m.

of foodstuffs, apparently our city friends forget that their advocacy of shorter hours and increased pay has taken away from the farms the people who by their work on the land would have contributed to a fair reduction of the cost of living. And our city friends by their advocacy of higher pay and shorter hours for railway workers have still further helped to increase the cost of transportation of the products of the farms to the cities. As a result, to-day we have dissatisfaction both in the cities and in the country, because there is a shortage of labour in the latter and a surplus of it in the former, and the trouble is that many of the men who were attracted to the cities by higher pay and shorter hours are disinclined to work.

I have no quarrel with my city friends for wishing to bar immigration completely, but, representing an agricultural constituency, I do not wish to see this resolution passed without saying to the minister in charge (Mr. Calder) and the Government that in my judgment what Canada requires to-day more than anything else is more and better immigration. If workers in the cities are to have cheaper foodstuffs and lower rents, Canada must produce a surplus of exportable products to meet our national obligations, and the only way to stimulate production is to encourage men to come to this country who are willing to work. I am quite ready to admit that there are a sufficient number of artisans in this country if they were only willing to work. And I am not urging upon the Minister of Immigration to make it easier for foreign agitators to enter Canada. Indeed, I am satisfied that even old Mother England should keep her agitators at home. We do not want them here, but we do want men and women who are willing to work, and therefore I do not think we would be acting wisely in placing a money restriction on the right type of immigrants. Perhaps many of us in this House would not be here had there been a money restriction placed upon the earlier settlers, for many of our parents came here with very little money; all they had was their health and their willingness to work. They did work, and their industry helped to make this country what it is to-day—attractive to those from overseas who are seeking to enter our ports. Therefore I urge upon the minister the adoption of a policy that will bring to this country all immigrants who are willing to work.

From what I read in the press recently it occurs to me that some gentlemen who are very closely associated with the Government apparently have not much confidence in its immigration policy. I noticed that recently in the city of Winnipeg there was formed what is known as the Western Canada Colonization Society, and, strange to say, instead of placing at its head the Minister of Immigration, who is himself a western man and should know the needs of the West, they selected as president a gentleman from Hamilton, Mr. Robert Hobson, one of the directors of our national railway system. The reason for the formation of that society was stated to be that, in the opinion of its organizers, Canada must have increased immigration in order to secure greater production, and instead of urging upon the Government to extend its immigration policy I gather from the newspaper reports that these gentlemen say: We are going to take this work out of the hands of the immigration authorities and ourselves see that the work is done right. It is aparent that they are not satisfied with the methods of the Immigration Department. The managing director of the association is General McRae, who did such splendid work in the war, and it has been left to him to go out and stimulate immigration. It seems to me that when the minister replies he should tell us whether the newspaper reports are correct, and whether those gentlemen are to send their agents throughout the British Isles and other parts of Europe in search of suitable immigrants, instead of leaving the work in the hands of the Immigration Department.

For these reasons, Mr. Speaker, I am not prepared to suport the resolution presented by my hon. friend for St. Mary and so well argued by him from his point of view. I say in all frankness to my hon. friend from St. Mary that if the city people wish to secure lower rentals and cheaper foodstuffs, the best thing he can do for Canada is to withdraw his resolution and allow the Government to proceed along sound, sane lines as was the case in the years from 1896 until 1911, when we were so prosperous, when we had immigration of anywhere from 200,000 to 350,000 each year. That is the policy we require for Canada—not the restriction or suspension of immigration.

Mr. W. G. McQUARRIE (New Westminster): Mr. Speaker, I think there is a good deal to be said in favour of the resolution, the effect of which is to recommend to the Government that all immigration shall be suspended until conditions

again become normal. We all have to admit that conditions are not normal at present, and it seems to me that they are going to become worse before they get better. Factories and industries all over the country are closing down; we hear that every day, and a great many men are out of employment. I was in Hamilton during the Easter holidays and I heard there that a lot of the Hamilton factories were closing down and that a great many men would be out of employment. Included in the institutions which are closing down, I think, is the International Harvester Company, a big concern which employed 3,500 men. Now, we have bread lines in nearly all the cities. I know that in Vancouver a great many men are at present out of employment, men who want work but cannot get it. I do not agree with the hon. member for Huntingdon (Mr. Robb) that the unemployed of Canada are men who do not want to work; there are a great many men who cannot get work. That being the case, why should we bring into the country a lot of men to make conditions worse? Because that is what the result would be. The great argument seems to be that the farmers are unable to get help. Well, I think the time will come, and come very soon, when the unemployed in the cities may be very glad to go back on the farm, and when that time comes you will have lots of men, and good men, to work on the farms.

When I was coming up from Hamilton I met one of the men who had been thrown out of employment through the closing down of a factory in that city. I got into conversation with him. I do not know what his name is, but I ascertained that he was one of the Princess Pats, one of the men who came back with the remnant of that famous regiment not so very long ago and marched along the streets of Ottawa; one of the regiment of which we are all so proud. That man said he had been working in a factory where threshing machines were manufactured; that the concern had been getting no business for some time and had had to close down. I asked him what he was going to do. He said: I am going to a farm here where I have secured employment. I believe that will be the case with a great many men; when they cannot get any other work they will have to go on the farm. I believe conditions will right themselves and that we have in Canada sufficient men to look after all the work which is required to be done on the farms.

The matter of the need for domestic servants has been referred to during the course of the discussion. I believe it would be advisable to encourage the coming to this country of domestic servants, because there is a shortage of that class of labour in Canada. If a good, capable girl comes into the country, in a short time she gets married, and I believe we should encourage that kind of thing if they are the right kind of people.

It has been said also that the solution of our railroad problem, which is a most unfortunate one, of course, is to throw open the doors to immigration and let everybody in. That course has been urged by men like Mr. Beatty, of the Canadian Pacific Railway Company, and the hon. member from Marquette (Mr. Crerar). Well, that may later be the proper policy; when conditions right themselves it will, I suppose, be proper for the railroad companies to do as they did before and bring people to this country by the thousands and tens of thousands. But I do not believe that time has come; I do not believe that the bringing of immigrants into Canada by the wholesale will help out our railroad situation. Before you throw open the doors, I would say, get rid of the bread lines—which involves practically what the mover of the resolution (Mr. Deslauriers) suggests, namely, the return of conditions to normal. I am not a pessimist, by any means; I believe that we have a great country and that a great future lies before us. But we should be very careful not to make conditions worse during the next few years.

The United States is restricting immigration, and no doubt a large number of people who are refused entrance into that country will try to come into Canada. Something has been said about the policy of the late Liberal Administration, and Sir Clifford Sifton's name was mentioned, great credit being given to him for bringing so many people into the country. But I am afraid that under that policy a great many people of the wrong kind were brought in. I do not think that the country gained anything by the admission into Canada of people like the Doukhobors, for instance,—I mention simply that one class; there are others. These people do not do any good to the country, so far as I have been able to discover. They have their own settlements; they make money for themselves; they cultivate the land, it is true, but they remain more or less a foreign settlement in our midst. I do not think that is what we want; we do not want men who, when we

get into any kind of trouble, will say that they are conscientious objectors and that they are not going to take any part in the defence of the country. We want people who will make good Canadians, who will perform the duties of Canadians, and who will help to make Canada the country which it ought to be.

I stated that there was a good deal to be said for this resolution, but I do not wish it to be inferred that I would support such a drastic proposition as this. I believe rather that the policy which the Government has adopted, of the very strictest kind of supervision of people who are trying to get into Canada, should be followed out. Such people should be examined in every possible way. I quite agree that it is not sufficient to qualify them that they should possess the sum of $250 or any definite amount of money; they should be the right kind of people, and the Government should examine them very strictly in order to find out whether that is the case or not. I would allow in, as the Government is doing, domestic servants and farm labourers. It is quite true that when you let in a farm labourer, you cannot be at all sure that that man is going to stay on the farm, but a certain number of them will do so. They have the farming instinct in them, and if they cannot get employment in other lines, they will go on the farm. I want to help the farmers; there are many farmers in my constituency, and there is a certain amount of room for men who will go on the land, particularly in the West. Let in domestic servants; let in farmers; but be very careful, though, about the class of people that you let in to be farmers. The mere fact that a man has been a farmer in some European country, to my mind, does not altogether qualify him as a proper citizen of Canada.

Some hon. members, in speaking of the need for farm help, have, perhaps, to a certain extent, exaggerated the situation. There are in this country people to work on the farms, provided that you can induce them to do so. If a man is out of work and will not go on a farm, there must be something wrong either with the man or with the treatment that he receives when he goes on the farm to work. Something can be done to improve conditions on farms so as to make them more attractive for men who might be expected to work on them. I am, unfortunately, not a farmer, and possibly I have not a great deal of information about the way in which farm labourers are treated; but it seems to me that they are more or less turned out in the backyard to live; that they are not given proper accommodation, and that they are not treated exactly as they should be in more respects than one. The time is coming when the farmer will have to get down to the eight-hour day, and while some hon. members may smile at that, things are changing; in other lines of industry, the eight-hour day has had to be adopted, and I do not see why farm labouring should not be considered in exactly the same way as labouring at any other kind of work.

This resolution should not pass, but the Government should carry on the policy, which the minister has stated as reported in the press, of the very strictest supervision of immigration for some time to come.

Mr. J. M. DOUGLAS (Strathcona): Mr. Speaker, the question of immigration, to my mind, is one of the greatest questions confronting the people of Canada at the present time. At the outset let me say that I have not the slightest sympathy with the resolution propounded by the hon. member for St. Mary's division of Montreal (Mr. Deslauriers). Some facts with regard to the difficulties of admittance of settlers into this country under the present immigration regulations were set forth very clearly by the hon. member for George Etienne Cartier (Mr. Jacobs) and I agree entirely with every statement he made in that regard. In the province from which I come we can accommodate millions of immigrants. The previous speaker (Mr. McQuarrie) stated that, under the regime of Sir Clifford Sifton there came into this country a certain kind of immigration which, in his judgment, was not in the best interest of Canada. He mentioned the class of Doukhobors. Personally, I have no knowledge of the Doukhobors; but I presume, in his classification of Doukhobors, he also included other residents of Austria and Russia who were of the same type, but who do not hold the same religious convictions which the Doukhobors hold.

In Alberta, we have a large number of foreign-speaking settlers who are now Canadian citizens, men who came from Austria, from Russia, and some from Germany. In spite of any criticism which may have been made as to the immigration policy which was put into effect in 1897 or thereabouts, I make the statement in this House that that immigration policy was the foundation of the success of this country, and that Alberta and the other western provinces

have profited greatly by the settlement of those people on our fertile lands. The regulations in vogue to-day contain so many restrictive measures that a great injustice is being perpetrated on people, particularly from certain sections of Europe, coming into this country. Those people, in many instances, are relatives of people living in Western Canada at the present time, who are progressive, well-to-do people, and who are prepared to take the chances of seeing that those people do not become charges on the country. I have had, under my personal observation, many cases of former Austrian citizens, former Russian citizens, former Polish citizens, now living in this country, who are quite prepared to give a bond, if necessary, to the Government that their relatives will not be a charge on the public of this country if they are allowed admittance. But they cannot get in, and yet we see other types of people coming into Canada who are not in the same class whatever as settlers, who are not under any circumstances to be regarded as being of as great value to the country as some of those people whose entry into this country has been prohibited by regulation.

We have a tremendous transportation problem on our hands; we have tremendous resources undeveloped; we have a huge national debt, and if we are ever going to get out of the mire, we must have the people. In my judgment the $250 qualification does not represent the value of an immigrant in the slightest degree. If I might be personal, I might cite the case of my father who came to this country in 1853 with one sovereign in his pocket. and who had to make his way in a country where the advantages at that time were not nearly as great as they are to-day. His case is only one of thousands This country was built up by men of that kind. If we are going to restrict and hamper this class of people we are not going to have a country at all.

Hon. gentlemen have referred to what the United States is doing, but the United States cannot be compared with us at the present time. They have in the neighbourhood of 110,000,000 people, while we have only a paltry 8,000,000 or 9,000,000. We have as large an arable country as they have, yet we are putting up the bars against possible assets in the form of hard-working industrious people who will make this country a place that we shall all be proud to live in. I am entirely in favour of the bars being thrown down to a great extent; at all events, more than they are at the present time. Give us a policy that will bring the most progressive and strongest type of immigrants to this country, and I have no fear as to what the results will be in the future.

Mr. FERNAND RINFRET (St. James, Montreal): (Translation.) Mr. Speaker, as this motion may go to a vote, I wish to address the House though very briefly, on the subject, if only to qualify my stand in reference to it.

I must first congratulate the member from St. Mary's (Mr. Deslauriers) for having brought about this debate and this independantly of what he had to say, and I should like also to congratulate him for having opened it in French, since this permits some of the members from the province of Québec to follow it in their own language. I hope that the minister in charge of the debate will not think it a lack of courtesy if I continue in the same language as that used by the member from St. Mary's, since the arguments on the debate have been offered in such profusion in English that he has certainly been able to form his opinion without having to hear in detail that which I wish to say. I will add though, that the Government is but imperfectly represented in this debate, since, while it is mainly a question of immigration that has been raised, it is at the same time one of labour. Once more we are shown the proof of the absurd position of the present Government which has in the Senate some of the ministers who are at the head of the most important departments, notably that department among all others which should be represented in the democratic House, the lower House, the House of those elected by the people, the department of labour. But I hope that upon this side of the House we have voices powerful enough to make themselves heard even in the richly decorated hall of the Upper House.

I agree with a good part of what has been said by my friend the member from St. Mary's who shares with me the distinction of representing one of the divisions of Canada's metropolis, and who is my neighbour on the left in the city of Montreal. I also agree with the part of what has been said by my neighbour on the right, the member from Georges-Etienne-Cartier (Mr. Jacobs), and it is an odd circumstance that though I am geographically situated between them, I should be called upon to take a stand which is not entirely that of either of them.

The member from St. Mary's maintains that the labour situation is such that all immigration should be suspended. The member from Georges Etienne-Cartier on his part answers, "It is true that the situation of labour is difficult enough, but nevertheless we should continue to open wide our doors." It appears to me, Mr. Speaker, that it should be possible to find in a treatise on architecture the contrivance of an aperture which be neither the dark closed grill of my hon. friend on my left, so to speak, nor the wide-open door of the member from Georges-Etienne-Cartier.

It is rather remarkable that the member from St. Mary's, while pretending to treat the immigration question as a whole, contents himself with presenting the arguments which have to do with the problem of unemployment from the labourer's point of view. It did not occur to him that one of the ways of solving the problem of unemployment in the towns is to increase the population in the country districts, for the larger the rural population, the greater is the need for articles manufactured in the towns. A community after all is like a person, it must be fed. But there are certain foods which suit this person and others which are distasteful to him, and if a diet of overfeeding (which I suspect my hon. friend from Georges-Etienne-Cartier of wishing to prescribe) would not agree just now with the Canadian people, I do not believe that we would be justified in exposing the community to starvation by cutting off the supply of food which it needs. For who can deny that up to a certain point we need immigration in Canada? The member from St. Mary's says that he does not wish an indiscriminate invitation to our shores extended to all would-be immigrants, but it seems to me that he falls into the opposite danger, which is to prevent all, without distinction, from coming in. If the motion is not at fault in its premises, if it be true, as he has so ably shown with the science and eloquence which gained for him the support of the most thickly populated county of the Dominion, I really believe that we have unemployment in our cities, and that this constitutes a grave problem. He adds that the Government purposes to study this question. This is also true, in the exact terms in which he puts it. The Government, alas, purposes all sorts of things and then does nothing further about them! It is true that a social upheaval exists in Europe, and that on this side we are exposed to having undesirable immigrants. All this, from my point of view, is quite true. But I am forced to disagree with my hon. friend from St. Mary's, when he asks that immigration be completely suspended, though that does not mean that I accept in their entirety the views of my hon. friend from George-Etienne-Cartier.

In fact, we know that in his conclusions the hon. member for St. Mary's has allowed it to be understood that he is willing to modify to a certain extent his conclusions; and he admitted that there might be immigrants who would become excellent citizens. It is therefore easy to see that we can come to an understanding. We must therefore content ourselves with asking the Government to exercise a reasonable control over the immigration that presents itself at our doors. This is what is done by our neighbours of the United States. I do not wish to prolong this discussion—I have here a very interesting compilation from *The Literary Digest*, on the subject of immigration to the United States, in which is explained, by extracts from different American papers, how they mean to proceed in that country. In the United States, though it is a very populous country, already having 110 million inhabitants, it is not the intention to stop immigration, because it is admitted that even in that thickly peopled country, certain elements from European or other sources may be needed. It is all the more so, Mr. Speaker, in Canada, where we are only 8 millions; where we have to face immense problems; where we have, for instance, the problem of State-owned railways—a problem which can only be solved as it seems by adding to the population of the country in years to come—where we have a heavy war-debt which will be reduced if our population increases. If this tax is so much per head to-day, it is evident that when the population is 16 millions it will be reduced by 50 per cent. Unless the Government persist in increasing the debt by their extravagance, but, notwithstanding the Government's great aversion to go before the people, we know very well that there cannot be a longer delay than fifteen or sixteen months. We must have a "back to the land" policy, and I believe that the member from St. Mary's will admit that in the increasing of the rural population lies a remedy—I do not say the only remedy, for no single remedy can solve a complex problem—for the evil of unemployment in the towns however would certainly disappear with reference to foreign immigration, I would like to add a word. I declare in all sincerity before this House,

that there are different European elements the incorporating of which would be a distinct gain to us. I would like to mention some who have become Canadian citizens and are worthy of our attention, for instance, the Syrians. Those who are familiar with Montreal, particularly the east end, know that they are easily assimilated; that they readily learn not only French but English, that they are industrious, and become merchants, not labourers. We have in Montreal, on Notre Dame St. east, and in other parts of the town, not only in the constituency of St. James, but in other constituencies, a Syrian population carrying on business along sound and profitable lines and constituting an immigration eminently desirable. Nevertheless I know, from having talked with them, that most of these Syrians came into the country with less than $250 which the Government now exacts on arrival.

As the hon. member from Georges-Etienne-Cartier (Mr. Jacobs) strongly put it just now, it is not the rich, it is not those who are comfortably off at home, who emigrate; those who leave their own country are the ones who seek better conditions than are possible for them at home. I do not wish to discuss in all its details this particular restriction which the Government imposes upon immigration, but I would like to simply show in a general way, and to remain within the bounds of this afternoon's discussion, that this question is very complex, and that it is very difficult to settle it by arrangements of a special character. This is why, in the best of spirit, and because my hon. friend from St. Mary's (Mr. Deslauriers) is one of the best Liberals I know, that I would suggest that he further develop his view of which he gave us a glimpse in the last sentences of his speech. In these he admitted that if it were necessary to maintain a barrier against all immigrants who might be a cause of social disaggregation, or of overbidding on the labour market, a door must nevertheless be left open not necessarily wide open, but it must be left ajar for a certain class of immigrants whom we need in our rural distracts.

Personally, I wish to say that I would gladly vote for a resolution along these lines, but I would be very sorry indeed to vote against that of the hon. member for St. Mary's should it remain exactly in its present form.

Mr. DONALD SUTHERLAND (Oxford South): After listening attentively to the speeches delivered on this resolution, I cannot help expressing the regret I feel, that it is rather unfortunate that the vision of some of those who have addressed the House does not extend beyond the borders of their own constituencies. The resolution reads in part:

> Whereas the question of unemployment in our large cities has become a serious problem . . . . therefore be it resolved: That, in the opinion of this House, all immigration should be suspended until a normal condition of affairs is established.

The large cities, it seems, are the only points to be considered, and all the other sections of the community, and the interests of the people in general, are to be lost sight of. One almost imagines, from the remarks that have been made upon the resolution, that the people of Canada and the people of the world at large ought to be in a normal condition to-day. It would be strange indeed, after the world-wide convulsion that has taken place, if there were not an unsettled state of affairs in many parts of the world, and in many sections of our own community. The conditions that prevailed during the war were entirely different from what they are to-day, and were in no small measure responsible for those unsettled conditions which the mover of the resolution referred to as existing at present in the large industrial centres. We heard a great deal during the war about profiteers, and the charge of profiteering was frequently hurled at a certain class of people. I question, however, whether any section of the community are altogether free from this offence, and many of those people who to-day are out of employment in the large cities are in my opinion not free from this charge. It is true there has been a great influx of people from all parts of the country into the large industrial centres, where wages during the war were higher than they have ever been in the past. In the manufacturing of munitions and other necessary war material, our people have congregated in these centres and now, owing to the cessation of hostilities, are to-day without the employment which they had during the years of the war. I venture to say that there was never a time in the history of Canada when labour was so necessary as it is at the present time. It is the only thing upon which we can rely to pull us out of the

difficult position in which we are placed. True, it may be impossible for some people to get employment in the trades and industries in which they had been previously engaged; but if they are out of employment to-day it is largely because they will not do the work which is to be done and which must be done before we shall be able to get back to a normal state. The mover of the resolution would bar all immigration into this country. Well, there is a certain class of immigrants whom I would not permit to come here at any time or under any conditions. But just now there is a certain class of people who are anxious to come to Canada, and I believe they ought to receive consideration at the hands of the Government. If you wait until you absorb all the elements that we find in the large cities to-day, then you will wait a long time; you will wait until those desirable settlers who are eager to come to Canada have gone to some other country. There are in Great Britain to-day immense numbers of men and women who are anxious to come to Canada and make this country their home. But some one says: If you bring these people here they must go on the land, and what assurance have you that they will remain there if you permit them to come in? A few hours ago, before the Pensions Committee of this House, we had certain witnesses, one of whom represented the tubercular patients at the hospital at Hamilton, where they had adopted an industrial scheme whereby they are building houses on the outskirts of the city for tubercular patients and establishing what is known as a "vetcraft industry." Men of means have interested themselves in their behalf as they are anxious that the Government should do something for them. The promotees have made careful observations as to what lines of business can be carried on under the auspices of this organization with a view to making them a success. A witness who appeared before the committee to-day, Mr. Speaker, a shrewd young man who has evidently made a study of the subject, referred to the various industries which could be carried on profitably and without subjecting tuberculous patients to undue strain. But he made some statement which was rather significant, he said that so far as agriculture was concerned they did not intend to do anything because it was absolutely unprofitable. I am afraid that a great many hon. gentlemen will not agree with me if I should concur in the view of that witness. Nevertheless it is very significant to-day to learn from a persual of the daily newspapers that many of the essential articles of food in Canada are being imported from Europe and South America and China where labour is cheap. These articles of food are coming into competition with Canadian products, and are taking the place of commodities that ought to be raised in this country. Why, Sir, look at our vast extent of territory which to-day is only occupied by some eight or nine millions of people. We have laid the foundations of great public works intended to aid in the settlement and development of the Dominion. We have built railways, we have dug canals, and we are building steamships to assist in carrying our produce to the various markets of the world. The foundations of a great system of transportation have been well and truly laid; and to-day we are anxiously waiting for people to come in and help develop this country, waiting for people to come here and fill the vacant places that need to be filled, and whose coming is justified by the immense area of this country, as yet so sparsely populated. The transportation system of Canada is in a very precarious condition to-day and I believe that it is more largely responsible for the existing unrest and the lack of employment than anything else. I believe that if we had lower railway rates in the Dominion you would not find the stagnation in business which you do find to-day. Who is responsible for the condition of our railways? It is not altogether due to the fact that we have built too far in advance of our needs, or rather that in many sections of the country there are railways paralleling each other, railways which should not have been built. Railway companies have been competing among themselves in order to obtain traffic, but they have not given that cheap service to the country which should have resulted from a competition in the real sense of the term. We find that during the war the railway unions of Canada, which were better organized perhaps than other unions, not only kept abreast of the high wages being paid to workers for turning out munitions and other necessities of war, but their remuneration was far in advance of that received in other branches of labour. The result is that it would appear as though the railway employees in Canada to-day considered that the railways were built for their convenience and benefit rather than for the con-

venience and benefit of the people as a whole.

As to the question of immigration we ought to be careful about the class of immigrants we permit to enter Canada. I have here a clipping which was published in a newspaper in 1913, just before the war broke out, and the article refers to information which had come from Berlin, that the Canadian Pacific Railway had succeeded in securing twenty thousand immigrants per month to come out to this country, and that these immigrants were mainly Austrians and people from southern Europe. There may have been some method in the policy of bringing immigrants to Canada which was pursued at that time; but in view of what has transpired during the past six or seven years we ought to be careful to see that the immigrants permitted to enter Canada are in sympathy with our laws and institutions. At the same time if we enforce a penalty, as it were, to the extent of $250 against the entrance of desirable immigrants we are going to handicap our people in a way that nothing else can do. As has been already pointed out by previous speakers, labour was never more difficult to secure in the rural districts. Never before was it so difficult to secure satisfactory farm labour as it is at this particular time. I think it was the hon. member for New Westminster (Mr. McQuarrie) who declared that the farmers do not treat their help properly and who proclaimed himself in favour of an eight-hour day, in order to overcome the difficult situation that confronts us. I say, and I have said it on previous occasions in this House, that what we need is labour and a class of labour that will not be too particular as to whether it works half an hour over the usual time or not. It is not an eight-hour day that is so necessary in many walks of life, but a desire to give value for the wages received. This is what is needed in order to establish confidence and put many of these industries on their feet again. My hon. friend says that the farmer should adopt the eight-hour day. Well we have to-day to consider the competition from Holland, Denmark, Argentine, and other countries whose products are now sold in Canada but of a quality that does not begin to compare with our own. Surely we are not going to permit such inferior importations to take the place of commodities which ought to be produced in our own country.

I had no intention of speaking on this resolution, I had not even read it before coming to the House this afternoon, but I do desire to put the Government on their guard against paying too much attention to the demands of some of the labour unions in Canada. These unions are asking not only that the hours of labour shall be cut down, but they are even fixing the amount of labour that a man will be permitted to do, with the result that if he exceeds the maximum he is fined by the union to which he belongs. It does not appear to be a question of giving value for what is received; it is an effort to curtail as much as possible what each individual man can do. How can a country expect to have prosperity under such conditions? If you follow such a policy out to its logical conclusion you must apply the same regulation to every other class in the community. The same standard must apply to all, which would mean that the Government would eventually have to take charge of the entire population and provide that they shall do just so much labour without competition, which all will admit, is an absolute impossibility. I do not believe it is advisable for a government to attempt to undertake anything that the people ought to do and are capable of doing for themselves. There are sufficient necessary duties devolving upon a government without its seeking new spheres of activity along that line. But I want to say again that the only hope for our country is to have competition whereby the best will come to the front, merit must be the test, because once you eliminate competition you are going to have stagnation. And that is the very thing sought to be accomplished by the so-called Independent Labour party of Canada. I realize that I may be saying something that will not be very popular in many parts of the country and it may be in certain sections of the constituency that I represent, but I have been accustomed to say exactly what I think on matters of public importance since I have been a member of this House, although, I recognize such frankness is not always popular in certain quarters. But I am so seized of the seriousness of the situation with which we are confronted to-day that I welcome this opportunity to put on record my views in regard to this question. You must remove the shackles that are to-day placed on trade, you must permit natural and normal development, and you must see that our transportation

5 p.m.

facilities are placed in such a position as will make them of the greatest possible use in the further development of the Dominion. Given these conditions, I am satisfied that the genius of our people will overcome the difficulties with which we are now surrounded.

Mr. J. W. KENNEDY (Glengarry and Stormont): Mr. Speaker, my only reason for taking part in this debate is that the question of immigration is so closely related with that of employment. I think it is rather strange that a debate of this kind should have arisen, even at this time, in a country such as Canada, and I am surprised that any one would advocate the barring out of suitable immigrants when our broad acres and our many natural resources are waiting the necessary labour to develop them.

We have heard a great deal this afternoon about unemployment, but it has not been suggested that there is much unemployment in our rural sections. It has, however, been stated that the unemployment situation is very general in all our urban centres and very serious. This condition, according to some people, is due to the refusal of labour to work reasonable hours for reasonable wages; certain others have been disposed to blame this condition on the employers; but in this particular I think the discussion has really overlooked the actual cause. I submit, Sir, that the present serious labour situation is a very sad commentary on the fiscal policy which Canada has so foolishly followed during the last fifty years. This policy was entered upon to a certain extent to afford employment to labour. We have heard a great deal of argument along this line in the last few years, and even in the present session, in the Address which we had from His Excellency it was mentioned that the present Administration was still pursuing the policy of protection in order to afford employment to our labouring men. After following that policy for fifty years, is it not strange that we have such a serious unemployment situation in our urban centres to-day? Surely the advocates of protection will not further argue that a continuance of that policy will afford permanent employment to the working men of this country. Protection has encouraged industry, but industry is dependent on so many conditions outside of itself that there are certain times when it flourishes very rapidly and demands a great deal of labour, while at other times it is beset by certain unfavourable conditions and it turns labour out. This is a great hardship on the labouring man, for he cannot easily change his employment. Therefore I would suggest that it is very unwise to continue a policy of trying to build up in this country large industrial centres which are so dependent on external conditions. I would suggest instead a policy of encouraging some of our basic industries, such as agriculture, which is not so dependent on outside conditions, and which will afford permanent employment for many more thousands of labourers than we have at the present day.

Much has been said about permitting farm labourers to come into this country, and excluding artisans. Well, the farm labourer who has come to us in the past has, after spending a few months on the farm, usually drifted into the urban centres to become an artisan. That has been the experience of the past and will likely be the experience of the future so long as we follow a policy which makes agricultural labour so unremunerative. I was struck by a remark made by the hon. gentleman (Mr. Sutherland) who immediately preceded me, that if you eliminate competition you produce stagnation. I would suggest to him that the fiscal policy of protection tends toward that very thing, towards restricting competition, and so inevitably producing stagnation.

I want to combat one or two statements made by the hon. member for New Westminster (Mr. McQuarrie). He intimated that the reason why agricultural labour was so scarce in this country was that hired men were not properly treated. I think he used the expression, that they were turned out into the back yard. I think the hon. gentleman admitted that he was not a farmer and was not familiar with farming conditions. This is quite evident or he would never have made such a statement.

Mr. SMITH: Is not that partly true?

Mr. KENNEDY (Glengarry and Stormont): The hired man has usually the same privileges, the same food and the same accommodation as the farmer and his family enjoy. The hon. member for New Westminster also stated that he advocated an eight-hour day for the farmer. Well, I am sure the majority of farmers would welcome an eight-hour day.

Mr. SMITH: Are you sure of that?

Mr. KENNEDY (Glengarry and Stormont): I am quite sure they would welcome an eight-hour day on the farm.

But I might advise the hon. gentleman that if such a thing came to pass our urban population would very soon be paying possibly a dollar a pound for their butter and for their beef and bacon, fifty or sixty cents a pound for their cheese, a couple of dollars a dozen for their eggs, and so on down the list. That would be the inevitable result from the establishment of an eight-hour day on the farm. I think it would be very unfortunate if this resolution were concurred in and suitable immigration to this country restricted at the present time.

Mr. W. K. BALDWIN (Stanstead): Mr. Speaker, this, to me, is one of the most important resolutions which has been presented to the House this session. If we cast our eye over this broad Dominion, three or four thousand miles in its extent, and consider the proportion which our population bears to our railway mileage, to our vast agricultural possibilities, our great waterways, our splendid mineral and other resources, we must come to the conclusion that only by increasing our population through a wise immigration policy can these vast resources be developed and our country attain its fullest progress. We have an area comparable with that of the United States; see what they have done. It is only recently that they have had restrictive immigration laws of any kind. People come from the four corners of the earth to that great country, and, as some hon. members have said here to-day, whether these immigrants be Norwegians or Swedes or Germans or Danes, they have been the best possible immigration agents and they look after their people as they come in. So unless we wish to retard and hold back the progress of this great Dominion we must work along progressive lines. Look at our railway system, our great agricultural and mining possibilities and our water-powers which, if developed, would enable us to get most of our coal in our own country instead of from Pennsylvania and to keep our money at home. All these branches of development need help, need the assistance of labour. Let me say right here that the climatic conditions of this country are such as to discourage the coming here of those nomadic races who live by putting their hands into the other fellow's pocket. We do not want that class of people; we want a better class. We do not want loafers; we have enough of them already. I am interested in some large undertakings and have been for many years, and I can say that there never was a time when it was harder to get labour than it is to-day. We talk about farmers and the need for production. Well, the value of the products of the farm has declined to the extent of one-third, and if the farmer is to go ahead, if he is to extend his tillable land, he must be enabled to get labour and to get it at rates more consistent with the prevailing prices of farm products.

We know that labour creates all things, all that we eat and use and wear, and our population must increase if this country of ours is to go along as it should. It is appalling to see hon. members looking no further than their own constituencies, their own little neighbourhoods. The great province from which I come, with all its important industries and its agricultural possibilities, loses one-half the people born within its borders—people who are persuaded to go down to the New England States through the inducements of cheap land and high wages.

Mention has been made of the need for domestic servants. Well, many who come from the Old Land and who would otherwise act in the capacity of domestic servants are absorbed in the Civil Service of Canada. In my opinion we have in this country—and I care not who hears it—three civil servants where we should have one, and here is where a great deal of our domestic help is absorbed. Then there are the telephone concerns and other institutions which want to employ people during a few hours each day; it is ridiculous. I know captains of industry in this country who work fifteen hours a day—there are not many of them, because it does not take a great many captains of industry to make a country grow; but they are all handicapped by the lack of labour. Agriculture is especially handicapped, and will be until we can get labour more cheaply. We are handicapped in a sense, even by the three thousand miles of border line between this country and the rich and powerful United States, a line so easily crossed by our people who seek to take advantage of the inducements offered by that country. They are re-claiming their marsh lands, re-claiming their arid lands by irrigation, even re-claiming lands along the Atlantic coast which are lower than the sea level. They are doing all these things to develop that wonderful country, and they are offering strong inducements to Canadians to go down there. I submit that we should have a system under which any one can come to this country who is law-abiding and willing to work.

Mr. J. R. WILSON (Saskatoon): Mr. Speaker, the resolution before the House

is a most important one and if concurred in might give rise to far-reaching and serious results. I believe, Sir, that there is inseparably bound up with this question of immigration the question whether this country is to progress or to stand still. Prior to the war, immigration was, so to speak, the life-blood of Canada, infusing new life and progress into our country. I agree that it may be well for us to restrict certain classes of immigration; certainly we do not need many more of certain classes of people. What we do require are persons who will settle on our rich agricultural lands, which are awaiting the touch of the hand of man to blossom forth and to produce all that is required for man's sustenance.

We have in the three prairie provinces about 1,100,000 people who are located on the land, holding in the neighbourhood of 26,000,000 acres. It is estimated that the arable land in those provinces consists of about 152,000,000 acres. If this land were settled even to the extent that the occupied parts of the provinces are now settled—which is sparsely—and brought under cultivation, there would be located on the land in these three prairie provinces about 8,000,000 people thus doubling our present population. It seems to me that the only solution of some of the problems which face us is a strong immigration policy to settle these vacant lands which are capable of valuable production.

It also seems to me that, in past years, in our policy of subsidizing railways, we were working at the wrong end. We were subsidizing and assisting railways to pay interest on bonds, which interest the railways were unable to meet owing to their having been built in advance of the settlement of the country. When the railways found that they were unable, through lack of traffic, to earn sufficient to pay their way, in years gone by they approached the Government, and the Government handed out assistance. At that time it was my opinion, if assistance that had been given in order railways had possibly been given in order to encourage agriculture and to induce men to go on the lands of the West, we, perhaps, would not have had the railways coming to the Government with their hands out for assistance to pay interest on bonds.

In this regard I should like to give an illustration of something that happened not so many years ago. In 1914—this is a matter of history—hon. members will remember that we had a very dry season in the West; that many farmers, through failure of crops, were faced with the problem of securing seed, and they had no money with which to secure it. The Government came to their assistance and furnished seed at an expense of about $10,000,000. What did that return in wealth to this country? At that time I was managing one of the Government elevators and I was in fairly close touch with this proposition, because there passed through my hands about a million and a half bushels of that seed I kept track of the districts into which the seed went. As things turned out, in 1915, we had, I will admit, an abnormally heavy crop; but the grain that was furnished by the Government, purchased at a cost of about $10,000,000, returned in wealth to the farmers of Canada, which after all means Canada as a whole, at a very conservative estimate, about $150,000,000. But the return did not stop there. If that grain was transported via our all-Canadian route from its point of origin to the Atlantic seaboard, it brought about $35,000,000 to the transportation companies. I give that as an illustration of my statement that I think we have been working at the wrong end with our railways in helping them to meet deficits. The only way in which we can solve the railway problem which is now confronting us is by increasing settlement on our western land, increasing production and thereby increasing traffic and revenue to our railways.

I think everyone admits that agriculture has been in the past, is at present, and will be, for some years to come, the basic industry of Canada. I was a little bit interested and amused to hear the hon. member for Glengarry and Stormont (Mr. Kennedy) blame the fiscal policy of this country for the unemployment which exists at the present time in our cities. This is a condition which prevails throughout the world, as can easily be found by correspondence with foreign countries or conversing with men who have travelled through them. There is not in the world to-day another country in which conditions, generally speaking, are as good as they are in Canada. Many problems confront us; but if we hold to a national spirit of self-reliance and have some confidence in our ability to meet and surmount those obstacles, we will meet and surmount them. I feel certain that this resolution will not be accepted, or taken very seriously, by members of the House, and it would be a calamity if it were.

The hon. member for George Etienne Cartier (Mr. Jacobs) referred to some impediments put in the way of immigrants coming into this country. I have had experience in dealing with some cases, and the regulations seem to me to be a little drastic, to work a hardship, and to be somewhat unfair. Prospective settlers who buy a ticket, possibly en route, who may be laid up for a month or two on account of illness and who then continue their journey, are debarred from entry into Canada owing to the journey not having been a continuous one. Some cases have occurred where part of the family is in Canada. This works a hardship, and it is something that should be taken note of.

As I said some few minutes ago, I did not intend to speak on this question, and I do not wish to take up any more of the time of the House, as time is passing and I know the Minister of Immigration and Colonization (Mr. Calder) wishes to have a little time in which to give us some information and probably an outline of what his policy in the future will be. In conclusion, I think this $250 qualification for the class of immigrants that we are in need of in this country, is putting a handicap on their coming in, and it should be seriously considered whether we should put any impediment in the way of the entry into Canada of the class which we are most in need of and most desirous of having. We all admit that the great need of this country is more people. People at the present time seem to be inclined to move, and while they have that inclination and we being in need of more people, now is the time for us to bestir ourselves and take advantage of the opportunity of securing as many as possible of the class of immigrants that we desire to have.

Mr. LUCIEN CANNON (Dorchester): Mr. Speaker, I wish to offer just a few brief remarks on the resolution which is before us for debate. First of all, I am in accord with the hon. member for Saskatoon (Mr. Wilson) when he says that the resolution probably goes too far. I would not favour barring altogether immigration into Canada, but I would favour a policy, on the part of the Government, under present conditions of restricting immigration to a certain extent. When one is considering this problem of immigration into Canada, the first consideration which comes to one's mind is: whence at the present time can immigrants come into Canada? Immigration certainly cannot come from Africa, for obvious reasons. Nor can it come from Asia. We have endeavoured in the past, and we are still endeavouring now, not only to restrict, but to bar altogether, immigration from Asiatic countries. Therefore, immigration can only come from the United States or from Europe. As regards American immigration, the more we have the better for Canada. As regards immigration from European sources, I think we should be very cautious and very careful; in fact, we cannot be too cautious or too careful. Immigrants cannot come into Canada from France, they cannot come from Belgium, they cannot come from any of the allied countries in any great numbers. We can only expect European immigration from the central Empires or from Russia. Now is that immigration desirable? Should we open wide our gates to Russian immigration, to German immigration, to Austrian immigration? That is a question of very great importance, and I am quite sure that before coming to any definite conclusion hon. members of this House will think the matter over very, very seriously.

Mr. JACOBS: May I point out that Austrian and German immigration is debarred completely from Canada?

Mr. CANNON: Notwithstanding the laws or regulations that might exist as regards Austrian or German immigration, these people manage in some way or other to evade the laws which exist in their own country.

Mr. JACOBS: The Canadian law prevents them from entering here.

Mr. CANNON: They evade the law in Germany and in Austria, and it is only when the Canadian laws are enforced that these immigrants are kept from coming into Canada in as great numbers as they desire to come.

Mr. JACOBS: They cannot, under the Canadian law, enter this country.

Mr. CANNON: They have such laws in both Germany and Austria, and I say that these people evade the laws of their own country and come here.

Mr. JACOBS: But they cannot land in Canada.

Mr. CANNON: That is exactly the question I am discussing. Should we allow

them to land in as great numbers as they now do land in Canada? German immigrants who have come to Canada and have settled here have become very good citizens. The German immigrants who came to Ontario, for instance, many years ago have become very good citizens. We have a striking example of how good a Canadian citizen a man of German descent may be in the person of my hon. friend who represents the constituency of North Waterloo (Mr. Euler). Therefore, I do not say that an immigrant should be debarred from Canada just because he is an Austrian or a German or a Russian, but I say that the more care the Government takes to examine into each particular and special case, the better it will be for the welfare of our country.

I have heard it said this afternoon that it is in the interests of Canada that our population should be increased. Some hon. members have referred to the railway situation, saying that in order to meet the deficits we are facing at the present time we ought to have an increased population, which would mean an increased traffic. There is no doubt about that, but there is a higher consideration than the pecuniary one. There is the very much higher consideration of moulding a national spirit in Canada. Every immigrant who comes to Canada should be of such a type and character that the Government can hope that within a reasonable period, if not the immigrant himself, his next descendants will cease to be foreigners, and become good Canadian citizens. Have we succeeded so far in Canada in assimilating our immigration? I do not think we have. We still have in the western provinces, and even in the province of Ontario, settlements which we might call foreign. Our policy so far as that is concerned has not been as perfect as it might have been, especially when we compare the results obtained in the United States along this line. Immigration has flowed into the United States in very great numbers. Thousands and hundreds of thousands of immigrants have gone in there every year for the past century, and in most cases they have become good American citizens and are proud to declare to-day that they are American citizens. Let the Minister of Immigration and Colonisation see to it that whatever immigration we have into Canada is of such a kind that very soon the new settlers will become Canadian citizens, not Germans, or Austrians, or Russians, or foreigners of any kind, but real Canadian citizens, enjoying the privileges and the rights of Canadian citizens, and realizing to the full the liberty and freedom that is given them under our Canadian institutions.

If we have not obtained as good results as we might have done from our foreign immigration, I lay the blame at the door of the present Government to a very great extent, and I am sorry to say that one of those who is responsible to a very large extent for the framing and moulding of that policy is the Minister of Immigration himself. How can we expect the foreigners who come to Canada to become Canadian citizens and assimilate themselves to our customs and our ways and our institutions if me debar them, as they have been debarred by the present Government, from their rights and privileges of citizenship when election time comes. I do not wish to discuss the law which governed the last general election of 1917, but I wish to say to the Minister of Immigration, who knew fully the defects of that law and who is aware of its eveil consequences, that I hope so long as he remains in the Government he will see that justice is done to every element in Canada, and if justice is done to every element in Canada, no matter how it may be composed, very soon we shall be able to promote in this country a truly national spirit.

I said that I thought the resolution went too far, but that, on the other hand, I believed the Government was right in restricting to a very great extent immigration under present conditions. But the Government ought to do more. If we are to open up new territory, if we are to develop our industries, if we are to make a success of our railways, we must have population in Canada. Now population is to be obtained not only from outside countries. Why should not the Government of Canada adopt a policy of promoting increased population from our native sources? The citizens of the province of Quebec understand fully their duties towards the State and have very large families. We do not need immigration from outside sources to develop our province. The French Canadians see to that themselves; they encourage the raising of large families. Now, why should not the Government adopt this principle as part of their policy and encourage throughout the provinces of Canada the same condition of things as exists in Quebec? Let the people in the English provinces have families num-

bering fifteen, twenty, twenty-five and thirty children, and very soon the problem which confronts the Minister of Immigration will disappear. The hon. gentleman receives this suggestion with a smile, but let me tell him that I offer it in all seriousness, and am only endorsing sentiments uttered by a very eminent statesman of the United States a few years ago—I refer to Theodore Roosevelt—when he spoke on the dangers of race suicide. Let us see to it in Canada that our race does not extinguish itself through the want of children and families. Let every citizen not only perform his political duties towards the state, but let him thoroughly appreciate the full responsibilities of fatherhood, and we shall have a natural increase in population which will, to a great extent, solve the problem we are discussing this afternoon.

I have been much longer than I intended, but before concluding my remarks I wish to say to the Government that on this side of the House we will support any policy which will make for a proper, a sensible, and a wise development of this country of ours. The policy which was adopted by a former Minister of the Interior, the Hon. Mr. Sifton, who opened wide the doors of Canada to immigration, had very bad consequences. Now, if on the one hand we oppose that indiscriminate policy, we will, on the other hand, favour a reasonable immigration, restricted where necessary, and all the more so under present world conditions, which are of so troublous a character that it behooves us to follow the example of our neighbours to the South, to go very slowly and moderately, not looking to quantity, but having in view the quality of the new citizens to whom we may open the doors of Canada.

Mr. ANGUS McDONALD (Timiskaming): I did not intend to speak on this resolution, but it has provoked so much discussion that I think it is well for me, as the only real labour member in this House, to put myself on record on the subject. Let me say at once that I am not in favour of the resolution of my hon. friend from St. Mary (Mr. Deslauriers) as it stands. I would support a resolution of this nature to some extent if it contained what I might describe as a classification. I believe the statement has been attributed to the ex-Minister of Finance (Sir Thomas White) that the enormous debt with which the people of this country are saddled, and which future generations will have to discharge—a debt which, if we take history into account, it is not impossible we may have as a burden for centuries—will have to be paid from the top six inches of Canadian soil. I want to ask hon. members, both farmers and others, if they ever saw not only the first six inches, but the first six feet, or six hundred feet, of Canadian or any other soil produce anything without the application and energy and skill on the part of the people. This resolution has elicited certain opinions which I think the Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Tolmie) as well as the Minister of Immigration (Mr. Calder) might well take into consideration. I am in favour of immigration under certain conditions. We need more population on the land in order to distribute more widely the enormous debt which at present possibly less than ten millions of people are responsible for. I would support an immigration policy if it were directed differently from the way things have gone in the past. I think we should aim at securing good citizens, people who would apply themselves to the land in order to open up the vast millions of acres which we have waiting for settlers, instead of leaving the direction of immigration in the hands of transportation companies who stand to benefit lavishly thereby.

Some hon. members say that there are many idle men in Canada. We have in this country to-day the sorry spectacle of some 500,000 people, who are idle, and together with their dependents they number probably a million and a half, out of a population of perhaps ten millions. This is a sad spectacle indeed in this glorious land of ours which we profess to be so proud of. Are these people idle by choice? Some hon. members suggest that the labour men of this country are idle because they are lazy. Well, were the people lazy who were laid off in Hamilton in the last week, as my hon. friend from New Westminster (Mr. McQuarrie), said? Were they lazy when they were working right up to the time they were laid off? Not by any means; and the man who says that the entire labour force of this country is lazy, makes that statement for a purpose which has no bearing on this resolution. Now, it is the duty of the farmers to think over this matter seriously. There are 500,000 men or thereabouts idle in Canada, and we have bread lines in every centre of population in the country. Why, the condition of affairs is staggering, and the Domniion Government if my information is correct, is asked to contribute towards the sustenance of men in Toronto,

Winnipeg, Vancouver and Montreal. I do not think, in view of these things, that it is fair for any farmer to rail at the condition of the working men, who are idle, not through any fault of their own, and who are only too anxious to get employment. They have been thrown out of work after the industrial concerns have reaped great profits from their energy.

I will not take up much more time of the House, but there is one hon. member to whom I should like to reply, and that is my good Scotch friend from South Oxford (Mr. Sutherland). That hon. member says that we want men who are willing to give an extra hour, if necessary. I give my hon. friend the right hand of fellowship so far as that is concerned, and I will go further than he did and say that I am one of those working men who like to see a man give an honest day for an honest dollar. But I want to tell you, Mr. Speaker, that we want to see the farmers apply this principle to themselves, and not stick at the last farthing. I have been on the farm; I was raised there to some extent, and I know something at least about agriculture. I am yet to find a farmer who will give you 2,240 pounds of hay for a ton anywhere, and I make that statement having farmed myself. Let me tell this House, Mr. Speaker, that the labouring men, like the rest of us, are human and are somewhat like politicians. No doubt they get into a rut in the centres of population because an inducement is there offered. In the cities, they can get work the year round if they want it, but this is not the case on the farm, not on the western farms at any rate. I worked there myself. I got work for three months in the year, and for the other nine months the attitude of the farmers was this: You can shift for yourself after you are through with us.

Something must be done for the working man; he cannot starve for nine months while he is waiting for the three months' work which the West offers. Of course he may be in the province of Ontario but is he likely to get work all the year round with a man who may be only farming one hundred acres. The average workman does not have employment the year round, and what are you going to do with him during the time he is idle? We want to see some policy of a reasonable character adopted; and it will be unfortunate if the labour situation to-day is not looked into to a little further extent than it is investigated by politicians. That brings me back to the point I left a little while ago, and

[Mr. McDonald.]

that is that the workingman is just like the politician in this chamber—he gets into a rut and he hates to be taken away from it; he has to be driven out just as a great many politicians have been driven out of Ottawa. I think that if the pleas which the leader of the Opposition has been making here for the last four or five weeks had been successful, the labouring people of Canada would have demonstrated beyond the faintest suspicion of doubt that a great many members who are now sitting here would never return to Parliament again. I do not want to occupy any more time; I simply wish to place on record the statement that I consider some of the things that have been said here as a direct insult to the labouring class of this country. It is a wonder to me that men—who perhaps have sons earning their living under the very hard and very disagreeable conditions which the workingman experiences—could sit here and listen to aspersions such as were hurled at labour this afternoon by the hon. member for Chateauguay-Huntingdon (Mr. Robb).

Mr. H. C. HOCKEN (West Toronto): I was very much pleased to hear the hon. member for Dorchester (Mr. Cannon) emphasize the necessity of developing a real Canadian spirit among the people of this country. I entirely agree with him that in the past we have admitted altogether too many persons to Canada to participate in the free land and the rest of the advantages that the Dominion offers, and who have shown very little desire to be assimilated. The result is that there are many sections of Canada where foreign ideals, the ideals of Central Europe, predominate among the majority of the people. They have been allowed to colonize in such a way that it is now a matter of extraordinary difficulty to effect in their case that assimilation so necessary to make them good Canadian citizens. Located in this and that corner of the prairie these people are removed from that particular environment which would assist materially in giving them Canadian ideals. Segregated and living in their own communities, they not only have no desire to assimilate with the Canadian population, but they resist every attempt that is made to influence them to do so. We find such a situation exists to a far too great extent in Western Canada and it is a most deplorable thing because, at some time or other, this Parliament must undertake a Canadianizing movement which will make of these men Canadian citizens, understanding British

institutions and desirous of being governed by them.

We have a country here capable of maintaining, in as great comfort as any of us live to-day, a population of one hundred or perhaps one hundred and fifty millions. We have a better country than there is to the south of us, and we have a climate that is designed to produce the very best type of humanity. The conditions in Canada are altogether different from those in the neighbouring republic where, south of the Mason and Dixon line, there are probably from thirty to forty millions of people who really do not have to work, and who do not work in the sense that a man works north of the forty-ninth parallel. That is the greatest handicap under which our neighbours to the south live, and it constitutes for them a problem, due to the enervating character of the climate in that sub-tropical region, which to my mind is practically insoluble. Now we have a different country and a different climate; and after you cross the forty-ninth parallel, you have to work, or somebody has to work for you, or you will starve or freeze to death. So that I believe the climate of Canada is its greatest asset.

Our great western country is capable of producing enormously, and of sustaining life under the very best conditions, and it is a matter of very negative concern to every Canadian who wants to see this country properly developed that the West should be filled up with industrious men. I believe that if a man is half industrious and is placed in that country he will become wholly industrious—I think that the conditions under which he would have to live would make him so, because the climate is calculated to give him additional energy both mental and physical. I think the immigration policy of this country ought to be to encourage every man who understands British institutions to come to Canada, and especially those who are able and willing to go upon the land. We have in the province of Ontario fifty or sixty million acres of as good land as there is anywhere else in the Dominion, but that great district is almost untenanted. There is a field for immigration in that northern territory where men can go and settle on free land, or what is practically free land —costing, I think, only a dollar an acre— and, after a few years of steady and perhaps laborious effort, clear for himself and for his family a home that will sustain them as long as they live. It has never been the policy of the Dominion Government to attempt to settle the province of Ontario. I am not complaining about that particularly, but I think there are a large number of people in the Old Land who would find themselves much more comfortably placed in a wooded country like northern Ontario than they would on the western prairies. I also believe that there are a very large number of men in the Old Country, possessed of sufficient means, who should be properly encouraged and directed to come to Canada and buy farms,—but developed farms, improved land. I am sure they would find the opportunities here superior to those which present themselves at home. So, Sir, I take it that the policy of the Government in the matter of immigration should be to adhere to the law which excludes—I think for about ten years except under certain very narrow restrictions— immigrants from central Europe, and to undertake an intensive campaign in Great Britain and Ireland to bring men to this country who understand our institutions, and to increase the number of men in the Dominion who will aid in assimilating the foreign element. In that way they will do a great deal to assist us to Canadianize that foreign element, some of whose members after being here ten or fifteen years do not yet understand our institutions, and do not want to understand them.

I have a great deal of sympathy, too, with the hon. member for Temiskaming (Mr. McDonald). Like him I am a labouring man, and have been all my life. I do not think the hon. member has worked nearly as hard as I have, and I am sure he has not worked as long. Therefore I always have sympathy for the working man. But the working man can hardly expect to be employed in industries which are insolvent, nor can he expect the proprietor to run deeper into insolvency in order to give him employment. To my mind that is mainly the reason why there has been so much unemployment in this country during the last few months. We had in Toronto, for instance, a large industry, the Dominion Shipbuilding company. That company had some large contracts, taken at what they considered to be a good price, but it became insolvent, and the reason given for its insolvency was not merely high wages, but the impossibility of getting the men to do a fair day's work. I am not in the shipbuilding business, but that is the statement of the assignee of the company. I have it from other sources, sir, and quite reliable sources, that in some of the trades the men during the last year or two, particularly during the last year, refused to give their employers the efficiency

of which they were capable. That has to be corrected, and I think the only way it can be corrected is by such a period of depression as we are going through at the present time. I know the great majority of working men are desirous of giving a fair day's work, and they do give a fair day's work, but during the last year a very large proportion made no pretensions of giving an adequate return for the wages they received. No employer will complain about wages if he gets the equivalent in work, and that is exactly where labour has fallen down. I could tell my hon. friend of instances in my own city where men have been doing twice the amount of outside work in the winter season that they did last summer. There is only one deduction to be drawn, and that is that they did not do a fair day's work in the summer season. That idea of rendering a minimum return was permeating all labour unions, not only to the lessening of production, but to the detriment of the men themselves, for they were losing their personal efficiency, they were becoming less competent, and they were suffering moral and spiritual deterioration. I hope that what we have gone through during the last few months has put an end to that mistaken idea. I have no desire to see reductions in wages and I have no fear that there will be if our working men will do their share and give a fair honest day's work to their employers.

Hon. J. A. CALDER (Minister of Immigration and Colonization): Mr. Speaker, this is a very important subject, I have followed closely the opinions expressed during the discussion this afternoon, and I had hoped to deal with many of the points which were raised. My suggestion would be, if the hon. member who has introduced the resolution agrees, that the resolution itself be dropped. We have had a long discussion and the field has been very well covered, and it is my purpose during the coming week, if it can possibly be arranged in connection with the Estimates for the department of Immigration to make a statement to the House that will not only cover the points raised this afternoon but will touch on the other phases as well. The discussion in that way will be thrown open again, and any hon. gentleman who desires to take part will have the fullest opportunity on that occasion. So, if it is agreeable to the hon. gentleman to withdraw his resolution, I can assure him there will be the fullest opportunity very shortly for discussion of the kind which I have mentioned.

[Mr. Hocken.]

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Is it the pleasure of the House that the hon. member for St. Mary have leave to withdraw his resolution?

Some hon. MEMBERS? Carried.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: The resolution is withdrawn.

At six o'clock the House adjourned without question put, pursuant to rule.

Thursday, March 31, 1921

The House met at Three o'clock.

REPORT PRESENTED

Second Report of the Select Standing Committee on Railways, Canals and Telegraph Lines—Mr. Armstrong (Lambton).

FRENCH TREATY

Right Hon. Sir GEORGE FOSTER (Minister of Trade and Commerce) moved:

That four hundred copies in English and two hundred in French of the trade agreement between France and Canada, laid on the Table of the House on the 29th instant, be printed forthwith, and that Rule 74 be suspended in relation thereto.

Mr. MURPHY: May I suggest to my right hon. friend that there is likely to be a greater demand for French copies of this treaty than for English copies?

Sir GEORGE FOSTER: I do not think so.

Mr. MURPHY: My right hon. friend should have at least the same number printed in French as in English.

Sir GEORGE FOSTER: I do not think there will be the same demand for the French copies. The demand for the English copies will come from traders and business houses.

Mr. MURPHY: French business houses will be interested to the same extent.

Sir GEORGE FOSTER: I have no objection to making the number of French copies four hundred.

Mr. SPEAKER: The motion now provides for four hundred copies in English and four hundred in French. Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt the motion as so amended?

Motion as amended agreed to.

QUESTIONS

(Questions answered orally are indicated by an asterisk.)

SALMON FISHERY—QUEBEC

Mr. MARCIL (Bonaventure):

1. Will salmon fishery licenses for the tidal waters of the Province of Quebec be issued this year by the Department of Marine and Fisheries? If so, when?
2. What policy is to be adopted?
3. Will the present holders of licenses from the province be given the preference for these licenses?
4. Will applications have to be made?
5. If so, to whom and when?
6. Will due notice be given to license holders and the public generally, and will application blanks be supplied?
7. Who are the fishery officials for the county of Bonaventure?

Hon. Mr. BALLANTYNE:

1. Yes. After April 1, next.
2. Licenses will be granted in accordance with the fishery regulations keeping in view adequate protection of the fisheries.
3. All applications for licenses will be considered on their merits.
4. Yes.
5. To a local fishery officer or to the Department of Marine and Fisheries.
6. Notice has already been given through the press. No special form of application is required.
7. None at present.

CIVIL SERVICE COMMISSION—PROPOSED ABOLITION

Mr. CASGRAIN:

1. Has the Government received a resolution from the Progressive Club of Montreal calling for the abolition of the Civil Service Commission?
2. If so, what is the intention of the Government in the matter?

Right Hon. Mr. MEIGHEN:

1. No.
2. Answered by No. 1.

SS. RECRUIT

Mr. SINCLAIR (Antigonish and Guysborough):

1. Was the ss. Recruit of the Canadian Government Merchant Marine, which went aground at Vache Point, St. Lawrence river, rescued and refitted for sea?
2. If so, how much was expended in repairs?
3. Where were the repairs made and were public tenders asked for by advertisement?
4. Was the insurance collected from the underwriters?
5. If so, how much was insured and how much was collected?
6. How much was earned by this vessel in the year 1920 after deducting all expenditure of every kind?
7. Where is she now?

[Mr. Speaker.]

Hon. Mr. BALLANTYNE:

1. Yes.

2, 3, 4, 5, 6 and 7. The information asked for is information as to operating details under the Canadian National Railway Board, and is not in possession of the Government. The question as to the desirability in the public interest of securing such and like information and making same available on motion or on question in Parliament is to be considered by a special committee of Parliament.

SS. CANADIAN VOYAGEUR, ETC.

Mr. SINCLAIR (Antigonish and Guysborough):

1. What was the initial cost of the ss. Canadian Voyageur? When was she first put into commission?
2. How much was spent in repairs to this ship since she was built, up to December 31, 1920?
3. What was the gross amount earned by this vessel for the calendar year 1920?
4. What was the gross amount of expenditure of every description in connection with the operation of this vessel for the calendar year ending Deecmber 31, 1920?
5. What were the net earnings of this vessel from the date when she was first put into commission up to December 31, 1920, after deducting all expenditure of every description?
6. What were the net earnings of this vessel for the calendar year 1920 after deducting all expenditure of every description?
7. How many tons of coal did this vessel consume during the calendar year 1920, and what was the average price paid therefor?

Mr. SINCLAIR (Antigonish and Guysborough):

1. What was the initial cost of the steamships Canadian Gunner, Canadian Farmer, Canadian Victor, Canadian Signaller, and Canadian Miller? When was each of these vessels first put into commission?
2. How much was spent in repairs to each of these ships since she was built up to December 31, 1920?
3. What was the gross amount earned by each of these vessels for the calendar year 1920?
4. What was the gross amount of expenditure of every description in connection with the operation of each of these vessels for the calendar year ending December 31, 1920?
5. What were the net earnings of each of these vessels from the date when she was first put into commission up to December 31, 1920, after deducting all expenditure of every description?
6. What were the net earnings of each of these vessels for the calendar year 1920 after deducting all expenditure of every description?
7. How many tons of coal did each of these vessels consume during the calendar year 1920 and what was the average price paid therefor?

Mr. DUFF:

1. What was the initial cost of the steamships Canadian Conqueror, Canadian Commander,

and Canadian Planter? When was each of these vessels first put into commission?

2. How much was spent in repairs to each of these ships since she was built up to December 31, 1920?

3. What was the gross amount earned by each of these vessels for the calendar year 1920?

4. What was the gross amount of expenditure of every description in connection with the operation of each of these vessels for the calendar year ending December 31, 1920?

5. What were the net earnings of each of these vessels from the date when she was first put into commission up to December 31, 1920, after deducting all expenditure of every description?

6. What were the net earnings of each of these vessels for the calendar year 1920 after deducting all expenditure of every description?

7. How many tons of coal did each of these vessels consume during the calendar year 1920 and what was the average price paid therefor?

Mr. CHISHOLM:

1. What was the initial cost of the steamships Canadian Spinner, Canadian Leader, and Canadian Navigator? When was each of these vessels first put into commission?

2. How much was spent in repairs to each of these ships since she was built up to December 31, 1920?

3. What was the gross amount earned by each of these vessels for the calendar year 1920?

4. What was the gross amount of expenditure of every description in connection with the operation of each of these vessels for the calendar year ending December 31, 1920?

5. What were the net earnings of each of these vessels from the date when she was first put into commission up to December 31, 1920, after deducting all expenditure of every description?

6. What were the net earnings of each of these vessels for the calendar year 1920 after deducting all expenditure of every description?

7. How many tons of coal did each of these vessels consume during the calendar year 1920 and what was the average price paid therefor?

Mr. SINCLAIR (Antigonish and Guysborough):

1. What was the initial cost of the ss. Canadian Otter? When was she first put into commission?

2. How much was spent in repairs to this ship since she was built up to December 31, 1920?

3. What was the gross amount earned by this vessel for the calendar year 1920?

4. What was the gross amount of expenditure of every description in connection with the operation of this vessel for the calendar year ending December 31, 1920?

5. What were the net earnings of this vessel from the date when she was first put into commission up to December 31, 1920, after deducting all expenditure of every description?

6. What were the net earnings of this vessel for the calendar year 1920 after deducting all expenditure of every description?

7. How many tons of coal did this vessel consume during the calendar year 1920 and what was the average price paid therefor?

[Mr. Duff.]

Mr. PACAUD:

1. What was the initial cost of the steamships Canadian Ranger and Seigneur and when were they first put into commission?

2. How much was spent in repairs to each of these ships since she was built up to December 31, 1920?

3. What was the gross amount earned by each of these vessels for the calendar year 1920?

4. What was the gross amount of expenditure of every description in connection with the operation of each of these vessels for the calendar year ending December 31, 1920?

5. What were the net earnings of each of these vessels from the date when she was first put into commission up to December 31, 1920, after deducting all expenditure of every description?

6. What were the net earnings of each of these vessels for the calendar year 1920, after deducting all expenditure of every description?

7. How many tons of coal did each of these vessels consume during the calendar year 1920, and what was the average price paid therefor?

Mr. ARCHAMBAULT:

1. What was the initial cost of the steamships Canadian Squatter and Pioneer and when were they first put into commission?

2. How much was spent in repairs to each of these ships since she was built up to December 31, 1920?

3. What was the gross amount earned by each of these vessels for the calendar year 1920?

4. What was the gross amount of expenditure of every description in connection with the operation of each of these vessels for the calendar year ending December 31, 1920?

5. What were the net earnings of each of these vessels from the date when she was first put into commission up to December 31, 1920, after deducting all expenditure of every description?

6. What were the net earnings of each of these vessels for the calendar year 1920, after deducting all expenditure of every description?

7. How many tons of coal did each of these vessels consume during the calendar year 1920, and what was the average price paid therefor?

Hon. Mr. BALLANTYNE: The answers to the foregoing questions are as follows:

1. Name of ship—Initial contract cost—When commissioned:—"Voyageur," $947,025.00, February 22, 1919; "Gunner," $815,541.25, Nov. 6, 1919; "Farmer," $713,520.00, April 28, 1920; "Victor," $1,433,610.00, Aug. 25, 1920; "Signaller," $814,926.25, Aug. 30, 1919; "Miller," $1,577,320.00, Sept. 24, 1919; "Conquerer," $1,429,190.00, Sept. 30, 1920; "Commander," not finished; "Planter," $1,579,075.00, May 7, 1920; "Spinner," $1,577,884.00, Dec. 6, 1919; "Leader," not finished; "Navigator," $984,915.00, Nov 22, 1919; "Otter," not finally ascertained, Aug. 18, 1920; "Ranger," $1,575,816.00, May 23, 1919; "Seigneur," $1,577,508.00, Aug. 14, 1919; "Squatter," not finally ascertained, Nov. 12, 1920; "Pioneer," $1,513,440.00, May 9, 1919.

2, 3, 4, 5, 6 and 7. The information asked for is information as to operating details under the Canadian National Railway Board, and is not in possession of the Government. The question as to the desirability in the public interest of securing such and like information and making same available on motion or on question in Parliament is to be considered by a special committee of Parliament.

DOMINION NOTES—SECURITIES

Mr. SINCLAIR (Antigonish and Guysborough):

With reference to the answer relating to Dominion Note Circulation found on page 1048 unrevised Hansard,—What are the approved securities referred to forming part of the basis of the issue of $137,115,075 Dominion Notes?

Hon. Sir HENRY DRAYTON:

Dominion of Canada bonds and treasury bills; bonds of the provinces of Canada and Canadian municipalities; Canadian Northern Railway Company notes; Canadian Pacific Railway debenture stock; British Government treasury bills; Dominion of New Zealand bonds; Union of South Africa bonds; certain industrial bonds and stocks; assignments of grain and produce and demand notes of commercial houses endorsed by the banks to the order of the Minister of Finance.

UPPER CROSSING, ST. ROCH, LIGHT

Mr. FAFARD:

1. Is the Government aware of the resignation of Mr. Fournier, lighthouse-keeper of the Upper Crossing, St. Roch?
2. If so, when did he resign?
3. Has anyone been appointed to the position?
4. If so, was he appointed by the Civil Service Commission?
5. If not, when will an appointment be made?

Hon. Mr. BALLANTYNE:

1. Yes, Alfred Fournier was lightkeeper at Upper Crossing, St. Roch, officially known as Upper Traverse.
2. April 30, 1920.
3. Yes, Gustave Fournier.
4. Yes.
5. Answered by No. 3.

ST. JOHN HARBOUR, N.B.

Mr. FAFARD:

1. What amount of money has been expended by the Publics Works Department at St. John Harbour, N.B., from the year 1900 to 1920?
2. What amount does the Public Works Department intend to spend during this year?

Hon Mr. McCURDY:

1. $14,283,857.94.

2. The exact amount cannot be stated at the present time. There was expended in 1920-21, $1,233,941.23. Item placed in Estimates for 1921-22, $1,250,000.00.

ALGERNON ROCK PIER.

Mr. FAFARD:

1. Is it the intention of the Government to put an Aga gas apparatus on the pier at Algernon Rock?
2. If so, will it be installed this year?

Hon. Mr. BALLANTYNE:

1. No, not at present.
2. Answered by No. 1.

PRINTING BUREAU BUILDING

*Mr. MURPHY:

1. Was an addition to the Government Printing Bureau built during the past year?
2. If so, were tenders called by public advertisement, and, in such case, who were the tenderers, and what were their respective prices?
3. If not, why?
4. Who was the contractor for the addition, and what was his price?
5. (a) What will be the total cost of the addition, and (b) how much has yet to be paid thereon?

Hon. Mr. McCURDY:

1. Yes, two additions.

2 and 3. Yes, first addition, tenders received February 11, 1920; Bate, McMahon & Co. $20,263; Grant Bros. $21,576; Doran & Devlin $22,700; Ross, Meagher Co. $26,054.

Second addition, tenders received July 12, 1920; Geo. C. Graves Construction Co. $89,103.

4. First addition, Bate, McMahon & Co., $20,263;

Second addition, Geo. C. Graves Con. Co., $89,103.

5. (a) Final estimate to Bate, McMahon & Co., $20,831.55; final estimate to Geo. C. Graves Con. Co., $90,154.50; (b) Nothing.

HOUSE OF COMMONS—DIVISION AFTER A RECESS

On the Orders of the Day:

Hon. W. S. FIELDING (Shelburne and Queen's): Mr. Speaker, With your permission I would like to ask the attention of the House for a moment to what might be called a question of privilege, I suppose, though it does not concern me any more than any other member of the House. It is to a telegram from Ottawa in the Montreal Gazette of Wednesday concerning the division of the previous evening. The correspondent writes:

It has been an unwritten rule of Parliament since confederation that there would be no vote on the day following a recess. This was an amenity of Parliament that has never been violated until to-day by the new Liberal leader.

I believe, Sir, I have to plead guilty to being now one of the oldest members of Parliament. I think there are only two, possibly three, who were here before me. With about twenty years of experience, I want to say that I have never heard of such a rule. I have consulted a number of the older members of the House, each one of whom tells me that he never heard of such a rule. It is quite evident, therefore, that the Gazette correspondent was misinformed and mislead.

GRAND TRUNK—PORTLAND TERMINUS

On the Orders of the Day:

Mr. PIUS MICHAUD (Restigouche): Is the Minister of Railways (Mr. Reid) aware of a dispatch published yesterday morning, coming from Portland, Maine, which reads as follows:

> The Grand Trunk Railway steamship terminus here will be enlarged and improved at a cost of approximately $500,000, officials of the railway said to-day. Construction will begin May 1. Plans have been approved for an immigration examination and detention building to provide accommodations for the handling of 1,000 passengers a day.

Is it true or not?

Hon. J. D. REID (Minister of Railways and Canals): I have seen the item. I wrote a note to Mr. Kelley and asked him what he had to say in that connection. He has replied as follows:

> There is no truth in the above item from Portland. Such work as is to be undertaken by the Grand Trunk at that point is merely in the nature of ordinary renewal of the wharves, piling, etc.

Mr. Kelley signs that note.

CIVIL SERVICE HOLIDAYS

On the Orders of the Day:

Mr. JOSEPH ARCHAMBAULT: (Chambly and Verchères): I would like to direct the attention of the Government to the fact that question No. 1, has been standing on the Order Paper since the opening of the session. It is as follows:

> 1. Is it true that contrary to the formal promise of Sir Robert Borden in Parliament, at the last session, the civil servants of the Government have been forced to work on Catholic religious holidays, notably on the following: All Saint's Day, Immaculate Conception, Epiphany?
>
> 2. If so, for what reason has the Government acted thus?

This is a very important question; at the same time, I do not see why the Government does not answer it.

[Mr. Fielding.]

Right Hon. ARTHUR MEIGHEN (Prime Minister): The question will be answered very shortly. I started the process of reading many pages of Hansard with a view of getting the whole purport of the debate on the subject but I shall be able to give an answer the first of the week, I think.

BUSINESS OF THE HOUSE

WEDNESDAY SITTINGS

On the Orders of the Day:

Hon. W. S. FIELDING (Shelburne and Queen's): I would like to suggest to my right hon. friend the Prime Minister that he reconsider the decision already made with regard to the taking of Wednesday as a Government day. I quite realize his desire to advance Government business, but there is a large number of motions on the Order Paper, and if the opportunity is denied to members to bring them up in the ordinary way they will be driven to bring them up in some other less direct way. I really do not think that the taking of Wednesday at this stage will facilitate the business of the House. I will not ask my right hon. friend to answer now, but I suggest that he give the matter his thought.

Right Hon. ARTHUR MEIGHEN (Prime Minister): In relation to that question, while I should not give a final negative at the moment, I want to say this—and it is no more in relation to one side than to another, this first sentence at least: There is not a motion on the Order Paper that has not been called and passed by twice, if not three or four times, since the beginning of the session. I recall one day in particular when the whole forty-six resolutions by private members were called and not one hon. member was ready to go on. It is true that the resolutions are still there and that possibly other means will be resorted to to have them proceeded with. But the Government must have regard to the fact that I have stated, because if we keep extending the time there will never be any very great desire on the part of an hon. member to go on with his motion at a time when he really has an opportunity to do so.

Mr. FIELDING: I think my right hon. friend must be under a misapprehension when he says these motions have been called again and again. I have two motions on the Order Paper and to the best of my knowledge and belief they have never been called. I spent a whole day here waiting for one to be called, but it was not reached. If my right hon. friend will look into the

matter more carefully he will see that some of these motions have never been called. I know that two of my motions have never been called, at least when I was present, and I am a pretty regular attendant at the sittings of the House.

Mr. MEIGHEN: I would not be certain that what I have said applies to the last three or four motions, but it applied to forty-six on one day; I know that, because I noted it. The hon. member (Mr. Fielding) put his on more recently; though I was under the impression that his first motion had been called once.

Mr. FIELDING: They were not put on so very recently.

PROPOSED EMPIRE CABINET

On the Orders of the Day:

Mr. CHARLES MURPHY (Russell): For the purpose of addressing a question to my right hon. friend the leader of the Government I desire to call his attention to a report published in the London Times on the 17th inst. giving a summary of a debate in the New Zealand House of Representatives on the question of whether the Prime Minister of New Zealand should attend the approaching conference of overseas Prime Ministers in London. After mentioning the somewhat unimportant features of the debate, in which Mr. Massey participated, that gentleman is credited with saying:

> He believed there would soon be an Empire constitution and a recognized organization, which he thought should take the form of an Imperial Executive, with the British Prime Minister as President. This executive should consist of representatives of Great Britain, the Dominions, the Dependencies, and India, and it should be responsible to the British and Dominion Parliaments. It should meet at least biennally, and it should be responsible for foreign policy, treaties, and declarations of war and peace.

My question is, whether the right hon. the Prime Minister has any knowledge of the proposed creation of such an Empire Cabinet or Imperial Executive, and if so, whether he has any information to give the House on the subject.

Right Hon. ARTHUR MEIGHEN (Prime Minister): I have not seen the despatch. The conception embodied in the despatch may be in accordance with the mind and intention of the Prime Minister of New Zealand. I have not subscribed to it.

THE AUDITOR GENERAL'S REPORT

On the Orders of the Day:

Mr. JOSEPH ARCHAMBAULT (Chambly-Verchères): Mr. Speaker, the committee on public accounts is a very important committee of this House but in order that it may proceed with its business it is necessary that the committee have before it the fourth volume of the Auditor General's report. On the twenty-second instant, when I asked for that volume, the Minister of Finance (Sir Henry Drayton) answered me in this way: "I expect it will be tabled at the end of the month." This is the last day of the month and I wish to ask the minister when he expects that his expectation will be realized.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON (Minister of Finance): The hon. gentleman realizes that no one is more anxious than I am to get that report down, because I seem to get all the blame for something with which I have nothing to do. I have been following the matter up, however, and pressing the work on a gentleman over whom I have no control. But I am glad now to be able to tell the House that I think the very last bit of copy went down yesterday afternoon to the Printing Bureau. There are some five or six hundred folios, and by having the work proceeded with at night as well as by day I think we shall be able to have the fourth volume laid on the Table early in the week.

SUPPLY

The House in Committee of Supply, Mr. Boivin in the Chair:

Trade and Commerce—bounties on crude petroleum, administration of the Act, $3,000.

Mr. LAPOINTE: Before you proceed with this item, Sir, the Prime Minister (Mr. Meighen) said last night that he intended to proceed with the Estimates of the Labour Department to-day. The Estimates of that department have not been taken up previously, and I will object to their being proceeded with to-day. Before we proceed with the estimates of the Labour Department, I have a few remarks to make about the hon. gentleman who presides over that department and about certain matters concerning it.

Mr. DENIS: I have been using a copy of the Estimates printed in French. I have no copy of the Estimates in English, and I object to proceeding with the Estimates unless we have English copies.

Sir GEORGE FOSTER: Does the hon. member object to the committee proceeding with the Estimates because he has not a copy of them in hand? These Estimates were printed as usual and a copy was placed in the box of every member weeks ago. My hon. friend has allowed his copy to drop out of his pocket. He must not

hold us all up because he has happened to lose his copy.

Mr. DENIS: I stated that I have only a French copy of the Estimates; I have not an English copy, and I do not think it is an answer to say that the Estimates have been distributed once. My objection can be withdrawn, but we will discuss these Estimates in French, and I want to know if the Government is willing to proceed on that understanding.

Mr. CANNON: In support of my hon. friend's contention, last week I applied for a copy of the Estimates in English, and I was told by the distribution office that they had none in hand. I hold here a copy of the Estimates in French. I have no objection whatsoever to holding a French copy; it suits me better to discuss the Estimates in French than it would to discuss them in English; but on the other hand, as my hon. friend (Mr. Denis) has said, as we have in our possession only copies of the Estimates in French, it would be only reasonable and natural that we should carry on the discussion in the language in which the Estimates are printed.

Mr. MARCIL: The minister speaks in French now. We can proceed.

Mr. CAHILL: What does the term "administration of the Act" mean in this case?

Sir GEORGE FOSTER: This appropriation has been passed every year for a long series of years. The object is to pay the salary and expenses of the officer or officers supervising the payment of the bounty upon crude petroleum oil. That bounty is granted, of course, by Act of Parliament; it has to be paid out under the regulations of the department, and the $3,000 is to pay for the supervisor and his aids, and for contingencies and travelling expenses. The work of the supervisor is to see that all claims that are made for payment of bounty are correct, to compare them and to issue his certificate as to their payment.

Mr. CAHILL: What amount of bounties has been paid? Or are any bounties being paid?

Sir GEORGE FOSTER: The bounties paid for the fiscal year 1918-19 on crude petroleum oil amounted to $162,187; for 1919-20, to $103,753; and for 1920-21 up to January 31, to $70,908.

Mr. CAHILL: What people were the bounties paid to?

[Sir George Foster.]

Sir GEORGE FOSTER: To the producers of the oil in two or three counties in Ontario where petroleum is produced; in New Brunswick where some oil is produced from the shales; and in Alberta where some oil coming under this Act is produced. The main part is paid to producers of oil in some two or three Ontario counties.

Mr. CANNON: (Translation.) Are those grants paid by the Government simply to individual owners of oil wells, or are they also paid to corporations and companies, say, for instance, the Imperial Oil and other trusts, which sell the oil at such a high price?

Sir GEORGE FOSTER: I must ask my hon. friend to speak a little louder and a little more distinctly, and especially to couch his question in particularly good French, so that it will commend itself to my ear.

Mr. CANNON: I am quite sure—

Sir GEORGE FOSTER: That is better.

Mr. CANNON: I am quite sure my right hon. friend is too modest. He has taken part in several conferences overseas; he has represented Canada with much honour and dignity at the Peace Conference; he has also represented our country at Geneva; and last year at the opening of Parliament, much to the pleasure and appreciation of hon. members on this side of the House, acting as Prime Minister of our country he delivered a magnificent, able, and, as usual, very eloquent speech in the French language. I am quite sure my right hon. friend understands French just as well as I do, and I am inclined to think he speaks French even better than I can speak it myself. But for the convenience, not of my right hon. friend who is a very noted bi-linguist, but of other members who might not be so conversant with the French language, I will proceed in English. I do not do so, however, for the convenience of my right hon. friend because I am sure he could carry on the discussion in French. The question I put to the minister is this: Are those premiums paid by the Government simply to individual owners of petroleum wells, or are they also paid to corporations and companies, say, for instance, the Imperial Oil and those very large trust companies which sell the oil at such a high price that I do not see why we give them premiums at all?

Sir GEORGE FOSTER: The premiums are paid in all cases to the people who produce the oil.

Mr. CANNON: Are any premiums paid to corporations or companies?

Sir GEORGE FOSTER: I think not.

Mr. CANNON: The right hon. gentleman says he thinks not. I would like to be sure on that point. As far as I am concerned, I do not think this House ought to pay a cent of bounty to any corporation like the Imperial Oil, and before we proceed any further with this item I would like the minister to make sure whether premiums are paid to this corporation. If they are being paid, I think he ought to see to it that they are not paid in future. This Government is not rich enough to give money to the Imperial Oil Company, the Standard Oil Company, or Rockefeller. We have heavy enough financial obligations to meet without throwing away our money to people who are richer than the Government itself.

Sir GEORGE FOSTER: If I might be allowed to interfere, at the expense of my hon. friend's well-turned and eloquent periods, I will give him the information absolutely that the bounties are paid only to those who produce the oil, so neither Rockefeller nor the Imperial Oil Company gets a squint at it.

Mr. McMASTER: It does not seem to me to be of essential difference whether this bounty is paid to a large company or to a small operator. I wish to state to the committee, and I think that what I say will have a responsive echo in the country, if not in the House, that for the Government to bonus an industry which is able to sell its products at the prices at which coal oil products are selling now is, in view of the present financial condition of the country, most unwise, to use the most modest term.

Sir GEORGE FOSTER: Can't you make it a little stronger?

Mr. McMASTER: I would say it was rank, raging lunacy, to speak plainly. In view of the respect which I have for the minister I couched my language in the most modest and gentle terms.

Sir GEORGE FOSTER: In the interests of my hon. friend himself will he allow me to intervene for a moment? I have noted the hard language which he has applied to this policy of bonusing. Does my hon. friend know that that policy was inaugurated in 1904, that it was re-inaugurated in 1907 and 1908, that it is there on the statute books by virtue of the concentrated wisdom of the Liberal Government to which my hon. friend paid allegiance, and which he considers to be one of the finest Governments that ever existed in Canada? It is ungrateful of my hon. friend after all the prominence that his party has given to it to stand up behind his aged and revered leader (Mr. Fielding) and tax him with introducing a policy of rank and unadulterated lunacy.

Mr. McMASTER: I have listened to the defence of this policy of bonusing by probably the ablest man on the opposite side of the House, and it has taken the form of chiding me because the Liberal party, when I was not in the House, did something which I trust I would have opposed then as I oppose it now.

Sir GEORGE FOSTER: But you sacrificed at their altars then.

Mr. McMASTER: I have this to say. I have always been against bonusing, I have always been against protection; I think it is a mistake, and that it was a mistake when it was brought about by the party to which I gave my allegiance at that time, and to which I give my allegiance now. I would, however, make this observation, and I believe the minister will consider it reasonable, that when the public debt of Canada was between $250,000,000 and $300,000,000 there was more excuse—I do not say more reason—

Sir GEORGE FOSTER: In principle?

Mr. McMASTER: There was more excuse for the giving of bonuses then, than there is at a time when, as I am sure the minister will agree, the financial condition of this country is a very serious one indeed. I hope that the minister will see his way clear, even if it is necessary to bring down legislation for that purpose to stop bonusing this industry, which I do not believe requires bonusing. If it has been bonused since 1904, it is about time it stood on its own feet, about time that the cask of petroleum stood on its own bottom. I protest energetically against what I consider to be this waste of public funds. I protests against the giving of bonuses by a country in the financial condition in which we find ourselves to-day.

Sir GEORGE FOSTER: I am only administering the Act.

Mr. GRIESBACH: I should like to ask the minister how he reconciles the policy of bunusing oil production with the policy of collecting royalties on oil production, as we have it in the West?

Sir GEORGE FOSTER: If my hon. friend or others are interested in looking at the history of this particular transaction, they will find, I think, that the bonus was given to the oil producers at the time when the duty was taken off crude potroleum entering this country from the United States and other contries. When petroleum was made free, on the theory that it would be of great general benefit, it was felt by those who were administering the affairs of the country at that time that the producers of oil should be compensated for this introduction of free petroleum. That was the theory on which the bounty was paid.

Mr. CANNON: I asked the minister whether large corporations like the Imperial Oil were getting any of these bounties, and he answered that he thought they were not. He was not very explicit in his answer. He did not say that no public moneys were being given to these very large corporations, these trusts which are crushing the people of Canada, and to which we should not give a cent.

Sir GEORGE FOSTER: I think my hon. friend must be wrong with reference to my assertion. I think I told him that the bounties were given simply to the producers of oil, and not to companies who do not produce or raise the oil.

Mr. CANNON: But suppose the Imperial Oil Company is the producer of oil on certain lands. Would they get a bonus for producing oil? That is what I want to know.

Sir GEORGE FOSTER: The Act, of course, provides how the money shall be paid. The provision, as I find it here—

Mr. CANNON: I understand the minister is about to tell the committee how the payments are made, but that is not the information I want; we can come to that later. I want to know whether the Imperial Oil Company, if it produces oil on lands in Canada, is entitled to this bounty. Should the Government pay premiums to the Imperial Oil Company?

Sir GEORGE FOSTER: I will read the section of the Act to my hon. friend, who I believe is a lawyer:

> The said bounty to be paid to or divided among the producers of the petroleum, the owner or occupier of the soil through which it is mined or won, or such other person interested, or injuriously affected by the mining operations or works as the Governor in Council by regulation approves.

I think that explains it.

[Mr. Griesbach.]

Mr. CANNON: If I understand the minister rightly, that means that the Imperial Oil Company occupy, own, or lease land upon which oil is produced. Then they would receive a bounty from the Government?

Sir GEORGE FOSTER: Being a producer, they would, I suppose.

Mr. CANNON: The minister says they would. I want to know, has the Imperial Oil Company, as a fact, received a bounty?

Sir GEORGE FOSTER: Now my hon. friend asks a question as to a specific point. I have not the information, but my own impression is that tne vast majority of the bounty is paid to the small producers of oil throughout the different districts. I am not prepared to say that there is not a company producing oil in those districts and that no such company is getting the bounty upon what it produces.

Mr. CANNON: Now I desire to call the attention of the committee to this point: About ten days ago my hon. leader (Mr. Mackenzie King) complained that we had not sufficient information to enable us to discuss the Estimates intelligently. The Prime Minister's attention was drawn to the fact that the fourth volume of the Auditor General's report had not been brought down yet, and that therefore the members on this side as well as hon. gentlemen opposite could not possibly consider the Estimates with that degree of care and scrutiny which is only proper. In reply to that representation, the right hon. gentleman who leads the House gave the formal and definite assurance that no items would be discussed unless information in connection therewith were first available to hon. members. If my right hon. friend refers to page 2 of the index of volume III of the Auditor General's report he will find therein stated that details in connection with crude petroleum are to be found under "Z-23." Now, "Z-23" is not in our hands; it is in the fourth volume. In view of the assurance given us by the Prime Minister I would ask my right hon. friend to postpone this item.

Sir GEORGE FOSTER: Item stands.

The CHAIRMAN: Sir George Foster moves that further consideration of item 346 be postponed.

Mr. POWER: Mr. Chairman, before we leave this item—

The CHAIRMAN: I am very sorry, but the motion to postpone consideration of an item is not debatable.

Item stands.

Bounty on Linen Yarn spun in Canada from Canadian Flax, including expenses of supervision, under Order in Council of September 3, 1918, $26,000.

Mr. MORPHY: I desire some information regarding this item, in view of the present condition of the flax market in Canada, and also in view of some letters I have received regarding the loss already sustained and the further loss which is anticipated by those who have produced flax, particularly in western Ontario. I am informed that the flax men throughout that part of the Dominion stand to be ruined one after another by the decline in the prevailing prices, which have fallen considerably since last year. I cannot give the prices in detail except as regards seed, which I understand was a year ago $6 a bushel and now has dropped $1.50. I have a communication from certain men who say that they stand to be ruined by the conditions under which they have to work. Now, I notice that the item this year is being reduced by the sum of $4,000. If the principle is a sound one of assisting, by way of bonus, the manufacture of linen, I think this is a most inopportune time in the history of the country to make any reduction in this grant. On the contrary, I think it ought to be increased. Is the minister or his department seized of the extreme distress in trade that now exists and is likely to be aggravated by the failure of the flax producers to dispose either of their fibre or of their seed? If the matter has been brought to the attention of the Government or of the minister, I should like to know what activities are in progress in the department to ameliorate the very serious conditions which have overtaken the flax interests, as a direct outcome, I fancy, of the war.

Sir GEORGE FOSTER: The department over which I preside has had numerous communications from flax growers, particlurly in the province of Ontario, regarding the difficulties under which they are labouring at the present time, difficulties which are summed up in the fact stated by my hon. friend, that the prices for either fibre or seed have very suddenly and largely dropped from those that prevailed a year or two ago. The hon. gentleman very properly said that he supposed this resulted from the general war conditions. It is a disability being suffered not only by flax producers but also, more or less, by the producers of very many of the staple articles of the country. For instance, I see that July wheat is selling on the Chicago market to-day at $1.25, which is a great come-down fro mthe price of $2.08 to $3.00 per bushel which prevailed on the market a year or so ago. The Department of Trade and Commerce cannot, of course, undertake to keep up prices nor to remunerate producers who have on hand stocks which they cannot get rid of at former prices and which consequently they must sell at a loss. But it is working in conjunction with these producers in an endeavour to find as profitable markets as possible in the different parts of the foreign field, and our trade commissioners are specially charged at the present time with this matter, being in possession of information which has been supplied me by the flax growers themselves. I do not know what will be the outcome. I am afraid there is not very much hope that these products, either fibre or seed, will regain anything like the values which they have had in the preceding three or four years. The special item under consideration is not intended as a relief to producers of flax. It is a child of the war, and the action which resulted in this bounty being granted for a period of three years was a direct outcome of the necessities of the war. At a certain time Canada found herself unable to get linen thread or yarn, either from the United States or from Great Britain, and this article was called for from all parts of the country for use by fishermen as well as for manufacturing purposes of various kinds. The War Commission, which was functioning at that time, took the matter up on the suggestion of Council, and in the end an Order in Council was passed by which it was proposed to give a bounty for the manufacture of linen thread and yarns of certain sizes, the bounty to be payable for three years after the Peace Treaty had been put into force, but not to be payable to the manufacturers of these yarns until the war had ended. The theory was that if manufacturers installed the equipment necessary for the production of these yarns, which had not before been made in Canada, the prices which could be charged for them, owing to the scarcity of the article, would be sufficient remuneration for the time that the war lasted, but—as this was an unusual and an emergent thing—when the war was

over, and supplies were available in greater quantity, the prices would tend to recede. Then the bounty was to take effect, and be paid according to the scale agreed upon, for three years after the war had ended. Some manufacturers undertook to equip their factories; but only one has really provided the required equipment, the owner, I think, of a factory at Guelph. That factory is now not only making linen yarns out of the Canadian product, but is also turning out a superior quality of linen goods of the coarser and of the finer kinds as well. I have seen an exhibition of these goods—either in Ottawa or in some other city—and they certainly are of excellent make; the quality of the fibre and the finish of the product seems to be everything that can be asked. To the extent that they manufacture, they may avail themselves of the bounty as given on these yarns up to the maximum; but in no year may the bounty paid to all manufacturers of yarns exceed $25,000, nor is it in the three years to exceed the sum of $75,000. The vote asked for here is for the purpose of paying the bounty as agreed upon, and as I have explained to the committee. The sum is smaller than was estimated for previously, and even the amount of this estimate may be reduced somewhat—in fact I am going to ask that it be reduced—simply because it is impossible for the manufacturers to absorb that sum of money out of the current year for which this estimate is being voted, and there is not much use of carrying in the Estimates an amount beyond the sum which can be absorbed.

Mr. MORPHY: The explanation of the minister with regard to the reason of the decrease is quite satisfactory to me, but I would like some further information as to the activities of his trade commissioners. I would like to know who they are, where they are located, what they are doing, and how hard they are working to assist the men who did answer the call in this country for production for national purposes of material for the manufacture of linen, and whether or not these producers are being treated by the trade commissioners with that consideration to which they are entitled. I am told that in England the warehouses are bulging to the roofs with linen, that ther never was in England the scarcity that is alleged, but that they had there all the yarn they wanted; and yet the manufacturers and farmers of this country were pleaded with by this Government to "go to it," to do their best, and to produce, and produce, and produce. Now they find themselves up against the wall, and I want to know from the minister just how hard his trade commissioners are working. I want to know where they are working, and what they are doing to ameliorate this unfortunate condition into which the flax industry has been thrown, and I think probably unfairly thrown by—may I use a mild term?—English commercial greed. I may be misinformed—if I am I would like the minister to tell me—but I wish to know whether it is true that during the war, and at all times since, the English linen producer, and the United Kingdom producer generally, has had all the yarn he wanted and that he could have supplied some to Canada and relieved the situation here, had he been actuated by a little more consideration of the difficulties under which this country laboured as the outcome of the war.

4 p.m.

Sir GEORGE FOSTER: As to whether the trade commissioners are acting fairly by this interest, as by other interests—

Mr. MORPHY: I did not say "acting fairly," my question was as to whether they are working actively.

Sir GEORGE FOSTER: As to whether they are working actively in comparison with their efforts in other directions I think I can answer that by a very strong affirmative. They have received special instructions outside of those relating to their general duty, and I must say with regard to our present staff of trade commissioners that I think they are a set of men whose intelligence, honesty, and assiduity cannot be successfully criticized. They work not only because they are paid a salary, but because they are instructed in their work. They are enthusiastic in the performance of their duties, and the intimate relations the department holds with them, and the statements of the men who travel in those countries where they are and should come into contact with these commissioners, affords evidence to back up the assertion that I have made. I honestly believe that we have amongst our trade staff to-day, our commissioners abroad, a better set of men than we have ever had. I believe that we have a most satisfactory staff which will compare with the staff maintained by any other country.

Now as to what it is possible for them to do, that is a different matter. If prices have gone down, the shoulders of all the trade commissioners are not strong enough to boost those prices agaisnt world conditions. That is a situation that the trade itself comes up against and that the com-

missioners are powerless to overcome. All they can do is to seek out any possible avenues that are available for the exchange of these products in the countries in which they have their work set out, and that they are doing. But the countries are not very many that take these products. Great Britain itself has absorbed them in the past. The manufacturers there have paid highly for the flax seed, and the fibre as well, that they have got in Canada, and they prize these commodities just as highly as before. But they have stocks on hand more than sufficient for their own use, and they will not buy fresh stocks when they stand face to face with the market, in a measure, as our own producers of flax fibre stand. I am convinced that three or four years ago the conditions of the market were such that neither the United States nor Great Britain could, in justice to their own people, satisfy the requirements of our people. They did it to a certain extent, but gradually we came up against the impossibility of getting any supplies from either one country or the other. There is one thing that lights up the situation somewhat, and that is that this factory which is at present making fibres from these yarns has demonstrated that Canadian material and machinery, backed by Canadian enterprise and technical skill, can make the product from the root up in this country of such a quality as will bear comparison with the product turned out in Ireland, Belgium and other countries where this industry has been established for many generations.

Mr. MORPHY: I am very much pleased to hear that the minister has such a remarkably active and well equipped staff, and I am sorry indeed to find that he is forced to confess that his staff is absolutely helpless under the circumstances to afford any grain of comfort at all. But in his long narration concerning his excellent staff the minister has not told us of a single instance where any of his men have endeavoured to ameliorate the serious conditions under which our producers of flax are labouring. His men, I presume, are scattered all over the world. What I asked him was whether he has been getting reports from any of his staff containing suggestions that would assist our people here to dispose of the product of their factories that they cannot work up for the foreign market because the banks have refused them accommodation. The situation is more serious, I think, than the minister realizes. To use his own words, the manufacturers of this country undertook to establish equipment for the working up of these products, but only one manufacturer lived up to the undertaking. I would like to know the names of the manufacturers who failed to redeem their promise. Let us see who they are and why they failed.

Sir GEORGE FOSTER: My hon. friend pushes me pretty tightly up against the wall. What answer would he make if he were in my place? I will put myself in his place and answer. He does not impugn the efficiency of our trade commissioners. If he did I would have to defend them, and I could do so with a perfectly honest heart. But what can men do under the circumstances? My trade commissioners cannot go down into Ontario and lift one ounce from the load these people have to bear. The only hope of relief is in extended markets. To secure extended markets you must go outside of Canada. That is what our trade commissioners are doing, but they are up against the conditions of the market in other countries just as our people are up against the conditions of the market here; and if the market is overstocked, and consequently prices are low, no trade commissioner can raise those prices or alter the general conditions. My hon. friend spoke about those manufacturers who gave a certain undertaking. Our action was in the nature of trying to get people to supply the need that existed at the time; and when the War Commission took the matter up they had communication with more than one manufacturer, but only one succeeded in establishing the proper equipment, and he is to-day manufacturing the goods. The others did not come under any bond and they could not be compelled to do anything. They would only get the subsidy when they produced the goods, and they would take upon themselves the responsibility of the equipment in view of the bounty which would be paid for the three years after the war while their equipment would be working. I do not think I can give my hon. friend any clearer answer than that.

Mr. CURRIE: In looking over the trade papers I notice that a short time ago there was a convention in Brussels or Antwerp of representatives of various countries with a view to fixing the prices of linen fibre and linen, the trade being in a bad way in all countries. Did we have a representative there?

Sir GEORGE FOSTER: I do not remember if we had one at that particular meeting, but I should not have much faith

in the power of a convention to fix prices which would stand against world conditions as they are to-day.

Mr. CURRIE: It was a meeting of flax growers and flax manufacturers at which England, Ireland, Germany, France and Japan were represented, and they made an effort to fix a minimum price of, I think, seven cents. I do not know whether they were successful or not. But the condition is world-wide, it is not confined to Canada alone.

Sir GEORGE FOSTER: Certainly not.

Mr. BEST: I would not think of criticising the members of this commission, but I understand that the purpose of the commission is to give information to the general public. Now it may be working very hard, but if it had done its duty, it seems to me it should have got information two or three years ago as to what would be the actual conditions after the war, because, if this had been done, many of our farmers in Ontario would not be in their present unsatisfactory position. We were led to believe that there was a great shortage of flax and linen and that for some years to come the price would be on a paying basis. But after going into the business quite extensively our farmers find this year that all along there was plenty of yarn and linen piled up in the Old Country. Why did not the commission know those conditions and report them to our farmers? I noticed in one of the leading papers a few days ago that some one had stated that Ontario fibre was not as good as Belgian or Irish fibre. We have at Ottawa a flax expert who states that the best quality Ontario fibre is equal to any that is produced either in Belgium or Ireland. The other statement will certainly hurt the sale of our fibre. Why does not the commission criticise that adverse statement? Why does it not come out and tell the world that our fibre is as good as any fibre that can be produced, as we are led to believe it is? Japan and many other countries have warehouses right in Belfast, where, from the information I have received, they manufacture more linen than in any other part of the world, and people can go to those warehouses and select what they want. The buyers on the other side do not want to buy it in lots of a few pounds, and they will not come over here and buy it in Ontario because the manufacturers there buy different grades of fibre. We should have a warehouse there as other countries have to which our fibre could be shipped and where the purchaser could select what he wanted and pay for it. I think that this commission should surely be able to furnish some information to the growers of Ontario. Commissions of that kind should give full information about conditions in other countries. I feel quite satisfied that if the farmers in Ontario, and I think some in Quebec, had known one or two years ago what the conditions would be they would not be suffering the losses that they are likely to suffer this year.

Mr. ARCHAMBAULT: The farmers of Quebec did not go into any large cultivation of flax.

Mr. BEST: Some small quantities were produced there, I believe.

Mr. COWAN: May I ask the minister whether the manufacturers of these linen goods in Canada are giving to the trade commissioners that co-operation which is necessary if trade in the foreign fields is to be captured? I understand that the trade commissioners are a thoroughly capable body of men who are performing their work in an excellent manner. But it has been stated and we had a man speaking on this subject a short time ago in one of the rooms in this building—that the manufacturers of Canada have not any agents in the foreign field. I know of two men who have been all around the world, who visited every commercial field, but who met no salesmen anywhere representing Canadian firms. It seems to me that the Canadian manufacturers of linen are relying entirely upon the Government and upon the trade commisioners to advance their interests, and I do not think it is possible for the trade commissioners to do anything of that kind. The trade commissioner cannot have that intimate knowledge of every line of business which is necessary to the effecting of a sale. Salesmanship to-day involves an accurate knowledge of the article which it is intended to sell, and it is impossible for the human mind—in this case, for the trade commissioner—to grasp the salient features of every line of business, and thus be able to effect the largest possible number of sales. Has the minister any information which would show whether or not Canadian manufacturers are actively engaged in the promotion of Canadian business abroad? If they are not, it is time they awakened to the necessities of the situation.

Mr. McMASTER: Are we under any moral or legal obligations to pay this

$2,000 to the producers of flax yarn? Are we free to withhold the bounty?

Sir GEORGE FOSTER: The answer is a very plain one, and as a business man my hon. friend will understand it. The Government entered into a contract; that contract has three years to run and is limited as to the amount that can be paid under it. These men, with that signed contract, put their money into the equipment of the business. They put in a splendid equipment and are doing excellent work. The Government, therefore, is not in a position to say: Well, we have not as much money as we used to have; we do not want to pay you anything; we will slide out. As to the question put by the member for Regina (Mr. Cowan), there is a negative and a positive answer. Some manufacturers are wide awake and have their representatives wherever in foreign fields there is a fair chance of making a sale. The trade commissioners were never instituted, never paid, never instructed, to make any sale for any particular party or for any particular corporation. They are not sales agents; the sales agents are to be put in the field by the men who have the commodities to sell. There never can be a thoroughly good foreign trade for this country unless the manufacturers co-operate with the trade commissioners and follow up the information furnished by them. To make your sale of goods to a man you have to sit down before him, first, a thorough master of your business in all its details so that you can meet his every argument, and then if modifications are suggested you have to be able to tell him on the instant: I will take you on that; you have made me an offer; I will take it. Where would your trade commissioners be if they were placed in a position of that kind?

Now, with reference to the flax industry, there are men engaged in that business who are fully alive to the situation and have their representatives in the Old Country and perhaps in other places. We are in constant communication with them and through our trade commissioners in England we help them all we can. I do not think they have any fault to find with the extent of the co-operation offered by the Trade and Commerce Department.

Mr. McMASTER: I thank the minister for the explanation which he gave us as to its being impossible for the Canadian people to break this engagement entered into with the producers of flax yarn. But at the risk of being tiresome may I just observe how this affords a striking example of the unwisdom of endeavouring to bonus into precocious economic life one industry or another? When a Government by bonuses or protection undertakes to interfere with the law of supply and demand, in the long run they do more harm than good.

Mr. CURRIE: What harm has that factory done?

Mr. McMASTER: The member for Dufferin (Mr. Best) has just placed before us the fact that inducements were held out to the farmers of Canada to go largely into flax production. It was held out to them that there would be a market for flax through the manufacture of flax into yarn as a result of this bonus.

Mr. CURRIE: Oh no, the hon. gentleman is altogether wrong.

Mr. BEST: I had nothing to say about the manufacturers here. In fact, I believe that if we had three or four similar factories engaged in the manufacture of this commodity, there would be a sale for it. I was only criticising the work of the commissioners in not informing the farmers of the conditions on the other side.

Mr. McMASTER: My hon. friend may deduce from the facts different conclusions than those which I arrive at. But I think I am right in saying that he is my authority for the statement that the increase of flax production was substantial; that farmers in Ontario were led to believe that it was a wise thing to go in for the production of flax; that they devoted certain of their land to the production of flax rather than to the raising of other crops, and that today the market for flax is broken and they are suffering a loss. Now I think it is a fair argument that these farmers proceeded as they did because of the hope and the expectation that there would be a considerable market for their crop, and that hope and expectation was no doubt based, in part at least, upon the action of the Government in granting this bonus upon flax yarn. My right hon. friend (Sir George Foster) shakes his head. It seems to me that is a reasonable deduction to draw, and I think most members will draw that deduction. What has happened? The market for flax has slackened and there has been a loss. You will generally find that this is what happens when you bonus, when you stimu-

late artificially one industry rather than another, because you cannot control world supply and world demand, and market prices, in regard to the great staples of production, are created by world supply and world demand. Of course, we must not do what is ethically wrong, seeing that the manufacturers of yarn have altered their position by reason of this contract entered into by the Government. Yet, while perhaps in war conditions, it may not have been improper to give this stimulus, I have always the gravest doubt about the advisability of following such a course, either in war or in peace. I would make this observation, that we have here another example of the unwisdom of interfering with economic laws; that, as a rule, this interference does not help, but hinders and hurts the general interest. Let me give an example. Prior to 1846, protectionist sentiment in the Old Country, largely looked to agriculture; the Corn Laws formed the great keystone of the protectionist arch, and it was agreed that by maintaining what was practically prohibition of imports until the price rose very high on the introduction of foodstuffs into Great Britain, you maintained agriculture in a flourishing condition and that tended to keep people on the land and to maintain an agricultural position.

Mr. CURRIE: They are doing the same thing in England now.

Mr. McMASTER: And they will have the same disastrous results as they had before, I have no doubt. Let me make my point, my hon. friend will or will not agree with me as he sees fit. The point I want to make is that, during these years, while the agricultural interest in England was supposed to be helped by the introduction of heavy duties on foodstuffs coming into that country, the agricultural interest suffered very severely. Every few years, parliamentary investigations had to be held to examine into the cause of agricultural distress. And why? Because in lean years, when the harvest was small, the prohibition or the impediments to allowing food to flow into Great Britain were such that prices became very high and rents were fixed on a very high basis. Then when there was a bountiful harvest, prices tended to drop; but rents tended to remain where they were, so that the only people who benefited in any way by the system were the landlords, and even they did not really benefit, because the misery which was thus imposed on the bulk of the people reacted upon the landlords as well. The committee will pardon this digression, but I want to emphasize the point, and all my reading and experience go to confirm the notion which I have held for years, that it is a great mistake to interfere with economic laws, and that harm and not good is the inevitable consequence of the pursuance of that policy.

Sir GEORGE FOSTER: My hon. friend has made his point, or he thinks he has. My contention is that his point was not well taken, and I do not want his argument to proceed from a false assumption. The argument of my hon. friend was: You set up a factory to manufacture yarn and textiles from flax fibre—by setting that up, and in setting that up, the idea you had in mind was to stimulate the production of flax in this country—that idea got abroad amongst the farmers; they produced flax and produced it and produced it on that assumption—and now your factory takes but a small proportion, and the flax producers find themselves with large surpluses which they cannot market. That argument does not apply in this case. The point had in view by the War Trade Board and the Government was not of giving this bonus to a factory to stimulate the production of flax in this country. To a certain extent, the factory would call for a certain proportion of flax that it required for its manufacture. The object in view was a war object and no other. What is wisdom at one time may, as my hon friend said, be unwisdom at another, so that we have to go back to the time which produced the action. What were the grounds upon which the action was taken? I think it well that the committee should know these grounds:

Whereas it appears that no linen thread or yarn has come forward from Great Britain since the first of January, 1918, for the manufacture of fishing nets, or shoe hemp for military and agricultural harness, or for the manufacture of aeroplane cloth,—

The demand for which was very insistent at that time.

—linen thread for military boots,—

And military boots had to be provided

—machine thread for the manufacture of agricultural and military harness, or yarns and threads for civilian use in Canada.

That was the basis. It was the utter lack of those things necessary for those purposes that induced the War Trade Board, on the suggestion of the Govern-

ment, to see whether or not they could bring about the manufacture of those things to apply to that necessity and that emergency. That was the purpose, and my hon. friend was quite wrong in placing it upon the broader ground that we went into this bonus for the purpose of stimulating the production of flax in this country. The production of flax in this country, not stimulated much by this, although that provided a certain limited market, was stimulated by the high price that prevailed for both the seed and the fibre, and the impression that those high prices or profitable prices would prevail for a long time and that, therefore, the farmer would have a remunerative result from his labour if he put his labour to the production of flax seed and fibre. My hon. friend (Mr. Best) finds fault with my poor trade commissioners because they were not prophets.

Mr. BEST: Not with them.

Sir GEORGE FOSTER: My hon. friend is not a prophet; I am not a prophet, and to put a man back five or four years ago in the turmoil of world conditions and ask him to tell your farmer in Ontario just what conditions would be four or five years afterwards, is giving the man no show at all unless the Lord Almighty pointed out to him what he should say. Only inspiration could do that; no human knowledge could. Therefore, I think it is not right to ask from our trade commissioners what they cannot do. The Jap, my hon. friend said, went ahead and put up a great warehouse and stocked it with flax fibre and seed and went on the market to sell it. I am afraid my hon. friend has hold of a bit of a fairy tale in that regard. Anyway, if that were a fact, the Government could not follow that course; it could not take wheat or flax or any other product that is made and establish warehouses and put in stock, and then either wait until somebody came to buy or induce them to buy.

Mr. BEST: I refuse to be charged with opposing this grant to the flax industry of Canada.

Sir GEORGE FOSTER: I did not say that.

Mr. BEST: I was referring to the hon. member for Brome (Mr. McMaster).

Mr. McMASTER: I hardly think my argument is open to that.

Mr. BEST: My complaint is that the bounty is not half a million or a million dollars. We send our fibre from here to the Old Country where it is manufactured, and then hundreds of thousands of dollars worth of the manufactured article is shipped back to Canada. Would it not pay the people of Canada better to give a bounty so as to have the manufacturing process done in this country? I was not criticising the item at all. What I was criticising was this. I believe this commission could have found out what quantity there was on hand each year. Perhaps I may be wrong in that, but I think it could have been done, and if that information had been given to the farmers there might not have been quite so much flax produced. I did not say that the Japanese had a great big warehouse in Belfast. I said they had a warehouse there, where every variety of their fibres and seed samples could be shown. A small room, with one man to look after it, would do. A buyer could look over the fibre and seed and decide how many bales of fibre or how many bushels of seed he would take. The cost would be very small. If the farmers of Ontario are going to produce fibre, I think the Government should certainly establish a small warehouse there. I hope no hon. member will think I am criticising this bonus. If this bonus had not been granted, we would not be in the position we are in to-day as regards the fibre industry.

Mr. SUTHERLAND: I think we have wandered a little from the item before the committee, which is to provide $26,000 for a bounty on linen yarn spun in Canada from Canadian flax. Last year the item was $30,000. It is admitted that there are immense stocks of flax fibres in the hands of the growers in this country. As a rule I do not favour bounties, but if ever there was a time when we were justified in passing such an item without criticism, it is now. I do not favour reducing the item to $26,000. I could not help but feel that if we had someone in this country whose foresight was as good as the backsight exhibited by the hon. member for Brome, we would have a world-beater. I did not approve of the bounty when it was first introduced, because I believed that flax growing was an industry that was peculiarly adapted to a country where cheap labour was plentiful. If you study the history of flax growing and linen production all over the world, you will find that it is most successful where cheap labour prevails, such as in Russia, India, Belgium, and Ireland. These countries have excelled in the growing of flax and the manufac-

ture of linen. During the war, however, there was such a tremendous demand for linen, and the price went up to such a figure, that many people went in for the growing of flax, for they knew that climatic conditions in this country were ideal for its production. Well, the price has fallen since. The deflation in the price of flax seed, linen and hemp is only what you find in the wool industry as well.

We had linen industries in this country before this item was placed in the Estimates. There was in the constituency that I represent a small factory engaged in the manufacture of linen. It is now a branch of the factory that is established at Guelph. They have been manufacturing linen very successfully, and their success is in no small measure due to the fact that this item was placed in the Estimates. Unquestionably there are immense quantities of flax in the hands of the growers for which they can find no sale to-day. I do not believe we are justified in encouraging its manufacture into linen in this country and therefore I am heartily in favour of this item in the Estimates. Instead of reducing it to $26,000, I think we would be quite justified in leaving it at $30,000.

Mr. COWAN: I want to disagree as strongly as I can with the attitude of my hon. friend from Brome in this matter. To my way of thinking, he is a most unprogressive gentleman. If his policy had been followed, Canada would never had got to where it is to-day. I think he would make a good old-time Conservative. This item in the Estimates has been a benefit to Canada, even if the flax market is broken to-day. We have proved that we can raise in Canada the very best kind of flax for fibre purposes, and that is worth a whole lot more than the amount it has cost us in the way of bonus. This industry is not for to-day only; we shall have a flax industry in Canada for all time to come, employing thousands of men, and bringing profit to the farmers who raise the fibre. I think this is the proper course to follow if we are going to develop this industry in Canada. We must start it by just such means as we are adopting here. I think we ought all to support the item, which will encourage the development of this industry.

Mr. CAHILL: The minister asked us to excuse him for this bad legislation on the ground that it was adopted in war time. I think the minister really should be excused because any ministry that thought winter time was the time to grow flax in this country must have been more or less confused. The Order in Council for the encouragement of the flax industry was passed in September. That fact alone, I think, shows that the minister must have been very much confused. Had he waited for a more reasonable time, he would have found that the war was over, and he would have avoided the criticism he has received this afternoon from his own supporters for his lack of knowledge of the conditions in the flax industry. An hon. member has asked whether it was not the whole Government that was responsible for this Order in Council. I suppose the whole Government would be responsible. Certainly Parliament was not responsible. Parliament was not consulted about the matter, and had nothing whatever to do with it. The Government acted on the principle of divine right, at the time they were doing things by Order in Council instead of submitting them to Parliament. They passed this Order in Council to grow flax in the winter time instead of waiting until the House was in session, which would have been time enough, if this legislation was really necessary. I say it was a bad move on the part of the Government, and the minister deserves the criticism he has received from his supporters this afternoon.

Sir GEORGE FOSTER: Flax grows better when it is sown on a snowbank.

Mr. CANNON: The particulars concerning this item are not to be found in volume 3 of the Auditor General's Report. I would be very grateful if the minister would indicate where they are to be found. I owe the committee an explanation with reference to the previous item. The minister and I, I am quite sure without any bad faith on the part of either of us, misled the committee when we agreed to let the first item stand. I stated that the particulars were not in volume 3, but in volume 4, and the right hon. gentleman was under the same impression. Now I wish to correct both my statement and his impression. The particulars are to be found in volume 3, and if the minister desires to return to the item I withdraw my objection. Will he tell me, if he can, where the details of this flax item are to be found in the Auditor General's Report?

Sir GEORGE FOSTER: If I am to answer my hon. friend exactly according to his question, the details of this item will not be found until it has been worked out on the basis of production and the accounts

have been paid and audited. That will appear in the Auditor General's Report, probably of 1922.

Mr. VIEN: We mean last year's expenditure.

Sir GEORGE FOSTER: Last year's expenditure, if anything, was very slight, and I am not sure that there would be anything in the Auditor General's Report this year concerning it. In the report of next year, the audited accounts will be found. I am glad to go back to item 346, but I am sorry to have to say that my faith in my hon. friend's general veracity has received a severe shock. He told me, with such an honest look in his countenance, that the details were to be found only in "Z" that I took his word for it. After this I shall have to query when my hon. friend makes a positive statement.

Mr. McCOIG: Has the minister any encouragement to offer the flax growers of the country for the future? What my hon. friend from South Oxford (Mr. Sutherland) stated a few moments ago is absolutely true. There are many flax growers throughout Ontario who were encouraged to take up this business by the facts placed before them by representatives or supporters of the Government. They went ahead and have produced a crop which they have yet. They have been at great expense, having paid out money which they could have spent to better advantage in some other direction; and now they have flax on hand which they are unable to dispose of. I do not say this in any unkind spirit or for the purpose of criticising the Government for having given encouragement to this or any other industry. I believe they are justified in taking such steps as they deem fit from time to time to encourage an industry which they hope will turn out profitable to the producers. But I would ask the minister if he has any advice as to the future to offer these men who have seriously gone into this industry, made large expenditures, purchased machinery, and put up buildings to take care of their crops. Would he advise them to continue or to withdraw from the industry, and take up some other line instead?

Sir GEORGE FOSTER: I certainly would not advise them one way or the other, and it would be a pretty bold man, I think, who would take the responsibility of giving advice to people as to how they should employ their enterprise and spend their money on production in the future. The best that could be said about it is that men must use their judgment in the light of their knowledge of the world and of business. You have to make your investment on the basis of your conviction as to what the future has in store, and a man would assume a great responsibility if he presumed to give advice to people to go on producing flax because year after next they would obtain splendid prices. It is not possible for one to make such a prediction, and if it were, it certainly would not be possible under conditions as they exist at present. If my hon. friend thinks for a moment he will realize the truth of this. Still, we cannot stagnate. If a government is to do anything to help conditions, it must proceed on general lines, advising that we produce all we can and raise all we can; but, after all, the producer himself must be his own judge as to whether or not he will follow such advice, even though it be given with the very best intention and on the strength of information available at the time. We all know that things change, and sometimes the change is so rapid that what appeared to be the height of wisdom at one time in the prosecution of an enterprise might be the height of unwisdom at another time, and a policy deemed advisable previously might later on turn out disastrously. I have no specific for that sort of thing, and if my hon. friend has any, I should like him to give me the formula.

Mr. EULER: How many factories have actually been established which are entitled to the bounty?

Sir GEORGE FOSTER: One.

Mr. EULER: Are they entitled to the bounty whether they produce yarn or not?

Sir GEORGE FOSTER: The bounty is paid only on the production of yarn.

Mr. EULER: On what basis is it given?

Sir GEORGE FOSTER: It is paid on the basis of so many cents per pound, based on the "lea"—their measurement—which signifies the degree of fineness or coarseness, as the case may be. The bounty is so many cents per pound of a certain fineness.

Mr. EULER: Would they receive any bounty merely as a remuneration for having put up a factory, or must they actually produce?

Sir GEORGE FOSTER: Nothing is paid except on what is produced.

Mr. VIEN: What part of the $30,000 was expended last year?

Mr. McGIBBON (Muskoka): What is the name of the company the minister mentions?

Mr. VIEN: Just a moment.

Sir GEORGE FOSTER: The bounty was paid from April 1, 1920, to December 31, 1920, on 110,011¾ pounds of linen thread, the amount paid being $3,939.00.

Mr. EULER: What is the name of the company and where is it located?

Sir GEORGE FOSTER: The name of the company is Dominion Linens, Ltd., of Guelph.

Mr. CANNON: What is the reason for the decrease this year?

Sir GEORGE FOSTER: I explained that the bounty is paid on actual production. At present there is one factory producing, and it is without the bounds of possibility that that factory will produce enough during the current year to warrant the payment of $30,000, and it was therefore reduced to $26,000. I do not think it is very probable that they will absorb the whole of that sum, but if it is not earned, it wil not be paid.

Mr. PEDLOW: The member for South Oxford, in his reference to this item, in speaking of the conditions in regard to the production of flax and manufacture of linen yarns, stated that one of the reasons why Canada was not able to compete with other countries was the cheapness of labour abroad. I think that another reason is the difference in climatic conditions. Climatic conditions in the north of Ireland particularly, in Belgium, Holland and Russia, are much more favourable to the production of a finer fibre than can ever be produced in Canada under the climatic conditions that prevail here. The conditions here will prevent the Canadian producer from ever competing in the markets of the world for finer fibres. There is another reason which apparently has not been considered this afternoon in discussing this subject. That is the fact, that while in the Old Country they produce flax for the fibre only, in Canada I understand they try to produce flax at the same time for both fibre and seed. Now it is impossible to produce the finer grades of fibre and save the seed at the same time. If you produce the fibre to the stage where the seed ripens you have coarser fibre as a result, and consequently it will not be possible for the Canadian producer to compete in markets of the world in the producing of the finer grades of this commodity.

Mr. ARMSTRONG (Lambton): I have no desire to prolong the debate on this item, but in view of certain definite statements which have been made by the last speaker I feel it incumbent to at least say a few words.

Mr. PEDLOW: I have not completed my remarks. Does the hon. gentleman wish to ask a question?

Mr. ARMSTRONG (Lambton): No. Let the hon. gentleman proceed with his speech.

Mr. PEDLOW: Not only is what I have said true with respect to the production of the fibre, but it is equally true when we consider the manufacture of the material. It is an undoubted fact—a fact questioned by no one who has any knowledge of the linen industry—that linens cannot be produced in Canada which are at all as fine as those produced in the north of Ireland. The reason for that also is the climatic conditions there. The humid atmosphere of the north of Ireland is extremely favourable to the manufacture of the linen material—it is favourable, in the first instance, to the production of the fibre, and it is equally favourable to the production of the finished article, the cloth produced from that fibre. Such being the case I do not think it is possible to produce in this country either the fibre or the finished article to successfully compete with the finer grades of linen manufactured in the Old Country. In making that statement I am speaking with authority, because I have not only had personal experience in handling the finished product, but I have also had experience in the whole process from start to finish—handling the seed; pulling, retting, and scutching the flax; spinning it into yarn, weaving it into cloth, finishing the woven product and placing it on the market. So that by reason of this experience I should know whereof I speak. I am aware that there are those who claim that what I state is not the case. Such people speak without knowledge for the production of an article as fine as that produced in the Old Land has been attempted under artificial conditions on this continent time and again, without any degree of success. That is to say the endeavour has been made to obtain artificial conditions in the

5 p.m.

factory where the material is spun into yarn and the yarn is woven into cloth, but even in that case the quality of the finished article did not compare with the finished article manufactured in the north of Ireland. I would like to give some consideration also to the point so properly referred to by the hon. member for Dufferin (Mr. Best). We have trade commissioners all over the world but what do they accomplish? The hon. member for Regina (Mr. Cowan) presided at a meeting of members of Parliament held in this building a few days ago when a certain gentleman delivered an address on trade questions. This gentleman stated that he had travelled entirely round the world, in the interest of the firm with which he was connected, in an endeavour to obtain information of value touching the manufacture and disposition of their product. He said that he had, during the past year, travelled a distance of over forty-one thousand miles; and I was astonished to hear him assert that in all his travels he had found only one really live Canadian trade comissioner who was of any assistance to him. I will not mention the locality where that trade commissioner is stationed, but the minister, if he wishes to investigate the matter, may secure information of value to him from hon. gentlemen on his own side of the House. Now, referring to the Auditor General's Report, pages Z—20, Z—21, Z—22, and Z—23, I find a list of 36 Canadian trade commissioners.

Sir GEORGE FOSTER: If my hon. friend will allow me, does he not think it would be more appropriate to discuss the matter of trade commissioners on the item relating to them which comes up a little later?

Mr. PEDLOW: On general principles I have no doubt the minister's view is correct, but I merely wish to refer to the matter in passing in order to emphasize a point which was alluded to by the hon. member for Dufferin. Now you have trade commissioners at Yokohama, Havana, Barbadoes, Rio de Janeiro, Vladivostok, Shanghai, Cape Town, Buenos Aires, Rotterdam, and other places whose title terminates in the same manner as the last one I quoted.

Sir GEORGE FOSTER: That is an awful mean way of swearing.

Mr. PEDLOW: Although there are trade commissioners at all these places there is not a single one in the city of Belfast. Now I ask the minister why it is that the Government, although it obtained last year $30,000 for the encouragement of the flax industry and is now asking for a sum of $26,000, has not any representative in the city of Belfast to look after the interests of the Canadians who have this yarn to sell?

Sir GEORGE FOSTER: In the first place the capacity of the Dominion is limited. There are a great many other cities in the world besides Belfast where we have no trade commissioner. As my hon. friend said we have about thirty commissioners, but even those are not sufficient to meet the needs; we have to send them where we think the best general advantages can be derived. At the present time I would imagine it to be a little bit dangerous to be in Belfast.

Mr. PEDLOW: I think a trade commissioner would be just as safe in the city of Belfast as he would be in the Bahamas, Shanghai, or Vladivostok.

Sir GEORGE FOSTER: But you have to keep indoors there.

Mr. PEDLOW: It seems ridiculous for the Canadian Government to be endeavouring to promote the production of flax in Canada and to be granting bonuses for this purpose, that it has not followed the matter up by appointing a resident agent in the city of Belfast, the world centre of this particular branch of trade, to look after the interests of Canadian producers.

Mr. GLASS: I wish to say, in reference to the observations of the hon. member who has just spoken, that he takes upon himself a very serious responsibility in criticising the support that the Government is trying to give to the establishment in Canada of an industry that has such immense possibilities. I am sorry that world conditions so far have prevented manufacturers from Ireland, and I may say even manufacturers from Belgium, who are experts in the cultivation and manufacture of flax, establishing mills here and taking advantage of this bounty to encourage the spinning industry in Canada. It must be patent to any one that it is the height of folly for us to continue to be the hewers of wood and the drawers of water for the countries of Europe—for us to produce our raw material and send it over there to be manufactured and re-sold to us in the finished state.

There seems to be a desire not only in the House but in the press to discount the ability of Canadian growers to produce flax

of high quality. A prominent Belgian who was in this country a short time ago, in the course of an interview given to a representative of the Montreal Star, stated that Canada grew as fine a quality of fibre flax as could be produced in the civilized world; but that Canadians so far had not been able to handle their flax as scientifically as growers in Belgium, Ireland and other countries. Why, Sir, the very object of establishing a department of fibre in connection with the Experimental Farm was not to show farmers how to grow flax—that is easy enough—but how to handle it after it is grown. You may produce a crop of flax the acre value of which might not represent twenty-five dollars after it is harvested, and yet that very same flax handled under expert direction and properly retted and scutched might represent a value of from $300 to $350 an acre. It is for that very purpose that we want expert direction through our Department of Agriculture. Then, having produced a quality of flax equal to the best that can be produced in Europe, the Department of Trade and Commerce, through this bounty, can encourage the spinning of the fibre into yarns. This means spinning it into threads from which the linen is woven. As a result of that encouragement a mill was established in Guelph by Dominion Spinners, Limited, the purpose of which was to use Canadian flax fibre for the making of yarns, and then in their adjoining mill to weave the yarns into linen. The quality of their goods is attested by the fact that the Canadian National Railways, the Canadian Pacific Railway, the King Edward Hotel and other leading institutions which demand a high quality of linen for their tables are buying their supplies from Dominion Spinners, Limited; in other words, they are buying linen which has been woven in a Canadian mill from yarn spun from Canadian-grown fibre. The Brooklyn Linen Mills of Belfast, Ireland, have already been looking into the possibilities of growing fibre in this country with a view to the establishment of linen mills here. I hold, Sir, in view of the fact that we have such a tremendous potential water power in this country, and that we can grow fibre here of such excellent quality, there is no earthly reason why with proper encouragement we should not have the flax spinning and weaving industries developed here to their highest possibilities. I submit that if several spinning mills were established here—as I hope they will be—the $25,000 or $26,000 appropriated for bounties on the production of these yarns would be too small, and it is my cherished hope that the industry may so develop and such a large amount of yarn will be spun as to require even a large appropriation for this bounty.

This afternoon, while this discussion was proceeding, I was engaged in my room dictating a long letter of protest to the Montreal Star in answer to an article which appeared there a week ago to-night. A Mr. Ireland, of Ireland Bros., large linen manufacturers of Belfast, allowed himself to be interviewed by an ignorant reporter of the Montreal Star—ignorant on this subject; I will qualify it to that extent; absolutely ignorant of the subject about which he was seeking information. Mr. Ireland, in expressing his optimism and hope for the future of the industry, made the statement, that with the present condition of the industry throughout the world there is a total visible supply of not one-third enough fibre to operate the mills in Ireland alone for a single year. Yet notwithstanding that condition, and the impossibility of the Baltic and other flax-growing districts getting back to normal conditions within a reasonable time, the price of this commodity has been depressed to a point where it is now below the cost of production in this country. That is a very unfortunate circumstance, but it is not one to discourage us, because production costs last year were abnormal by reason of the very high rate of wages. Mr. Ireland expressed the opinion that these conditions impelled the conclusion that in the very near future there must be a large increase in the consumption of fibre, and that as soon as the retailer commenced buying linens there would be a demand on the manufacturers for their goods, and having eased themselves of their stocks, a demand would spring up very quickly from the manufacturers for the limited supply of fibre that was now available. Therefore there is every possibility that our growers will come through with a very fair profit if they will have patience. But the point in this article that I object to, and the point which I drew to the attention of the chief of the fibre department of the Experimental Farm, is this. The interviewer asked Mr. Ireland what did people in Ireland and the rest of Europe think of Canadian flax. He said: Oh, Canadian flax does not meet with very much success. He could not say anything against

its quality, for it was good, but the flax in this country was grown mostly for linseed. Now, that was an absurd statement for him to make. It is true that in the West flax is grown for linseed, but in Ontario and Quebec we grow flax for fibre exclusively, and we have developed a quality equal to the best fibre grown in any part of the world.

I urge, Sir, that it is the duty of the Government at this critical time not to get discouraged. Our growers are not discouraged. They will grow more flax next year, but not so much as in former years; they are going to feel their way. I have expressed the opinion in this House time and again that the duty of our growers is to develop quality rather than quantity, that a hundred acres of good flax from which good fibre can be produced is better than five hundred acres of mediocre flax, the fibre from which you cannot find a market for, against the competition of Russia, Japan and other flax-growing countries. I hope the Government will stand to its guns and will follow up its good work by establishing a demonstration plant in the district where fibre is mostly grown, and will by research work encourage the adoption of better methods and better mechanical appliances. There is no reason why we should not have by this means, a flax industry developed to the limits of its possibilities, and an industry which will add enormous potential wealth to this country.

Mr. ARMSTRONG (Lambton): I cannot allow the statement of the hon. member for South Renfrew (Mr. Pedlow) to go unchallenged. In my constituency there are five flax mills which took care of a production area last year of over two thousand acres. Some of these mills have been in operation for fifty years or more and their business has been conducted in such a way that their fibre has been sent to Belfast and is considered of the very best quality in every particular. There is no question about the capability of the people of my county to raise the very best quality of flax fibre. I merely make that statement for the purpose of correcting the hon. member for South Renfrew.

Mr. PEDLOW: I am pleased indeed to hear the correction made by the member for East Lambton (Mr. Armstrong). I am pleased also to see the hon. member for East Middlesex (Mr. Glass) here. During the progress of the discussion I looked around for him, and as my hon. friend has made a specialty of this subject and has discussed it on numerous occasions on the floor of the House, to take the matter up without his being present seemed to me to be like trying to play Hamlet without the star performer, the Prince of Denmark. I was glad to hear from him the facts of the situation in regard to the production of fibre and to know that in Ontario at least they have not been trying to grow flax both for seed and for the production of fibre. That was attempted in the early stages of the production of flax, but without satisfactory results. I am sure that the information which has been given in regard to this matter by the member for East Middlesex will be of much interest to the general public.

Mr. GLASS: A certain amount of confusion constantly arises from the fact that we can grow flax for seed as well as flax for fibre. The characteristics and the methods of cultivation in the growing of flax for fibre and the growing of flax for seed are entirely different. In producing flax for seed in the West they sow one-half bushel to the acre and as a result they grow a short, stocky straw which throws out its branches and has many seed bolls on it. The statistics show that in good soil and under favourable conditions they have reaped a crop of as high as twenty-eight bushels to the acre. Their purpose is to grow seed; the fibre is of no consideration whatever; for generations back the straw has been burned as waste, there being no use for it. In Ontario, Quebec, British Columbia, and the provinces where we grow for fibre, the seed is of an entirely different character. It is seed which has been cultivated down through successive generations, having been grown originally in Riga, Russia, developed in Holland and then sent out here and grown as it is in Ireland—Dutch Child seed, we call it. This seed, instead of being sown one-half bushel to the acre, is sown a bushel and one-half to the acre, and the result is that instead of growing a short, stocky straw, they grow a long, lean straw running from thirty-six to forty-five inches high, the whole outer surface of which is covered with this fibre. The seed that is grown for oil contains twenty-five per cent more oil than the seed which is grown for fibre, therefore when you have to sell the fibre seed to the oil mill a deduction of value is made because oil cannot be produced from that seed in as great quantity as it can be produced from the regular oil seed. It is owing to the confusion with regard to our growing that

flax in the West and growing this other type in other parts of the country that the countries of Europe are getting mixed up as to our capacity for the production of flax. It is necessary, therefore, by propaganda and advertising to keep before the public the fact that there are two distinct varieties, one having no connection with the other, one produced for one purpose and one for another. The statement that flax cannot be grown for fibre as well as for seed is also erroneous to some extent, because this is the only country under God's sun where we can do both. We pull the fibre flax up by the roots at a time when the seed in the boll has not been fully developed—is not ripe. But the seed is left in the straw and it goes on to maturity while the plants are in the stock, and there is no very great deterioration in its quality. The Government demands, of course, that all seeds exported to Europe for growing fibre must be certified as to quality, must show a purity of not more than one weed seed to the ounce avoirdupois, which means one weed seed in 3,390 seeds, and that they must germinate ninety per cent. My hon. friend will admit that if we grow from our fibre straw a seed that will germinate ninety per cent—and it does germinate, as has been shown by test, up to ninety-five and ninety-eight per cent—it can scarcely be said that we cannot grow fibre and, from the crop grown, obtain seed as well. We do obtain the seed, but it is not our purpose to sell it to the oil mills if we can find a market for the product in the form of fibre; because last year it had a value of $10 a bushel for fibre whereas its value for oil seed is not half that amount at the present time. There does not appear to be a market for the seed for fibre, because of the large surplus of Holland seed. The flax growers who grow for fibre have to sell their seed at twenty per cent under the price obtained for the oil seed of the West because their fibre seed does not produce the same amount of oil.

Mr. PEDLOW: The hon. member for East Middlesex (Mr. Glass) has just substantiated the point I made, to the effect that when you try to produce flax fibre and seed at the same time, the quality of the fibre is depreciated. You cannot produce the highest quality of flax fibre and produce a ripened seed at the same time. During the course of the discussion this afternoon the minister said that he did not desire to give advice to the farmers or to anyone else in a matter of this kind. But after the discussion which has taken place here to-day I think he should arrive at the conclusion that is is not advice the farmers want, but information as to the proper methods of handling this product. If the Department of Trade and Commerce will supply the correct information to the men who handle this product, those men will have received from the department all they should expect, and all, I am sure, that they desire.

Mr. McKENZIE: It has been stated during the discussion that this is an old industry, having been carried on in Canada for fifty or sixty years, and that we are producing here the very best quality of fibre in the world. That being the case, I do not understand why the minister has been giving a bounty for the encouragement of the industry. Bounties are usually given to encourage new industries, and before a bounty is granted the minister has to be satisfied that the industry in question is of a national character and that it has a future. What is the reason, then, for the granting of a bounty to this industry?

Mr. ARMSTRONG (Lambton): The statement I made is with regard to the production of flax seed and flax fibre. I have in my riding no industry like this that would require a bounty. There is in Canada only one industry for the manufacture of fibre and that is located at Guelph.

Mr. McKENZIE: We have the raw material in abundance and of the very best quality, so that in the state to which we have developed it, we have for the last fifty or sixty years been capable of controlling the markets of the world. Why then, having such splendid material, should we not go on and develop and manufacture it further without any bounty at all? If we have to get a bounty for the manufacture of flax which is of the very excellent quality which the hon. member says it is, would not the same argument apply to every industry in the country? If a fisherman says that he is going to produce boneless codfish or that he is going to manufacture canned halibut or anything like that, where he takes a stage in advance in the production and output of fish, then he can come to the Government and say: "If you give me a bounty on every can or barrel of fish, I will produce a more advanced article." In that case, I think the department would say: "You have the article; you have your opportunities in the world, and you must hold your own or go under, just as the case may be, because we cannot follow a general policy of granting bounties to every industry in this country." I understood the minister to say that there was in Canada only one mill that

was spinning this kind of yarn, and the bounty goes only to the spun material. Therefore, if all of this $26,000 is to go to one mill, I would like to have a little further explanation from the minister. Until I looked a little more closely to this item, I thought the bounty went to the farmer; that when he produced the flax in some stage or another, he was getting the bounty. The farmer, however, does not get the bounty at all. All this afternoon we were making a lot of noise about what the farmer was going to get, when the farmer was not entitled to anything, because this item says that the flax must be spun. If there is, as I understand the matter, only one factory in Canada in which this process is carried on, I do not quite like the idea that we are going to give this $26,000 to one concern. I should like a further explanation why we had so much talk about the farmer over-producing and this bounty being given to relieve the farmer when he does not get it at all.

Mr. SUTHERLAND: Ask the hon. member for Brome (Mr. McMaster).

Mr. McKENZIE: I am discussing this question with the minister now, and I give it as my opinion and practice that I always stand by and get information from the department which is the responsible source. I would not even take chances on going to South Oxford, although, perhaps, it is the most prolific source of information known to the human race at present. If the farmer does not get this money, and if there is only one man who does the spinning, why should we give him, or let him earn, $26,000 out of the depleted treasury of this country? The minister told us a little while ago that the bounty on oil goes to the farmer who has a side-show of oil producing. If the farmer who produces flax must be encouraged, why does he not get the bounty, without waiting until somebody takes the flax and spins it and then the latter gets the bounty for doing so? The spinner does not take any chances at all; he need not buy from the farmer, and he will spin and manufacture only as he sees an opportunity of selling. I cannot quite understand why he is getting the bounty and nothing being given to the farmer, who may have a large stock of this material piled up. On the other hand, the moment the manufacturer sees an opportunity of selling some of this manufactured stuff, after he has spun the fibre, he gets a bounty. I do not see the consistency of that course.

Sir GEORGE FOSTER: I think my hon. friend could not have been here when I explained why this bounty was granted in the first place. If he had, he would have known that it was a war measure and that it was not given specifically in order that more flax might be raised, but it was given specifically in order that linen thread, of which there was an absolute lack in this country, might be furnished to the fishermen and boatmen and harnessmakers and all those that required it as an absolute ingredient in their manufactures. My hon. friend might use the same argument with reference to an industry in which he is interested. Why was a bounty given on steel plates or iron? Why was the bonus not given to the men who dug the ore out of the mine? That is susceptible of an answer much the same as this. What the country and the department wanted at that time was not flax seed or fibre; it was what was never made in this country before, something of which there was an absolute lack and which was necessary for all those different purposes that I mentioned. We wanted to find a man who would spin the flax fibre and make it into thread, which would be used in those various works of necessity and out of which ultimately the textiles would be woven. My hon. friend proceeds on the wrong ground when he proceeds on the idea that this was a bounty to stimulate the production of flax seed or fibre. Indirectly, it had the effect of stimulating the production of flax. The bounty is open to any mill that will put in the machinery and manufacture the article. If my hon. friend or any friends of his would put in the amount of money necessary, erect the machinery and spin this flax from the fibre, they would have a share of this bounty; it would not be given to one. But this is the only mill which has equipped itself and is, consequently, the only spinner of flax thread in the Dominion.

Mr. McKENZIE: The minister has drawn an analogy between the granting of a bounty to the spinner of flax fibre and the granting of a bounty to the producer of steel. When he talks about a bounty to the producer of steel and pig iron, we are dealing with a concrete case and we know exactly the circumstances. There was no distinction of ownership in that case; the same man who made the pig iron owned the raw material.

Sir GEORGE FOSTER: Not necessarily.

Mr. McKENZIE: There was only the one specific case in Canada, or two at the outside.

Sir GEORGE FOSTER: My hon. friend is wrong. The bounty was given on pig iron with which was mixed a certain and quite a large proportion of foreign iron ore. It does not necessarily follow that the man who made the pig iron owned the iron mines.

Mr. McKENZIE: There was never anything else. There were only two companies in Canada that ever got much advantage —The Dominion Coal Company, and the Nova Scotia Steel and Coal Company, and they both owned their iron ore. The bounty was never given to anybody simply because he had ore and was not manufacturing it. I do not wish to detain the minister with his Estimates for one moment. I only wish to tell him that we are seem to be following a different practice than has been usual when considering Estimates. A minister used to get through his Estimates without very much trouble from his own side of the House, but it is different to-day, and I would suggest to the minister that he should caucus his Estimates so that when he brings them down here he will only have to battle with those who are not in his confidence. Practically the whole afternoon has been taken up with sniping from behind the minister. He has had very little trouble indeed from this side of the House.

Mr. FIELDING: Was this Order in Council passed under the War Measures' Act?

Sir GEORGE FOSTER: Yes.

Mr. ROBB: The minister has just admitted that the Order in Council was passed under the War Measures' Act. I gathered from a previous statement he made that we had made a contract for three years, and that we could not, if we were to keep our faith as a nation, rescind the contract until the end of that time. I am not sure that I am quoting him correctly. Well, in answer to a question from the hon. member from North Cape Breton and Victoria the minister has just made the statement that so far only one mill in Canada has availed itself of the advantages of this contract. I suppose the minister is providing in his Estimates this year for the subsidy which that mill will earn?

Sir GEORGE FOSTER: Or any other that may qualify for it.

Mr. ROBB: I notice that the item is for a subsidy to the manufacturers of flax, including expenses of supervision. I suppose $5,000 would cover the expenses of supervision fairly well. If that be true, the minister will be subsidizing this particular mill, providing he appropriates the $26,000, to the extent of seven per cent upon $300,000. That will equip a pretty good mill. The shareholders in this particular mill one therefore given a preferred dividend of 7 per cent upon $300.000; I do not think that is an unfair statement.

Sir GEORGE FOSTER: My hon. friend's statement is not right in this respect. If this mill with its equipment can make a sufficient quantity of linen thread to make it necessary for us to pay out $20,000 as a bounty upon the number of pounds that it makes, it would get the $20,000, and my hon. friend would be right in his reasoning, but at its present rate of production it would not get that amount. If another mill equipped itself and produced thread it would also share proportionately in the bounty, which cannot exceed $25,000.

Mr. ROBB: I thought it was $26,000.

Sir GEORGE FOSTER: The contract is $25,000, and if ten mills were producing, and producing at an equal rate, each mill would get only one-tenth of $25,000.

Mr. MEIGHEN: The vote is for $26,000.

Sir GEORGE FOSTER: That includes the expenses of supervision.

Mr. ROBB: I allowed $5,000 for that, leaving a bonus of $21,000. The fact remains that the minister is providing for a preferred dividend of 7 per cent on an investment of over $300,000 for three years. Now, either the minister has in mind that this particular company will get the whole subsidy, or that some other company will avail itself of a part of it; otherwise, it would not be necessary to vote this full amount. I think it would be well for the minister to take the committee completely into his confidence in view of the opposition that has developed from his own supporters. The opposition to this item, I gather, is largely upon the ground that this particular mill subsidized by Canada, with its dividends guaranteed, is not taking care of the crops which the farmers of that district have been encouraged to grow in anticipation that they would be able to sell them to this mill. The mill will not take the flax, and consequently the farmers are the losers because they could have utilized the land for growing cereals or for dairying or some other purpose.

We have heard a good deal to-day about developing the flax industry in this country, but if my knowledge of the trade is at all correct, Russia grows two-thirds of the flax production of the world, and exports one-half of its product to Great Britain, Germany, France and Belgium. I am not sure that it is a wise policy to subsidize an industry that comes into competition with the cheap labour of Russia. We might invest our money in something that would be more suitable to this country, and that would give us a better return on the investment.

There is another feature. On the one hand, hon. gentlemen who represent constituencies where fibre is produced for this mill complain that it is not buying the fibre. I should like to know how this mill is dealing with the people of Canada in selling its manufactured product. Is their selling price up to the very limit they can obtain under the tariff laws of this country, or is there any advantage to the Canadian people in purchasing linen from this particular company?

Sir GEORGE FOSTER: My hon. friend, I think, was scarcely fair in trying to make it appear that a very large amount of opposition had developed to this particular vote on this side of the House.

Mr. ROBB: That is how it looked to us over here.

Sir GEORGE FOSTER: But the glasses probably were arranged so that it might look that way. Neither was my hon. friend quite fair, I think, in stating that all the incentives to the raising of flax in Ontario and other parts of the Dominion were centered entirely on the fact that here was one mill that was manufacturing a small proportion of linen thread. That was not what caused the development and expansion of the flax fibre and seed industry. As I stated before, and as my hon. friend will readily admit, it was the general conditions of supply and demand throughout the world which made the price for flax fibre and flax seed very high and remunerative, and it was that high price which stimulated the growth of flax fibre and seed. The market has suddenly receded, as it has in a thousand other instances, and consequently there are stocks on hand that cannot realize the old price. There may be stocks on hand which cannot realize a remunerative price. This is but a small item in the incentive towards increased development in the production of flax. My hon. friend wants to know how they are selling, and so on. Well, as I mentioned a while ago to the committee, only about 110,000 pounds has been manufactured up to the end of 1920, and that would go a very small way in the manufacture of textiles. I imagine they are selling at as good a price as they can obtain.

Mr. ROBB: Is the number of pounds mentioned by the minister the full capacity of the mill?

Sir GEORGE FOSTER: That was only what was spun by the mill in a limited time; it does not take in the whole year, neither was it the full acapacity. Your capacity increases according as you bring in your units. What the full capacity is I do not know.

Mr. GLASS: I hope the hon. member for Huntingdon (Mr. Robb) does not propound the doctrine that because Russia in the past has produced two-thirds of the total flax fibre production in the world, and, owing to cheap labour, was able to produce it at a low cost, therefore we must lie down or get out of the way and let that country continue this production. We produce a quality of fibre in this country that is superior to the great bulk of the fibre produced in Russia. Hon. gentlemen do not seem to understand the conditions that were responsible for this bounty. Primarily, I suppose, it was due to war conditions, because we had mills that could weave linen cloths for aeroplanes, but we could not get the yarns. We had raw fibre and were sending it across the seas to help the Mother Country, but we could not get a pound of yarn here, and the only mill we had was shut down because it could not obtain supplies of yarn to carry on manufacturing. Cotton looms were installed and, I believe, cotton was spun. Now, the production of fibre by the farmers and the small co-operative mills of this country had been possible only by exporting the material. During the war it was felt that if we could spin the fibre here and produce aeroplane cloths, we should be doing the Empire a great service. But, there was the fact that we were allowing our fibre to go out of this country to be spun into yarns in Ireland, Belgium, France, and elsewhere, where there are spinning mills. My hon. friend from Cape Breton (Mr. McKenzie), said he understood that we have been manufacturing these yarns in this country for a period of sixty years. He is entirely wrong in that impression. Except through

the hand loom in the home of the habitant, we have never before spun yarns in this country. This bounty was given to encourage the establishment of an industry which would enable us to use our materials right through the various stages of production to the finished article, linen. No one would imagine that a mill would begin operations on the assurance of a bounty for one year. The mills asked for a bounty of $25,000. That was the maximum that could be given in one year, and it was to be given for three years. It was divided into three classes, a bounty of three cents, six cents, and nine cents per pound, according to the quality of the yarns spun. The three cents per pound bounty was given on all yarns between ten lea and twenty lea, which is the coarser quality. The yarns of a finer fibre, between twenty and forty lea, were granted six cents a pound, and all above forty lea were given nine cents. The object of the higher bounty was to encourage the spinning of a finer and better quality of yarns in this country. That, of course, is a matter of great importance to the grower as well as to the spinner, because if we are to spin yarns of sixty lea and upwards, it is necessary for the farmers to produce the higher quality of flax.

Mr. ROBB: Were these various qualities of yarn spun in the same mill?

Mr. GLASS: Yes. Now, the spinning of yarn of good quality is not a question that depends on any method of handling in the mill; it is a matter of having a quality of fibre that will produce fine yarn.

Mr. McKENZIE: Were these various very fine qualities required for war purposes?

Mr. GLASS: I am informed that yarn that would spin sixty lea was of ample fineness for the purposes of manufacturing aeroplane cloth, which was the matter of principal importance at that time. It has been stated by a prominent linen manufacturer that ninety per cent of the production of all linens in the world are manufactured from yarns that are spun under one hundred lea of fineness. We have already produced yarns in this country that have spun up to one hundred lea, which is an exceptionally fine quality. We need not worry ourselves if we are unable to produce a quality fine enough to compete with the finer yarns spun from Belgium flax retted in the Courtrai district. If we can produce a quality sufficiently high to be included in the ninety per cent of the total world production, we are producing an article which, I think, should command sufficient sympathy from this House to ensure its development. My hon. friend from Cape Breton said he thought we were helping the farmers. Well, so we are. If we can develop the spinning of a finer degree of yarn by developing our own spinning facilities, naturally it follows that the onus is on the grower to produce a finer fibre that will give us the better quality of yarn. An acre of flax will produce three hundred pounds of fibre, and that fibre may be worth anywhere from fifteen cents per pound to seventy-five cents per pound, according to quality. Whatever be the quality of the fibre, it has taken the same amount of labour and the same area of land. But it is a matter of great importance to the producer whether he gets fifteen cents a pound or seventy-five cents for the product. It is a total difference of $1,200 per ton in price, or as will be seen, $180 an acre. I think that we should urge our people to produce, not so much with a view to quantity as for the purpose of securing as good a quality as can possibly be had, because it is in the hope that we may produce an article of the highest quality that we shall ultimately displace Russian flax from the American, and even from the Irish, markets. Russia will not bother us in the production of flax for a few years to come, and unless she improves her methods she will not be a serious competitor in the higher grades. But if our ambition stops at the coarser grades, then Russia will be a serious competitor against us in the years ahead. In order to encourage this industry a bounty of $25,000 a year was granted by Order in Council as a maximum to be continued for a period of three years.

Now people might naturally say, in fact the statement was made at the time, "There may be half a dozen mills start up, and in that case we will not get this bounty on our production. We will only get the bounty in the ratio that our production bears to the entire production; and it may be that if five or six mills were producing enough to absorb $100,000 on the basis of the bounty given, that each mill would only get twenty-five per cent of that bounty to which it might be entitled if there was not competition." Nevertheless we hoped the assistance given would attract the Irish mills to this country, and that we would ultimately develop a large and extensive spinning industry in this country, because

it follows as surely as that the night follows the day that to develop the spinning industry means the development of the growing industry, and that is where the advantage to the farmer comes in. I submit that in fairness to the manufacturer who started the mill in question, it is our duty to keep faith with him. I hope that if we keep faith with him we will find before the expiration of the term for which this bounty is granted, other large firms in Ireland desirous of establishing mills in this country.

Mr. VIEN: Would there be an ample market for the yarn spun in Canada?

Mr. GLASS: There is a market in the world for more than Canada could possibly produce if she had twenty mills. The spinning capacity of the world to-day is not sufficient to supply the world's needs for linen at the present time.

Mr. ROBB: My hon. friend said something about the mills wanting a guarantee of $25,000 before they would enter into this undertaking. Does he mean that they wanted such a guarantee from the Government of Canada, or from the city of Guelph?

Mr. GLASS: I do not think I made myself clear to my hon. friend; I certainly did not mean to create such an impression. What I said was that they were presuming at the time that half a dozen mills, maybe a dozen, might take advantage of the encouragement as proposed for the establishment of spinning mills in this country. Now the maximum amount of the bounty was $25,000. If twelve mills of equal capacity started operations and each mill earned according to the rate granted, a bounty of $25,000, it would instead of getting the full bounty, receive only a ratio as one of twelve.

Mr. VIEN: If my hon. friend is right in saying that there is an ample market at the present time for yarns spun in Canada, and that even if several other mills were established they could not produce all the yarns that the world's market could absorb, I fail to see the necessity of a subsidy to bonus such an industry. The idea of such a subsidy is to protect an industry during its earlier years against competition; but if my hon. friend's statement is correct, and I take it that he is an authority on the subject, I fail to see why this industry requires assistance. It should not need aid if there is an ample demand for its product in the markets of the world. I would like to have some explanation from my hon. friend as to his reasons for supporting the granting of a subsidy when, according to his own statement of a moment ago, no subsidy is necessary for the establishment of the industry.

6 p.m.

Mr. GLASS: My hon. friend propounds a question in regard to a matter which seems to me very clear. The bonus would be applicable in this case just the same as it is in the case of the iron and steel industries, or any other industry which it is desired to encourage.

Mr. VIEN: My hon. friend will permit me to point out that the iron and steel industries in Canada had to fight their way, in the matter of marketing their products, in the face of very strong competition. The point as to which I would like my hon. friend to give some enlightenment is that in this case, according to his own statement, there is no competition—there is a demand for the entire production not only of the existing mills but of other mills that might be established. The hon. member also said that we need not fear competition from Russia, which used to produce most of the flax consumed, for years to come. The case of the steel bounties is not at all parallel to the present case: In the one there is competition, and in the other there is not at present, according to my hon. friend, a sufficient supply to meet the world's demand.

The CHAIRMAN: Is there any possibility, by sitting a few minutes longer, of putting this item through before the committee takes recess?

Mr. McKENZIE: I think there is every possibility of putting the item through if the Minister of Trade and Commerce would promise to control his followers.

Mr. VIEN: If my hon. friend will pardon me. I do not wish to unduly prolong the debate, but a point has arisen upon which I would like some enlightenment before I am ready to support this vote. The point is the one I have endeavoured to explain. We are asked to vote a subsidy for the encouragement of this industry and the hon. member (Mr. Glass) has just informed the committee that there was such a demand for yarn that even if several spinning mills were established it could not be supplied. If that is true, it seems to me no reason exists why we should assist this industry

by voting it a subsidy. The reason for the granting of a subsidy is to protect an industry against competitors in the markets of the world. In the case of the present industry not only is there no competition but there is an insufficient supply of the material—that is accepting the statement of my hon. friend. Under the circumstances the matter will stand further investigation, and I therefore respectfully beg to differ from the hon. member for North Cape Breton and Victoria (Mr. McKenzie) who said that the question could be disposed of in a very few minutes.

At Six o'clock the House took recess.

After Recess

The committee resumed at Eight o'clock.

The CHAIRMAN: When the committee rose at six o'clock we were considering the Estimates of the Department of Trade and Commerce. Item 346 had been allowed to stand. We had considered item 347, which has not yet been adopted. Shall the item carry?

Mr. VIEN: Mr. Chairman, when the committee rose the question was on the advisability of continuing the bounty to the flax industry in view of the fact that there is not a sufficient supply of fibre to satisfy the excessive demand. Therefore I do not see why a subsidy is necessary to encourage the development of the industry. The principle underlying a subsidy is that of protection to the particular industry during its infant years so that it may survive undue competition of stronger rivals. I would be very much interested to hear the hon. member (Mr. Glass) who is known as an expert on this subject, give the committee his reasons for supporting the grant of such a subsidy.

Mr. GLASS: Mr. Chairman, the hon. gentleman draws the deduction from my statement that because there is an unlimited demand for the visible supply of fibre there is no reason why encouragement should be given to the manufacture of the raw material in this country. In theory his deduction may seem to him to have some force. It was pointed out this afternoon that although this industry had been in existence in this country for a period of fifty or sixty years—and I may tell my hon. friend that he would not have gone astray if he had said that it had been in existence for a period of over two hundred and fifty years—yet we had not made that substantial progress in it that might reasonably have been expected. The total visible supply of flax fibre to-day is not sufficient to keep the British spinning mills alone employed for one year. But that visible supply will also be sought by the spinning mills in Belgium, Austria, France, Germany and other parts of the world. Therefore it is a fairly reasonable statement to make that the present supply is not at all sufficient to meet the demands of the world. Now, my hon. friend asks the question: If there is an unlimited demand for flax fibre, why is there any need of protection? I answer him by saying that there is a demand, but there is a suspension of that demand for the time being by reason of what is generally conceded to be a consumers' "strike." The impression prevailed that all commodities had reached such a high cost that there must inevitably come a reaction, and the consumers of linen came to the same conclusion and they quit buying. The result was that the wholesaler ceased buying his supplies from the mills, that reacted on the mills and they had to suspend operations, and at present they are operating on very short time and are loaded up with their manufactured product. If my hon. friend's question applies to the immediate present, I would say that the demand having been temporarily suspended, and the supply in the mills being ample under those circumstances, there is a supply for which there is no call at present.

Mr. VIEN: Since when?

Mr. GLASS: Practically since last September. It has been intermittently stagnant from that time on. The consumers' "strike" still continues and therefore the manufactured goods are not moving. But so soon as the usual channels of trade become active again the demands of consumers will react on the wholesalers, and they in turn will be eager to relieve the manufacturers of their present stocks.

Mr. VIEN: Although this temporary condition of slackness of demand has existed only since last September, I would point out to my hon. friend that the subsidy was introduced under the provisions of the War Measures' Act in 1919, if I remember rightly.

Mr. GLASS: The conditions arising out of the war only added force to the arguments in favour of a subsidy to encourage the development of the flax industry in this country.

Mr. VIEN: Was there not at that time such a tremendous demand that although

all our mills worked day and night they could not satisfy the war-time requirements?

Mr. GLASS: No, my hon. friend is entirely wrong. There was not such a demand as the mills could not satisfy, but there was such a dearth of raw material that they could not produce the yarns with which to manufacture cloth.

Mr. VIEN: Did I not understand the hon. gentleman to say that there was such a demand for fibre in England that our Canadian weaving mills could not get their supply, and that the demand for their products was out of all proportion to their means of supplying it?

Mr. GLASS: I am sorry I cannot make myself clear to my hon. friend. I do say that there was a demand for the cloths, the resultant product of the weaving mills, which could not be supplied at that time because the available supply of flax fibre, which is the raw material of the spinning mills, could not be produced, and the only weaving mill in Canada at that time was the Dominion Linens, Limited, in Guelph, they having established a mill there at a cost of $750,000. They had previously been importing their yarns, the manufactured article from the fibre, and from those yarns weaving their cloths. Due to the war conditions then prevailing and the necessity for aeroplane cloths, Great Britain, Germany and all the belligerent countries forbade the exportation of the fibre and yarns and of any other flax products. What was the condition in Canada? We had a mill but that mill was stagnant because we could not manufacture our fibre into yarn to keep the spinning mills going.

Mr VIEN: Because you could not get the yarn from European mills?

Mr. GLASS: Precisely.

Mr. VIEN: Then there was such a demand for the yarns that the Canadian weaving mills could not get their supply to keep them going. Therefore my argument is that if there was such a demand for yarns, there is no need of protection to the spinning mills.

Mr. GLASS: My hon. friend draws a very unreasonable conclusion. Does he think for one minute that by reason of the demand for fishing nets, aeroplane cloths, harness threads, shoe threads and the other products of flax fibre it was reasonable under the pressure existing at that time to start their manufacture here, although the war might be over in six months or a year, when the large manufacturers in England, with their experience and their organization spread over centuries, with all the facilities and advantages which were at their command, might be in a position to crush any small mill which was started in Ontario? Surely it is unreasonable for my hon. friend to take that position.

Mr. VIEN: Not at all. I will ask for further information from my expert friend. Under normal conditions before the war, was there an excess of supply in yarns, or was there an excess in demand?

Mr. GLASS: Before the war there was an adequate supply of yarns and an adequate supply of fibre, eighty per cent of which was produced by Russia. When the war started the York Street Spinning Mills of Belfast saw the possibility of great diminution of the supply in Russia, so they sent an expert out to look over the field in Canada and see whether they could produce here the raw material for their linen mills. The man whom they sent out was a Mr. Lockhart, who is still chief of their organization. He came to the little village of Park Hill in the county of Middlesex and from that centre he established mill after mill in adjoining districts, and as a result of the success of their effort the acreage was increased year after year until it had run up to between three and four thousand acres. This Belfast mill had not known that they could use any flax fibre produced in Canada. Not a dollar's worth of flax fibre had ever been exported from Canada to European countries. Our sole market had been in the United States, in the thread mills of Massachusetts and New Jersey, and the result was that our growers were compelled to take the price fixed by the mills in Andover, Massachusetts and the other mills in New Jersey. They could scarcely get a price that would yield a profit sufficient to encourage any expansion of the industry. Now, Russia got out of the market completely and the demand continued to increase throughout all the years of the war, chiefly through the demand for aeroplane cloths. As a matter of fact, the manufacture of flax into linen for table-cloths and things of that kind was prohibited in Great Britain and Germany; the governments took control of the whole supply of linen and directed its manufacture to the production of aeroplane cloths. The hon. gentleman suggested this afternoon that

Russia was able to grow eighty per cent, or four-fifths of the world's supply of fibre, and he asked what was the use of Canada producing fibre in the face of that fact. Well, would he suggest that because Russia, Argentina or other countries can produce wheat at a lower cost than we can, our farmers should discontinue the growing of wheat? I hope that this country will build up a great home market in which they can use all their wheat and all the fibre and linen that we produce. The point I want to make is that we have grown fibre in this country for two hundred and fifty years, but we are very little advanced in our methods of production—and so it is throughout the world—over the methods that were employed six thousand years ago. Canada has done something in the development of mechanical appliances for handling these crops, but in my opinion she has not measured up to her responsibility in the matter of research work with a view to improving the methods of retting this fibre. We have manufactured throughout all these years, but we have never been able to establish an industry here by which we could spin our yarns.

Mr. VIEN: Why?

Mr. GLASS: Because the production of fibre was small on account of the expensive methods of handling, on account of the cost of labour as against the low cost of labour in Russia.

Mr. VIEN: Could we not import the fibre as Ireland did?

Mr. GLASS: Yes, we could import the fibre, but we could not get labour with which to operate our spinning-mills at four times the price they pay in Ireland.

Mr. VIEN: I speak of the conditions prior to the war.

Mr. GLASS: I, too, am speaking of conditions prior to the war. We have open markets in the world for raw fibre just as Ireland has. But my hon. friend knows or should know that the conditions of labour prevailing in Ireland were such as to involve a standard of living that would not be desirable for the workingmen of this country, and I hope that the standard of living of the workingman in this country will never come down to the point which it reached in Ireland. Before the establishment of this spinning mill we did not know the quality of the fibre we had been able to grow. We accepted the price for our fibre fixed by the spinning mills in the United States. The lower grades of tow—the waste or by-product of the manufacture—were suitable for a good deal of the material which they manufactured, and not having any market for our fibre in our own country we exported our superior material at a price based on that of the cheaper tows which are produced to-day. When we established the spinning mill—

Mr. VIEN: When was that?

Mr. GLASS: A year ago. When we established the spinning mill we commenced to show by actual demonstration what we could do in this direction. Hon. gentlemen may theorize all they like about Canada not being able to grow flax, but when we delivered the goods, when we produced an article from our own raw material, we demonstrated that we could grow a fibre that would spin yarns up to sixty lea. There has been some difficulty in getting the machinery necessary to the development of the business up to the standard we aim at. This mill which has been in operation for a year has been able to get a certain amount of machinery with which to carry on the development of the coarser grades of fibre, but machinery for the spinning of the finer yarns is under order and when it is installed we shall be producing a quality of fibre away above that which we are producing now. If for no other purpose than to encourage the production of a higher and better quality of fibre I submit that the encouragement which has been given to the spinning industry has been fully justified. Hon. gentlemen have expressed the view that if the bounty re-acts beneficially upon the farmer, they are enabled to view it from a more favourable standpoint. That may be all right so far as it goes, but my argument is that the development of the spinning industry has shown the farmers and the growers what they did not know before: that they are able to produce a fibre that can compete with the best standards of fibre in Europe; that they do not have to take twelve and one-half cents a pound for it; that in the future, instead of receiving $250 a ton, they may reasonably expect a permanent market at a price of from $750 to $1,000 a ton.

Mr. VIEN: I do not think the hon. gentleman has answered my question at all. He has repeated the theories that we heard from him this afternoon and that we had heard with great interest at various times prior to that. The question I put to him is this: If there was a demand under normal conditions, setting aside abnormal con-

ditions created by the war, and if the supply was sufficient for the demand for spun yarn, then there is no field for such an industry in Canada, and it would be better if we diverted our energies and capital to more profitable propositions. If, on the other hand, there is not a sufficient supply, then the demand is incentive enough to our manufacturers to start such an industry, and thereby the necessity for such a subsidy disappears. That is the point I tried to make clear to the committee this afternoon. I wanted to be enlightened but I am sorry that I have received very little enlightenment on the subject so far. There are only two alternatives—whether the demand exceeds the supply or the supply exceeds the demand. If the demand exceeds the supply, there is no necessity for a subsidy to protect such an industry. If the supply exceeds the demand, there is no field for such activity, and the Government would have been better advised to encourage industries with greater prospects of success.

Sir GEORGE FOSTER: As my hon. friend (Mr. Vien) has, after this arduous series of debating conflicts with my hon. friend on this side, come to the conclusion that he has not received any enlightenment and does not see any prospects of receiving any, probably it would be better for us now to leave the general question with which this is incidentally connected and go back to the appropriation itself.

Mr. VIEN: Is the minister not of opinion that the principle at stake, underlying the appropriation, is of some importance?

Sir GEORGE FOSTER: If my hon. friend will allow me to present, for a moment or two out of his precious time, my point of view, I shall be very glad, and then he can go on again. This appropriation is for a special purpose. I explained it early in the afternoon. During war time and at a period when it was impossible to get any linen thread in this country from outside sources, and when there was a great demand for these linen yarns for war and for peace purposes here, under the War Measures Act the Government, on the recommendation of the War Commission, proposed, for the purpose of getting these yarns spun in Canada and getting a material which we could get in no other way, that we would give a bounty if anyone be found to put in the equipment necessary for spinning yarns, none of which equipment we had had in Canada before. We had not spun an ounce of linen yarn in Canada previously to that. As a result of inquiries and after a good deal of negotiation, we proposed a plan of giving for three years a subsidy, of the limited amount of $25,000 a year, not to exceed in the three years $75,000, and to give that on a poundage basis to men who would put in the equipment and spin the yarn, such subsidy not to be paid during the continuance of the war, but to commence after the determination of peace and to be continued for three years thereafter. The reason for that was that, during the war period, owing to the scarcity, the price would be sufficiently high to be an inducement to remunerate them somewhat at least for the extra equipment put in, but their hard time would come after peace had been declared and after prices had taken the fall which they inevitably would take. Under the War Measures Act the Government made a contract with those people. We have paid them upon the first year of their contract; we are to pay them on two years more of their contract, and I am simply asking for this appropriation to enable us to do what our part of the contract asks to be done in an obligation out of which no reasonable person would, I believe, think we ought to attempt to crawl for any reason whatever. We are not discussing any broad principle of subsidies to flax interests or to the making of yarn. This is a war child, born of war necessity, a contract entered into by the Government under the War Measures Act, and we ask the committee to give us this appropriation to carry out our part of the contract.

Mr. VIEN: Does the minister consider that this will be a permanent industry in Canada or that there is an opening for such an industry?

Sir GEORGE FOSTER: If we take the vote on the ground on which I have stated it, it would make no difference what I thought in that regard. This is a contract we propose to fulfil. We ask the committee to give us this appropriation in order to fulfil the contract. My hon. friend is a business man; he knows what contracts are, and I do not think in his heart he has any objection to the Government fulfilling a contract into which it has solemnly entered. All these extraneous things in the discussion are very important, but we are not discussing to-day a permanent policy of subsidizing either the spinning or the production.

Mr. VIEN: But there is this much to be said: The Government is now before the committee and subject to the judg-

ment of the committee as to the wisdom of the policy adopted at that time and as to the wisdom of the conract entered into by the Government with that company. The minister has explained to the committee that this was a war measure adopted for war purposes. Other industries were started during the war for no less important objects. For instance, new industries had to be started for the manufacture of shells, cartridges and a number of other articles of great necessity during the war. The prices given for such articles were the incentive, and the Government never thought of resorting to a subsidy or bonus to those industries no matter what amount of machinery they had to purchase or what amount of experience they had to acquire. The Government simply placed contracts with those firms to deliver certain quantities of materials, and they never introduced the idea of protection by way of a bonus to these industries for war purposes. In the present instance the Government has adopted a different course. Owing to the necessity of getting the yarn, not only did the Government offer the inducement of the general conditions prevailing, but they went a step further and offered a subsidy amounting to $25,000 a year if a manufacturer could produce sufficient to earn this subsidy. This was a departure from the general policy which prevailed at that time. The minister, to explain his position, brushes aside the principle at stake and says: "Surely the committee will not refuse the Government the fulfilment of their contract. The Government have entered into a contract and this committee cannot put that contract aside." I am in favour of the flax industry in Canada and of developing the establishment of mills to spin yarns from fibre produced in Canada, but before we decide to protect such a new industry I put to myself and to my right hon. friend the question: Is there a field of operation before it which holds out prospects of success in the future? My right hon. friend evades that question. He brushes it aside altogether, and says it is not the question involved, that the only question involved is the fulfilment of a contract. In my humble opinion, the Government were wrong in making a contract with such a company, because the demand for this material at that time, as the minister himself has admitted, was just as great as for the material turned out by any other industry started during the war period. So I say from the point of view of the contract the Government was wrong in entering into it. Before we determine to protect a new industry by way of this subsidy to be paid during three consecutive years, I put to myself and to my right hon. friend the question: Is it an industry which has any chance of success in the future? I have failed to draw either from my right hon. friend or from the previous speaker any answer to that question, and to my mind that is the whole principle which underlies this vote; it is not the question of the contract, but the question whether we should protect such an industry. If there is a chance of this industry surviving we might consider this vote, but we have not been enlightened on that point so far.

Mr. ROBB: What amount was paid to this corporation last year? I notice the vote this year is $4,000 less than last year.

Sir GEORGE FOSTER: $3,939.77.

Mr. VIEN: Is that for the calendar year? I understood the right hon. gentleman to say it was up to December 31.

Sir GEORGE FOSTER: Yes, from the time production commenced.

Mr. VIEN: Were any further amounts paid after December 31, last.

Sir GEORGE FOSTER: No.

Mr. VIEN: So the figure given by my right hon. friend covers the fiscal year as well?

Sir GEORGE FOSTER: Accounts may have come in which have not yet been paid, but they will be accounts for work done during the remaining months of the fiscal year.

Mr. VIEN: Would my right hon. friend tell us why the Auditor General's report is absolutely silent as to the expenditure during last year? As it is an expenditure during the period covered by the Auditor General's report, it seems to me the matter should have been reported on by the Auditor General.

Sir GEORGE FOSTER: The Auditor General's report that my hon. friend has before him deals with the fiscal year ending March 31st, 1920. This production was after the expiration of that fiscal year.

Mr. PEDLOW: I understood the minister to say that $3,939.77 was paid in bonus to this industry last year. How much

was paid for supervision, or for nursing this war baby?

Sir GEORGE FOSTER: The large amount of $197.

Mr. PEDLOW: That was all that was paid out of the appropriation of last year?

Sir GEORGE FOSTER: Up to that time.

Item agreed to.

Bounties on Crude Petroleum, administration of the Act, $3,000.

The CHAIRMAN: This item has already been considered to a certain extent. The hon. member who objected to its passing this afternoon is now willing that it be re-considered.

Mr. CANNON: I find, at page Z-23, volume III, of the Auditor General's report, that the monies expended in the period covered by the report were paid, not to individual farmers, as was intimated by my right hon. friend this afternoon, but that all the monies have been paid to companies, some of which have received very large amounts. I would like the minister to tell exactly what these companies are, and where they are operating.

Sir GEORGE FOSTER: I am afraid I cannot give my hon. friend the information with reference to all these companies or individuals who have been recipients of the bounty. The law states to whom the bounty shall be paid. Our supervisor makes certain that the oil which has been raised has been correctly represented, and thereafter the bounty is paid at the rate of one-and-a-half cents, I think it is, per gallon. As to the composition of these companies or the associations of the farmers amongst themselves I have no knowledge at all, and no information which I can give to my hon. friend.

Mr. CANNON: I think the minister might supply the committee with more information than apparently he is willing to give. This afternoon I raised the question whether this Government was paying this bounty to the large oil companies, such as the Imperial Oil Company, which is a subsidiary of the Standard Oil Company. I notice by the Auditor General's report that the moneys which have been paid by the Government have been paid to corporations, not to individuals. If the right hon. gentleman will look at the list on page Z-23, volume III, of the Auditor General's report he will see that these corporations are apparently important concerns. I am under the impression—I may be wrong—that they are subsidiary companies of the Imperial Oil Company. If they are, I think the principle is altogether wrong that this Government should give bounties or premiums to such corporations. Oil in this country is sold at very high prices, and I do not see why the Government should add to the already exorbitant profits made by these corporations by paying them bounties from the public treasury.

Mr. GRIESBACH: I am not so much interested—

Mr. CANNON: Perhaps the hon. member would permit the minister to answer my question first.

Mr. GRIESBACH: What I am about to say has to do with the point raised by the hon. member, and after I have finished the minister will be able to answer both questions at the same time. The point I want to raise is this: It would appear that under the law a bonus is paid for the production of oil. I do not know whether it is payable only to concerns operating in certain provinces, or whether it applies throughout Canada. But I do know that the Government proposes to exact a royality on oil produced, and I should like to know how it is that we grant a bonus on the production of oil and at the same time impose a royality on that oil. That is what I cannot understand.

Sir GEORGE FOSTER: I think I explained this afternoon the origin of the bounty on oil. In 1904 the Government of that day removed the duty from crude oil imported into Canada. The production of oil in this country was at that time almost exclusively confined to some districts in the province of Ontario. Oil was produced in small quantities by a large number of people from individual wells, and some companies also produced on a small scale; and the bounty given at that time was a compensation to these people by reason of the introduction of free crude oil from the United States. That legislation was amended on two or three occasions so as to provide that the individual producers of oil, whether farmers or companies, should have the bounty paid directly to themselves. There are farmers who have oil and produce it simply in the line of their individual operations. They get their bounty on the amount they produce. There are associations of farmers in a small way that work a number of wells amongst themselves, and there are also companies, small and

large. The subsidy is paid to producers, whoever they are, whether individual farmers, associations of farmers, or companies. As to the quality of the oil, I suppose it was fixed at a standard corresponding to that of the oil allowed in free of duty. The law provided a specific gravity test of .8235. Those hon. members who are familiar with this subject will understand this matter better than I do; I do not know much about it myself. This provision first appeared in the Act of 1908, and has been in it since. This specific gravity test, I have no doubt, was applied to ensure that the oil on which the bounty was paid should about equal in quality the oil obtained from the United States and the condition is therefore precedent to the payment of the bounty, that it must be oil of a specific gravity of .8235. No oil gets the bounty if it does not fulfil that test. Very little of the oil that is produced in the West conforms to that test, and therefore but a small portion of the bounty is paid on western production. Some is paid on oil raised in the vicinity of Edmonton. From the shales in the province of New Brunswick some oil is produced and that has to fulfil the test. The bounty is granted to all oils, wherever produced, that fulfil the requirements. The other question of my hon. friend, as to why oils on which a bounty is paid are made to contribute to the revenue, is explained in this way. Usually oil concerns that are started give promise of large results, and it is considered right that some royalty at least should be paid to the Government to pay for all the preliminary work which is necessary and for proper regulation and supervision.

Mr. McMASTER: May I suggest to the minister that the wells of knowledge do not flow far enough in this direction? We are not able to follow him; we cannot hear.

Sir GEORGE FOSTER: I thought they were filled to overflowing. However, I will turn round and face my hon. friends. Now, to reply to my hon. friend on the other side who is thirsting for information, I find that there are companies and individuals mentioned in the memorandum before me, and broadly speaking, I think there are more individuals or associations of individuals, than companies, to whom the payment is made. Various names of companies are given, and my hon. friend has a suspicion that possibly they are subsidiaries of the Imperial Oil Company. I do not know. No doubt they sell their oil after they get it. They would not raise it unless they had some prospects of disposing of it. The Imperial Oil Company may be the buyer of their oils; there may be affiliations between them—I do not know—but under the law I do not think I have any particular duty to enquire. It is the producer that receives the bounty under the law, and all that I have to do is to see that the party that produces the oil gets the bounty.

Mr. CANNON: The question I am putting to the minister is this: Does the Government consider it fair that public money should be given to companies such as these under the law as it exists to-day? The question is all the more timely because if these corporations are rich, and are simply representatives of the very large oil trust called the Imperial Oil Company, the financial condition of Canada is such that we certainly cannot be extravagant and over generous in our treatment of them. I do not believe that any of these companies need any bounties if they are affiliated with, or related to, the Imperial Oil Company. If the law forces the Government to give these grants, I think the sooner that law is changed the better it will be for the country. I wish to draw the minister's attention to another fact. Looking over the Estimates concerning his department I have not seen any item covering the amounts which are to be distributed as bounties during the coming year?

Sir GEORGE FOSTER: These grants, as I have told my hon. friend, are the result of a law passed by the Dominion Parliament in 1904 and which has ever since been upon the statute book. By virtue of that statement preceding Governments have paid these bounties in exactly the same way as we are paying them now. If my hon. friend looks into the Estimates he will see that there are statutory payments made which appear in the Auditor General's Report. There are also payments made by virtue of votes passed by Parliament and debitable to the Consolidated Revenue Fund.

Mr. CANNON: I understand that, but it does not affect my argument. I contend that whether an amount is authorized by statute, or whether it is simply voted in the ordinary way by the House of Comcons, it should appear in the Estimates to be voted for the current year. Such is the

case I contend, and to illustrate my contention I will mention the salaries which are voted every year for the judges, which salaries are fixed by statute. The amount for this purpose is what we may call a statutory amount, but nevertheless the Minister of Justice comes to the House every year, with the Estimates for his department and in those Estimates there appears a fixed amount from which will be taken the moneys to pay the salaries of the judges throughout the country. I contend that whether the money to be paid as a bonus to petroleum companies in Canada is a statutory payment or not it should appear in the Estimates. I would therefore like the minister to tell me where the money for this purpose does appear, so that we will know exactly what amount is to be expended in the coming year.

Sir GEORGE FOSTER: It is impossible for my hon. friend to tell, or for any one to tell him, the exact amount that will be expended during the year. That amount will be based on the number of gallons of this specific kind of oil which is raised and approved for bounty. The production may be large or it may be small, it varies from year to year, and you could put no sum in the Estimates which would represent the exact amount which may be spent. The contention of my hon. friend that in certain cases statutory payments appear in the Estimates is perfectly clear. I am not so certain that an amount, following the general rule, might not be placed in the Estimates to cover this item, but it would have to be an indeterminate amount. There would have to be a sufficient amount voted to cover the possible expenditure while the real expenditure, 9 p.m. owing to reduced consumption, might be very much less. But, as a matter of fact, the basic principle of the law is adhered to. The law states what shall be paid per gallon in the form of bounty. The administration of the law carries out the direction of the statute, and cannot go beyond that. So that whether the amount is put as an indeterminate item in the Estimates, no more or no less can be expended than what the statute calls for.

Mr. CANNON: My point is that no minister of the Crown has a right to spend five cents of public money without having previously obtained from Parliament the consent of the representatives of the people to the expenditure of that money. If the minister will look through his Estimates, and I refer him particularly to page 24 where the Estimates of the Department of Agriculture are set out, he will see where statutory payments are mentioned. The rule in this matter is well known. Does my right hon. friend seriously contend, in view of his very long experience in Parliament, that he has the right as a minister of the Crown, or that his department has the right, to spend money during the coming year without the representatives of the people having previously voted that money? I do not think he will contend any such thing because it would be absolutely opposed to all rules of constitutional procedure. My right hon. friend is in exactly the same position as every one of his colleagues, and he cannot, after this session of Parliament is concluded, spend five cents, or a dollar, or ten dollars, without having previously obtained our consent as representatives of the people. The right hon. gentleman says "I cannot say to-night exactly how much money will be spent." Very true. But we do not ask the right hon. gentleman to state the exact amount which will be expended. We do want the right hon. gentleman to follow the rule of parliamentary procedure which requires that an amount for this purpose should be placed in the Estimates. That amount may not be all spent but it cannot be exceeded. The minister, through his officials and especially through this official whose salary we are now being asked to vote, should find out how much money he needs —he should fix the maximum which cannot be exceeded but which possibly will not be reached. This is the rule, and it must be followed by my right hon. friend as well as by every other member of the Government. If the right hon. gentleman refers to the Estimates, and the Supplementary Estimates, and the further Supplementary Estimates, of last year he will find nowhere an item covering moneys which have been paid for this purpose, even though the expenditure appears in the Auditor General's report. Under what authority did the minister spend that money? Under what authority did he spend money of which the Estimates of last year make absolutely no mention, and as to which they are just as blank as the Estimates of this year? How could he make such an expenditure without it having been voted by Parliament? I think, Mr. Chairman, that having regard to constitutional procedure the situation is very serious, and before we vote the salary of an official who is supposed to look after the administration of this law and distribute bounties to companies, we have a right to know how much money that official is going to distribute. Further-

more we have the right to find out by virtue of what authority the right hon. gentleman distributed money last year of which the Estimates contained no mention. I maintain that my contention is right, and that the Government has absolutely no power to spend any money unless that money has been regularly voted by Parliament.

Sir GEORGE FOSTER: My hon. friend has worked himself up to a wonderful pitch as a constitutional authority, but he has ended with one sentence which is the only thing that I shall advert to. It was that no minister has a right to spend a single dollar which has not been voted by this chamber. Let there we no doubt in our understanding of my hon. friend's statement. Now I will ask my hon. friend how much this House voted to the Minister of Justice? Will he be good enough to turn to the Estimates and see? Will he then turn to the expenditure and tell me and this committee whether he still considers himself to be right in his dictum? Or will he impeach the Minister of Justice for spending some millions of dollars in his department over and above what has been voted by this chamber?

Mr. CANNON: Will the right hon. gentleman allow me—?

Sir GEORGE FOSTER: Will the hon. gentleman allow me for a moment longer?

Mr. CANNON: The right hon. gentleman is putting a question to me.

Sir GEORGE FOSTER: I am, and I will give my hon. friend an opportunity to answer it afterwards, and I would like him to bestow a little thought on it before he makes his answer. I am giving him an opportunity to be correct. Will he look at page 8 of the Estimates, item 4, and find out how much was voted by this chamber to the Minister of Justice for salaries and contingencies? It amounted this year to $190,832.50 with contingencies $25,000. Does my hon. friend suppose that all the expenses of the administration of justice will be paid for out of those two amounts? But that is all that was voted. And in his search after knowledge will my hon. friend turn to page 12 of the Estimates? There he will find that besides the amounts voted by this chamber $1,345,300 will be spent on the administration of justice under authority of statute, and under that authority alone. The figures there given are simply details, and not one dollar of it has been voted by this chamber. So that my hon. friend is not quite right in the stand which he has taken.

[Mr. Cannon.]

Mr. CANNON: The right hon. gentleman was kind enough in his answer to adopt a tone which I am not going to copy, and he was also kind enough to ask me to bestow some thought before I replied to him. I always do think before I speak, and the answer to what the right hon. gentleman asks is very simple. I think that if he was a lawyer he would not have spoken in the way he has, because from a legal viewpoint his answer is no answer at all, and the question he put to me is no question at all. What I said is very simple, and I want the right hon. gentleman to understand and to bear in mind that when I am speaking I am thinking, and not to make the mistake of believing for one moment that I bestow no thought on what I am saying. We are asked to-day to vote the salary of an official of the Department of Trade and Commerce, which salary, if I mistake not, is fixed at three or four thousand dollars.

Sir GEORGE FOSTER: Two thousand dollars.

Mr. CANNON: This official has the duty of supervising the administration of a special law. This law sees to it that certain bounties are distributed to petroleum companies throughout Canada; and those bounties are distributed in accordance with that special law. My contention is very simple. I say that the amount which the Department of Trade and Commerce wishes to distribute for the coming year ought to appear in the Estimates in the same way as the salaries paid to our judges, so we may know exactly what moneys are being spent. The right hon. gentleman asks: Will I move for the impeachment of the Minister of Justice, because in the summary appearing in the index of the Estimates he has shown two amounts, one of $190,000 and another of $25,000 which do not cover the whole expenditure of his department? Certainly not; and the right hon. gentleman could not have been serious when he suggested such action. The amounts which are to be spent in accordance with the law and which are voted by Parliament can be expended by the department, but I say that those amounts have to appear in the Estimates so that every year the law as regards that expenditure will be again ratified by Parliament.

Sir GEORGE FOSTER: How ratified?

Mr. CANNON: May I point out to my right hon. friend that there is a wide difference between a law passed by Parliament ten or fifteen years ago, providing for

the expenditure of a certain amount of money, and the expenditure by the Government of those moneys every year. It is a well known rule, and a rule which exists in England as well as here, that Parliament does not vote money for more than twelve months. That has been well established in England, and is considered to be one of the greatest safeguards of English liberty and freedom. My right hon. friend is not going to deny that. Therefore, as public moneys are not to be voted by Parliament for more than twelve months, another rule has been established in England—a rule so well known that my right hon. friend with all his experience will not deny its force—that Parliament has to meet at least once every twelve months. What does that mean? It means that every year the Government, through their ministers, have to come before the representatives of the people to obtain new subsidies, and the subsidies which are then voted to them are annual subsidies. The principle is the same, no matter whether it is a case of voting salaries to judges, or bounties to petroleum companies as in this instance. My right hon. friend will not deny that. So, coming back to my first argument when the right hon. gentleman answered me, I say that he ought to put in the Estimates an approximate amount of what is to be spent, which we are entitled to know. Does the right hon. gentleman contend for one moment that this committee is giving him a blank cheque for any amount at all? We are just as much entitled to know what the Minister of Trade and Commerce intends to spend as we were to know what the Minister of Agriculture intended to spend in accordance with laws passed by Parliament. On page 4 of the Estimates, the summary, I find the following: "Trade and Commerce, authorized by statute"—nothing; not a cent. So I think I have answered the question of the right hon. gentleman. I wish to be very respectful to him on account of his age and experience, but I am quite sure that his answer will be as thoughtful as the one I have given him.

Sir GEORGE FOSTER: I have stated my position, and my hon. friend in his reply has fled the coop.

Mr. JACOBS: What does that mean in English?

Sir GEORGE FOSTER: In English that means that he has carefully avoided reaffirming the assertion which he made twice—it is on Hansard and he cannot get rid of it—that no minister has the right to expend one dollar which has not been voted by this Parliament. Now, I am within the hearing of both sides; I am within the hearing of my hon. friend directly opposite, and he will not deny that.

Mr. FIELDING: It is quite correct.

Mr. CANNON: I maintain the position which I took.

Sir GEORGE FOSTER: I do not think my hon friend restated his position, and I do not think he can maintain it.

Mr. CANNON: Well, I tried to state it.

Sir GEORGE FOSTER: All through the Estimates there are certain sums which are voted and certain sums which are authorized by statue. For instance, in the case of the Department of Justice the sum of $1,300,000 for judges' salaries, authorized by statute, is absolutely fixed.

Mr. CANNON: And has to be voted.

Sir GEORGE FOSTER: And has not to be voted by this House. These sums that are authorized by statute are placed in the Estimates for information, but the House does not vote them. The total amount voted for agriculture this year was $4,502,-139, but agriculture will spend this year an additional $1,100,000 which is authorized by statute but not voted by the House. In the case of pensions, $620,910 will be expended by virtue of the statute but is not and will not be voted by the House. So all the way through the Estimates. I am not prepared to say that as a matter of information it might not be shown under this vote that there is authorized by statute the payment by the minister of one and one-half cents per gallon for all crude oil of a certain test which has been raised and certified to; it would be information, but you would not have to vote it. If my hon. friend's contention is that it would be useful to the House to have it appear in the Estimates that there was an expenditure authorized by statute, when I would concur with him, but I cannot agree that no single amount whether authorized by statute or not, can be expended by the mniister unless it has actually been voted by the House.

Mr. FIELDING: This being an oil item, I would like to be able to pour some oil on the troubled waters. There is something to be said on both sides of the question. When the member for Dorchester (Mr. Cannon) says that no minister has the right to spend one dollar of public money until it has been

voted by the House he is absolutely right, and if my right hon. friend disputes that assertion he is absolutely wrong. But it does not follow that you have to vote it every year in the Estimates. The sums that are put in the Estimates as authorized by statute are there for information. The only point of difference between my right hon. friend and the member for Dorchester is whether it is necessary to vote these amounts every year, and on that point I am bound to say that the Minister of Trade and Commerce is correct; these sums are voted by statute and the statute is a standing authority to the ministers concerned for the expenditure of the money. Where the amount is fixed, as in the case of judges' salaries, you have no difficulty in stating it in the Estimates for the information of the House, but in this case I see the difficulty of putting in any particular amount. It is not intended by the law that there shall be a limit to the amount in this case, and as there is no fixed sum it would not be easy to state it in the Estimates each year as the member for Dorchester desires. However, the main point taken by the member for Dorchester is correct: that the minister has no authority to spend one dollar unless it has been first voted by the House. All these sums mentioned as authorized by statute have ben voted by the House; otherwise there would be no authority for spending them. But I agree with the minister that it is not necessary in all cases to set the amounts out in detail; in cases where there is not a fixed sum he might have difficulty, indeed, in doing so.

Mr. CAHILL: I submit there is no more difficulty in fixing the amount in this item than there was in fixing it in the next item of $26,000 for a bounty on linen yarn.

Mr. FIELDING: I believe that is not voted by statute. It is done by an Order in Council, and unless it is voted by this House from year to year, it cannot be paid at all.

Mr. CAHILL: I contend that this item should not be paid either.

Mr. FIELDING: That is another question.

Mr. CAHILL: The minister this afternoon said that the statute was passed by the Liberal administration. If it had any usefulness at the time, apparently its usefulness has passed, and surely the minister should not attempt to perpetuate any evil legislation on the part of the former Liberal administration as an excuse for further expenditure of this nature. If the expenditure is unnecessary—and I think it is; indeed I do not think the principle of bounties is good in any event—why not eliminate it? Is it not time that the Government should look around for ways and means of saving money instead of spending it in every possible way? To be consistent, the Government should either eliminate this bounty or throw the lands open for prospecting to all. The Government is adopting a principle of paying a bounty to one set of people and not giving other people an opportunity of prospecting. The person who has a little oil well is getting his bounty, but the Government does not allow others to go in and prospect. The fact that this appropriation has been passed from year to year, is not a sufficient excuse for its continuance. There must be some period at which this bounty will terminate, and I do not think it was the intention of the Government of that day to perpetuate it. If there is no advantage in continuing it this year, why not discontinue it? The Government never seem to find any way by which they can save money; with them, it is always a question of added expenditure. The only excuse they offer is: Well, this legislation was passed by a Liberal administration; therefore, it must be good. I am quite free to admit that about the only good things they have to offer are some of the things which they have taken from the Liberal administration, but I do not think this is one of them and it should be eliminated at once.

Mr. REDMAN: I cannot follow the argument of my hon. friend. As I understand the matter, this is a bonus which was given to oil producers in counties of southwestern Ontario where the production is so low as to make it almost impossible to proceed with that production unless some Government assistance is furnished. That was the situation at the time the Act was passed under the late Liberal administration, and it is much more the position today, because from that time the production of individual wells in those counties has gradually and continually decreased. What I rose to speak about is this. I wish to take the minister back to the statement he made a short time ago when he said that this bounty is limited to oil of a certain specific gravity. I think he threw out the suggestion—I do not think it was more

than that—that this was done because this may have coincided with the specific gravity of oil which must necessarily be imported to meet our domestic needs in this country. I do not know whether or not that was the fact at that time. My view is that this has always been an incentive to the production, discovery and exploration of oil in this country. In Alberta, we have a grade of oil which is very different in specific gravity from oil obtained in Ontario, and to that Alberta oil this bounty is not applicable. In Ontario, the wells are sunk to a depth of only 400 to 1,000 feet at a very small cost, whereas in Alberta, wells are sunk to a depth of some three or four thousand feet, it costing $40,000 to $100,000 to put down one well. The quantities of oil which we have been obtaining southwest of Calgary are not great although the value of the oil is great, and the field may have potentialities. I wish to point out the unfairness of paying a bounty in Ontario where the cost of obtaining oil is so small, when a bounty is not paid to those who produce oil in Alberta where very great cost is incurred in putting down wells. I think this matter has already been presented to the minister in petitions, and he has probably looked carefully into the matter and will have an answer ready. The bounty should be continued until such time as we discover in Canada the sort of oil which will enable us to produce oil in competition with the outside world on an equal basis without the necessity of a bounty. Until that time a bounty should be paid by this Government, not only to assist those who are now producing, but to encourage others to explore and prospect for oil, the necessity for which in this country no one can dispute.

Mr. CANNON: I have listened with great interest to the remarks contributed to the committee by the hon. member for Shelburne and Queen's (Mr. Fielding), who has had a long experience in this House as Minister of Finance and as a member. His opinions have great weight and I am sure the Minister of Trade and Commerce will not dispute the opinion given by the hon. member for Shelburne and Queen's. But the two hon. gentlemen seem to agree on one point, and that point is that statutory expenditure has not to be voted by Parliament every year. I accept with great respect their opinion; but on the other hand I would submit that the wording of the Estimates and also the spirit of the law, as I understand it, although I may be wrong, do not seem to agree with that opinion. I would refer the minister to page 4 of the Estimates, on which there is a summary of the whole expenditure for the current year? What do we read? It is the "summary of the estimated expenditure of the fiscal year ending March 31, 1922, together with the sums granted for the fiscal year ending March 31, 1921"—that is granted not, for an indefinite period, but for a definite period—"and a statement showing the increase and decrease for each service." If we read the summary in one column, we see the ordinary Estimates and in the other column we see the Estimates authorised by Statute. The law was passed in Parliament in 1904, says my right hon. friend. This law, having been enacted by Parliament, and having been sanctioned by the Governor General, becomes the law of Canada. That sanction is an authority to the Government to put the law into force, and one of the provisions of the law is that moneys are to be expended. I say that as far as the money part of the law is concerned, it has to be placed before Parliament every year in just the same way as every statutory vote is placed in the Estimates for all the departments. Being placed before Parliament in that way, which is not as formal and direct a way as is followed in the case of the other Estimates, every year Parliament gives a new authority to the Government to expend the sum which is mentioned in the law, and my contention is that unless this is done the Government has not the authority to spend the money. I do not wish to detain the committee very much longer on this point, but I might recall to the right hon. gentleman that in the old days in England when Parliament met only at long intervals, perhaps once in 15 or 25 years at the convenience of the King, the King did not need Parliament because at the opening of each reign Parliament met and voted once for all what was called the civil list and that civil list covered the expenditure for the whole administration of the realm during the reign of that sovereign. That was changed at the Revolution, and after 1688 the law was laid down by the British Parliament that in future moneys would be voted for only 12 months, and would be voted only after an itemized and detailed account had been submitted to

Parliament. Therefore I say that my contention is correct, and that my right hon. friend has no right, any more than has any other member of the Government, to spend a dollar of public money unless it has first been voted by Parliament. If my right hon. friend will refer to page 2 of the summary he will find that it does not contain one single cent of expenditure by his department authorized by statute. The position taken by the right hon. gentleman to-night might be improved if he would give more information to the committee; if he would tell us approximately what amount of money is to be expended this year in bounties to petroleum companies, and if he would do what all his other colleagues have done—place in the Estimates the moneys authorized by Parliament. I appreciate what my hon. friend from Shelburne and Queen's has pointed out, that it is very hard to fix a precise amount, but this law has been in force since 1904; the officials of the department know how it works, they are acquainted with all these companies and have a good idea as to the quantities of oil produced each year; so I think the official whose salary we are voting now should be in a position to give sufficient information to the minister to enable him to do with regard to his department what his colleagues all do with regard to theirs. I would ask another question of my right hon. friend. According to the law which was passed in 1904, is the amount to be expended by his department limited?

Sir GEORGE FOSTER: It is one-and-a-half cents per gallon for every gallon of oil which comes up to the test.

Mr. CANNON: Suppose these new oil fields which have been discovered in the West produce immense quantities of oil. Does my right hon. friend contend that, without giving any figures to the committee, or any more information that than he has done, he has authorization by this Parliament to give out in bounties at the rate of one-and-a-half cents per gallon, millions and millions of dollars? Where would he stop? We do not know. According to his interpretion of the law there is no limit to the amount he can expend. If that is the case, next year when we come back, if we do come back, and ask the right hon. gentleman how much money was expended, and he answers that in consequence of the immense success of these new oil fields he has paid out in bounties ten to fifteen million dollars, we could not be able to reproach him in any way, unless we now insist upon his giving us more information and fixing a limit, so that we shall know where we are going. I think the right hon. gentleman will acknowledge that the position I am taking is very reasonable. We cannot give to his department a blank cheque any more than we can to any other department, and we have all the more reason for not doing so because he does not mention anywhere in his Estimates the amount which he is to expend, either as authorized by Parliament or otherwise. In the summary it is stated that the expenditure authorized by statute for the year 1921-22 amounts to $114,000,000, and then the total amount of the other Estimates is given, but in neither of these two columns does this particular expenditure appear. I do not think it is reasonable for the right hon. gentleman to insist on the committee giving him an absolutely blank cheque for this expenditure.

Sir GEORGE FOSTER: I do not know that there is much to be gained by prolonging the discussion between my hon. friend and myself. The position I take I am quite willing to let go before the House, and the House can judge of it. The ex-minister of Finance, and trusted leader of my hon. friend, has coincided absolutely with my view.

Mr. CANNON: And also with mine.

Sir GEORGE FOSTER: May I ask my hon. friend if when he made the statement that the minister could not spend a single dollar except it was voted by this chamber, he included in that assertion the vote of money by statute, or was he referring only to the annual votes which we pass here?

Mr. CANNON: My statement was to the effect that all moneys to be expended by the Government must first be voted by Parliament.

Sir GEORGE FOSTER: My hon. friend said that I could not spend anything during the next year except it had been voted by the House this year. There my hon. friend and myself differ entirely, and my hon. friend the ex-Minister of Finance agrees with me absolutely. No one in this House believes that any minister has the right to spend money unless it is either voted in the Estimates or provided by statute, but the statute may provide for expenditure for years and years and years, and we never revote in the House what Parliament has already voted through a law which it has passed.

My hon. friend says that if my officer were really any good he ought to give me such information as would enable me to put the precise sum in the Estimates. How can you do that? My hon. friend must realize that although you have the records to go by you can put in the Estimates only approximately what the cost will be. The production differs from year to year. Some years it is twice what it was the year before, and sometimes you will find a falling off of 50 per cent in production in the course of a year. So that it would be altogether misleading to attempt to put before the committee an exact estimate of what you would spend. You must put a sufficient amount to keep you out of all difficulties, even though it might not all be used. Every member has the Auditor General's report, which is a treasured document, and he knows exactly what is spent each year. That is, therefore, a guide. Now, with reference to the remarks of my hon. friend (Mr. Griesbach), I have had many communications from the West regarding oil fields producing oil that does not fulfil the test that is required before the bounty is payable. This is a vexed question, and in one way it seems to be unfair. But you have only to go back to the purpose for which this bounty was given, namely, to compensate for legislation that was passed some time ago, equalizing the quality of oil produced here with that imported from the United States, in order to get at the basis of the matter. The proposition is put up to me strongly: why not change the law so that it will cover our oil-producing regions in the West? Well, frankly, the question then would be as to where we should land if we made the subsidy applicable to all oil produced in Canada; and should the promises of large production in the West, which at present seem to be very great, be realized, it would involve a very heavy charge upon the revenues of the country. This specific gravity test has been on the statute books for quite a while, and I am not going to say that because it has been there it should remain there for ever. It is a matter for the House to take into consideration if it thinks that the time has come when that provision ought to be done away with; and there are different minds with reference to that. But until there is a change in the law, it is, of course, my duty to administer the Act as I find it. With reference to the millions upon millions which I might find myself under the necessity of spending, if something on a large scale took place in the North West—well, if we proceed on suppositions I fear we may get off the solid basis of argument. I do not look for any such expansion. Anyway, so far, the specific gravity test has been the differentiating factor in the granting of the bounty.

Mr. LEMIEUX: I want to say a word or two, not in connection with the discussion that has taken place, although I think the country and the House should be thankful to my hon. friend (Mr. Cannon) for having put his point so clearly, that is to say, that not a dollar should be spent without the authority of Parliament.

Sir GEORGE FOSTER: That has been long recognized.

Mr. LEMIEUX: Yes; but the sooner it is made clear in the Estimates as to what our statutory expenditures are, the sooner those expenditures are specifically stated, the better it will be.

Sir GEORGE FOSTER: That might be.

Mr. LEMIEUX: We are facing a very serious situation and the country is entitled to know what expenditures are to be made every year. The public will be more and more critical also in regard to the total amount of our expenditures. Although theoretically, on one branch of the argument, my right hon. friend is correct, yet the hon. member for Dorchester has rendered the country a service this evening in calling the attention of the committee to this very important question of putting before the country the real expenditures which are to be made and which are proper only as sanctioned by Parliament. The point I wish to make, however, is this: We are paying a bounty on the production of crude petroleum. I remember when this bounty was created by Parliament; as my right hon. friend stated a moment ago, it was in the year 1904. Now, I am not going to suggest the creating of other bounties, because I do not think that the country at the present time is in a mood to grant further subsidies. But in connection with oil, would it not be possible to encourage the exploitations of the large fields of shale oil in my right hon. friend's native province as well as in my own? There are immense fields of shale oil in the province of New Brunswick, in the county of Albert; and lately very large fields of shale oil have been discovered in the counties of Gaspé and Bonaventure. As I say, I am not asking for a bounty, nor would I dare propose the creation of one for the development of those fields. But when the new tariff is enacted, the Government should help the

pioneers and the miners by decreasing or completely abolishing the duties on the machinery needed by the miners and operators for the development of those fields of shale oil. I believe I am speaking by the book when I say that my right hon. friend, who is familiar with this question, has reason to view this suggestion with sympathy, not only because it concerns his own province or the east of Canada, but because the whole subject is a highly important one. This country is in need of fuel oil, and the Government should help to develop these natural resources. Evidence was taken by a committee which sat a year or so ago in the Senate chambers, where experts were heard, and it was recognized and admitted that these fields of shale oil can be successfully developed if the Government will agree to admit the necessary machinery without exacting the duties that are at present levied. In all mining ventures, and especially in regard to oil, the crucial test, or, to use Wilsonian language, the acid test, is the period of development; and if the miner or the operator cannot secure at reasonable rates the machinery and the engineering required for that development, he is, of course, barred out, and under such circumstances these fields will remain unproductive. I call the attention of the right hon. gentleman to that fact. We—I should not say "we", because I am not the owner of any of these fields, but the Canadian people—would be pleased if the Government would give free machinery, and free mining implements, in order to promote the development and the operation of those natural resources.

Mr. BELAND: I want to ask the right hon. gentleman a simple question touching a matter as to which I would like to be enlightened. We read on page 4 of the Estimates that the grand total of the expenditure for the next year will be $582,000,000. Does that represent the whole of the expenditure for next year barring the Supplementary Estimates?

Sir GEORGE FOSTER: My hon. friend's question has reference to the figures in the third column?

Mr. BELAND: Yes. The grand total of the summary is $582,000,000. If we have no Supplementary Estimates this session does this amount represent the whole of the money that will be paid out during the next fiscal year?

Sir GEORGE FOSTER: I would not undertake to say that it does. That third column is the total of the two sums in the two preceding columns, of what is to be voted and what is authorized by statute, but whether everything authorized by statute is included in that amount or not I do not know. If it is, then that would represent the total amount that could be paid out, exclusive of expenditures by Governor General's warrant for special emergencies and things of that nature.

Mr. BELAND: May I further ask whether the minister expects that during the next fiscal year his department will pay out about the same amount as that which appears in the Auditor General's Report for the last fiscal year in bounties on crude petroleum? The figure for the year ended March 31, 1920, was $103,000. Does the right hon. gentleman think that the amount to be paid out during the present fiscal year will exceed that sum or be about the same?

Sir GEORGE FOSTER: There again I cannot give a definite answer. In one year 350,000 gallons of oil are raised; in another year the quantity is 202,000 gallons. What is raised one year is no definite lead as to what may be raised the succeeding year. Last year a certain number of gallons were raised, and the bounty was paid on that quantity at the rate which is allowed. Next year there may be half that amount raised, or there may be fifty per cent more than that raised—it is impossible to say. That indefinite feature is there and you cannot get over it; you can make no definite statement with regard to it. From the year 1904 that item has never appeared, so far as I know, in the "Authorized by law column" of the Estimates. I suppose the reason it is not put in is that you would be rather misleading the House if you put in a certain amount not knowing whether the production of oil would rise or would fall, or would remain just about the same.

Mr. FIELDING: Where you are dealing with a contract for the construction of a work by the Government, or anything of that kind which is under government control, you can, through your officers, make a reasonable estimate of what you are going to do—

Sir GEORGE FOSTER: Yes.

Mr. FIELDING: —but when you are dealing with corporations over whom you have no control—

Sir GEORGE FOSTER: And with Providence.

Mr. FIELDING:—you cannot make an estimate with any accuracy; you have to be dependent upon the work which it suits their convenience to do. Now, in fairness, while we are on this branch of the subject I must say that we have in times past spent vast sums under the authority of statutes which have not appeared in the Estimates. Let me take as an illustration the railway subsidies. Again and again we have voted railway subsidies and millions—many millions—of dollars have been expended under these Acts, but my recollection is that they never in any case appeared in the Estimates. Let me mention another case. Within my own experience we have spent millions in bounties on steel and iron, and I do not recall any case in which they were mentioned in the Estimates. Why? For the reason I have just given, that they were not Government works; they were operations carried on by corporations over whom the Government had no control; and so long as there was statutory authority to pay the money—at any rate, speaking within my own recollection—I do not think it was customary to mention these sums in the Estimates. I agree that it would be a convenience if you could have a general summing up of the whole thing, but in the case of the operations carried on by corporations that would have to be largely a matter of guess work.

10 p.m.

Mr. BELAND: We may at all events draw the conclusion that the amounts specified in the main Estimates do not cover the whole expenditure for next year, and it is a disagreeable revelation that at least $100,000 can be added to the already very large sum required for the next fiscal year without the public knowing anything about it.

Mr. McMASTER: May I make a suggestion? I think most of the people who take an interest in these matters have been accustomed to feel, though quite wrongly, that the sum total found at the beginning of the Estimates was the amount which the country would have to provide for the fiscal year next ensuing. Now we learn that they are amounts authorized by statute which do not appear in the summary. The fact that some of these amounts do appear in the summary would lead the ordinary reader to suppose that all expenditures authorized by statute do find a place there. In order that the public, who, though they have not taken an interest in the past in our financial condition, are bound to do so in the future, may have a more correct idea of just what the commitments of the country are, I would make this suggestion, which I trust is a reasonable one—that there should appear at the end of the summary a statement of what was paid under the authority of statute which is not mentioned in the summary itself. I quite understand from the statements of the minister and the member for Shelburne and Queen's (Mr. Fielding) that it may be quite difficult to estimate the amounts that are to be paid under any special statute, by way of bounties, for instance; but we should be able to put in a supplementary statement at the end of the summary showing what has been paid under the authority of statutes for the preceding year.

Sir GEORGE FOSTER: For the last year?

Mr. McMASTER: Yes, for the last year.

Sir GEORGE FOSTER: You find that in the Auditor General's report.

Mr. McMASTER: No doubt all these things are available if one knows just where to look for them, either in the Auditor General's report or in the Public Accounts; but my suggestion is that when persons—members of this House and the outside public who are interested in these matters—come to examine the Estimates, they should have before them in convenient form exactly what is submitted to the House and voted, and what was paid under statute, although difficult of computation, for the past year.

Mr. EULER: The minister seems to take the position that the principle of bounties cannot fairly be discussed in connection with this item. In a sense he is perhaps correct, yet I would like to associate myself with the member for Dorchester (Mr. Cannon) in his opposition to the granting of bounties. I have not heard the minister give any reason whatever why these bounties should continue to be paid, except that they are paid under a statute enacted in 1904. With all respect to the right hon. gentleman, I do not think that is a sufficient reason for their continuance. This matter is directly in his department, and it seems to me that he should proceed

on the principle that the monies to be paid out by way of bounties are for some definite purpose. If he believes the reasons which moved the previous government to give these bounties by way of encouraging oil production still hold good, he should be prepared to defend those reasons. I am entirely opposed to bounties and I think it is time to repeal the law under which they were granted. I question very much whether the bounty of a cent and a half a gallon encourages the production of oil; it merely adds that much more to the profits of those who do not require any assistance. Unless the minister is convinced that the granting of bounties does still give encouragement to oil production, I think he ought seriously to consider the introduction of legislation to repeal the Act under which these bounties were first granted.

Mr. BELAND: As the Supplementary Estimates are sometimes laid on the table of the House as late as the end of June, would it not be well to include in them the amount paid during the fiscal year ended the previous March, so that the country will know exactly the amount likely to be paid during the current year? I would ask the right hon. gentleman to bring this suggestion to the attention of his colleagues.

Sir GEORGE FOSTER: I will.

Mr. CLARK (Red Deer): I am sure my right hon. friend (Sir George Foster) must be impressed with the strength of sentiment opposed to the principle of bounties. The words which have just gone from my hon. friend from North Waterloo (Mr. Euler) are very impressive. I have no doubt myself that this item, small as it is, is a waste of public money. I settled that question for myself many years ago, and when I first came to this House I expressed myself more than once along those lines. I think my hon. friend from Maisonneuve (Mr. Lemieux) has pointed out to the minister a more excellent way of helping the exploration of the wealth beneath the surface of the earth—by making it easier to get the implements by which that wealth may be won. I have not had time to look into what the Argentine has done of recent years, but before the war she had no duty whatever on mining implements, and the Argentine resembles Canada in these respects, that it is thinly populated and is a new country. My right hon. friend balks at the idea of paying out this bounty on large amounts of oil; but he contends for this modest sum of $3,000. That attitude brings him to what is the fundamental and, in my opinion, the insurmountable objection to bounties. You can only pay a bounty to two kinds of business: either to a business which is a paying business, when obviously it does not need any assistance and it is a gross injustice to the taxpayers to assist it; or to a non-paying business, which is a foolish waste of public money. In the absence of bounties people would put their capital and their energies into a line of business which on the whole was likely to be remunerative; otherwise, they would withdraw from it. I hope my right hon. friend has been impressed, as I have been, with the strength of sentiment that has been expressed by my hon. friends from Dorchester, Pontiac, Maisonneuve and other hon. gentlemen. I want to add my modest word to theirs, and I hope if he does bring in the Estimates another year he will be so much impressed by the arguments advanced to-night that he will drop even this small sum. I want to reiterate in a sentence that, in my humble judgment, it is a waste of public money, and certainly no responsible citizen of Canada at the present time will argue for one moment that we have any money to waste.

Mr. CAHILL: My hon. friend from Calgary (Mr. Redman) states that this bounty is necessary for wells that are not producing enough oil to make them pay for the labour expended on them, but he must know that such enterprises are better closed down at once. He might just as well argue that his friend who is sitting beside him, the member for Fort William and Rainy River (Mr. Manion), would be justified in asking for a bounty on fish in portions of Lake Superior which have been fished out. I have no doubt that the right hon. gentleman would grant such a bounty, and I also have no doubt that lots of fishermen would be ready to take that bounty to catch fish.

Mr. CLARK (Red Deer): They would catch the bounty.

Mr. CAHILL: Yes, that is what most of them are looking for. The principle of bounties is wrong. When an enterprise will not pay for the labour, and we have too many remunerative occupations for our people to waste their time and money on those that are unprofitable. The minister has stated that if it was the wish of Parliament to abolish this bounty, it would be abolished. I am quite satisfied that if I moved to strike the item out the minister would call to his support all his followers, and the item would carry. Legislation is conducted by the Government, and the Gov-

ernment is sure of the votes of its supporters. While they may criticise, as they did this afternoon, when it comes to a vote they are sure to support the ministry. Therefore such a suggestion cannot come from this side with any hope of success; at least, the amendments we have made so far have been voted down. The time is coming, and coming soon, when that will not be the case. But in the meantime what can Parliament do about it? It is for the minister to take the responsibility for this expenditure, and before he asks for an unlimited amount, say $100,000 or $200,000, he should consider well the advisability of eliminating unnecessary expenditure. This is not a time for unnecessary expenditure.

Mr. CANNON: Before this item is passed I wish again to protest against the principle of giving bounties to companies and corporations that do not need them. I object also to our voting a salary to an official who will distribute an amount which is nowhere mentioned in the Estimates. In other words, we are giving a blank cheque to the Department of Trade and Commerce and my right hon. friend can spend any amount he wishes; there is nothing to restrict or to curb his extravagance if he is inclined to be extravagant. If my right hon. friend's contention is correct that if an expenditure is authorized by statute he does not have to come back to the House and have the amount voted but can spend what he likes each year, the Government might as well introduce a Bill conferring upon themselves the power to spend a lump sum of say $500,000,000. We would then have no budget; the usefulness of the House of Commons would disappear, and the Government would be able to run the country as they wish to run it.

Item agreed to.

Canada Year Book, $20,000.

Mr. CAHILL: What is the reason for the increase?

Sir GEORGE FOSTER: It is due largely to the increase in the cost of paper.

Mr. CAHILL: How many of these books are distributed free, and what good purpose is served by spending $20,000 for the Year Book? Is it worth the money to the people, and if so, in what way?

Sir GEORGE FOSTER: That might be a debatable question; it would depend upon one's point of view. I, myself, have no doubt as to the utility of the book and the usefulness of the purpose which it serves. I know of no progressive country in the world which does not publish a year book of singular excellence. Our year book has been published for a number of years; its quality and efficacy, so to speak, have been increasing each year and I believe that Canada has to-day, with the possible exception of Australia, a year book as comprehensive, as well put up, and as consecutive in the information which it gives as that of any other country which publishes such a book. Last year we published an English edition of about 9,000 copies and a French edition of about 3,000 copies at a cost of $22,000. The work is now done in the Printing Bureau; formerly that was not the case. A certain number of copies are distributed to libraries, chambers of commerce, and permanent institutions of that kind, where they are available to those who seek information concerning Canada. Then, a price, which is just about the cost of publication, is charged for all copies distributed, other than the complimentary copies of which I have spoken. One feature which has been introduced in the book is, I think, valuable. Each year an exhaustive article is published dealing with one particular phase of Canada's development—whether concerning her history, her mineral wealth, or otherwise—so as to bring up to date all the information in compendious form with reference to that subject. Then in succeeding publications there is a reference column to articles which appeared in the preceding books, so that if one does not find in this year's book the information which he seeks he may refer to the previous volume dealing with the subject.

Mr. CAHILL: How many have been distributed each year?

Sir GEORGE FOSTER: I cannot tell my hon. friend the number, but I can get the information for him.

Mr. BELAND: The information in the book covers the calendar year?

Sir GEORGE FOSTER: Yes.

Mr. BELAND: I have noticed that the Canadian Almanac contains more recent information in some respects than that which appears in the Canada Year Book.

Sir GEORGE FOSTER: Yes, that is bound to be the case. The Year Book is not so much a pocket volume containing strictly up-to-date information as a permanent record. It takes a good deal of time to prepare it and get it published.

Mr. CAHILL: Has the Year Book always been published under the name "Canada Year Book," or was there some other title?

Sir GEORGE FOSTER: I think the earlier volumes had a different name, but it has had the name "Canada Year Book" for a number of years.

Mr. CAHILL: The Imperial Canadian Year Book is a different publication?

Sir GEORGE FOSTER: Yes.

Item agreed to.

Culling timber, including an amount of $600 for superannuated cullers, $1,600.

Mr. McMASTER: Why have we to pay cullers? I did not know the Government was in the timber busines.

Sir GEORGE FOSTER: This comes in as the tail end of a long transaction, and this is the last time it will appear. It has been gradually diminished by appointments not being made, until I think we have now three officers left who are being paid small superannuations. Most of them, I regret to say, are over eighty years of age and will soon disappear. The active operations of this work will disappear after this year.

Item agreed to.

Grant to Canadian Engineering Standards Association for the promotion of uniformity of standards in metallic and other products, $10,000.

Mr. CAHILL: What does this appropriation accomplish?

Sir GEORGE FOSTER: This appropriation has appeared for the last two or three years, and when the committee understands what it is for, I am sure it will consider the apropriation a very useful one. It is granted to the Canadian Engineering Standards Association. The Canadian Engineers banded themselves together, and they are now at work particularly in forming standards of various kinds, so as to standardize productive operations. As members of the association they give their whole time to this work, and we give them a grant of $10,000 to enable them to carry on.

Mr. CAHILL: Are they meeting with any positive success?

Sir GEORGE FOSTER: Yes. They have divided themselves into a large number of committees, each committee taking up one special subject with the idea of introducing standardization in regard to that product, whatever it is. They get together and canvass the question, discuss the standards that they fix, come to an agreement and then bring all the pressure they can to bear upon the manufacturing companies to adopt those standards. They are meeting with great success in that respect. Anyone who will think for a moment will realize the great economic gain which would be had if, instead of a manufacturer devoting himself to five, six, seven, eight or ten different standards in the manufacture of an article of use, he could bring those down to the minimum number of usable standards and manufacture along that line.

Mr. CASGRAIN: Do they make reports to the Department?

Sir GEORGE FOSTER: Yes, and we have on record the results of their work.

Mr. CASGRAIN: Are the reports available for the public?

Sir GEORGE FOSTER: We have them on record; we have not printed them. My hon. friend could get any in which he is interested.

Honorary Advisory Council of Industrial and Scientific Research,—salaries and expenses, including printing and stationery and the collection and distribution of information, and for studentships, scholarships, special problems and forestry studies, $120,000.

Mr. COWAN: In the speech from the Throne reference is made to a Bill dealing with scientific research. Will any expenditure entailed by that Bill be in addition to this amount, or does this include it?

Sir GEORGE FOSTER: This does not include it. What is contemplated in that allusion is something of a much more extended kind; it is really a national laboratory for standardization and research. On the other hand, this would have an intimate connection therewith, and when the other is established, this would work in with it to a very large extent. That correlation would have to be made after we knew the form of the new venture, so to speak.

Mr. CROWE: The latter part of the item refers to: "forestry studies." Is that work in a forestry products laboratory?

Sir GEORGE FOSTER: That is an explanation, a little more extended, of what is meant by the research. Those are the lines along which they are carrying on research. They include not only the research and salaries and expenses, but a system of studentships, fellowships

and bursaries which the advisory council supervise, and, after proper examination, award for special researches in different lines. They take up quite a large range at the present time. There are included in them some forestry problems, mining problems, productive problems in industry, and scientific problems to a certain extent where they are trying to solve difficulties which are met in processes of production and they carry on experiments to that end. the system of bursaries, fellowships and studentships has been found to work well in Great Gritain and other countries, and the same line is being followed out under this research board.

Mr. McMASTER: I would venture the assertion that the work conducted under this Advisory Council of Industrial and Scientific Research might far better be conducted under the universities of this country. For instance, we know that in the Faculty of Applied Science of McGill Universities we have had some of the leading scientists, I may say, of the whole world, some men who occupy chairs in that faculty are really men of world-wide reputation and have done a great deal of their most important work in connection with the university. What I am afraid of, in voting this $120,000, is that we are largely duplicating the work of the universities, and I think if we wish to promote scientific and industrial research, that work can much better be carried on in the great scientific schools attached to universities like McGill, Toronto Varsity and Queen's University at Kingston.

Mr. CASGRAIN: The University of Montreal.

Mr. McMASTER: The University of Monereal, Laval University and others. I would like to bring forward this objection which, I believe, is a serious one. Would the minister inform us how he expects with the appliances available at Ottawa to have the work done as well as it would be done with the magnificant equipment at McGill, for instance, and I speak of McGill not because I do not realize there are other universities splendidly equipped, but because I am familiar with the equipment of my Alma Mater.

Sir GEORGE FOSTER: I am afraid my hon. friend has not read the yearly reports as diligently as he might have done if he had had more time. The universities are not ignored under this system. Their energies are co-ordinated by the members of the Research Council, many of whom are connected with the universities. These researches are not carried on by means of appliances here in Ottawa, but at the universities themselves by members of the universities, either professors or students who have gained their degrees or passed through most of their courses and have specialized in some one of the subjects. They are appointed under the bursary studentship and fellowship appropriations to carry on during the vacation months researches along a certain line. Here is a research, for instance, being carried on by Professor Porter of McGill University. A grant of $1,500 is proposed to be given him out of this vote in order to defray his expenses in carrying on an investigation with reference to oil flotation in the recovery of values, by the application of Canadian and other oils, taking into consideration minerals other than those of the Cobalt district. There is a line along which research has been extended. The professor has been at work on that and shows an aptitude for it. This grant is given to him under the supervision of the Research Council to enable him to defray his expenses in carrying on that investigation for another year. That is just an example of how the work is done. There is no laboratory here under the management of the Research Council where independent research is undertaken. I have a number of instances here of bursaries, studentships, fellowships, and grants for researches that are being carried on at McGill, Queen's, Toronto University, and other universities which have the appliances and the skilled workmanship necessary to enable them to undertake that work.

Mr. McMASTER: I would not like the minister to think I was opposed to research work. I am glad to know that it is being carried on in these places where it can best be carried on, but I would like to be convinced of the necessity for this council in regard to this work. Would the minister tell us roughly how much of this $120,000 is going to the actual work of research at the universities, and how much goes for the salaries of officers or officials connected with the council?

Sir GEORGE FOSTER: The Research Council is composed of a number of gentlemen who are selected because of professional and scientific knowledge and skill, also of men who are versed in and familiar with the industries of the country. All of them give their services without any

remuneration with the exception of the president, who is a constant or stationary officer and who had to give up his work in the university and become a sort of Director for the Research Council, supervising their work. All the others give their services free. We pay their expenses when they come to Ottawa for their meetings, which are every fortnight or three weeks as necessity dictates. Dr. Macallum, who was the Director, and received a salary of $10,000, has resigned and gone on a mission to Pekin after being appointed to a position in McGill University. His place has been taken by Dr. Ruttan, who is filling the position until we come to a conclusion in reference to the laboratory which has been spoken about and the rearrangements which are to be made. He fills that position gratuitously. I make that explanation to show that salaries are not a large part of the expenditure. The others receive their travelling expenses and their living allowances when they are attending the meetings. Last year, salaries and allowances and the staff which is necessary to carry on the work consumed $14,800, printing and stationery and travelling expenses of members took up a certain amount and the standard gauge laboratory equipment took up $9,000. I must make an explanation with reference to the standard gauge laboratory equipment. It had been purchased by the Imperial Munitions Board, and had been used by them to a certain extent. When the Imperial Munitions Board was demobilized this valuable machinery remained there. The value of it was somewhere in the neighbourhood of $30,000. They offered it to the Research Council for $9,000. It is worth fully the amount that I stated first. After consultation, the Research Council decided to buy it at $9,000. It could be sold at more than that price at any time, but if this new arrangement is made and comes into force it will be absolutely necessary to have that gauge. Forestry examinations took $8,000, assistant researches, seventeen in all, $24,467, fellowships $4,100, studentships $4,125, and bursaries $2,150.

Mr. BELAND: Are all these studentships carried in Canada?

Sir GEORGE FOSTER: All in Canada.

Mr. BELAND: None in England?

Sir GEORGE FOSTER: No. Professor McLennan, who has charge of the physics laboratory in Toronto, has been conducting experiments there for us. During the war, he was taken over to England and employed by the British Government in research work, and his investigations proved very valuable indeed. While in England he was working for the British Government, not for us.

Mr. BELAND: How many of these students are there?

Sir GEORGE FOSTER: There were seventeen researches carried on last year in different lines, an example of one of which I put before the House. There are six students.

Mr. BELAND: Are they university graduates?

Sir GEORGE FOSTER: They are university graduates or undergraduates who have made their mark and shown a distinct aptitude in and desire for a certain line of research, and they are selected by the Research Council after consultation with the presidents of the universities with a view to obtaining the best men. They are given fellowships which enable them to carry on research.

Mr. McMASTER: In glancing over the Auditor General's report, I would submit, for the consideration of the minister, that the overhead, if I may so term it, in connection with this enterprise, is very much higher than it should be. The administrative chairman is far from being a stationary officer, for I see he spent seventy-eight and three-quarters days at $10 per day travelling around, and his railways fares amounted to about $436. The expenses in connection with this undertaking amount to about $33,000 out of a total of some $94,000 for the work that is supposed to be done. I think the thing is top-heavy, and there are comparatively few students who are being helped. At any rate, the amount spent on helping students is very much less than the overhead. Let me draw the attention of the committee to this item:

> Dr. Andrew Hunter, Toronto: Grant to aid in research into the problems of the fox-breeding industry, honorarium $200, travelling expenses, $191.10, advance for expenses, $5,000.

I respectfully submit that if you are going to make experiments in fox breeding, an amount to some fox breeder down in Prince Edward Island would be a good deal wiser than grants to any gentlemen who lives in Toronto. I never knew that city to be famous for fox production.

Mr. PARENT: They have to be foxy.

Mr. McMASTER: It strikes me that we have paid out a good deal of public money in this direction, and far too much has gone in the way of expenses to those who were not doing the real work, but who were more or less supervising. The Minister of Immigration and Colonization has a very wise look on his face and perhaps he could give us some information in regard to the subject of fox breeding. I throw out this suggestion because there is a sapient expression on his face.

Mr. CALDER: I have no knowledge of the subject.

Sir GEORGE FOSTER: First, with reference to over-head expenses. The one purpose of the Research Council was to interest scientific bodies and to line them up as far as possible in accordant action. In order to do that they must visit the different parts of the Dominion and consult with those men and form organizations. To have said to Dr. Macallum, "We will pay you $10,000 as director, and then make you stay in Ottawa so as to obviate travelling expenses", would not have been a proper manner in which to conduct the enterprise. Dr. Macallum did travel over every part of the Dominion. He called on scientific and university men, had conversations and conferences with them, and formed them into groups which affiliated themselves in work with the Advisory Council, under their direction. That was the first really excellent step that was taken. It had to be taken if you were going to collect information, focus scientific research work in Canada, and carry it on under proper supervision and in a regular manner. With reference to fox breeding, this is an industry that has had its ups and downs. On the whole it has shown possibilities of very large returns, not only from foxes, but from other wild animals that might be cultivated. The difficulties in fox culture arise, so far as I understand, chiefly in regard to habitat, feeding, and procreation of foxes. Foxes are, of course, a foxy lot, and many a breeder, after he has spent large sums of money, and has obtained a litter, suddenly finds, after leaving them in good condition one day, that the next day they have in some way or other disappeared. Very frequently they are destroyed by the mother herself. Now why is that? The mother fox destroys her young through fright. Some clumsy method in dealing with these animals may give rise to fright on the part of the mother and she probably thinks that the best way of standing between them and their enemies is by destroying them. An endeavour is made to provide proper food and, generally, such treatment as will make the habitat as natural as possible and on the whole make for natural conditions. This research work was carried on in the actual farming of foxes for a certain period. Strict scientific observation was made of them on which conclusions might be based as to the best methods of feeding,, breeding and looking after them. When that information is ascertained, and has behind it scientific authority, as well as experience, it will prove very valuable to the fox breeding industry as a whole.

Mr. McMASTER: What is Dr. Andrew Hunter, who is devoting his attention to fox breeding? Is he a veterinary doctor?

Sir GEORGE FOSTER: So far as this research goes, I suppose you would call him a fox doctor.

Mr. McMASTER: Well, he is doctoring foxes and he gets an advance for expenses of $5,000.

Sir GEORGE FOSTER: That is for carrying on experiments.

Mr. McMASTER: Where has he carried on these experiments?

Sir GEORGE FOSTER: In Prince Edward Island in the vicinity of Ottawa.

Mr. McMASTER: Well, I submit that it is not wise to appoint a man who is a veterinary doctor, or a homeopather, or a dentist, who lives in Toronto, to carry on investigations of this nature in Prince Edward Island. Why should a man in Toronto be engaged to carry on research work in Prince Edward Island at a total expenditure last year of over $5,000?

Sir GEORGE FOSTER: I am not a fox doctor, nor am I an authority on the breeding of animals. My hon. friend, however, has a high opinion of McGill University, and I know he has an equally high opinion of Dr. Ruttan who was on the Advisory Council, which thought it necessary, after a thorough consideration of the matter, to devote a certain amount of money to this purpose. He was one of the Advisory Council who made that proposal. I cannot give my hon. friend the information which I know he could obtain from Dr. Ruttan, although I could get it for him and give him a memorandum on the subject. I know it would be both interesting and

instructive as well as satisfactory to my hon. friend if he would meet Dr. Ruttan and talk the matter over with him.

Mr. McMASTER: There are many things which we should like to do in Canada if we had the money. I do submit, with all respect to the minister, that the country's finances are not such as to warrant the expenditure of this amount of money on investigating the psychology of mother foxes in order to provide some remedy against their unnatural and most unmotherly propensity for dining off their young. As a matter of fact, the member for Châteauguay and Huntingdon (Mr. Robb), who has experience in country life and is member for one of the finest agricultural counties in the Dominion, tells me that the female pig also very often does the same thing. To my mind, Mr. Chairman, we have to economize, and I think the Government is very severely to blame for spending so much money on this sort of scientific investigation.

Sir GEORGE FOSTER: It is not only scientific, but it is practical. This industry is one which is largely carried on at the present time and is capable of almost indefinite expansion in our country. I will just read a little memorandum I have on the subject for the benefit of my hon. friend:

To the Associate Committee of the Research Council investigating the problems affecting the fox-breeding industry of the Dominion.

I may say that $5,500 was the grant.

This committee has been engaged for over a year in studying the causation of the low yield from this industry. In Prince Edward Island, the average number of fox pups to a litter ranges from three to five, but the number of pups reared to maturity averages only one to three per pair of foxes. The loss, therefore, is in the neighborhood of about sixty-five per cent of each litter, and apparently is largely due to wholly unsuitable diet which affects the mother vixen before the birth of the litter, and also the young pups. There is no knowledge for the fox breeders to go upon on this score, and the Fox-Breeders' Association appealed, over a year and a half ago, to have this investigation conducted under the auspices of the Research Council. This was agreed to by the latter, which planned an investigation which would extend over two years at least. The associate committee consists of five professors—

Now I will catch my hon. friend—

—of biochemistry and physiology two representatives of the Department of Agriculture, one of whom is Dr. Torrance, the Veterinary Director General of the Health of Animals Branch. The investigation is now being conducted under the auspices of the Associate Committee by an expert Canadian biochemist, who has, for the past fifteen years, been engaged in studying the nutrition of farm animals in the North Western States and Canada, and who has control of part of the Research Laboratory of the Health of Animals Branch at Hull, P.Q., where there are installed special pens for the foxes and special equipment in the laboratory for this purpose, at the expense of the Department of Agriculture.

The Fox Breeders' Association have donated six pair of foxes estimated at a value of $2,000, which are now under observation as to diet and the resulting state of nourishment. Already data have been obtained which seem to point the way to a standard diet for these animals which, if established, will lower the mortality amongst the young foxes and thus save, it is hoped, about a million dollars a year for Prince Edward Island alone.

The grant will enable the work to be continued until the end of 1921.

Mr. BELAND: Are the grants made by the minister or by the Council?

Sir GEORGE FOSTER: The grants are recommended by the Council and the minister agrees or disagrees, and with his approval they go into operation; but I may say that so far as I am concerned I have taken, in most instances, the considered recommendation of the Research Council. In some cases I have talked recommendations over with them and they have been withdrawn.

Mr. BELAND: I understand that all the members of the Council do not devote the whole of their time to this work?

Sir GEORGE FOSTER: No, they do not.

Mr. BELAND: But they convene in Ottawa?

Mr. BELAND: How often?

Sir GEORGE FOSTER: Yes.

Sir GEORGE FOSTER: As a rule the meetings are held about once a fortnight. The members of the council could not be expected to give their whole time to the work. They are men who have their allotted duties in the universities. They get no salary for this work, but they do give a large amount of time. They not only attend meetings here but they are more or less at work even when they are absent from Ottawa.

11 p.m.

Mr. MURPHY: The right hon. gentleman has just read an interesting document, the product of a number of eminent gentlemen, some of whom were biochemists. Now among those "bios" was there a practical fox-breeder—even one practical fox-breeder?

Sir GEORGE FOSTER: I have read a statement giving the composition of the committee, and that statement also mentions the fact that the foxes were placed in these pens by those who own them in Prince Edward Island. The foxes are kept under the supervision, and subject to the constant observation, of these men who are carrying on the experiment and making the notes. That is the only way in which the investigation could be conducted. Even a practical fox-breeder might not be able to make scientific observation. I do not know how it is with foxes—but generally a successful breeder has the knack of it and has luck—gets along well.

Mr. MURPHY: The last observation of the right hon. gentleman is really the one that applies to this industry. The practical and successful breeder does not need the assistance of the "bios" who compose this committee. To quote the language my right hon. friend used in the House a few weeks ago, "honest injun now," does he not think the money is wasted?

Sir GEORGE FOSTER: I do not.

Mr. MURPHY: The right hon. gentleman says he does not?

Sir GEORGE FOSTER: I do not.

Mr. MURPHY: Then may I tell the right hon. gentleman that among the large population in this part of Canada he is an outstanding exception.

Sir GEORGE FOSTER: That is not always a demerit.

Mr. MURPHY: It is very well known that this Council of Industrial and Scientific Research is just a method of providing—well, a sort of pleasant occupation for a number of gentlemen who form little coteries here and there, and to whom the irreverent refer as members of a mutual admiration society. Now just in this connection, a gentleman who is said to be a very eminent man, and whose standing in a university I will not attempt to question, was until lately the head of this Council of Scientific and Industrial Research—I refer to Dr. Macallum. Amongst those who have been born and have lived in Ottawa all their lives, and who are not very easily impressed by the great or the near-great, there was a very settled conviction that Dr. Macallum was not at all what he was represented to be in connection with this Council of Industrial and Scientific Research. Efforts were made in this House from time to time to find out what salary Dr. Macallum received in Toronto university before he was transferred to Ottawa but those efforts were unavailing.

Mr. McMASTER: Futile.

Mr. MURPHY: As my hon. friend from Brome classically says these efforts were futile. But a few short months ago I chanced to read an address by the present president of Toronto University in which he gave the secret away, and he mentioned that Dr. Macallum used to get $4,000 in that institution. He was brought down here and was provided with a position affording much more time for recreation than occupation, and was paid $10,000 a year. So far as I am aware, neither the House nor the country has ever been given a single proof of any practical work accomplished by Dr. Macallum or this Council of Scientific and Industrial Research. I am not charging the present Government, still less my right hon. friend, with having been the initiators of this method of public expenditure. In times past I recall that other gentlemen, supposed to be very eminent in the scientific world, were also engaged in alleged scientific occupations. To one gentleman we used to vote money annually—indeed, we may do so yet, for I have not scrutinized the Estimates with sufficient care to state definitely—for experiments in electric smelting. From time to time this gentleman interviewed himself and handed out information to the newspapers of wonderful accomplishments at the Soo in connection with electric smelting, but so far as a critical and cynical public ever knew the only thing he turned out were some paper weights. I remember I was favoured with one.

Sir GEORGE FOSTER: Have you got it yet?

Mr. MURPHY: I believe so. I hope to produce it here as Exhibit A to illustrate to the House and to the public what value we received for the expenditure of public money in this way. Now, Dr. Macallum has resigned and no successor has been appointed?

Sir GEORGE FOSTER: No permanent successor.

Mr. MURPHY: Is the $10,000 being paid to anybody else?

Sir GEORGE FOSTER: Not at the present time.

Mr. MURPHY: Is it to be paid to anybody in the future?

Sir GEORGE FOSTER: I cannot tell; that will depend on the reorganization.

Mr. MURPHY: In any event the work is going on without Dr. Macallum?

Sir GEORGE FOSTER: Yes.

Mr. MURPHY: I submit, Mr. Chairman, that that is the most eloquent commentary that need be made on the value of Dr. Macallum's services to the country in return for his $10,000 a year. I am not criticising my right hon. friend, in fact, I do not know if his department has had the supervision of this Council from its inception, but, to use his own phrase again: "honest injun, now," isn't it about time we stopped providing for these gentlemen? They are all quite respectable, but none, I submit, renders any service of practical value to this country for the money received. Just take the illustration given to the committee a few minutes ago by my right hon. friend of the expenditure of some $5,000 as a retainer and honorarium, with travelling expenses thrown in, for a gentleman in Toronto to instruct people down in Prince Edward Island in fox-breeding—people who have forgotten more than this gentleman will ever know about foxes. If my right hon. friend requires any information on fox-breeding, all he need do is move down a few seats to the hon. member from Prince Edward Island (Mr. McIsaac), who will no doubt enlighten him. The report the right hon. gentleman read contains no practical information regarding fox-breeding that was not known before, and much more accurately by the people who are engaged in the industry in Prince Edward Island. All Governments have been sinners in this respect, they have yielded to the importunities of pestering friends, and jobs of this kind have been created for people who have nothing else to do, or who in public competition with practical men could not earn enough for their keep, to use a common phrase. In view of the serious financial situation of the country, I submit to my right hon. friend that he could render no greater national service at the present time than to ask the committee to drop this item.

Mr. FIELDING: The suggestion of the hon. member for Russell (Mr. Murphy) seems to be that Dr. Macallum was furnished with a soft and easy job, to repeat an expression which is sometimes used in the Government service. Yet the strange fact is that Dr. Macallum seems to have voluntarily resigned that job and gone where his services are appreciated. That would suggest to me that Dr. Macallum is more entitled to commendation than criticism. Without going into details, and particularly without undertaking to sit in judgment on this foxy business, I wish to say that in regard to some general system for carrying on scientific research in Canada I am cordially with the Government, and I think it is desirable that it should be encouraged. Of course, it should be conducted in a practical way and should be devoted to the development of the natural resources of the country. We have suffered in the past because other countries have given more attention to scientific research than we have. It is a matter of notoriety that much of the success of Germany in industrial affairs was due to scientific research. I have not sufficient knowledge of these matters to go into details, but I do wish to go on record as heartily supporting every effort to employ scientific men to the end that they may devote their talents to the development of the natural resources of Canada. I do hope that if there are any defects in details the criticisms offered today will be taken into consideration, but on the main question of having some well defined system of scientific research I wish to give my cordial support to the action taken by the Government.

Mr. NICHOLSON (Algoma): Statements have been made that the money voted for the purposes of scientific and industrial research has literally been thrown away. In my judgment, as one who has had something to do with practical affairs, instead of the vote being cut down it should be very materially increased if the country could possibly afford it. We are lagging behind industrially because we are away behind scientifically. The tremendous waste that is taking place every day could be avoided if we had the leadership of just such men as Dr. Macallum, to give our industrial leaders the scientific direction which they require. We could pay our national debt out of the waste that is involved in our industries every day. In northern Ontario during the whole period of the war we were importing iron ore from the United States and smelting it into shell when the ore itself only carried thirty per cent of iron. At the same time we were mining ore in northern Ontario, taking it out to the roasting beds, destroying vegetation, and roasting out of it twenty-three per cent sulphur, then at very great expense putting it through the

smelter and securing only fifty to sixty per cent iron because we have not developed any scientific process to make it possible to separate the precious and coarse metals in the one operation. In those slag heaps there is enough iron to keep every rolling mill in Canada going if we had a process by which the iron could be saved. That is the kind of thing that is going on. My hon. friend from Shelburne and Queen's (Mr. Fielding) thinks it is very strange that Dr. Macallum, who was head of the Research Council, should have resigned this fat job that he was holding down, I suppose my hon. friend would consider, as an ornament to society or as the head of a mutual admiration society. Well, why did he resign? Because his worth was recognized by a commercial organization which is willing to give him just double the salary that he was receiving as head of the Research Council.

Mr. MURPHY: Does the hon. gentleman state as a fact that Dr. Macallum is now receiving twice the salary he was receiving before?

Mr. NICHOLSON (Algoma): I am credibly informed that Dr. Macallum has been engaged on a five year contract at $20,000 a year and expenses. I am confident, without having any more than a passing acquaintance with Dr. Macallum, that those who have employed him would not have done so were they not confident that he would earn his salary. But leaving Dr. Macallum out of the question altogether, if this country is going to advance as it should, we should increase this item rather than decrease it. We should strengthen the hands of the Research Council by giving them a laboratory here in Ottawa where this work can be carried on. I know scores of cases in which men who wanted to get a certain commodity or product analyzed in this country could not do so; they had to go to the United States or to some other country in order to get the information. The committee of the House which dealt with this matter heard the evidence of the heads of the universities, to whom the member for Brome (Mr. McMaster) referred, and it was recommended by those gentlemen that a research institute be established and properly equipped with laboratories where research work could be carried on under the most favourable conditions. It will be seen by the evidence given by the heads of the universities before this committee that they do not agree with the view of the member for Brome that this research work should be done in the universities. They say that the business of the men in the universities is to teach what others search out for then and place in their hands, and that if you double up the work—well, the member for George Etienne Cartier (Mr. Jacobs) shakes his head. But it was the view of all these gentlemen that the man engaged in the teaching profession in the university is not in a position properly to carry on research work. I do not wish to labour the question, but I repeat that instead of reducing this amount we should look forward to increasing it and to giving the Research Council all the necessary facilities for properly carrying out this very important work.

Mr. JACOBS: Are the professors to whom the right hon. gentleman referred in the document which he read—those engaged in the fox farming industry—veterinarians?

Sir GEORGE FOSTER: The associate committee which is carrying on the investigation consists of five professors of biochemistry and physiology and two representatives of the Department of Agriculture, one of whom is Dr. Torrance, Veterinary Director General, Health of Animals branch. I should just like to reply briefly to the statements made by my hon. friend from Russell (Mr. Murphy). As an exhibition of good-natured banter and persiflage, of its kind, it was excellent; but the very same type of speech has been made on numerous occasions for many years past with reference to scientific men engaged in the work of research. This patient, tireless, exhaustive work does not show itself from day to day, but it frequently results in some discovery, either of synthesis or of analysis, some discovery of the relations of materials and their effects in combination, which puts into the world's productive industries millions upon millions of money and into the economic use of the country products which it otherwise would not have and at lower prices than would otherwise be the case. My hon. friend spoke about Dr. Macallum. I am loath to bring Dr. Macallum's name here; his affairs are his own affairs. But I can tell my hon friend that neither before he took this position nor since has Dr. Macallum been obliged to beg for offers of emolument or for the highest positions. He is at this moment loaned to the Rockefeller Institute, having been selected by them for special work in China during five, six or seven months. Before he was appointed head of the Research Council he received an offer of a position in

another capacity, involving scientific work, at a salary of $15,000 a year, which he refused because he did not care to leave Canada. Dr. Macallum was not my appointment, nor was his appointment ever pressed upon me by anyone selfishly interested. He was chosen on the recommendation of the twelve eminent men from our universities and in our public life who were appointed upon the Advisory Council. My hon. friend asks for results. The results brought about by scientific research are slow in their processes, often disappointing in their leads, but where they do work out well they are of inestimable value to the productive interests of the country. One result which has been brought about is this: within a month or two, perhaps less, there will be in operation in the Northwest a process for the carbonization of low lignites, making them capable of withstanding the rough handling of transportation as anthracite does, and therefore opening the way to a countless advantage for the people in that vast country as affecting fuel and motive power and, indeed, their general sustenance. When that is in operation successfully, as it will be, it will give the lead to an operation which will make the Northwest absolutely independent of the rest of the world, and when the Northwest gets its millions and millions of people, there are still untold milions of tons of lignite which may be put through those processes and which, therefore, may be made available as anthracite is now made available. In Great Britain itself a research council, upon which our research council is absolutely modelled, has been in operation for the last five years, and the British Government has appropriated more than £5,000,000 in order that they may carry out their researches, because when the war came on, Great Britain woke up and found that she was so far behind in this matter of industrial and scientific research that she was at the mercy of her enemies. She determined not to be at the mercy of her enemies any longer; she put her money into this work; she called her scientific men together, and they are working on exactly the same plan as our council is. Go to the United States and see what is being done there, go to our own manufacturers. I have before me to-day a pressing demand from one of the most extensive and practical producing industries in this country which is longing for this research and is willing to put its money into it and to have tried out its own difficulties in process working just as soon as the laboratory, which has been contemplated and of which my hon. friend has spoken, is established here, if it is established in Ottawa. There is this call for it, from all parts of the country, and depend upon it we make no mistake; I am quite of opinion that we must be careful and wise in our selections and the like of that; but I have seen the workings and the spirit of that advisory council for two and one-half years, and I am bound to stand for the work they are doing and the fidelity with which they have attached themselves to that work.

Mr. MURPHY: With the hon. member for East Algoma (Mr. Nicholson) and with the Minister of Trade and Commerce, I am in hearty accord as to the desirability of applying science to Canadian industry as rapidly and generally as possible; but neither of these gentlemen told the committee, because neither of them could do so, that any practical result or benefit to Canadian industry has resulted from the work of this Advisory Council of Industrial and Scientific Research.

Sir GEORGE FOSTER: I just mentioned one.

Mr. MURPHY: My right hon. friend is one of the cheeriest optimists in Canada, and that excellent quality develops and increases as time goes by, and I commend him heartily for it. He mentioned that in a couple of months he expected that so-and-so would likely happen in connection with production of some of the lignite in the West. With him I hope that will be the case. My criticism is not based on any objection to the application of science and industry; quite the reverse; my objection is that real scientists with a practical knowledge of industrial chemistry have not been engaged, and I will give my right hon. friend my authority for saying so. I think the minister, my hon. friend from Algoma and other gentlemen in the House, will not be disposed to question my authority. Having the general knowledge that a person goes through college and university has about scientific subjects, without having devoted himself to the pursuit of the study of anyone of them in particular, I was anxious to find out from gentlemen competent to speak, what was the practical value to Canadian industry of the work of this Advisory Council. In looking about for the quarter to which I might address my inquiry, it occurred to me that I could not address it to any better informed quarter than to the Canadian Manufacturers' Association. I, therefore, made inquiry there, and I was told by one of the most

competent officials of that association—and I need not mention either to the minister or to the hon. member for East Algoma that the Canadian Manufacturers' Association makes a specialty of employing competent officials—that while Dr. Macallum might be very eminent as a bio-chemist in a university, he was absolutely useless as an industrial chemist in connection with the industries of this country; that he had absolutely no knowledge on that subject, and the council of which he was a member produced no practical results. The opinion of this official of the Canadian Manufacturers' Association was that no practical results would follow from the work of this Advisory Council of Industrial and Scientific Research until chemists with a knowledge of industrial chemistry were employed in connection with it. That is my reason for the statement that I have made; that is the information I got, and that is the quarter from which I received it. My right hon. friend has described the results that flow from the application of science to industry. My right hon. friend used the phase that it was slow in its processes. In that respect this council measures up to the definition. We in Canada—and in this regard I want to point out that I am in perfect accord with the hon. member for East Algoma—need the application of chemistry and science to Canadian industry; but I desire to see whatever money may be voted for that purpose applied in the proper way, the way to produce results applied, for instance, in connection with those who may be engaged to conduct those scientific inquiries, in securing the services of men who not only have scientific knowledge but are able to apply that knowledge practically. The fact that, according to my informant of the Canadian Manufacturers' Association, not one single practical result has so far flowed to Canadian industry from the work of this council, is the strongest possible criticism that may be offered with regard to expenditures of moneys that have in the past been voted for this purpose. An I said in my opening remarks, I do not offer these observations by way of criticism of the Government, still less of the minister in charge of the Estimates; I am offering them to the committee as a reason why either this vote should be discontinued or a very different method pursued in future in the expenditure of the money.

Mr. MANION: As one of those who some twenty years ago was a student of Dr. Macallum in Toronto University, I have listened on different occasions in this House to criticisms of that gentleman, and while I should not like to pass upon his ability as a bio-chemist, or on his ability in the position which he occupied on this Research Council, I should like to say this in justice to him, and I think it is only fair that someone should say it. Twenty years ago Dr. Macallum was one of the few men Canada had ever produced who had an international reputation in science. Dr. Macallum's name was known in every civilized country in the world in which the scientific branch which he taught at Toronto University was studied. I mention that in passing because I think it is only just that should be said about him. It is an absolute fact that cannot be denied by anybody who knows the subject which he taught to the students in Toronto University. I should like also to say that there have been various investigating committees in England looking into the industrial life of that country and wondering why it was not going ahead as it should have done, particularly since the war, and I have seen reports which stated that one of the main reasons why the industrial life of England was not going ahead was because Germany, for example, went into industrial research work on a much greater scale than England. It was also pointed out that all these industrial research committees in Germany were working for the advancement of that country, and that many large industries there had these research committees working for them. They would often find that a man or a body would be engaged on investigations for a number of years before accomplishing any result which would be of use to the industry, but then after many years work results would be attained which would be very beneficial to the industry and fully justify the length of time that had been taken up by the investigation. The Industrial Research Council of Canada has been in existence for only a short time, and I think we should wait with patience for a while at least to give them an opportunity to bring forth results which I believe will be of great benefit to the Dominion of Canada. I believe personally that a research council of some kind should be maintained to a reasonable extent, I think it is one of the most needed requirements of this country at the present time.

Mr. McMASTER: I do not wish to detain the committee at any lenght, but I desire to say just a few words in reply to

the observations made by the hon. member for East Algoma. I would hardly agree with him in his statement that the university is not the proper place for research.

Mr. NICHOLSON (East Algoma): That was not my statement, but the statement of the presidents of the universities and the professors in the universities, made to a committee of this House.

Mr. McMASTER: I was just going to take that up. I could hardly imagine that the Principal of McGill University made any such statement. My recollection is that this committee sat within a year. Prior to that the Principal of McGill had been laid aside by a paralytic stroke, and his successor was only appointed within the last few months. At any rate, if the president did make such a statement I cannot agree with him. I think the whole history of research is contrary to that statement. If we take McGill University for instance, we find among the scientific discoverers who have shone in Canada in recent years, such men as Professor Rutherford, who was a professor at McGill, Professor Nicholson, also of McGill, Sir William Dawson, a principal of McGill, and one of the greatest discoverers in geology that we ever had, and Professor Barnes who was one of the great discoverers of the action of freezing water and eminent in scientific research along that line. Then if we go to the Old Land we remember that the great surgical discoverer, Lord Lister, was a professor at Glasgow if I mistake not, that the discoverer of chloroform, Sir James Simpson, was a professor at Edinburgh, and that Lord Kelvin was a professor at Glasgow. If we look at the history of scientific research in Great Britain and Canada we shall find that a large proportion of the most eminent men were college professors. My hon. friend from East Algoma made the statement that a man could not be an investigator on research work and be a professor at the same time. I hardly think that is correct. But I would have him and the House remember that a university has advanced students, such as the students of the graduate school of Johns Hopkins University, probably the greatest school for research in the whole of North America. I am, however, opposed to the idea of incurring expense for laboratories, which would be expensive to maintain, here in Ottawa. These laboratories should be at the universities, where the best work, in my humble opinion, can be done. I would not like the hon. member for East Algoma or any other hon. member of the House to think for a moment that I am opposed to the application of science to industry. We are all in favour of it. It is simply a question of what is the best way to arrive at the desired end.

Mr. VIEN: I should like to inquire what formalities have to be complied with in order to obtain the services of the Research Council.

Sir GEORGE FOSTER: If my hon. friend wants information with reference to any particular scientific research problem, just make application to the Chairman of the Council. If in the operation of an industry he comes up against a difficulty which puzzles him, an exact statement of his problem should be sent tc the Research Council. It would then be taken into consideration, and if they thought it was of sufficient importance to work out, they would hand it over to some person who was au fait in that particular line of research, and through a bursary or fellowship he could be given the means to defray his expenses while he was at work on that problem. That, however, cannot be thoroughly and efficiently done without a central laboratory, and we shall have a discussion on that in the future.

Mr. VIEN: Is it the intention of the Government to take advantage of the Advisory Research Council for furthering investigation into the electrical treatment of titaniferous iron ores? The Government some years ago spent quite a large sum of money studying the treatment in electrical furnaces of these titaniferous ores, and if I remember rightly, they sent Dr. Stansfield of McGill University to Sweden and Norway and other countries to investigate the processes in vogue there. I understood from the report of Dr. Stansfield that titaniferous iron ores could be successfully treated in Canada provided we could get electrical power cheap enough, but that the development of the electric furnace had to be carried still further before any economic advantage could be taken of our deposits. Has the minister any information as to the activities of the board in that respect? If not, is it the intention of the Government to investigate this matter further with a view to utilizing our deposits?

Sir GEORGE FOSTER: If I mistake not, the laboratory which is carried on by the

Mines Department has had that subject before it and has conducted research with reference to it. Does my hon. friend remember to whom Dr. Stansfield made his report?

Mr. VIEN: To the Mines Department.

Sir GEORGE FOSTER: Well, I am quite certain that the Advisory Council has not undertaken any ambitious work in that respect. It is a pretty costly undertaking, and I suppose they have not felt themselves in a position to do anything in that direction.

Mr. VIEN: I do not think the experiment would be extremely costly in view of the developments which have been made in the electrical furnace. There is only the question of the magnetic selection of ores after they have been crushed, so that the iron ore might be obtained and the titaniferous portion be so reduced as to be economically treated afterwards in the electrical furnace. I think this would be of great interest to the province whence I come, because we have there in large quantities deposits of titaniferous ores, and also of oriferous and iron ores. In the county of Charlevoix there are deposits which were exploited about forty or fifty years ago, but operations had to be discontinued owing to the economic difficulties that had to be contended with. They could not compete with iron ores free from titaniferous alloy. I think the Advisory Council would find that it is not so expensive to complete the investigations already carried on under the direction of the Mines Department by Dr. Stansfield. I do not think very much study of the subject is necessary.

Sir GEORGE FOSTER: I will bring the matter to the attention of the council.

Item agreed to.

Inspection and Sale Act, administration of, $2,500.

Mr. CAHILL: What is it that is inspected?

Sir GEORGE FOSTER: Hides, leather, etc.; the payment is chiefly by fees.

Mr. VIEN: Are there any grants in this?

Sir GEORGE FOSTER: This is all for the principal inspector.

Mr. McCOIG: Are any of the officials in connection with this matter paid any fees?

Sir GEORGE FOSTER: This is the salary of Elzéar Côté, who is the inspector of hides for Quebec. It also includes expenses in connection with the inspection of hides and the supervising of binder twine, $250, stationery and printing, $130. The salary of Cote is $1,620.

Item agreed to.

International Customs Tariffs' Bureau, $1,400.

Mr. CAHILL: What is this?

Sir GEORGE FOSTER: This is larger than the vote of last year because during the war, for two years, no appropriation was made. The work went on, not as efficiently as before, but still it was continued. This is an added appropriation to cover expenses. We pay a certain proportion, about $600 a year, as our share.

Mr. PEDLOW: On page 105 of the Estimates, I find an item for a similar proposition. I would call the attention of the minister to item No. 12, which is similar to this item. Will be explain the reason for these items appearing under two different heads in the Estimates? The item on page 105 is:

Chief, Foreign Tariff's Division.

Sir GEORGE FOSTER: That is an entirely different thing. This is a fee that we pay to the International Customs arrangement which gathers together the tariffs of all the different countries and keeps track of their changes, distributing the information to the associate nations. We are one of the associate countries and we pay this $600 a year as our contribution towards the maintenance of this arrangement.

Mr. PEDLOW: The information given me the other night in regard to the other item is practically the same as the statement now made by the minister.

Sir GEORGE FOSTER: It was an explanation along similar lines. We have to keep a staff here for the collation of that information and its distribution to our own people.

Mr. PARENT: Who determines Canada's contribution?

Sir GEORGE FOSTER: A certain sum is necessary for carrying on this work, and it is divided as fairly as possible among the associate nations. The amount is only small.

Mr. PARENT: According to the Auditor General's report, Canada has not paid anything for six years. At page Z-30 I find the following item:

International Customs Tariffs Bureau—Canada's share of cost for six years to March 31, 1920, $3,972.

Apparently the department has to wait quite a long while to ascertain what its share is to the general fund.

Sir GEORGE FOSTER: The information I have here is just as I have given it. However, I will look into what my hon. friend has said:

Item agreed to.

West India Cable, $38,933.33.

Sir GEORGE FOSTER: This is the customary vote under the contract. The contract is one entered into between the British Government, ourselves, and the West Indian colonies. Its purpose was to extend cable connection between the various West India Islands and to provide for a reduction in the tolls charged for the service. The British Government pays the same amount as we do. The contract has two years yet to run. The different West Indian governments pay proportionally. The service was considered necessary, and as we were interested in it we contribute towards the subsidy.

Mr. FIELDING: Is it paid to the Cable Company?

Sir GEORGE FOSTER: Yes.

Mr. VIEN: When was the service established?

Sir GEORGE FOSTER: About six or seven years ago.

Mr. CAHILL: What is the real purpose of the service? Is it for commercial purposes only or for news and general purposes?

Sir GEORGE FOSTER: It is for commercial purposes and for the sending of any messages that anyone wants to send; it is not a newspaper service. It represents about four thousand miles which is served by the companies which are subsidized.

Mr. VIEN: Is this regarded as a subsidy to the cable companies?

Sir GEORGE FOSTER: Yes.

Item agreed to.

Printing of Parliamentary and Departmental publications, including cost of translation, $125,000.

[Sir George Foster.]

Sir GEORGE FOSTER: This is a new vote as it appears here and is following out the resolution of Parliament which, instead of paying for the printing done by departments, now asks that the departments pay for their own printing, Parliament paying what is necessary for its own purposes. All the departments come under the resolution referred to, which I consider a very salutary one. The departments formerly acted under the belief that Parliament would pay the whole of their printing bills, and were probably less careful in the matter of printing. The new policy throws the cost of printing upon the department which is responsible for it.

Mr. FIELDING: Each department will have its own printing done?

Sir GEORGE FOSTER: Yes.

Mr. CAHILL: Is the cost of the new distribution service that the hon. member for Durham (Mr. Rowell) used to conduct from here included in this vote?

Sir GEORGE FOSTER: The news service for the hon. member for Durham?

Mr. CAHILL: The news service formerly conducted by the ex-President of the Privy Council?

Sir GEORGE FOSTER: There is no news service by the hon. member for Durham.

Mr. CAHILL: I am glad to know the minister acknowledges that it did exist.

Sir GEORGE FOSTER: I do not know what my hon. friend is referring to.

Mr. VIEN: I would like to know of the cost of the Canadian Record, which used to be published under the ex-President of the Privy Council, is included in this item?

Sir GEORGE FOSTER: No, nothing of the kind. This covers departmental printing done by the Trade and Commerce Department entirely, and that department undertakes no news service such as was carried on formerly by the Publicity Department conducted under the President of the Privy Council.

12 m.

Mr. VIEN: Is there any news service carried on at present?

Sir GEORGE FOSTER: I cannot speak as to what is being carried on under the President of the Privy Council, but I am of the opinion that the news service such as we formerly had is now a thing of the past.

Mr. PARENT: I believe last year all the Government printing was done through a certain department which controlled the distribution of the material that every department had to print. May I ask the minister if this change means that the minister himself will have charge of the distribution of the material for printing?

Sir GEORGE FOSTER: There is no change made at all in the distribution itself. This simply applies to the bill for the printing.

Mr. FIELDING: At the Printing Bureau?

Sir GEORGE FOSTER: Yes.

Item agreed to.

Progress reported.

On the motion of the Right Hon. Sir George Foster the House adjourned at twelve o'clock midnight.

Friday, April 1, 1921

The House met at Three o'clock.

FUEL SUPPLY PROBLEM

Right Hon. ARTHUR MEIGHEN (Prime Minister): I beg to move—subject, I think it must be, to unanimous consent:

That a special committee consisting of Messrs: Steele, Blair, Cowan, Keefer, Hocken, Douglas (Cape Breton South and Richmond), Ross, McKenzie, Lemieux and Maharg, be appointed to inquire into all matters pertaining to the future fuel supply of Canada, with power to send for persons, papers and records, to examine witnesses under oath and to report from time to time.

This is in pursuance of a resolution of the House debated a few days ago.

Mr. SPEAKER: In the absence of notice, this motion, I believe, does require the unanimous consent of the House.

Motion agreed to.

CRIMINAL CODE AMENDMENT

Mr. P. F. CASGRAIN (Charlevoix-Montmorency): In the absence of the member for Jacques Cartier (Mr. Lafortune) I beg to move for leave to introduce Bill No. 52. to amend the Criminal Code.

Mr. MEIGHEN: Explain.

Mr. CASGRAIN: The folowing section is inserted immediately after Section 229 of the Criminal Code, Chapter 146 of the Revised Statutes of Canada:

229a. Everyone is guilty of an indictable offence and liable to two years imprisonment or a penalty not exceeding one hundred dollars, or both, who

(a) In any premises under his control, to which the public have access, engages in or permits other persons to engage in the game known as "Three Card Monte" or similar game played with other instruments than cards,

(b) Engages in the game of Three Card Monte, or similar game played with other instruments than cards, in any public place, or any place to which the public have access.

The member for Jacques Cartier himself could explain the Bill more fully than I can. It has for its object, however, the preventing of the extortion of money from people in the city of Montreal through the carrying on of a crooked confidence game which has been flourishing there for some time. The law does not seem to be very clear on this subject; the courts have had difficulty in finding any authority upon which to base the conviction of culprits who have been found guilty of engaging in this practice.

Motion agreed to, and Bill read the first time.

PRIVATE BILLS

FIRST READINGS

Bill No. 45 for the relief of William Henry Coulson.—Mr. Hocken.

Bill No. 46 for the relief of Elizabeth Alexander.—Mr. Douglas (Strathcona).

Bill No. 47 for the relief of William Gleaves Doyle.—Mr. Best.

Bill No. 49 for the relief of Dorothy Mearuel Score.—Mr. Fripp.

Bill No. 50 for the relief of Henry William Maynard.—Mr. Middlebro.

CANADIAN NATIONAL RAILWAYS—SECTION MEN

On the Orders of the Day:

Mr. C. A. GAUVREAU (Temiscouata): I would like to put a question to the Minister of Railways and Canals (Mr. Reid): On my way to Rivière du Loup during the recess I heard that one man working on a section of the railway had been dismissed. This is a matter of public importance, having regard to the safety of the road.

Mr. SPEAKER: I hope the hon. gentleman does not, on the Orders of the Day, purpose putting a question in respect to the dismissal of one man on the Intercolonial Railway.

Mr. GAUVREAU: I think it is in the public interest that we should know.

Mr. SPEAKER: Everything which takes place in the House of Commons should be in the public interest. There is, however, an opportunity to put a question of this kind on tne Order Paper in the ordinary way.

Mr. GAUVREAU: I would not take that trouble, Mr. Speaker, because it would take too long, and I want an answer at once. I would like to know if an order has been issued to dispense with the services of one man on every section of the road.

Hon. J. D. REID (Minister of Railways and Canals): The hon. gentleman knows that the management of the Canadian National Railways is not under the Department of Railways and Canals, but under the Board of Management; therefore no orders have been given by the Minister of Railways.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: May I ask what department the Board of Management is under?

Hon. Mr. REID: There is a Board of Management appointed for the operation of the Canadian National Railways—appointed by statute, not by the Minister of Railways. In reply to the hon. member, I stated that no orders, therefore, had been issued by the Minister of Railways or by the Department of Railways.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: Are we to understand that the Board of Management is not responsible to any department of the Government?

Mr. MEIGHEN: The hon. gentleman knows that the statute speaks for itself in that regard.

Mr. SPEAKER: I must submit in any event that this subject cannot be tried on the Orders of the Day.

CANADIAN GOVERNMENT MERCHANT MARINE—INFORMATION

On the Orders of the Day:

Mr. J. H. SINCLAIR (Antigonish and Guysborough): When the Minister of Marine (Mr. Ballantyne) made his statement on Tuesday with regard to the Government ships, he stated that he was willing to give the fullest information to members of the House. He used very broad language:

> That every contract made, every voucher paid, every letter and telegram exchanged between the Department and contractors is open for the fullest inspection of any member of the House who desires any further information.

[Mr. Gauvreau.]

Taking advantage of that pledge or promise I put a question with regard to the steamship Recruit and I got my answer yesterday that the Department did not know anything about it; that the matter was in the hands of some corporation in Toronto. I want to ask the Minister of Marine how he failed to implement the pledge that he gave to the members of this House on Tuesday with regard to this matter.

Hon. C. C. BALLANTYNE (Minister of Marine and Fisheries): The words that my hon. friend has referred to as having been used by me when presenting my statement to this House on Tuesday last pertain only, as he can easily tell by reading them over, to the letting of contracts for steel ships entered into between the Marine Department and the shipbuilder. It does not go any further.

Mr. JOSEPH ARCHAMBAULT (Chambly-Verchères): From the statement made by the Minister of Marine that this question will be considered by a special committee of Parliament, are we to understand that the Government has decided to adopt the fatherless child of the hon. member for Halifax?

Sir GEORGE FOSTER: Explain.

Mr. ARCHAMBAULT: The hon. member for Halifax (Mr. Maclean) has on the Order Paper a resolution calling for the appointment of a committee. Does the Minister of Marine and Fisheries refer to that committee when, in his answer, he says that all these questions will be considered by a special committee of Parliament?

Mr. MEIGHEN: As I made the statement with regard to a special committee in a previous debate in this House, I may say that it is the intention to move that a special committee be appointed to consider just such subjects as were referred to by me in my speech and as were referred to by the Minister of Marine and Fisheries in answer to these questions.

Mr. SINCLAIR (Antigonish and Guysborough): Are we to understand that the committee is to decide what questions are confidential and what are not?

Mr. MEIGHEN: A committee does not decide, it reports. The special committee will report on such subjects as are referred to it. The subjects referred to it will be such as were indicated by myself in that speech.

Mr. ARCHAMBAULT: Are we to understand that all the details of operation of the Canadian Government Merchant Marine and the Canadian National railways will be considered by that special committee?

Mr. MEIGHEN: I have not said so.

Mr. SPEAKER: There can be no cross-examination of the Government upon the Orders of the Day.

Mr. ARCHAMBAULT: Surely I am entitled to an answer.

Mr. SPEAKER: Not upon the Orders of the Day. The hon. gentleman will have ample opportunity on several occasions during the sittings of the House; but I must point out, as I have on previous occasions, that there is no right, inherent or otherwise, on the part of hon. members on the Orders of the Day to submit questions except with regard to returns and matters pertaining to the business of the House. There has, however, been on the part of the Chair always a desire to permit questions of public and of such urgent character that it would be undesirable if they were left on the Order Paper for several days before being answered. But there can be no cross-examination of the Government as to policy or otherwise. Furthermore, in no case could there be submitted a question which tended to reflect upon or call in question the policy of the Government. That rule has always been rigorously adhered to in all instances.

Mr. THOMAS VIEN (Lotbinière): Will a statement be made public as to the administration of the Canadian Mercantile fleet, or will the only information be that which was put on Hansard the other day?

Hon. C. C. BALLANTYNE (Minister of Marine and Fisheries): The only statement which the Government will make is the one that I presented to the House on Tuesday last; but the operating company will also embody the report of their directors—and, I should imagine, rather fully—in their annual report when it is issued.

Mr. VIEN: Will the report of the managing company be distributed amongst the members?

Mr. LEMIEUX: And when?

Mr. BALLANTYNE: I cannot inform the hon. gentleman definitely now. I will find out and let him know at the next session of the House.

CANADIAN LOAN TO ROUMANIA

On the Orders of the Day:

Mr. S. W. JACOBS (George Etienne Cartier): A newspaper despatch announced last night that the Canadian mission in London had arranged to accept Roumanian Government bonds bearing interest at 7 per cent, to cover indebtedness due by the Roumanian Government for credits which were granted a few sessions ago, and it is further stated that the interest on the loan will be paid to-day. I should like to ask the Government whether, seeing that the banks are now closed for the day, the money is to the credit of the Canadian Government, or whether this is merely a cruel hoax on the part of the Roumanian Government, as this is "All Fools'" day.

Right Hon. ARTHUR MEIGHEN (Prime Minister): I do not receive hourly or momentary reports from the banks as to what money is paid in, and I have not knowledge of the subject to enable me to answer the question. I will bring the matter to the attention of the Minister of Finance.

QUEBEC CITADEL

On the Orders of the Day:

Mr. C. G. POWER (Quebec South): I should like, with your permission, Sir, and for the purpose of asking a question, to read certain extracts from the Quebec Telegraph of March 30, with reference to the rocks from the Citadel threatening the inhabitants of a certain portion of the city of Quebec.

Mr. SPEAKER: I have no desire to object to the hon. gentleman submitting his question because it may be of an urgent character, although perhaps local in its nature. If the lives of people are endangered through lack of attention on the part of the Government, it may be proper to put the question; but the hon. member is not called upon to read a newspaper article in order to put his question. He might summarize it.

Mr. POWER: The newspaper report sums up the situation probably better than I could do so. As regards urgency, these rocks are falling at almost the identical place where a great landslide occurred some years ago, causing a number of people to loss their lives, so that the question is really one of some urgency and of more than local importance.

Mr. SPEAKER: I think the hon. gentleman has submitted his case sufficiently to put the question to the Government and get the answer he desires.

Mr. POWER: There is just one more thing I wish to say, namely, that the city disclaims all responsibility, and it was to that portion of the article that I wished to call the attention of the Minister of Militia.

Hon. HUGH GUTHRIE (Minister of Militia and Defence): I will see that the matter is communicated to the officers of the department and that they be instructed to take any precautions we should take in the matter. I do not know who is liable in such a case.

SUPPLY.

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

Trade and Commerce—Canada Grain Act, administration of, $1,175,000.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: Will the minister explain the increase of $175,000?

Sir GEORGE FOSTER: This appropriation covers the operations under the supervision of the Board of Grain Commissioners in carrying out the operations authorized under the Canada Grain Act. The increase of $175,000 over last year is almost, if not entirely, due to reclassification and the raising of salaries consequent thereupon. This appropriation covers all expenditures for salaries of officials, permanent and temporary, and contingencies of the various officers under the eastern and western grain inspection division; it includes salaries and contingencies of the Board of Grain Commissioners, the working expenses of all Government elevators, internal and at port terminals, and salaries and expenses of the grain research laboratory, with the exception of the chief chemist, who is on the Civil Service list and whose salary has already been passed. I may say generally with reference to this service that it is self-sustaining, and a little more than that, varying from year to year according to the crop. For the year 1920-1921 up to January 31, the fees collected amounted to $1,118,813, which is a little larger than the revenue for the whole year 1919-1920, so that we may expect to find, when the accounts are closed to the 31st of March, that the total receipts for the year have been considerably above those of the previous year; and if we have as good a crop next season the revenues on the same basis will meet the expenditure and probably leave something to the good. The aim is, as far as possible, to make the service pay its way. During the several years that the Grain Act has been in operation there have been years when there was a deficit, but since 1911 I have tried so to arrange it that whilst the charges shall not be so high as to bring in a great surplus, they shall be sufficient to meet the expenditure for the year, and leave a little surplus to go upon in case the returns for the following year are not so large.

Mr. BELAND: How many grain elevators has the Government?

Sir GEORGE FOSTER: The Government has a terminal elevator at Port Arthur, terminal elevators at Saskatoon, Moosejaw and Calgary, and a transfer elevator in Vancouver. There is also a bit of the foundation of an elevator in futuro at Hudson Bay, but that is not in operation at present so far as elevating grain is concerned.

Mr. BELAND: Are there any in the East?

Sir GEORGE FOSTER: The Government has elevators in the East at Port Colborne, operated by the railway department in connection with the railways, as well as elevators under the Harbour Commissioners in Montreal and Quebec. Then there is a small elevator in Halifax, which is in fact a transfer elevator.

Mr. BELAND: The Quebec elevator is not very busy, is it?

Sir GEORGE FOSTER: It has done some work, and I hope it will be busier in the future.

Mr. ARCHAMBAULT: Would the minister explain the increase of $175,000 in this item?

Sir GEORGE FOSTER: My hon. friend's question shows he was too busy conversing with his mate, because I have answered exactly the same question by the leader of the Opposition. I am not averse, however, to answering it again. The increase of $175,000 is due to the increases in salaries under re-classification. Altogether, under this vote some 429 employees are paid, so the increases spread over that number amount to a pretty tidy sum.

Mr. ARCHAMBAULT: I understand the country derives some revenue from this

item. Where can we find a statement of that?

Sir GEORGE FOSTER: I can give my hon. friend the figures.

Mr. ARCHAMBAULT: Are they not published?

Sir GEORGE FOSTER: I already gave them when my hon. friend was conversing.

Mr. LAVIGUEUR: What is the amount to be expended on the Quebec elevator out of this item?

Sir GEORGE FOSTER: Nothing has been expended on the Quebec elevator by us. It was built by the Harbour Commissioners of Quebec, out of loans advanced by the Dominion Government. The elevator is managed by the commission.

Mr. LAVIGUEUR: Has the Government nothing to do with its management?

Sir GEORGE FOSTER: No.

Mr. MICHAUD: The minister has given the elevators in the West and in the province of Quebec. How many are there in the Maritime Provinces?

Sir GEORGE FOSTER: I gave that information, but I will give it again. There is a small elevator at Halifax, used chiefly for transfer purposes. That is the only one the Government owns in the Maritime Provinces. The Government had an elevator, as my hon. friend will recollect, in St. John, but it was destroyed by fire. The Canadian Pacific have elevators on the west side, which do the grain transfer of the harbour.

Mr. ARCHAMBAULT: Are the revenues pertaining to this item published in the Trade and Commerce report?

Sir GEORGE FOSTER: Yes, I will give them to my hon. friend. The revenue for 1920-1921 up to January 31, was $1,118,813.

Mr. VIEN: How does that compare with the expenditure?

Sir GEORGE FOSTER: The expenditure that is asked to be voted for the coming year is $1,175,000. The expenditure up to January 31, 1921, was $982,431, but of course the accounts are not all in for the year ending to-day, nor even for the period up to January 31. The expenditure so far as the accounts have come in, is quite a bit less than the revenue up to January 31. There is no doubt that the revenue for the year ending to-day will be over and above the expenditure.

Mr. McKENZIE: Does the minister follow the financial year or the calendar year in adjusting these accounts?

Sir GEORGE FOSTER: The financial year.

Mr. SINCLAIR (Antigonish and Guysborough): I should like some information from the minister in connection with an answer which was given yesterday by the Minister of Finance to a question I asked. My question was, what were the approved securities forming part of the basis on which a large number of Dominion notes were issued. Dominion notes are authorized up to a certain number of millions of dollars, according to the gold kept in the vault. A change has been made in the statute by which not only gold but securities forming part of the basis on issue of Dominion notes. The question was, what are the particular securities on which this $127,000,000 of Dominion notes are issued? The Minister of Finance tells us that, among other things, Dominion of Canada bonds were one of the securities, others being bonds of the Canadian National Railways and assignments of grain and produce. How can grain and produce be used as a basis of currency in Canada?

Sir GEORGE FOSTER: What is the last phrase my hon. friend is reading?

Mr. SINCLAIR (Antigonish and Guysborough): A number of securities are specified, among others, assignments of grain and produce and demand notes of commercial houses endorsed by banks to the order of the Minister of Finance. Now, it was a new idea to me that grain and produce could be used as a basis of issue of notes for circulation in Canada. We were accustomed to the idea that Dominion notes must be based on gold, and I confess it was a rather startling idea to me that bonds of the Canadian Government,—a debt owed by the Government itself—could be used as a basis for the issue of further notes. That, however, is not the question I am asking now. The question is: By what means are grain and produce used as a basis for issuing Dominion notes?

Sir GEORGE FOSTER: I am not entirely conversant with the matter. The Minister of Finance will give more precise information to my hon. friend. But I suppose

that these are bankers' securities that they hold. It does not mean that grain in its passage through Canada can be, or is, in any way used as a basis for the issue of Dominion notes. It must mean that notes are issued on the strength of securities which the bankers have. However, I would prefer my hon. friend to take the matter up with the Minister of Finance.

Mr. VIEN: Will the minister please explain these items contained on page Z 12 of the Auditor General's report?

* Advances to George Searls, chief inspector, Winnipeg, $115,711. Advances to George Searls, chief inspector, Winnipeg, $129,445.57.

It seems that the Auditor General's report does not afford much information with regard to the expenditure of this money.

Sir GEORGE FOSTER: My hon. friend will quite understand the purpose of these advances. Mr. Searls is chief inspector of the whole of the grain business and has a large staff at Winnipeg working under him. All the samplers, graders, inspectors and clerks who have to carry on this manifold work must be paid, and an advance is put into the bank to the credit of Mr. Searls. When these salary cheques become due he checks out against that advance.

Mr. BELAND: His own personal cheques?

Sir GEORGE FOSTER: No, the cheques are all official. It may be that his is the last signature, but the cheques are thoroughly conserved as to security.

Mr. VIEN: Are all these employees under Civil Service Commission appointment?

Sir GEORGE FOSTER: They are all under Civil Service Commission appointment except those that are not.

Some hon. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

Sir GEORGE FOSTER: That statement sounds superfluous, no doubt, but I will explain the situation to my hon. friend. Those that are not under the Civil Service Commission are nevertheless under a certain regulation; according to the income of the grain at different seasons, or at different periods within active seasons, it is necessary to put on a certain number of temporary employees. Similarly, if a man goes out through sickness or any other cause someone must be put in his place. Now, it is obviously impossible to carry on these operations uninterruptedly if a written request for employees to fill these temporary positions must be sent to the Civil Service Commission. If such written applications were sent to the commission, the positions would have to be advertised, and that, of course, would consume so much time that in the interval the service would be disorganized. Under an arrangement with the Civil Service Commission, the staff officer out there, Mr. Searls, can put on these temporary employees as the necessity for them arises. They cannot be termed permanent because, after a little time, the rush is over and their services are immediately dispensed with. Trouble having become imminent in regard to temporary positions, I requested the Civil Service Commission to send one of their number to Winnipeg. He went into the whole matter with the authorities there, and this arrangement was agreed upon between them and is being carried out under the supervision of the Commission.

Mr. VIEN: What is the system that prevails in the appointment of these temporary employees?

Sir GEORGE FOSTER: I cannot give complete information regarding the whole modus operandi.

Mr. BELAND: Is it similar to the system in connection with the census?

Sir GEORGE FOSTER: No.

Mr. VIEN: What is the difference?

Sir GEORGE FOSTER: I know nothing about the matter so far as the temporary employees are concerned, neither do any of my officers. If Mr. Searls wants a man for any of the reasons I have given, he employs a proper individual who, in his judgment, is fitted for the work. These appointments are absolutely without the least shadow of patronage so far as my department or anybody else is concerned. They are within the entire control of the supervising officer himself.

Mr. VIEN: Who is one of the officers under my right hon. friend?

Sir GEORGE FOSTER: Yes; if he were not he would not be there.

Mr. VIEN: Then I am sure this gentleman will take into his serious consideration the advices he receives from my right hon. friend's supporter, the member for the particular locality, when he makes such appointments.

Sir GEORGE FOSTER: I am quite sure, because I have absolute knowledge, that

he acts on no recommendations, he takes recommendations from no person whatever. Any one may submit a name to him, but he acts entirely on his own responsibility. I hope my hon. friend will be serious about this matter.

Mr. VIEN: I am.

Sir GEORGE FOSTER: Two hundred and fifty thousand cars pass through that centre. They have their periods of congestions as also of diminished numbers, and Mr. Searls is absolutely responsible for getting these cars graded and checked through with the very minimum of delay. He is responsible for the grades, because they furnish the basis upon which commercial transactions go on. Being responsible, therefore, he is the only man to decide who these temporary employees shall be.

Mr. BELAND: Does he also settle the question of salaries or remuneration?

Sir GEORGE FOSTER: The question of remuneration is settled, under those circumstances, on the basis of the current wage for that kind of employment in the locality. That is the wage he pays. But he must have the men, he must carry on the work; and if he cannot get a man that suits him at that wage, he is at liberty to give him what is necessary. And this has the approval of the Civil Service Commission.

Mr. MAHARG: What opportunity has he for making a comparison with the wage that is paid elsewhere for similar work?

Sir GEORGE FOSTER: Mr. Searls is in the very centre of the grain business. He has been there, as my hon. friend knows, for a long period of years. He knows what an expert grader gets, and what the current wage is, and I do not know of any person in Winnipeg who would have a deeper or more comprehensive knowledge than he would in regard to the services for which he requires men.

Mr. MAHARG: I quite agree with what my right hon. friend has said because I know Mr. Searls intimately. But my point has reference to the minister's statement that Mr. Searls paid the current wage. Now there is no other similar work being carried on in the city of Winnipeg that I know of—there is only the one inspection bureau.

Sir GEORGE FOSTER: My hon. friend must surely be a little bit mistaken in that statement as regards men who are competent to grade grain. The work done in the other elevators, and by the other companies, gives Mr. Searls a line upon which he can base his determination. But outside of that, he knows the man he wants and he gets him by giving him what he considers necessary to obtain his services and to keep them. He also knows thoroughly well the wages that are current in other cities, outside of Canada itself, where graders are used. I do not know any one who would know the facts in that regard better than he.

Mr. MAHARG: I quite admit that Mr. Searls is quite qualified to estimate the ability of the man he is employing, but he has no other similar institution, such as there is elsewhere, which will enable him to make a comparison as to the wages that are paid—there is only the one inspection bureau in Winnipeg. It is different in other places. For example they have an independent inspection bureau on the other side of the line. That is something that we have for a long time been trying to get this Government to establish, but so far without success. I believe there should be a check maintained in that respect. That is why I raise the point.

While we are on the matter of inspection I would like to draw attention to another point. When the salaries in connection with the Grain Act, were under consideration a short time ago the stipend of the individual in charge of the laboratory in Winnipeg was under review. The hour was rather late and I did not press the point at that time, but I now wish to have a little further elucidation. The point arose in connection with the amount of moisture that was allowed in the grain to permit it to enter certain grades. If I remember correctly the minister said that that factor did not enter into the matter of grading to any extent—that the grading was done by the feel, the touch, and the appearance and colour of the grain. In reality the operation of grading goes much further. I believe there is a fixed standard and that 12.8 of moisture is permitted in the grain. Now we in the West have never been able, as yet, to find out just who has been responsible for the fixing of that amount of moisture which is permitted in the grain, other than the chief inspector. No doubt that official takes advice from other individuals. And that is where our quarrel arose. I remember

that at a sitting of the Grain Commission held in Winnipeg a few years ago this point came up. We always believed, and experience has proved, that the amount of moisture allowed in grain to enable it to enter storage in certain grades is much below the amount of moisture that grain will carry and keep. That has been proved before; but at the sitting in question representatives of the two largest milling concerns in Canada were present and they were much opposed to the amount of moisture being increased —that is the amount of moisture allowed in the different standards of grain. They claimed that they were continuously having trouble in disposing of their flour to the European buyers on account of the excess of moisture that was in the flour. We, as producers, were absolutely helpless in the face of that argument advanced by two responsible men. However, I took opportunity on the very first occasion that offered to make a little inquiry into the matter. I happened to be in the office of another of the largest milling concerns in Canada, who also have interests in the United States. I asked the manager of this firm if they were exporting large quantities of flour to the Old Country, and he replied in the affirmative. I then asked him if they had any difficulty or any complaint as to the amount of moisture that was contained in their flour, and he replied that they had absolutely never heard of a single complaint from any person. Now that mill was running day and night, including Sundays, on war orders, continuously during the war; and yet those people had received absolutely no complaint at all as to any excess of moisture in their flour milled from practically the same wheat as the other mills were milling from—the different concerns' elevators being scattered over the entire country. Now that is our complaint. There is a difference of anywhere from six to eight and ten cents a bushel in the price paid for grain, as between the straight grade and what is known as "tough." The mills are usually quite anxious to get the grain that is graded tough, as I think the reports of the chemist in Winnipeg if they are examined will show that that grade makes just as good wheat for milling purposes and can be used to as good advantage as even the straight grade. The only difference is the actual weight of the excess of moisture—one-half, one-quarter, or one per cent—which it may contain.

[Mr. Maharg.]

Mr. CURRIE: Has not the wheat got to be passed through a drier, which is an advantage?

Mr. MAHARG: No it does not have to be passed through a drier; it is simply run in with the other grain and there is no drying process—in fact moisture is added to it. Those who understand the milling business know that moisture has to be added to wheat in order to fit it for a proper working. Under the circumstances we would like to have this matter investigated a little further. We do not think that the man who is in charge of the inspection should say just what amount of moisture wheat should contain before it is permitted to enter certain grades. We are especially fortified in that opinion by reason of the evidence given at the sitting to which I alluded, where it was clearly shown that the inspector based his conclusions on the statement of the millers alluded to—statements which were absolutely contradicted by another firm who have practically as large milling interests, and as large an European market, as are possessed by those who appeared before the commission. I would like the minister to take this matter into consideration, as it means a very heavy loss to the farmers of western Canada for no reason whatever.

Some hon. MEMBERS: Carried.

Mr. MAHARG: Before the vote carries —I notice an item of $350,000 of revenue from the surplus fund of the Board of Grain Supervisors of Canada. I would like to know just how that money has been apportioned? Has it been allotted to assist in meeting the expense of the administration of the Canada Grain Act, or has it gone into the general revenue?

Sir GEORGE FOSTER: My hon. friend refers to the surplus that was left over after the Board of Grain Supervisors had finished their work?

Mr. MAHARG: Yes.

Sir GEORGE FOSTER: That went into the Consolidated Revenue Fund.

Mr. MAHARG: I would like to know if that is the only surplus that has gone into that fund from the handling of grain under the control of the Government at different times.

Sir GEORGE FOSTER: Yes. The surplus which remained, after all the accounts have been adjusted and the expenses pro-

vided for, went into the Consolidated Revenue Fund. The wheat board has been in charge during the succeeding season, and there will be a certain surplus over and above the expenses after the distribution of the $2.63 a bushel which has already gone into the farmers' hands. That surplus, however, is so small that it is absolutely impracticable to make a division of it amongst the holders of certificates—the expense of making the distribution would be almost as great as the amount to be distributed. But any small surplus will go into Consolidated Revenue Fund. As to whether there are any other surpluses, there were no other methods that I know of by which any could accrue to the Government on the handling of grain. My hon. friend may have sometning in mind, and if he mentions it I will be able to tell him clearly.

Mr. MAHARG: Was there any surplus from the first commandeering of certain quantities of wheat at the head of the lakes?

Sir GEORGE FOSTER: My impression is there was none. I will make inquiries and let my hon. friend know.

Mr. MAHARG: Am I right in understanding that this large increase of $175,000 in this vote is to provide for salaries under the reclassification?

Sir GEORGE FOSTER: Yes, that increase arises from reclassification.

Mr. MAHARG: What percentage of the total cost of administration is attributable to salaries?

Sir GEORGE FOSTER: I can give my hon. friend 1919-1920, which is a full year.

Mr. MAHARG: That is satisfacory.

Sir GEORGE FOSTER: The statement of expenditure for that year is as follows: Board of Grain Commissioners, salaries $21,200, wages, commissions and contingencies $9,522, making a total for the Board of Grain Commissioners and their staff of $30,722. In the western inspection division the salaries amounted to $219,300; wages and contingencies, $340,389, making a total of $559,691. In the eastern inspection division the total is $13,411. And in the Grain Research Laboratory the total is $9,244. Therefore the total for permanent salaries is $256,052, and for wages and contingencies $357,018, or together $613,070, the total expense of the Act being $925,597.

Mr. MAHARG: One hundred and seventy-five thousand dollars seems a very large increase on a little over six hundred thousand dollars. It would appear as though the Civil Service Commision was a rather expensive institution if its reclassification has resulted in similar increase all the way through.

Sir GEORGE FOSTER: My hon. friend will recollect that there are about 400 employees altogether, including temporary and permanent.

Mr. MAHARG: That does not affect the percentage. That percentage is tremendously high. It would be interesting to have comparative results in the case of a similar number of employees in any other department. We have heard both in the House and in the press a good deal about the appointment of a commission of inquiry into the grain trade. Will the expense of that inquiry be taken care of by these figures?

Sir GEORGES FOSTER: That would not come under these figures at all.

Mr. MAHARG: Of course, the appointment of that commission comes, indirectly at least, from the Department of Trade and Commerce?

4 p.m.

Sir GEORGE FOSTER: I presume so.

Mr. MAHARG: The personnel of that commission is of great interest to us in the West; in fact, the whole inquiry depends on the personnel. I do not know whether we are to pay attention to current rumours or not, but if some of the men whose names are mentioned are to be on that commission, the expenditure entailed will be absolutely thrown away. Among the names mentioned are those of two gentlemen, one a direct member and the other was secretary for years. The most important feature that needs investigation, it seems to me, is the working of that Grain Commission. Certain transactions we would like to have an opportunity of probing, for instance, the famous Curry case—11,000 bushels of wheat went out of one government elevator without anybody knowing anything about it. Now, the Grain Commission is absolutely responsible there, and in the investigation or suit entered to determine the ownership of this quantity of wheat in so far as I can find, not a single individual who had to do with the moving of that wheat from the elevator was called on the carpet. There are other things we would like to inquire into as well.

Sir GEORGE FOSTER: My hon. friend will have a full opportunity of criticising

the commission when it is appointed, and maybe it would be just as well to wait until that time, as then we will be certain we are criticising the proper parties.

Mr. MAHARG: I am not criticising the proposed commission, I am criticising the grain commission that has been in existence for years. To my mind there is absolutely no use in appointing a commission to inquire into the irregularities that have been mentioned across the floor of the House if the personnel of that commission is to include gentlemen who were or are connected with the Grain Commission which is responsible for some of those irregularities. If there is anything in the rumours I have referred to, the commission certainly will not appeal to the grain trade and the wheat producers in Western Canada.

Sir GEORGE FOSTER: We will see when the report comes out.

Mr. McKENZIE: Although we are not a grain producing country in Cape Breton we are very much interested in grain and its products, and I would like some further information on the grain question. The minister has been congratulated that notwithstanding the many changes which have taken place in the ministry which he adorns, his own department has been managed so satisfactorily by him that he has continued to remain at its head. For that reason we appeal to him with all the greater confidence for reliable information. I must congratulate the minister upon being able to give information which, whether or not it is always well founded, is pretty well rounded off and stands the test for the time being. Many years ago I suggested that the minister's department should be able to follow the grain through its various stages from the time it left the field until it got into the hands of the consumer and to be able at all times to tell the people whether or not they were getting a square deal. The price of flour at present is abnormal. For many years we got the very best flour available for $5 a barrel, sometimes for $4.50, but now we are paying as high as $16 a barrel, although the income of many men who have to buy that flour is pretty much at a standstill. The people who pay that big price expect their representatives in Parliament to ascertain some of the facts in connection with this very important staple article. I heard the minister say yesterday that the price of wheat had gone down very materially. Is that reduction in the price of wheat to be followed by a reduction in the price of flour? A western man who is very much interested in this business told me the other day that figuring a fair price for flour and counting four and one-half bushels of wheat to a barrel, flour should sell at $8 or $8.50 a barrel. Now, there is an enormous profit somewhere when a barrel which, it is stated, should sell at $8.50 or thereabouts actually sells at $16. The ordinary person has no power to inquire into these things. During the war the people were told that they could complain to their town council or municipal council of any exhorbitant charges made for the necessities of life, with a view to having the matter taken before a magistrate's court. That procedure was not of much avail; it was not productive of any serious results. These things must be dealt with by the machinery of government, and if it is a fact that the price of wheat has gone down and that wages are to some extent going down, the Department of Trade and Commerce should at least make it known authoritatively that there is no justification for these exorbitant and as it would appear to me extortionate, prices of flour. I am well informed that we have no honest competition in any trade in this country; that everything is divided off and that a combine of more or less potentiality exists with respect to all these things. The Government has cut off the head of the Board of Commerce; therefore they have taken the responsibility upon themselves. I bring these matters in all seriousness to the minister's attention in the hope that there shall be no combines, either in connection with grain or the activities of the millers or the wholesaling and retailing of flour, which will make possible the charging of extortionate prices. No one finds fault with the carrying on of business in a proper way and with a view to making legitimate profits, but the people do object to any combine which has the effect of restricting production and keeping up prices. I am sure that the minister has such a knowledge of his department as will enable him to take this matter in hand. It is not one which concerns me personally, because the quantity of flour I buy is very small.

Sir GEORGE FOSTER: The hon. gentleman eats oats mostly.

Mr. McKENZIE: Yes, I am largely an oats eater. I commend it to my right hon. friend or to anyone else, because it produces the proper kind of pugnacious material. As I say, I bring these matters to the attention of the minister in all serious-

ness on behalf of thousands of people who buy flour and have families to feed.

Mr. JOHNSTON: Following up the remarks of the hon. member for Maple Creek (Mr. Maharg) may I ask the minister if it is the intention of the Government to appoint a commission to inquire into the grain trade of this country?

Sir GEORGE FOSTER: There have been rumours that such is in the air, but I think all I can say to my hon. friend is that if a commission is to be appointed, announcement will be made to the House in due course. I cannot give him any other information.

Mr. JOHNSTON: Judging from the minister's answer a commission may or may not be appointed. I think there is no need for such a commission, because the present grain board have every power to investigate all matters pertaining to the grain trade. Why another commission should be appointed at great cost to the country is more than I can understand. Rumour also has it that in connection with the personnel of this commission the name of a member of the present board is mentioned. If anything of that kind is done it would only tend to create dissatisfaction and no good results would be obtained. The appointment of a new commission to deal with matters pertaining to the grain trade, would not, I am sure, meet with the approval of the producers of Western Canada. Unless it is an absolutely independent commission.

Mr. CURRIE: I quite agree that an independent commission should be appointed to investigate the whole matter. For instance, it would be very interesting for the farmers of Western Canada to know why, when the British Government was buying wheat in June last, they could not buy any in Canada, but they bought a whole year's supply in the United States at $3 a bushel, and then when there was no one buying wheat for Great Britain, how it was that wheat was sold short in Chicago and who benefited by that selling short. Those are matters involving $100,000,000. It is of far more importance to the western farmer to have those facts brought out than to have the duty on a binder reduced by fifty cents. Those are matters that should be investigated because, through some person's action, the markets of the world have virtually been closed to Canada, and a great deal of loss has resulted to the farming community, not only in the West, but in Ontario, and we ought to know those facts. I quite agree that no one connected with the ring in the West should be put on any of those commissions. Ontario farmers would like to know why they have to pay a toll on their grain to carry wheat for gentlemen in the West. The Ontario farmer has been taxed so much a bushel for all his grain—I do not know whether he is now—to carry wheat in western elevators. Those are matters affecting farmers in the eastern part of the country; an independent commission would go quite a long distance in straightening out these facts, and the Grain Growers' Company of the West should be the first to welcome an investigation, because there have been some ugly rumours in the East with regard to the conduct of their business.

Mr. MAHARG: How are the Canadian farmers taxed?

Mr. CURRIE: That is what I should like to know. The Ontario farmer was charged two cents a bushel all during the war. He does not carry his grain in an elevator, but there was an elevator charge on all the wheat he sold.

Mr. MAHARG: I think the hon. member will find that that was in the case of grain sold to the mills. There was some dissatisfaction at the start in connection with that, but I think that matter was gradually straightened out. In reply to the first part of the hon. member's remarks, I think I can tell him why the market was closed to Canada. Immediately on the announcement that the Canada Wheat Board would not be continued for another year, the Americans sold their entire surplus of wheat to Great Britain. That was something they would not have dared to do had the wheat board been continued, as they would have known they would have the wheat board to buy from and not a hundred thousand farmers scattered throughout the country. That is the secret of the whole thing, and the hon. member's estimate of $100,000,000 is quite conservative. In my speech in the debate on the Address I stated that we had lost a hundred million dollars and that our adverse balance of trade between Canada and the United States would have been rectified to that extent, had we had the price we would have had if the wheat board had been continued. That is the answer to the whole thing. Immediately the announcement was made that the wheat board would be discontinued, the Americans sold their surplus

wheat, knowing they could well replace it, and the Chicago market tells the tale. It was pounded down immediately after that; our markets had to follow, and the result was the Americans got at least $100,000,000 of our good money that we should have got from them for our wheat through the one action of the wheat board being discontinued.

Mr. CURRIE: The hon. gentleman knows more about this question than I do. I am speaking from information. My knowledge of the facts is simply this, that the hon. gentleman and his followers in the grain exchange in the West have been fighting for open markets and free trade for years. They fought the Government last year, and then the action of the Government in regard to the wheat question turned out to be all right. Last year I challenged the hon. member, as a matter of protection, to fix a price for the farmers, and he refused to do so. This year they fought for an open market and they got it. What happened? Great Britain came into the market last June to buy her wheat, but there was no person in Canada to sell our wheat to her. If we had had a grain board, it could have sold the whole Canadian crop for $3 a bushel, but there was no one functioning for Canada. Then the British buyers went to the United States, and they could get people in that country who sold them 180,000,000 bushels in June last. That shut out the Canadian farmer from foreign markets except in the United States. Then these gentlemen, knowing that the needs of the market had been fulfilled as regards the United States' and Canada's crop, and knowing that the British would not be buyers for six months, pounded the market; the grain gamblers in Winnipeg sold fall wheat in Chicago at from $2.80 to $3 a bushel, and then they turned round and hammered the western farmer and covered their trades at around $1.50 a bushel, pocketing the difference. An investigation of the whole matter would enlighten the country a great deal as to the way in which those agricultural philanthropists do business with their friends.

Mr. MAHARG: My hon. friend (Mr. Currie) is right in part when he states that the grain exchange was asking for an open market, but he is entirely wrong when he says that the farmers were asking for an open market a year ago.

Mr. CURRIE: I did not say that the farmers were, but hon. gentlemen opposite, who represent the Agrarian group and the Grain Growers, were yelling for an open market all the time.

Mr. MAHARG: The hon. member is absolutely wrong. Hansard will prove, without any words of mine what attitude I took. I do not need to say a word; the hon. member can look at Hansard. Within three months after the board was first appointed, its continuance was asked for unanimously, without a complaint, at a shareholders' annual meeting of the largest elevator company in Western Canada, and that action was followed up right along to the day that the wheat board was discontinued. Every western organization, not only the associations, but the commercial companies as well, asked for the continuance of the wheat board. So that the the hon gentleman's statement that the farmers or those representing them wanted an open market, is absolutely wide of the mark, as everything published goes to prove that they were unanimously in favour of its continuance. Immediately they saw the personnel of the commission they said: That is the board we want; we want it continued just as long at least as there is controlled buying in the Old Country.

Mr. MORPHY: What does the hon. member mean by "open trading"?

Mr. MAHARG: Trading on the exchange.

Mr. MORPHY: What did the sellers on the grain exchange want?

Mr. MAHARG: They did not want a closed market at all; they wanted the gambling that has been going on. If my hon. friend has followed the workings of the Winnipeg Grain Exchange—

Mr. MORPHY: I do not follow gambling practices.

Mr. MAHARG: I did not say "if the hon. member followed the practices;" I said "if he followed the workings of the market." I do not think, for a moment, the hon. gentleman would indulge in practices such as that; but as a citizen of Canada and a consumer of flour, he should take an interest in knowing why the dealers charged practically as much for their flour when the mills bought their wheat at $1.50 or even as low as $1.25 a bushel as when they paid $4 a bushel for it. The difficulty in this country is that the consumers are not taking the interest they should take in the matter. A very pertinent question for the consumer to

ask is why they were charged the same price for flour when the wheat that it takes to make a barrel of flour was bought for $6 to $7, as they were charged when it cost possibly $20 for the same quantity of wheat. The hon. member should be interested in the matter as he is a consumer of flour, or he would not have the healthy appearance he has to-day.

Mr. CURRIE: The whole trouble with this open market is simply this. The man who headed the commission, Dr. Magill, came down here and preached and talked four-dollar wheat.

Mr. HENDERS: Five-dollar wheat.

Mr. CURRIE: Yes, four and five and six-dollar wheat. He quit this Government and was going to take charge of the grain exchange business in Winnipeg. Things were very rosy then. But six months before, the boys in the West had been using their grain certificates to light their pipes at poker games. A man would light a ten-dollar certificate at the candle thinking it was of no use whatever, and as a matter of fact they turned out to be worth real money, something like 63 cents, if I mistake not.

Sir GEORGE FOSTER: The difference between 15 cents and 63 cents.

Mr. CLARK (Red Deer): They were very useful anyhow. I kept mine.

Mr. CURRIE: Somebody has made a tremendous loss. The Agrarian party have been pusyfooting this way and that. You never can tell where they stand on any question, and I think it is well to have an investigation to find out what was at the bottom of all this. When Dr. Magill was preaching five-dollar wheat, did any of the Agrarian party say, No, the whole world is buying—as nations, there is no individual buying? It was the nations that were buying the grain, just as they are to-day. Great Britain bought grain as a nation, so did France and all the other countries, so the only rational way was to trade in grain as a nation. No objection was raised to the open market. I did not see them parading any brass bands around or sending in any petitions against open marketing. Through the lack of common sense of the Agrarian group the farmers of this country lost $100,000,000, and we ought to have an investigation to find out what is at the bottom of it.

The CHAIRMAN (Mr. Steele): I would draw the attention of the committee to the fact that the item under consideration is the administration of the Canada Grain Act. I think the discussion that has taken place is not relevant to the item and I would ask hon. members to confine their remarks more closely to the item before us.

Mr. MAHARG: I would be quite prepared to do so, but the hon. member for North Simcoe (Mr. Currie) has made an accusation against the Agrarian group to which, in all fairness, I think I should be allowed to reply.

The CHAIRMAN (Mr. Steele): We had better adhere to the item under consideration at the present time. There will be other opportunities to reply.

Mr. CLARK (Red Deer): Surely all this is connected with the grain business. I think we should be allowed a little latitude in the matter. We have not been very troublesome in this corner.

The CHAIRMAN (Mr. Steele): I thought I had already allowed very considerable latitude, but perhaps the committee will not object to the hon. member for Maple Creek (Mr. Maharg) being allowed a reply; then we will return to the item under consideration.

Mr. MAHARG: I thank you, Mr. Chairman. The hon. member for North Simcoe stated that when Dr. Magill, the secretary of the Winnipeg Grain Exchange, and other officers were here telling the people they would get $5 for their wheat, no one in the Agrarian group protested. Now at that very time they were sitting in the galleries here when I protested just as strongly as I could against the market being opened. I wish the hon. member would keep closer tab on what is being done, but perhaps he may be excused, for even his leader made the statement that the continuance of the wheat board had never been asked for—either on the floor of the House or outside. I did not want to let my hon. friend's statement go unchallenged, for we did protest, and Hansard will show just what I said in respect to the gentleman who was sitting in the gallery and had been there month after month.

Mr. MORPHY: The hon. member for Maple Creek has disclosed the fact that he desired a closed market in wheat for the purpose of increasing the price.

Mr. MAHARG: I must absolutely object to that statement. The hon. member is simply putting words into my mouth that I did not use.

Mr. MORPHY: I take it that that is the only logical deduction from the cry he made, because the market was not kept closed. He says the effect of opening it was to lower the price of wheat. At the same time he complains very much because the poor consumer has to pay so much for his flour. His argument is that the high price of wheat should be kept up for the Agrarians, so that the poor consumer can get flour at a lower cost. Such a proposition is absolutely ridiculous. It just shows the insincerity of the hon. gentleman, who is always clamouring in this House for free trade in implements and everything else, but who, when it comes to a question of his own bread basket, through wheat, says: Don't open the market; close it tight, so that we can make all the money we can, and by increasing the price of our wheat we will give the poor consumer cheaper bread. Did any one ever hear anything more ridiculous?

Mr. MAHARG: Facts cannot be disputed. My hon. friend will find that he has been paying for his flour lately just about what he paid when wheat was nearly three times the price it was at one time this grain season. My hon. friend from North Perth says that we asked for the open market in wheat. We never asked for any such thing. What we were talking of was trade on the exchanges in Canada.

Mr. CURRIE: Yes, but the hon. gentleman—

The CHAIRMAN (Mr. Steele): I must again ask hon. members to make their remarks relevant to the item under consideration.

Mr. CURRIE: I was going to speak to the resolution.

The CHAIRMAN (Mr. Steele): Order. The rule reads:

> Speeches in Committee of the Whole must be strictly relevant to the item or clause under consideration.

I think the committee quite realize that the discussion recently has not been strictly relevant to the item under consideration, and it is only for the purpose of expediting the business of the House that I now ask hon. members to confine their remarks to the item before us, which is the administration of the Grain Act.

Mr. CURRIE: We were discussing nothing but the operation of that Act. If we are to be limited to a discussion of what may happen in connection with this item in the coming year, the ruling of the Chair is all right, but I have never yet seen a Chairman in this House who was bold enough to close a discussion on what happened in connection with the item under consideration the previous year. It is the past year's operations we are discussing now, not what is going to be done in connection with this item this year. We are not projecting ourselves into the future, but endeavouring to discuss what happened in the past, which is of very great importance to this country.

Just one word in reply to the hon. member for Maple Creek. It is quite safe to say that if anybody hunts through Hansard he will find him on both sides of every question that ever comes up affecting the Agrarian party. You will find his leader on the one side, and perhaps my hon. friend on the other, just to ease up matters, so that if anything goes wrong, one of them will be able to say: We did not take that position. I challenge my hon. friend to show that his party or his leader took a decided stand against the open market. The reason they did not was that they were interested personally in having an open market. I say that a commission should be appointed to investigate and find the nigger in the woodpile.

Mr. MAHARG: I must take direct issue with the statement of my hon. friend that I have been on both sides of every question. I defy him to show by Hansard where at any time I have taken both sides of any one question. That I took one side while my leader took the other is not the question. The statement I originally rose to object to was that the Agrarian party had taken no action either in this House or outside when there was this talk of five-dollar wheat.

Mr. COWAN: I do not agree with the hon. member for Maple Creek, and I do not believe that any one has ever said that that statement was not made on the other side. I think you could get quite a few in the Agrarian party throughout the west to agree with the member for Maple Creek, but my position is that that hon. gentleman does not speak for the Agrarian party. They have a chosen leader, and when the Prime Minister challenged him he did not say he was in favour of the wheat board. He said most unequivocally that he was strongly opposed to its continuance. Then what happened? That same hon. gentleman who has been chosen as leader in this House of the Agrarian party went to Manitoba and Saskatchewan, in both

of which places he was acclaimed the leader of the party. Within the last few months, since he made that statement in the House, he went to Saskatchewan and was chosen as their leader, and then he went to Alberta where he was also welcomed by that party and where his policy was endorsed. He is the leader of the party and speaks for it, and in that capacity he declared he was strongly opposed to the continuance of the wheat board. The hon. member cannot deny it, and I refuse him the right to speak for the party until he is chosen by them to express their views.

Mr. THOMSON (Qu'Appelle): To be fair, the hon. member for Regina (Mr. Cowan), should quote what my hon. friend from Marquette (Mr. Crerar) said.

Mr. COWAN: I will get Hansard in a moment.

Mr. THOMSON (Qu'Appelle): Keep quiet; you have not the floor all the time.

Mr. CURRIE: It is up to hon. gentlemen to prove the position they take.

Some hon. MEMBERS: Order.

Mr. THOMSON (Qu'Appelle): The hon. member for Marquette said that he did not want the wheat board continued as a permanent thing.

Mr. MAHARG: That is the point.

Mr. THOMSON: He never said that he was opposed to the continuance of it at that particular time; he was opposed to it as a permanent policy. Now, let the hon. member for Regina be fair or pretty nearly fair; at least, let him be as fair as he can.

Mr. CURRIE: When an hon. member rises in his place and challenges a statement it is up to him to produce Hansard.

Mr. THOMSON (Qu'Appelle): Nothing of the kind.

Mr. CLARK (Red Deer): I want to help the minister with his Estimates, but I think they are being obstructed badly at present by his own followers, who are straying quite a distance in the debate on this point. With regard to the attempt to expose the woebegone condition of opinion in the small Progressive group, I think my hon. friends are raising a tremendous tempest in a very little teapot. Why, Sir, it is one of the glories of this group that there is some independence of thought in it. In the last divisions in this House we have been the only group to show that it has capacity to divide on great issues of public importance. We never see that quality on the part of my hon. friend from Regina, nor is it often displayed by the member for Simcoe (Mr. Currie). However, let that go by the board. With regard to the position of the wheat board, I take it that we can all get our thoughts into a very narrow and satisfactory compass. I venture to think that there is not a single gentleman in this House who believes that the wheat board was to be a permanent institution in this country. I venture to assert that, and I do not observe anyone rise to say he considered that it should be permanent. It was an immediately post-war arrangement. There were differences of opinion amongst all thoughtful men as to the exact time at which the wheat board's operations should be suspended. There were differences of opinion in this group. My own view about the wheat board is that it is impossible to prove exactly that it was ever of any use to the western farmers. That is my own individual view. During the war anyone could sell at a high price wheat or anything else which the Allies wanted. I make that statement in support of my previous assertion. The same possibility of a difference of opinion arises in regard to the effect of the suspension of the board. Everyone knows that agricultural prices were bound to descend within a reasonable time after the close of the war. During the war, on my own farm in the West, we never took less than 50 cents a dozen for eggs; within the last few months—greatly to the benefit of consumers in this country, I hope,—eggs have gone down to 20 cents a dozen, that is all we are getting now. I suppose the operations of the wheat board have nothing to do with eggs at twenty cents.

Mr. SMITH: Thirty cents.

Mr. CLARK (Red Deer): My hon. friend is probably informed in regard to Ontario. His information on agricultural matters is no doubt wide, but he cannot correct me in any statement as to what the people in my part of the country are getting for eggs. I congratulate him that he is getting ten cents more. Now, as to my hon. friend's (Mr. Crerar's) position with regard to the wheat board, I am not at all sure that he ever made a definite statement. As I say, there were great differences of opinion as to whether or not it should be continued for another year. The Government was in great difficulties. I for one never attempted to increase those diffi-

culties because I sympathized with them, as I did in all reasonable cases where those difficulties arose from the prosecution of the war. Why is my hon. friend from North Simcoe trying to mix up the question of free trade and free exchanges with the wheat board and differences of opinion on that subject? Where does he want to get to? What is he proving? I submit that all he is doing is retarding the Estimates of the minister, and I do think we had better help my right hon. friend along.

Mr. JOHNSTON: The member for Regina (Mr. Crerar) made a definite statement that the leader of this group had opposed the reappointment of the Canada Wheat Board. Now, in my speech on the address, I quoted from the speech of the leader of this party the hon. member for Marquette (Mr. Crerar), in regard to this enabling legislation as introduced by the Minister of Trade and Commerce, when this subject was before the House last session, and I shall read that extract. The original statement of the hon. member for Marquette may be found at page 4119, volume 5 of Hansard of last session:

> Everyone who knows anything of the European situation must realize that conditions there are very unstable, and in those circumstances I think, perhaps, there is justification for the Government assuming the power which they are asking for under this legislation.

That is a direct contradiction to the charge made by the member for Regina. Regarding the stand taken on this matter by the hon. member for Marquette, hon. T. A. Crerar.

Mr. CURRIE: What I said was that the hon. member was on both sides of the question. His whole speech was for open markets, but he concluded by saying at the end that on the whole the board might be continued for a time.

Mr. VIEN: This discussion has demonstrated the difficulties that arise from the application of a vicious principle. To my mind the motive that prompted the institution of the wheat board was both vicious in principle and unjust in application. As the hon. member for Red Deer has said, I doubt very much whether it was of any use to the farmers. But we must admit that it was established at the instance of at least some sections of the agrarian community.

Some hon. MEMBERS: No.

Mr. VIEN: It was surely not the eastern provinces that insisted on the institution of the wheat board. Why is it vicious? It is vicious because by it the state instead of private enterprise undertook the marketing of wheat crops.

Mr. CLARK (Red Deer): Does my hon. friend not recognize that in war the state must be the chief actor in a great many fields of activity, a role which it would not play in time of peace.

Mr. VIEN: No. Not as generally as the hon. gentleman has just said, and not in this particular instance because my hon. friend has just shown that there was such a demand for wheat that time that there was no difficulty in marketing the western crop.

Mr. HENDERS: How then do you explain this fact: On the average we in Canada sold our wheat at a lower price than the Americans sold theirs. But during the operation of the wheat board the Americans operated on the open market and we under the wheat board, and got more money for our wheat than our neighbours across the line got for theirs.

Mr. VIEN: It does not matter at all; it has no relation whatever to the principle I am now discussing.

Mr. HENDERS: It has, absolutely.

Mr. VIEN: The fact that it had or had not that effect has nothing to do with the principle which underlies this question. All sections of the farming interest in Canada might have asked the Government for some assistance—the farmers of the province of Quebec, or the farmers of the province of Ontario, who grow potatoes, or hay, or any other kind of farm produce, could have come to the Government and said "organize a hay board, organize a potato board, so that when the crop is collected we may go to some government warehouse, or elevator, get a certificate and ask the government to finance our whole crop." Such a system is unjust, it is vicious, and it placed on the whole community a risk which the community should never have accepted. The wheat board fixed a minimum price of $2.15 for the wheat crop of the western fields. It is true that at that time $2.15 was quite a safe margin. But we were not under normal conditions, and it was possible for the wisest man to make an error in judging what would be the market price for wheat four or five months afterwards. Then having fixed $2.15 as a minimum price to

be paid the grain growers for their wheat the whole community would have had to stand a loss if the market price had fallen to $1.75, or some other lower figure. I say, this is a vicious principle; and the whole difficulty into which the Government was plunged in judging whether the wheat board should be continued or discontinued, arose from the application of that principle. It shows that a vicious principle should never be introduced into legislation to help in the solving of an immediate difficulty, because it always creates a greater difficulty and it at least creates a wrong precedent. Neither in the case in question nor in any other case should vicious principles be adopted in our legislation.

Mr. COWAN: I was challenged by hon. gentlemen opposite to quote from Hansard anything which would show that the leader of the Agrarian party was opposed to the establishment or the continuance of the wheat board last year, and to its continuation as a permanent policy. This subject was under discussion for a considerable period last session. The present Prime Minister (Mr. Meighen) who was then leading the Government, correctly appreciated the situation. He saw that the Agrarian party were not taking a very definite stand on this matter and he challenged them to do so in these words:

I did not say I was closing the debate. I earnestly hope I have prodded these hon. gentlemen opposite—

That is the Agrarian party, sitting opposite—

—tc speak their minds. I was very much afraid that the debate was going to close without a word from them.

Following that the member for Marquette (Mr. Crerar) took the floor, and during his speech he used the words which the hon. member for Last Mountain (Mr. Johnston) has quoted to-day. But I wish to draw attention to the very unfair method followed by that hon. gentleman. The hon. member gave a quotation from his leader's speech, but he neglected to cite the qualifying language he employed and which I now propose to read. The hon. member for Marquette, the leader of the Agrarian party said:

I think the Minister of the Interior furnished the only argument that constitutes a real reason why the board should be continued for another year, and that is the possibility of unified buying again in Europe.

These are the qualifying words which my hon. friend from Last Mountain did not read:

At the present time that is not the case.

Now the hon. gentleman (Mr. Crerar) meant that if there was unified buying in Europe he would continue the board for this year. At present there is not unified buying and therefore what is the only conclusion you can draw from the hon. gentleman's statement? It is that he was opposed to the continuance of the wheat board for last year. Having taken that attitude very definitely with respect to one year what does the leader of the Agrarian party say with respect to the Board's continuance as a permanent policy:

Personally I am opposed entirely to any permanent policy that meants the control of the marketing of grain in this country.

Could you have anything more definite than that? "There is no unified buying in Europe for this year consequently we do not need the wheat board and as a permanent policy I am opposed to it." There is no equivocation about that, it is straight opposition from beginning to end, and the hon. member was quite unfair in refraining from reading the expressions of opinion on the part of the hon. member for Marquette which I have just quoted.

Mr. GOULD: This question has again come to the front owing to members on the Government side endeavouring to fasten the responsibility, upon the Agrarian group in connection with this matter. Despite all their efforts I do not think they have succeeded in converting the majority of members of this House to their belief; neither have they persuaded the people throughout the country that they are right, and after all they are the persons that are most interested. When this question was last under consideration a certain hon. member refused to answer a question that I put to him and the incident thereupon closed. However the subject has once more come to the surface, and perhaps it is well now to thoroughly ventilate the matter. But why, may I ask, do hon. gentlemen opposite endeavour to place the responsibility upon the Agrarian group, because we are not the dominating party in this House?

Mr. VIEN: At whose request was the wheat board instituted?

Mr. GOULD: I believe that the Government and their supporters were responsible.

Mr. VIEN: But at whose request did they act?

Mr. GOULD: Not at mine, for I was not in the House. However the point is, hon. gentlemen opposite were so wise they persuaded the Government that this was good legislation. They were able to forecast events so accurately they knew it was going to be a success. Being convinced of the likelihood of its successful operation they urged the Government to continue the operation of the board. At that time public opinion in the country was favourable to the continuation of the wheat board. Yet hon. members opposite are endeavouring to saddle members of the small Agrarian group with the responsibility of their action. Their conduct demonstrates that at one time they were shivering with indecision and they were not then so sure of their ground as they now appear to be, and they are indulging in all sorts of insinuations with respect to us which will not do us the least bit of harm. We try to reflect public opinion. I have done so since I became a member of this House. Speaking directly at the hon. member for Macdonald (Mr. Henders) who made the assertion that wheat in the United States sold for a less price than our wheat sold for under the wheat board, you might, Sir, remember this fact, that in United States by far the greater proportion of the total crop is soft wheat and should not equal our hard wheat in price. Therefore it is not fair to draw a comparison in that way. I can tell the hon. gentleman from personal knowledge that the hard wheats of North Dakota and Minnesota sold for a higher price than our wheat realized under the wheat board, and I have figures to substantiate my statement. Further than that, the assertion that was made—

Mr. HENDERS: I beg to state—

Some hon. MEMBERS: Order, order.

Mr. GOULD: I am just answering the assertion made that I was diametrically opposed to the wheat board. I want to say that if I lived close to the international boundary, and an open market obtained under the same conditions as prevailed in the fall of 1919, and if I had an opportunity to take my wheat across the international boundary, I would still take my chance of selling my wheat as an individual; but in the interests of wheat growers in the large areas far removed from the international boundary I would support the continuance of the wheat board. But I do know, as I said in my speech on the Address, in the first speech I made in this House, that the individual who went across the line and accepted the Americans' money got thirty cents, seventy cents and as high as a dollar more than was received by the farmer who lived north of the imaginary line along the forty-ninth parallel of latitude. From this would be deducted the value of the participation certificate—48 cents a bushel.

The fact that the wheat board was not reconstituted last year, with the resultant loss of $100,000,000 to western farmers, which I think is very close to the mark, is the very reason why manufacturing establishments in Eastern Canada are closed to-day. The people who require the implements manufactured in those establishments have not got the money they expected to have from their crops, and consequently they are not purchasing. Conditions were upset by the action of the Government in allowing the wheat board to pass out of existence. Why are factories in Eastern Canada full of implements and obliged to shut down? It is because the people have not got the money with which to buy those implements, which were manufactured in anticipation that the purchasing public would require them.

I would like to ask the minister a question about the personnel of the proposed commission of inquiry into the grain business. Assuming such a commission is to be appointed, will the names be submitted to the House before the commissioners are actually appointed?

The CHAIRMAN (Mr. Steele): Order. I must call attention again to the fact that the matter under discussion is not the appointment of a commission to investigate the grain business, but an item regarding the administration of the Canada Grain Act. It is quite out of order on this item to discuss the appointment of any proposed commission of inquiry.

Mr. GOULD: Mr. Chairman, with all deference I would say that this commission would have to enquire whether the Canada Grain Act had been wrongly administered. I therefore wish to ask, in case such a commission of inquiry be appointed would the names of the proposed commissioners be given to the members of the House before they are actually appointed, so that we may have an opportunity to discuss the merits or demerits of the proposed appointees?

5 p.m.

Mr. CURRIE: Now, Mr. Chairman—

Mr. GOULD: May I have an answer from the minister?

Mr. CURRIE: The hon. minister cannot answer that question because the matter involved is not before the committee. This is not our fight, it was started by the hon. member from Maple Creek, and we do not want to retire from the field without having the subject very thoroughly threshed out.

Mr. CLARK (Red Deer): Finish the fight.

Mr. CURRIE: The most pithy saying in the debate last year on this question was the statement of the leader of the Grain Growers' party, which has been quoted already, and I will quote it again. He said:

> I think the Minister of the Interior furnished the only argument that constitutes a real reason why the Board should be continued for another year, and that is, the possibility of unified buying again in Europe.

Then he deliberately misleads the House in order to make his point—

Some hon. MEMBERS: Order, order.

Mr. CURRIE: He said—

Mr. CLARK (Red Deer): Mr. Chairman, I rise to a point of order. I submit that my hon. friend is out of order in charging any hon. member with deliberately misleading the House.

Mr. CURRIE: I said that he was misleading the country.

Mr. CLARK (Red Deer): I say further, Sir, that my hon. friend is the only gentleman who would prefer such a charge, even if it were in order, against the hon. member for Marquette in his absence.

Mr. CURRIE: Yes, I am very sorry the hon. member for Marquette is not here to take his gruel. But I did not say he deliberately misled the House—

Mr. CLARK (Red Deer): Mr. Chairman, I must ask for your ruling on the point of order. My hon. friend charged the hon. member for Marquette with deliberately misleading the House.

Mr. CURRIE: I said he deliberately misled the country, not the House.

Some hon. MEMBERS: No, you said the House.

The CHAIRMAN (Mr. Steele): If the hon. member did not charge the hon. member for Marquette with misleading the House, he is in order; otherwise he is not.

Mr. CURRIE: Then I will withdraw the remark and say that he deliberately misled the country, because he made a statement that there was no unified buying in Europe. As a matter of fact, unified buying in Europe continues to-day. Greece within the last week has bought four million or five million bushels of wheat in the United States. Great Britain has purchased all her wheat as a nation since the war and is doing so to-day. Lord Lee bought 180,000,000 bushels of wheat in the States last June. Why did he not buy here? Because we had no grain board to arrange credits with him for the purchase of such a large amount of grain. I say that by taking the deliberate action which they did the Agrarian group enabled the western grain speculators to sell wheat short in Chicago at from $2.80 to $3.00 a bushel, and then to kick the props from under the markets in the West and fill their orders with Canadian grain at $1.50. That touched the pockets of the farmers in the West, not the pockets of the grain operators or speculators there. Knowing as they did that the requirements of the British market were filled, and there would be no buying for six months or a year, they were the only people in the market and they put the wheat price down to the point I have stated, and their action cost the country about one hundred million dollars —perhaps I should not say it cost this country quite that amount, because I think some of these gentlemen got away with a lot of that money. I think we should have a commission to investigate who was at the bottom of selling out the western farmer and the eastern farmer. It has caused a lot of trouble to our agriculturists, and the gentlemen opposite very well know that they are being held responsible for the low prices by the farmers in the West.

Mr. McMASTER: "Angularly opposite."

Mr. CURRIE: Yes. The hon. member for Brome, of course, did not put himself on record on this question. But the leader of the Agrarian group, I say, misled the country in that statement—whether he misled this House or not—when he said that there was no unified buying in Europe. There was unified buying in Europe. He said he was in favour of a wheat board if there was unified buying in Europe, and then he said there was not unified buying, therefore the inference is that he wanted an open market. There was unified buying in Europe at that time, and there is to-day. Somebody has been misled and we must place the onus where it belongs. Hon. gentlemen "angularly opposite" expressed

great perturbation at the suggestion that this commission of investigation should be appointed. I hope that the Government will have the courage to appoint it and find out who has been digging into the markets out there, who has been selling short, who has been getting the difference betweeen the $3 and the $1.50 which the Western farmer got. I do not hesitate to say that if the wheat board had been in existence last June the whole Canadian crop could have been sold by the board at $3 a bushel. The attitude taken by the representatives, so-called, of the Western Agrarians, has cost the farmers of the West $100,000,000, and that will require a lot of explanation on the part of my hon. friends when they go to their constituencies in the West.

Mr. CLARK (Red Deer): I do not want to prolong this discussion; certainly I do not want to take up the extremely rash and unfounded statement of my hon. friend.

Mr. CURRIE: Now, I want a ruling, Mr. Chairman, because I have read the facts from Hansard, and I think I understand the English language as well as my hon. friend.

Mr. CLARK (Red Deer): My hon. friend cannot prove, nobody else can prove, that $100,000,000 has been lost to the farmers of the West. It passes human proof; it is purely a matter of opinion on the part of my hon. friend.

Mr. CURRIE: The hon. member to your right (Mr. Maharg) said so to-day.

Mr. CLARK (Red Deer): My hon. friend must open his ears, and to do that he needs sometimes to close his month. It is not usual in this House for two gentleman to talk at the same time. I want to point out to him that I listened with the utmost patience to what he said. I say now that neither he nor any person else can prove that the farmers lost $100,000,000 or any money at all by the dropping of the wheat board. I have given reasons for having believed that the prices of all agricultural products would drop within two years after the conclusion of the war. I, myself knew they would, because I have informed myself reasonably about the history of other wars and what happened when they were over. If I may be so personal, I may tell my hon. friend that in my little business on a farm in the West, which consists largely in the handling of cattle, I handled my cattle accordingly and sold them down very largely, knowing that the high prices of the war would not continue. I have previously given my hon. friend the instance of the drop in eggs; I could do it in regard to butter. It happens in regard to every kind of agricultural produce and in my opinion it was sure to happen in regard to wheat whether you had the wheat board or not. That is my opinion; my hon. friend holds a different view. I can tell him why agricultural produce falls, if he would like to know, and why it falls faster than manufactured goods do. Agricultural products cannot fall back upon the artificial aid of a tariff. That is why the farmers are the first hit. Yet I had to give $10 this morning for a pair of boots of a kind which I could have bought for $6 even after the war started. And so all along the line. I repeat that my hon. friend cannot prove—it is a matter of opinion—that the farmers of the West have lost $100,000,000. If they have, I want to say that there was nothing in the very careful and statesmanlike utterances of the hon. member from Marquette, which my hon. friend has read, to indicate that his attitude contributed in any degree to that loss. The Minister of Trade and Commerce will agree with me that the last and final responsibility for dropping the board for one year or carrying it on for another year rested with the Government of the day. The board was not suspended while Parliament was sitting; if my recollection is right, it was suspended after Parliament had prorogued. It was done by the Act of the Government. Now, it is not I, it is one of the followers of the Government, who says that the suspension of the board has cost the farmers of the West $100,000,000. If that be so, let him settle his charge with the minister whose Estimates are under discussion, who represents the Government for the moment; because he ought to realize by this time that his charge is directed, and directed solely, against the Government of the day. But if I could have proof of what my hon. friend believes so easily without proof, I certainly think he would have added an important reason for looking carefully into the votes that may arise during this session as to the advisability of keeping this Government in power a moment longer. Every question that comes up for a vote would be influenced mightily by a consideration such as my hon. friend has raised. I did not raise it; my hon. friend raised it. But I do want to

clear my hon. leader's reputation, if it needed it. His statements were of the most careful kind. And I want to tell my hon. friend something more: the wheat board has no existence in the political platform of the Dominion Council of Agriculture, the tariff platform which is the platform of this party. My hon. friend expresses great anxiety about how my hon. leader will clear himself with the farmers of the West when an election comes on. Well now, I really think there are parts of this House where there is more anxiety about what is going to happen when an election takes place than there is in the bosom of my leader. But in case my hon. friend is really and sincerely exercised about the chances of my hon. friend from Marquette in an election, let me assure him that he will be able to take care of himself among the farmers of the West, so far as I know anything about it.

Mr. CURRIE: Now, Mr. Chairman, we have heard the ipse dixit of the hon. gentleman; we all have to take our little licking from him. But he must have been asleep during the early part of this discussion, otherwise he would have heard the hon. member for Maple Creek (Mr. Maharg), sitting on his right, make the statement that the loss was $100,000,000. I am only repeating hearsay; I do not know for a fact whether it was $100,000,000 or not. I do say, though, that this House, and I among the members of this House, have looked largely to the hon. member for Marquette for light and leading on this grain question. It is a national question, and a very serious one. When he made the statement in this House last year that he believed in a board, in national selling, as it were, when there was unified or national buying, and that there was no national buying, the inference was that it was his opinion that the board should be dissolved. At the very time he made that statement he must have known that the facts were entirely different. You cannot play fast and loose with the people all the time. But my hon. friend's information was wrong; his lack of knowledge in respect to the very question upon which he should have been informed has led this country to a loss of fully $100,000,000, as has been expressed by one of his own followers. For that reason, and as there is some difference of opinion as to the way in which the grain board, with which he is connected, functions, and as there are questions that need to be asked of the grain board, I say again that the Government would be well justified in appointing a commission to go into this whole question and to fix the responsibility for the great loss which the country has sustained. We want to know the facts. The farmers to-day are not getting a better deal than they were getting before. The facts of the matter are simply these. There is just a small group selling fish, and they are calling everybody else's fish no good. They are dealing only in a particular brand of politics, and in view of the disastrous agrarian policies of Townley in North Dakota, which are of a similar character, this should lead this country seriously to investigate matters and ascertain whether the policies of the group represented by hon. gentlemen opposite are the best policies for the country, or whether they are only preaching socialism in a mild form. I have quoted the hon. member for Marquette (Mr. Crerar), and his statement cannot be denied; I took it from Hansard; I took his word for it, and I think the Government took his word for it, because we knew if anybody should be interested in the farmers' affairs, he should. When we took his advice, we found that he was misinformed or he misled somebody deliberately, and the results have been disastrous to the farmers, so that if anybody is to blame for those results, he and his followers must be blamed.

Mr. DAVIS: May I refer for a moment to an expression used by the hon. member for North Simcoe (Mr. Currie), that is, as to unified buying? Last year I supported the Government in its policy as to the grain board. I thought it was wise that the Government should have the power to go on or to quit as, in its judgment and upon its responsibility, it decided. I think that probably was the position of the hon. member for Marquette. Unified buying at that time by Europe meant this, that all the buying was done by England and that the proceeds were distributed amongst the various countries in the order of their requirements. But that had ceased at the time we were discussing this, and instead there was buying by each country separately. One of the problems before the Government was this, that it must decide whether that buying by separate countries was going to offer a field or area of competition as would still give us prices that would justify us in opening the market. Apparently it did not entirely do that. I am, however, in-

clined to deal charitably with the Government with regard to its decision on that matter; but nevertheless the form of the term as used by the hon. member for Simcoe North entirely misplaces the judgment used by the hon. member for Marquette with regard to the system of buying, and I think the latter's opinion was clearly understood at the time, although it may since have been forgotten by the House and, of course, by the country.

Mr. THOMSON (Qu'Appelle): A quotation has been given from Hansard of a speech delivered by the hon. member for Marquette (Mr. Crerar). I see the quotation stops at a very convenient place to suit the purposes of the hon. gentleman who made it. Had he gone further, it would have knocked the foundation from his argument. I follow directly after what has been read:

> While during the years of the war the Royal Commission on wheat supplies in London had the practical control of the buying of wheat, and other cereals for that matter, since the Armistice has been signed the various countries in Europe have each organized its own government buying agency. At least, this is very largely the case; some of the neutral countries are getting back to old conditions of trade. Every one who knows anything of the European situation must realize that conditions there are very unstable, and in these circumstances I think, perhaps, there is justification for the Government assuming the power which they are asking for under this legislation.

If you take that altogether, the action of the Government had not the opposition at least of the hon. member for Marquette; it had his support. More than that, I think I am right in saying that, when the matter came before the House, there was not a single vote in opposition to it, certainly not by the hon. member for Marquette. If he had been opposed to it, he would have so voted, because we know the hon. member for Marquette is not in the least afraid to say what he thinks—if all the rest of the House were just as ready to give expression to their opinions as he has been, whether that helps or hurts him, the House would be conducted in a different way from what it is. Let me repeat what was said by the hon. member for Red Deer (Mr. Clark). At the time this House prorogued the power for which the Government had asked was in their hands; they had enabling legislation to do what was required. They decided themselves, with that enabling legislation before them. Almost as soon as they got rid of Parliament, they decided that they would not have anything to do with the wheat board, and on them the responsibility rests.

Mr. MAHARG: The hon. member for Lotbinière (Mr. Vien) stated that the organization of a board of control of any kind, or words to that effect, was a vicious principle.

Mr. VIEN: May I take the liberty of correcting my hon. friend? I did not say the organization of a board of any kind; I said the organization of a wheat board under the provisions of the statute enacted for that purpose, as the statute reads.

Mr. MAHARG: I am quite prepared to accept the statement, but that does not affect the point that I wish to raise. The hon. member wished to know at whose instigation this was brought about, or words to that effect. The impression that his remarks would leave on the House is that the farmers themselves asked for control in the matter of the marketing of wheat. I believe that is a fair inference to draw from his remarks.

Mr. VIEN: Yes.

Mr. MAHARG: The original control in the fixing of price for the marketing of Canada's wheat during the war was never asked for by the farmers at all.

Mr. VIEN: Could the hon. member inform me who instigated the organization of the wheat board?

Mr. MAHARG: It is not the question of the wheat board I am touching now; it is the original action of the Government in taking control of the marketing of wheat, —the wheat board is an after-consideration. The original control that was taken was not asked for by the farmers at all at any time; in fact, the opposite was the case. The minister himself will remember very well that when the original action was taken he asked that representatives of the western farmers should meet him in conference in this city, and we did so. And he will also remember that I opposed this action very strenuously unless he was prepared to take similar action in regard to the necessities that enter into the production of the grain, that is, to take control of the price the farmer should pay for his implements of production, his labour and so on. If they were going to control the price he was to receive, it was only fair that they should, in a measure, control the price it would cost him to produce.

The minister will remember that was my attitude. The point is, the Government having taken control, having stepped in, having broken down the organization, credits and such like, and having established that control, we believed in all fairness, some method of control should be continued. We did not ask the Government to appoint the wheat board. Committees from this House waited on the Minister of Finance from time to time, and they did not state any definite opinion whatever, but they asked him to institute some measure of control over wheat. This was absolutely refused. The question of the wheat board, however, is an after-consideration and only arose out of conditions that had been created by the Government stepping in and taking control in the first place. Just where the instigation came from I am not prepared to say, and I am not objecting to it at all, but I believe it came from the allied countries in order that they might get control of the distribution of wheat. In fact, the chairman of the wheat executive in London told me there were only two reasons for it, one being to get control of the wheat and the other to keep the price down.

Mr. VIEN: What was the nature of Government control before the institution of the wheat board?

Mr. MAHARG: Government control previous to the institution of the wheat board was under the Board of Grain Supervisors. I have already referred to their turning in $350,000 to the Government as a surplus from their operations. That board was discontinued.

Mr. VIEN: How did it exercise control?

Mr. MAHARG: They fixed the price—the price of $2.20 per bushel for the wheat produced by the farmers all over this country.

Mr. VIEN: Was it illegal to ask any higher amount?

Mr. MAHARG: Yes. They had absolute control over everything in regard to the fixing of prices and the disposition and direction of the grain. They had practically the same control as the wheat board.

Mr. VIEN: That was vicious too.

Mr. MAHARG: I am not going to say whether it was vicious or not, but I might say that we did not ask for it. It is a matter of opinion whether it was vicious or not, but we are not considering that question at the present time.

Mr. VIEN: I am glad to hear that the hon. gentleman was opposed to the wheat board.

Mr. MAHARG: No, the hon. gentleman cannot put those words into my mouth at all. I was opposed to original control of the wheat in any manner, shape or form. We did not ask for it in any shape whatever, but when the Government stepped in and took control, we believed that in all fairness they should continue when they had broken down the organization that had formerly been used, more particularly when control buying continues in the Old Country. I was pleased to hear the hon. member for North Simcoe state that there was still controlled buying in the Old Country, for his leader (Mr. Meighen) when he was speaking in Saskatoon, gave as a reason for discontinuing the wheat board, the absence of controlled buying in Great Britain. What the leader of the Agrarian party said was absolutely right. There was no unified buying; that requires two parties, and there were no two parties buying jointly. But there was controlled buying in Great Britain and the allied countries, and there is to-day, although there was no unified buying at the time our leader made that statement, nor is there to-day. It is controlled buying that is in existence to-day by the governments of the different countries. It is the hon. member for North Simcoe's leader who will have the explaining to do and not the leader of our group.

Mr. COWAN: Do I understand the hon. member for Maple Creek to mean that it was his desire that the Government should have continued to advance credits to foreign countries to buy our wheat last year and this?

Mr. MAHARG: If any such inference could be drawn from my remarks, that was not what I intended. That thought never entered my mind.

Mr. McKENZIE: The point that I intended to make has been brought out so well by the hon. member for Red Deer that I shall merely call the attention of the minister to it again. I refer to the loss by this country last year of $100,000,000 of money. That amounts to $12.50 per head of our population. That much was lost at one fell swoop by some one's blundering. The establishment of the wheat board and wheat control was a matter of

policy on the part of the Government. First the Government got control buying through an agency which the hon. member for Maple Creek mentioned, then they established the wheat board. Both institutions were created as a matter of policy on the part of the Government. Then, later on, as a matter of policy the Government discontinued the wheat board. They said: We have come to the stage where the wheat board should be abolished. That again is a matter of policy for which the Government is entirely responsible. I was surprised to see the disloyalty, if I may use the word, of the hon. member for North Simcoe (Mr. Currie) this afternoon. He always votes for this Government, always stands by them when it is to his political advantage to do so, but to-day he tells the Government: You lost the country $100,000,000 of cold cash last year.

Mr. CURRIE: The hon. gentleman is putting words into my mouth I did not use, and is drawing inferences from what I said which are not justified. I did not make any such statement, or even imply it. What I said was that we took our light and leading from the Grain Growers group and that we were misled; that was all.

Mr. McKENZIE: That is a most humiliating confession to make, that this Government, with twenty ministers, and agents and sources of information all over the country, did not themselves know what was the proper thing to do, but took a sort of sidelight, a remark that was not very definite that was delivered by some private member of the House, because that is all the hon. member for Marquette was. My hon. friend from Simcoe says that he swallowed that advice hook, line, and sinker, as the saying is, and passed it on to the Government, and that childish simple-minded aggregation thereupon inaugurated a policy that lost this country $100,000,000. And the extraordinary thing is that the hon. member for North Simcoe now says in all solemnity that a commission must be appointed by this Government to investigate why the Government themselves blundered and bungled the affairs of this country to the extent of $100,000,000. He does not realize the full force and effect of what he says. If he is right and the Government has bungled to the extent of this immense amount of money, the Government must take the responsibility, and the appeal must be to Caesar, and not to any commission.

[Mr. McKenzie.]

Mr. CURRIE: I again protest against the hon. member putting words into my mouth or drawing inferences that are not justified. I said it was time that we had a commission to investigate the Grain Growers Grain Company and similar groups that were very much interested in seeing that wheat fell from $3 to $1.50 per bushel. They are the people who should be investigated.

Mr. GOULD: There is no such company to my knowledge as the Grain Growers' Grain Company.

Mr. CURRIE: I may have made a single mistake.

Mr. GOULD: Lots of them.

Mr. CURRIE: They have changed their name so often. It is now the North West Trading Company? They have had about sixteen different names.

Mr. FIELDING: Almost as bad as the Conservative party.

Mr. MAHARG: The question of the name does not matter at the moment. My hon. friend from North Simcoe, in the course of his remarks said that we were very much concerned over the possible appointment of this commission. Now I made my position clear on that a few days ago when this matter came up in the House. I said that we would welcome an investigation, and that so far as our company was concerned we would render the commission every possible assistance. Our objection is to the possible personnel of the commission. If a commission is going to be appointed, we want one that can do something, and that will take a little more action than the present commission has done which has every authority to do what this proposed commission will likely be called upon to do, if appointed. We want a commission that will be entirely independent of any other commission now in existence; and, I repeat so far as we are concerned we will give them every possible assistance, and it may be considerable too, when the opportunity is afforded to disclose some of the things that have been going on.

Sir GEORGE FOSTER: It rather strikes me after careful observation that we have pretty well exhausted this line of argument, and I am going to suggest to the committee that we now turn our attention to the work that is before us and show our good intention, in the first place, by passing this item.

Mr. VIEN: I should first like to inquire from what quarter came the request for the establishment of wheat control and the fixing of a maximum price for wheat?

Sir GEORGE FOSTER: That is a very important question and as my memory is not in the very best order at the present moment, perhaps my hon. friend will allow me to take it into consideration and to give him an answer some of these days.

Mr. VIEN: That is very vague. I am afraid that if we let the item pass, I shall not get the answer until the Greek calends. The minister has on many occasions given evidence of a very retentive memory, and if he would jog his mind a bit I think he could easily recollect how it happened that the Canadian Government stepped into the wheat marketing business and undertook the establishment of wheat control and a maximum price. He may desire to rush the voting of this item, but I think he might make an effort to recall this thing.

Sir GEORGE FOSTER: We are not rushing much, are we?

Mr. VIEN: How is the increase of $175,000 in salaries, due to the reclassification, going to affect the bonus paid these employees?

Sir GEORGE FOSTER: I do not quite understand my hon. friend.

Mr. VIEN: I will try to make it clear even if it takes a minute or two. Last year and the year before we voted a bonus to civil servants to meet the high cost of living. It was then understood that when the reclassification came into effect this bonus would in all probability be discontinued. I see now that the reclassification calls for an extra expenditure of $175,000 in salaries in this branch of the administration. What will be the policy of the department regarding the bonus in view of this increase?

Sir GEORGE FOSTER: The reclassification, as my hon. friend knows, affected all departments, and the bonus likewise applies throughout the Civil Service. The statement has already been made that the Government purposes this year to reduce the bonus by 25 per cent, and that, of course, will apply to this as to other departments.

Item agreed to.

Maintenance of Terminal Elevators and necessary equipment, $10,000.

Mr. MAHARG: How is this money to be applied? Is it for the upkeep of elevators, for improvements in plant, and so forth?

Sir GEORGE FOSTER: This is a very small vote which we have taken from year to year to be applied to capital account, if, for instance, new machinery is to be added, such as drying or cleaning plant.

Mr. MAHARG: I want to ask another question regarding the previous item. I was about to ask it when the chairman declared the item carried. We made provision during the last session for a certain amount of surpluses at terminal elevators being taken. Has any action been taken by the Government in that respect and have any returns come in from those surpluses over and above the actual grain which the elevators were supposed to have taken in?

Sir GEORGE FOSTER: You refer to overages?

Mr. MAHARG: Yes.

Sir GEORGE FOSTER: The hon. member will recollect that Parliament passed, either last year or the year before, an amendment by which the elevators are allowed a certain percentage, the rest of it coming into the consolidated revenue fund. That has been carried out.

Mr. MAHARG: Why should these surpluses go into the consolidated revenue? This money, as well as some $350,000 of a surplus in connection with the operations of the Board of Grain Supervisors, has gone into the consolidated revenue. Why should it not be applied to the administration of the Act? This is what we had in mind when we requested that the overages over a certain amount be taken. While I am speaking about overages, it might be interesting to the House to know that when we took the overages away from the houses, the Board of Grain Commissioners immediately turned round and gave them an additional increase in elevating charges, which practically recouped them for everything they had lost in the way of overages. Now, that is a very significant fact. That increase was opposed by farmers' companies, but in the face of that opposition, the grain commission granted a rise of one half cent a bushel, which, on the whole handling of grain, amounts to approximately the total amount of money the different elevator companies received from their overages in previous years.

Mr. FIELDING: Is my right hon. friend correct when he describes this as a vote on capital account? It is not capital account in the ordinary sense in which we use the word in the Estimates.

Sir GEORGE FOSTER: No. In the first place, the elevators were built by a vote of Parliament. A vote was made for construction of elevators; and, so far as new construction is concerned, the capital account has been brought almost to a close. But we have had a small vote each year to provide for additional machinery. After that, the operating expenses come out of revenue. The expenditure has been very small. In 1919-1920, it was only $895; in 1920-21, to January 31, it was about $6,000, owing to addition of new machinery.

Mr. FIELDING: The words "capital account" do not, in the Estimates, mean quite the same thing as they do in the sense in which the minister uses them. This is capital account as respects that particular transaction, but it is not chargeable to capital in the sense in which we use the word in the Estimates.

Sir GEORGE FOSTER: It is for the maintenance of necessary equipment.

Mr. MAHARG: The minister did not answer my direct question in regard to surplus overages. Has any money been collected from that source?

Sir GEORGE FOSTER: That question has reference to the vote we have just passed. I will look up the information and get it for my hon. friend before we are through with the Estimates.

Item agreed to.

Trade Commissioners and Commercial Agents, including salaries, travelling expenses, contingencies and other expenditure in connection therewith, $230,000.

Mr. POWER: May I ask what new Trade Commissioners have been appointed since last year and where they are located?

Sir GEORGE FOSTER: During the current year G. E. Short was appointed to Rotterdam, Holland, and Mr. E. L. McCall to Rio Janeiro, Brazil. The latter is a new appointment. I think we have not heretofore had a Trade Commissioner in Brazil. These are the only new appointments that have been made during the current year.

Mr. FIELDING: Was there no trade agent at Rotterdam before?

[Mr. Maharg.]

Sir GEORGE FOSTER: We had one at Rotterdam many years ago and afterwards at Antwerp. During the war there was no agent at either place, but the office was kept open with a clerk there in charge in order to answer enquiries and preserve continuity as it were. This is a new appointment to Holland, and Rotterdam is the headquarters of the trade commissioners.

Mr. JACOBS: Have these officials passed an examination by the Civil Service Commission?

Sir GEORGE FOSTER: Yes; the appointments are under the Civil Service Commission.

Mr. JACOBS: And do these men possess the necessary linguistic qualifications?

Sir GEORGE FOSTER: Yes, so far as we could get them. That is a necessary thing. We make it a point as far as we possibly can that appointees to certain countries while passing through their period of probation here shall acquire the language of the country to which they go. In this case Mr. Short does not possess a knowledge of the Dutch language, but has a fair knowledge of French. You cannot in all cases get that linguistic requirement, but in most cases we make it an absolute necessity. For instance our commissioner to Brazil is familiar with the Spanish language and is fairly conversant with Portuguese, in which languages he will make himself more proficient. Our trade commissioner in Japan is a master of the Japanese language. I should not, perhaps, say a master of it, but he was born in Japan, as it happens, and during his school days, and ever since, has studied the language and has a good colloquial grasp of it.

Mr. JACOBS: Is he a British citizen?

Sir GEORGE FOSTER: Yes.

Mr. POWER: Who is the commissioner to the Fiji Islands?

Sir GEORGE FOSTER: We have not appointed anybody there.

Mr. POWER: Yes, we have a commissioner of some kind in the Fiji Islands?

Sir GEORGE FOSTER: No, not a Canadian Trade Commissioner.

Mr. ARCHAMBAULT: Is there not a gentleman there by the name of Catellier?

Sir GEORGE FOSTER: As trade commissioner?

Mr. ARCHAMBAULT: Yes. In the Fiji Islands.

Sir GEORGE FOSTER: No.

Mr. POWER: This gentleman was certainly appointed to the Fiji Islands in some commercial capacity. I would like to know if he speaks the language used there, whatever it may be?

Sir GEORGE FOSTER: The hon. member will have to accept my statement that we have not appointed a trade commissioner.

Mr. JACOBS: He may have been eaten by the natives.

Sir GEORGE FOSTER: My hon. friend could go there with perfect safety; they stopped the practice of cannibalism some time ago.

Mr. CURRIE: This should not be a matter of jest at all, because Canada does a lot of business with the Fiji Islands. Orders from there are now coming in fast, and there is quite a large trade growing up.

Mr. JACOBS: What do we supply to the Fiji Islands?

Mr. CURRIE: General merchandise.

Sir GEORGE FOSTER: We get a considerable amount of sugar from the Fiji Islands.

Mr. JACOBS: I suppose we supply the natives with clothing?

Sir GEORGE FOSTER: Yes, they require some.

Mr. THOMSON (Qu'Appelle): How many trade agents are there altogether?

Sir GEORGE FOSTER: At the present time there are twenty-four trade commissioners.

Mr. THOMSON (Qu'Appelle): How many are there in the United States?

Sir GEORGE FOSTER: Not one.

Mr. THOMSON (Qu'Appelle): How does the hon. gentleman explain that state of affairs? When practically half of our trade is with the United States why have we not some one looking after our trade there?

Sir GEORGE FOSTER: I made rather an extended explanation about this matter the other day, and I can refer my hon. friend to the statements appearing in Hansard. I may say, however, that the main reason is this: We have never adopted the policy of placing our trade commissioners in the United States, the two countries lying so close to each other, and the knowledge by one or the other of markets or marketing conditions being so easy to obtain, and being so generally well distributed. Access to either country is possible in a few hours, and there is a vast amount of intercommunication between the two countries. Neither this Government, nor any of the Governments which preceded it, has ever thought that it was necessary to extend through the United States our trade commissionership propaganda, but we have placed trade commissioners in more distant fields, where in the course of time, we knew our foreign commerce would extend with the idea of affording information and providing facilities for such expansion. The trade commissionership policy of the country has been a progressive one. It commenced really from nothing, or, more properly speaking, began with very few commissioners and involved but very little expense. It takes money to carry on this work on an extensive scale. Development has been carried on progressively as it was thought the necessity arose, and as we could provide reasonable means for carrying out the work. There are people who take the other view, that it would be well for us to place trade commissioners in the United States. If we commenced that policy it would require a large number of commissioners to cover the whole territory, and then the matter of expense comes in. The first question is as to whether it is necessary, and then there is the question of cost. I may say that the subject is engaging the attention of myself and my department, and probably before the session is over I will have an opportunity of speaking further with reference to it.

Mr. JACOBS: Before the war they had a system in Germany and Austria under which men well-known in commercial life were appointed to act as a sort of advisory board to the ministry. Has the Minister of Trade and Commerce ever considered the question of similar action along those lines?

Sir GEORGE FOSTER: Yes, I myself have considered the matter as to whether it would be possible to have an honorary board of advisors from different parts of the country. There is something to be said for it, and there is something also to be said, probably, on the other side. In a way we are getting advise though we have no formal board. Our department is in communication with all the Boards of

Trade, and with all the important centres of industrial trade acitivity. We are getting constant advice, and we are trying to give information on the basis of that advice. If my hon. friend were to see the correspondence which passes in the course of a month in the department I think he would be surprised at its diversity and volume. We are in touch with every quarter of the Dominion through its prominent business men and business and industrial organizations. Outside of that we have an excellent publication, the Bulletin, which we send to no one who does not apply for it and feels that it is necessary and useful to him. Our circulation in that way has gradually grown until now we have a live bona fide circulation of between eight thousand and nine thousand. We get commendation from our business communities as to its usefulness. In many ways it is utilized in a manner that we had not thought of. For instance, many school teachers use the Bulletin for lessons in geography and commerce and make those lessons of live interest to their pupils. Generally the policy which has been adopted is that our trade commissioners must pass from one to two and a half years in the work of the department before they are sent out into the field, and that work familiarizes them with the kind of information which they should gather. After their training in the departmental office we have those student trade commissioners travel through the country to examine the various industries and report to us thereon, and so make themselves fully acquainted with what is being produced, the way in which it is produced and the cost of its production. In these ways we seek to give them a training to equip them for their work, and with a knowledge of the language of the country to which they are assigned, which is the case in most of our appointments, these trade commissioners are able to do very efficient work. In short, I think we have a really good class of men who are rendering valuable services to our manufacturing industries.

The committee rose, and the House resumed.

At Six o'clock the House took recess.

After Recess

The House resumed at Eight o'clock.

PRIVATE BILLS

THIRD READINGS

Bill No. 6, to incorporate The General Synod of the Church of England in Canada.—Mr. Cronyn.

[Sir George Foster.]

Bill No. 34, respecting The London and Lake Erie Railway and Transportation Company.—Mr. Glass.

SECOND READINGS

Bill No. 43, to incorporate Standard Insurance Company.—Mr. Mowat.

Bill No. 44, respecting The Western Dominion Railway Company.—Mr. Morphy.

SUPPLY

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

The CHAIRMAN: When the committee rose at six o'clock we were considering the Estimates of the Department of Trade and Commerce. We had reached and debated item number 358, concerning trade commissioners. Shall this item now carry?

Item agreed to.

Development and extension of Canadian trade, including exhibits and publicity, negotiations of treaties, miscellaneous advertising and printting, or other expenditure in connection therewith, $100,000.

Mr. CAHILL: Does this item cover foreign exhibitions?

Sir GEORGE FOSTER: No. Exhibitions are really under the Department of the Interior. In this are involved certain small exhibits in connection with our trade commissioners' offices as illustrating the products of Canada.

Mr. FIELDING: What are the principal items of the expenditure?

Sir GEORGE FOSTER: The principal items of expenditure are in connection with the Exhibits and Publicity Branch, the work of which I explained the other night. In the Exhibits Branch we have articles from different countries which are tabulated and priced for the information of any manufacturers in Canada who may feel that we could supply any of those particular articles. The work is in its initial stage, and we shall see in the course of a little while what good really comes from it. Some good results, however, have already been obtained, and we feel that it will be of benefit to the manufacturing industries in connection with the supplying to other countries of articles similar to those exhibited. The Publicity Branch handles the film operations, which are very interesting and are a very valuable development in connection with publicity. At the Bureau of Exhibits on Wellington and Bank streets we have an equipment for the taking of pictures, the development of the films and their distribution. The work done there can-

not be excelled, I think, by any of the establishments engaged in that kind of manufacture. Our purpose is to give to the outside world a picture of our productive capacity, our natural resources, and so on; and we make the film story interesting by weaving in bits of scenery expressive of our natural scenic resources. These films are being distributed through a large number of the countries with which we are dealing now and with which we hope to deal. One of our pictures, for instance, that which depicts the water powers of Canada, is a very valuable one and has been exhibited in Great Britain and in the United States with profit in the actual realization of a great deal of business. Our agricultural film depicts the work of the settler, his coming into the Northwest, building his shack, beginning his operations, tilling his field and reaping his harvest. Then the movement of the grain is shown from the field to the elevator, thence to the cars and to the point of shipment to foreign countries. This very interesting film is a type of the many that we produce. Films illustrating manufacturing processes and activities are shown, in connection with fishing, logging, the manufacture of pulp from pulpwood, forestry work, and so on, and the legends include statistics with respect to the particular resources dealt with. For instance, if it is water-powers, the available water-power is stated, the horse-power already developed, the capabilities of further development, and so on. These films are being so distributed that the distribution really costs nothing, and in fact, has now begun to bring us in a revenue. When I was in Great Britain two years ago I arranged a contract with one of the most prominent film exhibitors there, Sir William F. Jury, and he was so well pleased with the original films that he is taking a new film from us almost every month He puts them through his regular circuit and a certain percentage of the proceeds comes to Canada. We have been doing work in the film line for other departments. We have done some work for the Canadian National Railways which they would otherwise have had done elsewhere; so in that way we try to keep our staff employed and to make as large as possible the income which is set against everhead expenses. During the latter half of the last year we did work for the departments to the amount of $8,559. We have now a large list of these motion pictures which have been taken and distributed. The total of the revenue up to January 31, 1921, is $11,875.

Mr. FIELDING: For the current year.

Sir GEORGE FOSTER: No, from the time they began distributing these pictures, probably about fourteen or fifteen months in all. In the United States these are distributed and are shown to probably two or three million people weekly, who see them through the pictures of current events. They also have been distributed in like manner in New Zealand, Australia and South Africa, and we are having the legends printed now in other languages so that they may be distributed in other countries as well. They were exhibited in France during the time of the Lyons Fair and at Paris when we had our exhibition there. This serves a double purpose. It stimulates trade; it excites curiosity as to our natural resources; but it also does a good deal of the best of work for our Immigration Department. It was a personal experience that I had at Paris and at the Lyons Fair. The city of Lyons set apart one of their large halls for the exhibition of our films, and we exhibited them there in the afternoons and in the evenings. The hall was crowded all the time, and it was very gratifying to see the interest that the people took in the pictures and to hear the remarks which they made in reference to them. The same thing occurred at Paris where we exhibited these pictures for about three months, where schools and colleges made expeditions at certain hours to see them, where the general public also came in, and where I had an opportunity of having them viewed by all the staffs and members of the countries represented at the Peace Conference, to whom I sent personal letters inviting them to come at certain times, so that we got a very wide publicity in that respect in reference to our resources and other features of interest.

Mr. DENIS: What amount was expended last year on these pictures out of the appropriation of $130,000?

Sir GEORGE FOSTER: Up to January 31, about $86,000. We have reduced the appropriation $30,000 this year.

Mr. CAHILL: What amount was expended on account of negotiations of treaties, and was any amount expended in connection with the proposed treaty with the West Indies?

Sir GEORGE FOSTER: Out of this appropriation we paid the expenses which were incurred by the meeting here. We provided the hall without expense; we met in the museum, and we took care of the

delegates while they were here. With the co-operation of the Board of Trade and the citizens of Ottawa, we gave them as good a social time as we could. We also paid the small printing expenses.

Mr. CAHILL: What was the amount of the item?

Sir GEORGE FOSTER: I have not seen the bills that are in. A very small amount comparatively.

Mr. ROSS: I notice from the right hon. gentleman's report that a preferential tariff has been extended by Australia to the United Kingdom and there is some little temporary agreement between Australia and South Africa giving South Africa a tariff preference also. The right hon. gentleman's report says that "the Canadian Government is now considering an exchange of views with the Australian authorities in the hope that the trade relations between the two countries may be improved." This report is dated 1st June, 1920. What has occurred in connection with these negotiations, and what success or failure have they had?

Sir GEORGE FOSTER: South Africa received a small preference in the Australian market on a very limited number of goods, and I think South Africa gave three or five per cent preference on a certain limited number of Australian goods. That is the only preference that Australia has given other than to the United Kingdom. In Australia they undertook, about two years ago now, a revision of the tariff. I am not going back beyond that because I suppose my hon. friend knows what took place before that. There have been negotiations for the extension of preference between the two countries, but they have never resulted in an actual preference being given in either case, there being several reasons for this. The Government which at present exists in Australia, when it came into power, undertook a revision of the tariff. In March, 1920, it brought down a resolution which was the basis upon which was to be founded a Bill and an Act, but the Bill itself has not yet been framed and passed by the legislature; only the resolution holds, and the Government is acting under the resolution. By that resolution Australia gave a preference to British goods, but gave no preference to any other outside dominion or dependency of Great Britain, but in the resolution she contemplated, after the legislation was completed, opening negotiations with Canada and New Zealand for preference between herself and those countries. As I have said, the Bill is still being discussed, and the latest advices that I have is that probably it will be autumn of this year before it is finally passed. Whilst I have been keeping in close touch, personally and otherwise, the answer has been invariably this: "When that Bill becomes law, we shall have our legislation, and we shall be very glad to take the matter up with you and see if we can arrange for a preference between these countries." In the meantime the present condition is that Australia made material additions to her tariff along protective lines, gave to Great Britain a fairly good preference on her products as Australia imported them, but has no other preferential arrangements either made or under negotiation. That is the situation as it is to-day, so that our manufactures going into Australia, if they are of a quality or kind like those that come from Great Britain, go in under the general tariff while the British goods go in on a basis of preference.

Mr. FIELDING: We do not give Australia a preference?

Sir GEORGE FOSTER: No, we have never been successful in getting an arrangement.

Mr. ROSS: Suppose this Bill is passed by Australia, what do they propose doing as far as the Dominions are concerned? What reciprocal arrangements are suggested?

Sir GEORGE FOSTER: There are none suggested by the Australian Government. There is simply in the resolution I have spoken of power to enter into negotiations for a preference, but there is no proposition, and there are no negotiations. The answer I invariably get is that as soon as this Bill becomes law they will take the matter up with us.

Mr. ROSS: The Bill will empower them to make any arrangements they please?

Sir GEORGE FOSTER: Yes.

Mr. FIELDING: We had a partial arrangement with Australia at one time. At the beginning of the preferential arrangement my recollection is that we extended the preference to New South Wales, which was at that time a low tariff colony, but we did not extend it to Victoria, which was not a low tariff colony. When the colonies were united in the Commonwealth of Australia, the tariff generally got a lift up, and from that time forward we did

not give a preference to any part of Australia. That is the present condition, I assume.

Sir GEORGE FOSTER: We are not giving a preference to any of the states in Australia.

Mr. FIELDING: I quite understand that, because when the colonies united and had a common tariff, that tariff being not as advantageous to Canada as the tariff of New South Wales had been, we ceased to give a preference to any of them.

Sir GEORGE FOSTER: Does my hon. friend refer to the first legislation of 1897?

Mr. FIELDING: Yes.

Sir GEORGE FOSTER: That was the legislation, if I remember rightly, under which Canada gave a preference to any country whose tariff came within a certain limit. That might have applied to New South Wales, but when the main preference came in, none was given to Australia.

Mr. McDERMAND: Will any part of this vote or any other item in the Estimates be used to promote trade within our own Dominion?

Sir GEORGE FOSTER: No, this vote is for the encouragement of foreign trade, but we cannot, I suppose, very well promote trade with outside countries without it having a reflex action on ours. This vote is not for any such purpose as my hon. friend has in mind. The different provinces interchange their goods, producers trade with consumers, and we do not by this vote, or any other vote in the way of subsidy or monetary encouragement, strive to aid that process of merchandising.

Mr. McDERMAND: I understand that Mr. Hoover, who was Food Controller in the United States, is very anxious to develop trade within the borders of that country, and I was in hopes that our Department of Trade and Commerce might be able to do something along that line, especially with respect to fruit. I had in mind aid to our growers in finding a market for their fruit. There is a great demand for fruit, but thousands of barrels of apples and smaller fruits go to waste every year owing to the scarcity of labour and of containers. We are not able to get this fruit on the market in bulk form, and I had hoped that the department might aid in finding a ready market for these perishable fruits. I think it would be a great benefit to the consumers in all the large centres. The high-priced containers certainly mean a higher price for the fruit to the consumer, but if the department could co-operate so that this fruit could be shipped in bulk or in sacks it would reach the consumer at a much lower price. Owing to the scarcity of labour in the rural districts and especially in the fruit growing districts, aid of this sort would be of great benefit to the consumer.

Sir GEORGE FOSTER: The different industries, the fruit industry, for example, are helped by the work of this department. The fruit industry is helped by the work of the department in gaining an entrance for it and in developing its distribution in foreign countries. It would be a wonderfully complex piece of business if we undertook here, in this Dominion, to aid the producers in any one section of the province to get their articles into another section or from one province into another province. That opens up a vista of a very great deal of complexity and expense. I think for a considerable time, maybe always, our internal trade will have to look after itself in so far as the transportation and representation of its products is concerned in other parts of the Dominion. The Statistical Branch of my department is doing a great deal of valuable work towards making the people of this Dominion acquainted with what is produced in different sections, its quality, quantity, price, and the like of that. Those parts of the country which do not produce a particular kind of article get that information, and that in itself is quite a large measure of aid and stimulus towards internal marketing. There is nothing in this item for the purpose my hon. friend speaks of, nor do I think anything will be voted along that line.

Mr. McDERMAND: I was lead to bring this matter up by a speech I read of the Minister of Finance delivered to the Retail Merchants' Association, from which I will quote only a short extract:

> Canada's chief claim to prosperity is as an agricultural country. There is no doubt of that. Does it look well for an agricultural country to be buying its agricultural products from abroad? Are we city people fair to our farmer cousins? Are we trying to see the home market retained for our own farmers as we should? Does it not seem strange that in a country like this, with such a climate, that for the nine months ending December 21 last we imported $27,000,000 worth of fruits, fresh and canned,

from the United States? What is the matter with the Canadian apple? Obviously something must be wrong somewhere. During the nine month period referred to we imported 198,000 barrels, three boxes to the barrel, with our own apples rotting by the thousand on the ground. Whatever it is which is wrong must be mended.

Having read that, and having had some experience in this matter, I felt that there was a great and needless waste of fruit in Ontario when there should be a ready market in our large centres and in the West; for we all know the food value of the apple. Now, we made an attempt last fall to ship apples through to Winnipeg in bulk and not in any container, and we discovered that this could be quite successfully done, although I think there is room for great improvement. We understand that in the Niagara district a large corporation has been formed and the Ontario Government has guaranteed the salary of an officer for the coming year to supervise the work that is to be carried on. If we could secure real co-operation on the part of the Department of Trade and Commerce in the way of advertising and so on, not only the producers generally, but the consumers in the large centres, would be greatly benefited. The consumers are very desirous of getting this fruit as cheaply as possible, and we are equally anxious to dispose of it at reasonable prices. So that the co-operation of the department along this line would, no doubt, meet with the approval of both consumers and producers.

Sir GEORGE FOSTER: I think my hon. friend has about struck the point in the last sentence or two. If there is one section of the community that has a large product which it wants to get rid of, and there is another community somewhere at a distance that has both the capacity and the desire for this product, then there is room and there is need for co-operative effort. Some organization is obviously required to bring supply and demand together. But my hon. friend must remember that some of the departments are doing a good deal in this direction. For instance, take the Department of Agriculture, among the different branches of which is the fruit department. If my hon. friend will study its reports, or listen to its minister, he will find out that the department is doing a great deal to promote the consumption of fruit and other products. And the Marine Department has also done something to encourage the consumption of fish by establishing a fish day. After they have succeeded in firmly establishing the habit of observing one fish day, I suppose a second such day will follow. By this means, the consumption of fish ought to be greatly increased. Some years ago I put on a campaign to aid the fruit industry, advising everyone to eat an apple every morning. A very successful advertising scheme was carried out and a great many apples were eaten that would otherwise have been wasted. That, however, was not a settled policy. After all, the industry itself must look out for its own avenues for customers and transport, and under this vote my department does not in any way contribute to that business.

Mr. McDERMAND: I may give the minister a concrete example of the cost to the consumer and it will show that something is needed. Perhaps I am appealing to the wrong department, but if the Department of Agriculture is properly charged with the responsibility for a matter of this kind, I trust it will give it some attention. We loaded cars on the Canadian Pacific railway last fall with bulk apples, hand picked, at $1.30 per hundred. The freight on these apples into Winnipeg amounted to $1 per hundred, which meant a cost of $2.30 per hundred landed there. These same apples were then retailed at $1.85 per fourty-pound sack, and the people came and bought them, at the car, paying something like $4.62½ per hundred. Someone was thus making a profit of about $2.30, which seems to me to be too much of a spread if business is to be successfully carried on. Now, we feel that if we could be put into closer touch with the consumer, it would benefit us both. I am sorry if I am appealing to the wrong department; but, I repeat, I hope something will be done, either through an advertising campaign or by some other effective means, to secure closer co-operation and communication between consumer and producer.

Mr. DECHENE: We export large quantities of butter and cheese every year to the United States and Great Britain. What is the department doing to extend this trade?

Sir GEORGE FOSTER: My hon. friend sets me a pretty large task if I am to tell him all that the department has done in the interest of trade. I do not think he quite means that I should give a lecture that would occupy the time which it would take for me to recount the operations of the department. As regards butter and cheese, neither of these is a product which has come to light within the last few days, or even within the last few years. The cheese industry of Canada established its

reputation in Great Britain decades ago, and it does not require anything in particular more than to keep up the standard. If possible, we should strive to improve the quality of our butter and cheese, and everything advisable in this respect is being done by the Department of Agriculture which looks after our butter and cheese and the dairying business to ensure that quality is maintained. If that is done, the market having been once opened, the demand created, the taste for these articles cultivated, and their reputation thoroughly established, trade must do the rest. My hon. friend, of course, does not think that we can go further than that. We cannot transport these products or open warehouses for their sale; that does not come within the scope of the department's activities. But we have, by the collection and distribution of information, done all we can to further the industry. The same applies to other articles.

Mr. A. M. DECHENE (Montmagny): (Translation.) Mr. Chairman, in taking my seat this evening, I promised the right hon. Minister of Trade and Commerce that I would furnish my humble contribution to the evening's debate by making a few remarks in French.

We know and it gives us much pleasure to acknowledge it, that he is about the only scholar within the Cabinet and that he alone together with one of his colleagues, the right hon. Minister of Justice (Mr. Doherty), may pay themselves the compliment of knowing and speaking French. We congratulate him. I wish to prove to him this evening that we appreciate his work, by taking up an industry that interests the whole country. Every year we export about $50,000,000 worth of butter, cheese, condensed milk and cream. In reading over the official statements which are placed at our disposal, the right hon. Minister will no doubt recall to his memory that we export to England at the very most between $10,000,000 and $12,000,000 annually of butter and cheese. According to the reports of the Department of Agriculture, we are one of the smallest exporters of butter and cheese to England. As a matter of fact, only France and Belgium, I believe, export less butter and cheese to England than we do. I can easily anticipate the right hon. Minister's answer that it is up to the Department of Agriculture to look after that end; but on the other hand, what benefit do we derive from the Ministry of Trade and Commerce, if all the other departments not only take care of the production but also attend to the foreign marketing of their respective products. Such being the case, there would be no need for a Deparment of Trade and Commerce. This is perhaps a truth known to everybody, yet no one dares utter it in public.

I am perfectly of the opinion of the right hon. Minister of Trade and Commerce, when he tells us that the Department of Agriculture sees to the production of butter and cheese. I know that the hon. Minister of Agriculture personally gives to it much of his valuable time and energy. In order to ascertain the quality of his products each year in either one or another of the provinces of this country, he organizes fairs at which all the provinces are invited to exhibit their choicest products. Last year, or rather a little more than a year ago, one of those large exhibitions was held in Winnipeg, and Quebec carried off a fifth prize. During the last session I had the honour to promise my hon. friend from Frontenac (Mr. Edwards) that the next exhibition would show whether we had improved, and I think my memory serves me well when I state that this year, the large Dairy School of St. Hyacinthe took a first prize. We, then, have first-class products, but we cannot ask the Department of Agriculture who is looking after production and tries to keep up quality, to find new markets for the surplus of those products. In fact, if we look up the Estimates of the Department of Agriculture, we find that there is nothing to warrant an expenditure by that Department towards finding an outlet abroad for our surplus of products, whether in the United States, France or Great Britain.

But, is it not rather strange, and I think the right hon. Minister of Trade and Commerce should be the first to acknowledge it, that countries situated at the Antipodes got ahead of us on the English market, that the products of Argentina, New Zealand and Australia arrive there in larger quantities and that a better price obtains for them than for our Canadian products. I think it is within the purview of the right hon. minister to ascertain why countries so unfavourably situated should have this advantage, while our country, so near to England, and with such an extensive merchant marine, should have such small shipments to Great Britain. He should find out why we are unable to find in England a market for those commodities which are there in great demand and of which we have a considerable surplus. This is even more striking when considered in the light of the

situation of the dairy industry in Ireland. We are aware that since unrest has broken out in this most unhappy part of the empire more than thirty large dairies, creameries and cheese factories have been destroyed by fire. Moreover, the Department of Agriculture does not allow the exportation of butter and cheese from Ireland except at fixed prices. Again we know that the butter which was smuggled from Ireland into England sold at five or six pence above the price fixed on the English market.

Taking all these facts into consideration, I am of the opinion that our Department of Agriculture should take more interest in the exportation of our dairy products. Our dairy, creamery and cheese factory products do occupy a special position in the country.

The hon. member (Mr. McDermand), who a moment ago showed his interest in the production and sale of fruit in this country, was told by the hon. minister that the department did not supervise internal trade. In my opinion, the department should at least show some interest in our foreign trade in a commodity which is not the produce of a province exclusively, but of all the provinces. Every province in the Dominion is interested in seeing to it that its butter, cheese, cream and condensed milk command better prices and sell in larger quantities. The result of such an undertaking is obvious. The owners of those small factories transact their business directly with a large number of farmers and, in helping those small manufacturers—I think they may be called manufacturers just as well as those who have steel, iron, etc., as their raw material—I am sure the department would be carrying on some useful work. The butter or cheese manufacturer gets his raw material from the farmer and pays him in proportion to the returns from the sales. If we create a larger market for our butter and cheese, the effect will be felt at once by the farmer and the country at large. It is not only a section of the country but the whole Dominion that would benefit by it. What is the use of voting for the Department of Agriculture amounts aggregating about a million dollars, and even more, to promote the better breeding and better care of our herds of cattle, if after all this the Department of Trade and Commerce does not exert itself in order to find a market for our products. From the special statement made to-night by the hon. minister, one would think that the Department of Trade and Commerce is nothing but a film machine, a photographic screen. If the Government of this country is going to do business with moving pictures as a specialty, there is but one thing to do: turn this House into a public hall and give us moving pictures concerning the intentions of the Government. We would have them before our eyes and the Government would not be committed in any way, as they would not have to say either yes or no. Moving pictures might help in making Canada better known to foreign countries; by their means, immigrants might be attracted here; but I do not believe that they would prove satisfactory to foreign dealers and induce them to purchase our products, though they might bring these dealers to invest money in our country, and perhaps come to see which industries could be developed here; yet, I fail to see how our trade could gain any advantage in this. All the reports of the weekly bulletin which is distributed to us—reports which unfortunately are published in one language only—prove that it is important that the Canadian dealer make some arrangement with the English dealer in regard to his sales, delivery and manner of payment, and also the packing of Canadian products. What do we find in pursuance of the advice given in this Bulletin which is published under the direction of my right hon. friend? We find moving pictures. They may be very nice and most enjoyable to look at but they are of no help, or very little, to trade. The right hon. minister and his colleagues who accompanied him to the conference of the League of Nations, may have found the sight of our movies most enjoyable but, after all, these gentlemen ought to realize that there is something better than movies to be offered to foreign countries. Is the Government of Canada a moving picture firm? I think this is of a nature to have us turned into ridicule, and if all may spend a pleasant afternoon or evening at a movie show, there is not much advantage there for our dealers.

We have companies and co-operative organizations in the province of Quebec. We have the large co-operative society of cheese-factories of Quebec which comprise 8,000 members, and which carries on a trade of several million dollars in foreign countries; this is indeed the only large trade organization which is seeking a foreign market for our farm products, and particularly for butter and cheese manufactured in our province. I cannot say what is being done in other provinces, but I know that there are large warehouses in these provinces, that there are dealers who are busy marketing a few million pounds

of Canadian butter in Great Britain. I think that the Argentine Republic shipped to England, last year, over 300,000 cwt. of butter, whilst Canada only shipped 32,000 cwt. at the most. Why this discrepancy? I cannot say, and would be glad if the hon. minister himself could suggest an explanation, though I doubt very much he will do so. Neither could it be explained by the movies. It would be most important, especially under present circumstances, that the minister should have under his orders, smart, active, pushing young men who understand business, and who could represent us and make our products known in England and the United States.

Nearly every day, on the floor of this House, we hear hon. members saing: "You must, we must do our best to trade with our Mother Country, with Great Britain." We would be delighted to sell our products to Great Britain. Only, we realize that our Department of Commerce is not adequately represented in England, that it is not represented in such a way as to help us. I believe that, under these conditions, a fifty million dollar trade should prove of greater attraction to the minister and induce him to take all necessary means so that this product—a product which is greatly needed by the British people, especially cheese which is as bread and wine to the British labourer, cheese which is his principal food —be delivered to him in as large quantities as possible by our country and not by the Argentine Republic or New Zealand or Australia.

I wish to tell the hon. minister that I believe that he, himself, together with the other members of the Government should see to the exportation of products which are manufactured by the farmer or by those who receive the raw product from the farmer. It is very well to attend to large industries; these are generally controlled by large business concerns, men of wealth, who can very well look after their own connections and interests on the European markets.

Until late years, we have had a representative in Europe soliciting orders from the allied countries for our different manufactured articles. This gentleman, though paid by the Dominion, has never very much exerted himself toward establishing commercial relations which might have helped in developing the tradè both in the raw material and the manufactured article supplied by the Canadian farmers.

Why this discrimination, which is constantly recurring? Why trouble about the large manufacturers and never about the agricultural class?

The fiscal year of 1919-20 shows us that about fifty per cent of the total exports of this country consists of products foreign to our large industries. For fifty per cent consisted of farm products, either in their raw state, or as manufactured goods; this being the case, why does not the Department of Trade and Commerce think it proper and expedient to bring on closer commercial relations with England which is our best market? Why do they not see that we export even more to the United States, which seems to be, at the present hour, the largest market in the world.

I hope that the hon. minister himself will deem it expedient to explain some of these flaws which exist in his department, and why he has erred, and if having erred, he wishes to find grace by creating at an early date, for the Canadian farmer, the manufacturer of butter, cheese, condensed milk or cream, a market worthy of our country. What benefit is derived, by the Minister of Agriculture, from stimulating agriculture and asking the farmers of this country to produce more and of a higher standard, if having done so and more than the population of this country can consume, his colleagues, the Minister of Trade and Commerce, cannot find the necessary outlet for the sale of the surplus of these products.

I think the right hon. Minister of Commerce should stir up his head officers if necessary, and put them to work, so that we, the small as well as the large producers, may profit from the work of his department.

Mr. MOWAT: I would like to intervene at this stage in order to call attention to a subject which was discussed very briefly this afternoon and which discussion seemed to end in rather an indeterminate manner—that is the importance of considering how much we can do for Canadian trade by establishing commercial agents in the United States. As it is now, those in the adjoining Republic who want to buy Canadian goods have no way of determining the extent of a particular trade or the rates in vogue, and we are accordingly at the greatest disadvantage in that respect as compared with the United States. The latter country has seventy or eighty commercial agents in Canada, most of whom are consuls, and these officers are furnished with admirable trade statistics of the manufactures of their country, and are

able at any time to supply those who are in want of goods from the United States with details in regard to railway rates and other data. We have no service of the kind in the United States, and the consequence is that Canadian manufacturers and producers are at a very great disadvantage in obtaining or filling orders from there. We now know that we are buying from the United States double the amount we export to that country, and this handicap could be largely overcome—so I am told by those who know, and it seems to me quite obvious—by having a better system of advertising our goods in the United States and indicating where reliable information could be obtained as to Canadian industries or products. The expense of such a proceeding would not be great for this reason: I am told, upon reliable authority, that the commercial agents of the United States in Canada—who, as I said before, are consuls and have consular offices in all our large centres—are paid fees by Canadians on the commercial paper involved in sending goods to the United States, and that these fees in the aggregate are sufficient to pay the entire salary or remuneration enjoyed by these commercial agents. We have therefore the extraordinary state of affairs that Canadians are paying the salaries or remuneration received by American officials, but Canada is getting no advantage from the value of the goods exported. I was told of a case by a gentleman in New York who received an enquiry from a manufacturer in New Orleans desirous of obtaining maple sugar and syrup from Canada. Unfortunately he did not know where to go. There was no Canadian agent to whom he could apply, and New Orleans is hundreds of miles away from this country. In some way or other he finally got information, through some agent in Montreal, as to where he could obtain these commodities and the result was that an order came from New Orleans for maple sugar and syrup to the extent of two carloads valued at several thousand dollars. If such a profitable transaction resulted in this one case, how many more instances are there where Canada loses orders for trade simply because of the fact that the people living over there, at such a distance from this country, have no information as to where to place their orders. If it is a fact that the salaries or remuneration which the American trade agents, or consuls, in this country receive, come from fees paid by Canadians, it seems to me that the same result would follow if Canadian trade agents were established in the United States. It would appear that if we could collect fees for Canadian trade agents appointed in the large American centres those fees would equal, and perhaps exceed, the remuneration that should be granted these officers, so there would be no extra expense to our country in putting such a system into effect. At present the work over there, as regards Canada, is done by the British consuls established in the large cities. While no fault can be found with the attention they give to Canadian affairs, they are not particularly anxious to see that Canadian orders are placed. They are British consuls, they are looking after the trade of Great Britain and Ireland, and while they are willing to do what is requisite there is no special effort made by them to help in the placing of Canadian orders. But if we had our own agents over there, and if a certain amount were placed at their disposal for the purpose of advertising in the papers where they were to be found, and what information they could give, I venture to say that a very large amount of the present disparity in the trade between the two countries would soon disappear, and we would find our Canadian business men deriving very great benefit by the appointment of these trade agents.

Mr. CAHILL: I would like to ask the minister, in connection with the item to cover the expense of negotiating treaties, whether the Government has in mind, or has attempted to negotiate, a treaty with England permitting live Canadian cattle to be imported into that country. We give a preference to British goods entering Canada, and I should think that if this Government displayed sufficient activity it could, in exchange for that preference, get permission to have our live cattle landed in Britain. The cattle industry of Canada is going to be very badly crippled if our livestock is excluded from the American market by a high tariff, and shut out entirely from the British market. I would not suggest that the minister should retaliate by increasing the duty on British goods, but I would recommend to him that if Britain is not agreeable to admitting our live cattle, we should reduce the customs duties on goods coming from other countries and make them equal to those prevailing on goods coming from Britain. Has the Government contemplated any such plan as the one I have suggested?

Sir GEORGE FOSTER: No, we have not thought of anything along that line, in order to achieve the object referred to, but my hon. friend knows very well the position which has been assumed by the Dominion for a great many years past with reference to this question. I think probably the matter will be in a better position by the Government continuing along the lines which have been followed in the past, and which are still being followed, rather than to interject into the issue a tariff question by way of reprisal. I do not think that would be the best way to reach a satisfactory conclusion.

With regard to the point raised by my hon. friend from Parkdale I may say, as I have already stated to-day, that my department is giving very special attention to the subject, and I repeat what I said this afternoon that probably before the end of the session I may have something further to say in a more definite way. The arguments which the hon. member has placed before the committee are believed in by a great many people; but there are others who think that trade between ourselves and the United States might very well be left to take care of itself for the reasons which I have already given. The two countries are in close proximity to one another; they have an intimate knowledge of each others resources, and in a variety of ways they are largely informed as to the extent of the business which each country may do with the other. Then the cost must be taken into account. For us to adopt the consular system which the United States employs and apply it to the United States would necessitate a rather heavy expenditure. The United States' consuls in this country number not more than thirty, and they are supplemented by a certain number of agents. It is true that for every package which is invoiced a fee of $2.50 is charged, and those fees in the gross more than cover the salaries and emoluments of these consular officers and their agents. If we adopt that system we must be prepared, as I said, to apply it to all foreign trade; otherwise it would be considered discriminatory against the United States. Of course, it would not be necessary to apply the system to Empire trade. As I said before, the matter is being considered.

Mr. MORPHY: I would like the privilege of going back, as did the hon. member for Parkdale (Mr. Mowat) to the item preceding, which varies very much from the present item. I am inclined to say a few words in advocacy of the same principle suggested by him. From what the minister said the other night, apparently he is thoroughly satisfied with his trade commissioners whom he has at work in various foreign countries, but I do not think he has yet given to the House the names and locations of those gentlemen. I should like to see this information put on record as a matter of publicity so that we may know who those gentlemen are and in what countries they are operating. After all, the best customer we have for our products is the United States, but, roughly speaking, they sell us two dollars' worth of goods for every dollar's worth that we sell them. Now, we enjoy our great volume of trade there without much solicitation on our part, and it seems strange to me that we do not adopt an aggressive trade policy in that great market right at our door instead of sending trade commissioners to remote foreign countries. The appointment of trade agents in unstinted numbers to make a drive for business in the United States would be most opportune at this particular time, for it is acknowledged by all economists that the only way to put ourselves as nearly as possible on a par of exchange with that great country is by increasing the volume of our exports there. The history of the United States after the Civil War shows most conclusively that they tackled their biggest problems in the building of canals and railroads on top of the greatest debt that the country had ever shouldered. Their slogan was: Full steam ahead! It seems to me that that would be a splendid motto for us to adopt now in developing our present trade channels and opening up new ones. I cannot conceive why in the trade bulletin which goes to all members all sorts of statistics are to be found about the opportunities for trade in Asia, Europe and Africa, illustrated with beautiful pictures of temples situated on the banks of the sacred rivers of the East, and of gondolas on the Venetian canals, while the possibilities of trade with over one hundred millions of people right at our door are apparently ignored. My hon. friend says that the United States has eighty-four consular agents and subsidiary officers here—although I think he would be nearer the mark if he stated the number at fifty-two—all active, energetic men pushing the sale of United States goods in Canada, while we are left to the tender mercies of the British

consular agents in the United States. What do the latter care for the trade of Canada? They are in the United States for the purpose of increasing the trade of England, Ireland and Scotland. Undoubtedly the English people are the greatest traders in the world. They are alive to the necessity of keeping their mercantile marine busy, and they do it through the medium of foreign trade. Here we are, close to that vast market with only an imaginary boundary line between us, and it is scarcely credible that the Administration will send its trade agents to foreign climes, thousands of miles away, and neglect the American market right at our door. The minister says that his trade agents abroad are very satisfactory, but I have a recollection of being in the office of one of those gentlemen —I will give his name to the minister privately, as it is something I do not like to speak of publicly. This was some years ago before the present minister was in charge of the Department of Trade and Commerce. I saw the sign, and I went in and interviewed the commissioner, purely out of my desire as a Canadian to know what was going on in relation to Canadian trade. He was a kindly gentleman and a pleasant conversationalist, but before leaving he asked me if I could get for him at Ottawa a map of Canada to put upon his office wall. I said, "Surely you have a map?" He replied, "No, and I need one very much." He also wished me to send him a little atlas which the Canadian Government published and which would be more convenient to him than a map when giving information to callers about Canada and her resources. On my return home I sent him the map and atlas. I am sure that had that been brought to the attention of the right hon. minister who is now head of the department it in itself would have caused a shaking up of the dry bones of the trade commissioners who represent Canada, and would have led to the fitting out of their offices in such a manner as would enable them to talk intelligently about the country they represent and to give to prospective traders all the information likely to promote Canadian trade.

not only information about goods but where the people are and who can supply them—how far it is from Montreal, how far from Toronto and so on. The minister may suggest that surely the trade agent knew that. Well, he had not a map by which to explain it to anybody, and he needed it. It does seem to me that the department should take for its motto: "Full steam ahead." These trade commissioners should be properly equipped and informed as to what is necessary in the best interests of our country. Moreover, there should be established at points such as those referred to by the hon. member for Parkdale (Mr. Mowat) independent Canadian trade agents for the express purpose of working in Canada's interests. I have heard no objections to the adoption of that course. The remarks of the hon. member for Parkdale with regard to the expense are much to the point. The fees received by the United States consular agents are, I gather from his remarks, sufficient to pay all the expenses of the American offices here. Surely it would be advisable to try it out, establishing only a few offices at first at the most advantageous points on the other side. The fact that we are doing $500,000,000 worth of trade or thereabouts each year with the United States is in itself an assurance that the cost of establishing and maintaining the offices would be made up by fees, as is the case with the United States offices in Canada. In other words, the offices of these Canadian trade agents would be practically self-sustaining. I leave that suggestion with the minister—full steam ahead on the specific line of the development of Canadian trade, making the Canadian seller of goods, the Canadian wholesaler, the Canadian manufacturer, feel that he has the loyal and active co-operation and assistance of the Government. Even if he is slow himself, he would give the Government credit for having pointed the way to the development and expansion of trade. Moreover, the adoption of this course and the resulting increase of trade would soon have the effect of adjusting the balance of trade as between Canada and the United States.

Mr. FIELDING: Mr. Chairman, "full steam ahead" is an excellent motto if you accompany it with another: "Be sure you are right, then go ahead." I need hardly say I sympathize most heartily with every effort to improve our trade relations with the United States; therefore the object that the member for Parkdale (Mr. Mowat) has in view is one with which I am in accord. But I am inclined to think that the argument in favour of trade agents in the United States is not as strong as some people think it is. There is very much force in the view advanced by the minister that one of the reasons why we do not need trade agents in the United States is because we are so near to that country. My hon. friend from Perth (Mr. Morphy) thinks that the fact that we are so near to them is a rea-

son why we should have trade agents there. But you need trade agents in distant ports because distant ports have no convenient means of communicating with us.

Mr. MORPHY: Not only does the United States have consular agents in Canada, but our country is overrun with their commercial travellers.

Mr. FIELDING: Is there any reason why we should not have commercial travellers in the United States? Do our merchants and manufacturers need Government assistance in the matter of sending their travellers to the United States? I do think, however, that the argument in favour of the maintaining of trade agents in distant countries which are not conveniently in communication with Canada is a strong one.

Mr. MORPHY: The reason why the commercial travellers come here from the United States is because the trade agents of the United States tell them what they can sell here—encourage them and bring them here.

Mr. FIELDING: Oh no, it is because they learn from the morning newspaper all about Canada. Of course, in exceptional cases trade agents might advantageously be maintained in certain parts of the United States. The member for Parkdale suggested New Orleans, which is rather distant from Canada. There might be exceptional circumstances under which our having a trade agent at a particular point would be useful, and so far from discouraging it I would cordially support the minister in adopting any suggestion of that kind. But the idea that we should have these trade agents all over the United States is open to the gravest objection. A man who wants to do business between New York and Montreal does not need any trade agents; he can get nearly all the information he wants for a postage stamp, or he can leave by the evening train and arrive in Montreal on the morning of the next day, and vice versa. I am persuaded that the business relations between Canada and the United States will be almost as good without trade agents as with them, unless under such exceptional conditions as I have mentioned. It is my recollection that years ago we had a trade agent in Chicago. We found that he was not needed; that he was not accomplishing anything of a practical nature, and I believe that he was sent to some other part of the country. If you appoint seventy or eighty agents of Canada in the United States and they collect fees on American goods coming in, as is suggested, that will be an additional tax upon the Canadian people who bring the goods in. Whether we want them to bring those goods in is another question. It is their liberty to do so; the tariff permits it. But if you have a large army of Canadian agents in the United States and bring about the imposition of that additional tax, it may suit some interests in the country but it will not suit the consumer. It may be said that the object of maintaining these trade agents is to check the exports and adjust the balance of trade. Well, I do not think that is the best way to do it. We do not want to impose unnecessary taxation upon any part of our people. I repeat that in special cases, such as at New Orleans or other distant ports—even, perhaps, at New York or Boston—we might well have trade agents, but the idea of having a large army of them in the United States ought not to be too readily accepted. I am rather in sympathy with the view expressed by the minister that our proximity to the United States is one of the reasons why we do not need an army of agents in that country.

Mr. MORPHY: The hon. gentleman is most delightful in exaggerating to suit his own purpose. I have not yet heard any one speak about a "large army" of trade agents. I purposely suggested the advisability of starting with a few agents with a view to determining the advantages of the plan. I admit that the hon. gentleman has had vast experience and it is with diffidence that I dispute his suggestion in regard to this matter. But I have come across Americans who do not know this country as we know the United States—people who believe that this is a country of ice and snow, a country of Indians and bears. I am not sure that it would not be a good thing for Canada to send a moving picture show to the United States with a view to depicting the activities in our large cities, the beauty and extent of our lakes and rivers, the value of our steamship services, and so on—in short, to educate those people down there who are apparently backward so far as a knowledge of Canada is concerned.

Mr. CURRIE: Our railways.

Mr. MORPHY: Our railways would also be an object lesson. Why, some people who plan to visit Canada in the summer think that they are coming to the frigid zone and that they should bring their winter

clothes; the fact is that they do not know us. These trade agents would make them know us, would make them know our trade capacity, would do a great many things. The hon. gentleman speaks about a large army; I want to remind him that this is not war time. That is not language that is justifiable in answer to what I have stated as a matter of principle. Nobody is talking about a "large army," an expression that was repeated three or four times by the hon. gentleman. My idea is to attempt to establish the principle of expansion of trade in that way. I asked the minister definitely and specifically if he did not wish to take a number of men and put them in that position to try to work out that scheme. The United States to-day is filled with the brightest brains of Canada in the services of banking, railways and other activities. Is it to be said that Canada cannot send men to expand our trade, when the United States is draining our country of some of the best brains we have for some of its greatest activities? I am surprised that the hon. gentleman has so little faith in the ability of our young men. I can safely point to the cities of Halifax, Montreal, Toronto, Winnipeg and Vancouver, and I can pick out fifty men as bright as any commercial agent that ever lived, who could go out and do equally good work for Canada as these United States agents are doing here. It is not right to belittle the idea that we have potentialities in our manufactures in Canada.

Mr. CURRIE: Would it not be better for us to establish trade commissioners at home to take that billion dollars worth of trade the Americans get here at the expense of our manufacturers? That would be starting the business at home.

Mr. MORPHY: That is a general principle with which I think both sides of the House would agree, but they may fail to agree upon the proper method of carrying it out. They have failed to come together on a straight national policy. I am prone to think, and I want to say right now, that one of the weaknesses in our Canadian national life is the fact that while in this chamber there are men, who believe in a certain policy for the welfare, expansion, growth and swelling of the activities of Canada, for those things that will go to bring us above the debt that burdens us, the one thing in the way is partisanship on the part of men who will surrender their conviction for the sake of the fetish of a party name. Men on the other side, ardent protectionists, willing to build up the country in that way, will vote for a reduction in the tariff in order to get into office.

Mr. FIELDING: The zeal of my hon. friend (Mr. Morphy) in favour of better relations with the United States is exceedingly interesting. I will not say it is amusing, because that would not be courteous to my hon. friend. I will not say it is surprising, although I might say that in view of certain events which occurred not very long ago. My hon. friend had something to say about men belittling the young men of the country. I do not know who did so, I certainly have not said anything of the sort. If there are these hundreds and thousands of able young men throughout the country, by all means let them go to the United States as commercial travellers or anything else, if they are wanted. I believe they can go without any Government assistance. The only portion of my hon. friend's remarks with which I can agree is that of advertising Canada by films and so forth. He must have been asleep or absent this afternoon and evening; otherwise he would have known that my right hon. friend (Sir George Foster) explained at great length this afternoon that the Government are doing that now. It is a good service, I commend my right hon. friend for doing it. I am willing to accept the assurance of the minister that he is doing it now. My hon. friend seems to assume that the minister is not doing it and that some movement of that kind is necessary.

Mr. MORPHY: I was absent this afternoon when that information was given to the committee. I was not aware of it.

Mr. FIELDING: I thought not.

Mr. MORPHY: I do not know that there was any crime in my not being in the House at the moment. As to the gratuitous suggestion of my being asleep in the House, that is a pleasure which, since I have been a member of the House of Commons, I have never once enjoyed.

Mr. BUTTS: You do not know what you have missed.

Mr. MORPHY: I hope hon. gentlemen opposite have as clean a sheet upon that subject as I. The point that I make is merely fringed by what the hon. gentleman

said a little time ago about commercial travellers. I would organize them or have the State take it upon itself to organize them as commercial agents and send them out. That is the difference between the hon. gentleman and myself. He is willing to admit the value of the trade and ardently desires the trade. I ardently desire to get it. The only difference is that he does not agree with the principle of the Government assisting to develop Canadian trade. What is the Department of Trade and Commerce for, unless it is for that very thing, —the development of the trade of Canada for the benefit of the people of Canada? If that be so, we have at our doors a market of 100,000,000 people who are crowding upon us and selling and dumping their goods upon us, through the activities of their trade agents and consular officers, but we are pusillanimous enough to say: "We will not do the same thing; we will go to them."

Mr. FIELDING: I am sorry to dissent from my hon. friend. He intimates that I am complaining of the Government. He is complaining of the Government; I am commending the Minister of Trade and Commerce for what he is doing. The hon. gentleman is doing his best to make it appear that the Minister of Trade and Commerce is neglecting his work. I am standing by the Government in this matter; my hon. friend is attacking them.

Mr. MORPHY: I am attacking the Government in this way: I believe it is the duty of every member of this House who has opinions, to express them freely.

Mr. CAHILL: Except when there is a vote on.

Mr. MORPHY: I do not know that that is an exception that it is not wise to follow when you have on one side of the House—

Mr. LEMIEUX: The patriots.

Mr. MORPHY: The hon. gentleman may have a right to talk about patriotism. He himself has it, but it is coming pretty close to some hon. members opposite who dare not say very much about it.

Mr. CAHILL: As much as the other side.

Mr. MORPHY: As to the vote, I have shown independence in this House in voting occasionally against the Government. I would like to know if the hon. gentleman ever did so in his life. Nobody ever heard of his doing so. He has been a party slave.

Mr. CAHILL: I have always voted against the Government.

Mr. MORPHY: That is pretty cheap and very well put in. I meant against the hon. gentleman's leader and party and policy. He knew very well what I meant. People who live in glass houses should not throw stones. I am not attacking the Government because the Government has not inaugurated this policy. There is no attack about the matter; I want them to carry out this policy; that is all.

Mr. NESBITT: There has been more or less discussion about charges made by consular agents of the United States. What are their charges for? When I have gone to export goods to the United States, I have never heard of being charged by them.

Sir GEORGE FOSTER: Before I answer that question, I want to address a word to my hon. friend (Mr. Morphy), who has spoken so eloquently to-night. I am afraid he has been asleep a bit. I am inclined to agree with my hon. friend opposite (Mr. Fielding) that he does occasionally take a nap.

Mr. MORPHY: No.

Sir GEORGE FOSTER: If not in the House, certainly somewhere else.

Mr. MORPHY: Not while the House is in session.

Sir GEORGE FOSTER: My hon. friend charged me and the Government because we were so dilatory that we did not give the names of our trade commissioners, and he thought I might at least get up and read them. Then, afterwards, he showed an intimate acquaintance with the bulletins. He had looked at the Ganges as it was portrayed in the bulletin, had seen a sacred temple here and Bangkok there, but he never knew, and does not know now, who our trade commissioners are, though every edition of the bulletin has the names of every one of our trade commissioners, and where they are stationed. If my hon. friend would just read that page of the bulletin he would have that information.

Mr. MORPHY: I have seen the names, but I want them put on record so that the country will know them.

Sir GEORGE FOSTER: The country sees them as well as my hon. friend. They are everywhere throughout the country.

Mr. MORPHY: Oh, no, they are not.

Sir GEORGE FOSTER: There is not a business house in this country that has not the bulletin on its table, and that does

not know where every one of our trade agents is stationed.

Mr. NESBITT: That is right.

Sir GEORGE FOSTER: There is not a trade commissioner in the service now who does not visit Canada once in every two years and make a tour of the whole Dominion from one end to the other; he talks with the merchants and manufacturers, interchanges information, gets the information that he needs, and goes back again to his field with the best possible equipment that can be given to him. My hon. friend was unfair to the service in resuscitating ancient history to the extent of giving a description of a trade commissioner of this Government who had not a map of Canada in his office and had to ask my hon. friend for a copy. That must have been in the dim and dusty ages of long ago. I do not think my hon. friend could find such a trade commissioner now. It rather grates on the commissioners, who are putting their best efforts into their work of securing trade for Canada along the most instructed and best possible lines, to be held up in the House of Commons as of the same type as that antediluvian of whom my hon. friend spoke, and who had to ask him for a map and a book that he wanted. All our agents are thoroughly furnished, all who are in the field now are intelligent men, and I believe that the exceptions are very few where these men are not absolutely devoted to their work and doing it with a spirit and elan which is entirely satisfactory. I have more to do with them than has my hon. friend, and when he gets a little leisure and goes out into foreign countries, I want him to go into the offices of our trade commissioners and talk with the men who are performing this service, and I know when he comes back he will have a higher opinion of them.

Now, let us come back for a moment to the stationing of the men in the United States. We have to do it on a wholesale plan if it is to be made self-supporting. You cannot place an agent in New York, or New Orleans, pay him by charges which he is authorized to make upon invoice of goods shipped from his locality, and not treat other parts of the United States where we trade in the very same way. It would not be fair to our own merchants; it would not be fair in any sense. We would in that case have to foot the whole expense, and not charge it upon the United States. I do not think there is any getting away from that, and that is one thing I want hon. members to think over as one of the difficulties in the way. It must be a wholesale business or none. We have to put at least one or two hundred men in the United States to cover the vast area where our people do business. The business is so widely distributed that you cannot mark off a little zone in one part of the United States, say to every man who trade from Canada in that zone that he must pay $2.50 on every invoice, or three per cent on the value of the goods, or whatever it is, and not subject his competitor who buys from other parts of the United States to the very same charge, because it is said in the United States, and it will be said with us, that it is really the purchaser in the United States who has to pay this invoice charge. But the matter does not go only that far. We must also take foreign countries into account. Some foreign countries do the same as the United States. They charge upon the invoice, either a percentage of its value, or a certificate of charge. A number of countries do that. These are some of the things we have to take into account.

In reply to the question of my hon. friend from North Oxford (Mr. Nesbitt), the United States consuls certificate the invoice and charge $2.50, whether the invoice is for $200 or $20,000. Other countries, the South American States particularly, follow a different plan. There are two or three of them that make a flat charge, but the others make a percentage charge of from 1 to 3 per cent upon the value of the goods. France has a flat charge, I think, and some other countries a percentage charge. It is a large subject, and I have mentioned a few of the things that we must consider before we jump into it. That is what I and the Government are trying to do before making up our minds as to the policy to be adopted. I am quite in accord with my hon. friend as to the necessity of being alive and active.

My hon. friend also alluded to publicity by means of films, evidently without the knowledge that we had been engaged in that work for a couple of years, and were pushing it. As I said this afternoon, there are probably three or four millions of people who in the United States see these films depicting our sources, our productive processes, the beauties of our scenery, and everything in connection therewith. They

are learning of Canada through the eye, and what is learnt in this way impresses itself on the mind. Every picture has a title which fixes on the mind one important fact with reference to what is being shown. It is a fine way of cultivating the interest and of expanding the knowledge of people.

Mr. LEMIEUX: I was very much interested in the remarks made by my hon. friend from North Perth (Mr. Morphy). As I listened, approving to a certain extent the remarks which he delivered this evening, I thought of ten years ago and asked myself, how it is that the hon. gentleman has reversed so completely his policy? I suppose, Mr. Chairman, that if in the year 1911 you and I, belonging to the same party and to the same league, had been suddenly transported to the beautiful county of Perth we would probably have heard very different sentiments from those the hon. gentleman has expressed here to-night. My hon. friend is most anxious now to develop trade with the United States. We should have, he says, young Canadian emissaries in every centre of American activity from east to west and north to south, and our motto should be the old Yankee motto after the Civil War, "Full steam ahead." We should attract American capital to Canada, and boost Canada in the U. S. What a change of heart, Mr. Chairman! Why, I am sure that the hon. members opposite in 1911, with the right hon. gentleman leading the chorus—

Sir GEORGE FOSTER: I do not sing.

Mr. LEMIEUX: Probably not the swan song; but the right hon. minister had a ebautiful clarion voice in 1911, and he sang the well known refrain: "No truck nor trade with the Yankees" and "Under which flag?" Canada first, Canada last, and Canada for ever!" By the way, I would suggest to my hon. friend from Perth that the real motto of our trade agents in the U.S. should be, not "full speed ahead,'" but the old Macdonald motto, the old Blake motto: "Canada first." That would be my motto in the United States of America. Mr. Chairman, trade will find its level just as water will, and it is not through a high tariff wall that you will attract trade to your country. There was, in 1911, a splendid and unique opportunity for Canada to develop a sound, healthy and prosperous trade with the United States. We had sought for that opportunity since the abrogation of the first reciprocity treaty in 1866. Sir John A. Macdonald in 1872, Mr. George Brown in 1874, Sir John Macdonald again in 1879, Sir Charles Tupper, and my right hon. friend, in 1891, indeed, all the leaders of public opinion on both sides of politics, for practically half a century, clamoured and clamoured in vain for the return of the golden era between 1854 and 1866. And in 1898, Sir Wilfrid Laurier, the last of our great statesmen who have disappeared from public life, after vain efforts to renew that reciprocity treaty, said at last: We shall make no more pilgrimages to Washington.

In the year 1910 the hon. gentleman sitting beside me (Mr. Fielding), who presided over the Treasury Department, having made a great name for himself as Minister of Finance, was invited for the first time in the history of our relations with the United States, to go, not to Washington, but to meet half way, at Albany, I believe, the representatives of the American Government with a view to securing to the United States the benefit of a reciprocity pact with Canada. He came back with the very same offer—there were perhaps a few items, more or less, changed, but it was practically the same—which had been on our statute book since 1879, because the National Policy, of which the right hon. gentleman is so proud, was based on a permanent standing offer of reciprocity in natural products with the United States. If my hon. friend will refer to the statute of 1879, he will see, in black and white, that the National Policy was launched with a view to obtaining a reciprocity pact with the United States. In that statute there is a permanent standing offer of reciprocity with them in natural products. My hon. friend, I say, went to the United States, where he met the chief of the executive and succeeded in obtaining from their Government a pact which no one can deny was the best commercial agreement ever reached by us with the United States. When it was presented to Parliament it was received with applause on both sides of the House. It made for better relations with the Republic to the south of us, not only in trade matters, but socially as well. We cannot forget that they are our neighbours and it is well for us to have cordial relations with them.

But the right hon. gentleman and my hon. friend from Perth (Mr. Morphy) were among the chief offenders in 1911. From one end of the country to the other they abused the United

States and the American people, and, not satisfied with that, they accused the great statesman who had negotiated the agreement, as well as his fellow-workers in the Canadian Government of being traitors. We know what the result was, because you and I, Mr. Chairman, were of the minority elected on that policy in 1911. Now, I repeat, if you wish to develop trade with the United States, the larger part of that business being agricultural,—because Canada is a great farming country—what is most essential is a market for our farm products. The manufacturers can take care of themselves. We have a great many manufacturing establishments in the province of Ontario and in Quebec, and I know that to a certain extent, from statistics available, they can compete in many lines even with the Americans. The trade which we must promote the most is that of our agricultural products with the United States. I am afraid that it must be said of my right hon. friend, as it was said of the statesmen of Europe in the last century who were responsible for the criminal partition of Poland, that since 1911 he has been in a state of mortal sin, because he helped by word of mouth, aye by incendiary speeches, to defeat the reciprocity pact that would have provided so much business for Canada.

If that agreement were in effect to-day, we should not have the adverse balance of trade which has been deplored in a way that ill became a Canadian minister who spoke in New York the other day. By the way, I do not think it is the proper way of improving our relations with the Americans, either commercially, politically, or socially, for any of our ministers to bewail at meetings there the fact that we are buying too much from the United States. I did not like the attitude of the right hon. gentleman at that New York banquet a few weeks ago; he is usually better inspired. Nor do I like the speeches of his colleague, the Minister of Finance (Sir Henry Drayton), who keeps on repeating to our good people not to buy from the Americans. That is not a position of which a Canadian minister can be proud. No: The blunder was made in 1911, when a campaign of prejudice was preached in the back concessions to defeat the commercial agreement between Canada and our great neighbour to the south. A flag-flapping campaign was organized and vigorously executed to defeat that arrangement. I can remember that some farmers from the province of Ontario, when they heard that a reciprocity pact had been negotiated, sent telegram after telegram of congratulations to my hon. friend, some of them affirming that the value of their farms would be doubled and trebled by the effect of that agreement. Sir, do you not see to-day that the wave of discontent and unrest which exists in the great farming communities of Canada, in Ontario and in the West, is due largely to the treacherous policy in 1911, of the party that faces me to-night? Why did you prevent the Canadian farmer from selling his products? The pact did not affect the manufacturers. You have created grievances which to-day have come back with a vengeance. This is plain talk, but the right hon. gentleman knows that I am speaking the unvarnished truth.

Now, as to the campaign against the United States. If you wish to promote trade with the United States, if you are so anxious to get an export market for Canadian products in that country, why do not hon. gentlemen opposite stop the campaign of vilification against the Americans—carried on here in the city of Ottawa, there in the city of Toronto? I have here a review which is published under the auspices of the Government party called The Onlooker. What do I read in that review? My hon. friend from Perth wishes to send Canadian trade agents into the United States. I wonder if the following from The Onlooker of March, 1921, is conducive to better trade relations with the Americans:

> At the back of the brain of the average American there lies the conviction that sooner or later but one flag will fly over the whole surface of the North American continent from the North Pole to the Isthmus of Panama. He calls it, and has called it for years, "Inevitable Destiny". We do not blame him. The genuine native-born American has many lovable qualities. . . . The danger may not be immediate, but in dim outline it already looms vast on the national horizon and fills some of us with apprehension.

Reference is made to the designs, "the sinister designs" of the average American against Canada. Further on the article says:

> It is not the cultivated American, half of whose heart, and almost the whole of whose culture, is in Britain, we dread. It is not spiritual and intellectual America we fear. It is commercial America we doubt. For commerce is impersonal, without sentiment, and takes no cognizance of those higher things that illuminate and enrich the national life. So far, indeed, as the soul is concerned, gold is the deadliest of narcotics.
>
> The true danger lies in scarcely recognized impersonal tendencies with which kindly ex-

pressions of goodwill have little or nothing to do.

My hon. friend can see to what danger he is exposing himself and his good people when he wants to get American gold. It is the "deadliest of narcotics" says this Tory publication. Mr. Chairman, let us be frank about this matter. The Americans, when the test came were at one with the British Empire, were at one with the Allies in upholding the cause of civilization and liberty. They have with us practically a common history, common laws, a common language and common ideals. I am speaking of the majority in both countries. What is the object of that pinpricking policy which is aided and subsidized by the funds of a certain party? Do you think you will promote Canadian trade with the Americans by publishing such vicious appeals as these? As to the merits of trade representation in the United States I am inclined to believe that it would not be a bad thing if there were some trade agents in the principal centres of the United States. I do not say that we should have trade agents in every city or town; but there are large centres like Chicago, St. Paul, Minneapolis, New Orleans, New York and Boston where there should be Canadian trade agents. We were told by the Minister of Justice (Mr. Doherty) not long ago, that Canada was a nation, and that so soon as it pleased this country she might appoint consular agents, and even an ambassador at Washington. Why do we not appoint consular agents if we have that potential power? If there is a country in the world where we are interested in having consular agents it is the United States of America. I do not know how it is with my friends of English parentage, but I know as regards those of my nationality, there are in the United States not as many French Canadians as there are in the province of Quebec, but there are certainly over a million and a half of them in that country. The largest French centres, outside of Montreal and Quebec, are in the New England cities—cities like Lowell, Manchester, Boston, Bay City and others. All these cities are large French Canadian centres. There is a coming and going of French Canadians all the time between these cities and our province, and it is strange to think that the invoices and the passports necessitated by that ebb and flow of people have to go before the British consul when we could have a consular agent of our own to look after these matters. As a matter of fact I know, because I have often accepted invitations from Canadian clubs in the United States, that Philadelphia, for instance, is simply an outpost for Toronto, Hamilton and London, as Boston is an outpost for Halifax and St. John. In New York, in Boston, there are at least twenty-five to thirty thousand Canadians. So we are closely connected with the Republic, and it is not by such writings as the one I have just read to the committee that we will improve our relations, commercial and otherwise, with the Americans. Remember, Mr. Chairman, that the first trade treaty of 1854 with the United States was negotiated at a time when it meant the salvation of Canada from a national point of view. Remember that the first reciprocity treaty was negotiated with the United States when there was in this country a strongly expressed sentiment in favour of annexation on account of the removal of the British preference following on the establishment of free trade in England. The annexation manifesto was not signed by rebels like myself or like my friends from Gloucester, Vaudreuil and Joliette, it was signed by Sir John Abbott. Sir John Rose, Sir A. T. Galt, Judge Johnson of Montreal—indeed by the best English stock in Canada, by our great merchants and captains of industry. That manifesto was remarkably well drafted. It was transmitted by Lord Elgin to the British authorities, and he warned them that if immediate action was not taken there was a grave danger that Canada would pass under the political domination of the United States. He was at once authorized by the British Government to himself go to Washington and negotiate a treaty. He succeeded in his mission, and that treaty lasted until 1866. We know why it was abrogated: In those days—as to-day unfortunately—there was a class of Canadians always ready to belittle the Americans and to speak of them in uncomplimentary terms. Some of the confederate victories were applauded even in the Canadian Parliament. As a result, when, after the civil war, the time came to renew the treaty the Americans refused. Since 1866 men in both our great parties, men occupying the position of my right hon. friend (Sir George Foster) and the position of my hon. friend the ex-Minister of Finance (Mr. Fielding) have tried in vain to secure the renewal of that treaty. Our statesmen went periodically to Washington with that end in view—Sir John A. MacDonald at the time of the Fisheries Treaty,

the Hon. George Brown, Sir Charles Tupper, my right hon. friend, Sir Wilfrid Laurier, Sir Richard Cartwright —because by them all, it was considered that the renewal of that trade agreement would be in the best interests of Canada. Ultimately my hon. friend from Shelburne and Queen's succeeded—but not at his asking. He was solicited by the Americans themselves, by Mr. Taft and Mr. Knox, to enter into a trade compact in natural products. But, unfortunately for Canada, there was a party in this House and in the country which was more anxious to defeat the Liberal government than to give the farmers the great market which Canda had been seeking for upwards of fifty years. Now my right hon. friend is anxious to secure business from the United States. Let him make a confession, and let him have contrition for the mortal sin he committed in 1911. Then we will give him another lease of office, if need be, in order that he may redeem his soul by improving the trade relations between Canada and the great republic to the south of us. I agree that it is not natural that Canada should have this enormous balance of trade against her; the Americans should buy much more than they do from their best customer. The best means towards attaining this worthy object, is to get the American market for our farmers and I know of no better man than the right hon. gentleman to do the trick, if he will undertake it.

Mr. THOMSON (Qu'Appelle): Mr. Chairman, we listened this afternoon to attempts to blacken the record of the little angularly opposite group here in connection with the items that came before this committee. We took part in that discussion, and I do not think it is necessary to follow up any further this political cross-firing. The subject with which we are now dealing is worthy of the most careful consideration. I quite agree with my hon. friend from Maisonneuve (Mr. Lemieux) that the best way to accomplish what we require here, if I interpret his view correctly, is by some reciprocal arrangement with the United States. I am satisfied that we will never secure proper trade relations except in that way. However, we have to take conditions as we find them, and we must recognize that while the present Government retain power it is hopeless to expect any move in that direction. As we are not in a position to set to work in the best way, we must adopt the second best, and I am still of the opinion that lies in endeavouring to secure a reception for exports to the United States through trade commissioners. The right hon. gentleman has held up the horrible picture of the necessity of one or two or possibly three hundred trade commissioners to carry out this plan, while the hon. member for Maisonneuve seems to think we might start with a small number. I would be sorry to advance my opinion against gentlemen of such great experience, but as they hold entirely different views I may venture to express the opinion that there is no reason why we cannot start work with a small number of trade commissioners. The hon. member for Maisonneuve has spoken of the necessity of cultivating a market in the United States for our farm products, and I agree with him that that is the only kind of trade which will help us to get rid of the present adverse balance of trade. It is natural that we should supply farm products to our neighbours to the south, and perhaps it is quite as natural that they should supply us with some other things which they can manufacture more cheaply. To my mind any effort to develop along unnatural lines is not likely to succeed. The best and only way of developing trade is along natural lines, that is, to purchase those things which can be more cheaply manufactured in other countries, and to export to those countries things which we can produce more cheaply. We have shown our ability to produce farm products as well as any country in the world, and better than our neighbours to the south. Our manufacturers tell us that it is utterly impossible for them to manufacture as cheaply as their competitors in the United States. I do not agree with that. Anyway, it is quite plain that in cultivating profitable trade with our American neighbours we must endeavour to sell to them as much as possible of our farm produce. I daresay that the efforts of our trade commissioners have largely been directed towards the procuring of markets for our manufactured articles, and that is because of the mad notion we have that that is the only way in which the country can be developed. I say it is a mad notion, and the sooner we get rid of it the better. The sooner we come to understand that we should export the things which we can most profitably produce, the better for us and for the world at large.

It is quite plain that we can improve our trade relations with certain countries by means of trade agents, because we are employing them now in different parts of the world. The Americans, who are a

shrewd commercial people, believe that they can improve their trade relations in contiguous countries by the appointment of trade agents. They are not spending this money for the pure love of spending it; they believe that they will get some benefit from the expenditure. Possibly one of the reasons for our adverse balance of trade with the United States is found in the fact that the United States is appointing trade agents to look after its export trade to Canada while Canada is making no effort to increase her exports to the United States. I understood the minister to say before six o'clock that the Government were considering this matter. If so, this is the proper time for us to air our views. I am sure that the right hon. gentleman will not be averse to receiving suggestions even from back benchers in this unfortunate group which has been so much abused this afternoon.

Item agreed to.

Mr. SINCLAIR (Guysborough): Before we proceed to another item I want to refer to item 361, which I understand was passed at a late hour last night. I suppose under that item would be included the printing of blue books. In one very useful book issued by the Finance Department, the Public Accounts, there had been published from Confederation up to last year tables of expenditure from the Consolidated Revenue Fund in the various departments, and by one glance at these pages the growth of our expenditure in all the various departments could be readily ascertained. In the issue of the book for 1920 these tables were eliminated, on the ground, as is stated in the first part of the report, of economy. I understand that my right hon. friend is a member of the committee that controls the printing of blue books, and that is the reason why I mention the matter now. I would like him to consider the restoration of these tables. They have been very useful to me and I know that they have been regarded as valuable by many members of the House as well as by men who are not in the House. Year after year I have been asked to send this book to people who value the information that had been given in these tables. Only a few leaves have been cut out by eliminating them, and I certainly think it is false economy. I trust that the minister will take the trouble to look into it, and if he agrees with me, to see that when the book comes out next year these tables are restored.

Sir GEORGE FOSTER: I certainly will look into it.

Weights and Measures, salaries of inspectors, and staff, $192,460; rent, fuel, travelling expenses, postage, stationery, etc., $125,000; International Bureau of Weights and Measures, $400.

Mr. McKENZIE: What is the reason for the increase?

Sir GEORGE FOSTER: It is due mainly to the reclassification. There is an increase also in contingent expenses for travelling, owing to the fact that we now carry out the inspection of weights and measures throughout the country every year, whereas we formerly did it once in two years. Last year or the year before we increased the fees. When this branch came over to my department I found a surplus of officials, and as some of the older officers are retired they are not being replaced. As a result of these considerations the Weights and Measures Branch for part of the year just passed has for the first time shown a surplus over expenditure. We think, therefore, that we are on the way to making this branch pay for itself.

Item agreed to.

Mail subsidies and steamship subventions—Atlantic Ocean—Canada and Newfoundland, steam service or services between, $35,000.

Mr. McKENZIE: Has the Government commission in charge of the Newfoundland railways, which are really a part of this service, brought about any betterment of the road or any general improvement of the system?

Sir GEORGE FOSTER: I am afraid I cannot say that matters with reference to the railway are being improved. My hon. friend, perhaps, knows something of the situation as regards that road. Newfoundland has had the hardest winter it has had for many years. The road has been practically out of commission for weeks at a time. The company have not entered into any contract yet for steamship service, although they are performing a service between Port aux Basques and North Sydney. They have been pressing us for a larger subsidy. The service is going on, and some of our own vessels have, I think, been put on for part of the time, but the condition of the railroad makes the service very unsatisfactory. I understand, by report, that a commission has been appointed to take into consideration the rearrangement or betterment of the road, but the situation is not very satisfactory at the present time.

Mr. ROSS: I notice, in his annual report, in connection with the Canadian Merchant Marine, the minister states:

Since the commencement of the overseas Government service up to the 31st March, last, 71 voyages have been performed.

And in that number I notice that seven voyages have been performed between Canada and Newfoundland. How are these subsidies entered into? Are they entered into for a term of years? It seems rather inconsistent for us to be building merchant ships and sending them to Newfoundland and also subsidizing vessels of other lines which are apparently competitors. As the Canadian Merchant Marine increases and grows strong, will these subsidies cease and will we do our own work between Canada and Newfoundland?

Sir GEORGE FOSTER: I have not the management of the Canadian Merchant Marine, and none of my appropriations go to the merchant marine, as my hon. friend knows. That is carrying on its services, and it has put on certain services between Halifax and St. John's, Newfoundland. It is putting on some services between Quebec and Newfoundland during the summer season, but neither of those touches this route, which is the link between the end of our Canadian National railways and the terminus of the Newfoundland railway at Port aux Basques.

Mr. ROSS: Why could we not use our own boats to make this connecting link?

Sir GEORGE FOSTER: We have not used them.

Mr. ROSS: Why should we not?

Sir GEORGE FOSTER: I do not know that they would be exactly fitted for that service. Anyway we have reduced the vote by $30,000.

Mr. LEMIEUX: What became of the old Bruce?

Sir GEORGE FOSTER: She came to grief some way or another, I do not know where.

Mr. ROSS: Are these contracts for subsidies made for a term of years or just for one year?

Sir GEORGE FOSTER: This one is made from year to year.

Mr. ROSS: Would it not be a good thing for the minister to look into the question whether it would not be wise to cut off this subsidy and use our own boats? They would not be all too busy.

Sir GEORGE FOSTER: I have looked into that, and in some cases we have taken off the subsidy where our boats are doing the work to-day. You cannot make all these substitutions at once. I am not sure whether our own boats can be used on this route at all. That, however, is a matter to be considered.

Mr. McKENZIE: I am afraid that the cutting down of this subsidy has rather paralyzed this service. For quite a number of years, as the minister knows, the Reid Newfoundland company was getting a subsidy of $70,000, and with that subsidy, the water end of the service was carried on very satisfactorily; they carried many passengers and large quantities of freight between the terminus of the National railways at North Sydney and Newfoundland. But ever since this cut was made, things have been paralyzed. There are no proper boats where there used to be a daily service and two boats on continuously. I think my right hon. friend will find that there is only one boat now, the Kyle, that can really be called a boat that is fitted for the service. The Reid Newfoundland company contend that they cannot enter into a contract to carry the mails, but the mails between Canada and Newfoundland are very large. As far as I know, they go from North Sydney to Port aux Basques, or when they cannot go to Port aux Basques, they go to St. John's. It is rather a serious thing so to cut this subsidy as to strike a blow at an old service like this. This route was established some twenty-five years ago when the first Bruce was built. The first Bruce was lost, and the second Bruce, which was an equally good boat, was commandeered by the British Government and sent to Russia as an icebreaker during the war. She has never come back, and I suppose she became a Russian boat long ago. The company would like to get a satisfactory condition again as they had before the war to carry on the service, and I am afraid that this cutting the subsidy by one-half is not going to enable us to have that service. My home town is the terminus of the road and the starting point for trade with Newfoundland. When I talk about that service, people might think I am talking about my home town, but the service is of very little advantage to us. The boat comes and goes; travellers land at North Sydney and take passage to all parts of the world; large quantities of freight come and are switched down to the wharf and the stuff goes on to the boat and off to Newfoundland. The service means very little to us, but nevertheless it is a magnificent source of trade. Our Canadian trade with Newfoundland is very large, and unless we have

proper means of handling it, we cannot hope to keep it going. If a man in Newfoundland buys a few cars of flour and they stand for six weeks on the wharf at North Sydney and are not taken across to meet the necessities of his trade, he is not very likely to repeat his order in that way. We have keen competition from Americans who have water advantages that we have not. When I bring this matter to the attention of the minister and of the Government, it is not a local matter at all; it is the broad question of Canadian trade with a British country such as Newfoundland is, a country that is willing to trade with us. It came out the other day that we were competing with ourselves. We are competing with ourselves in this trade by putting on boats at Halifax and carrying stuff from that port to Newfoundland instead of letting it all go by the one route. I can readily understand that the Government boats are not fit for the trade between Port aux Basques and North Sydney, so far as passengers are concerned, but they can certainly carry freight. I have been in conversation with the minister several times about the betterment of the terminus at Norh Sydney. This is not a local matter at all. It is a matter of just as much concern to the man who ships a carload of flour from Manitoba to Newfoundland as it is to the people of North Sydney, that there should be proper facilities at the terminus of the road for handling the business that goes there. For the last three years, at all events, we have been promised from day to day that the wharves would be extended and that better facilities would be provided at that point. So far I have not heard this year whether that is to be done or not, and I am simply doing my duty in bringing this matter to the notice of the Department of Trade and Commerce, which seems to be particularly the one that functions along this line. If the people of Canada find that their trade with Newfoundland is falling off, they will know that the cause to some extent is that we are not in a proper position to handle expeditiously the traffic that now exists, and that has been growing very satisfactorily during the last 25 years. While the trade was very small at the beginning, it is very substantial now, and I hope that the minister, so far as he can do so, will see that everything is done to hold the trade we now have, and develop it as much as possible.

Sir GEORGE FOSTER: Repairs and improvements are now being made on our end of the road, but the trouble is at the Port aux Basques end. The trouble is with the railway accommodation in Newfoundland itself. It has happened again and again that vessels loaded at the Sydney side have gone over to the other side and have had to bring back part of their cargo, in whole or in part, because it could not be accommodated there. The service which was meant to be a daily service when we paid the heavy subsidy is now at best a tri-weekly service. With poor equipment, a bad road, no accommodation at Port aux Basques, and only a tri-weekly service, the trade is going in some respects through other channels. Our own vessels of the merchant marine are going from Halifax to St. John's, Newfoundland, which is the objective of most of the traffic. They are also putting on a service which will serve Prince Edward Island and go from there direct to St. John's, Newfoundland. Everything that can possibly be done to keep the connection on this route, I think, we have a right to do, and I am disposed to do it.

Mr. McKENZIE: Perhaps on this item I might ask a question of the minister in reference to the new route that the Minister of Marine and Fisheries hinted the other day would be established between Montreal and Newfoundland, via Charlottetown. I take it that the intention is to go to St. John's, Newfoundland. I understand that the Board of Trade of North Sydney has been in communication with the Department of Trade and Commerce or the Department of Marine and Fisheries with a view to getting the boats to call at North Sydney or Sydney. The right hon. gentleman knows that in going from Charlottetown to St. John's, Newfoundland, the Isle of Cape Breton is pretty much in the track of the boat. The boats will require bunkering, of course, and instead of bunkering at Montreal or St. John's, where the price of coal is very heavy, I would submit that as a matter of business the boats should bunker at North Sydney, where they can get coal at the pit's mouth, as the saying is. As my good friend from South Cape Breton, who is now sitting beside the minister, knows, that is the spot for the boat to bunker. While there she could also take on passengers and freight for Newfoundland, and on the return voyage carry coal back from North Sydney to Montreal or Quebec. If this service is established, I think it would be a great mistake to give the go-by to a place like North Sydney or

Sydney, where a trade could be developed, and where the boats could get the coal they need very much cheaper than at Montreal or St. John's. The coal they would get at Montreal would have come from North Sydney in the first place, and would have added to it the expense of hauling. So, as a pure matter of business, I would impress upon the minister the advisability of adopting the suggestion I have made.

Sir GEORGE FOSTER: That matter has already been represented and is being considered by the Mercantile Marine company, which is anxious to get all possible traffic which will pay, and to bunker at the cheapest places.

Item agreed to.

Canada and the West Indies or South America, or both, steam service or services between, $340,666.66.

Mr. FIELDING: Would the minister explain the present condition of tnat contract, who are the contractors, and what are the ports of call?

Sir GEORGE FOSTER: The same contractors.

Mr. FIELDING: The Royal Mail Steam Packet company?

Sir GEORGE FOSTER: Yes, their contract was first for five years. Then the war intervened and we have been keeping it on from year to year. At the present time, as a part of the arrangement we are making with the West India Islands for a larger preference, there is a proposition for an improved service, and if possible, a weekly service. Of course my hon. friend knows that up to the present time everything has been at peak prices. We are simply continuing this for another year in order to give us an opportunity of getting an improved service, a weekly service if possible should the trade warrant it.

Mr. FIELDING: Most of our Government ships, I am aware, are only freight vessels, but I understand that in the case of at least one, if not two, of these vessels going to the West Indies passenger accommodation has been provided. Are these boats now running to the same ports as come under this item or different ports.

Sir GEORGE FOSTER: It is a service which runs from Halifax and St. John, Halifax mainly, to Jamaica. It touches at the Bahamas, Bermuda and British Honduras, and returns by the same route. We have had no subsidized service on that route, but as a result of the conference we had with the West Indian delegates two vessels of the mercantile marine were fitted up with certain passenger accommodation, enough for about thirty passengers, and have been put upon that route. They will be regularly kept on that route. Jamaica and Honduras pay a certain amount. If the agreement is carried through, they bind themselves to pay a certain portion of any deficit that may occur as their contribution towards maintaining the service. Two trips have already been made, I think, and both, so far as I have learned, have been successful.

Mr. FIELDING: They are not in any sense competing with this line?

Sir GEORGE FOSTER: No; they have a different route entirely.

Mr. FIELDING: Do they not call at Bermuda?

Sir GEORGE FOSTER: If this line calls at Bermuda there might be some competition; just with reference to that point, and just now when it is brought to my attention, I am not sure that these steamers do call there.

Mr. FIELDING: They formerly did.

Sir GEORGE FOSTER: Yes, this line does, but the other line I have spoken of does not.

Mr. FIELDING: My hon. friend himself said that they went to Bermuda. I have no knowledge of the matter but I took it from what he said that the Government steamers are calling there.

Sir GEORGE FOSTER: I am not so certain about that, but I know that Jamaica is the chief port, and from there they go to British Honduras.

Mr. FIELDING: Do they go to Nassau too?

Sir GEORGE FOSTER: They touch at the Bahamas.

Mr. CAHILL: What practical advantage is there to Canada from the expenditure of this money?

Sir GEORGE FOSTER: This is the only regular service we have between Canada and the whole ring of West India islands and Demerara, the whole comprising the Windward and Leeward islands. It is absolutely essential to have this service if we are to promote trade between ourselves and those colonies. Whilst we have so far been carrying on this service entirely at our own expense, the West India islands touched by that route will, under the new

agreement, pay a certain proportion of the subsidy which is necessary to maintain the service.

Mr. CAHILL: What practical results accrue to Canada from this service? Do we get any business that we should not otherwise get? Do we sell goods there which, without the service, we could not sell?

Sir GEORGE FOSTER: If the hon. member will take the trouble to look over the trade returns he will find that there has been a very large increase in the total trade, both imports and exports, between ourselves and these islands.

Mr. CAHILL: Carried by these boats?

Sir GEORGE FOSTER: Yes, this is the only regular line that visits them, and it is the best service that we have ever had. The returns show the benefit of it.

Mr. SINCLAIR (Guysborough): I see that Demerara is one of the ports which it is intended to serve this year.

Sir GEORGE FOSTER: Yes, two of the Mercantile Marine boats have been going there.

Mr. SINCLAIR: Are they under the control of the company that has the contract?

Sir GEORGE FOSTER: No, they are run by the Mercantile Marine.

Mr. SINCLAIR: Then the Mercantile Marine is competing with the company?

Sir GEORGE FOSTER: Yes.

Mr. SINCLAIR: That does not seem to be business.

Sir GEORGE FOSTER: It is business in one way, although in another way it introduces a complication, and it is one of the problems with which we are dealing.

Mr. SINCLAIR: It ought to be dealt with in a sound and sensible commercial way. The same thing happened, I understand, in the service between Halifax and Newfoundland, and created considerable confusion and friction. Four companies were competing for the business between St. John's and Halifax, and the business was so small that it afforded no profit to any of the ships running on the route, but they did their best to keep the boats going. In the face of this, the Government suddenly entered the arena, and broke up the little trade there was, making it unprofitable for all concerned. There was not enough traffic to make it worth while for four companies to operate but they endeavoured to keep up the service and divided the work. The Government boats came in but did not reduce the freight by one cent. I am told they adopted the same schedule of freight paid to the commercial boats and simply made the business unprofitable for everyone; no one got any good out of it. Now, if that policy is to be pursued in the West Indies as well as in Newfoundland I think it is time the minister or someone in the Government took this matter into consideration. It seems to me to be very unbusinesslike to subsidize a line serving a place like Demerara and then to step in and make that line unprofitable for those who are struggling to keep it up. Nobody engaged in private business would think of doing such a thing. I hope my hon. friend will give this matter some attention and either keep the Minister of Marine away from these places or else discontinue the subsidy.

Sir GEORGE FOSTER: There is a portion of the year in which it is very convenient to have extra vessels on the route. This is during the sugar season, when the amount of sugar to be moved is greater than the regular service can handle. There is the difficulty which my hon. friend speaks of, but the Mercantile Marine is bound to keep its vessels afloat and, so long as they operate, freights must be got wherever possible. So that there is in this line a competition for a certain part of the year, but these vessels prove a valuable addition during the sugar season because then there is more freight than could otherwise be moved.

Mr. SINCLAIR: This competition will make it unprofitable for the private company and next year the minister will find them asking for an increased subsidy. That is what I wish to avoid. There should be no competition of this kind. The Government have full control of the routes. My right hon. friend fixes the rates obtaining on the subsidized routes; they are submitted to him and he approves of them. So that it is not a question of rates, and if the Government step in with their boats and operate over the same lines as these subsidized vessels, the business will be unprofitable to the latter, and inevitably they will come back for increased subsidy. I do not know whether the minister sees my point.

Sir GEORGE FOSTER: I see the point.

Mr. SINCLAIR: Then I hope it will be given some consideration.

Mr. McKENZIE: The point made by my hon. friend (Mr. Sinclair), is perfectly clear. We have an item of $340,366.60 for a line to the West Indies and South America. Now, we are told that we have our own boats serving a part of that route, so that we are in competition with the vessels running there. Yet the Government is so exceedingly generous that it gives to a company with whom it is competing for trade the sum of $340,000 odd. They give them that magnificent handicap and then boldly and proudly step up and say: We will get plenty of profit notwithstanding this handicap we are giving them. Does it strike my hon. friend as good business that we should be spending $75,000,000 of the people's money in the building of boats and in looking for trade and then when we find an old service established on this route which we intend to work, instead of trying to displace those competitors, give them a subsidy? The Canadian people will not look favourably on that kind of business. We should do one thing or the other; either take these boats away and put them somewhere else and let the other people go on as they did before, or, if we find that there is enough business to warrant competition, discontinue the subsidy. It is an old theory that the moment a water route becomes so profitable that it can stand competition, the subsidy must go. I thought that principle was always recognized by the Government, and if the minister finds that there is enough business for our boats as well as those of this company, let him drop the subsidy.

Sir GEORGE FOSTER: We cannot drop the subsidy because this is a passenger service.

Mr. CAHILL: The minister should let the item stand until we can have the benefit of the advise of the Minister of Marine, who is in charge of shipping affairs as subordinate to the Minister of Railways, who is in turn under the Board of Management. We should wait until we can get some information to see if this line of ships is really competing with us, and if the subsidy is any longer necessary. This item amounts to about $1,000 per day, which is a good deal of money in these times for the Canadian people to pay, especially when they are paying something like $200,000 a day of a loss on the Canadian National railways. I think the minister should let the item stand until we can see whether there is not some way by which we can save this $1,000 a day.

Sir GEORGE FOSTER: I do not think there is any reason for allowing the item to stand. This is a vote which we must have; we must keep that service up; otherwise the whole business would fall to pieces. The boats on this route carried pretty nearly $10,000,000 worth of export freight.

Mr. CAHILL: What is the necessity of maintaining this service when vessels of the Canadian Merchant Marine are available?

Sir GEORGE FOSTER: The vessels of the Canadian Merchant Marine could not carry on the service at all; they are entirely freight vessels. This is a freight and passenger line, and we must preserve it if we are going to maintain communication between Canada and these islands.

Mr. ROSS: Why not utilize the Canadian Merchant Marine when two of its vessels are also being fitted up for this line?

Sir GEORGE FOSTER: Not this line.

Mr. ROSS: Then what line is it?

Sir GEORGE FOSTER: That is another line running from Canada to the Bahamas, Jamaica and British Honduras, an altogether different line.

Mr. ROSS: I am very much inclined to agree with my hon. friend (Mr. Cahill) with regard to this particular item. It seems to me that when we are spending $340,000 a year subsidizing boats for a service to the West Indies, and when vessels of the Canadian Merchant Marine make thirty-two trips, apparently, to the same ports that these vessels serve, we might very well effect some economy here.

Sir GEORGE FOSTER: Not to the same ports; they are thousands of miles apart.

Mr. ROSS: That may be true, but you have now about thirty-nine vessels in the Canadian Merchant Marine and you are about to increase that number to sixty. It seems to me to be inconsistent, and very bad business, to be building vessels for the Canadian Merchant Marine which will have all they can do to operate at a profit if they go on this service, and at the same time subsidizing other lines that will compete with us. It would appear that there is not proper co-ordination between the department of my right hon. friend, and

the Department of Marine and Naval Affairs. Under the circumstances, and until we get some explanation from the Minister of Marine that will clear up the uncertainty about this matter, I think the item ought to stand.

Mr. SINCLAIR (Guysborough): At what ports in South America do the vessels on this service touch?

Sir GEORGE FOSTER: These vessels do not run to South American ports.

Mr. FIELDING: Yes, they go to Demerara.

Sir GEORGE FOSTER: Yes, they do touch at Demarara.

Mr. FIELDING: That is a South American port.

Mr. CAHILL: The minister stated that a trade of $10,000,000 had been developed. Now, I understand this is a passenger line. How many passengers are represented in that $10,000,000? I do not see the necessity for subsidizing passenger service when it is freight we are looking for, and when we have our own freight ships tied up owing to lack of cargoes. The explanation given by the minister is not very illuminating—it does not explain anything. I regret that the member for Red Deer (Mr. Clark) is not in his seat. I am sure that if he were here to-night he would express very strong opposition to this policy of granting subsidies for this purpose. I think, therefore, the minister should let this item stand and give my hon. friend from Red Deer an opportunity of condemning the Government for its extravagance.

Sir GEORGE FOSTER: The $10,000,000 was the value of the export freight carried. In addition there were a number of passengers amounting to something over three thousand.

Mr. CAHILL: And we pay about $100 apiece for carrying these passengers.

Sir GEORGE FOSTER: We are carrying freight as well as passengers.

Mr. CAHILL: But our own ships are tied up in port waiting for freight to carry. Apparently our own ships are capable of carrying this freight, so we do not need to subsidize this passenger service. What benefit is it to us? Would it not be better for us to do away with this subsidy and let our own vessels attend to whatever freight business there is?

Sir GEORGE FOSTER: You might do away with the subsidy but you would also do away with our West Indian trade in so far as the agreement between ourselves and the West Indies is concerned. If my hon. friend were to look into the matter he would not entertain the idea that you could do away with this passenger and freight service. Unfortunately, our own vessels do not carry passengers. If our own vessels had the necessary passenger accommodation there would be no question about employing them, but they do not and there is the difficulty.

Item agreed to.

Canada and South Africa, steamship service between, $146,000.

Sir GEORGE FOSTER: That is the usual vote.

Mr. CAHILL: I would like to have some information about this item. To say "This is the usual vote" is a very poor explanation for these huge expenditures. Are we getting any value for the money? Is it any benefit to the country? Are we getting fifty cents on the dollar, or ten cents on the dollar, or any value at all for our money? We are voting these large amounts from year to year and the minister says in regard to each of them, "It is the usual vote." To say that it is "the usual vote" might perhaps have been satisfactory when we had lots of money, but it is not satisfactory now when we have unusual taxation. The people of this country are sufficiently burdened without our passing large expenditures on any such ground.

Sir GEORGE FOSTER: If the vote was there before, it is pretty good proof that it was supposed by Parliament to be necessary, and the necessity does not seem to have diminished. Last year about $10,000,000 worth of exports was carried from our country by that route to South Africa. It is the only subsidized service we have between the two countries. During the last ten years our trade with South Africa has greatly improved. Our merchants are largely availing themselves of this service; in fact it is the only traffic line that they can avail themselves of to get to the South African market. The service might be dropped, but our whole trade with South Africa might then be diverted to some other country.

Mr. CAHILL: What is our principal trade with South Africa?

Sir GEORGE FOSTER: I have told my hon. friend that the vessels on this service carried exports to the value of $10,585,000.

Mr. CAHILL: I suppose the products are principally manufactured products that we are now paying the equivalent of a bonus to have manufactured?

Sir GEORGE FOSTER: Yes. It is quite necessary that everything they manufacture should be sold. It is part of our trade.

Mr. CAHILL: It is not necessary that the people of Canada should be taxed to find an outlet for the goods of the manufacturer; that is the business.

Sir GEORGE FOSTER: Yes.

Mr. CAHILL: We tried that with Roumania. We not only furnished the goods but we paid for them and sent them over there to give the manufacturers something to do. We are taking entirely too much interest in Mr. Manufacturer. He is perfectly capable of taking care of himself, much more so than the farmer or the labouring man who has to pay these subsidies to support the manufacturer. The manufacturer is getting it at both ends; he insists on protection to rob the people here, and not satisfied with that he must rob them again by way of subsidies.

Sir GEORGE FOSTER: "Rob" is a good strong word.

Mr. CAHILL: I know of no stronger word. If I did I would use it. There is not any more positive robbery in the world than the robbery of the Canadian people by the Canadian manufacturers with the aid of the Government. I think it is about time we took notice of these things. The Government should say to the manufacturers, "Here, these people will some day revolt against this kind of thing."

Sir GEORGE FOSTER: We take notice of these things every year when we discuss these Estimates and pass them.

Mr. CAHILL: We have loaned our gold to every country in the world that cared to borrow it until now we have nothing to base our currency on but cabbages and carrots. But we are not satisfied to buy the manufacturer's goods and sell them to people who will never pay their obligations, we must also provide means for transporting his goods. Do you not think it is time for the people to have a "look-in" instead of continuing to rob them from day to day? My right hon. friend argues that the point of view of the Government is always right. My experience since I have been in the House is that more often their viewpoint is wrong, and they have had to admit that themselves sometimes. We should stop squandering money to ship the manufacturer's goods for him when he is not in a position to pay himself. Let him look after his own business for awhile.

[Mr. Cahill.]

Mr. MAHARG: Does our disadvantage lie in our geographical position or in the incapacity of our manufacturers, or is this subsidy for the purpose of inducing ships to come here and give the manufacturers a cheaper rate? It did not look so serious until the minister said that if we did not vote this subsidy we would lose trade. There must be something wrong somewhere if the holding of this trade is contingent upon the subsidizing of boats to carry our manufactured goods to market.

Mr. ROSS: Does the Government intend putting any of our Mercantile Marine boats on the South African route?

Sir GEORGE FOSTER: I do not know. The Government may put on some boats to West Africa. This is to South Africa.

Mr. ROSS: I think we should have information.

Sir GEORGE FOSTER: The export trade in 1912 amounted to $4,000,000 in round figures, last year to $10,585,000. Our trade has been growing with Africa.

Mr. ROSS: I am not disputing that. I see in 1914 the trade was $3,000,000 and in 1920 it was over $8,000,000. But we should know what is contemplated.

Sir GEORGE FOSTER: We are putting on our own boats where we can do so. For instance, last year we had a subsidy to a steamship line to Australia amounting to about the same as this. Our own boats have been put on that route and we have withdrawn the subsidy. In so far as our own boats can be substituted to do the work it is our policy to use them.

Mr. ROSS: My right hon. friend is today asking for a subsidy to Australia in the next item $130,000.

Sir GEORGE FOSTER: That is on the Pacific side.

Item agreed to.

Pacific Ocean. Canada and Australia or New Zealand, or both, on the Pacific Ocean, steam service between, $130,509.

Mr. SINCLAIR (Guysborough): This item appears to be subject to the same criticism I made in regard to the sailings to the West Indies and South America. There are three proposals here now to establish monthly sailings between Canada and Australia.

Sir GEORGE FOSTER: The first refers to the service that I spoke of a moment ago from the Atlantic seaports to Australia and New Zealand. That has been taken off.

Mr. SINCLAIR (Guysborough): We are going to establish a service from the Atlantic side by our Government Merchant Marine, and yet subsidize similar services by this vote?

Sir GEORGE FOSTER: No, not similar services. The service which was carried on for a number of years from the Atlantic ports to Australia and New Zealand was a freight service. For that has been substituted our own vessels, so that subsidy has been withdrawn. On the Pacific side the subsidy I am asking for is contributed by ourselves and New Zealand to a passenger and freight service regularly from Vancouver and Victoria, touching at Fiji and New Zealand and going on to Australia. It is a first-class service. The year before last we gave a subsidy of $180,000, and I have reduced it to $130,000. I should be very sorry to see the subsidy taken away, because I think the service would be withdrawn.

Mr. McKENZIE: Is this one of the C. P. R. boats?

Sir GEORGE FOSTER: No, the Union Steamship line.

Mr. SINCLAIR (Guysborough): If the minister would tell us between what ports this service, and the monthly sailings provided by the Department of Marine are to be given, I think we could understand the item.

Sir GEORGE FOSTER: This line of vessels starts at Vancouver and touches at Victoria.

Mr. SINCLAIR (Guysborough): I am referring to the one on this side.

Sir GEORGE FOSTER: I am referring to the one on the other side.

Mr. SINCLAIR (Guysborough): I have no trouble with the one on the other side. My hon. friend tells me it is the Atlantic service he is going to subsidize.

Sir GEORGE FOSTER: My hon. friend and my other hon. friend thought it was the Pacific side. They are confusing that service with the service on the Atlantic side. We had subsidized for several years a service between the Atlantic ports of Canada and ports in Australia and New Zealand. That subsidy has been dropped, because the Mercantile Marine has put its own vessels on it.

Mr. SINCLAIR (Guysborough): The mercantile marine propose to put two lines of vessels on the Pacific—monthly sailings direct from Vancouver to Australia and monthly sailings direct from Vancouver to New Zealand. Will that be a similar service to that which my hon. friend now proposes to subsidize?

Sir GEORGE FOSTER: I do not know the ports at which that service really touches, but if its objective is Australia it will probably touch at Sydney, as is the case with the service proposed to be subsidized. I do not know whether the ports of call are the same in the case of the New Zealand services.

Mr. SINCLAIR (Guysborough): This is subject to the same criticism as was made in the other case. My right hon. friend is paying his competitor $130,000 to take business away from himself. He should delay the passage of this item until he can consult with the Minister of Marine and ascertain whether or not this subsidy can be dispensed with, as was done in the case of the Atlantic service.

Sir GEORGE FOSTER: The vessels operated by the Canadian Mercantile Marine on the Pacific are exclusively freight vessels. If we are to have a first-class service between Canada and Australia and New Zealand we must have vessels equipped to carry passengers as well as freight.

Mr. ROSS: Do the vessels of the mercantile marine on the Atlantic carry passengers?

Sir GEORGE FOSTER: No.

Mr. SINCLAIR (Guysborough): Some of them are equipped to carry passengers. I know that one left Halifax a few days ago with passengers.

Sir GEORGE FOSTER: Not on that route. The two vessels which have been fitted up for passenger service go to Jamaica, Nassau and British Honduras.

Mr. McKENZIE: There should have been a thorough agreement between the Minister

of Marine and the Minister of Trade and Commerce as to the new routes which were to be established. Will the minister say that he was consulted about the various new services which are to be operated by the government-owned boats?

Sir GEORGE FOSTER: I assure my hon. friend that I am not running the mercantile marine.

Mr. McKENZIE: Then what has been said by the member for Guysborough (Mr. Sinclair) is quite right, that there should be a clear understanding between the Minister of Marine and the Minister of Trade and Commerce on these subjects.

Sir GEORGE FOSTER: My hon. friend must remember that the classes of vessels in these respective services are different. One is freight solely; the other must be first class passenger and freight.

Mr. McKENZIE: These services are all for the one people and I do not think it is proper that two departments should act independently when the business is practically the same. Our purpose is to carry trade from Canada to the outside world and vice versa, and if that is to be done by government-owned boats we should not subsidize companies to do the same work. There should be no unnecessary expenditure of the people's money.

Sir GEORGE FOSTER: It would be very much easier if the classes of vessels were the same.

Mr. SINCLAIR (Guysborough): How many boats does the subsidized company propose to operate in this service?

Sir GEORGE FOSTER: They make a voyage every four weeks, the ports of call being Vancouver, Victoria, Honolulu, Fiji Islands, Auckland, and a port in Australia.

Mr. ROSS: How many passengers do they carry?

Sir GEORGE FOSTER: In 1919 they carried 9,521. The value of export freight carried was $5,305,000.

Mr. McKENZIE: This line has been subsidized for quite a number of years, I believe, and so fas as the minister has told us there is no complaint of congestion of freight or inability on the part of the service to carry what was offered. If we are getting the necessary service as the result of this subsidy, why put our own boats on the same service when we could use them elsewhere with advantage? We need boats on the St. Lawrence to carry coal to points where it is much needed. Here is a service which is strictly for our own people, and for which a crying need is felt. I see nothing in the proposals of the Minister of Marine which would indicate that any provision is being made for a service of that kind. He does seem to be very solicitous, however, about Australia, New Zealand, and other countries. If the minister can disperse with those far-away voyages and put those vessels on serviceable routes in the very heart of our own country, that is what our people will approve more than speculating where or not they shall get any trade on the Pacific in New Zealand, Australia or any of those far-away ports. The principle seems to be that these boats must be put out of sight somewhere or the people will find fault.

I wish to bring to the notice of the minister something I discovered within the last two days that I did not know before. I find that Norwegian boats which used to carry coal from Nova Scotia to Montreal and St. Lawrence ports are almost prohibited from entering into the trade at all by an Order in Council that was passed in 1902, and although the situation was relieved by an Order in Council which permitted those boats to run, I understand that the last Order in Council permitting them was passed in 1915; and it expired in 1916, so that to-day a Norwegian boat cannot carry on coastal trade in Canada, and it will be very difficult for our coal dealers to get ships to carry their coal.

Sir GEORGE FOSTER: Those ships cannot do coastal trade in Canada?

Mr. McKENZIE: They cannot carry a pound of freight from one Canadian port to another Canadian port. When we are carrying coal from North Sydney to Montreal, that is, of course, from one Canadian port to another. They cannot handle that trade. Therefore, it is highly important that our boats should do the business—I am not suggesting that they do it for nothing—as cheaply as possible and put us on an independent footing, so that our companies can make contracts with Quebec, Montreal and other places, knowing that they will always have the steamers to carry the coal. The minister is, perhaps, not aware that this is the situation to-day. I have made inquiries of the Marine and Customs Departments within the last two days, and I was positively informed to-night, that no Norwegian boat, nor any

other foreign boat, can carry freight between any one port and another in Canada.

Sir GEORGE FOSTER: Unless they reciprocate with our vessels. I suppose that is the principle.

Mr. McKENZIE: That is the situation now. We have nothing to send to Norway, and there is nothing to do after we get there, so that reciprocity would be of no good to us. I am very glad, for one thing, that we have those ships, and I am sure the minister will keep in mind, in co-operation with the other department, that that is the best service in which they can be used.

Mr. BUTTS: My hon. friend (Mr. McKenzie) has spoken a number of times about those ships and about the St. Lawrence coal trade. He referred to the matter several days ago in the House. I think I am not going too far when I tell my hon. friend that I have it on very credible authority that those ships that he speaks of as being tied up in different ports, are now under repairs and being refitted for the coal trade of the coming summer, and that they are now under contract and will likely be in the coal trade carrying coal from Sydney Harbour to Montreal and the different St. Lawrence ports.

Sir GEORGE FOSTER: That answers the question of my hon. friend.

Mr. McKENZIE: I am glad that the hon. member has come to the assistance of the minister. My right hon. friend did not know what was going on in his department. Now we have it on the highest possible authority that certain repairs are going on and possibly some contracts will be entered into.

Sir GEORGE FOSTER: My hon. friend ought to be satisfied.

Mr. SINCLAIR (Guysborough): Another feature of this matter that I do not think the minister has looked into is the enormous expense he will incur in running this service to New Zealand and Australia by these large Governement boats if there is no trade for them. If it is true that the service that we now have is able to carry the goods that are passing between Vancouver and Australia and New Zealand, why are we proposing now to put on five 8,000-ton boats to compete with the service that we are now subsidizing? This is what the Minister of Marine and Fisheries says:

> Vancouver-Australia and New Zealand service. Established February 23, 1920: Monthly sailings: Allotted five 8,100-ton steamers: These steamers call, East and West bound, at Wellington, Auckland, Sydney and Melbourne.

The expenditure of running these five large steamers between Vancouver and Australia will be enormous. They have to plough their way through the Pacific ocean burning coal that will cost some six dollars a ton. You cannot expect them to run for a day with less than fifty tons of coal, so that that amounts to $300. Therefore, the five boats will take at least $1,500 worth of coal per day to keep them running on the Pacific ocean, and the coal is only a small item compared with wages and other expenses to keep these steamers in commission. This looks to me like an insane proposal unless the minister can show an enormous increase in trade between Vancouver and those ports in Australia and New Zealand. The Marine Department are proposing to put those five large government owned boats on that service, the Minister of Trade and Commerce is proposing to subsidize the old service that carried the trade before, and we have no information at all to show us that there is any need of putting those new boats on. The minister ought to take my advice and stop asking for the passing of this item until he consults the Minister of Marine and Fisheries in order to find out just where he stands in regard to this matter.

Mr. ROSS: In answer to a question I asked, the minister stated that some 9,000 passengers were carried from Vancouver to Australia. Did he mean that the subsidized boats had carried 9,000 passengers?

Sir GEORGE FOSTER: Yes.

Mr. ROSS: Did he also mean that the $5,000,000 worth of goods shipped from Canada to Australia was carried by those boats?

Sir GEORGE FOSTER: Yes.

Mr. ROSS: What is the tonnage of those boats?

Mr. PECK: Some of the boats that run to Australia are first class ships of ten, twelve and fifteen thousand tons. Our ships are not in the same class.

Sir GEORGE FOSTER: The tonnage of the Makura is gross, 8,200 and the Niagara, 13,444.

Mr. ROSS: Our ships are 8,100 tons.

Sir GEORGE FOSTER: Yes.

Item agreed to.

Mail subsidies and steamship subventions—local services—Mulgrave and Canso, steam service—between, $13,500.

Mr. SINCLAIR (Guysborough): Has this contract been renewed for the coming year?

Sir GEORGE FOSTER: I think it has. It will be anyway.

Item agreed to.

Pictou, Montague, Murray Harbour, and Georgetown, steam service between, $6,000.

Mr. McISAAC: Has this service been renewed?

Sir GEORGE FOSTER: I am not sure, but it is about the time for signing the contract.

Item agreed to.

Supervision of subsidized steamship services, expenses in connection with, $4,000.

Mr. FIELDING: Before we dispose of this last item I would like to remind my right hon. friend that last session I called his attention to what I supposed was an accident in the omission of a small subsidy of $1,000, I think the amount was for the steam service between the town of Lockport and Froude's Point. It is a service between the Canadian National railways and the town of Lockport. My right hon. friend said that he had dropped it out as he understood it was merely a ferry of three-quarters of a mile, speaking from memory. I pointed out that that was quite a mistake. By road it is four or five miles, and by water four miles. It is really an important service. It is not a question of subsidizing any company, for the service is maintained by the town of Lockport, and if there is any deficiency the town has to make it up by taxing the people. I think it is as legitimate a claim as many of these here of the same class. I am quite sure that my right hon. friend was mistaken on the ground on which he left this item out, and I draw his attention to the matter now in the hope that when the Supplementary Estimates are being prepared he will be able to make provision for it. It is not a question of subsidizing any private capitalist or anything of that sort. It is a service run by the town of Lockport, and is of vital importance to them and also to the Canadian National railways. Lockport is one of the largest towns on the south coast, and is a very important fishing community. It is already doing a large fishing business, and would do a much greater business if it had better transportation facilities. My right hon. friend cannot introduce an item now, but I trust he will make a note of it and make provision for this service in the Supplementary Estimates.

[Sir George Foster.]

Sir GEORGE FOSTER: I will certainly look into it.

Item agreed to.

Civil Government—Patent & Copyright—Salaries, $161,292.50; contingencies, $35,000.

Mr. SINCLAIR (Guysborough): Is this increase of almost $29,000 justifiable?

Sir GEORGE FOSTER: The increase is due largely to the reclassification. Then there are some additional appointments which are necessary in order to clear up the arrears of work which have accumulated during the latter years of the war. Extra examiners have to be appointed for the largely increased number of applications for patents. While the war was on, there were not so many applications, but now the applications are in arrears and piling up, and when people pay for patents they want them got out. I have very carefully gone over this vote, and I can assure my hon. friend there are no unnecessary additions to the staff.

Mr. FIELDING: Are we doing something this session with regard to copyright? Is ther a Bill under consideration?

Sir GEORGE FOSTER: There is a Bill under way.

Item agreed to.

On the motion of Sir George Foster the House adjourned at 11.55 p.m.

Monday, April 4, 1921.

The House met at Three o'clock.

REPORTS AND PAPERS

Annual Report of the Veterinary Director General for the years ended March 31, 1919, and March 31, 1920.—Hon. Mr. Tolmie.

Fourth Volume of the Auditor General's Report.—Right Hon. Mr. Meighen.

Correspondence relating to the appointment of Sir Thomas White as arbitrator on the Grand Trunk arbitration.—Right Hon. Mr. Meighen.

Copy of Order in Council respecting the appointment of a manager for the Parliamentary restaurant.—Mr. Speaker.

PRIVATE BILLS

FIRST READINGS

Bill No. 53, to incorporate the Fort Smith Railway Company.—Mr. Douglas (Strathcona).

Bill No. 51 (from the Senate), for the relief of George Elmor Glossop.—Mr. Copp.

SECOND READINGS

Bill No. 45 (from the Senate), for the relief of William Henry Coulson.—Mr. Hocken.

Bill No. 46 (from the Senate), for the relief of Elizabeth Alexander.—Mr. Douglas (Strathcona).

Bill No. 47 (from the Senate), for the relief of William Gleaves Doyle.—Mr. Best.

Bill No. 49 (from the Senate), for the relief of Dorothy Mearuel Score.—Mr. Fripp.

Bill No. 50 (from the Senate), for the relief of Henry William Maynard.—Mr. Hocken.

RAILWAY ACT AMENDMENT

PROPOSAL TO PLACE INLAND MERCHANT SHIPPING UNDER RAILWAY COMMISSION

Mr. J. E. ARMSTRONG (East Lambton) moved for leave to introduce Bill No. 54, to amend the Railway Act, 1919. He said: This Bill is similar to the one that I introduced last year.

Some hon. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

Mr. ARMSTRONG: It is coming to a time when this Bill is looked upon possibly as a hardy annual, but I hope it is coming to a time when members on both sides of this House will appreciate to the full the importance of the measure and will vote to place it on the statute book. The purport of the Bill is to bring boats on our inland waters under the control of the Railway Commission. I have eliminated an important clause in the former Bill dealing with the question of controlling boats on our coasts. This Bill confines the control entirely to boats on our inland waters, and there is in the Bill a clause defining the limits contained in our statutes regarding inland waters. I do not need to tell members of the House that I hope the Bill will receive their approval, and that it will be placed on the statute books during the present session.

Motion agreed to, and Bill read the first time.

FERTILIZER ACT, 1909, AMENDMENT

Mr. THOMAS W. CALDWELL (Victoria and Carleton) moved for leave to introduce Bill No. 55, to amend the Fertilizer Act, 1909. He said: It is not proposed by this Bill to make any drastic changes in the Fertilizer Act. This Bill is simply to provide for the better marking of commercial fertilizer which is offered for sale, so that the farmer may know exactly what he is purchasing. It is proposed that the manufacturer of fertilizers shall specify the material from which his different chemicals are derived, also the available phosphoric acid in the contents of his fertilizer. I believe a majority of the fertilizer manufacturers of Canada would be in favour of this amendment, from the very fact that a few unscrupulous manufacturers of fertilizer are putting into their compounds ingredients which are not plant food, such as ground leather, and mustard seeds, which have a large content of ammonia.

Motion agreed to, and Bill read the first time.

IMMIGRATION ACT AMENDMENT—DEPORTATION

Mr. ERNEST LAPOINTE (Quebec East) moved for leave to introduce Bill No. 56, to amend the Immigration Act (deportation of undesirable persons). He said: The object of this Bill is to repeal certain provisions of the Act passed by this Parliament during the session of 1919. The most important provision of which repeal is asked is that part of the Act which gives authority to deport, without the form of a trial, persons who are under the law Canadian citizens. This Bill is similar to a Bill which was introduced last year by the Government in the Senate and which was rejected there in committee. At that time I asked the Prime Minister whether the Government would introduce the Bill in this House, and I was told that the Bill, having failed in the Senate, could not be brought into this House in the same session. This session I have waited until to-day expecting that the Government would introduce the Bill again, and I may add that I would be glad to give way, if they will accept the Bill as their own and proceed with it as a Government measure.

Motion agreed to, and Bill read the first time.

GRAND TRUNK ARBITRATION

On the Orders of the Day:

Hon. CHARLES MURPHY (Russell): In view of the published announcement that the Grand Trunk railway arbitration proceedings will not be completed on the 9th of the present month, is it the intention of the Government to have the time for completing the award extended?

Right Hon. ARTHUR MEIGHEN (Prime Minister): The Government has not decided the question as to the extension of the award. Correspondence is now passing on the subject.

BUILDING TRADES' CONFERENCE

On the Orders of the Day:

Hon. CHARLES MURPHY (Russell): Is it the intention of the Government to defray the expenses of the delegates who will attend the Building Trades' Conference, which has been called, I understand, by the Government, to be held in Ottawa sometime within the next month?

Right Hon. ARTHUR MEIGHEN (Prime Minister): I have no information on the subject, but I will obtain it and let the hon. member know to-morrow.

GRAND TRUNK RAILWAY—ALLEGED REQUEST FOR ASSISTANCE

On the Orders of the Day:

Mr. P. F. CASGRAIN (Charlevoix-Montmorency): I beg to draw the attention of the House to an article which appeared in the Ottawa Evening Citizen of April 1, in which it is stated, "Railway situation was considered at ministerial caucus." In the course of the article it is stated that extensive assistance, the amount being upwards of eighty million dollars, was asked for on behalf of the Grand Trunk Railway Company. Has assistance of that extent been given?

Right Hon. ARTHUR MEIGHEN (Prime Minister): No assistance except what is in the Estimates.

CANADIAN NATIONAL RAILWAYS

On the Orders of the Day:

Hon. H. S. BELAND (Beauce): I read in the Montreal Gazette of this morning a report of a very able speech delivered by the Prime Minister in Montreal last Saturday. With your permission, Sir, I would like to read the concluding remark and to put a question in connection with it.

The right hon. gentleman is reported to have said:

> The Government had taken over the railways not because it wished to do so, but having been forced to undertake the task would give the system a fair trial at least, and if it could not make it a success, someone else might.

The question I would like to ask the right hon. gentleman is whether this foreshadows impending action of the Government in handing over the National railways to private ownership, as the system has evidently not been a success.

Right Hon. ARTHUR MEIGHEN (Prime Minister): The answer to the question is: No.

GRAND TRUNK RAILWAY—ALLEGED DEFAULT OF INTEREST

On the Orders of the Day:

Mr. D. D. McKENZIE (Cape Breton North and Victoria): I would like to call the attention of the Minister of Railways to a despatch from Montreal to the Citizen of this morning stating that the Grand Trunk Railway has defaulted in payment of interest on bonds, and that, according to the language of the telegram, the financial condition of that company appears to be in the air. Is this condition of things true, and if so, what effect will it have upon the negotiations now going on between the Government and the railway company, or will it have any effect at all?

Right Hon. ARTHUR MEIGHEN (Prime Minister): The Government has no information that default has taken place. There are some bonds, interest on which, I believe, is due to-day. In respect of them, and in respect of other subjects related thereto, correspondence has been and is passing, and is not yet completed. When it is completed, full details will be given to Parliament.

CASE OF SMALLPOX ON THE "SCANDINAVIAN"

On the Orders of the Day:

Mr. O. R. GOULD (Assiniboia): I have received information from a passenger who was on board the steamer Scandinavian, which recently docked at the port of St. John, that a case of smallpox was found on board. The complainant states to me that all the passengers were cabin passengers, all eating at the same table, and so forth, and that 104 of them were segregated on Patridge island while the rest of the passengers were allowed to go to their

destination. My informant does not protest against the segregation, but he wishes to know why, and from whom, the orders came that allowed some of the passengers to go forward to their destination while the others were detained.

Hon. J. A. CALDER (Minister of Immigration and Colonization): This is the first intimation that I have had that a case of smallpox has broken out on one of the boats. I am not familiar with the circumstances, but I shall immediately make inquiries, and will give a further reply to my hon. friend to-morrow.

INQUIRY FOR RETURN

On the Orders of the Day:

Mr. A. T. LEGER (Kent, N.B.): On the 14th of March an order of the House was passed for:

A copy of all correspondence, telegrams, and other documents, relative to the resignation of Mr. John Sheridan, Indian Superintendent for the North Shore district, in the Province of New Brunswick, in 1920. Also copy of all correspondence, telegrams and other documents relative to his re-appointment to the said position.

I should like to know when I may expect the papers.

Right Hon. ARTHUR MEIGHEN (Prime Minister): I will look into the matter, and it will be spoken to to-morrow.

QUESTIONS

(Questions answered orally are indicated by an asterisk.)

CIVIL SERVICE—RELIGIOUS HOLIDAYS

*Mr. ARCHAMBAULT:

1. Is it true that contrary to the formal promise of Sir Robert Borden in Parliament, at the last session, the civil servants of the Government have been forced to work on Catholic religious holidays, notably on the following: All Saints' Day, Immaculate Conception, Epiphany?
2. If so, for what reason has the Government acted thus?

Right Hon. ARTHUR MEIGHEN: In answer to questions 1 and 2, the assurance given by Sir Robert Borden in this matter is to be found on pages 4259 to 4262 inclusive, of Hansard 1920, Volume V. A perusal of the entire discussion on these pages and especially the perusal of the requests made of the then Prime Minister as regards observance of the Epiphany, Ascension Day, All Saints' Day, and the feast of the Immaculate Conception, would lead to the view that the assurance given following the requests so made was to the effect that pursuant to custom and convention Catholic civil servants in Ottawa should be at liberty to observe these days by attending church or other religious observances according to the laws of their church without any deduction of pay if the observance should take any of the time which they ought to give to the public service. Accordingly, instructions were issued by the ministers of each department that such Catholic civil servants should have full liberty as above set out on such days. A reading, however, of the last reference of Sir Robert Borden to the subject on page 4262 would indicate a possible interpretation that not only should the above privileges be granted but that the entire days should be observed as holidays in the civil service in Ottawa. In view of the fact that the assurance given may have been so understood and accepted, instructions are being issued that, while the law in this regard stands as it does, it be so carried out.

Mr. SEGUIN:

Is it the intention of the Government, in future, to exempt Catholic employees from work on religious holidays, specially All Saints' Day, Immaculate Conception and Epiphany?

Right Hon. ARTHUR MEIGHEN: This question is answered by the answer given to question No. 1 on to-day's Order Paper.

CANADIAN GOVERNMENT MERCHANT MARINE

Mr. DUFF:

1. What are the names of the steamers of the Canadian Government Marine which were in commission up to December 31, 1920?
2. Where were said ships built and where registered up to and including said date?

Hon. Mr. BALLANTYNE: In answer to questions 1 and 2, a list is attached:

Steamers of Canadian Government Merchant Marine in Commission up to December 31, 1920.

Name of Steamer—Where Built—Where Registered:

Canadian Adventurer, Port Arthur, Ont., Montreal, Que.
Canadian Aviator, North Vancouver, B.C., Montreal, Que.
Canadian Beaver, Collingwood, Ont., Montreal, Que.
Canadian Carrier, Port Arthur, Ont., Montreal, Que.
Canadian Conqueror, Montreal, Que., Montreal, Que.
Canadian Exporter, Vancouver, B.C., Montreal, Que.
Canadian Farmer, Collingwood, Ont., Montreal, Que.
Canadian Gunner, Collingwood, Ont., Montreal, Que.
Canadian Highlander, North Vancouver, B.C., Montreal, Que.
Canadian Hunter, Lauzon, Levis, Que., Montreal, Que.

Canadian Importer, Vancouver, B.C., Montreal, Que.
Canadian Inventor, Vancouver, B.C., Montreal, Que.
Canadian Mariner, Halifax, N.S., Montreal, Que.
Canadian Miller, Montreal, Que., Montreal, Que.
Canadian Miner, Trenton, N.S., Montreal, Que.
Canadian Navigator, Montreal, Que., Montreal, Que.
Canadian Observer, Collingwood, Ont., Montreal, Que.
Canadian Otter, Welland, Ont., Montreal, Que.
Canadian Pioneer, Montreal, Que., Montreal, Que.
Canadian Planter, Montreal, Que., Montreal, Que.
Canadian Prospector, Vancouver, B.C., Montreal, Que.
Canadian Raider, North Vancouver, B.C., Montreal, Que.
Canadian Rancher, Three Rivers, Que., Montreal, Que.
Canadian Ranger, Montreal, Que., Montreal, Que.
Canadian Recruit, Collingwood, Ont., Montreal, Que.
Canadian Rover, Collingwood, Ont., Montreal, Que.
Canadian Runner, Port Arthur, Ont., Montreal, Que.
Canadian Sailor, Port Arthur, Ont., Montreal, Que.
Canadian Sapper, Trenton, N.S., Montreal, Que.
Canadian Sealer, Trenton, N.S., Montreal, Que.
Canadian Seigneur, Montreal, Que., Montreal, Que.
Canadian Settler, Three Rivers, Que., Montreal, Que.
Canadian Signaller, Collingwood, Ont., Montreal, Que.
Canadian Sower, Port Arthur, Ont., Montreal, Que.
Canadian Spinner, Montreal, Que., Montreal, Que.
Canadian Squatter, Welland, Ont., Montreal, Que.
Canadian Trader, Port Arthur Ont., Montreal, Que.
Canadian Trapper, Lauzon, Levis, Que., Montreal, Que.
Canadian Trooper, North Vancouver, B.C., Montreal, Que.
Canadian Victor, Montreal, Que., Montreal, Que.
Canadian Volunteer, North Vancouver, B.C, Montreal, Que.
Canadian Voyageur, Montreal, Que., Montreal, Que.
Canadian Warrior, Collingwood, Ont., Montreal, Que.
Canadian Winner, Victoria, B.C., Montreal, Que.

PAYMENTS TO JUSTICES RIDDELL AND LATCHFORD

Mr. CLARK (Bruce):

1. Has the attention of the Government been called to the evidence given by Mr. R. T. Harding before a committee of the Ontario Legislature that he has personally paid out of public funds the sum of $2,000 each to Justices Riddell and Latchford, acting as commissioners in a public inquiry in which the said Mr. Harding appeared as prosecuting counsel?

2. Is the acceptance by these two judges of this or any payment for acting as commisioners in contravention of Section 12 of the Judges Act as amended in 1920?

3. If so, what action, if any, does the Government intend to take in the matter?

Right Hon. Mr. DOHERTY:

1. No.

2. Section 12 reads as follows:

(1) No judge shall receive any remuneration in addition to his judicial salary for acting as administrator or deputy of the Governor General, or for any duty or service, whether judicial or executive, which he may hereafter be required to perform for or on behalf of the Government of Canada or the Government of any province thereof. Provided that this section shall not affect the right of any judge under the provisions of any statute, Dominion or provincial, now in force.

(2) Every judge who may be nominated for the purpose by the Governor in Council or the Lieutenant Governor in Council shall execute without additional renumeration any commission or inquiry for which he may be appointed as commissioner under any authority in that behalf exercisable by the Governor in Council or the Lieutenant Governor in Council, including the discharge of the duty of arbitrator in any case in which he may be named to act by the competent authority. Provided, however, that any such judge while acting as commissioner or arbitrator at the nomination of the Governor in Council shall be entitled to his moving or transportation expenses and living allowance at the rate and upon the conditions provided by section eighteen of this Act, and such judge when employed under the authority of the Lieutenant Governor in Council may be paid by the Lieutenant Governor in Council his moving or transportation expenses and a living allowance not exceeding the amount he would be entitled to under the said section eighteen.

The question is a mixed one of fact and law. The Government is not in possession of the facts, and it is not the practice to answer, nor can the Government take upon itself the function of answering, questions of law.

3. Answered by 1 and 2.

TOBACCO GROWING

Mr. GERVAIS:

1. Have the reports respecting tobacco growing been published in detail in the monthly Bulletin, January 1921, for the province of Ontario and not for the province of Quebec?

2. If so, why the discrimination?

Right Hon. Sir GEORGE FOSTER:

1. The area and yield of tobacco in 1920 in the province of Ontario are given in the Monthly Bulletin of Agricultural Statistics for January, 1921, by countries and townships, for each variety of tobacco. For the province of Quebec the area and yield is given for the province as a whole and are not distinguished according to varieties.

2. The estimates for the province of Ontario are as furnished to the Dominion Bureau of Statistics by the Tobacco Division of the Central Experimental Farm. For the province of Quebec the area and yield are as estimated jointly by the Dominion Bureau and Quebec Bureau of Statistics and details by countries and municipalities are not available. The Census of 1921 will collect statistics in greater detail.

Mr. THOMAS CANTLEY

Mr. DUFF:

1. Is Mr. Thomas Cantley, of New Glasgow, Nova Scotia, a director of the Canadian National Railways?
2. Has a private car been placed at the disposal of the said above mentioned director, since his appointment?
3. If so, what is the name or number of said car?
4. Is said car supplied with a chef, porter and all necessary supplies?
5. What has been the cost of said car to the country since being placed at the disposal of the said Mr. Thomas Cantley?

Hon. Mr. REID:

1. Yes.
2. No. On two occasions, for special reasons, Mr. Cantley had use of car of Superintendent at New Glasgow for two trips between New Glasgow and Halifax, and return.
3. Answered by No. 2.
4. Answered by No. 2.
5. Answered by No. 2.

ST. JOHN AND QUEBEC RAILWAY

Mr. MICHAUD:

What were the gross earnings of the St. John and Quebec Railway during the last fiscal year?

Hon. Mr. REID (Grenville): $218,127.54.

INTERCOLONIAL RAILWAY—WORK AT CHARNY AND ST. FOY

Mr. PARENT:

1. Is there a station called Charny on the Intercolonial Railway?
2. If so, are any buildings being constructed there?
3. What kind of material is being used for the said buildings?
4. Where was the material obtained?
5. Has the engine house at St. Foy, opposite the Quebec bridge, been demolished in whole or in part?
6. If so, what has become of the brick taken from the said engine house?
7. Under whose instructions was said engine house demolished?
8. Who gave instructions concerning the disposal of the said brick?
9. Is there any similarity between the brick used in the building at Charny and the brick removed from the engine house at St. Foy?

Hon. Mr. REID:

1. Yes.
2. No.
3. See answer to No. 2.
4. See answer to No. 2.
5. Yes; in part.
6. Used in enlarging engine house at Chaudière, near Charny.
7. Authorized as a result of decision of management to concentrate all terminal operations of the Intercolonial, Transcontinental and Grand Trunk Railways at one point, viz., Chaudière.
8. See answer to No. 7.
9. The bricks taken from Bridge engine house were used in enlarging Chaudière engine house, and second-hand bricks were also brought from other points for the same purpose.

APPLE EXPORTS TO GREAT BRITAIN

Mr. McCOIG:

1. How many barrels and boxes of apples were exported from Canada to the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Ireland from August 1, 1920, to and including February 28, 1921?
2. What was the total value of such exports?
3. What quantity and value of such exports was of Ontario product?

Hon. Mr. WIGMORE:

1. and 2.

	Barrels.	Value.
August	4	$ 36
September	51,558	301,549
October	169,853	1,085,725
November	231,885	1,449,269
December	237,202	1,507,226
January	310,784	1,882,796
February	123,222	737,281
Total	1,124,508	$ 6,963,882

3. Customs export entries do not indicate in what part of Canada exported apples originate.

MONTREAL-QUEBEC PILOTS SUPERANNUATION

Mr. CANNON:

1. What is the amount of superannuation paid to former pilots from Montreal-Quebec Division, or to widows and dependents of same?
2. What is the number of those pensioners?
3. What are their names and respective ages?

Hon. Mr. BALLANTYNE:

1. Pensions to Montreal-Quebec retired pilots and widows of retired pilots are paid out of the Montreal Decayed Pilots' Pension Fund, and is administered for the Montreal pilots by the Department of Finance.

Retired pilots receive $350 per annum since 1920.

Widows of retired pilots receive $175 per annum since 1920.

Dependents—nothing.

2. 17 retired pilots,
17 widows of retired pilots,
Total 34.

3. No record of ages. Names follow:

1. Widow, Alexis Gauthier,
2. Widow, Octave J. Hamelin,
3. Widow, Jean Nault,
4. Widow, Elzéar Bellisle,
5. Widow, Nestor Arcand,
6. Widow, C. Lyderic Bouille,
7. Widow, G. Joseph Dussault,
8. Widow, Célestin Brunet,
9. Widow, L. A. Bouille,
10. Widow, Joseph Chandonnet,
11. Widow, Onésime Naud,
12. Widow, George Dufresne,
13. Widow, Louis Mayrand,
14. Widow, Alfred St. Amant,
15. Widow, Barthelémi Arcand,
16. Widow, Wilfrid Raymond,
17. Widow, Joseph Léveillé,
18. Decayed Pilot, Jean Arcand,
19. Decayed Pilot, Philippe Bélanger,
20. Decayed Pilot, Liboire Perrault,
21. Decayed Pilot, Gédéon Groleau,
22. Decayed Pilot, Néré Bellisle,
23. Decayed Pilot, Narcisse Perreault,
24. Decayed Pilot, Ulric Groleau,
25. Decayed Pilot, S. C. Auger,
26. Decayed Pilot, Ferdinand Labranche,
27. Decayed Pilot, Geo. Perrault,
28. Decayed Pilot, G. Téo. Hamelin,
29. Decayed Pilot, Laurent Gauthier,
30. Decayed Pilot, Constant Toupin,
31. Decayed Pilot, Louis Z. Bouille,

INQUIRY RE QUESTIONS

Hon. CHARLES MURPHY (Russell): With your permission, Mr. Speaker, and the permission of the House, I would direct the attention of the Minister of Railways (Mr. Reid), to the fact that when a question appears on the Order Paper the department concerned usually begins to prepare the answer immediately. Question No. 13 has now been on the Order Paper for about three weeks, and so far it has not been answered.

Hon. J. D. REID (Minister of Railways): I made enquiries to-day before coming to the House in order to ascertain the cause of the delay. I am informed by the officials of the department that this particular question requires some little time. They are preparing the answer and will have it ready in the course of a day or two.

Mr. MURPHY: To-morrow?

Mr. REID: I cannot say.

CANADIAN NATIONAL RAILWAYS CORRESPONDENCE

Mr. GEORGES PARENT (Quebec West), moved:

For a copy of all letters, reports exchanged between engineers and officers of the Canadian National railways concerning the demolition of the round house at St. Foy, opposite the Quebec bridge, the removal from that place of a mechanical staff to a place called Charny on the other side of the St. Lawrence river; the proposed demolition of the station on the main line of the Transcontinental Railway at Quebec bridge.

Right Hon. ARTHUR MEIGHEN (Prime Minister): This motion should await the report of a committee which I hope shortly to be able to move the House to appoint. It is a motion for the production of papers that would be in the possession of the management alone.

Mr. PARENT: This motion has been standing for about three or four weeks now, and I thought that the Government, by this time, would have had ample opportunity to obtain the information sought.

Mr. MEIGHEN: It is not a question of getting the information; it is a question that affects the whole general principle, as has been debated in the House frequently. If the hon. member will wait, the question can be handled precisely in the same way as all others relating to the same subject.

Mr. PARENT: Thanks very much.

Motion stands.

UNOPPOSED MOTIONS FOR PRODUCTION OF PAPERS

Mr. SUTHERLAND:

For a copy of all reports, orders, telegrams, certificates of valuation, or any other correspondence relating to or connected with the slaughter of 245 hogs the property of one George B. Alderson, by officers of the Department of Agriculture on or about the 20th day of April, 1920, and for which compensation has been refused by he minister.

Mr. STEVENS:

For a return showing (a) the number of ex-civil servants now drawing superannuation from the Government and who had contributed for thirty-five years to the superannuation fund, and (b) the amount still remaining in this fund and (c) the amount withdrawn in the years 1918, 1919 and 1920.

Mr. LAVIGUEUR:

For a copy of all correspondence between the Government and the Board of Trade and City Council and Harbour Commission of Quebec, since the session of 1917, with regard to the diversion of the Northwestern grain trade to New York, the alleged non-fulfilment by the Government of its undertakings with regard to the terminals of the Transcontinental Railway at Quebec, and of the Memorials addressed to the Prime Minister on these subjects.

SCRUTINY OF ESTIMATES—SPECIAL COMMITTEE PROPOSED

Hon. RODOLPHE LEMIEUX (Maisonneuve and Gaspe) moved:

That, in the opinion of this House, in order to co-ordinate and expedite the business of Parliament in a more intelligent and practical way, the estimates of the various departments should, before being laid on the table, be scrutinized by a special committee of the House, where officers would be summoned to appear with plans and reports bearing on each appropriation.

Right Hon ARTHUR MEIGHEN (Prime Minister): This motion relates particularly to the Finance Department, and as this is one day when the minister is necessarily away, may I request my hon. friend to let the motion stand?

Mr. LEMIEUX: Certainly.

Motion stands.

QUEBEC RIOTS OF 1918

Mr. GEORGE PARENT (Quebec West) moved:

That, in the opinion of this House, an indemnity should be paid the innocent victims who during the so-called Quebec riots of 1918 have either been killed or wounded by the soldiers of His Majesty.

He said: Mr. Speaker, it was my privilege last year to place before the House certain facts which, to my mind, should have justified the Government in paying some indemnity to those innocent victims who, during the so-called Quebec riots of 1918, were either wounded or killed by His Majesty's soldiers. At that time we had from the Minister of Justice (Mr. Doherty), certain declarations that led us to believe that the Government would institute an inquiry and give these people an opportunity to state fully and fairly their claims in this matter. Unfortunately, notwithstanding these declarations, no action has been taken, and I am compelled, under the circumstances, to put the matter once more before the House in a different form, and to ask hon. members to concur in the opinion that an indemnity should be paid to these people on whose behalf I now speak. My motion of last year was one for the production of papers. I moved:

For a copy of all reports, letters, petitions or documents referring to claims for damages on behalf of innocent victims who, during the so-called Quebec riots of 1918, have either been killed or wounded by the soldiers of His Majesty?

This motion was accepted by the Government, and on April 29 the Secretary of State produced the following document:

Sessional Paper No. 140: Thursday, April 29, 1920. Return to an Order of the House of Commons, dated April 14, 1920.

Canada, Department of the Secretary of State.

Answer: No information.

I was very much surprised at this answer because, to my personal knowledge, letters had been exchanged between certain persons and the Government, between certain persons and the Prime Minister of the day (Sir Robert Borden), and between certain persons and the Minister of Militia. On the strength of this information I communicated again with the parties interested and I received copies of letters which they wrote at the time to the Government. I know of one man particularly, G. Alfred Mercier, who wrote to the Minister of Militia, and the Prime Minister of the time a good many letters, and answers were received from both hon. gentlemen. I mention this fact, in passing, to show that there was no reason why the Secretary of State of that time should state that there was no information on the subject, when as a matter of fact, a number of letters had been exchanged and certain claims made. The only inference, so far as I can see, is that the matter was considered trivial by the Government of that time. To my mind the matter is not one that should have been treated lightly. A number of persons were killed, persons who were innocent victims, and it is not a case for refusing to entertain the claims that are being advanced. The people of that part of Quebec city suffered a grievous wrong. The wound then inflicted is still unclosed and it will so remain until the Government adopts measures of a remedial character and treats fairly those persons who have suffered so grievously.

I do not intend to repeat at any length the remarks which I made last year on this subject; but in order that the House may have a better grasp of the facts it is necessary that I should refer to some of the more important cases to which, at that

time, I called the attention of the Government. I do not intend to condemn the Government for sending troops to Quebec on the occasion in question. A year ago I said, and I now repeat the statement, that the Government were influenced in acting as they did by special circumstances; they were badly advised by the reports of the men who represented the Canadian press at the time of the occurrence and who gave to this small trouble such exaggeration and such publicity that the Government were deceived with respect to it. I have already characterized the occurrence as "a small trouble." In that statement I am supported by the views expressed by the Quebec Chronicle, a paper which supported the Government throughout that period. The editorial in the Chronicle was written the day following the events referred to, and from it I quote the following sentences:

> Assuredly it would be foolish and unfair to allege that the natives of St. Roch's as a whole were guilty of acts of anarchy and we specifically state not only that what has taken place has been "the work of an excited populace," but also that only a relatively small minority of irresponsible youths "were involved".

Influenced by the publicity given to this small trouble troops were sent down to Quebec, and, prejudiced as the troops undoubtedly were, it is a wonder that other unfortunate acts did not occur in addition to those which actually happened. Still the actual events were sufficiently serious and greatly to be deplored. First I would draw attention to the case of Lecours. But first let me state that I will not take the responsibility of affirming that what these men say is correct; I will say, however, that I have no reason to believe they are stating anything contrary to the facts. I took the trouble of writing to each of the sufferers to ask him to put in writing what he had to say. I will first read the letter addressed to me by Lecours, which is dated at Buffalo, N.Y., March 22, 1920:

> Mr. GEORGE PARENT, K.C., M.P.,
> 70 St. Paul Street,
> Quebec.
>
> Dear Sir,—On the first of April, 1918, I was the proprietor of a store situated on the Iron Stairs, Crown street, in which I sold cigars, candies, cigarettes, etc. About 10.30 p.m., on the 1st of April I thought in view of the fact that the soldiers were guarding Crown street and the Steps, that it would be well to close my store earlier than usual. I had just put up my blinds and locked my door when a party of twenty-five or thirty soldiers suddenly burst the door and entered. Several of them struck me with their rifle butts on the head and elsewhere and threatened me with death. They took away the money which was in the drawer as well as several boxes of cigars and cigarettes and broke my window panes. I have already sent in my account to the Militia Department which refuses to pay on the grounds that the city is responsible.
>
> Yours very sincerely,
> A. J. LECOURS,
> 38 Cottage street,
> Buffalo, N.Y.

This letter speaks for itself. I shall dispense with comments except to draw attention to the writer's statement that he has "sent in his account to the Militia Department." If this be true, how could the Secretary of State declare on April 29, 1920, that he had no information concerning the claims referred to in the statement presented by me last year? Are we to presume that both gentlemen are right in their respective contentions?

The next case is the one of Joseph Blouin, and it well deserves attention. Here is what Blouin says in a letter addressed to me:

> In answer to your letter requesting details of the wounds which I received during the time of the Quebec riots, and asking me whether I was one of the rioters, I may state that I was not. I was travelling on St. Valier street when I was attacked. I was going home at half past five in the afternoon on Sunday the 31st of March, the day before the riots. I was bayoneted four times. These bayonets penetrated the abdomen and moreover I was struck by the butt end of a riffe on the head to such an extent that my health has diminished fifty per cent and according to my physicians I will be obliged to undergo an operation every two years for the rest of my life. I have given full information to Doctors George Racine and Simard, of the Hotel Dieu, and if I should happen to forget anything, these people will give you the details.

One would hardly believe this statement to be true, yet it professes to state the facts. If it does—and I have no reason to doubt its veracity—I claim that the Government should see to it that this man receives compensation.

I could bring many other cases to the attention of the House such, for instance, as that of J. Alfred Mercier, who has written more than one letter to the Prime Minister and to the Minister of Militia, although the then Secretary of State could obtain "no information" concerning his case. There is also the case of Edouard Tremblay, one of the saddest of all and to which I specially draw the attention of the Minister of Justice. I would say more about this young man's case were it not for the fact that my hon. friend from Charlevoix (Mr. Casgrain) will no doubt put up a strong plea in his behalf. I pass over the case of Demeule, Bergeron and Bussieres—killed at the age of twenty.

Here we have the remarkable fact that four civilians were killed and not a single fatality happened among the forces of His Majesty. This fact would naturally lead any one to pause and reflect. There is a principle of common law laid down in the Criminal Code which declares that, if necessary, force must be met by force. It is to be found at section 53 of the Criminal Code, Cap. 146. It reads as follows:

Everyone unlawfully assaulted, not having provoked such assault, is justified in repelling force by force, if the force he uses is not meant to cause death or grievous bodily harm, and is no more than is necessary for the purpose of self-defence.

2. Every one so assaulted is justified, though he causes death or grievous bodily harm, if he causes it under reasonable apprehension of death or grievous bodily harm from the violence with which the assault was originally made or with which the assailant pursues his purpose, and if he believes, on reasonable grounds, that he cannot otherwise preserve himself from death or grievous bodily harm.

The cases I have put before the House are the cases of men who being practically alone were shot at by a few soldiers and killed or wounded when there was no reason whatever to think that they had had anything to do with the riots. To prove this I must refer again to the unfortunate case of Avila Blouin. I shall read a letter from him which he is willing to back up at any time that an investigation takes place, if the Government decide to grant one:

Mr. GEO. PARENT, M.P.,
Quebec.

Rue Chevrière,
Parish of the Sacred Heart,
Quebec, P.Q.

SIR,—I wish to interest you in my case, which I am sure deserves special attention. I was unfortunate enough to be wounded on April 1, during the Quebec riots. I was hit in the right leg, and after two operations, I am obliged to walk with crutches since the leg has been amputated two inches below the knee. I declare upon my honour that the following is the true story of the events which occurred on the above-mentioned date.

On the night of April 1, after having worked all evening at my garage at the corner of Desglacis and D'Aguillon streets; this spot is quite remote from the scene of the riots.

I started for home about 11.40 p.m. On arriving at the Boulevard Langlier I was ordered by two sentries to keep straight on. I had gone but a few steps when I heard a whistle, and I threw up my hands, thinking this to be the most prudent thing to do, since I understood no English. I retraced my steps, in order to make myself understood by the sentries who had just let me pass. Whilst I was in the act of turning I was fired upon and hit in the left leg. The leg was badly injured, and the soldiers wishing to prevent me from getting up, I presume, tied me to a post, in order to bandage my wound. I am under the impression that they were not quite sane, because, instead of relieving my pain, they hit me on the head and in the face. Soon afterwards they carried me into a private house, and the military doctor gave orders for the ambulance to carry me to the Military Hospital. They amputated my leg without asking my consent or that of my parents, in spite of the fact that I had given them the telephone number of my home. I underwent treatment at the hospital for five months.

My leg was amputated twice, and I consider myself disabled to the extent of fifty per cent. It is now impossible for me to run a garage, and I have lost all hopes of the future. My incapacity I ascribe to the fact that the operation in question was so badly performed that specialists have advised me that I will find considerable difficulty in wearing an artificial limb.

I wish to call your attention to the fact that it would appear from the coroner's' inquest that the officer commanding gave orders not to shoot after eleven o'clock. I was fired upon a few minutes before midnight. I was alone, and if they had any reason to suspect me they might have taken me prisoner, and there was no necessity for shooting.

Yours very sincerely,

AVILA BLOUIN.

I have seen this unfortunate man a few times, and I must repeat, Sir, what I said last year, that his case is deserving of consideration. His daily appearance in the public streets, popular as he was and still is, bearing the evidence of the treatment he received, is no doubt a sore which cannot be cured in a day, but which will be very much alleviated if the Government comes to his rescue in the form of adequate compensation.

I will not specify any further cases. The right hon. Minister of Justice (Mr. Doherty) was good enough last year to say a few words concerning this matter, and from the tenor of his speech I was inclined to believe that he would find some means of indemnifying these persons. I shall quote his words because I want to have them on record. Here is what he said last year:

With regard to that proposition I can at the present moment only say—and I fancy that the strongest supporter of the motion would expect no more of me under present circumstances—that I shall certainly be glad to give consideration to it, and to approach it with a desire simply to look into the justification or lack of justification that may be found for it. Of course, even if one accepted the general proposition as being sound—that general proposition being, as I understand it, that if you assume, on the one hand that that action of the Government was not subject to criticism but was a necessary action in the general interest, and on the other hand, that the particular persons injured were perfectly innocent persons, and that under those circumstances it would be proper to assimilate the injury done to those persons to the damage suffered by individuals whose properties are taken in the general interest, and that therefore proper compensation for those injuries would be justified as being an indemnification to a party suffering by some perfectly proper action necessarily taken in the public inter-

est—I did not, of course, come here expecting to be asked to pass a final opinion upon a question of that kind, and I can say nothing more except that I shall be glad to give consideration, and to ask my colleagues to give consideration, to the proposition that has been put forward. and to weigh carefully what has in support of that proposition been so moderately and at the same time so clearly put forward. The papers will be brought down.

I have no objection whatever to the conditions imposed by the right hon. gentleman to justify his intervention. I have not thrown any blame upon the Government, except in so far as its mind and its executive powers were permitted to be influenced by wrong advice.

A good deal of harm has been done, innocent victims have been killed and others wounded as I have stated. To point out the animus that existed at the time among the soldiers, I could have mentioned, for instance, the way Father Evain, a priest, was handled by certain soldiers at the very moment he was administering the last rites of the church to wounded civilians. I did not do so because I did not wish to appeal to racial or religious prejudices. I could have related how I myself, just as I was walking home from church on Saturday evening, was told by an officer to follow three different directions at the same time. I could have said that the first shot fired was the act of a soldier. I could have said all this and a little more, but I do not think the purposes I have in view would be better served if I were to give more details.

One word more, Mr. Speaker, and I shall have concluded my remarks. Last year when a subject similar to the present one was discussed, the right hon. Minister of Justice expressed the view that the demands for redress appeared to come at a very late hour. The reasons for that apparent delay are obvious. When minds were inflamed, when prejudices were running high, it was not the time to present such claims as these. It was considered more advisable to wait until time had shown and proved the injustice committed. To-day Quebec is known, as it should always have been known, as a law-abiding province whose people are lovers of British institutions. Now that the province of Quebec seems to be better understood by the whole Dominion, and when she is declared to be the fairest and one of the soundest of our provinces and our compatriots are regarded as good loyal citizens —as they always have been—it is time to come back and again to claim reparation for the injustice done to them, and I believe that that injustice can only be righted by the Government of Canada as a whole.

[Mr. Parent.]

We have tried to discover who is responsible for the shooting and killing. Some lawyers advised that the city of Quebec might be responsible, and the city was sued for damages, but the court declared that the city was not liable. Other lawyers have advised that the Government of Canada is responsible. In my humble opinion it is a case for the Dominion to deal with. I think every citizen of this country should contribute towards indemnifying the innocent victims who under those sad circumstances suffered so severely.

Mr. ERNEST LAPOINTE (Quebec East): Mr. Speaker, I second the resolution moved by my hon. friend from Quebec West (Mr. Parent), and I shall add very few words to what he has said. As to the circumstances which led up to the troubles to which he has referred and the events which occured in connection with those troubles, I do not think it is necessary to say anything. No good purpose can be served by doing so; the issue is one of the past. However, as a result of these troubles innocent victims have suffered, and my hon. friend is right in claiming that these victims are entitled to compensation. The city of Quebec cannot be held responsible in any way, because they had no latitude in the matter; the military authorities had taken from them the duty of maintaining peace and order; therefore they were no longer responsible. This is the view which has been taken by the law courts, and undoubtedly it is the correct view. Men who had nothing to do either directly or indirectly with those troubles, men who were returning from their work and had to pass through certain streets of the city, were either killed or wounded, though they were connected in no way with the occurrences of that time and were not responsible in any way for them. I submit that under the circumstances the Government and the military authorities are responsible for the damage that was caused. Human life is more important than real estate or property of any kind. When in time of war a piece of property has to be taken for military purposes, compensation is always paid to the owners. I think I may fairly say that even if the military authorities were properly carrying out their functions when these lives were taken, the Government is responsible to those who suffer—even if the military authorities were right; even if what they did served the purposes of the war. I do not think any fair-minded gentleman in

4 p.m.

this House can deny that those who suffered under such circumstances have a right to compensation. The Government ought to investigate thoroughly every case, and in all cases where lives were taken or persons wounded, when the persons in question were not responsible in any way for the troubles and had proper occasion for being where they were at the time they suffered injury, the Government owes it to the dependants of these persons, as a matter of honour, to pay to them a fair and just compensation. For these reasons I second with pleasure the motion of my hon. friend.

Mr. CASGRAIN (Montmorency and Charlevoix): (Translation.) Mr. Speaker, allow me to say a few words on the subject of this most important resolution which is to-day before the House and was already last year submitted to its consideration. I do not desire to prolong this debate and I do not wish to repeat the arguments so ably presented last year and this year by the hon. member for Quebec West (Mr. Parent) and by the hon. member for Quebec East (Mr. Lapointe). Let me just call your attention to one of the cases mentioned by my hon. friend from Quebec West, the case of Edouard Tremblay, a young man who was to finish his technical school course in June, 1918. As I said, Mr. Tremblay would have completed his course at the technical school in June, 1918. He was a son of Mrs. Mailloux, a widow, of Murray Bay, in the county of Charlevoix. At the time of the so-called Quebec riots he was spending his holidays with his family. On April 1 he returned to Quebec and, on the very same day he was shot near Bagot street. He reached Quebec by the Quebec-Saguenay railway at four o'clock in the evening, after supper, he went for a walk with one of his cousins, and it was whilst taking this walk near Bagot street, that he was shot through the leg and elbow and died shortly after. The inquest showed positively that neither of the wounds could have caused death; according to Dr. Marois' own words, at the coroner's inquest: "The wounds were not sufficient to cause death." In fact, if in this circumstance, there had been available an ambulance, or some one to give first aid, his case would not have proved so serious; this boy would still be living, and helping his mother to earn a living, as it is done in the province of Quebec, and in the county which I have the honour to represent in this House. He was shot about ten o'clock, and it was not until one o'clock in the morning that he was attended to by Dr. Marois himself. Unfortunately, he was already in a very weak condition, and it was too late. He died the next morning, at eight o'clock, without having recovered consciousness.

Mr. Speaker, I am well acquainted with young Tremblay's family; his uncle, Mr. Arthur Blackburn, is a well-known citizen of Murray Bay, and I have every reason to believe that this young man, who was quietly on his way to see some of his relatives, had in no way whatever transgressed the law or endeavoured to participate in the riots in question. Besides, at the coroner's inquest, where all the facts were proven, no evidence of this kind was given.

I believe that this case, as well as the others which have been submitted to the House by the hon. member for Quebec West, prove clearly that on this occasion there were innocent victims who were either wounded or killed, or who sustained losses. We have but to look back to our history to find that there have been other such disturbances. In 1837, for instance, after many appeals and great difficulties of all kinds, the government had to acknowledge the claims put forward by the respresentatives of the people, and if I remember well, an Act was passed by Parliament by which a compassionate allowance was granted to all those who had sustained losses during the rebellion of 1837. What is happening in the different countries of the world? Take those countries, for instance, which are not as civilized as our beautiful Dominion of Canada, countries where disturbances and riots recur from year to year; such, for example, is the case in Mexico. A press despatch from that country, which I read in an English paper, the other day, says that General Obregon, who has just assumed the direction of public affairs, is endeavouring to re-establish order and peace, and one of his first measures will have for its object to compensate the rebels who have suffered from any loss whatever, those who have been wounded or whose relatives have been killed. Surely, Mr. Speaker, if a country like Mexico takes into consideration the fact that there may have been losses of life or of money, and if such a country is ready to compensate even those who have caused the rebellion and have taken part in it, there is all the more reason, in a case where quiet and peaceful citizens like the victims of the Quebec riots—case which has been submitted to Parliament by the hon. members for Quebec West and Quebec East—as well as in the case which I have just mentioned myself. I think that the Government should accede to the re-

quest of the hon. member for Quebec West and adopt this resolution. This would only be a fair measure, a measure of equity, and at the present moment, it would be a good policy on the part of the Government. I therefore appeal to all members of the Government, and to those who support them, to vote in favour of this resolution.

Hon. H. S. BELAND (Beauce): Mr. Speaker, I am happy to be able to congratulate the hon. member for Quebec West (Mr. Parent), upon the persistence with which he has brought forward this question during the course of this Parliament. It was my pleasure last year to follow the hon. gentleman when he explained in such a clear manner the claim of the wounded and of the dependents of the killed in the famous Quebec riots. Having listened, last year, after his clear exposition, to the answer given to him by the Minister of Justice (Mr. Doherty), I came to the conclusion that the Government, immediately after the session came to an end, would investigate the whole matter. I find, however, this session that nothing whatever has been done. The question, apparently, has been treated in a light manner; it seems to me, at all events, that the subject has been discarded, as it were, by the Minister of Justice as being of insufficient importance to engage the close attention of the Government. These riots are more or less a family affair, I mean a Canadian affair; they are one of the regrettable legacies of the war. The war, indeed, in Europe, has amassed any amount of miseries, and it would be expected that that should be the case, because the continent of Europe was the actual theatre of the operations of the war. The miseries that have been accumulated in Europe, it will take, probably, centuries to repair. The Treaty of Peace has endeavoured to repair the damages and losses suffered during the war as between the allied nations and the enemy countries; but as my right hon. friend is well aware, the Treaty of Peace has not, in any instance, attempted to repair any damage or inconvenience that might have been caused by one country to its own résortissants, as my right hon. friend would say. It remains the duty of the government concerned in each country to see that, if any damages or losses have been suffered by some of their Nationals, they should take the proper step to right the wrongs that have been caused.

It is not my intention to rehearse the different cases which have been cited by the hon. member for Quebec West, but I think the House will be unanimous in coming to the conclusion that the relation of facts as presented by that hon. member is impressive; in a word, the situation is like this: You are a peaceable citizen; you are going from the place of your occupation to the place of your residence or domicile; on your way home, you meet an attack on the part of His Majesty's soldiers, although you are in no degree guilty of any offence; as a result of this attack, which may not have been absolutely voluntary on the part of the soldiers, but which may have been a result of their orders, you suffer a disability, or you incur death. This, in short, is what happened. If it is not so, let the Government find out. Can the statements made by the hon. member for Quebec West be sustained by evidence? This is the whole question. If those statements can be sustained, who amongst the hon. members who sit in this House would deny the right of those who suffered to be indemnified in some degree? This argument appears absolutely clear to me. This is not a provincial question; I am not drawn into this debate by the fact that the riots have taken place in the city of Quebec, with which I am, perhaps, better acquainted than any other city in Canada. That the same things occurred in the sad situation that developed some two years ago in the city of Winnipeg, had any of the Winnipeg citizens suffered injury or death from the action of the soldiers of His Majesty in their efforts to re-establish order, my position and my contention would be absolutely the same. This is not a question of provincialism, nor of race, nor of politics; those conditions must be put absolutely out of the mind of every hon. member. The principle appears to me to be right, that, if the soldiers of His Majesty have committed a wrong, the Government, the Parliament, the country as a whole, must right the wrong.

There is more than the question of principle involved. What about the question of national interest? Is it not of paramount importance in Canada that the most modest citizen be firmly convinced that, if he or she, suffers an injury from the constituted authorities, reparation will be made? It is, I think, of much concern to us also that this sentiment should prevail in Canada

amongst all citizens, regardless of their situation. I will not press the point any further; but I would urge the right hon. gentleman who presides over the Department of Justice to institute an investigation into this case in order to find out whether the statements of the hon. member for Quebec West are well founded, and if they are well founded, the question is then one of honour, one of equity, and more than that, one of national interest, as I tried to demonstrate a minute ago. I shall say no more on this subject except to congratulate again my hon. friend from Quebec West (Mr. Parent), and to commend to the House his persistence and tenacity of purpose in bringing this case before Parliament. In doing so, he is serving not only his electors, but Canada as a whole.

Mr. C. G. POWER (Quebec South): I am sorry that I was not present at the opening of this debate and so missed hearing my hon. friend from Quebec West (Mr. Parent). I was otherwise engaged in attempting to convince the Government that in order to avoid further claims for compensation something should be done to prevent the rocks from falling on the inhabitants of another portion of our city. However, I listened with considerable attention to the hon. member for Quebec East (Mr. Lapointe) and to the other members who have taken part in this debate, and I heartily concur in what they have said.

Without entering into a discussion of the causes, either proximate or otherwise, of the famous Quebec riots, I think we all agree after hearing the evidence so ably presented by the hon. member for Quebec West that there were undoubtedly a large number of innocent victims of these riots. So far as a case of which I have personal knowledge is concerned, a gentlman who lives in my constituency was, at the time he was wounded, walking along the street at some distance from the scene of any riot or trouble. He was a member of a family which had given several sons to the war, one of whom had been killed at the front, so his sympathies, if any, would most assuredly not have been with people of a riotous or rebellious disposition.

We have, on the other hand, this point of view to take into consideration. Hon. gentlemen will remember that at the time of the riots the whole country was very much stirred up. We had flaming head lines in the newspapers from coast to coast, which seemed to indicate that in the city of Quebec an actual state of warfare existed. Naurally, the soldiers sent from outside points—and a large number of them came from other provinces—were somewhat influenced by these inflammatory reports. I am in a position to state that a large number of these soldiers were raw rcruits, that some of them had never had Ross rifles in their hands before the evening on which they arrived at Quebec. Some of them even—and I can give authority for this statement—had received Ross rifles and had been issued with ball ammunition for the first time in their lives only ten minutes before they marched to Jacques Cartier Square in the city of Quebec. A large number of them, in shooting, I have no doubt, acted contrary to the orders which they had received. Taking these things into consideration, the state of mind in which these raw recruits must have found themselves, the reports which they must have heard, their obvious inexperience in the handling of dangerous weapons and placed in such a situation as they were, I think, without in any way imputing any blame to the soldiers themselves, that some blame must attach to those that sent them there. If, as will no doubt be urged by hon. gentlemen opposite, there were no other troops available, that does not in any way help the case of those who are of the opinion that no compensation should be paid. We have here, at any rate, on the facts of the case, shown that there was some negligence on the part of some one in authority, that certain well behaved citizens were injured, and some unfortunately killed. We have it that all precautions in the way of sending experienced men were not taken, and we have the inflamed state of public opinion at that time. So it seems to me that a case for compensation for the victims has been made by the hon. member for Quebec West, and I think the Minister of Justice would only be doing simple justice to the victims and their families if he would give this matter more serious consideration than he has hitherto given to it. He would at the same time, as my hon. friend from Beauce (Mr. Béland) has said, be confirming in the minds of the citizens of Canada that opinion which they have always had, and which they should have, that for any damage to which they have been subjected on the part of any one in authority they should be fully and amply compensated.

Mr. HORATIO C. HOCKEN (West Toronto): My hon. friends opposite have spread a good deal of salve over this incident in respect of which they are asking compensation for men who were injured. What they are asking is practically a pension for rioters, for men who were on the streets, in the midst of a riot, after they had been warned by General Lessard that they should not be there. Nobody can claim, by any stretch of the imagination, that men injured under such circumstances have any legal right to compensation. If I understand the arguments put forth, one of the men lost half his earning power, and therefore his demand will be for a fifty per-cent pension. This man, who was injured in a riot at home when this country was being urged to raise a sufficient number of men to support our troops at the front, was with his friends rioting on the streets of a Canadian city. My hon. friend from Beauce (Mr. Béland) says that this is a family question, a Canadian question. No, Sir, it is a French Canadian question, for in no other part of this country was there anything of the kind. There was unanimity everywhere else in support of our men at the front. The men who refused to be warned and went out and joined in a riot of this kind at the most critical time in the history of our country and empire have no right to come to this Parliament and ask for an indemnity for wounds or any thing else that they suffered. They went there deliberately; with their eyes open, they engaged in an unlawful assembly and if they have suffered any loss it should be made up to them, if by anybody, by either the province of Quebec or the city of Quebec. The people of the other provinces of Canada, who contributed so enormously in men and in money, and made such tremendous sacrifices to save this country from the Hun, should not be called upon to contribute in the slightest degree to indemnify men who played the part of rebels at that critical period in our history. There is no moral right, there is no legal right. I cannot imagine how any man can bring a question of this kind before Parliament. It is probable that it will be brought up in the House year in and year out until we have a Government supine enough to heed the plea; but I cannot conceive of a Parliament composed of men such as are here to-day passing this motion. To my mind it would be a disgrace if this motion were carried. It would arouse among the Great War Veterans throughout the country, as well as among people who have suffered so seriously through the war, a sense of resentment that would be expressed in no uncertain manner against any Government or any party that would be gulity of an act so entirely without justification.

Mr. BELAND: May I ask the hon. gentleman a question?

Mr. HOCKEN: Yes, sir.

Mr. BELAND: Did you say that the hon. member for Quebec West (Mr. Parent), was asking the Government for compensation for rioters?

Mr. HOCKEN: I say that.

Mr. BELAND: Well, I deny that entirely.

Some hon. MEMBERS: You are wrong.

Mr. HOCKEN: I say that these men had been warned, just as though the mayor of the city had read the Riot Act. They were warned by proclamation to keep off the streets. They refused to obey the proclamation, they went into the crowd, and if they suffered under those circumstances it was entirely their own fault.

Mr. BELAND: Do you still claim that they were rioters?

Mr. HOCKEN: I claim that they were among the rioters.

Mr. BELAND: Oh, "among".

Mr. HOCKEN: They had no right to be among the rioters, because they were warned by public proclamation not to go out.

Hon. CHARLES MURPHY (Russell): It was not my intention to intervene in this debate, nor do I purpose taking up more than a minute or two. I merely wish to draw attention to the free and easy way in which the hon. gentleman who has just concluded (Mr. Hocken), ignores the crux of the matter brought before the House. In characteristic Toronto fashion he misrepresented the statements made by my hon. friend from Quebec West regarding the merits of this case. My hon. friend from Quebec West read a number of statements from the survivors in whose behalf compensation was claimed. As I recall the cases that were cited, they were either those of men peaceably engaged in their places of business, or going peaceably through the streets on their way home after business. One man in particular—I think, the man whose case was first mentioned by the hon.

member for Quebec West,—told about his premises having been entered by men wearing the uniform of soldiers, and of the attacks made upon him in his store. Yet, in the face of the evidence submitted through my hon. friend in connection with that case, the hon. gentleman from Toronto (Mr. Hocken), bulks all these people together and refers to them as rioters who were on the streets when they had no business to be there. How does he make a man a rioter who is attacked in his place of business? But that is the characteristic Toronto style of dealing with facts.

Mr. BELAND: Hear, hear, but they are not all like that; I know.

Mr. MURPHY: Then he went on to allege that these people went out in the streets and joined in a riot. Now, listening attentively to the evidence submitted by my hon. friend from Quebec West, I did not hear the name of one man mentioned who had joined in a riot. Each of the men injured was wounded while engaged in some peaceful occupation, or while proceeding quietly along the street. My hon. friend from Quebec East (Mr. Lapointe), mentioned a matter which I do not recall having heard in any of the preceding discussions of this unfortunate incident. He mentioned that the military authorities had superseded the civil authorities on the occasion in question and had taken the administration of law and order into their own hands. If that be the case, then I submit that that fact alone would afford my right hon. friend the Minister of Justice (Mr. Doherty), and the Government of which he is a member, a ground for action, if nothing else did. In any event, in view of the interpretation sought to be placed upon the incident by the hon. member for West Toronto (Mr. Hocken),—an interpretation which, during this week or the following week, will be blazoned forth in large print on the front page of the newspaper with which the hon. gentleman is inseparably associated—I submit that it is a duty which the Government owes it to the people to perform,—I say this with all due respect, and without any desire to dictate to my right hon. friend at all—to see that the evidence bearing on this incident shall be fully elicited in some formal way. When that has been done, I am sure Parliament and the country will be satisfied with whatever action may follow afterwards.

Mr. D. D. McKENZIE (Cape Breton North and Victoria): If ever there was a question before Parliament which should be approached calmly and dispassionately, and without any party feeling, it is a question of this character. We as British subjects pride ourselves on the fact that every man who casts his lot and his allegiance under the British flag shall always have a square deal, a fair show, and an impartial trial, if there is anything to be tried. I think, therefore, that this high court of Parliament would make a mistake if it approached any case before the full facts were available in a proper and conclusive form, so far as they can be made conclusive in a matter of this kind. The facts set forth by the hon. member for Quebec West impressed me very much, and I was shocked to find that such a thing as described, could take place in this Canada of ours. We all have a high sense of the liberties of the subject, and we should be able with good reason to declare that every man, woman and child can at all times, at any hour in the day or in the night, move about in any part of this country, and particularly on the streets of a city of the size of Quebec, without the slightest fear of molestation in any way. That is a fact which we are apt to take for granted. Now, if it is true that in the city of Quebec some time during the war assaults were made on peaceful citizens, that men's shops were broken into, business interfered with, goods practically stolen, and those in charge of business places assaulted, then that is a matter for investigation; and if, as a result of inquiry, it were found that these things did actually take place, there are only two courses of action: Somebody should pay those who lost their goods, and the criminal responsible should be brought to justice and treated in accordance with the nature of the crime of which he might be found guilty. The fact that a man is wearing a uniform, and is permitted to carry a gun, does not relieve him of criminality in this country if he does anything wrong which he is not ordered to do. As I understand the law, the military power of this country can only be called to the aid of the civil authorities in a certain way, and when conditions are such that the civil authorities are no longer able to mantain order. If conditions of that kind arise in Canada proper orders are given, and the Minister of Militia orders out a certain number of troops to the aid of the civil authorities. If that happened in this instance then, as I understand it, that military force was subject to the orders, discipline and direction of the civil

authority in the city of Quebec, and that authority is responsible for anything that may have ensued from the issuance of those orders. But if a body of men, sent into the city of Quebec by the Dominion, had broken away from authority, I would be disposed to think that the Government and Parliament, as the central authority to which those men are subject, would be liable, I would say in a general way, for anything done by those men contrary to law. The matter is one that should be fully inquired into and the facts properly placed before Parliament. I would regret indeed if any province or an individual from one province or another, should, for one moment, try to stir up trouble over this matter. The facts should be investigated by some properly constituted court whose findings, when presented to Parliament, would not be questioned. I would submit to the Government that if any inquiry is to be made it should be conducted by parties regarded as highly competent, and absolutely removed from any partisan or other influence that would cause them to make any report but such as would be in absolute conformity with the facts. That having been done, I trust this Parliament would rise to the occasion and treat the case on its merits. The impression should never be allowed to go forth, whatever the reason might be which created the situation, that our citizens might be assaulted with impunity, and some of them killed, without the proper authorities taking cognizance of the matter and doing something to compensate the sufferers for the depredations that were committed. Such, I am sure, will not be permitted here. No person, I am certain, will ever be allowed to say, with any degree of truth, that he was not treated fairly and in an absolutely just manner by the authorities of this country.

Right Hon. C. J. DOHERTY (Minister of Justice): It is a matter of some regret to me that the hon. member for Beauce (Mr. Béland), followed in like manner by the hon. member for Quebec West (Mr. Parent), should have assumed that this matter was treated lightly by the Minister of Justice, and that it had not received the attention, and had not been looked into. I only have to say in that regard that both gentlemen are entirely mistaken.

Mr. BELAND: We are glad to hear it.

Mr. DOHERTY: After the discussion of last year when I intimated that I would look into the matter, I received some three claims. These did not include a claim for the breaking into of anybody's shop, nor if my memory serves me, a claim on behalf of a man named Mercier, who was mentioned. In regard to those cases I understand there was an inquiry made by the Militia Department, at least I am so informed. Touching the three cases that came before me I was at pains, so far as my time and capacity enabled me to do so, to look into the law on the question, and I also had the law officers of the department do the same, and I reached the conclusion—the conclusion is one, I am satisfied, that hon. gentlemen opposite who are lawyers, if they also will look into the matter, will inevitably come to—that there can be no question of legal responsibility in the matter. We may as well lay that feature aside at once, and put it out of the question. I venture to say it is perfectly clear. Where the military authority intervenes, the soldier, because he is a soldier has not any more right than any person else to use unnecessary force for the maintenance of peace. If he does more, and it is a wrongful act, he has his responsibility for it; but there is, as a matter of law, I do not hesitate to say, no legal responsibility upon the Crown. I said last year I was impressed with the argument made by the hon. member for Quebec East (Mr. Lapointe), and which I think was supported by other hon. gentlemen, in which it was sought to establish an analogy between the case of the expropriation, for public purposes, of a man's property, where the principle is recognized that it implies an obligation of compensation, and the case where—without imputing blame to anybody—a man's life is taken by an operation necessary for the public good. I must confess that I have not been able to find anything to support that proposition; so I think we have to approach this question—I at all events am forced to do so—accepting of the position that I am not face to face with a legal claim, with a claim susceptible of being legally established or maintained by a court. Hon. gentlemen are exceedingly sympathetic with the persons whom they represent as affected, and who they represent to be absolutely innocent people. Of course, I do not suppose it would be suggested that if that assumption were not sound there could be any question of discussing from any point of view a claim advanced by people who themselves were guilty of taking part in the riots that required to be suppressed or of unduly exposing themselves with knowledge; but the

case, I take it, is put forward upon the assumption that the people concerned were absolutely innocent victims. Even assuming that to be so, we are not face to face with a claim enforceable in law, at all events I can find anything nothing to justify that view.

As I have said, hon. gentlemen opposite are exceedingly sympathetic with the sufferings of these people and, if the facts are as they have been representing them to be, I can quite understand the existence of that sympathy. But my hon. friends are in position to indulge their sympathy to the full; I am not. Whatever might be my sympathy—and assuming perfect innocence on his part surely I would sympathize with a person, who, without fault of any kind, unfortunately lost his life, or was subjected to grievous injury; under the circumstances I think I would sympathize as fully as hon. gentlemen do—I have a duty to perform—and my function is to advise as to the legal responsibilities of this Government. Now I did, as I have said, go into this matter and I had my law officers go into it, and I have before me their report which confirms the only conclusion I was able to arrive at myself. So, clearly, I at all events have to take that position, and I do it with a very considerable degree of confidence that I am not mistaken.

We are not face to face with a question of legal responsibility. Then the question arises, how far are we to go? I have to remember when I am listening to this very impressive appeal to sympathy from hon. gentlemen, that it is not an appeal to me for payment of my own money; it is an appeal for payment of the money of this country. Now, am I or are hon. gentlemen themselves entitled to ask, because of their sympathy with people who have no legal claim against the Government, that the moneys of this country should be paid to those people in compensation of injuries sustained? It is not the only case where in law and in justice damage may be suffered and nobody be responsible for it; hon gentlemen, I suppose, are all perfectly familiar with what is often described in very barbarous Latin as damnum absque injuria. So far as this Government is concerned while these people may have suffered damage, and may be quite innocent sufferers, there is no wrongdoing established on the part of the Government, and that is absolutely essential as a basis of legal responsibility.

Mr. BELAND: That is the doctrine that the Crown can do wrong.

Mr. DOHERTY: The Crown has no responsibility for the wrong-doing of its individual employees. If you acknowledged any other principle there would be practically no limit to the possible liability of the Crown. Assuming it could be established that the soldiers were in some respects at fault, those particular soldiers, of course, have their responsibility. If the officer commanding unlawfully ordered certain things to be done, he has his responsibility. But you cannot pass that off onto the Crown. There are cases, of course, where a Government, acknowledging no responsibility, does feel justified in granting what are called compassionate allowances. But let me point out in that connection that the city of Quebec is not the only city where difficulties arose which gave rise to complaints by reason of the action of soldiers. We had such claims emanating from people in the city of Calgary amounting to very considerable sums.

Mr. BELAND: Was that during the war?

Mr. DOHERTY: Yes.

Mr. BELAND: My hon. friend from Toronto does not appear to know about that.

Mr. HOCKEN: They were not rebelling against the authority of the Crown.

Mr. DOHERTY: Those complaints referred to soldiers breaking into some man's shop. I do not know that there had been any previous rioting on the part of the citizens concerned. We had to take the same position in regard to all these claims, that they were all governed by the same general principle. Perhaps it is not necessary for an hon. member to say it, but of course a question of this kind cannot be made a question as between provinces or races or classes; there has to be one law and one rule for everybody.

Now, under that law, unfortunately there are cases of suffering and damage in different parts of the country. In regard to all such cases I and the officers of the department who are advising this Government as to its liability have to advise in accordance with the law as we find it, and I think it will be readily understood how dangerous it would be for us to undertake to view cases from the compassionate standpoint. It is not the function of a lawyer at all events to be compassionate—indeed, some wicked people say that in order to be a good lawyer one should have a bad heart and a good stomach. I do not know whether I meet those two requirements or not and whether the badness of my heart is as

great as it ought to be to make me a good lawyer, but it is undoubtedly true that, acting as the adviser of this Government, it is not possible for me to allow any sympathetic feeling to influence my advice. As I said when this matter was brought up last year, I was very much struck by the suggestion of the possible analogy between the case of the expropriation of a man's property and the case where a Government doing something for the public good does incidentally, through its employees or officers, deprive some one of his life—an analogy which would justify from the legal standpoint the granting of compensation. The best examination that I have been able to make has led me to the conclusion that that analogy cannot be sustained.

Eliminating absolutely the question of legal responsibility, and treating the appeal as based upon considerations of commiseration, I have to remember that all my colleagues have not had the advantage of hearing that appeal, and while I cannot, in view of what I have said, do otherwise than oppose this particular motion, I shall be glad to bring to their attention what has been said this afternoon.

Hon. RODOLPHE LEMIEUX (Maisonneuve): Mr. Speaker, I have followed this debate with some interest. If from the purely legal point of view there is not in the judgment of my right hon. friend a case for compensation of the victims of the Quebec riots, I believe that when we consider what is called in law the res gestae, there is good ground for at least a compassionate allowance to those victims. I have not the cases at hand, but I believe if my right hon. friend will delve into the precedents of the Department of Justice under the Union of the two Canadas he will find that at the time of the Gavazzi riots in Montreal, compensation was given by the Government to the victims of the military on that occasion. If my memory serves me well, my right hon. friend will also take up Justin McCarthy's "History of Our Own Times" and peruse the chapter dealing with the Gordon riots in England, there he will find that the Home Government compensated some of the victims.

Let us take a case which is probably more familiar to my right hon. friend, a case in which the Crown came to the rescue of men who had no legal claim for compensation. I refer to the case of the squatters at Fox Bay, on Anticosti Island. These squatters had been on that island, and that particular part of the island, for many years, but finally the owner of the island demanded that they be deported; that the squatters leave the particular place where they had located. There was not one tittle of evidence that the squatters were entitled to any compensation. Yet the Dominion Government—and I believe the law officers of the Crown advised accordingly—decided that the squaters should be compensated in some way. As a matter of fact, the squatters did leave the island of Anticosti and were given by the Department of the Interior letters patent in respect of lands in the West in order to compensate them for the semblance of title which they imagined they had by virtue of their having for many years lived at Fox Bay on the Island of Anticosti. My right hon. friend was impressed last year by the appeal which was made by my hon. friend from Quebec, on the ground that there was some similarity between the cases brought forward by my hon. friend and cases of expropriation. I believe that the case of the squatters of Fox Bay should have some influence on the final decision arrived at by the Government in this matter. It was not a question of law; it was a question of equity, of fair play—of British fair play, I might say to my hon. friend from Toronto West (Mr. Hocken). It was a question of compassionate allowance. I find that on several occasions this Parliament has ignored the strict letter of the law and voted sums of money on the ground that there was occasion for granting compassionate allowance. Now, Mr. Speaker, I wish to come back to the particular events which took place in 1917, and in reverting to that phase of the discussion I wish to be as moderate as I can. It is not necessary to rekindle old fires; I believe we are all anxious to have peace not only in this wide world, but more so in our own country, Canada. My right hon. friend will remember that the cause of this whole trouble was the announcement suddenly made that we were to have compulsory military service. Are you going to blame very seriously the young men of this country because they at first resented the application of that law? Of course, every man must obey the law of the land. But, Mr. Speaker, it is the privilege of the young men of my race to be very logical. My right hon. friend will admit that the French mind is generally logical. The young men had been told—indeed, a solemn pledge had been taken before Parliament

5 p.m.

and before the country—that there would be no compulsory service in Canada; that enlistments would be under the voluntary system. But suddenly this was changed. We live in a free country, Mr. Speaker. We rejoice in the fact that we have free political institutions, and naturally it was the privilege of the yeomanry to criticize and to protest. The young men of Quebec criticized and protested, and they were not alone in doing so; other men in other parts of the country criticized and protested. And if finally that feature of the political situation in 1917 was accepted in other parts of Canada, you well know, Mr Speaker, and every conscientious member of this House well knows, that it was because the promise was made to these young men of Ontario and the West that they would not be conscripted; that the law would apply only to the young men of the province of Quebec. Sir, it is too soon yet to begin writing the history of the war, but when that history comes to be written, I make bold to say that the historian will give justice to whom justice is due. I was telling my right hon. friend a moment ago that one must remember the peculiar circumstances of the application of the Military Service Act; one must take into consideration what the criminalists call res gestae. Let us remember the inflammatory speeches delivered throughout the whole country, the incendiary writings published broadcast, the appeals made on all sides, for and against. Let us bear in mind—and this has been admitted since—that the people of the old city of Quebec are a law-abiding and liberty-loving people. All of a sudden, on the very day when the churches of that city were packed full of pious people, the Ontario soldiers appeared and began tramping in the streets. Remember that it was on Holy Friday in the city of Quebec, a God-fearing city, if there is one on this continent, that regiments sent from Ontario started marching. Poor soldiers! They were doing their duty as they knew it; they were obeying the orders as they were given to them. Who will ever believe that the soldiers, who came from Ontario to restore order on Holy Friday in the city of Quebec, did believe in their heart and soul that there was any order to be restored in that city on that particular day? But, elsewhere, there were men anxious, indeed, to send soldiers into Quebec during that period of inflammatory speeches throughout Canada, in order to serve the political ends, we know. The situation in Quebec, I say to my right hon. friend, on the morning of Holy Friday in 1918, is on a par with the situation prepared, abetted, concocted by other agitators, at the time of the raid on the Guelph Novitiate. We all know for what purpose that raid was organized, and all liberty-loving Canadians were humiliated by what happened on that occasion.

My right hon. friend says that no compensation can be given under such circumstances. It has been stated that law-abiding citizens, who were not rioters, lost their lives, that others lost property. I have in mind a case which came up before the criminal courts of Montreal, where young men were brought under the criminal law before their peers because they had threatened to destroy by dynamite the residence of Lord Atholstan at Cartierville, near Montreal. The Department of Justice must have been represented when that trial took place. At all events, my right hon. friend will remember that it was established before Mr. Justice Pelletier, and the twelve jurors, that the chief, the star witness of the Crown was a man by the name of Desjardins and that that man had received money from the Department of Justice. It was also proven that Desjardins received $25 and acted as "agent provocateur."

Mr. CASGRAIN: He was bonded by them and defended by their attorney.

Mr. DOHERTY: The man was employed. That he was employed as an "agent provocateur," is another statement, and that certainly is not true.

Mr. LEMIEUX: I will ask my right hon. friend—I am sure he is speaking in good faith—to read over the evidence in that case. He will find that Mr. Justice Pelletier, one of his former colleagues, who presided over the assizes, was so dumbfounded that he at once adjourned the court. Read his address to the jury. Later on, this man Desjardins was arrested, and he was bonded by the Crown. Later on again he was found guilty of highway robbery, or I do not know what other crime, in the district of Hull.

Mr. CASGRAIN: Defended again by the Government.

Mr. LEMIEUX: He was defended by one of the Crown's attorneys, I am informed.

Mr. CASGRAIN: It is true.

Mr. LEMIEUX: He was sentenced to jail or penitentiary, and he is now out under ticket-of-leave. Is that a fact or not a fact? If it be true that jailbirds of that ilk were employed and paid by the Department of Justice as "agents provocateurs" for political reasons of the lowest and meanest order, is there not ground at least for the innocent victims of the Quebec riots to claim a compassionate allowance from the Government? "Oh," the hon. member for Toronto West says, "the whole country would revolt against such an idea." I do not expect that this year or next year or the year after, the victims of the Quebec riots will be indemnified. It takes some time, even in British countries, for justice to be achieved; in some countries there is no hope for justice, but under the British flag, as I read history, justice is sure to triumph. Some day, Sir, when there is a better feeling between the various races and provinces in Canada, the victims of those riots and their families will be indemnified.

Canada has passed through other crucial tests in the past. Our forefathers passed through the rebellion in Upper Canada, in Lower Canada. The forebears of the hon. member for Toronto West were not slow in exacting from the Crown, after 1837 and 1838, an indemnity for the Loyalists, and the indemnity was granted by a majority in Parliament. Years went on, and went on, and finally a patriot from Upper Canada, by the name of Robert Baldwin, took office. He allied himself with Louis Hippolyte Lafontaine. They brought peace, harmony, order, into the country, and in 1849, under the Baldwin-Lafontaine government, the families of the rebels and some of the rebels themselves were indemnified for losses incurred during the rebellion. There were some protests at the time. The Hockens of the day set fire to the Parliament Buildings in Montreal.

Mr. SPEAKER: Order. I think the hon. member must realize that his remark is hardly Parliamentary.

Mr. LEMIEUX: Let us say, the Orange Sentinels of the day set fire to the parliament buildings in Montreal. They even treated with very scant respect the person of the Governor General of the day, Lord Elgin. I have myself seen in England, in the family of Lord Elgin, a big stone which was found in the carriage of His Excellency after he left the Parliament buildings in Montreal. It was exhibited somewhere in London—a souvenir of the loyal Sentinels of 1849. Some day too there will be a bill of indemnity to cover the damages inflicted on innocent victims of the Quebec riots, and people will then realize that the so-called riots were caused first by agents provocateurs in the pay of political agitators and secondly by the swaggering and bullying attempts of some very superior people to dominate a minority; The young men were only exercising a right by protesting against a law which they had been promised by the Prime Minister would never be enacted by this Parliament, Sir, we owe it to our dead in Flander's fields to put an end to all these causes of friction. They did not fight, they did not die, to let people like my hon. friend from West Toronto fill the air with their song of hate in Canada. They fought and they died so that their fellow-countrymen, of both races, might hereafter replace the song of hate by a song of love.

Mr. Speaker, I hope that my right hon. friend the Minister of Justice, when he has time, and is far from the sinister influence now around him, will again scrutinize closely the cases which have been so ably brought before the House by my hon. friend from Quebec West, and I have no hesitation in saying that I believe his better judgment will be in favour of a compassionate allowance for these unhappy victims of the so-called Quebec riots.

Mr. J. H. SINCLAIR (Antigonish and Guysborough): I did not intend to say anything on this question, but it appears to me there is one phase of it which my right hon. friend the Minister of Justice has not yet considered. The claim was made, I understand, against the city of Quebec that the city was responsible for the disorders at that time, that the city was responsible for the protection of the property and lives of the citizens. The claim was disallowed in the courts, I am told, because the civic authorities of Quebec were not in charge of keeping order at that time. That function was transferred from the city of Quebec to the military authorities. The Government at Ottawa took the very unusual step of passing an Order in Council for that purpose, notwithstanding the fact that the civil authorities had not asked for any assistance from the military authorities. I have here the Order in Council. It is somewhat lengthy, and I do not intend to do anything more than read a paragraph or two to illustrate the point I am trying to make. The Order in Council is dated April 4, 1918, and reads in parts as follows:

Whereas on the 28th day of March last the opposition of a large number of the population of the city of Quebec to the enforcement of the Military Service Act, 1917, and the regulations thereunder, broke out in open violence and serious riots ensued on that day and on subsequent days in which the rioters destroyed the office of the deputy registrar appointed for the District of Quebec under the said Act, and moreover caused great damage to other property, and threatened further damage, and it became necessary for the restoration of order, the protection of property and the preservation of the King's peace that these riots should be suppressed by military authority;

And whereas at common law it is the duty of a military officer with the troops under his command to interefere—when such interference is necessary, to put down riot, insurrection or civil disturbance;

And whereas it is provided by the Militia Act that the active militia of Canada may be called out on active service in aid of the civil power upon requisition of the civil authorities, and the King's regulations and Orders for the Militia contain certain directions for regulating the exercise of command and disposition of the troops upon such occasions;

And whereas notwithstanding that it was necessary as aforesaid for the preservation of the peace and to repress rioting that resort should be had to military force the civil authorities of Quebec made no requisition for the calling out of the Militia and the Officer Commanding therefore, acting manifestly in the general interest and for the protection of the public, and by direction of the Minister of Militia and Defence assumed the responsibility to command and direct the operation of the troops for the protection of life and property and the restoration of the peace—

in the city of Quebec. Now it appears that the military authorities intervened and took the city under their own protection, turning aside the civil authorities from looking after the property and lives of the citizens and the maintenance of peace and order. Consequently it follows that the military authorities should feel themselves responsible for what took place. If they had kept their hands off altogether and thrown the burden on the civic authorities, it would be another matter, but their interference at that stage and their taking upon themselves the duty of maintaining order in the city, puts the case in a different light. How did they perform that duty? The very men who were entrusted with the preservation of order in the city were the ones who committed the offences. As my hon. friend from West Quebec told us this afternoon, a shop was looted by soldiers wearing the uniform of His Majesty the King, and directed by officers of the Militia Department—the very men who were entrusted with the protection of the lives and property of the citizens of Quebec. Surely the responsibility is upon the Government, and not upon the city of Quebec, to compensate the people for the injuries that were done by these soldiers who did not perform their duty at that time. That was the decision of the courts, I understand, and I think the decision was right under the circumstances.

My right hon. friend the Minister of Justice says there is no legal claim. This is not put forward, I understand, as a strictly legal claim. It is a moral claim, and the practice in this Parliament, this High Court of Justice, has often been to entertain moral claims as well as legal claims. The claim of the city of Halifax was the moral claim. They had no legal claim upon us to furnish millions of money to compensate the victims of the disaster in the city of Halifax in December 1917, but the Government recognized that the disaster arose out of the war and that innocent victims in the city of Halifax had suffered great damage, and the Government stepped in and voted a large sum of money to compensate them.

I wish to draw that fact to the attention of my right hon. friend, not because the case is exactly the same, but because it disposes of the point made by him that he can deal only with cases of legal liability. We are not pressing for his attention in this case on any ground of legal liability. The question is as to whether it is just and right on the part of the Government to refuse to entertain these claims, seeing that they were responsible at the time for order in the city of Quebec and that the damage was done by soldiers in their service. This must not be forgotten. The men that did the damage were our soldiers, wearing our uniform, and directed by our officers. A case cited by my hon. friend from Quebec West seems to me to be a very serious one of hardship. The man in question was walking past the sentry. He did not understand English, although, when ordered to stop, he evidently realized the nature of the command and held up his hands. What more could he do? Nevertheless, a rifle was discharged and he was wounded, losing one of his limbs. Surely there is no excuse for that, if the facts be true. Whether they are strictly true or not is something that this House is not in a position to decide; it is a matter for my right hon. friend to find out. I understood from the minister's speech that he had made some investigation, but he did not tell us the results. He did not say whether these men injured in Quebec were in any way guilty of participation in the riots that took place in that city. That is a vital question. If they were not in any way connected with the riots, then I submit

that they have a moral claim for compensation. Of course, if they were associated with rioters and were making a disturbance, resisting the law, they would have no claim for compensation. But that appears to me to be the crux of the claim, and my right hon. friend did not tell the House whether he had discovered that they were guilty of any misconduct or not. I trust that this question will be considered on its merits, and considered with a view to doing justice to the victims of the riot. The cases put before us by the hon. member for Quebec West were clearly stated. We must put aside any question of legal liability, and I do not think that my hon. friend intends that the subject should be considered by the House as involving any legal claim. It is simply a matter in which justice ought to be done; as I have said, it is a moral claim. I hope that no discrimination will be made because of the fact that this trouble occurred in the city of Quebec. The case should be dealt with as though the incident had taken place in Toronto or in any other city in the Dominion.

Motion negatived on division.

THE CASE OF SERGEANT-MAJOR N. BRUNELLE

Hon. RODOLPHE LEMIEUX (Maisonneuve and Gaspé) moved:

For a copy of all papers and correspondence concerning the application to the Board of Pension Commissioners of Mrs. Brunelle, widowed mother of the late Sergeant Major N. Brunelle, No. 62068, for a pension.

He said: I shall be very brief in presenting the case of the widow Brunelle. She is the mother of Sergeant-Major N. Brunelle, who enlisted in the 22nd Battalion, on December 4, 1914, and was discharged on May 21, 1919, being medically unfit owing to chronic bronchitis. He was examined at the North Bay district office of the Pension Commissioners and was awarded a pension of 25 per cent. I may say, en passant, that this young man, who enlisted at the beginning of the war and served until 1919, was awarded a decoration on the battlefield. He was 26 years of age at his death. After his return to Canada, he died on July 3, 1919, at Swastika, in northern Ontario, by accidental drowning.

Mr. BELAND: How long was that after he had been discharged from the army?

Mr. LEMIEUX: He was discharged on May 21, 1919, when he was given a pension of 25 per cent.

[Mr. Sinclair.]

Mr. BELAND: Disability?

Mr. LEMIEUX: Yes, and he was drowned on July 3, 1919. It will be seen that he did not long enjoy the pension granted him. When he was found after the accident a coroner living at a great distance from Swastika was summoned and held an inquest which, I may say, was all on hearsay evidence, for no one could say how the accident had occurred, except that it was during a very hot spell of weather when this young man and some companions took a bath in the river. In some way Brunelle got beyond his depth and was drowned. His mother is a widow. She is in poor in health; in fact she is absolutely helpless, being obliged to go from house to house, looking for work. She has two young daughters to take care of, and within the past few weeks, one of them, unfortunately, was nearly killed by a street car in Ottawa. So that this woman is altogether helpless. I appeared on her behalf before the Pension Commissioners and stated that in view of this man's disability and the fact that he had been incapacitated on the battlefield, the presumption was that he came to his death because he was not strong enough to cope with a situation in which a man in ordinary health would have been safe. He was sub-normal. I was referred, of course, to subsection 1 of section 11 of the Act which reads as follows:

The Commission shall award pensions to, or in respect of members of the Forces who have suffered disability in accordance with the rates set out in Schedule "A" of this Act, and, in respect of the members of the Forces who have died in accordance with the rates set out in Schedule "B" of this Act, when the disability or death in respect of which the application for pension is made, is attributable to military service.

My contention is that this death, caused by an accident, is above all chiefly attributable to the military service of the unfortunate Brunelle. He came back from the battlefield with twenty-five per cent less of his fighting power, and therefore I contend that his mother should receive the pension with which, if he had been alive, he would have helped her. It is a very sad case, and I hope the Government will instruct the Committee on Pensions to report in favour of so amending the Act as to enable a case of this nature to be dealt with by the Pension Commissioners. I wish to inform the House that the coroner's inquest has revealed nothing which should prevent the mother of this young Brunelle from receiv-

ing a pension. His death resulted from an accident in the river, and the presumption in law is, that if he had been in the physical condition in which he was before he became incapacitated on the battlefield he would certainly have been able to escape that fatal accident.

Sir GEORGE FOSTER: The minister under whom the Pension Commissioners act, in liason with the Government, is not at present in his place. The case as stated by my hon. friend is largely one that appeals to the sympathy, but he has also stated that the Pension Commissioners do not find that it comes within the law and they, of course, have to strictly administer the regulations according to the law. The pensions that have been arranged, even with their conditions and limitations are, I think, on a very generous scale—

Mr. LEMIEUX: No doubt about it.

Sir GEORGE FOSTER: —but there will always be cases, even outside of that generous provision, which seem to involve very great hardship and appeal to the sympathy of individuals who become acquainted with them. It is, I suppose, absolutely impossible to frame a law which will cover all cases. I do not understand that my hon. friend finds any fault with the Board of Pension Commissioners, who have acted according to their rendering of the law and the regulations made thereunder. My hon. friend, however, as I understand, asks that they may be instructed to apply for amendments to the law, which would cover a case like this. I am not quite sure that that would be a wise procedure; but it might be possible that cases of this kind should be taken into account by the committee of the House which at present is sitting. I do not understand that my hon friend has presented this case to that Committee, but it would seem to me to be a fair method of procedure to bring it to the attention of the chairman. However, my hon. friend has placed his case on Hansard and I will call the attention of the proper minister to it.

Hon. H. S. BELAND: I may add just a word to what the minister has said. I am only sorry that the hon. member for London (Mr. Cronyn), who is the chairman of the Pensions Committee, is not at present in the House, because, he perhaps, more ably than myself, could have explained the better course for my hon. friend to have followed. The case that the hon. friend has cited is a pathetic one, and there are a number of others that are similar. The Board of Pension Commissioners are confronted with almost innumerable cases of that kind; but that Board is a tribunal unlike any other in Canada—there is no appeal from it, it is a sovereign Board. It is only fair to add that the Pension Commissioners, so far as I have been able to judge, always give the benefit of the doubt in exercising their discretion, and it is, I think, a fair Board. It is customary, however, in cases such as my hon. friend has outlined, to refer them to the Pensions Committee. That committee have appointed a sub-committee—called the "special cases sub-committee"—which deals with all these peculiar and pathetic cases which may be brought before them. I need not mention the names of the hon. members who compose this sub-committee—they are eminently qualified for the position—and I understand that the Board of Pension Commissioners in a case like this would abide by the recommendation of the sub-committee supported by the committee as a whole. I would therefore advise my hon. friend to report the case to the committee, and it will be dealt with in due course.

Mr. LEMIEUX: I certainly will accept the advice given by my right hon. friend the acting leader of the House, and my hon. friend from Beauce (Mr. Béland). I think indeed, that as the special committee are sitting during the session they would have no objection to hearing whatever complaints are made by the families of the soldiers. In the present instance, I wish to emphasize, that I do not find fault with the commission; far from it; they have treated me with the utmost courtesy and have taken a good deal of their time in going over the whole record. I spent a morning with them, and they were absolutely fair in their dealings with me. But, as the right hon. gentleman (Sir George Foster) has stated, here is a case which just touches the edge of the law and yet cannot come within the law, because the law itself is not elactic enough to cover it. However, every one will admit the hardship. Here is a man who was disabled, receiving a pension of twenty-five per cent; he is drowned in the river; there is no coroner's inquest to speak of except to view the body and say that it was found in the water. Is there not a legal presumption, Mr. Speaker, that this man was drowned because he was not able

to look after himself as presumably he would have done had he been fully normal? He received his pension in the month of May, the drowning accident took place in the month of July. He was the only support of his widowed mother. Now she is penniless and left with two young girls, one of whom is crippled as a result of an accident on the street railway in Ottawa. And yet the Pension Commissioners tell me that the law cannot provide for such a case. I accept the advice of my hon. friend from Beauce—I will appear before the committee with widow Brunelle.

Motion agreed to.

At Six o'clock the House took recess.

After Recess

The House resumed at Eight o'clock.

COMPLAINT OF DR. BURNHAM AGAINST SIBERIAN GOVERNMENT

Hon. RODOLPHE LEMIEUX (Maisonneuve) moved:

For a copy of all correspondence exchanged between the Canadian Government and the Serbian Government concerning the expulsion of Dr. Burnham and his Hospital Mission from Montenegro.

He said: Mr. Speaker, in the old parliamentary struggles between the King and the Commons the Speaker could not leave the Chair before the grievances of the people were ventilated. I am satisfied, Mr. Speaker, that you would not, as was the case with the Speaker in ancient times, often acting as the agent of the King, force the House of Commons to vote supply before the grievances of a fellow Canadian were redressed.

I wish, this evening, Mr. Speaker, to present the case of a fellow Canadian. I do not know him personally, but I do know that he is a brother of a gentleman who for years was a member of the House; I refer to Mr. Burnham, former representative for the county of Peterborough. It is as a fellow-Canadian that I present Dr. Burnham's grievance to my right hon. friend the leader of the House of Commons and to the country.

First of all, who is Dr. Burnham? I am informed that he is a graduate of Manitoba University; that he was for years a distinguished medical practitioner in the city of Winnipeg; that he was a brilliant surgeon, and that he has published books bearing upon the line of work which he has pursued, books which are well known in the scientific world. When in 1914 the

Great War was declared Dr. Burnham happened to be on the ocean on a trip round the world. True to his traditions and to his love of the Mother Land, Dr. Burnham immediately decided that he should serve in the ranks. Accordingly, he interrupted his trip and boarded a ship at San Francisco—I believe it was the Ortiga. I may mention in passing, that after proceeding some distance the Ortiga was chased for several days by the famous German raider Emden. However, he landed in Europe, offered his services to the Allies, and being a surgeon and most anxious to give his services, as did our gallant friend from Beauce (Mr. Béland) in Belgium, in hospital work, he was assigned to a hospital in Montenegro at a place called Plevna. Not long afterwards, as war was raging most intensely in that district, he was with thousands of others driven from Montenegro in the great Serbian retreat, where thousands were lost and he himself nearly perished. He managed, however, to escape and subsequently served continuously during a year on the Western front. Then he was sent to Salonika and there put in charge of a relief hospital, in which post he remained until 1919, giving most excellent service. In that year, being somewhat exhausted and his health failing, he returned to Canada on leave of absence, and proceeded to his home in Winnipeg. I may say that for his gallant service on the batlefield and in the hospitals and relief missions he received several decorations. Having returned to Winnipeg, where he had a host of friends, he started to organize a Canadian war hospital. He had seen with his own eyes the desperate situation to which the Serbians, the Montenegrins and the Albanians had been reduced and he knew by experience what efficient service could be rendered if a Canadian war hospital could be organized. His efforts met with a great measure of success. Not only did the citizens of Winnipeg subscribe large sums of money to the object, but municipalities in Manitoba and in other western provinces contributed generously. In 1919 he again left for Serbia and Montenegro, and made his headquarters at a place called Dulcigno. He was in charge of relief work there for several months until his activities were interrupted by the Serbian authorities.

I do not intend to read all the letters written by Dr. Burnham or the controversial letters exchanged between the Serbian consul and Dr. Burnham's friends. I will simply recite the grounds of complaint which have been urged by Dr. Burnham

himself, and the House will judge whether under such circumstances the Government is not justified in taking action in order that the grievances of Dr. Burnham may be redressed. In a letter dated December 13, 1920, Dr. Burnham states as follows his grounds of complaint against the Serbian administration:

As officer-in-command of the White Cross Mission—

It is a Canadian organization.

—I have to complain of the Serbian administration as follows:

(1) That the Mission was under constant police surveillance.

That is Serbian police surveillance.

(2) That without known reason, two nurses were ordered to appear before the authorities at Antivari. Bearing in mind the painful experience elsewhere described the order was ignored.

(3) That the Serbian authorities sent and order coupled with a police threat, to open the White Cross magazine for examination.

(4) That in my absence, members of the staff were ordered before the Serbian authorities and terrorized.

(5) That they seized material shipped into the country for the relief of the inhabitants, that the cases were opened and when released did not contain the quantities cited in the invoices.

I may say that this material had been shipped largely from Canada, consisting of contributions from Canadians.

(6) That they seized the boat whereby material was conveyed from steamer to port, and that although the boat had been leased from the owner, the White Cross never afterwards had the use of it.

(7) That I was ordered before the Serbian Government at Antivari who made threats against the Mission and stated that it was no longer safe to remain in Montenegro.

(8) That shortly after the Serbian Governor came to Dulcigno and again summoned me. In the interview which followed Lekitch repeated former threats and concluded by ordering the Mission out of the country. On being requested to put the order in writing he refused.

(9) That on August 17, while waiting for the departure of the steamer at Antivari I was arrested by order of the Serbian Governor in the presence of one hunderd people on the quay, and

(10) That I was sent under guard of a soldier with rifle and bayonet to the Hotel Marina where I was detained four hours.

(11) That in consequence of the foregoing I was compelled to return on foot to Dulcigno where I arrived after midnight in an exhausted condition, having walked fifty-two miles during the day with the thermometer standing at 85 f. at midnight.

(12) That on the departure of the White Cross Mission for Albania, the Serbian authorities refused to allow the transfer of the stores and material belonging to the Mission.

He states in the same letter:

I have compiled accurate case reports of people in the number of 2,152 who availed themselves of the medical services alone. No further evidence is necessary to show that no reliance whatsoever can be placed in the statements emanating from the Serbian Government respecting affairs in Montenegro.

The letter is signed:

F. W. E. Burnham.

Sir, I am not concerned with political agitation which may exist in Serbia and Montenegro; I am not concerned at all with the quarrels which are too evident between the two above-named countries; but one must not forget that the Dominion of Canada was an ally of both Montenegro and Serbia from the beginning until the end of the war. There is, it seems to me —and it is a fact indeed—in the comity of nations, even as between enemies on the battlefield, a protection for Red Cross and such like. A fortiori is there a protection as between allies fighting and dying for the same cause? We have been told repeatedly, during this session and, indeed, during the last few years, that Canada is a nation. Not later than two or three weeks ago, when the Minister of Justice (Mr. Doherty) was defining what the new Act meant in speaking of a Canadian national, we were told that Canada was a nation; that before long, as soon as it pleased Canada, she might have consular representation, even an ambassador in the neighbouring republic. I should like to test this evening the statement made by one prominent member of the Government and know from the leader of the House (Mr. Meighen) if Canada is really a nation. There is one statement which certainly cannot be discounted—Canada is a member of the League of Nations and, therefore, Canada, whether a nation or not, but a member of the League of Nations, is certainly concerned with her nationals, not only at home, but especially abroad. Even if Canada were not a full-fledged nation, shall I be told that this Dominion, the premier Dominion of the British Empire, my native land, will stand for the humiliations, outrages and indignities inflicted on Canadian nurses and a Canadian surgeon doing work to serve a humanitarian cause, and that under the flag of one of her Allies?

I have to take exception to the statements which have been made by the Serbian consul against Dr. Burnham. He has written to several newspapers denying the statements made by Dr. Burnham, and even accusing him of political intrigue in the performance of his duties in Montenegro.

Mr. Speaker, I resent the insults of a foreigner, even though he be a consul, against a fellow-Canadian of the standing of Dr. Burnham, who, to serve the cause of humanity, to relieve the sick, the poor, and the oppressed in those distant lands, left everything behind him and consecrated his life and his talents to that purpose. I say that the least the Government should do is to ask the Serbian authorities to recall their consul who has libelled in the press the good name and the good faith of Dr. Burnham.

Another point I wish to emphasize is that until an investigation has taken place, and until the statements of Dr. Burnham which I have just quoted have been proven false, and, if sustained, until an apology and reparations have been made, the Government of this country, through the League of Nations, should prevent any Red Cross funds coming from Canada or the British Empire from being apportioned in favour of Serbia. To give you, Mr. Speaker, an idea of the spirit which animated Dr. Burnham let me read the last sentence of one of his letters:

> Thus we close the first chapter of the activities of the Canadian White Cross in the Balkans. We look back without regrets. To retrace our steps would be to do exactly the same. We throw in our lot with the poor, the sick and the oppressed. It was for them that this fund was organized. We resolutely set our face against injustice in every form. To have chosen differently would have been easier, but would not have been the policy of the White Cross or in harmony with the spirit of the people of Canada.

You have in that sentence the ring of honesty, and I ask that the Government investigate the complaints which I have just recited—that Canadian nurses were terrorized, that the materials sent from Canada were seized, that the surgeon and his staff were prevented from continuing their work amongst the poor and the sick, and that finally they were all ejected from the country. I say it is the duty of the Canadian Government to investigate this case and to see that justice is done.

I do not wish to be more historical than necessary, but let me recall to my right hon. friend the leader of the House a case which in many respects, is parallel to the one I have just mentioned. I refer to the Don Pacifico case when Lord Palmerston, then Minister of Foreign Affairs, despatched the British fleet to the Piræus in order that the Greek government might compensate Don Pacifico for the losses sustained. It was stated at the time that Don Pacifico had very poor antecedents, that he was British, but of foreign origin, and that he had fyled a very extravagant claim arising out of the riots which had taken place in Athens, the capital of Greece. Here is the answer of Lord Palmerston:

> The rights of a man depend on the merits of the particular case; and it is an abuse of argument to say that you are not to give redress to a man because in some former transactions he may have done something which is questionable. Punish him, if you will—punish him if he is guilty, but don't pursue him as a pariah through life. . . . "Oh, but," it is said "what an ungenerous proceeding to employ so large a force against so small a power!" Does the smallness of a country justify the magnitude of its evil acts? Is it to be held that if your subjects suffer violence, outrage, and plunder—

That is the case in the present instance.

> —in a country which is small and weak, you are to tell them, when they apply for compensation, that the country is so weak and small, that we cannot ask it for compensation? Their answer would be that the weakness and smallness of the country makes it the more easy to obtain redress.

Now, Mr. Speaker, let me repeat the question I put a moment ago: Is Canada a nation? I say that if she is not a fully-fledged nation, she has at least acquired certain titles of nobility during the last great war. She is the premier Dominion of the British Empire, and if we cannot as a Dominion within the four corners of the British North America Act assert our rights and protect our nationals abroad, we still have the old British flag, which protects every British subject wherever he is to be found in the four quarters of the globe. I should like to quote what Lord Palmerston said in the case of Don Pacifico in perhaps the most eloquent speech of his life. In his famous peroration he says:

> I therefore fearlessly challenge the verdict which this House, as representing a political, a commercial, a constitutional country, is to give on the question before it; whether the principles on which the foreign policy of this country has been conducted, and the sense of duty which has led us to think ourselves bound to afford protection to our fellow subjects abroad, are proper and fitting guides for those who are charged with the government of England, and whether, as the Roman in the days of old held himself free from indignity when he could say *Civis Romanus sum*, so also a British subject, in whatever land he be, shall feel confident that the watchful eye and the strong arm of England shall protect him against injustice and wrong.

I repeat, Sir, that if the Canadian Government feel that they have not the power to redress the legitimate grievances of Dr. Burnham and the noble nurses who were subjected to such humiliation and indignities at the hands of Serbian officials, they

should draw the attention of the Foreign Office in London to the matter, and, through that channel, obtain justice for these British subjects. It was my privilege some years ago to be in the city of Rome. It was in the year 1909, and on that occasion I witnessed some very grave riots that took place in the Eternal City. These incidents occurred after the execution in Spain of a Spaniard named Ferrer, and the anarchists of Europe being of the opinion that this act was unwarranted and that the governments of the Continent should rise up in arms against the government of Spain. In many of the cities on the Continent, in Paris and in Rome, the Spanish Embassy had to be guarded not only by the police, but also by the military authorities. In Rome, the anarchists for a few days seemed to hold sway; there were general strikes, and riot after riot raged in that great city. I happened one day to visit the Superior of the Canadian College in Rome on a well known thoroughfare, the street of the Four Fountains. That college is under the jurisdiction of the Sulpician Fathers, who, as the House knows, are amongst the oldest French religious orders, together with the Jesuits and the Recollets, to have done missionary and educational work in this country. That institution in which our young men pursued their theological studies is under the direction of the Sulpician Fathers. In that year the Superior was a distinguished Canadian from St. Hyacinthe. The Canadian College is not far from the Spanish Embassy, and was consequently very much exposed to the anarchists and rioters who were passing back and forth in the vicinity. I asked the Superior whether he was not a little too exposed and did not fear for the young priests and students who were under his charge. He pointed to the British flag and replied: "With that flag flying I fear nothing." Sir, it seems to me that under the protection of the British flag, as was so eloquently said by Lord Palmerston, Dr. Burnham, whom I do not know, and who has no other claim upon me than the fact that he is a fellow Canadian, should receive justice. His staff of devoted nurses who were subjected to persecution at the hands of the Serbian Government should also be accorded, through the instrumentality of this Government, the protection which is the right of every British subject.

Right Hon. ARTHUR MEIGHEN (Prime Minister): The motion of the hon. member as it appears on the Order Paper calls merely for the production of certain documents, being correspondence exchanged between the Canadian Government and the Serbian Government concerning the expulsion of Dr. Burnham and his hospital mission from Montenegro. Of course, to the production of the correspondence no objection can be made. But the hon. member in his address has assumed that the treatment of Dr. Burnham by the authorities in Montenegro, or in greater Serbia, has been such as to cast upon the Canadian Government the obligation of calling for atonement or redress, either through the Foreign Office or on our own initiative, from the offending government. I did not put myself in a position to argue, in view of the way the resolution reads, whether the presumption upon which the hon. member has based most of his address is correct or not.

Speaking from recollection, without having recently brought my mind to the facts, I am aware that some correspondence has taken place, and I believe that the Foreign Office has been consulted with regard to Dr. Burnham's complaint concerning his treatment in Montenegro. If I recollect rightly, Dr. Burnham came back to Canada, having already conducted some work in Montenegro in the earlier years of the war. I thought his return was earlier than the hon. gentleman mentioned; I was under the impression it was about 1917. So far as the Government was concerned, its only connection with him was to assist him in securing reduced passage back to carry on again the work in which he was interested there. Montenegro, it seems, is to be, subject to certain delimitations, a part of Greater Serbia. Within the confines of Montenegro a party has arisen whose purpose is to resist its incorporation in Greater Serbia, and who carry on there a political agitation, if indeed they do not go farther, in order to make effective that resistance. Dr. Burnham's troubles are claimed to have arisen from the fact that he espoused the cause of the minority in Montenegro and became involved in political agitation there. Whether that is true or not, I should not like finally to say; but, at all events, troubles have arisen in connection with him and correspondence has taken place. If that correspondence, when brought down, discloses that there has been any failure or default on the part of the Government in looking into the merits of the complaint made, or in seeking redress if the merits of the complaint are

established, then, of course, it will be time enough for the House to take action.

I was intensely interested in the address of the hon. member for Maisonneuve (Mr. Lemieux), and, what is more, I was exceedingly pleased, not only with its substance but with the enthusiasm with which the doctrines propounded by the hon. gentleman were set forth. The hon. member asked me, as head of the Government, to say whether or not this country is a nation, and, if it is, whether or not it purposes to assert the attributes and rights of a nation in respect of the claims of one of its citizens wronged in far away Montenegro. Well, I have no hesitation or doubt at all in answering the question. Canada unquestionably is a nation, and something more than a nation. It enjoys a status and rights in the world beyond those which other nations of its strength and age enjoy. Canada is as well, a member of the great British Commonwealth of Nations, and as such is in the position to assert such authority as its own strength, and moral status entitle it to assert; but, also, the authority of the Motherland and of that entire League of Nations known as the British Empire, if their concurrence in our position is obtained.

It was, however, interesting indeed to hear this position taken up and espoused by the hon. member for Maisonneuve, a member of the Liberal party in Canada; and particularly interesting was it to hear him refer to that famous debate in the British Parliament on the Don Pacifico claims, to hear him quote from the speech of Lord Palmerston, and point to the doctrine which that speech contained as the proper motto for Canada to adopt in her march among the nations of the world. I remember reading that speech. It has been referred to time and again, not only in this country but in general literature, as expressive of the extremely Imperialistic attitude of the British Tory, as jingoism of the highest type. And I recall at the moment the reply of Mr. Gladstone, delivered early in the morning after Lord Palmerston had spoken, in which the old statesman described the speech to which he had listened; in which he described the spirit that it embodied; in which he said that this high and mighty Imperialistic attitude which Lord Palmerston had assumed, was typical of the old Roman statemanship, and was expressed in those lines of the poet:

> Oh Rome 'twas thine alas with awful sway
> To rule mankind and make the world obey,
> Disposing peace and war thine own majestic way.

[Mr. Meighen.]

Whatever may have been the rights of Don Pacifico, it was claimed to be doubtful at the time whether they were great enough, or fundamentally strong enough, to warrant the intervention of the British Fleet. But if the example of the British Government in the Don Pacifico case is to be followed by Canada, it undoubtedly can only be followed if this country maintains not only the name but the attributes of a nation—unless, in a word, we maintain that strength behind the word of Canada which will enable us to speak with substantial authority. I commend the address of the hon. member for Maisonneuve, I commend the doctrine that he has espoused tonight, I commend the spirit with respect to the mission of this country which evidently animates him, to all hon. gentlemen around and behind him, and especially to his leader who, only a few months ago, moved in this House that we should strip ourselves of naval and military strength and leave ourselves powerless. The mere word of any country does not go very far without any strength behind it.

Now the hon. gentleman—on the assumption again that a wrong has been done a Canadian citizen, a wrong that the courts and civil authorities of the State that is supposed to have done it have refused to redress—asks us to invoke not only the power of the Foreign Office, not only any authority that Canada may exert of herself, but, as well, to invoke the influence of the League of Nations, and if need be to see to it that any moneys that might come to Serbia from the reparation that Germany is required to make are withheld from Serbia pending atonement for the wrongs done by her to Dr. Burnham.

Mr. LEMIEUX: I had reference to the Red Cross funds, not to reparation funds.

Right Hon. Mr. MEIGHEN: I thought the hon. gentleman spoke of "reparation funds," anyway he suggested that moneys be withheld from Serbia. I am not apprehensive that it will be necessary to go to that length. In fact I have not yet been convinced—I have not the papers before me because I did not know that the hon. member intended to do more than move his resolution—that wrong has been done. I do not think, at least, that there is information now in the Department of External Affairs to warrant the Government in assuming that there is cause for specific intervention. If the papers disclose that there has been cause, and that intervention has not taken place, then, of course, the time will come for Parliament

to speak its mind. I am not convinced that the papers will disclose such cause, nor am I sure that the papers will not disclose quite the opposite. However if it be found that there is something in the complaint that Dr. Burnham has made, and which the hon. member to-night has pressed on the floor of Parliament, then it may be altogether proper that we should invoke the assistance of the Foreign Office and it should be possible to secure such redress as will be appropriate to the wrong done. I do not think the matter will need to go to the length indicated in my hon. friend's address. Let me repeat that the subject has not been neglected; I know that communications have passed; I know that some information has been obtained; and I think it will be found that there has been nothing in the way of neglect on the part of the Department of External Affairs.

Mr. C. G. POWER (Quebec South): Before this debate closes I would like to add a word in support of the statement of my hon. friend from Maisonneuve. The facts in connection with this case were, I think, first brought to the attention of the Canadian public by Mr. Arthur G. Penny, the Editor of the Quebec Chronicle. I may say for the information of the House, Mr. Speaker, that the Chronicle is not a newspaper which could by any manner of means, be accused of having tendencies other than those of the most orthodox Conservative kind. For a considerable period the Quebec Chronicle carried on an agitation, if I might so term it, on behalf of Dr. Burnham, and on reading its article we come to the conclusion that in so far as we are able to obtain confirmation of the facts placed before us, Dr. Burnham a Canadian citizen, a colonel in the Canadian or the Imperial army, and a brother of an ex-member of this House, whilst carrying on a work of mercy in a foreign country was subjected to certain outrages and indignities. It would appear from his statements—and they have not as yet been contradicted, though more than six months have elapsed since they were first made to the Canadian people—that our fellow countrymen and women were terrorized by some petty Balkan bureaucrat, that goods and money sent by Canadian citizens to help the starving, the oppressed and the miserable in Europe were taken and used for other purposes, and that finally one of our own ex-soldiers, a man who bears a high reputation in Canada was forcibly ejected from Serbia. His mission was backed by the funds of individual citizens of Western Canada, by municipalities throughout the Dominion and even by provincial governments, and moreover Dr. Burnham went overseas, if not with the authorization of the Dominion Government, at least, as admitted by the Prime Minister, with its knowledge and consent. The only answer we get when the matter is brought on the floor of the House is that some time, sooner or later, we may obtain redress.

9 p.m.

Perhaps I am one of those who have placed too literal an interpretation on the language used in this House and outside by hon. gentlemen who have represented us both at the Imperial conferences and at the meetings of the League of Nations when they said that we were a nation, for when they said that I thought they meant we had the attributes of a nation and that our citizens were not to be insulted with impunity by any petty sovereign or bureaucrat. I understood, as my right hon. friend the Prime Minister said, that we were more than a nation—though I am not quite prepared to be so enthusiastic as he about the reason why we are more than a nation. He stated we were so because we belonged to the Great Britannic commonwealth, and being backed as we were by this grat commonwealth we would not have the slightest difficulty in having our rights and privileges respected by other nations. The history of our boundary relations with the United States has not given me any great confidence in the value which my right hon. friend places in this alliance. However, taking his word for it that we have increased the value of our nationhood by such an alliance, and by recent events in Europe and elsewhere, I cannot understand how it comes about that we must wait for months and months until some petty clerk in the British foreign office decides that probably one Canadian might have been insulted by a ruler of one of the Balkan States. It seems to me that it is the duty of the Canadian Government and the Canadian people to protect our citizens wherever they may be.

Although I do not join in the enthusiasm of my right hon. friend from Maisonneuve and Gaspé with regard to the words used by Lord Palmerston in the Don Pacifico debate, and although I do not agree that we should go about the world with a chip on our shoulder blustering about our rights and our powers and shouting Civis Britannicus sum, I do believe that if we are to place any value on our citizenship we should

have the means of being able to protect our nationals. I do not think anyone in this House would ask the Government to declare war on Serbia, for there are other measures which can be taken, financial and economic, and strong diplomatic pressure could be brought to bear. Then, as my hon. friend from Gaspé said, there is the League of Nations. That League, I understood was formed for the protection of the small as well as the great nations. How well these small nations have been protected would be a question perhaps for further discussion. For instance, how well the doctrine of self determination has been upheld in the case of this same little country of Montenegro would be a question which the League of Nations might very well ponder.

However, this is the point which I think should be taken up by this House. If a British subject is proud of being able to say he is a British subject in whatever part of the world he may be, and if being a British subject implies protection in every way, so should the title of being a Canadian national. I would not say, like my hon. friend from Gaspé, Civis Britannicus sum; I would say Civis Canadensis sum. Our men have made Canada so well known in the world that she is no longer a stranger. And I would ask that the Government make such representations as would lead the world to understand that our nationals cannot be insulted and outraged with impunity, however far they may be from their native land.

Mr. C. W. PECK (Skeena): Mr. Speaker, I rise to support the motion of the hon. member for Maisonneuve (Mr. Lemieux). The hon. and gallant gentleman who has just sat down (Mr. Power) I think rather assumed to send our fleet into the Adriatic. I listened to the speech of the hon. member for Maisonneuve with great interest, and he certainly spoke temperately and with dignity. I think we should first do what he asks for, that is, investigate the charges. He did not state that the charges were true, he simply asked the Government to take measures to investigate them. In that he is entirely right. All I can say is, if those charges are true, it is a case of base ingratitude on the part of Serbia, because this young nation plunged into the war with the greatest courage and chivalry to uphold, among other things, the rights of small nations, and particularly the rights of Serbia, who was the first nation to get us embroiled in the war.

[Mr. Power.]

Therefore, Mr. Speaker, although I am not a swashbuckling imperialist and though I do not go round, as the hon. and gallant gentleman said, with a chip on my shoulder, I think we may rely upon the right hon. gentleman who is the head of the Government in this country, if he discovers that injustice has been done to a Canadian citizen, to be the first to uphold the cause of the nation with that dignity and firmness which are characteristic of him. It is a very good occasion upon which to let the whole world know that the rights of Canadian citizens must be respected everywhere. The Government should take every step necessary to the fullest investigation of this matter and adopt such measures as the facts seem to warrant.

Mr. D. D. McKENZIE (North Cape Breton and Victoria): Mr. Speaker, as the seconder of the motion I feel that I should like to say a word or two on the subject. I am not quite satisfied with the enthusiasm, if it could be called enthusiasm at all, with which the Prime Minister (Mr. Meighen) dealt with this motion. We should all be of one mind in regard to the matter brought to our attention by the hon. member for Maisonneuve (Mr. Lemieux). We have to accept the word of a British subject until conclusive evidence to the contrary is presented to the House or to some tribunal inquiring into the matter. A British subject has made certain statements; they are presented to the House by the hon. member for Maisonneuve, and I for one accept for the time being those statements as being correct. If they are correct, they certainly require a most thorough investigation and it is for the Canadian people, both on their own behalf and as part of the great British Empire, to give Montenegro or any other country strictly to understand that Canadian subjects are not to be treated unfairly with impunity.

Now, the answer that we received from the Prime Minister to this motion is a fling at the Liberal party, an attempt to belittle the Liberal party and to tell us some things that we ought to know if we have such big notions concerning ourselves as British subjects or as Canadians or as members of this Parliament. I did not think, Sir, that there was any possible way by which the right hon. gentleman could get around to that attitude in connection with this motion. As the hon. member for Skagway has said—

An hon. MEMBER: Skeena.

Mr. McKENZIE: The hon. member for Skeena (Mr. Peck) will pardon me for not remembering for the moment the name of the constituency which he graces and honours, as he does the whole of Canada. I thought that the case was presented with fullness, with dignity, in a manner quite free from the slightest degree of political bias. But my right hon. friend says it would be well for the hon. member who proposes the motion to look around him and see what sympathy he is getting from his own side of the House; that it would be well for him to inquire into the history of the Liberal party and see what they have done to make Canada a nation or to maintain her in that position. Well, I would ask the right hon. gentleman where the party to which he belongs stood in 1882 when we were called upon as an integral part of the Empire to send troops to the Soudan, where they were much needed. What was the answer of Sir John A. Macdonald? "Not a dollar, not a ship, not a man; let England fight her own battles; we have nothing to do with them." That was the answer of Sir John A. Macdonald, and not a man was sent; a few Canadian voyageurs went on their own responsibility. That was the attitude of the Conservative party in 1882 when it was at the zenith of its glory and headed by the biggest statesman it ever had.

What was the attitude of the Liberal party when the South African war broke out? That was the second opportunity which this country had to show what it wanted to do as a part of the British Empire. I need not recite to you, Sir, the attitude that was taken by that great statesman, the late Sir Wilfrid Laurier, who was at the head of the Liberal Government at that time. Instead of saying to the British Empire: "Not a man, not a dollar! Sir Wilfrid Laurier said: "The last man, the last dollar; everything that we can do to support the Empire in this crisis." That was the first great step taken by Canada along the lines that we are now discussing, the first great event in connection with which Canada was brought prominently in contact with the affairs of the world. And is my right hon. friend to tell us that we should look around; that we should examine our history and see what our antecedents have been as citizens of Canada and as subjects of the British Empire? Speaking for myself, I take no slurs from the right hon. gentleman as to my relationship with the British Empire or the British flag. I am just as strong in that regard as he is, and that is true of everybody connected with my family during the last two or three hundred years. I therefore do not take kindly to anything coming even from the Prime Minister which tends to reflect in the slightest degree upon the attitude of the Liberal party in this respect.

About the time when I came to this Parliament, in 1904, a case occurred which was somewhat analagous to this. A small sailing schooner, having on board some natives of Nova Scotia, had been improperly seized at a port of Uruguay; the vessel was confiscated, and the men lost their furs and their money. The first word that I said publicly in this House was to ask Sir Wilfrid Laurier and his government to look after the interests of those men away down in Uruguay with their schooner and their furs confiscated. What happened? The government of Sir Wilfrid Laurier appointed a commissioner, conferred proper powers upon him, and sent him to Uruguay. A full investigation was made, and he returned and reported conditions to the then government. The Republic of Uruguay was obliged, through the British consul there, to make compensation for the schooner and the furs which they had confiscated. There was a case in which we did something along those lines. There was no hesitation about the matter; there was no speech-making on the part of the right hon. Sir Wilfrid Laurier; his government immediately went to work and redressed the grievances of those men.

All that we are asking for in this case is that proper steps should be taken; that we should not be governed by the correspondence that has reached us from Serbia. That correspondence is tainted and coloured to suit the views of the people of that country. I would not be satisfied with this correspondence. I presume they have a consul in Great Britain, and Great Britain has consuls in that country. If this matter cannot be handled through Canadian avenues, the British consul in that country should be called upon to inquire into the matter and report, and in that way we can get at the facts without the high colouring that may be given to them through this correspondence. The Prime Minister should make a more pronounced deliverance on that point, and not say that he is simply going to wait; that he will give another reading to this correspondence, and that if he is convinced by the correspondence that has been received from the defendant in

this case, he may do something to redress the grievances of Dr. Burnham. I am not quite satisfied with that. I think a little stronger statement should be given, so that Canadians, wherever they may be, may realize to the full that they have behind them at home a people, a Parliament and a Government always keenly on the lookout to see that they are properly safeguarded and protected in both their persons and their property.

Hon. RODOLPHE LEMIEUX (Maisonneuve): Mr. Speaker—

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Before the hon. gentleman speaks, it is my duty to inform the House that he is about to exercise his right to close the debate. Therefore, any other hon. gentleman desirous of speaking to the motion, should do so now.

Mr. LEMIEUX: I wish to thank hon. gentlemen on both sides of the House who have supported the principle involved in this motion, and I hope that means will be taken to hold an investigation to find out whether or not the grievances of Dr. Burnham and his nurses are really deserving of our attention, as I have no doubt they are.

Before taking my seat, I wish to tell the hon. member for Quebec South (Mr. Power) that he is quite in error if he believes that I am animated by any jingo spirit in proclaiming "Civis Britannicus sum." If my hon. friend will read my remarks in Hansard to-morrow, he will see that I have said that, if Canada is really a nation, she can, through her own channels, obtain redress in the present instance, but if there is no possibility, as we have no foreign office or foreign minister ourselves, of Canada obtaining justice for one of her nationals, John Bull is always at the old stand and, as for one hundred and fifty years we have lived under the British flag, we may still invoke the protection of that flag so that one of our fellow-Canadians may be protected against any humiliation, indignity or outrage abroad. That is what I said. It is true that we have in Canada the Department of External Affairs, of which I believe the Prime Minister (Mr. Meighen) is the minister, ex-officio. If my right hon. friend will take this matter in hand, will investigate it and see that justice is done, as I have no doubt he will if he has that authority, I shall be the first one to proclaim that Canada is really a nation, or at least on the way to become a nation. But, meanwhile, if it is impossible, through that channel, through that machinery, to obtain justice for one of our nationals, I look to the British Foreign Office to redress the grievance of one of our citizens. By doing this I am not parading in the highways and byways with a chip on my shoulder; I am simply talking common sense and speaking the language of a good Canadian.

Motion agreed to.

Hon. RODOLPHE LEMIEUX (Maisonneuve) moved:

For a copy of the special report made by Dr. Burnham on the treatment by the Serbian Government of the Canadian Hospital Mission in Montenegro.

He said: What I have just said on the former motion, applies to the present one, and I wish the two to be linked together.

Motion agreed to.

MURRAY BAY—TADOUSSAC PROPOSED STEAMSHIP SERVICE

On the motion of Mr. Casgrain:

That, in the opinion of this House, an up-to-date steamship service should be established between Murray bay situated in Charlevoix County and Tadoussac in Saguenay County.

Mr. CASGRAIN: I am ready to proceed with this motion; but the Minister of Trade and Commerce (Sir George Foster) asked me to continue it until next Monday because he was unable to attend to-night. I would, therefore, ask that it stand.

Motion stands.

PROPORTIONAL REPRESENTATION

Mr. J. A. SEXSMITH (East Peterborough) moved:

That, in the opinion of this House, in order to give each voter an equal share in the representation, some system of proportional representation should be adopted, and that a special committee of this House should be forthwith appointed, charged with an enquiry into the different systems of proportional representation, with a view to recommend one of these for adoption.

He said: Mr. Speaker, in presenting this resolution to the House, I do so with considerable timidity, because I realize there are, perhaps, members as well as many other people who look upon proportional representation as something new or somewhat of a fad. I would say to any one who may hold those ideas that it is not new and that to-day every country in the world, that has responsible government and an electoral system such as we have in Canada, is seriously discussing proportional

representation. I sincerely hope that something may be done in order that we may secure in Canada a better electoral system than we have at present. I trust this subject, that has to do with the national interest and that is something of much greater importance than the success of any party, may be freely and fully discussed from an unbiased and non-partisan standpoint.

The chief evil of our present system is that large and important sections of opinion are left unrepresented, and the end of all political reform should be to secure to these important sections their due and fair share of representation in this House. In speaking of the single member mode of representation, I do not think I can do better than quote from one of the most outstanding statesmen in Great Britain to-day, the Right Hon. Arthur James Balfour. Speaking before the Scottish Conservative Club, in Scotland, he said:

> Everybody who has watched the actual course of a contested election in a constituency where parties were evenly balanced knows perfectly well the monstrous power which is given to a very small minority to exact a pledge from the candidate, not that he should support this or that great policy, but that he should help their small and particular interest.
>
> I know of nothing which is more corrupting both to the electors or to the elected than that process, and, although I have fully seen the difficulties which attach to what is commonly known as minority representation, it surely is an extraordinary criticism upon our existing system that, while a small handful of interested people, can turn an election one way or the other on their own personal issue, huge minorities like the minority of the Unionists in Scotland are utterly and grossly unrepresented. We give every privilege to the little knot of people in the individual constituencies: we ignore the great mass who under our existing system find no representation at all comparable either to their numerical strength or their public spirit or to any other quality which makes them useful, able and independent citizens.

Those are very strong words from one who I am sure every hon. member of this House will regard as a great authority. I look upon his words as a very strong condemnation of our present single member electoral system.

Looking over our election returns in this country, I find that we have large majorities grossly unrepresented in this country. I should like, if time permitted, to go over all the provinces of Canada and give to the House the results of elections during the last decade or two under our present system. In the province of Quebec, for instance, in the general election of 1900, fifty-seven Liberals and eight Conservatives were elected. The fifty-seven Liberals secured 133,566 votes, and the eight conservatives 103,253. The average number of votes required to elect one Conservative was 12,907, while the average number of votes to elect one Liberal was 2,344. Thus one Liberal vote had the value of six Conservative votes. Under proportional representation thirty-seven Liberals would have been elected instead of fifty-seven and twenty-eight Conservatives instead of eight.

Take the election of 1904 in the same great province. Then fifty-four Liberals were elected, and eleven Conservatives. The fifty-four Liberals secured 144,992 votes, and the eleven Conservatives 111,550. The average number of votes required to elect one Liberal was 2,636, and the average number of votes required to elect one Conservative was 10,141. A Liberal vote had the value of four Conservative votes. Under proportional representation thirty-nine Liberals would have been elected instead of fifty-four and twenty-six Conservatives instead of eleven.

In that same election of 1904 we find that in the province of Nova Scotia 56,526 Liberal votes were cast and eighteen Liberal members elected, and that 46,131 Conservative votes were cast, but not one member was elected. In the same year practically the same condition obtained in the province of British Columbia.

In 1908 in the province of Quebec we find the results were very similar. The Liberals secured 162,176 votes and elected 54 members, while the Conservatives secured 115,579 votes and elected 11 members. The average number of votes required to elect one Liberal was 3,003, and the average number of votes required to elect one Conservative was 10,144. One Liberal vote had the value of 3 Conservative votes. Under proportional representation 38 Liberals would have been elected instead of 54 and 27 Conservatives instead of 11.

These examples should be enough to convince any man in this House that any electoral system that allows such a condition to prevail where it is impossible to elect a Parliament that will properly reflect the opinion of all the people, which is one of the main principles of responsible Government, cannot possibly make for the welfare of our country, and I believe it is the duty of this Parliament, which is about to make a new redistribution of seats, to see that such a condition should

no longer prevail. Should we fail to improve it, in my opinion, this Parliament will have failed to do its duty towards the people.

If we look over conditions in other countries we find them very similar where the same electoral system prevails, and in passing I may say that every country in the world that has responsible government has practically the same electoral system of single member constituencies. We find in Great Britain in the general election of 1874, and these are the reasons, Mr. Speaker, that Mr. Balfour and many other British statesman are looking very seriously at the present system, which is absolutely unfair, the Conservatives had a majority of 50 in Parliament although the Liberal vote polled was 1,400,000, against a total Conservative vote of 1,200,000. In other words, although the Liberals in that election polled 200,000 more votes than the Conservatives, the Conservatives having a majority of 50 in the House, the Parliament of that great country was elected and served on a minority vote.

Again, in the British election of 1906, the ministerialist group had 56 per cent of the votes polled and elected 72 per cent of the members, while the Conservatives had 44 per cent of the votes polled and elected 28 per cent of the members. The unprecedented ministerial majority of 256 should have been the safe majority of 68.

I have selected only a few outstanding cases but I could give many further examples if time permitted. In the United States in the Oregon election in 1896, the Republicans, with 55 per cent of the votes, elected 83 members to the Legislature, while the Democrats, with 34 per cent of the votes, elected 7. It required 4,499 votes to elect one Democrat, and 619 votes to elect one Republican. The Socialists and Prohibitionists, with 11 per cent of the vote, were unrepresented. I have been unable to secure the returns for some of the other provinces of Canada, but I am told on pretty good authority that the present Government in British Columbia secured only 37 per cent of the vote polled.

We have an example in Toronto to-day of a Government carrying on with a very small minority vote. Now, in regard to the by-elections in East Elgin and West Peterborough, I have not a word to say about the men that represent these ridings. They are no doubt good representatives, but they failed to secure a majority of the total votes polled. Is it fair, or proper, or democratic that we should suffer to exist an electoral system that allows such a condition of things? The principles of democratic government, by the people and for the people, are well established in the minds of citizens, but in my opinion they have failed to work out in practice. For example, in the election of 1904, when the great question of building the Grand Trunk Pacific and the National Transcontinental railway was the main subject before the people of this country, what was the situation? That was the question on which the election was decided, and I think it is fair to assume that all those who voted Conservative at that time were opposed to that railway proposition. In the province of Quebec, under our electoral system, 54 supporters of the proposition were elected and only 11 opponents, whereas, under proportional representation, the respective figures would have been 39 supporters and 26 opponents. In other words, had the election of 1904 been conducted under the proportional system, Quebec would have elected 26 opponents to the proposition instead of 11, and 39 supporters instead of 54, or a difference of 15 supporters fewer and fifteen opponents more. In the good province of Nova Scotia, 46,000 electors did not secure one representative; they did not secure a voice in the House at all, although they had within 10,000 of half the vote. The Liberals elected 18 supporters and the Conservatives, who were at that time opposing the measure, failed to secure one representative. I am convinced that had the election been run under the proportional system, and had the people's minds been properly reflected in the House, that ill-advised and ill-considered railway proposition would never have been put through and Canada could have gone along and developed on safer and saner lines.

Now, the spirit of democracy requires that an equal share of representation shall be given each separate elector, and not that the direction of government shall be entrusted exclusively to one class or party. The first duty of a democracy should be to respect the rights of its citizens. Ever since the earliest days of responsible government, and you may go back centuries in the history of the great British nation, when the first representative government was formed, and follow it down to the present day, there has been a steady development until we have our present great system of government. But in the earlier times only a very small coterie of people had the franchise, and from those days

until now the masses have been clamouring for the extension of the franchise. Why did they want the franchise? It was because, in all those years, there was a feeling that the people did not rule, and they believed that if they had the vote they would have sufficient power to control government, and would really have democracy. The franchise has been extended until, at present, almost every adult in the great British Empire has the vote. Yet, notwithstanding this universal application of the principle, the people have been unable to control government sufficiently to see that the different elements of the nation have a fair and equal share in the councils of the country and, may I say particularly, in its inner councils.

A short time ago a thoughtful editorial appeared in the Ottawa Journal. It pointed out that from 1896 to the present day not one farmer from the great province of Ontario had ever been taken into the Cabinet; not one had ever been taken into the inner councils of the nation. I ask, in all fairness and sincerity: Is there a man in this House who could say that in that great and important class in the province of Ontario one man could not have been found with sufficient ability to warrant his inclusion in the Cabinet? I say that there is not an honourable gentleman who would dare stand up on the floor of Parliament and so aver. Yet fifty per cent, we may say, of the people of the province of Ontario, so far as the inner councils of the nation have been concerned, have been disfranchised. Wonder has been expressed at the farmers organizing and going into politics. Well, Spencer says that self-preservation is the first law of nature, and I look to my right to-night and see there the nucleus of a farmers' party. I have heard that party variously called the Agrarian party and the Farmers' party, and there is not a man in this House who has more respect for the farmers or the agrarians, by whichever name you choose to call them, than I have. There is no man in this House who has fought the battles of the farmers longer and more strenuously than I have done, or who is more desirous to see them get their right and fair share in this country. But I must say that if the Farmers' party of to-day aims at becoming the sole governors of the country, then I cannot endorse any such ideal. If, in the past, the people from the urban centres have been governing, that is no reason or excuse for the farmers now to say that because they have perhaps a majority of votes, they will retaliate and elect a government to run the country, and that the people of the cities and towns will have to submit. No. This is a great country, stretching from the Atlantic to the Pacific, with millions of farmers, and room for millions more, and millions of citizens in the great and glorious cities of Canada, of which we are all proud, and room for more; and if the Agrarian party desire to serve the best interests of the country, then, instead of seeking to become the governors of the country, they should be willing to join hands with others in the direction of affairs.

If I had my way, I would dispense with all parties, and that is not a conclusion which I have reached only to-day; it is probably some ten years since I saw the advisability of it. I would elect a Parliament of sensible Canadian citizens to come here and deal with the questions of the country on their merits, and not from any party standpoint or party bias; and for the farmers to come as a separate class and say: "We are going to make an effort, if possible, to seize the reins of power, and to govern the country," is an attitude which I cannot support. When a man elects to become the representative of one class he then, to my mind, ceases to be a representative and becomes a delegate. Professor John R. Commons, professor of political economy in the University of Wisconsin, has said "That one man of wealth has the influence of a thousand farmers, storekeepers and labourers." Well, with my experience I would be inclined to think that in some instances you might multiply his estimate a thousand fold.

We are living in a democratic age, an age, I trust, of advancement, but a time of unrest—even dangerous unrest—a time when people are dissatisfied with the old order of things. So many strange evils have sprung into life that one is bewildered. On the one hand we find unusual concentration of wealth in the control of a few; on the other, a growing restlessness and frantic attempts at organization on the part of the wage-earning class. I believe the Government should have an important place in solving these contradictions, and I believe that the remedy lies in the adoption of a proportional representation system in elections.

Let me quote what Lord Robert Cecil, an eminent man in public life in Great Britain, says. At a luncheon held in the House of Commons, London, England, on November 3, 1920, Lord Robert Cecil, speak-

ing on proportional representation, uttered the following words:

I am satisfieid, that propirtional representation has never been more important that it is at the present moment. We are faced all over the world by an attack on what may be called the world order,—a general challenge and dispute on the presupposition of which the whole of our civilization and society is based. It is a time when democracy as a system of government and as a system of social organization is going to be tested to its uttermost, and the machinery which expresses democracy will be overhauled by no friendly critics, to see whether it really does justify the claim it makes. In this country, we have for many years, been aware of a growing criticism of representative institutions as they actually exist. We know that some of our most cherished institutions no longer keep the position in the public reputation that they did half a century ago, and the additional danger exists now, that not only are there those who criticise our institutions, but there are those who desire definitely to set up a different form and method of governing the country which many of us, at any rate, think would lead us straight to anarchy.

It is a time when it boheves all of us who believe in democracy and in stability to look carefully at the foundations on which our institutions are based and to do our utmost to see that they really are based on the only foundation on which democratic institutions can be based, namely, a true accord with the expressed and determined will of the people. It is for that reason that, to my mind, proportional representation has an added importance at the present time.

At the same meeting Colonel L. S. Amery, Under Secretary of the Colonies said:

We are only beginning to realize—the general public I mean—that methods of election influence the whole character and structure of the political life. We have plenty of object lessons before us, both in the present and in the past. I was reading the other day the life of my first political chief, Lord Courtney, and I was impressed with the far-seeing grasp he showed, forty years ago, of the inevitable results of applying the old political system of election to the Irish problem—and he endorsed his belief by sacrificing his political position.

I believe that half, if not the whole of the appalling problem with which we are faced to-day is a by-product of an unfortunate system of elections which created artificial divisions and exaggerated them, when the important thing was for the men of moderate views to get together and find a real solution. If we had had proportional representation, forty years ago, a solution might have been found of the Irish problem then on the lines of moderate men of all shades of opinion, drawing together on common ground.

It is not my intention, Mr. Speaker, to discuss the different systems of proportional representation. That will be the work of the committee, if appointed. However, I may say I agree with Colonel L. S. Amery when he expresses the belief that, had proportional representation been adopted forty years ago in the British Isles, a solution might have been found of the Irish problem. Our present system does not encourage unity of the Canadian people, which is so necessary for the well-being and general advancement of our country. It rather encourages the opposite. At election time we find Quebec talking about Orange Toronto, and Toronto talking about French Quebec, which, I think, does not make for unity. Does any man tell me that that mode of conducting elections is to the advantage of this country? Personally I cannot see it. In place of drawing our people closer together we, at election time, indulge in picayune methods in a constituency where a man can use "the glad hand" and resort to all the evils that may be attached to a corrupt election to try to secure his return. In a word the idea seems to be "Anything to get votes." We have to acknowledge these things because we all realize that they take place. Instead of talking in Montreal about Orange Toronto, and talking in Orange Toronto about French Quebec, we should, as some one has well said:

Be noble, and the nobleness
That lies in other men—sleeping but not dead—
Shall rise in majesty, to meet thine own.

There are many countries in Europe that have adopted proportional representation, and some countries in the British Empire where the system is in vogue. I do not deem it necessary to outline the conditions which exist in those countries, and the success which has followed the adoption of that system, but I want to refer to a few cases in our own country where proportional representation has been tried. The system was tried in the city of Winnipeg a short time ago, during the Provincial election, and I now wish to quote the opinion of the Hon. Thomas H. Johnson, Attorney General of Manitoba, as to how it worked out.

Mr. Johnson wrote:

I feel I can truthfully say that I have not now, and never have had, a single regret for the efforts made by me, personally, in connection with the introduction of this reform in our election laws. The proportional representation system gives a more truly representative legislature than the system of single member constituencies. Everything claimed for it in the literature which we used, and with which we are familiar, was clearly accomplished. The electors of Winnipeg had no more difficulty than usual, and the counting, nothwithstanding the great number of candidates, forty-one in all), came off without a hitch of any kind.

I now wish to quote the opinion of another gentleman Mr. W. J. Tupper, K. C.,

a Conservative member of the Manitoba Legislature, who wrote:

In my opinion the test that proportional representation underwent in this city during the late provincial election, was successful. As I understand the system, it is intended to give representation to all parties in proportion to their numerical strength. The result of the late election showed that the minority parties in the city of Winnipeg received representation in accordance with their voting strength. It however, did not favour independent candidates, as you will have observed.

I may say that the success of the system seems to me to depend upon the effciency of those in control of the counting. We were fortunate in this province to have exceptionally able men in charge and the result is, no doubt, in a great measure due to them.

The mayor of Winnipeg, Mr. C. F. Gray, wrote:

I might say that I followed the application of this new system of election with keen interest and the results have satisfied me that it is the best means of ascertaining the wishes of all sections of the electorate. I look forward to its successful application in the forthcoming municipal election in the city of Winnipeg.

The Manitoba Free Press, in its issue of July 7, 1920, commented editorially on the election, as follows:

Winnipeg, it may be ventured, has put proportional representation upon a Canadian political map. The test the new system has successfully passed through in the recent Manitoba election is the last thing needed to demonstrate the practicability and merits of proportional representation. Its extension to the rural constituencies in Manitoba is assured, and its ultimate adoption of all elections—civic, provincial, and federal—may now be looked on as inevitable. In Winnipeg the test was classic, and proportional representation won with flying colors.

I have some other comments here which perhaps are worth puting on Hansard:

Some of the advantages of the new system are very apparent. In the first place, proportional representation eliminated the excitement and bitterness from the election campaign; the knowledge that each party could only get its fair proportion, and no more, of the available seats made the old-time stategy and electioneering useless—

That is worth considering, Mr, Speaker, if nothing more.

—it also saves thousands of dollars which would have been spent in pushing individual candidates, and it enabled the electors to approach the ballots with a calmness of mind which gave them an opportunity to cast their votes with the greatest possible understanding and intelligence. The trifling number of spoiled ballots is an eloquent testimonial to the fact that the electors were cool and clear-headed when they went to the polls.

The leading fact, however, is that the result of the ballot has worked out with mathematical exactitude to the desired end; the elected candidates represent in accurate proportion the voting strength of the parties in the city; no votes were lost, and the voter who saw that his first choice had been defeated, knew that his vote was not extinguished, but passed on to his alternate preference, and that in the final results he had secured his correct proportion of representation.

I know there are those who think that proportional representation favours little cliques and independent candidates, but the results so far have proved the direct opposite.

Now, Mr. Speaker, after giving this question considerable thought I feel that something should be done to secure for this great country a better election system.

10 p.m.

Last year we spent weeks of valuable time trying to pass an election Act. Yes, we spent weeks trying to build barbed wire entanglements, if I may so express myself, around the polling booth so that the individual elector might be allowed to cast his vote without danger of its being switched or stolen. We acknowledge the principle of one man one vote, or one elector one vote, but we allow in our system of distribution the direct opposite. What would be thought of a government or of an individual member of this House that would introduce a bill giving the electors in one district six votes and those in the adjoining district one vote? What chance would a bill of that description have of adoption by this House? But that is exactly what has happened in some of our electoral districts, in every election for the last twenty years. In one district one Conservative vote might be worth five or siv Liberal votes; in another district that I have referred to in the province of Quebec, at one election, one Liberal vote was worth six Conservative votes; and in the province of Nova Scotia 46,000 Conservative votes out of a total of 103,000—I am speaking in round numbers—did not secure one representative in this chamber, while 56,000 Liberal votes elected eighteen representatives. While the Government of that day might have been elected by a small majority, still I look upon that as very significant because that is the year, 1904, when the great railway question which we are encumbered with to-day was before the country. There is not an hon. gentleman within sound of my voice who would hesitate for a minute in condemning any attempt that might be made to grant to our citizens in one district one vote and to those in another district five or six votes,

but that has been the result of our elections during the past year.

Say not it matters not to me
My brother's weal is his behoof,
For in this wondrous human web
If your life's warp, his life is woof.
Woven together are the threads
And you and he are in one loom
For good or ill, for sad or glad,
Your lives must share one common doom.
Then let the daily shuttle glide
Wound full of threads of kindly care
That life's great lengthening web may be
Not only strongly wrought but fair.

Mr. LEVI THOMSON (Qu'Appelle): Mr. Speaker, the resolution before us, is to my mind, well timed. The public is seriously considering this question and is intensely interested in it. It has received much study and is receiving more study. Such experience as we already have had in Canada with this system has been very satisfactory. I think the time for the introduction of the resolution is also well chosen because of what some people call the present political unrest, but which I prefer to call a political awakening.

People are doing their own thinking now as they have never done before in the world's history. There are extremists among labourers and among advanced thinkers, but we have always had extremists among thinking men and women. We must decide how we shall treat our extremists. In olden days they had a way of their own—those in authority adopted the plan of putting extremists to death as the handiest and most expeditious plan available; later on the plan of imprisonment was substituted; and in still later years Englishmen adopted the plan of allowing the extremist to shout himself hoarse in Hyde Park. The world mildly applauded the heroic action of the Englishman, but hesitated about following his example. The world moves and the extremist is no longer satisfied with being allowed to air his view in the public parks. He wishes to be given the opportunity of expressing his views in the legislative halls of his country, and the idea is gradually gaining ground that where the extremist has any considerable backing he should have that opportunity, and that the only safe course is to give it to him.

The best citizens are always drawn towards the under dog, and their sympathy always goes out to those who appear to be oppressed. They want to see every one have a chance, and the old plan of suppressing the extremist is no longer workable. The main result of suppressing the extremist was to get a new and bigger crop of his kind. We may kill or imprison the idealist, but we cannot kill or imprison the ideal. There is a law above the law of man and wiser than the law of man, which prevents that.

With education even so general as it is in our land, the only safe way is to give every encouragement to those having advanced thoughts to give expression to their thoughts, whether they be right or wrong. Public parks served their day as places for that expression, but to my mind election days and legislative halls are the proper times and places for their expression in our day. In the public parks there is no satisfactory method of answering the soap-box orator, but in this House all new ideas can be met under the most complete rules and regulations and in such a way that those new ideas will be subject to the acid test. They will be set before the public with their strength and their weakness clearly exposed to the public gaze. Each argument will be publicly met by those well qualified to meet it. All new ideas will be exposed to cold-blooded public scrutiny, and I have sufficient faith in the public to believe that the general result will be that new ideas that are worth while will survive and in time will be put into effect, while those ideas not well founded will die. I doubt if there is any better place in Canada than this House in which to give effect to sound ideas and to kill unsound ideas. Carlyle, referring to the French Revolution, speaks of "truth clad in hell fire." It rests largely with this House to say how the new ideas of our day, be they true or false, shall come to us. It is largely ours to say whether they will come to us clothed in the garments of peace or dressed in the lurid garments described by Carlyle.

I do not think our extremists in any particular line are so numerous as some people suppose. They must be fairly numerous before they can get representation in this House even under the most democratic plan of proportional representation, but if extremists in any particular line are sufficiently numerous to obtain representation in the House under that plan, then I believe it is for the benefit of the country that they should come here and air their views in a place where those views can be properly met. Let me repeat that I believe if their views are well founded they will survive and eventually conquer, while if they are not well founded they will die.

This surely is as it should be. I believe we should arrange that in all our cities, at least in those which are entitled to more than one representative, the constituencies should be grouped together and each elector should only have one first vote, being entitled to give second and further choices, where necessary, to other candidates. This would enable any group of people to obtain representation, provided they are sufficiently strong to be entitled to representation. In time, as the plan is worked out, it may be well to provide for the grouping together of a considerable portion of thickly peopled rural sections under the same plan. Possibly at present it might be well to try it out in cities where it can best be worked out, and in rural communities where we have only one member for each constituency we should have provision for a second choice where there are more than two candidates.

The hon. gentleman who moved this resolution has suggested that a committee should be appointed to go into the matter. That is certainly the proper course. There is no need of going into the details here or of elaborating any argument as to how the plan should be worked out. I have no doubt that a committee would be prepared to consider all phases of the question, not only the matter of proportional representation in grouped constituencies, if you like to use the term, but also the matter of transferable votes in single constituencies.

The hon. gentleman has said something with regard to the experiment in Manitoba. I suppose the House generally is aware that in the last local election in Manitoba provision was made for the working out of proportional representation in the city of Winnipeg. The city was granted ten representatives and they were elected under proportional representation. In the country nothing of the kind was provided; no provision was made for transferable votes. Now, let us see how the different plans worked out. I refer again to the Free Press of July 5 last. The three groups which had any large representation in Winnipeg were Labour, Liberal and Conservative. Besides the candidates for these groups there were eleven Independent candidates, each representing, I suppose, some new idea of his own. The fear is sometimes expressed that some faddist or other might by means of this plan be elected to Parliament, but the Winnipeg experiment does not justify any idea of that kind. In Winnipeg, according to the Free Press figures, which, no doubt, are correct—they were published some days after the election—the votes cast as first choice were 42.5 per cent Labour, 30.4 per cent Liberal, 13.7 per cent Conservative, and 13.4 per cent Independent. You will notice that the Independents had nearly as many votes as the Conservatives, but it must be remembered that the Conservative group was one group where as among the Independents there were anywhere from six to eleven groups, so to speak; there were eleven candidates. As a result of the voting, four Labour candidates, four Liberals and two Conservatives were elected. It might be said that only one Conservative and one Independent should have been elected, and perhaps, another Labour candidate. But I have given a reason why the Independents were not elected—it is simple enough: because they were a lot of dissociated groups; none of them had sufficient backing among the people of Winnipeg to entitle them to represent the people of Winnipeg. The Conservatives had sufficient backing; they had that whole group of 13.7 per cent. Had anyone known the total number of Conservative, Liberal and Labour votes and endeavoured to give to each group the representation to which it was intitled, he could not have done it more fairly than was the case as the result of this election by proportional representation. It is true that there were less votes per member for Conservatives than in the case of any other group and considerably more votes per member for Labour than for any other. Had they elected, say, one more Labour candidate and one less Conservative, the inequality would have been very much greater. As it is at present, you have about one Labour representative for a little over ten per cent of the vote and one Conservative representative for a little less than seven per cent of the vote. Had you changed that, had there been one more Labour member and one less Conservative member, the disparity would be still greater. Labour would have one representative for a little over eight per cent, and the Conservatives would have one for thirteen and a half or nearly fourteen per cent. So you see a fairer result could not have been obtained amongst the parties.

We come to the other question of transferable votes in single constituencies, and there is little enlightenment to be thrown on that by the Manitoba situation. In Manitoba no provision was made in the provincial election for transferable votes in single constituencies. As is liable to be the case in Canada for some time at least,

there were more than the two old groups; there were additional groups. I have from the Canadian Nation figures given of the results in some of those constituencies, which figures show that many of the elected representatives were minority candidates. It is not, however, fair to say of those men that they were not entitled to their seats, because they obtained the seats under the plan that was established, the only plan on which they could be candidates. No blame, therefore, attaches to them; the blame is on the system. In Brandon, the Labour candidate secured election by 2,007 votes, while 2,648 votes were cast against him for the two non-Labour candidates, so that he was a minority candidate. In the electoral division of Emerson 989 votes elected a Farmer representative, while 1,681 Liberal and Conservative votes were ineffective. In Manitou constituency 1,085 votes elected a Conservative candidate, while 1,927 votes for Liberal and Farmer candidates were wasted, or nearly double the number. In Rockwood the elected candidate obtained 978 votes, rendering ineffective the 977 votes, or one vote less, for another candidate, and 638 votes for a third candidate. That is, the elected candidate received only 978 votes, while 1,615 votes were cast against him. As I have said, there is no fault attaching to the candidates in that case; they obtained their election under the only system which was available.

We have at present in this House three members elected from constituencies in Ontario against whom the taunt is sometimes hurled that they are minority representatives. The fact that they are minority representatives is not any fault of theirs; it is the fault of the people generally and the fault of this House and of our plan of election. They offered themselves as candidates under the only system available, and they were duly elected under that system. It is very unfair to them that any one should be in a position to claim that they are minority representatives. If we wish to avoid the possibility or even probability of minority representatives in this House, we must adopt the principle of allowing the elector more than one choice, that is, where there is more than one candidate. It is quite plain that, for some time at least, we shall, in our politics, be divided into groups, and we should make our electoral machinery suit changed conditions. There is very little doubt that in the next election three-cornered and even four and five-cornered fights in single constituencies will take place, and it is our duty before the next election to provide legislation which will properly meet changed conditions and enable the electors to have complete say as to who shall represent them.

We hear the complaint made by leaders of the present Opposition that the opponents of the Government will be divided and will be fighting against one another in such a way as to weaken the effect of anything they decide to do. On the other hand we hear complaints from leaders and supporters on the Government side that there is danger of unfair understandings and arrangements amongst the leaders of the Opposition groups, and that this will militate against the Government. The way to overcome these dangers, if such exist, is to adopt the principle under discussion, where every elector can exercise his choice to the full limit.

Something has been said by the hon. member for East Peterborough (Mr. Sexsmith) with regard to the action of the farmers in forming an organization of their own. I do not think he was quite consistent with what he said before that; I think he rather contradicted himself. Let me, however, say this to my hon. friend, that I think he must admit that he has never seen in this group anything that would justify him in supposing that we want to make this group exclusive. The farmers generally do not want to form an exclusive political organization; they do not want to be exclusive; they do not want any class to rule. In fact, the main reason of their organization is their objection to class rule. We have had class rule in Canada since Confederation, and we want to do away with that. We have a platform on which we believe that members of every class can stand, that every honest man who wants fair play can stand. Therefore, we stick to that platform. Perhaps I am getting a little out of order; but if so I am only following my hon. friend who spoke before, who was also out of order. We ask for proportional representation amongst other things, so that my hon. friend is with us there.

Personally, I would like to see our law so framed that every opportunity will be given to the electors to decide who shall be their representatives. I realize that the leading issue in the next election campaign will be the issue between a customs tariff, probably somewhat resembling the tariff we have at present, on the one side, and a very low tariff on the other. I need not say where I stand on that question. Still, if the majority of the people of Canada desire

to retain a protective tariff such as we have at present, or even a higher tariff, they have an absolute right to such a tariff, and notwithstanding my own preference, I wish them to have it. They have the right to rule, and they have the right to decide what should be done. I may believe their course a mistaken one, but I must grant them the right to make their own mistakes.

I trust this resolution will be adopted by an overwhelming majority of the members of the House, and that it will be followed by immediate and effectual legislation.

Mr. J. W. EDWARDS (Frontenac): Mr. Speaker, I did not arrive in the chamber in time to hear the opening sentences of the speech of the hon. member for East Peterborough (Mr. Sexsmith); but I think I was in time to hear the greater part of his speech, and I may frankly say that I was very much impressed with many of the arguments which he presented. I have had the privilege of sitting in this House with the hon. member for East Peterborough for a number of years. I know he never advocates anything unless he is absolutely sincere, and he is always very careful in his accumulation of facts and always logical in his presentation of them. I find myself, however, in this position in regard to the resolution before us. Very frankly I confess that I have not given this subject the careful study which has undoubtedly been given to it by the hon. member for East Peterborough and by the hon. member for Qu'Appelle (Mr. Thomson). I find myself then in a position of being ill-informed as to, perhaps, the benefits of this proposed system over our present system. It may be, as these hon. gentlemen urge, that the system of proportional representation, such as is proposed in this resolution, would be vastly superior to the system which has prevailed ever since Confederation, and I am conscious of many defects in that system. I am not sure at the present moment that the system suggested would be better than our present system, with all its difficulties, and that brings me to the objection which I find in the resolution as proposed. It reads:

> That, in the opinion of this House, in order to give each voter an equal share in the representation, some system of proportional representation should be adopted—

Let me stop there. Now if I vote for this resolution, then perforce I am voting in favour of adopting some system of proportional representation, and speaking for myself alone, I have not sufficient information at the present time to convince me that such a system would be superior to our present system. It is true that the resolution goes on to suggest that a special committee be appointed to gather information in regard to proportional representation with a view to reporting to the House, but I would feel I was in a much better position to cast a vote in regard to proportional representation if I was provided with the information which this committee is supposed to gather than I am now, when the information has not been gathered and presented. If that part of the resolution were eliminated which asks me to vote in favour of a system of proportional representation, and the resolution merely asked me to support the appointment of a committee which was to gather information in regard to proportional representation, I would freely vote for it.

I shall not take up time discussing the subject further, for the reasons I have already given. I do not feel competent to discuss the subject on its merits. I have not given it careful study, and I think it is of sufficient importance to warrant hon. members of this House giving it careful consideration. I should like to hear the opinions of hon. gentlemen who have been longer in public life than I have. I should be very glad, indeed, to hear the well-considered opinion of the hon. member for Shelburne and Queen's (Mr. Fielding), for instance. He has been a long time in public life and no doubt has given the subject some consideration; whether or not he has gone deeply into the question it is for him to say. Frankly, Sir, I feel that I am not qualified to discuss this matter on its merits. I also feel that I have not sufficient knowledge of the system of proportional representation to enable me to vote for a resolution declaring in favour of it.

Mr. G. W. ANDREWS (Centre Winnipeg): The outstanding fact to my mind with regard to proportional representation is that it is here now. It is here in this House. It is in the Ontario Legislature, it is in the Manitoba Legislature, and in British Columbia. Proportional representation is in every place where they have held an election in recent years. The people of Canada are not satisfied with the old system, and they have split themselves into groups, not as the result of proportional representation, however; and if groups we must have, for Heaven's sake let us have intelligent groups. Perhaps the most useful contribution that I can make

to the debate, coming from Manitoba, where the question is no longer an academic one, but where the system has actually been tried, will be to give a few facts with regard to the trial that was made of the system there during the last election. In the first place, it was tried in Winnipeg alone, and with this extraordinary result, that in Winnipeg we have a group of three parties only, Labour, Liberal and Conservative, whereas in the outlying parts of the province where the old system was in force, we have a group of five, Liberal, Farmer, Conservative, Labour and Independent. It will no doubt be interesting to the House to ascertain how this occurred. I have some figures here which I shall not read at length, but which with the permission of the House I shall place on Hansard, after quoting briefly from them. I have here the actual returns of every constituency in Manitoba, the number of votes polled, the number of candidates, and the results. In Brandon, for instance, where my old friend, General Kirkcaldy was running as a Conservative, he polled 1,245 votes. My old friend, Mr. Clements, a Liberal, polled 1,403 votes, and Albert E. Smith, the Labour man, polled 2,207 votes. This is a fair sample of a modern election where more than two candidates are running. It happens to-day, Mr. Speaker, quite often, I think, that we not only do not have majority representatives, but we have minority ones and this is a fair case in point. In Emerson constituency, the farmers elected a member with a vote of 989. The Government polled 756, and the Conservatives, 925. The man who was elected with 989 votes had against him 1,600 votes of people who did not believe in his policies. It has sometimes been said that if it had not been for proportional representation there would not have been so many groups in the Manitoba House. With your permission, Mr. Speaker, I shall read a letter from the Executive Council in Winnipeg.

> I am in receipt o your letter of the 23rd ult., with respect to the recent Manitoba elections, and I am enclosing herewith the list of the candidates and the votes polled for each in each constituency in the Province of Manitoba.
>
> I cannot understand how the newspapers are possessed with the idea that proportional representation is responsible for the reduced majority of the Norris Government, as the vote in Winnipeg did not show this by any means. I have given as near as possible the party affiliations of each candidate, but until the House meets it is difficult to accurately state how some of these will line up.
>
> Had proportional representation been in force throughout the whole of the province there is no question in the world but that the Norris Government would have received a much larger representation.

One point I want hon. members to realize, is that we are not having groups because of proportional representation, but in spite of it. I think most of the ground has been covered in this debate. A point, however, that presents some difficulty is: What are you going to do in single-member constituencies? Most men feel that it is impossible to group the outside constituencies, and frankly I am of that opinion. Our areas are too far-flung to do it. As a result of the election in Manitoba there is a Bill before the Manitoba House at the present time, and it has passed its second reading, for the purpose of carrying out the idea of the single transferable vote in every constituency in Manitoba. This does not mean group constituencies, but if there are more than three candidates the elector will be given a first, second, and third preference. For instance, if there are three men, one a Conservative, one a Liberal, and one a Farmer, I, being a Liberal, would probably vote for the Liberal. Now, the majority is the majority of the votes cast at the election. Supposing 14,000 votes are cast; half of that would be 7,000, and one over that would be the quota required to elect a member. Now, I vote for the Liberal, and if he has sufficient votes in the first round to elect him, that settles it. If not, it is proposed to drop out the low man and transfer his votes, according to the preference of the votes. Probably, in the next case, I would transfer my vote to the Farmer if my first choice was not elected. These votes are transferred in accordance with the expressed desire of the voter; so that, as a matter of fact, no vote is lost, and it is impossible to have a minority candidate returned. The man who does come back must have at least a majority of one.

I was very much interested the other day, when the debate on patronage was before the House, to hear the hon. member who has just spoken (Mr. Edwards), suggest that the patronage should be given to the sitting member. I wonder what he would do in a case like Emerson, where the sitting member represented 900, although approximately 1,680 people had voted against him. It is entirely possible under our present system that we may have a House, after the next election, unless there is a change, representing about one-third of the people of Canada. That is quite possible. To-day, this proposal is right in

line with practical politics. It is no longer a matter of academic debate, and I do sincerely trust that the Government will appoint this committee. I agree with the hon. member who has just resumed his seat that if the mover of the resolution could recommend the appointment of a committee without committing us to some definite form of proportional representation, it would be very much better. I will vote for it in any case, because it is a right thing; but if this suggestion were adopted I think it would be in the better interests of all concerned. With regard to the figures which I have, with the permission of the House, Mr. Speaker, I would place them on Hansard. The statement gives the names, the number of votes and the number of candidates in every constituency. In some constituencies there were as many as five candidates running. I think that this table would be of general interest to members of the House, and it would be well to have it on Hansard.

Mr. SPEAKER: I think the hon. member would be better advised to read the list: It is only in rare and exceptional cases that documents are permitted to be embodied in Hansard without having been read, and I have never known instances in which this was done in a debate on private member's day. While I regret that this is so, nevertheless it is the fact, and I think it would be well, in the interests of proper procedure, for the hon. member to conform to the rule and read the list.

Mr. McMASTER: May I rise to a point of order, Mr. Speaker? If this is a very long statement the reading of it may take up considerable time. This is an extremely important debate, and while the statement may not strike hon. members on its reading, yet in printed form the facts would catch the eye, and I have no doubt that they would be of interest. I suggest, Sir, that it would be helpful to a proper consideration of the subject if the document were allowed to be placed on Hansard.

Mr. SPEAKER: It is only a question of principle. It is the duty of the Chair to direct the attention of the House to the rule, which is very clear and well defined. However, under the circumstances, I have no objection to submitting the question to the House. Is it the pleasure of the House that the tabulated statement submitted by the hon. member (Mr. Andrews), be inserted in Hansard without being read?

Some hon. MEMBERS: Carried.

Mr. ANDREWS: I have just one more word to add. I would quote the following from the letter I received from Mr. Tupper:

> I might say that the success of the system seems to me to depend upon the efficiency of those in control of the counting. We were fortunate in this province to have exceptionally able men in charge, and the result is no doubt in a great measure due to them.

I want to point out that this success in Winnipeg was not a mere accident. It was due almost entirely to the efforts of Mr. Ronald Hooper, who is employed in the Labour Department in Ottawa. While many of us have been playing at golf and having a good time for years, this young man has been devoting his energy and his time to the study of the question or representation in Parliament, and I have no hesitation in saying to-day that he knows more about this subject than any man in Canada. or perhaps in the world. If the committee is appointed, I do hope that he will be asked to attend, because his views will be of great value.

Following is the list submitted by the hon. member for Winnipeg Centre:

MANITOBA

List of Candidates and Votes Polled, June 29th, 1920.

Electoral Division	Name of Candidate	Votes Polled	Remarks
Arthur	John Williams	891	G
"	Duncan Lloyd McLeod	881	C
Assiniboia	W. D. Bayley	2,054	L
"	J. W. Wilton	1,941	I
Beautiful Plains	George Little	Acc.	F
Birtle	George J. H. Malcolm	995	G
"	Samuel Larcombe	861	F
Brandon City	Albert E. Smith	2,007	L
"	S. E. Clements	1,403	G
"	Brig. Gen'l. Kircaldy	1,245	C
Carillon	Maurice Duprey	973	F
"	Albert Prefontaine	925	C

MANITOBA—*Con.*

List of Candidates and Votes Polled, June 29th, 1920

Electoral Division	Name of Candidate	Votes Polled	Remarks
Cypress	Wm. H. Spinks	1,487	C
"	Andrew W. Miles	1,307	G
Dauphin	George H. Palmer	1,466	L
"	Wm. J. Harrington	1,044	G
Deloraine	Hon. R. S. Thornton	1,503	G
"	John C. W. Reid	1,188	C
Dufferin	E. A. August	1,478	G
"	Alex. Morrison	1,401	C
Ethelbert	N. A. Hryhorczuk	1,271	I
"	Ernest A. Marcroft	684	F
"	Jas. Guiszdaski	110	G
Emerson	Dmytro Yakimischak	989	F
"	John D. Baskerville	756	G
"	Roy Whitman	925	C
Fairford	A. W. Kirvan	241	G
"	Y. G. Serkau	240	G
"	A. Calverly	236	I
"	A. F. Carpenter	137	I
"	J. Matheson	121	I
Fisher	H. L. Mabb	443	I-F
"	J. W. Arsenyth	362	G
"	A. J. Yamache	214	G
Gilbert Plains	W. B. Findlater	735	G
"	R. J. Dalgleish	715	I
Gimli	Gudmundur Fjelsted	1,359	F
"	T. D. Ferley	1,242	G
Gladstone	Hon. J. W. Armstrong	1,327	G
"	William W. Lobb	1,147	F
Glenwood	William Robson	1,149	C
"	James W. Breakey	1,145	G
Hamiota	John Henry McConnell	1,109	G
"	William Ferguson	762	C
Iberville	Arthur R. Boivin	Acc.	I
Kildonan and St. Andrews	Albert Farmer	1,184	L
"	David Morrison	876	G
"	T. McConnell	852	F
Killarney	Samuel Fletcher	1,072	F
"	Melville Hayden	676	G
Lakeside	Chas. D. McPherson	1,104	G
"	Edwin Herbert Muir	1,081	C
Lansdowne	Hon. T. C. Norris	1,752	G
"	H. T. Hicks	914	C
La Verandrye	P. A. Talbot	1,023	I-C
"	L. R. Magnum	709	F
Manitou	John S. Ridley	1,185	C
"	George T. Armstrong	901	G
"	George Compton	926	F
Minnedosa	Hon. G. A. Grierson	1,296	G
"	W. T. Bielvy	1,029	F
Morden and Rhineland	John Kennedy	814	C
"	H. Winkler	752	G
Morris	Wm. R. Clubb	930	F
"	Alex. Ayotte	765	F
"	Fred. J. Last	251	I
Mountain	J. A. Baird	1,304	G
"	Andrew Young	1,178	F
Norfolk	R. G. Waugh	1,090	C
"	John Graham	873	G
"	John H. Wright	503	F
Portage la Prairie	Fawcett G. Taylor	1,306	C
"	E. A. McPherson	1,019	G
Roblin	Henry R. Richardson	991	F
"	Fred. Y. Newton	887	C
Rockwood	Wm. C. McKinnell	978	F
"	Arthur J. Lobb	977	G
"	Thomas Scott	638	C
Russell	W. W. W. Wilson	1,274	G
"	R. J. Brown	642	F
"	Albert L. Reid	593	I

MANITOBA—*Con.*

List of Candidates and Votes Polled, June 29th, 1920

Electoral Division	Name of Candidate	Votes Polled	Remarks
St. Boniface	Joseph Bernier	1,434	C
"	Joseph G. Dumas	730	G
"	T. Hoarnaert	404	I
"	John G. Howden	942	G
"	Christopher R. Rice	675	I
St. Clements	Matthew J. Stanbridge	977	L
"	Donald A. Ross	850	G
"	Hugh McLennan	445	F
St. George	Albert Edward Kristansson	Elected	L (no return)
Ste. Rose	Joseph Hamelin	878	C
"	D. J. Hill	745	G
"	L. H. Rhéaume	488	G
Springfield	Arthur Ernest Moore	987	S-L
"	Isaac Cook	928	F
"	Edgar D. R. Bissett	352	G
"	E. A. Dugard	123	F
Swan River	Robt. Wm. Emmonds	1,163	F
"	W. H. Sims	544	G
Turtle Mountain	Geo. McDonald	1,020	G
"	R. G. Willis	1,001	C
Virden	George Clingan	1,313	G
"	Reginald A. Knight	1,022	F
Winnipeg	D. Nelson Armstrong	1,174	I
"	George Armstrong	2,767	L
"	Duncan Cameron	2,402	G
"	Neil Thomas Carey	776	I
"	Samuel Cartwright	452	L
"	William John Christie	1,274	C
"	Mrs. Harriett Dick	1,307	I
"	Frederick John Dixon	11,586	L
"	Edward Bailey Fisher	431	I
"	Charles Henry Forrester	282	I
"	Will Gibben	792	G
"	John H. Gislason	28	I
"	John T. Haig	1,893	C
"	Mrs. Alice Ann Holling	105	I
"	William Ivens	1,928	L
"	Robert Jacob	1,206	G
"	Walter Albert James	56	L
"	Richard James Johns	52	L
Winnipeg	Hon. Thos. H. Johnson	4,386	G
"	Frederick W. Law	368	G
"	George Henry Lawrence	135	C
"	James Lightfoot	554	C
"	Robert N. Lowery	254	G
"	David S. Lyon	45	I
"	Albert McMartin	189	C
"	Wm. C. Morden	1,150	I
"	Malcolm McInnes	218	C
"	William L. Parrish	945	G
"	William A. Pritchard	443	L
"	George W. Prout	219	I
"	John Queen	1,253	L
"	Mrs. Edith Rogers	1,541	G
"	Robt. B. Russell	1,535	L
"	Mrs. G. Lipsett Skinner	359	C
"	John Stovel	1,743	G
"	Frederick G. Tipping	95	L
"	Percival V. Torrance	265	C
"	William J. Tupper	1,500	C
"	James O. Turnbull	88	C
"	Leo Warde	845	I

NOTE.—G—Liberal. L—Labor. I—Independent. F—Farmer. C—Conservative.

Hon. J. A. CALDER (Minister of Immigration and Colonization): Mr. Speaker, in view of the discussion which we have had, it seems to me that probably the debate might be shortened if I intimated to the House briefly the decision which the Government has reached with regard to this important question. As every member

is aware, there has been for some years past very considerable discussion throughout the country with reference to our present method of securing representation in the House of Commons and to our various legislative bodies. Whether we may agree with it or not, there is undoubtedly a large mass of public opinion to the effect that our present method of selecting representatives to our legislative bodies is not all that it should be. I do not propose at this stage to enter upon a detailed discussion of the merits or demerits of the present system. I am rather inclined to the view that the opinion expressed by the hon. member for Frontenac (Mr. Edwards), fairly well represents the views of the House; that is, that most of us have not given as close and exhaustive study to the question as we should.

I doubt very much whether the House at this time should be called upon to express an opinion upon the broad principle as to whether or not we ought to adopt some method of proportional representation. I think we shall be in a better position to give a verdict on that question a little later in the session, if the course suggested is adopted, namely, that the whole problem should be referred to a special committee of the House, and that every means be taken to get the fullest light possible upon the subject. That is what I would desire myself. While I have followed the discussions that have taken place throughout the country, and particularly in the press, during the course of the last few years, I must confess that I have not that full knowledge of the whole problem that would enable me to cast an intelligent vote. Let me give a simple illustration. I intended when the member for Qu'Appelle (Mr. Thomson) was speaking, to ask whether or not, in the case of the city of Winnipeg, where proportional representation was adopted for the last election, every voter was required to vote for ten candidates. That I was not sure of; I do not know. I understand they had but one constituency for a population of about 225,000 people, that in that one constituency they elected ten members, and that during the course of the election they had something like over forty candidates running. In the case of Vancouver, I think they had something like fifty odd candidates running in that one constituency. One thing that bothers me—and I think it is very essential in providing for any such system—is that in the case of an election method of that kind an individual, in many cases apparently, must be voting for a principle rather than for a man. Because I can conceive that in an election such as they had in Winnipeg it would be almost physically impossible for candidates to become acquainted with thier constituents, or for constituents to get to know their candidates, by reason of the size of the constituency and the multiplicity of candidates, and particularly where an election is arranged in a comparatively short time as it was under the Manitoba law.

Another thing that troubles me—I am merely mentioning this at the present time—is that I see difficulties in adopting one principle of representation for urban communities, and another system for rural communities. Now there may be good reasons for that. However, I do not wish at the present time to enter upon a detailed discussion of the features of the system either pro or con, I simply throw out this suggestion: The whole subject is one worthy of the very fullest consideration of this House, and Parliament should take means whereby it may obtain the very best advice and the very best evidence it possibly can on the subject. In so far as the resolution itself is concerned I think the member for Frontenac (Mr. Edwards) pointed out what may be called a defect, and that is that the House should not at this stage be called upon to vote upon the principle of the resolution. For that reason it has therefore been suggested that the motion should be amended, and I propose to move an amendment so as to bring about that result. Accordingly I beg to move:

That all the words after the word "House" in the second line thereof be struck out and the following be substituted therefor:

A Special Committee of this House should be appointed to consider the subject of proportional representation and the subject of the single transferable vote—

Which is a very different thing, as I understand it, from proportional representation; both subjects should be considered—

—and the desirability of the application of one or the other, or both, to elections to the House of Commons of Canada, and to report thereon to the House, and that such Committee have power to send for persons, papers and records, and to examine witnesses under oath.

If that amendment is acceptable I think, before the House meets to-morrow, we will be able to arrange for a committee that will be satisfactory.

Mr. F. L. DAVIS (Neepawa): I do not intend spending any time upon a discussion of the question. I merely wish to refer

to the use in the amendment of the term "the single transferable vote." This has generally referred to the Hare System of Representation, and I think perhaps the amendment would be clearer if it was phrased in this way "the single transferable or preferential vote" as doubtless that is what the Minister of Immigration has in mind.

Mr. CALDER: I have no objection to inserting the words "or preferential vote."

Mr. J. J. DENIS (Joliette): At this late hour of the night I shall not impose a long speech on the House. However, as I take a deep interest in this matter of proportional representation, or the method of transferable votes, or any other system which might have for its object the improvement of the existing system of election, I think it my duty to say a word or two upon the present resolution. At the outset I congratulate the Minister of Immigration (Mr. Calder) for introducing the amendment which he has brought in. I understood on the reading of the resolution as originally drafted that it was a committal on the merits of the issue. But now I gather that the only question that should be dealt with by the House at the present time is, whether or not this question is important enough to justify the House in appointing a committee to consider it. Therefore I think it was wise to omit that part of the resolution which was a committal on the merits of the issue, and simply leave before the House the question of whether or not a special committee should be appointed.

One might ask what is proportional representation? To the man who has not made some study of the question, proportional representation, might, perhaps, mean a revolution in the electoral franchise. I must say, Sir, that in my opinion proportional representation means nothing of the kind. Proportional representation, to my mind, is purely and simply a mile-stone on the road of political evolution and reform. The electoral franchise is rather a new invention in the lives of civilized nations. One has not to go very far back in history to find the origin of the electoral system. Civilized nations had existed for many centuries before the popular electoral franchise was given, or invented, if I might use that term. The development of a popular electoral franchise was gradually accomplished, first in Great Britain then in the United States, and finally in all the important countries of the world. Like every other improvement, or every other device, it has developed by degrees. The first systems were crude and very antiquated and also unjust to the people, but by degrees these systems have been improved, and to-day the system of proportional representation is nothing more or less than an improvement upon the present plan which has defects—a fact, no one can deny. If, for instance, one should only look back through history for the last five years one will readily find that the electoral system has been changed and modified in many countries of the world. Take our own country alone. Is it not true, Sir, that in the last five years more changes have been wrought in our electoral system and our electoral laws than there surely were in the fifty years that preceded this period? The object of proportional representation is to see to it that the wish of the elector be given effect to. It has been demonstrated by the mover of this resolution, and it is known to everybody in this House that the present system is defective in that it does not give effect to the wishes of the elector. Especially is this true when in a single constituency there are several candidates representing different groups. I will not go into details, but en passant I might point out the fact that at the next general election it is common knowledge that there will be in the field the candidates of four parties—the Unionist party, the Liberal party, the Agrarian party and the Labour party. Now, taking a single constituency in which four candidates are running, each representing one of those parties, is it not true that in many cases the successful candidate will not be the man who will represent the majority of the electors? The hon. member for Winnipeg who took his seat a few minutes ago pointed out the same circumstance in another form. I think it is sufficient to bring that defect before the House to convince every hon. member of the necessity of a change in our law. Needless is it for me to say that in each and every case the man elected should represent the majority of his electors, and if we come to the conclusion that a different result might follow under the existing law, I think it is the duty of Parliament to change that law in order to give effect to the will of the electorate. Proportional representation, Sir, although relatively new, is not an entirely new system. I find

that proportional representation has been in effect in over ten countries, including Galicia, Denmark, Sweden, Belgium, the Netherlands, Switzerland, two or three of the Balkan States, and Brazil. Further, wherever the system has been given a fair trial it has never been discarded, which speaks strongly in favour of its merits. The hon. member who introduced this resolution quoted many instances in which flagrant injustice has been done to the electorate. I might perhaps add to the long list. Indeed, if one should go through the results of parliamentary elections in this and other countries the book which I am now holding in my hand would not be large enough to contain all the examples of the dire injustice to the electors on account of the present system not being as effective as it should be to give proper expression to the will of the electorate. While the hon. member was speaking there came to my mind two instances which are familiar to us and which occurred in the Federal elections of 1917. In those elections the country west of the Great Lakes elected only two Liberal members. Is it to be supposed, Sir, that under proportional representation more than two Liberal members would not have been elected there? The answer is obvious. Taking my own province, sixty-two Liberals were elected as against only three Unionists. Is it reasonable to suppose that the Union party could not have secured more than three seats if proportional representation had been in operation? I do not believe it, I am sure of the contrary. Therefore, we have on the one hand in the West the Liberals deprived of that representation which they should have had; and, on the other hand, in the province of Quebec we have the Unionists deprived of the representation which they should have had. And these are typical of other cases that could be cited.

11 p.m.

Now, proportional representation to my mind is only an expression qualifying a proposed change in the present electoral system. The change might also come under the form of transferable votes for single constituencies, or under any other form. But at all events, as was clearly demonstrated by the hon. Minister of Immigration, it is certainly a reasonable and just reform, and the House owes it to itself and to the country that a special committee be appointed to consider this question very thoroughly and report thereon to the House, and then every member will be able to carefully study that report and be able to express an enlightened opinion on the subject.

I will not attempt to enumerate the many advantages which in my opinion would follow the adoption of proportional representation, but I might bring to the attention of the House one point which was raised some time ago by the hon. member for Red Deer (Mr. Clark) when speaking on the address. in substance he said that in the Old Country, England especially, when a man has become a national figure, whether it be in one party or another the people will support him at the polls and almost invariably that man will be returned to Parliament as often as he desires. We know that history supports that statement. In this country, where politics are not so well developed as they are in the older countries, and where perhaps the political sense is not as keen, we often see men of the highest integrity and unquestioned ability defeated at the polls. Well, whatever party such men belong to it is always a loss to the country when they fail to secure re-election. When men have made their mark in Parliament, men of the type we have in this House, I do not care to what party they belong, my opinion is that such men have become an asset to their country and should be encouraged to remain in public life. Under the present system we have seen time and again our best men defeated simply because the electors have not had the advantage of voting under a system of proportional representation.

Mr. McMASTER: They could be put in the Senate.

Mr. DENIS: The resolution as amended simply asks that a committee be appointed. Taking into consideration the fact that this question is a most important one and that members on both sides seem to be most anxious that it be debated at length, I think it is only proper and right that the resolution as amended should carry and that a special committee to investigate this matter should be appointed.

Mr. JOHN HAROLD (Brant): Mr. Speaker, I rise to support the amendment proposed by the Minister of Immigration (Mr. Calder). I feel that the Government are to be commended for the stand they have taken with regard to the request that a committee be appointed to consider this important question. I am not an enthusiast, nor have I been entirely won over to proportional representation, but being a so-called minority representative, I have given

the matter a good deal of consideration. One point to which I should like particularly to refer is the desirability of having the transferable vote in the single-member constituency. In our own constituency the representative in the provincial House is a minority representative; he did not secure fifty per cent of the vote in the riding. As I took part in a three-cornered contest, the same thing resulted, the vote being about 2,100 out of a total of 5,400. Now we have to face the situation which confronts us. We are going to have in many constituencies throughout the country representatives of three or four different groups of thought and we should consider in what way the laws should be changed so that the best representatives can be selected from those constituencies. From my experience I would say that the adoption of the transferable vote would lead to a much better condition in such constituencies from the standpoint of fairness and honesty in elections. Considerable influence would be brought to bear in such cases to have certain candidates withdrawn in order that a combination might be effected against some other candidate. On the other hand, we know from experience that influence would also be brought to bear with a view to bringing out certain candidates in order to split certain votes and to elect the one whose success was desired by those working for such an end. If every group is perfectly free, without the exercise of any influence, to put its representative in the field, a candidate's election being impossible if the sentiment of the majority of the people is not beind him, a much more desirable state of affairs in regard to elections in such cases is brought about.

I understand that the present Government in Ontario polled the smallest number of votes of the three parties that were running. They themselves recognize the weakness of their position and have quite consistently pressed that some change be made in order that a similar condition might not again prevail. We are experimenting with proportional representation in the provinces and the municipalities. It seems to me that this Parliament should proceed very cautiously in respect to any proposed changes; we had better profit by the experience of those who are already carrying on experiments. Furthermore, one trial is not going to tell the tale. Sometimes a new thing is taken up enthusiastically; many people are interested in making it a success, and it proves to be a temporary success. But we have to keep in mind the necessity of having a strong and stable government and at the same time of changing our electoral machinery from time to time so as to take care of any abuses that arise through the changes in the opinions of the people such as their desire to form themselves into different groups. The Government have, I think, correctly interpreted public opinion in this matter. I have every confidence that the committee which is to be appointed will come to a wise decision, one that would prove to be a benefit to the country at the next election.

Hon. T. A. CRERAR (Marquette): Mr. Speaker, I do not wish to let this occasion pass without extending a word of commendation to the Government for granting the committee asked for in the resolution moved by the hon. member for Peterborough (Mr. Sexsmith). Let me say at once that I am in entire accord with the principle of proportional representation, and that it has my hearty support. It is a principle that has long since passed the experimental stage. It is a significant fact that those European countries which have adopted it and applied it in their legislative system are to-day perhaps the most orderly countries in the world, and are among those subject to the least political disturbance. The system has prevailed in Belgium, Holland, Denmark and Sweden for many years and has operated very successfully. There is very good reason for that; for it is simply an extension of the principle of representative government.

In 1916 the British House of Commons, the mother of parliaments, arranged for a Speakers' conference to consider this among other matters of reform in their electoral system, and that Speakers' conference, composed of the most representative men in the British House of Commons, brought in a unanimous report in favour of the application of the principle of proportional representation in the conduct of elections in the United Kingdom. It is, therefore, not a question of experiment; it is a principle which has been tested and tried and the operation of which has been proved to be successful.

Reference has been made to-night to the experience of Winnipeg in the last provincial election. I have talked to many representative men in that city, and without exception, irrespective of political affiliations, they are strong in their commendation of the principle as it was actually

worked out in the last provincial election in Manitoba. I am heartily in accord also with the application of the system of preferential voting in single-member constituencies. My hon. friend from Brant (Mr. Harold) has referred to the fact that we have quite a number of groups, shall I say, seeking representation in this House. In a constituency where three or four candidates are running it may very well happen—indeed it is almost certain to happen under our present method—that the successful candidate will represent the minority of the electors in the constituency. That, indeed, was the case in the election held in East Elgin last autumn and in the election later held in Peterborough. By the application of the principle of preferential voting in single-member constituencies that difficulty can be overcome and the representative finally selected will be the representative of a majority of the people in the constituency. I was much impressed indeed with the remarks of my hon. friend from Joliette (Mr. Denis) and I endorse the arguments he advanced in favour of this reform. I am glad the Government has granted this committee; I trust it will investigate the matter fully, and I would offer this suggestion to the committee, that has not yet been appointed, but will be, according to the statement made by the Minister of Immigration and Colonization (Mr. Calder), that it might be a very appropriate and useful thing if all the members of this House would hear the principles underlying the system of proportional representation explained by some of the gentlemen whom, I am sure, the committee will call before it to give evidence. I wish, in closing, to express my strong support of the principle, and I trust the work of this committee will result in the system being adopted by this House.

Mr. W. F. COCKSHUTT (Brantford) Mr. Speaker, for fear it might be presumed that every member of the House is in favour of proportional representation, I think it is well that one should say a word or two against the proposition, and at the expense of being considered singular, I am going to risk the operation and say that, in my judgment, the recommendation that this House should endorse such a principle as proportional representation is, to say the least of it, folly. The hon. member for Joliette (Mr. Denis) has named ten countries, I think, in which he says proportional representation has been in operation for several years. With all due deference to the countries that he named, I do not think they can show anything to Canada or to the British Empire about government. I take the ground that proportional representation is entirely unsuitable to the British system of government, which is that the majority of the people should rule. I cannot see that proportional representation is going to bring that about by any manner of means. Proportional representation is a help to group and class systems, both of which are most undesirable to be introduced into this country. I say that with all deference to my hon. friends opposite who may not agree with me on that. I was informed, within the last few minutes, by a western man—and I think he was telling me the truth—that only recently the Farmers' party themselves in the West tried out this system in their own convention, and they were obliged to abandon it as being too cumbersome even in electing their representatives in their own meeting. Perhaps the hon. member for Marquette (Mr. Crerar) can tell me whether or not that is true. I have every reason to believe it is.

Mr. REID (Mackenzie): Will the hon. member kindly tell the House what province in the West that happened in?

Mr. COCKSHUTT: I cannot tell my hon. friend the province, but I can get the information and let him have it in the morning. The gentleman who gave the information is within the confines of this building, and I suppose it is a matter of common knowledge that in one of the western provinces within the last few months the farmers tried out this system in their own convention and they were obliged to abandon it because they found it cumbersome and unworkable.

Mr. CRERAR: If I might be permitted to interrupt the hon. member for a moment, because I am quite sure he does not wish intentionally to get astray, his statement is altogether wrong. The system has been applied in those conventions; it has worked out successfully without any question of doubt whatever, and it has not been abandoned anywhere.

Mr. COCKSHUTT: If that be the truth —and I am bund to accept the statement of the hon. member for Marquette—I say: So much the worse then for the commonsense of the farmers' organizations. I thought they knew better than to try their own physic on their own bodies, but apparently they did not. Proportional representation is at present being con-

sidered in the Ontario House by a committee similar to the one proposed, and the riding from which I come is proposed to be one of the victims. That is one reason why I feel particularly strong upon this question. One of the selected constituencies upon which the physic is to be tried consits of the county of Brant, containing two members, the county of Oxford, containing two members, and the county of Waterloo, containing two members. Therefore, I examine the system in the light of what I know about elections and about those particular constituencies. In the first place it is desirable that a community should know the men for whom they are voting. Is that not desirable? It cannot be done in six Ridings. A candidate is hardly known in his own Riding until he has run in two or three elections. Perhaps it is well that he is not known too well. That may be; but whether it be the case or not, it is an axiom of British procedure at any rate that a candidate should be a local man; that his character and ability should be known; that he should have some stake in the community and that he should be a man in whom the people have confidence. In six Ridings that is not possible. Futher, supposing a vacancy occurs by death or because of malpractice in elections; what happens? The successor has to run in six Ridings to be elected. Supposing a man in one Riding was selected as a minister of the Crown; he would have to run, and be elected, not in his own Riding, but in six.

In other respects proportional representation is a most cumbersome and undesirable system; it will advance the class system and the group system. I understand that in Medicine Hat a paper has been established recently by the Non-Partisan League formerly of North Dakota, who have moved into Canada. They have bought up a paper there, if I am credibly informed, and they have proposed eight classes to run in the coming election. It is a great mistake for the people of Canada to break up into eight classes. I want to see a party run, that will run on a policy for the general advantage of Canada. That will be my policy; and I think I can show, in just a few words, that it will be possible for forty-five per cent of the vote in Canada to be given on a platform that was for the general advantage of Canada and that that party should not succeed, and that the seven other groups, by buying certain privileges from one another, can make a working arrangement by which seven different fads will be bought up and paid for at the expense of the people, and thus fifty-five per cent of the vote will be controlled, and forty-five per cent, which was a solid vote for the general advantage of Canada, will be side-tracked under proportional representation. That is quite possible; it is quite probable that it will be done. We know from time to time a group is ready to sell out if it can get its price, its price would be some fad that it has set its mind upon, and it is ready to sacrifice all other interests for the advantage of this one particular fad that is selected by it as being the most important thing at issue in the present crises. The British system has grown up under a thousand years of parliamentary reform. We have the British system in Canada; they have it very largely in the United States, and I say with all deference to the ten countries my hon. friend has mentioned, that they cannot show any one of those three countries, Great Britain, Canada and the United States, anything about up-to-date responsible government.

Mr. CRERAR: They are adopting it in Great Britain.

Mr. COCKSHUTT: I do not think so, and I do not think the hon. gentleman will live to see the day that it will be adopted in this House, unless such a calamity should happen as that a certain group should get into power, and I do not think that will happen. If we are going to investigate all the fads that are proposed, we should at the same time send to this committee the recall, the referendum, the initiative and all those fads that have been copied from certain parts of the United States and brought into our western country. Let us make a clean breast of it and a clean sweep. I would be in favour of a representative committee properly appointed, investigating proportional representation, because I believe such a committee would kill it.

I say the House would in a way be stultifying itself if after this committee brought in its report the House turned it down, which possibly would be done, a consummation devoutly to be wished. In my judgment the proposition should not be entertained by whatever committee may be formed. I do not think our time should be spent in following up these various fads, and certainly they are abroad in the land at the present moment. This is a time when ordinary old-time common sense cannot get a place, but has to make way for every kind of fad proposal for hampering the people and bringing in laws for the sake of multiplying them, instead of for

the advancement of the people. As I said in the House recently, I would far rather hand my name down to posterity as a man who had prevented noxious laws from getting on our statute books than I would be known for having introduced ten or twenty or fifty laws of very doubtful character, and whose utility would be disproved as soon as put in operation. There is too much of that kind of legislation altogether, and I for one think that this House should not lend itself to this proposal even to the extent of appointing a committee.

Though not many have so far spoken, and perhaps nobody else will speak in this House on this occasion against this proposition, I believe I am speaking the view of a very considerable number of members of this House when I say they have absolutely no use for proportional representation. In fact, a western man told me that there are 257 varieties of it, which is 200 more varieties than there are of Heinz pickles, so this is a pretty pickle—257 varieties of proportional representation! I understand that in Winnipeg it took over one week to find out who was elected under proportional representation. Is it desirable to keep the public in suspense that time, to keep the home fires burning and the brass bands and the processions waiting for a week before you find out who is elected? I understand that proportional representation has been abandoned in certain parts of British Columbia that had it in a municipal way. I understand that in Calgary, where it is in operation, the people—at any rate, those I have had an opportunity of speaking with—have absolutely no use for it. Others who have tried it are all nearly of the opinion that it should not be introduced into Canada to any great extent.

I want it distinctly understood, Mr. Speaker, that so far as I am concerned I do not oppose the committee, because I think they will do their duty, and if they do, they will kill this proposal and all the other fads connected with it. We will then get down to business and go ahead on the good old British system, which says that the people shall rule. What I want to see in this country is a proper redistribution of seats, so that one man will have one vote and one woman one vote, and so that one vote will have one value to elect. If that is done, a great deal of evil we are now labouring under will be removed. In some constituencies it takes 50,000 or 100,000 people to elect a representative, and in others only 13,000 people; I think everybody knows the constituency where the 13,000 people live. It is questions of that sort that we should be studying. I would vote to have a committee on a question of that kind at once, so that when a redistribution of seats is made it will be on the basis of population, on the principle that a certain number of votes has a certain value, whether those votes go to my hon. friends opposite or not. I do not want favours for any party. I say that the old British system that has been tried out and proved to be good for generations should not lightly be set aside because some new fad is being introduced into Canada from countries that cannot show us anything about liberty, good government, or stable organization. I understand that some of these governments change over night, that a certain group may be here to-day supporting the Government, and to-morrow jump to the other side because they have been bought up by some particular fancy, or some particular idea that may be entirely undesirable. The result is that they sell out, and the Government goes down over night. Many countries of Europe change their premiers and their cabinets almost every twelve months, and some much oftener. That is a most undesirable thing to encourage, and therefore I say that if this committee is going to kill this fad I will certainly vote for the committee. I do not believe any committee can investigate the question without killing it, and all the attendant fads that go with it. They are all in line, and are brought in largely by the same people. The referendum, the recall, the initiative, and all that sort of trash should be all buried together by this one committee, and if they will do that, I will certainly hold up both my hands for appointing it.

Mr. A. R. McMASTER (Brome): I had not intended to intervene in this debate but the remarks made by the hon. member who has just resumed his seat (Mr. Cockshutt) with that intense, genial and enthusiastic Toryism which marks his every utterance, make me feel that I would like to say just a word or two. He reminds me of that Irishman who followed the advice: whenever you see a head, hit it. Whenever a new idea comes up my hon. friend takes a crack at it. "It's a new idea," he says, "away with it." The hon. member has referred to the old British system. I am always somewhat doubtful of the logic of a gentleman who leaves aside reasoning on the instant to appeal to patriotism, and here not only the

logic of the hon. gentleman is wrong, but his history, because the old British system was two knights from a shire and two burgesses from every borough. They did not have a single-seated constituency, but a double-seated constituency, which gave in a somewhat meagre and attenuated form a degree of porportional representation.

My hon. friend also talks about the initiative, the referendum and the recall, as fads from the United States. My idea was that the initiative and the recall had their rise in Switzerland, not in the United States. Certainly the referendum had. He also says: I want to have our party get the votes to which it is entitled; I want every voter to have a vote of equal value; and he referred to the fact that some constituencies in this country are very much larger than others. I agree with my hon. friend; there are some a great deal larger than others, and that constitutes an unfairness for which, of course, members who represent the smaller constituencies are not responsible. They cannot get more votes than there are in the constituencies, but if they get three-fifths of the votes which were cast in the last election, as the member who now modestly addresses this House got, my hon. friend should be perfectly well satisfied.

Let me just say this: Our parliamentary institutions are on trial. I do not think even the hon. member for Brantford (Mr. Cockshutt), if he would sit down and carefully study matters, would say that our present single-seated constituencies give a just result. For instance, in the election of 1904, the Liberals in Nova Scotia cast about 56,000 votes, and the Conservatives, for the Conservate party was then called the Conservative party, without trimmings, got 46,000 votes.

Mr. COPP: It was well trimmed that time.

Mr. McMASTER: So well trimmed that the Liberals came back with the whole 18 seats. Although the Conservatives in Nova Scotia had polled within 10,000 of the votes polled by the Liberals, they had no representation in this Parliament at all. Now does my hon. friend think that was fair to the Conservatives of Nova Scotia? I do not think he does. Of course, my grief at the situation was not as great as his, but I say it was not a square deal to the Conservatives of Nova Scotia, and did not properly represent the voters of Nova Scotia, whether Conservatives or Liberals. Then, in the election of 1911, the same thing happened again, only here the boot was on the other foot. In the British Columbia elections the whole seven Conservative members were elected with about 25,000 votes while the Liberals, who had 16,000 votes, elected none at all. I do not think that is fair representation, and our present system does not give that equality of voting which we all desire. Is it reasonable or right that to-day in this House the province of Ontario should have only some eight Liberals? Is it fair that, in federal matters at any rate, for the last twenty of twenty-five years, the great city of Toronto has never had a Liberal representative? It is not fair; it is not right; and when there is such unfairness, it seems to me that we should cast aside our disinclination even to consider what is new and should say, after all:

> That men may rise on stepping-stones
> Of their dead selves to higher things.

Mr. COCKSHUTT: Is the hon. member desirous that proportional representation should be introduced into Quebec and all other parts of Canada?

Mr. McMASTER: Oh, of course. I am a Liberal, and I want only fair play. In the last election, the public sentiment of Quebec was such that even under proportional representation I doubt whether there would have been any great difference in the number of men returned. But under ordinary circumstances, during the last few years, the single-seat system has tended to over-emphasize the Liberal representation of Quebec and similarly to over-emphasize the Conservative representation of Ontario. That has been the tendency of the single-seat system, and it is a bad thing. Anything that causes the Canadian people to divide on religious, or racial, or sectional lines is a great mistake. The only lines on which our people should divide are lines of political opinion. As Mr. Asquith said, in speaking of proportional representation, there should be no substantial strain of public opinion unrepresented in the House of Commons. It is true we may have to make some changes in our practices in Parliament; it is true we may have more groups than we have now, although I am not sure about that. But the fundamental principle is that people should have the right to rule through their elected representatives and a

system of eleetion should be devised and put into practice which will bring into the House of Commons the strains of public opinion in the same proportion, or as nearly as possible in the same proportions as they exist in the country. It seems to me that no one, whether in favour of this system or not, could object to the proposal made by the Minister of Immigration and Colonization (Mr. Calder) that we should have a committee. I am sure this will appeal to the members of the House. There is Biblical authority against refusing to examine any proposition. If it be of good it will succeed, and if it be of evil, then in the long run it will fail. I heartily support the amendment, and I trust that all members of the House will unite in at least examining into the question.

Mr. MICHAEL STEELE (Perth S.): Like some of the previous speakers, I feel that I ought to apologize for taking up even a few minutes at this time of night; but, with the hon. member for Brantford (Mr. Cockshutt) I should not like this opportunity to go by without saying a word as to what I think on this question. I am very much in agreement with the hon. member for Brantford on this subject. I believe that in the discussion to-night, and perhaps in the discussion generally on the question of proportional representation, the fact is lost sight of that we are endeavouring to substitute not only a different method of conducting elections, but also, unconsciously perhaps, to substitute a different method of government, for what has been the practice in the British Empire for many years. There is no system of election that is perfect. Proportional representation is not perfect, as is evident from the fact that there are, as some one has said, 257 varieties of it. My study has led me to believe that there are 300 varieties and none of them is entirely satisfactory. That also is evident from the fact that no two countries, at least so far as I know, have adopted the same system; each has a system varying from that of any other country. But I desire to get back, as the hon. member for Brantford did, to the good old British system. Ridicule it as we will, criticize it as we may, endeavour to substitute for it anything we choose, we cannot ignore the fact that the British system has built up the greatest Empire the world has ever seen, and that under that system the people of Great Britain have proven themselves the best governors that the world has produced. Not only has their own country been better governed than any other country, but their colonies and dependencies have enjoyed the same good government. The British have been more successful in colonizing the world and in governing their colonies than any other nation has been. That, to my mind, is pretty good evidence of the value of the system of government which they have been practising. But not only has this system proven its value in the British Empire, but the greatest Anglo-Saxon nation of the world, outside of our empire, the United States, practically uses the same system, with the exception that its executive is independent of Parliament, while in British countries the executive is really part of Parliament and subject thereto. Under the party system of Great Britain, it is essential that there shall be a strong executive. In Britain and in Canada the duties of the government are not only administrative, but legislative; the governments of these countries govern as well as administer. If the only function of government were to administer, then I would admit that proportional representation might very well be used. But where Parliament and the Government must govern, it seems to me that it is absolutely necessary that the Government shall have a good strong majority so that they may not be dependent on any clique, or group, or set of men for their support, relying only upon those who consistently support them in their general policy. We have heard a great deal to-night about the evils of the present system and members being elected by minorities. Under the proportional representation system every elected member is a minority member.

Mr. McMASTER: No.

Mr. STEELE: You cannot elect a member under the proportional representation system by a majority vote. The number of votes required to elect a member in each of the constituencies under proportional representation is found by dividing the total number of votes cast by a number one greater than the number of representatives required.

Mr. McMASTER: Plus one.

Mr. STEELE: Yes; one greater than that number; so that any member elected by that system must be a minority representative. Some criticism has also been made of the single member constituency. But one advantage of the single member constituency is that it provides one of the very things which advocates of proportional representation demand: it gives minority

representation; if not representation to the minority in that constituency it gives representation to the minority in the country, and that is the minority that ought to be represented and is entitled to be represented. I believe that every man who is elected to the House of Commons of Canada is elected, first, as a supporter of the national policies which are best adapted to the needs of Canada. That is the first thing that he must support. The next thing that he must do is to represent the people of his constituency—not only those that voted for him but all the people of his constituency—and I say that in no country in the world, and never in the history of Canada, has there been such need as there is to-day for representative men with a national outlook who are prepared to stand by the policies which are developed and offered by this Dominion. In order to have that it is necessary for us to get away from parochial ideas, and petty policies, although they may please a section of one constituency—may please perhaps a section even of one province. We need to get down to greater things, the more important things, the things that, to my mind, are to-day essential for the welfare of Canada.

Let us elect men who will support the national policies of Canada. In order to bring that about it seems to me we must retain the system that we have at present. But we cannot retain it if we adopt proportional representation, and if the people of each constituency divide into two, or three, or four or five or six classes; one class perhaps, or even two classes, with their ideas on great national questions, and the balance divided up as to whether a man should be a farmer or something else, whether he should be a labouring man or something else—supporting one man because he advocates a certain view which is not before the electors of the country at all but is merely held by some of the electors in his constituency—enough, the candidate thinks, to elect him. Now we cannot build up a great nation in Canada by adopting that method of electing our representatives to Parliament.

In 1909 a Royal Commission was appointed by the British Parliament to look into this whole question—not only the question of proportional representation, but the many and varied methods, of electing their representatives. One portion of the report of that commission dealt with the present system of electing members in single member constituencies by the process of a relative majority, and the opinion expressed on that system was this:

> None has been devised more simple for the elector, more rapid in operation, more straightforward in result—advantages in an instrument for use by a large electorate of varying intelligence which it is difficult to over estimate.

Now, is there not a good deal of truth in that statement? Is it not a fact that what we want is not a system which will be mathematically correct—because after all the system of election by proportional representation is largely a mathematical system. What we want is a system which will appeal to the intelligence of our people, which the average person or,—in fact, every elector—can use with reasonable intelligence, a system by which the people can mark their ballots in such a way as will show what the individual elector, at least, believes is best for our country? Talk about the transferable vote and the alternative vote! I think there is a good deal to be said in favour of both, but the fact is that in Western Australia where they have I think, the transferable vote—they have one or the other—only sixty-five per cent of the voters made a second choice. And what, after all, is the value of the second choice? Is it not the electors first choice that is important? It will be the custom for every elector, I think, to give less consideration to his second choice than he gives to his first, even less consideration to his third than he gives to his second; and the result will be that men will be elected on second, third or fourth choice, the most ill considered choices which the elector makes.

Small majorities will cripple governments; and I know of nothing more unfortunate for Canada to-day than that this Parliament should, at the next election, or at any time within the near future, be so composed that no one party can carry on with a strong support and a strong majority. That would be the most unfortunate position this Parliament could get into. Why I would much prefer seeing my friend the leader of the Opposition in control of affairs in this country than that condition should exist. I would even go so far as to say that I would prefer even to see my hon. friend from Marquette (Mr. Crerar) in control of the affairs of this House rather than witness a condition where no party could control. What Canada needs to-day is a stable government, a strong government that can carry on, and if the policy which that government adopts is wrong, the people of the Dominion will

attend to it and attend to it very promptly.

Something was said by the hon. member for Marquette about this system being in use in Belgium. I am sure the hon. gentleman does not intend to advocate that we in Canada should adopt a system that is in use in Belgium. The system in vogue there is the "list" system where a list for each party is made out and arranged, as I understand it, by—shall I say—the organizers of the party, arranged in a certain order, and each elector votes for a list. He ignores the personnel of the representatives entirely, and the policy they are working for—the elector merely votes for a list. Or would my hon. friend advocate the system of proportional representation in operation in France, which has produced for many years a general election in that country every few months or every year or so. That is what we would probably get in this country if proportional representation were adopted at the next election.

Mr. PROULX: Does the hon. gentleman say they have elections every year in France? My understanding is they only have elections there every five years.

Mr. STEELE: They have had a change of government there much more frequently than that in the last few years on account of the ministry being unable to secure the support of a majority in the House. It might be of interest to us to hear what some of the men who helped to build up the British Empire in the past have to say on this system of proportional representation. Disraeli discussed it in debate in 1870. That is a considerable time ago, but the British system then was much the same as it is to-day. This is the opinion which Disraeli gave on the system of proportional representation. He said that such schemes are:

> Refined and fantastic arrangements for the representation of the people

He also said:

> Proportional representation is a proposal opposed to sound principle, the effect of which would be to create a stagnant representation and bring about a feeble executive; an admirable scheme for bringing crochety men into the House; a scheme of coteries, not the politics of nations; which if attempted would end in chaos and confusion.

John Bright was opposed to the system and so were Gladstone and Harcourt. If the British Empire has produced any greater men than these, I am not familiar with their history.

[Mr. Steele.]

Now, there are practical objections to proportional representation which have not been mentioned, and one is the large constituency. I am free to admit that a system which might be very convenient for the people of Great Britain or in the other densely populated countries of Europe would be entirely unsuited to a sparsely settled country like Canada. It would be impossible even in the older portions of our country for any representative to become familiar with the views of the people in a constituency made up of four, or five or six of the present constituencies, and when we get into our newer sections, such as Northern Ontario, Northern Quebec or the Western Provinces, it would be entirely out of the question. Imagine a constituency as large as the half of Saskatchewan to be canvassed by the men seeking election. How much would the people know of their qualifications? It seems to me that the advocacy of this system for Canada to-day is far ahead of the times, and while I think it was very wise indeed for the Government to agree to the appointment of this committee to study the system of proportional representation, I am only sorry that they did not also instruct the committee to inquire into the present system of representation in view of the disparity in the size of our constituencies. To my mind that is one of the greatest electoral evils we have to-day. A man representing a constituency of 13,000, 15,000, 18,000 or 20,000 certainly is a minority representative compared with the man who is representing a constituency of 60,000 or 80,000 people.

That is all I have to say on the matter at the present time.

Hon. W. L. MACKENZIE KING (leader of the Opposition): Mr. Speaker, I should not like this debate to conclude without giving expression to my own personal views on this important subject of proportional representation. From such study as I have been able to give it, I find myself in full sympathy with the principle. I wish also to support the amendment which has been proposed by the Government, and to congratulate my hon. friend the President of the Privy Council on having brought forward an amendment which at last gives this House the privilege of getting information on at least one important public question.

Part of my study of proportional representation was made as a member of a select committee of this House, and I have been rather interested in listening to the

different speeches to find that no single member appears to have had any knowledge that such a committee had investigated this important subject. During 1909, 1910 and 1911 that select committee was 12 m. appointed, and my hon. friend from Brantford (Mr. Cockshutt) who has spoken so strongly this evening against any committee was one of those who at that time supported the motion in favour of a committee.

Mr. COCKSHUTT: I rise to a point of order, Mr. Speaker. I was not a member of the House at that time.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: Oh, yes.

Mr. COCKSHUTT: Excuse me. I came in in 1904 and was out from 1908 until 1911, and therefore did not support the appointment of the committee at that or any other time.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: I accept the statement of my hon. friend. I was under the impression that he had been in the House continuously from the time that he was first returned. I owe him an apology if he was not in the House at that time. However, a committee did take this matter in hand and was unanimously supported by the House of Commons of that day. I am not sure that its report has been printed. My impression is that it has been, but I have been unable to secure a copy from the Library this evening. I mention the appointment of that committee as an evidence that the subject has already been under consideration by a committee of this House. What is needed for a correct understanding of proportional representation is the most careful study which it is possible for hon. members to give the subject. If any evidence were needed in support of the wisdom of having a committee appointed, it would be found in the speeches made by the hon. members for South Perth (Mr. Steele) and Brantford, (Mr. Cockshutt) and Frontenac (Mr. Edwards), all of whom were more or less inclined to view proportional representation as something not in accord with the principles of the British electoral system. What is that system other than an endeavour to give expression to the democratic principles of justice and freedom?

Proportional representation, so far as I can see, is a juster system than any we have at the present time, in that it gives the electors, whether of a minority or a majority, their fair share of representation in Parliament, where their views can be aired; and it seems to me that it also gives greater freedom in that it allows the greatest possible latitude to every citizen in expressing his choice of who shall represent him in Parliament. Because proportional representation is founded on the true democratic principles of justice and freedom, and as it gives better expression to those principles in our electoral machinery, I for one, strongly favour its adoption.

However, it is desirable that a resolution of this importance should, if possible, receive the unanimous support of the House. It is apparent from the debate that if hon. members were asked to vote on the resolution as moved by the hon. member for East Peterborough it would not receive unanimous consent. On the other hand, I am inclined to believe that the amendment proposed by the Government will, notwithstanding the one or two reactionary addresses which we have listened to this evening, receive the almost unanimous support of hon. members. This will mean that at least we will have a committee appointed to carefully study the merits of proportional representation and make a report to the House.

In conclusion, reverting again to what I said at the outset, it is a sign for which we on this side I am sure are all duly grateful, that the Government seems at last to be waking up to the wisdom of doing something which we have constantly urged this session. The last two amendments that we moved, one asking that every department of the Government should supply this House with information, and the other to the effect that it was desirable in the public interest that we should have as adequate representation as possible during the present session, were voted down by the supporters of the Government. Tonight fortunately my hon. friend brings in an amendment which recognizes the wisdom of giving the House information and of finding a way for more adequate representation. I congratulate him on this improvement. I hope the Government will follow the lead he has given, and I trust his supporters will lend a hand by giving his amendment their unanimous support.

Mr. A. THOMPSON (Yukon): Mr. Speaker, I am glad this subject has been brought to the attention of the House, particularly for my own sake, because it is one I have found great difficulty in arriving

at an opinion on. Maybe there are other members who are in the same position. We shall now have an opportunity of giving the subject careful study and of hearing the evidence which will be submitted to the proposed committee. So far as my observations have gone I am not quite sure whether I am in favour of proportional representation or not. However, I want to approach the question with an open mind, and I shall endeavour to do so. It must not be forgotten that the splendid system of government which our forefathers worked out and under which we are operating, was founded altogether upon the majority system, and that system is the basis upon which the representatives in the parliaments of the Empire are selected. It is a system which, I think, we should not hastily cast aside.

So much for proportional representation. There is, however, in the working out of this majority system of ours a development which occurs from time to time which has never seemed to me to be quite in keeping with the spirit of our representative institutions or with the genius of our people. I refer to the case of a single constituency in which one member is elected out of three or four candidates. We have instances of it in the House at the present time. The amendment proposed by the minister to-night will give us an opportunity of considering a remedy for that in the preferential or transferable vote, so that when more than two candidates run in the same constituency the candidate who is elected will represent a majority of the electors. That principle, indeed, has been adopted by us, in our political conventions, as well as by the United States in theirs. When a number of candidates are nominated and a ballot is taken it is quite frequently found that no single candidate has the majority. In that case the low man drops out and the votes given to him are transferred by his supporters to some other candidate, and so the process of elimination goes on until finally a candidate is elected who has the confidence of a majority of the delegates at the convention. That principle, therefore, is not new. It seems to me it is quite compatible with the transferable vote, which would result in the election of a candidate with a majority rather than of a plurality candidates. I have much pleasure therefore, in supporting the amendment, and I feel sure that I shall obtain much information from the discussion which will ensue before the committee, the meetings of which I shall have great pleasure in attending.

[Mr. Thompson.]

Amendment agreed to.

Mr. J. A. SEXSMITH (Peterborough East): Mr. Speaker, I shall detain the House only for a few moments. I wish to say first that I have been very much pleased with the reception accorded to this resolution. Had the motion been accepted unanimously by the House, including my two good friends so close by, the member for Brantford (Mr. Cockshutt) and the member for Perth (Mr. Steele), I would have had serious doubt whether the proposal was a desirable reform or a movement forward. I myself am a Conservative; I like to cling to some of the old things—those that are good, but I like to discard those things which are ready to be discarded, and look onward to the future. We talk about this great Canada of ours and about British principles of freedom. Well, that is the reason why I introduced the resolution—because if under our old system, one man's vote is equal to the vote of six other men, I say that condition is not British. But that is exactly what has been taking place in almost every election since Confederation. We have in Ontario sometimes one Conservative vote worth four or five Liberal votes. We have in Quebec, as I said to-night, one Liberal vote worth six Conservative votes. We had the spectacle in Nova Scotia in 1904 of 46,000 Conservatives unable to get one representative while 56,000 Liberals got eighteen. Now, I ask my hon. friends from Brantford and from Perth, is that British fair play? Is that British justice? If it is, I do not understand British fair play or British justice.

I wish to say, Mr. Speaker, that I gladly accept the amendment offered by the Minister of Immigration and desire to thank him for taking the matter into consideration. I hope and trust that a committee will be appointed and that it will go on in good British style and secure some better system than we have to-day, a system fairer and more British—and if it is more British it will be more just.

Motion (Mr. Sexsmith), as amended, agreed to.

Right Hon. ARTHUR MEIGHEN (Prime Minister): Mr. Speaker, if there is no objection I would move now, while we are on the subject, seconded by Mr. Calder:

That the special committee appointed this day to consider the subject of proportional

representation and the subject of the single transferable or preferential vote and the desirability of the application of one or the other or both to elections to the House of Commons of Canada, consist of the following members: Messieurs Blair, Calder, Crowe, Currie, Davidson, Denis, Harold, Manion, McMaster, Molloy, Pardee, Sexsmith, Simpson, Sinclair (Antigonish and Guysborough), Thomson (Qu'Appelle), Whidden.

Motion agreed to.

PROPOSED SELECT STANDING COMMITTEE ON RAILWAYS AND SHIPPING

On the proposed motion of Mr. Maclean (Halifax):

That Rule 10 of the House of Commons, relating to the appointment of the Select Standing Committees of the House, be amended by adding to the Select Standing Committees of the House a Select Standing Committee on "Railways and Shipping" owned, operated or controlled by the Government; and that the Special Committee appointed to prepare and report the list of members to constitute the Standing Committees for the present session, be instructed to prepare and report the list of members to compose the Select Standing Committee on "Railways and Shipping" owned, operated or controlled by the Government, for the present session.

Mr. MACLEAN (Halifax): I wish to move that this motion be discharged from the Order Paper.

Motion agreed to.

On the motion of Right Hon. Mr. Meighen the House adjourned at 12.17 a.m. Tuesday.

Tuesday, April 5, 1921.

The House met at Three o'clock.

PRIVATE BILLS

FIRST READINGS

Bill No. 48 (from the Senate), for the relief of William John Bell.—Mr. Tudhope.

Bill No. 58 (from the Senate), for the relief of Hazel Galbraith.—Mr. Douglas (Strathcona).

THE BUDGET

On the Orders of the Day:

Hon. W. L. MACKENZIE KING (leader of the Opposition): I should like to ask my hon. friend the Minister of Finance if he is yet in a position to give the House any information as to when he intends to present his Budget.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON (Minister of Finance): I am afraid that I cannot give my hon. friend any definite date. But progress is being made, and we are getting nearer to the Budget every day.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: Can my hon. friend give an approximate date—a week, two weeks, a month?

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: I should hesitate to give even an approximate date, for I should not like to disappoint the House.

GRIFFENHAGEN AND ASSOCIATES

On the Orders of the Day:

Hon. CHARLES MURPHY (Russell): May I inquire from the leader of the Government if any person in any way connected with Griffenhagen and Associates is still in the employ of the Government, and if so, what work such person or persons are doing, and under what authority?

Right Hon. Sir GEORGE FOSTER (Minister of Trade and Commerce): In answer to my hon. friend I would say that the contract, as per notice, has been cancelled, but the work of organization a part of which remains unfinished will still be carried on by the subcommittee of Council with the aid of certain persons employed from that company.

Mr. MURPHY: How many of them are still employed?

Sir GEORGE FOSTER: Not many. I could not tell my hon. friend the exact number at the moment, but I will find out and let him know, probably to-morrow.

ANSWER TO INQUIRY FOR RETURN

On the Orders of the Day:

Right Hon. ARTHUR MEIGHEN (Prime Minister): In answer to the hon. member for Kent, N.B. (Mr. Leger) who inquired yesterday as to the progress of a return ordered by the House on March 14, I may say that the delay in bringing it down occurs by reason of the way the notice of motion for production of papers was framed, it being worded by the hon. member in the general form which, I venture to suggest is too often used, and which compels inquiry to be made of, and reply awaited from, every department of the Government. If hon. members would confine notices of motion to cover only the department they have in mind, they would get returns more rapidly. This particular return really covers the Department of Indian Affairs, but being general in its form inquiries had to be made of all departments. The answer from the Department of Indian Affairs went to the Secretary of State some

time ago, and consequently it will only be a short time until the return is brought down.

BUILDING TRADES' CONFERENCE

On the Orders of the Day:

Right Hon. ARTHUR MEIGHEN (Prime Minister): In answer to the hon. member for Russell (Mr. Murphy), who inquired yesterday whether the Government intended to defray the expenses of the delegates who will attend the Building Trades' Conference, I am informed by the hon. the Minister of Labour that it is the intention to make the same allowances as were made to the delegates to the Industrial Conference of 1919.

[Sir George Foster.]

GRAND TRUNK RAILWAY—ALLEGED DEFAULT OF INTEREST

On the Orders of the Day:

Right Hon. ARTHUR MEIGHEN (Prime Minister): I desire to refer to an inquiry made yesterday by the hon. member for Cape Breton North and Victoria (Mr. McKenzie) with regard to the reported default of the Grand Trunk Railway on certain securities interest on which fell due April 1.

The House will no doubt remember that the Act embodying an agreement which passed this Parliament calling for an arbitration tribunal to determine the value, if any, of the three preference and common stocks of the Grand Trunk Railway provided that the arbitration tribunal should have nine months from the date of the appointment of the arbitrators within which to secure evidence and make their award, such nine months being capable of extension by approval of the Governor in Council. The provisions of the agreement also called for the Grand Trunk Directors remaining in possession pending the result of the arbitration and the making of the award, a committee of management being established in the meantime with certain limited powers. Owing to the heavy demands made upon the Government for financing the road while the Grand Trunk thus remained in possession, owing as well to what we believed to be dilatory methods of preparing for, if not conducting, the arbitration, the Government felt that there should not be further financing except what we might be under legal obligation to pay or a further extension of time, involving as it probably would, still further financing with the Grand Trunk in control, unless the time contemplated by the original agreement for the transfer of possession and control should be adhered to notwithstanding any extension.

An intimation of the Government's position was made to the Grand Trunk Railway a very considerable time ago. Up to the present, arrangements for that transfer have not been made. As a consequence there has not been further financing by the Government since the final intimation of our position was made. That may have something to do with the reported default on April 1. I have only to add that the Government has as yet no official intimation that the Grand Trunk did default, but inasmuch as a statement did come from the President that they would not be in a position to pay, it is not improbable that the report is correct.

[Mr. Meighen.]

CASE OF SMALLPOX ON THE SCANDINAVIAN

Hon. J. A. CALDER (Minister of Immigration and Colonization): A question was asked yesterday by the hon. member for Assiniboia (Mr. Gould), concerning a case of smallpox that had broken out on a steamship arriving at the port of St. John a short time ago. I have received a statement from the department in connection with that inquiry which is as follows—

> The original case developed the fourth day out from Antwerp, March 19th. The patient was at once isolated; so were two immediate contacts occupying the same room. Then everyone on the boat was vaccinated. No other case developed on the voyage.
>
> During the period of incubation there is no risk in the way of general transmission. In the present case the incubates would have developed only after landing.
>
> Only a few Anglo-Saxon passengers shipped at Antwerp. These had their cabins on the upper deck (B), with those who embarked at Southampton later. The Continental Antwerp passengers occupied (C) deck below. We know for a fact that the upper deck passengers used a different dining room, parlour and living room from the Continental. The only common place of meeting was the upper after deck from the promenade, which was very little used by passengers detained, thus reducing the possibilities of contamination to a minimum.
>
> The Health Department considers that no unjustified risk was taken in making the separation that was made.

Mr. OSMONDE GRATTAN ESMONDE

Mr. S. W. JACOBS (George Etienne Cartier): A Vancouver despatch this morning announces that Mr. Osmonde Grattan Esmonde has been arrested on orders from the mayor of Vancouver for alleged sedition. The despatch goes on to

say that the case will probably be disposed of by the Immigration Board. Has the Minister of Immigration any information to offer the House regarding this matter?

Hon. J. A. CALDER (Minister of Immigration and Colonization): I have no information whatever; I was not aware of the fact that Mr. Esmonde had been in Vancouver.

Mr. JACOBS: Will the minister make inquiries?

Mr. CALDER: I will, yes.

THE CANADA WEST INDIES TRADE AGREEMENT, 1920

On motion of Right Hon. Sir George Foster, (Minister of Trade and Commerce) the House went into Committee to consider the following proposed resolution, Mr. Boivin in the Chair:

Resolved, (1) That it is expedient to approve the agreement dated the eighteenth day of June, 1920, between the Government of the Dominion of Canada and the Governments of certain of His Majesty's colonies in the West Indies, which agreement is termed "The Canada West Indies Trade Agreement, 1920";

(2) That the provisions in the said agreement relating to the customs duties upon goods, the produce or manufacture of any of the colonies, the government of which is a party to the said agreement, be sanctioned and declared to have the force of law in Canada;

(3) That the Governor in Council shall have power to prescribe, by proclamation published in the Canada Gazette, the day upon which the preferential treatment of the said goods provided for in the said agreement shall be brought into force under the terms of the agreement with respect to each of the said colonies, the extent of such preference within the limits prescribed by the said agreement where the exact amount thereof is not specified in the said agreement, and the day upon which the preferential treatment of the said goods of any of the said colonies is terminated under the said agreement;

(4) That the Customs Tariff, 1907, and the amendments thereto be amended in accordance with the provisions of the said agreement; and

(5) That the Act to be based upon these resolutions shall come into force on a day to be fixed by proclamation of the Governor in Council published in the Canada Gazette.

Mr. FIELDING: Is this agreement to be found in the Votes and Proceedings?

Sir GEORGE FOSTER: It was laid on the Table some time ago. I will also have placed in the boxes of hon. members copies of the report of the proceedings of the conference, of which this agreement is the result. The resolution pretty well explains itself, and I would rather take the discussion of the subject on moving the second reading of the Bill. I should like to get the matter advanced to that stage, but if there are any questions which hon. members desire to ask, I shall be glad to answer them.

Mr. FIELDING: Does the right hon. gentleman propose to introduce the Bill immediately?

Sir GEORGE FOSTER: Yes.

Mr. FIELDING: And deal with the matter in Committee at a later stage?

Sir GEORGE FOSTER: Yes.

Mr. FIELDING: That is reasonable.

Mr. LEMIEUX: Has my hon. friend received any petition from the tobacco growers in connection with this Treaty?

Sir GEORGE FOSTER: I do not remember having received any.

Resolution reported and concurred in. Sir George Foster thereupon moved for leave to introduce Bill No. 59 respecting the Canada West Indies Trade Agreement, 1920.

Motion agreed to and Bill read the first time.

FRENCH TREATY

On motion by Right Hon. Sir George Foster (Minister of Trade and Commerce), the House went into committee to consider the following proposed resolution, Mr. Boivin in the Chair:

Resolved, (1) That it is expedient to approve the provisions of the Trade Agreement made between the Government of the French Republic and the Government of Canada, dated at Paris the twenty-ninth day of January, 1921.

(2) That the Governor in Council may make such orders and regulations as are deemed necessary to carry out the provisions of the said agreement, and such orders and regulations may be varied or revoked, and they shall be laid before both Houses of Parliament as soon as may be after they are made.

Sir GEORGE FOSTER: I would like to make the same remarks with reference to this resolution that I made with regard to the other: we will take the discussion of the matter on the second reading of the Bill. The agreement has been laid on the Table and has been printed—at least the order has been given for the printing—and if the resolution passes I will introduce the Bill founded upon it which also is printed.

Mr. LEMIEUX: May I ask my right hon. friend, who has returned but lately from France, if, during his interview with the French Government and especially with the Minister of Trade in France, mention was made of the exhibition train which will

be sent throughout Canada, from ocean to ocean, this spring? My right hon. friend knows that the Chamber of Commerce in France have made certain arrangements with the railway companies in Canada, and the harbour authorities in Montreal especially, with a view to sending some of the French commercial exhibits throughout the Dominion, provided that Canada makes a similar exhibition in France at a later period. My right hon. friend will know what I am referrng to; I think he has had some conversation on this matter with Senator Beaubien. When I was reading about my right hon. friend's discussion with the French Government, my attention was called to some speeches delivered in Paris and some articles published in the press over there, to the effect that as a result of this treaty this arrangement would be put into effect and would be conducive to more extended trade relations between the two countries.

Sir GEORGE FOSTER: The proposition to which my hon. friend refers was one placed before the merchants of France and some officers of some of the departments of government there, long before the negotiation of this agreement and did not necessarily—and did not as a matter of fact—come up when we were talking with reference to this treaty. That was a matter along the line of commercial development which is not based upon the treaty, so to speak. But, so far as my knowledge goes now, the arrangements are pretty well completed for an exhibition train, furnished with samples of French merchandise, to make a tour of our country —going from city to city and stopping for a little time in each, the exhibits being upon cars of the train and remaining there, and advantage being taken at the same time for film representations, more or less extended, of not only the exhibits which are being shown but of French productions and French scenery. The films are said to be of a most excellent quality, and some samples that I have seen fully bear out that statement. In return for that we give certain facilities, in fact all the facilities that we possibly can. The railroads do the hauling and provide the cars and, practically, the Dominion of Canada, as a government, has no expense in the matter. The French Government and authorities, in their turn, undertake to facilitate a similar train being carried through France fitted out with exhibits from Canadian producers, industrial and otherwise, and to give to that train and those exhibitors the same facilities and courtesies that are extended to the French train in Canada.

Mr. FIELDING: I concur in the view expressed by my right hon. friend that the details of this matter may be better considered when we have the Bill before us in Committee of the Whole, and therefore I do not rise to offer any objection to that course. But I want to call my right hon. friend's attention to a somewhat queer "scrap of paper" which he has circulated, and which purports to be an agreement. The only information which we have at the present time on this subject is that "scrap of paper." It is headed "An Act respecting a certain Trade Agreement between His Majesty and the President of the French Republic." Yet it is not in the form of an Act, and there is nothing in it to show that it is intended to be an Act, but it goes on to state that it is a trade agreement between France and Canada. It not only does not seem to be in the form of a treaty but is entirely lacking in all the characteristics of one. I cannot imagine that this is a complete copy of the document. If this is the actual and complete agreement as it has been arranged between the Government of Canada and the Government of France its presentation in such a form is a very unusual proceeding. I only call my right hon. friend's attention to the fact now in order that before he brings in the Bill we shall be supplied with information in proper form, and shall have an exact copy of the treaty, or agreement, and not merely a "scrap of paper" which is evidently not complete.

Sir GEORGE FOSTER: The agreement itself has already been laid on the Table, as I informed the committee a moment ago, and is being, or has been printed; it is either now distributed, or will be immediately distributed, to hon. gentlemen. We are now dealing with the resolution and my hon. friend assents to its being passed. A Bill, founded on the resolution, will be introduced which, on being passed by the House, becomes the Act governing this matter.

Mr. CLARK (Red Deer): Has the whispering now going on any reference to the trade question?

Some hon. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

Sir GEORGE FOSTER: My hon. friend must have seen the agreement itself because it has been placed on the Table. I have not drafted the Bill which is to be

founded upon this resolution; that duty has been performed by the officers of Parliament.

Mr. FIELDING: I have seen the only information on the subject, as far as I know, that my right hon. friend has caused to be laid on the Table. What I hold in my hand is apparently a copy of what was laid on the Table and that, I repeat, is headed "An Act respecting a certain Trade Agreement between His Majesty and the President of the French Republic." It is not in the form of an Act, there is no reference to His Majesty in it from beginning to end, and it is clearly lacking in all the characteristics of an agreement. In substance the information may be there, but in documents of this character we do not want merely the substance—we want complete copies, and no complete copy of this agreement I am satisfied has been laid on the Table.

Sir GEORGE FOSTER: There is a great difference of opinion then between my hon. friend and myself because I certainly gave the agreement to the Prime Minister, and I think he laid on the Table the whole of the official documents.

Mr. FIELDING: Well, here is a document which was laid on the Table. If my hon. friend has any other I would be happy to see it; I do not know of any other. This appears to be an agreement, I suppose it is fair to say that in substance it is an agreement; but in documents of this character, which are necessarily of a formal nature, we should have a copy of the actual agreement itself.

Mr. MEIGHEN: I see the point raised by the hon. gentleman. It has not the form of an Act, and it would appear to me as if something had been omitted by the parliamentary counsel; nor when he purports to describe an agreement, does the opening recital look to me as if it was really the beginning of the agreement. I will have both matters looked into by the parliamentary counsel, but doubtless the substance of the agreement is there.

Resolutions reported.

JUDGES ACT AMENDMENT

On motion of Right Hon. C. J. Doherty (Minister of Justice) the House went into committee to consider the following proposed resolution, Mr. Boivin in the Chair:

That it is expedient to provide,—

1. That the provisions of section eleven of chapter fifty-six of the statutes of 1920, entitled An Act to amend the Judges Act, withdrawing the exemption of certain judges from the operation of certain taxes, shall not apply to the present Chief Justice of Canada.

2. That an additional judge of the Court of King's Bench for the province of Saskatchewan be appointed at an annual salary of nine thousand dollars.

3. That paragraph (b) of section eighteen of the Judges Act be repealed and in lieu thereof provisions be enacted as to when certain judges of the Supreme or Superior Courts of the province of Nova Scotia, New Brunswick, Manitoba, British Columbia, Prince Edward Island, Saskatchewan and Alberta are not to be paid travelling allowances for attending court or chambers.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: Explain, please.

Mr. DOHERTY: Mr. Chairman, I will try to explain this resolution so far as it calls for explanation. The reason why it is essential that the Bill proposed to be introduced be preceded by a resolution is that it provides for the salary of an additional judge in the province of Saskatchewan. The legislature of that province has increased the number of its judges in the court of King's Bench by one. The purpose of one of the clauses of the Bill is to make provision for the salary of that additional judge. There are two other clauses. One of them is to correct an error. In the legislation for the increases made last year in the judges' salaries, provision was made that all judges whose salaries were increased by that measure should, both as to their salaries and as to any retiring allowances they might later be entitled to, become subject to the payment of income tax. The fact was overlooked that the salary of the chief justice of the Supreme Court, though in words it appeared perhaps to be increased, was not in reality increased. Prior to that legislation the salary of the chief justice of the Supreme Court was fixed at $10,000, and he was voted annually an allowance of $5,000 as remuneration for the performance of his duties as Deputy Governor General. By the legislation of last year the salary was made $15,000, but it was provided that it should cover not only the performance of his duties as chief justice but of his duties as Deputy Governor General. So as a matter of fact no increase whatever was made in the actual remuneration. It was therefore considered unfair, and I think I am safe in saying that it was not intended, that, receiving no increase, he should be made liable to the payment of income tax. It is proposed to rectify that error. The third clause has to do with the payment of travelling allowances to judges in the

provinces mentioned. It is to correct an abuse that has grown up, resulting from the fact that in those provinces the place of residence of the judges are not fixed by provincial law, so that in the past they apparently have considered themselves—and I think they could not be criticised for that—entitled to reside wherever they chose. That, of course, does not concern this Government or this Parliament, save in so far as it affects the amount allowed for travelling allowances. The purpose of this clause is to provide that judges who under provincial legislation are free to fix their places of residence where they please, shall not be entitled to travelling allowances for attending court at the centres where the proper seat of their court is.

Mr. EDWARDS: If I understand the minister correctly, we are informed by him that the second part of the resolution is to provide that a judge who does not travel is not in future to receive anything for travelling expenses. That is a wonderful piece of legislation; it is really remarkable; if it means that in the past we have been paying judges certain amounts of money for travelling expenses when they did not travel, then it is certainly time the abuse was rectified. We had an oustanding case some time ago where a chief justice did pull down some $5,000 for travelling expenses when he did not travel. That amount of money we received back after considerable trouble and after considerable wriggling on the part of that particular chief justice. It was nevertheless a reflection upon the common sense of this House that the payment ever was permitted. I want to enter my protest, Mr. Chairman, as a member of this House against the first part of that clause exempting the chief justice of Canada, who is in receipt of a salary of $15,000 from payment of income tax.

An hon. MEMBER: He is too poor.

Mr. EDWARDS: I venture to say that if you will fly in the face of public opinion to the extent of increasing the sessional indemnity of hon. members to $15,000, we will all be willing to pay income tax on that amount. Why in the name of reason is the chief justice of Canada to be exempted from paying income tax on his salary of $15,000?

An hon. MEMBER: Shame.

Mr. EDWARDS: I am only a layman, but for the life of me I cannot see any rhyme or reason in any proposal of this kind. The minister says that really no increase was made to the salary, that the $5,000 was added to the $10,000 salary of the chief justice to cover his expenses for acting as Deputy Governor General of Canada. Was anything more ridiculous ever uttered on the floor of this Parliament? Let us have done with this subterfuge and camouflage. Every hon. gentleman knows that it does not cost the Chief Justice of Canada $5,000, or $500, to come to this Parliament now and then to act for the Governor General. It does not cost him $5,000, or $500, occasionally to write his name on a document as Acting Governor General. The thing is absolutely ridiculous. If you want the salary of the Chief Justice of Canada to be a certain sum, fix it at that sum and be done with it. The principle is unsound, Mr. Chairman; a man who receives a salary of $15,000 a year should not be exempt from income tax. I for one will vote against this motion.

Mr. DOHERTY: I very much regret that notwithstanding my effort to speak both loudly and clearly, I should have conveyed to the hon. member the impression that this resolution proposes to do something which it does not propose to do and something with which it has nothing to do. In certain provinces, owing to the fact that the law did not fix the places at which the judges should reside, the judges found themselves free to choose their own places of residence. Under the existing legislation, which had in view the provinces in which the places of residence were fixed by law, provision was made for travelling allowances when a judge attended court elsewhere than at his actual or legally fixed residence. Our attention was called to the fact that in certain of these provinces where there was not a legally fixed residence the judge selected his residence and charged travelling allowance when he travelled from that selected residence to the chief cities where the sittings of the court were held. We did not and we do not think it is right that there should be a travelling allowance under these circumstances. If a judge in the exercise of his own free will chooses to reside elsewhere than at the principal city where his work is, we think he should not have travelling allowances—and the purpose of this measure is to provide accordingly—except, of course, in cases where by law he is compelled to reside in some place

other than the chief centre where the sittings of the court are regularly held.

Now, with regard to the Chief Justice, this is not a provision to introduce a system under which the salary of the Chief Justice shall be exempt from income tax. Wisely or unwisely, the legislators of the past provided that the salaries of the judges should be exempt from taxation. That was the law under which the present Chief Justice and all judges prior to the legislation of recent years were appointed; they were to have a certain salary and they were to be exempt from taxation. Now, it is one of the fundamental principles of the British constitution that the independence of the judges must be made as certain as possible, and it has been universally recognized that in order to accomplish that, their remuneration should not be subject to reduction at the pleasure of the Government or of Parliament. The salaries of all judges other than the Chief Justice of the Supreme Court were increased last year and it was considered right as a condition of that increase to remove the exemption and to subject their salaries to taxation. But the reason for removing the exemption did not exist in the case of the Chief Justice because his remuneration remained the same as before, only that previously it was divided into two sums, one of $10,000, his salary as Chief Justice, and one of $5,000, his salary or remuneration as Deputy Governor General. That $5,000 was not in the nature of an allowance to pay expenses.

Mr. EDWARDS: What if he goes overseas to attend the sittings of the Privy Council?

Mr. DOHERTY: The law at present makes a provision of $3,000 for any qualified judge who sits on the Privy Council. The present Chief Justice has never sat in the Privy Council.

Mr. LEMIEUX: Who does?

Mr. DOHERTY: Last year, and, I think, the previous year, Mr. Justice Duff did. But that has nothing to do with a question of allowance for expenses.

Mr. LEMIEUX: Who selects the judge who sits on the Privy Council?

Mr. DOHERTY: Well, it is subject to the approval of the Governor in Council.

Mr. LEMIEUX: Has the Chief Justice anything to say in the matter?

Mr. DOHERTY: There is no law defining how it ought to be done, but as a matter of propriety certainly the Chief Justice should be consulted. So far as I am concerned in the matter I certainly would consult with him before coming to any conclusion.

Mr. CANNON: The person who sits on the Privy Council has to be a Privy Councillor as well as a judge, has he not?

Mr. DOHERTY: Yes. Any member of the Imperial Privy Council who is or has been a judge of a High Court in any of the dominions is eligible to sit on the Judicial Committee of the Privy Council.

Mr. LEMIEUX: When was Mr. Justice Duff made a Privy Councillor?

Mr. DOHERTY: I cannot recall the precise date, but I think it was two years ago. I would like to make this quite clear, if I may. This is not a question of allowance for expenses at all; the Chief Justice has had this salary or remuneration for acting as deputy Governor General for years back and the legislation of last year, therefore, left him absolutely where he was. If this legislation should not now be passed, you would have this anomalous situation, that the legislation of last year, intended to increase the judges' salaries operated to reduce the remuneration of the actual Chief Justice, and had no other effect as regards him.

Mr. McLEAN (Royal): I am sorry I cannot understand the perhaps very clear explanation made by the Minister of Justice (Mr. Doherty). Sometimes in the past it has been difficult for me to follow him on account of his speaking very low, and it is difficult for members to hear clearly what he states. What I understand the Minister of Justice to state is this. This measure is to remedy a hardship on the part of the learned Chief Justice of the Supreme Court of Canada. What we members, who object to this resolution, object to, is the principle that is established that the Chief Justice shall not pay income tax. That is a bad principle to go out to the country. Under the law as it stands at present, every man in Canada is liable to pay income tax; that is the principle that stands and that should be enforced, and the Minister of Justice has no right to make an exception. If, as stated by my hon. friend (Mr. Edwards), you want to increase the salary of the Chief Justice, increase his salary. But is this not true? The salary of the Chief Justice is raised to $15,000; is he not now entitled to retire on $15,000?

Mr. DOHERTY: No, because in that same legislation it was provided, in the first place, that all judges appointed in the future should be liable to pay income tax; second, that with regard to all judges of the Higher Court appointed in future, the provisions enabling them to retire on full salary should be repealed, and that as regards all existing judges, in fixing the amount of their retiring allowance, where they were entitled to their full salary, the increase of last year should not be taken into account. So that the position of the actual Chief Justice of the Supreme Court is this: As long as he remains on the bench, he will receive absolutely the same remuneration that he received before the legislation of last year. If he comes to retire, having fulfilled the conditions which, under the past law, entitled a judge to retire with his full salary, he will retire with that full salary, not as it is created by the legislation of last year, but as it stood before that legislation, that is to say, with a retiring allowance of $10,000.

The hon. gentleman asked one other question. He asked—Was this laying down the principle that the Chief Justice of Canada should be exempt from taxation? It is not. The principle that has been laid down for the future is that the salaries of all judges appointed hereafter shall be liable to taxation. As regards existing judges, the salaries of all
4 p.m. judges whose salaries were increased by last year's legislation, shall be liable to income tax. But as regards those judges whose salaries were not increased, we were bound by the contract which was made with them when they were appointed and under which their remuneration was to be exempt from taxation. We took occasion of the increase made to make, as a condition of the increase in salary, the withdrawal of the exemption to which judges were otherwise entitled. In doing that, however, we withdrew from one man, who got no increase at all, the privilege to which he was entitled under his appointment, and we could not justify our action in that regard as being hte condition of an increase in remuneration.

Mr. McLEAN (Royal): I thank the learned Minister of Justice for his lengthy and perhaps not very clear explanation, because I am still in a little doubt in comprehending all he says. What I understand him to say is this. We are making this poor man suffer by increasing his salary by $5,000. That is unfortunate. Before that he received $5,000 for the onerous duty of acting as deputy Governor General. Very good. The learned Minister of Justice has not brought before our attention this matter: that all the other judges were allowed extra remuneration for extra work when they served on Royal commissions. They were often taken off the bench and appointed on Royal commissions and on other special work for which they received extra remuneration. It is now put into the Judges' Act that the increase of salaries shall cover all extra work that judges may perform; that they shall not receive one dollar more for extra work, which they may perform on Royal commissions or other work. Are they not then on the same ground or standing as the Chief Justice? They are prevented from earning this extra remuneration. The learned Chief Justice is prevented from earning this extra remuneration. But to come back again, this is the principle on which I want to stand. I have no objection to the salary of the learned Chief Justice being increased. The position should carry an ample salary to command the highest legal talent in this Dominion, and $15,000 is too small a salary for the Chief Justice of Canada. Why, you are paying to counsel, retainers of $20,000 and so many hundred dollars a day. If you go to Montreal at the present time, you cannot obtain a leading counsel under $10,000 or $12,000. So I say, I am not objecting to the salary being increased; I am objecting to this roundabout way of doing the thing. It is not the right way of carrying out the increase in the Chief Justice's salary. I think the salary of the Chief Justice of this Dominion should be $20,000.

Mr. EDWARDS: I may have misread into the resolution something that was not intended.

Mr. McMASTER: Louder.

Mr. EDWARDS: My hon. friend should consult a specialist down town with regard to his hearing. If I have misread or misinterpreted the resolution prepared by the Minister of Justice (Mr. Doherty), some members in the House will, I am sure, be good enough to excuse me to a certain extent. It is not always easy to arrive at a conclusion after a resolution has been prepared or a sentence uttered by the Minister of Justice. It is unquestionably my fault or my misfortune, that I have not had that legal training to enable me to follow, if I may speak without offence, the twists and turnings of a legal mind.

Mr. McMASTER: Order, order.

Mr. EDWARDS: I had no reference to the hon. member for Brome when I used that expression. Now, Mr. Chairman, even if I did come to the conclusion that some members of the bench were receiving travelling expenses when they did not travel, am I to be blamed for coming to that conclusion? I do not have to remind the Minister of Justice of the very outstanding instance in this country where a certain legal gentleman collected money for travelling expenses when he did not travel, and that there were certain gentlemen connected more or less closely with the law in this country who were prepared to excuse that action on the part of the Chief Justice of the Dominion of Canada. I am one who will not excuse him. The Lord defend me from the legal quibbles and technicalities that we have handed out to us here on the floor of this House.

The Minister of Justice says that when the salary was fixed at $15,000 there was no increase made in the salary of the Chief Justice. I say that in my estimation, and I believe this was also in the minds of other hon. members of this House, there was an increase made in his salary when it was fixed at $15,000. It was in my mind, and I believe in the minds of many hon. members, that he was not earning the $5,000 he got for coming down here once in a while and acting on behalf of the Governor General—that he was not earning $5,000, nor $4,000, nor $3,000, nor $2,000, in doing that;—and when it was agreed to fix the salary at $15,000, that was taken into account, and it was considered that we were giving him a definite, and a pretty substantial, increase in salary. That is the way I viewed it, at all events; I considered that it was an increase. Formerly, his salary was $10,000. The other was, of course, a little side line that gave him another $5,000, but we made the thing definite and fixed his salary at $15,000.

We hear a good deal about the independence of the judiciary, that it is necessary to fix their salaries at a certain figure in order that they may keep their honour above reproach, and all that sort of thing; we have heard that time and again. So, when the salary of the Chief Justice of Canada was $10,000, in order that he might not be subjected to any temptation to stray from the path of virtue, we gave him another $5,000 for trotting down here once in a while and signing his name when the Governor General was absent. Then in order to shield him still further from temptation and keep him in the path of rectitude, we gave him another $5,000 to trot over to England once in a while to attend the sittings of the Privy Council. But all that did not prevent a Chief Justice from collaring the money even though he did not go overseas. What was wrong? There was no income tax at that time to lead him away from the path of virtue. Were we remiss in not fixing his salary at $100,000 so that he would not feel like pocketing $5,000 that he did not earn? Something was wrong. He took money that he was not entitled to, that he had never earned. Even though he was the Chief Justice of this Dominion, I repeat, he took money that he never earned and was not entitled to. If we are to fix their salaries at the point where, like Caesar's wife, they will be above suspicion, we have never yet reached that point, apparently.

The principle of the thing is wrong in my estimation. We have our income tax. We have a man who is supposed to be something superior in intelligence dropped down from Heaven to this earth to make regulations in regard to the collection of income tax in this country. We have regulations now which make every man in this country who is liable to income tax, and even if he is not liable, his own assessor and his own collector, and he is liable to a fine, if he makes a mistake in assessing himself. That applies to people who are above the $2,000 mark, if married, and above $1,000, if single. But you must not touch the man drawing $15,000 because it was not in the Act that his salary was raised. Well, if that was not included in the Act, I submit that the proper procedure is to bring in a Bill to amend the Act and fix it up right instead of following this roundabout way. I object to any man in this country who is drawing a salary of $15,000 getting out of paying income tax; I do not care if he is the Chief Justice of Canada or who he is.

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: Mr. Chairman, I could perhaps put this matter before my hon. friend from Frontenac (Mr. Edwards) from a layman's point of view. The position before the legislation of last session was this, as I understand it, and I am following in this regard the statement which has just been made by the Minister of Justice. Each of the puisne judges of the Supreme Court of Canada received a salary of $9,000. The Chief Justice of the Supreme Court of Canada received a salary of $10,000. As Chief

Justice he was called upon, under the constitution of this country, to perform certain other duties, to act as deputy of the Governor General, and to discharge the duties of the Governor General whenever he might be absent. I might point out to hon. members that the duties in that respect are somewhat more extensive than has been suggested by hon. members who have addressed this committee in opposition to the proposed legislation. Not only had he the duty of representing the Governor General from time to time, at the opening of parliament when a new parliament had been assembled, and during the sessions of parliament from time to time when legislation required the assent of the Crown, but he also had the duty, and discharged the duty from day to day, during the Governor General's absence, of examining all the Orders in Council and giving his approval to them. I know personally that the Chief Justice of the Supreme Court of Canada has spent a considerable amount of time each day during the absence of the Governor General in performing that duty.

To go back to the observation which I made a moment ago, each puisne judge of the Supreme Court received a salary of $9,000, and the Chief Justice received as such, a salary of $10,000 a year. In addition to that, in view of the obligation placed upon him under the constitution to discharge the duties to which I have alluded, he had the additional remuneration mentioned by the Minister of Justice, amounting altogether, I think, to $5,000 per annum. By the legislation of last session the salary of each puisne judge of the Supreme Court of Canada was raised to $12,000—I think I am correct in that —and the salary of the Chief Justice of Canada was fixed at $15,000 a year. It was provided that that sum should include everything which had previously by way of allowance been voted to him from year to year in remuneration for the duties which he discharged as deputy Governor General. So that after the legislation of last session had been passed the Chief Justice of Canada received in all precisely the same remuneration that he had been receiving before, and each of the Puisne Judges of the Supreme Court of Canada receives $3,000 in addition to the salary that had been provided for him up to that time. The Minister of Justice has spoken of the further provision of the Act of last session which declared that any judge receiving an addition to his salary under that legislation should be liable to income tax. In the terms of the statute, that was made applicable to the Chief Justice of the Supreme Court of Canada, although, as a matter of fact, he received no actual increase to the remuneration which had been provided for him before. I am perfectly confident, and I am sure every hon. member must be confident, that the gentleman who is filling the position of Chief Justice of Canada would desire no exceptional treatment. It is merely suggested that he should receive fair treatment and, inasmuch as the remuneration which he is receiving at present is the same in amout, although differing in the method of appropriation, as that which he had received before, he naturally would feel that he ought not to be treated as if he had received an actual increase of salary. If I understand the statement of the Minister of Justice, that is exactly the position which he is placing before the committee to-day, and under all circumstances it seems to me that hon. gentlemen, on reflection, ought to reach the conclusion that the proposal, upon its face, is not unreasonable and is no more than just.

Mr. EDWARDS: If this resolution carries, as I understand it the Chief Justice's salary will be exempt from income tax. Suppose, as suggested by my hon. friend from Royal (Mr. McLean) this House saw fit to increase the Chief Justice's salary to $20,000, would he then come under the Income Tax Act?

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: I really do not desire to enter into a discussion of hypothetical questions, but in the case which my hon. friend has cited, there would be a distinct increase in remuneration, and there a liability to income taxation. The point I have endeavoured to make, if I have succeeded in putting it clearly before hon. gentlemen, is that the Chief Justice of the Supreme Court of Canada is receiving, in respect of the duties which he performs as Chief Justice and as Deputy Governor General, exactly the same amount as that which he received before the legislation of last session was passed.

Mr. EDWARDS: But if his salary were increased to $20,000 he would be liable to income tax, because there would be in that case an actual increase in his salary. How is it that he is liable to income tax now, in view of the fact that there has been no actual increase in his salary?

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: It is clear, I think. The form of remuneration has

changed, without the necessary qualification of the statute which should have been thought of last year, and which the Minister of Justice is now bringing to the attention of the House.

Mr. EDWARDS: That is to say, his salary does come under the income tax law. Why?

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: Owing to an oversight in the legislation of last year which is now being remedied.

Mr. EDWARDS: If the Act is wrong, then make it right.

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: That is what the Minister of Justice is doing.

Mr. HOCKEN: It is interesting to observe that if the salary of the Chief Justice had not been increased, but $5,000 had been appropriated as formerly, he would be liable for taxation on that $5,000. Was there any contract exempting him from payment of taxes on that $5,000 as well as on the $10,000? I do not think the question of the independence of judges comes into the matter at all; you might as well talk of the independence of members of Parliament. We had to pay income tax before our indemnities were increased, and every business man must pay his taxes, no matter what he makes. The situation is a rather strange one in view of the fact that this gentleman would be liable to pay taxes on $5,000 if he had been left in the position he was in before the Act of last session was passed.

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: The legislation proposed by the Minister of Justice has no effect whatever except in respect of the present incumbent of the office of Chief Justice. The purpose of it is to place him in the same position as he would have been in, if the legislation of last year had not passed.

Mr. BEST: Would it not apply to his successor?

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: No; it has no application to any future incumbent.

Mr. BEST: I believe that the Chief Justice and every judge should have a good salary. I am in favour of that, because they should be placed in an independent position. But we have a lot of trouble in Canada to-day, principally because, in my opinion at least, the people think that there are some who get too much and others who do not get enough. How can I go before my electors, who are honest people, some of them working hard the whole year round for $3,000 on which they have to support their wives and families, and justify a thing like this, when those people have to pay income tax on what little they make, while the Chief Justice goes scot free? I oppose that principle, for I do not believe that any man should be allowed to get off without paying the tax. If the salary is not enough, increase it, but let us have the same system applicable to all classes. I oppose the resolution on principle, and not because I think this gentleman is receiving too much. Probably he should get more. But the principle is wrong, and I cannot support it.

Mr. ROBB: The Minister of Justice, in introducing this resolution to-day, is creating embarrassments for his colleague the Minister of Finance, upon whose department devolves the duty of collecting the taxes to meet the extravagances of the Government. How can the Minister of Finance go out and demand taxes from people who are drawing $2,000 or $3,000 a year, when they know that his colleague the Minister of Justice has passed special legislation to exempt the Chief Justice of Canada, who has a salary of $15,000? The minister says it was owing to a mistake of last year; but that particular mistake and the resolution which the minister brings in to-day are creating new embarrassments for the Minister of Finance, who already has lots of trouble, and it seems to me that the minister would be well advised to accept the advice of his own supporters and withdraw the resolution.

Mr. DOHERTY: I should like to repeat one thing I said before, something which I do not appear to have succeeded in having penetrate into the minds of some of my hearers. I did point out that this legislation does not create exemption from taxation; that was created by legislation of the past which applied to the salary of the Chief Justice and, at that time, of all judges. The legislation of last year withdrew that exemption upon the ground that the conditions were being changed to the advantage of the judges concerned.

Mr. CANNON: Are the salaries of judges at present taxable not only as regards the increase but on the old salary?

Mr. DOHERTY: The taxation applies to the old salary.

Mr. CANNON: The old salary plus the increase?

Mr. DOHERTY: Yes.

Mr. CANNON: Why not treat the Chief Justice of Canada the same way?

Mr. DOHERTY: The proposal is to treat the Chief Justice exactly in the same way as any judge whose salary was not increased—that is all that we are doing. Under the law that withdrew the exemption from every man whose salary was increased this one gentleman found himself liable although he got no actual increase. This legislation is not to create a new exemption, it is to correct the error that withdrew the exemption.

Mr. TWEEDIE: The hon. member for Toronto (Mr. Hocken) suggested a question which I think has not yet been answered. The Chief Justice of Canada acts in a dual capacity,Chief Justice of the Supreme Court, and Deputy Governor General of Canada. Under the old statute he receives a salary of $10,000 a year as Chief Justice and for acting as Deputy Governor he gets $5,000 a year. It is virtually a matter of contract between the Government and the Chief Justice that his salary of $10,000 shall not be liable to taxation, but would the exemption apply to the salary of $5,000 paid him as Deputy Governor General?

Mr. CURRIE: As a layman I have some reluctance to discuss legal matters. However, the House is at one on this question apparently, and that is that there is no desire on the part of anybody to penalize the Chief Justice; it is only a question as to the method by which we may overcome this difficulty. Evidently the law of last year created the difficulty, and I think the simplest and easiest way of overcoming it is to grant an increase in salary. We are confronted with the difficulty that we cannot make any increase in the Estimates submitted to us by the Government—in fact in view of some past rulings of the Chair I am doubtful whether we can even discuss an increase in the expenditures. If, however, it is desirable to make up the sum to the amount of taxation that the Chief Justice is subject to, why not add $2,000, or $3,000, or $4,000 to his salary and let it go at that, and not have the impression go abroad that we are letting somebody escape from having to pay taxes? It is the easiest way to overcome the difficulty, and to my mind would best meet the situation as far as members on this side are concerned.

Mr. DOHERTY: First with reference to the question of the hon. member for Calgary (Mr. Tweedie). I have not the statutes before me, and I am not in a position to say positively whether the $5,000 paid to the Chief Justice as Deputy Governor was or was not liable to taxation. I recognize that the point ought to be looked into because it is not the desire to make his position better—the intention is to make it just what it was.

With regard to the other suggestion that we should meet this situation by an increase in salary rather than by the method proposed, I think it certainly is deserving of consideration. There is, however, this to bear in mind from the point of view of the charge on the country—that if you increase the salary it will apply to every future Chief Justice, whereas this provision would be of application only to the present incumbent of the office. If I might make a suggestion it is this: the necessity of passing a resolution before introducing this Bill is mainly, if not entirely, due to the clause which has not been questioned—that is the clause providing the additional salary for an additional judge in Saskatchewan. Now the suggestion I was going to make to the Committee is this: the passing of this resolution does not mean the enactment of the measure, it only makes it possible to introduce the Bill. The whole matter will have to come before the House when the Bill comes up for consideration, and my suggestion therefore would be that if the Committee pass the resolution we will consider between now and then the suggestion that has been made and be in a position later on to determine which is the more desirable course to take.

Mr. CURRIE: As long as we are not adopting the principle involved, and the Government is willing to consider the point raised, I do not see why we should not pass this resolution.

Mr. DOHERTY: The Committee will be at perfect liberty to deal with the matter at a later stage.

Mr. FIELDING: As stated by the Minister of Justice the case is this—that by an error in legislation last year we did penalize the Chief Justice and that was not the desire of Parliament. As stated by the right hon. gentleman this legislation, or something equivalent to it, is necessary to keep faith with the Chief Justice. Accept-

ing it in that spirit I desire to support the resolution, because I do not imagine that you can accomplish the same purpose in any other way without as much, or more, money being involved. But the discussion will be useful I think in the consideration of certain general principles to which I would like to make brief reference.

In the first place, I entirely agree with all that has been said regarding the desirability of giving our judges good salaries. I have supported every proposition that ever came before this House to advance the salaries of the judges; and if in the judgment of the Department of Justice and the Government of the day it would appear necessary, at any time, because of high reasons of State, to advance these salaries —not all of them—to a fair degree, in all probability I would support the proposition; I would not object to any generous and liberal stipend that is given if it is given as a straight salary. Then there should be no exemption. In this period of unrest when people are so unreasonably pressed it is an ugly thing to find some poor struggling business man paying a tax on $2,000 and discovering that a man receiving $15,000 is exempt; it is a bad state of affairs and it should not happen. Let us give the judges—and for that matter all other officials—decent salaries, but let them stand before the law and the country as citizens and pay their income tax the same as anybody else.

The next point I wish to make is this: I do not want any judge to be getting any pay by way of "side shows." I do not think the Chief Justice of Canada should get one penny for any extra duty discharged by him outside of the office of Chief Justice. I do not think he should be paid for acting as Deputy Governor General; it is part of his duties as Chief Justice of Canada. Pay him a decent salary as Chief Justice, and then see that he performs all the duties of his office. I do not think he should get a separate allowance in any shape or form, neither do I think that judges should get allowances for serving on commissions. The essence of the whole thing lies in giving a judge a liberal or generous salary and seeing that he gets it straight and square; do not pay him extra for doing something else. I do not believe either in dual services or dual salaries. Whatever the Chief Justice of Canada receives he should receive by virtue of his position as Chief Justice. The salary he gets as Chief Justice should be sufficient, and he should not be paid any more for any other purpose whatever, from the treasury of Canada.

Mr. MEIGHEN: I think I can say I am in hearty agreement with the hon. member (Mr. Fielding). The reason he gives for the introduction of this legislation has been, in the few words which he employed, as well put as it could be. Rightly or wrongly Parliament has historically adopted this principle—that when a judge's salary is fixed that salary shall not be reduced, shall not be subject to the will of Parliament whether exerciseable by way of reduction of salary or by way of the imposition of a tax. It may be questioned whether Parliament was wise in going so far as that. I know that this Parliament merely followed the example of the British Parliament, and I think the legislatures of United States as well, in that regard. It was thought that the desirability of placing the judges in a position where they could in no way be influenced in their conduct by a desire to appease Parliament or Government or anybody else was worth paying this price for, and that there should be taken from Parliament even the right by practice, if not by statute, to reduce their salaries at any time in the future, whether by actual deduction or by tax. I know it can be argued with some force that in going to that extent we may have gone too far. It may be argued that judges would not be subject to influence in any degree by taking their chances with the rest of the country; if the necessity for taxation came, even though it should mean a reduction in their remuneration, they would take their chances in that regard. But, any way, this much must be admitted, that whether the argument against any deduction under any circumstances is strong enough or not, it could not be contended for one moment that you should apply one rule to one judge or class of judges, and another rule to another judge or class of judges. The Chief Justice of Canada is entitled to stand in just as good a position in that regard as any other judge in the country.

Now, as a matter of fact when the Chief Justice came to his position he was entitled at law to a remuneration of $15,000. Consequently if we are going to adhere to the principle at all, we must see that that is not deducted from in any way whatsoever. We failed in this a year ago because it was not observed that the form of the statute was such, that the remuneration which he had a right to expect when he

took office was not secured to him. Having failed to do that then, whether the principle is right or wrong—and I think I speak the word of this House when I say that, though something can be said against it, on the whole the weight of argument is in favour of it—whether the principle is right or wrong, it must be adhered to in respect of the Chief Justice of Canada if we are to adhere to it at all. To adhere to it we must pass this legislation.

Only one possible argument that I can see should be taken into account in further consideration of this matter, and that is the argument advanced by the hon. member for West Toronto (Mr. Hocken) and supported by the hon. member for Calgary (Mr. Tweedie), that possibly under the law and the practice as it stood when the Chief Justice took office he had no right to expect that there would be no deduction for income tax in respect of the $5,000. If so, then we would still adhere to every principle that we have ever adhered to, if we made an exception in respect of that $5,000. Consequently I think that is a matter for further inquiry, but, except as regards that, it does seem to me that there is no sound argument against passing the Bill, and if we fail to pass it we shall be failing in our obligation to the Chief Justice of Canada.

Mr. NESBITT: Is the Governor General's salary exempt from taxation?

Mr. MEIGHEN: That is of course another question. My understanding is that it is.

Mr. NESBITT: If so, why should not the deputy's salary be exempt when he is acting in the Governor General's place?

Mr. MEIGHEN: That is another matter altogether. But the hon. gentleman, I am afraid, has missed the argument as I have sought to present it,—this seems to be a subject that it is impossible to state clearly; I studied the method of presentation as carefully as I could, and I have done my best to make it plain to all. The point is this. We have adopted in this Parliament, as in the British Parliament, the practice of securing to our judges the whole amount they had a right to expect would be secured to them when they took office. We departed from that practice in the case of the Chief Justice, in that we did not observe that the form of the statute imposed an extra deduction upon him. Having departed from that practice, we seek now to make it right. We want to make it right, but we do not want to go one dollar further; and if we are going further in respect of the $5,000 the Act should be amended. That is the intention of the Government.

Mr. JACOBS: I would like to ascertain from the Minister of Justice why it is that when the salaries of all the other judges were increased no provision was made for increasing the salary of the Chief Justice of Canada?

Mr. DOHERTY: I hope that light may shine in the darkness and that this time the darkness may comprehend. What was done was this. The salary, designated as salary, of the Chief Justice of Canada was $10,000. The salary so designated was made $15,000. But the Chief Justice, in addition to the salary of $10,000 so provided in the Judges' Act was in receipt of $5,000 a year for duties performed as Deputy Governor General. The wording of the statute last year in terms increased his salary as Chief Justice from $10,000 to $15,000, but went on to provide that that $15,000 should cover all the services rendered by him as Deputy Governor. So that while the statute with one hand, addressing the gentleman as Chief Justice, handed him a five-thousand-dollar increase, with the other hand, addressing him as Deputy Governor, it took $5,000 away from him. And so as to the amount he received he was landed just where he was.

Mr. JACOBS: Why was that?

Mr. DOHERTY: It was thought wise to include the whole remuneration in one sum precisely for the reason stated by the hon. member for Shelburne and Queen's (Mr. Fielding)—that it was considered undesirable that a chief justice or other judge should be receiving remuneration under other titles than the title of his judgeship. So uniting the two sums, as I said, in words we increased his salary, but, in fact, suppressing the remuneration of the Deputy Governor, we left the Chief Justice and Deputy Governor in receipt of $15,000.

Mr. JACOBS: That is to say, he is receiving now the same salary that he received before only in another form?

Mr. DOHERTY: Yes.

Mr. JACOBS: Is it not a fact that the Chief Justice refused to accept an increase in salary because it would have affected his pension?

Mr. DOHERTY: He never refused to accept any increase.

Mr. JACOBS: Then why, when we increased the salaries of the superior court judges of the province of Quebec from $5,000 to $9,000, almost double—there are cases of that kind—and his puisne judges are receiving as I understand, $12,000 a year, is the salary of the Chief Justice of Canada left at only $10,000, plus $5,000, or altogether $15,000? The butcher and the baker do not ask whether he got this partly as deputy governor and partly as judge. He was getting $15,000 before, and he is getting $15,000 now. It is simply the difference between Tweedledum and Tweedledee. The fact remains that the Chief Justice of Canada to-day is not getting any larger salary than he did before, while all the puisne judges and the chief justices of the provinces have had their salaries advanced. That seems to me to be an anomaly.

Mr. DOHERTY: That may be the reason why, as has been suggested, we should increase his salary. But is that a reason why we should subject his unincreased salary to a deduction? This legislation is only for the purpose of correcting that.

Mr. JACOBS: I have no objection to the legislation.

Mr. DOHERTY: I am open to consider objections.

Mr. CANNON: Is it not the fact, Mr. Chairman, that the law last year providing that a judge could receive no other salary but his salary as judge made it impossible for the Chief Justice of Canada to receive a salary as deputy governor, so that in reality his salary was increased by $5,000? If his salary had not been fixed at $15,000, according to the law passed last year he could receive only $10,000, because if he had drawn any salary as deputy governor it would have been against that law.

Mr. DOHERTY: His being deprived of the right to receive any outside remuneration was the condition under which he was given an increase. Before the legislation of last year, there was nothing to prevent his receiving a salary as Deputy Governor.

Mr. CANNON: But there has been since.

Mr. DOHERTY: In the case supposed, if we had granted no increase there would have been no prohibition in respect of receiving outside remuneration.

Mr. CANNON: If then, a judge in the province of Quebec declined the increase, would he be permitted to receive outside remuneration?

Mr. DOHERTY: All these things were dealt with by specific provisions. The case of the Chief Justice was dealt with by a specific provision so far as the Deputy Governorship was concerned—that his salary increase as judge should cover that. Then, the general prohibition of the receiving of other sums was dealt with by a prohibiting provision. The question of exemptions from taxation was dealt with by permitting a judge to decline the increase, in which case he would not lose his exemption. The Chief Justice was deprived of any extra remuneration as Deputy Governor, but it was provided that the two salaries should be merged into one, whereupon he became subject to the general prohibition against receiving any other remuneration.

Mr. CANNON: Would the exemption apply also to the pension received by the Chief Justice?

Mr. DOHERTY: The exemption from taxation fell upon the pension as well as upon the salary of every judge who became liable to taxation. The Chief Justice, having received no actual increase in remuneration and being not liable to taxation before, remained not liable to taxation, and that exemption applied to his salary as well as to his retiring allowance.

Mr. CANNON: If this legislation is adopted, then, the Chief Justice of Canada will not have to pay any taxes on his pension.

Mr. DOHERTY: In the same way that every judge who declined to take the increase provided by the legislation of last year is entitled to his salary and to his retiring allowance exempt from taxation.

Mr. CANNON: I am not opposed to the resolution; I am simply looking for information. The minister says that judges who have had their salaries increased may not receive any outside remuneration; but is it not a fact that even since the enactment of last year the right hon. gentleman has permitted judges to deviate from that rule and to draw moneys that they should not have drawn?

Mr. DOHERTY: Will the hon. gentleman be good enough to give specific cases?

Mr. CANNON: I will give the minister the case of Judge Désy, of Three Rivers, who has drawn $6,500 from the city of

Three Rivers as Royal Commissioner, an amount to which he is not entitled. The attention of the right hon. gentleman has been drawn to that case, but I do not think he has done anything. Does he intend to do anything?

Mr. DOHERTY: I am surprised that so distinguished a lawyer as my hon. friend should not be aware that the Minister of Justice exercises no authority over the judges. I do not sit here as the judge of the judges. If hon. gentlemen know that a judge has violated the law, the courts are open to them.

Mr. CANNON: Parliament, too.

Mr. JACOBS: And impeachment.

Mr. DOHERTY: If hon. gentlemen know that there is ground for impeachment, it is in their power to institute the necessary proceedings. If they think that the circumstances call for official action by the Government I would respectfully suggest that they bring the matter to the attention of the Government elsewhere than on the floor of Parliament. A specific rule of this House makes it not permissible to launch accusations against the judges on the floor of Parliament. There is only one method of disciplining a judge. If there be ground for impeachment in this instance, even if action ought to initiate with the Department of Justice—which I am not prepared to admit—I would suggest that the hon. gentleman give us the necessary information.

Mr. CANNON: The minister has the information.

Mr. DOHERTY: I have read a newspaper article which states that for holding a commission for a municipality this honourable judge received a remuneration. I myself do not undertake to be responsible for the statement of facts. But in the statute which sets forth the services in respect of which the judge is forbidden to receive extra remuneration there is reference to Government and provincial requirements; there is a saving of any right existing in favour of a judge under a Dominion or a provincial statute. Now, I have not studied the case, because I am not, as I have said, sitting here as master of the judges or as judge of the judges. But the question that arises is this: That was a municipal investigation, and if my memory serves me aright—I am speaking only from recollection—the laws of Quebec provide that, in certain instances, judges may be called upon under those statutes to hold certain investigations in municipal matters.

Mr. CANNON: But they get no money for doing so.

Mr. DOHERTY: My recollection is, and I know of numerous instances where municipalities have considered that it was proper to pay the judge, and where he has been paid. In the particular instance, I understand the municipal council passed a resolution and made the payment. There is in connection with the matter another fact of which I am not aware, but which is very material—Was the judge called upon to perform that duty before or after the passing of the statute?

Mr. CANNON: After.

Mr. DOHERTY: I have said all that I know about the matter; but what I want to point out, and where I think the hon. gentleman is mistaken, is, in the first place, when he puts this matter to me to know what I am going to do about it, and in the second place, when he suggests that we should try to decide that question before this House to-day. I really respectfully would call the attention of the Chairman to the fact that this is entirely out of order.

Mr. CANNON: Before the Chairman decides, it would be only fair to allow me to reply to the right hon. gentleman.

The CHAIRMAN: I would regret to be charged with unfairness, but as the point of order has been raised I must rule this debate to be out of order. I do so for two reasons: First, because it is an attack or reflection upon the conduct of a judge.

Mr. CANNON: It was not an attack, it was a reference.

The CHAIRMAN: All references to judges and courts of justice of the nature of attacks or censure have always been considered unparliamentary and the speakers of British and Canadian Houses have always treated them as breaches of order. That will be found in Bourinot at page 358. The second reason is the well known rule that discussion in committee must be strictly relevant to the item or resolution under consideration.

Mr. CANNON: In answer to what the Minister of Justice said a minute ago as to the enforcement of the law of our country concerning the administration of justice in general, I simply wish to say this: The right hon. gentleman was kind enough

to refer to my legal standing. My legal standing does not compare in any way with the very eminent standing held by the right hon. gentleman in this country as a legal mind. Every man in this House will admit that the right hon. gentleman is one of the best lawyers; that he has been one of the best judges, and that he is now one of the best Ministers of Justice that we have ever had. Therefore, I was very much surprised when I heard him express the views which he expressed a minute or two ago, because I do not think those views are in accord with the real interpretation of the law as the law should read and be interpreted. The right hon. gentleman says: I am not the judge of judges, and if a member is not satisfied with anything that might happen in this province or any other province, let him apply to the courts of justice and have whatever abuses may have been committed, remedied or rectified. Discussing the matter on very general lines, and not, for instance referring, as the hon. member for Frontenac (Mr. Edwards) did, to a former Chief Justice of the Supreme Court as a thief, without being called to order, I will proceed and say that the Minister of Justice appoints judges throughout the land. The Attorney General of each province sees to the administration of the law within the province of which he is Attorney General. That is the general administration of the law. As regards the personal conduct, dignity and honour of each individual judge, it is the Minister of Justice who has to attend to that and not the Attorney General of a province. The right hon. gentleman, as he knows full well, is not only Minister of Justice, but Attorney General of Canada, and what for?

5 p.m.

The CHAIRMAN: I would be glad to hear any remarks the hon. member may desire to make to show the relevancy of this discussion to the resolution now under consideration. Unless he succeeds in doing so, I shall be obliged to ask him to discontinue his remarks.

Mr. CANNON: I cannot argue the point of order; I understand it has been decided. I am only continuing the discussion along the lines which have been adopted by the right hon. gentleman himself. We have before the Chair a resolution to the effect that the salary of the Chief Justice of the Supreme Court of Canada shall be exempted from taxation, and in that resolution there are other clauses providing for other matters in different parts of Canada. Under this resolution a very general discussion ensued, and the Prime Minister (Mr. Meighen), the hon. member for Shelburne and Queen's (Mr. Fielding), the hon. member for King's (Sir Robert Borden), the Minister of Justice (Mr. Doherty), discussed the question whether it would be wise or unwise to exempt from taxation the salary of the Chief Justice, and they also discussed the application of the law in general as regards all judges throughout the country. Following that very general discussion which has been allowed by the Chair throughout the afternoon, I am now discussing with the Minister of Justice very generally the question whether, should a judge, no matter who he is or where he sits, not behave as he should, it is for my right hon. friend as Minister of Justice for Canada or for the Attorney General of the particular province concerned to interfere.

The CHAIRMAN: That particular question had not been discussed until it was introduced by the hon. member for Dorchester (Mr. Cannon). That is the point raised by the Minister of Justice, and that is why the Chair has ruled this debate to be out of order.

Mr. CANNON: I shall not insist. The field of discussion has been very suddenly narrowed down by your ruling, Sir, much to my surprise. You were in the Chair, and there was no call to order when the hon. member for Frontenac (Mr. Edwards), for instance, went very far and attacked the former Chief Justice of Canada and present Lieutenant Governor of Quebec. Yet there was absolutely no remark and no call of order from the Chair. But I always respect the Chair; I always respect your ruling, and seeing that you have allowed the Minister of Justice to say all he wanted and you are calling me to order and preventing me from answering him, I will now resume my seat.

Mr. PROULX: I did not happen to be present when the Minister of Justice (Mr. Doherty) gave the reasons for asking for exemption from income taxation of the salary of the Chief Justice.

Mr. ARCHAMBAULT: Let the minister explain again.

Mr. PROULX: I cannot see any good reason for this. Is it because the salary of the Chief Justice was increased more than the salaries of the other judges? Is it because the higher the salary, the more the exemption should be? Last year we

increased the salary of the Chief Justice from $10,000 to $15,000, or an increase of $5,000, and the salary of the other judges was increased from $9,000 to $12,000; there the increase was only $3,000. Yet there is no provision in this resolution to exempt the salaries of these other judges. I think the principle is wrong, and I believe that if you exempt the salary of the Chief Justice, who receives the highest salary of all the judges in the land, you will have very strong representations from all the other judges to have their salaries also exempt from taxation. I believe my right hon. friend is not well advised when he brings down this resolution asking for this exemption. I believe there should be no exemption from income taxation, and especially in the case of the judge who receives the highest salary of all the judges in the land.

Mr. DOHERTY: May I just say one word, because I do not want to be lacking in courtesy to the hon. gentleman. I forego with great regret the opportunity of addressing to him the explanation I have already addressed to the House, because I have implicit confidence that in addressing it to him I would be addressing it to an intelligence that would grasp it at once. I only want to ask him to be good enough to read in Hansard the answers I have endeavoured to give to the questions which he puts, and which were put, before he came into the House, by other hon. gentlemen.

Mr. ROCK LANCTOT (Laprairie and Napierville): (Translation.) Mr. Speaker, as in the past I have always taken much interest in this question of the judges' salaries, and as I have always been the only one to discuss the subject, it is with much pleasure that I find myself to-day, one of a goodly company of members, not only of the Opposition, but also of the Government side, and I now hope for better success before long.

I am always surprised to hear the right hon. Minister of Justice (Mr. Doherty) say, when discussing these questions of the judges' salaries, that the Government must keep its word even after a period of ten, fifteen or twenty years, and that no change can be effected. I find that since 1914, in this House and outside of it, much has been said, and yet owing to the war much has been changed. We had been promised that there would be no conscription, and yet we have had it. Granted these judges had been promised that they would not be taxed, nobody was taxed in those days, no wonder they could be promised that they would not be, because there was no question of an income tax at that time. But to-day that taxation exists, and I do not see why a judge who receives $15,000 a year should not pay an income tax as well as the poor farmer who earns $2,200 and pays on $200 an income tax of $8. This man who gets $15,000 should to my mind pay the tax like every one else, and set a good example. Nothing is worse than bad example coming from above. The example set by the right hon. Minister of Justice, I hold to be of the worst kind, for the hon. gentleman is paid as a minister and as a member of the House, and draws at the same time a pension from the State. Then why cast doubts on the honesty of purpose of the Chief Justice of the Supreme Court? I would not suspect them.

Last year, the salary of the Chief Justice of the Supreme Court was raised to $15,000 and since then, I believe, he has drawn that salary. I do not know how payments to judges are made; they must be paid monthly or quarterly; at all events, he has likely received a part of those $15,000 since the passing of the last Act, and his salary having been increased, he has no right to be the deputy of the Governor General of this country with a stipend of $5,000. If he has that right and wants to draw those $15,000 the Government should select another man who would not be such an expense to the country. For my part, I would not object to such a change, and were I living in Ottawa I could perform those duties for a dollar a day—because I am a thrifty man—and I would deem it a great honour.

Before concluding my remarks, I beg leave to move as an amendment that the first paragraph of the resolution be struck out, that is that part which reads thus:

1. That the provisions of section 11 of chapter fifty-six of the statutes of 1920, entitled An Act to amend the Judges Act, withdrawing the exemption of certain judges from the operation of certain taxes, shall not apply to the present Chief Justice of Canada.

Amendment (Mr. Lanctot) negatived; yeas 38, nays 59.

Mr. McKENZIE: What will be the effect of the change proposed in paragraph 3 so far as the judges in the province of Nova Scotia are concerned? The Minister mentioned that the judges had the right to settle their own location. So far as the judges in Nova Scotia are concerned, I think they all reside in Halifax, so I do not think that would affect them.

Mr. DOHERTY: There is no change so far as Nova Scotia is concerned. The reason it is mentioned is that we are repealing the whole section and re-enacting it in order to make the change in the other provinces.

Resolution reported.

Mr. DOHERTY: I desire to cover an omission. The other day, by oversight I forgot to state that the resolution in question had been submitted to the Governor General and had obtained his approval. I desire to make that statement now.

I move for leave to introduce Bill No. 60, to amend the Judges Act.

Motion agreed to and Bill read the first time.

THE FRENCH TREATY

Right Hon. Sir GEORGE FOSTER (Minister of Trade and Commerce): Mr. Speaker, I move for leave to introduce Bill No. 61, founded on the resolution, which was passed to-day, respecting a certain trade arrangement between His Majesty and the President of the French Republic.

Motion agreed to and Bill read the first time.

SUPPLY — CANADIAN NATIONAL RAILWAYS

PROPOSED REFERENCE TO SPECIAL COMMITTEE OF HOUSE

Right Hon. ARTHUR MEIGHEN (Prime Minister) moved that the House go again into Committee of Supply.

Hon. A. K. MACLEAN (Halifax): Mr. Speaker, I wish to avail myself of this opportunity to move an amendment which is substantially the same as the notice of motion which stood in my name for several days and which had relation to the appointment of a committee to be known as the Railway and Shipping Committee. Last evening, the House will remember, I moved for the discharge of that motion from the Order Paper. I did so because I was likely to be absent from the House during the next few days, and also because, even were I sure of being here continuously, there was considerable doubt as to when I might have an opportunity of moving that motion. I was anxious to be able to present it to the House as early as possible, and after consultation with the Prime Minister last evening, I made the motion for the discharge of that motion from the Order Paper, which was unanimously carried by the House. Upon giving notice this afternoon to the Prime Minister of the text of this amendment, he pointed out to me that his position would be somewhat prejudiced by my moving it on a motion to go into Supply, and that possibly he might not have consented last evening to my motion being discharged from the Order Paper had he understood that this amendment would be moved to-day on the motion to go into Supply. I refer to this fact merely to say that I do not desire to prejudice the position of my right hon. friend or his supporters, particularly if any embarrassment to them were due to any act or word of my own. Therefore, upon the conclusion of the debate on this amendment, I shall ask the House for leave to withdraw it. It will be understood, of course, that when the right hon. the Prime Minister comes to move for the appointment of a committee, which, I understand, he has intimated he will do, there will then be an opportunity for me or any other hon. gentleman to move for additions to the powers of that committee, if in my judgment or theirs it is felt that those powers are too limited.

Mr. MURPHY: I dislike interrupting the hon. gentleman, but did he say that the amendment which he is about to move this afternoon is substantially the same as the motion he got leave to withdraw yesterday? If so, in what respect do they differ?

Mr. MACLEAN (Halifax): The only respect in which they differ is that the period of continuance of the suggested committee is limited, in this amendment, to this session, and it was my intention to incorporate that amendment in the original motion had I moved it. Now, the purpose of the amendment is disclosed in the text itself; the reading of it will show the intended functions of the committee if this House decides to establish it. The name of the committee also suggests substantially the range of its jurisdiction. I think that such a committee should have the right and power to enquire into substantial matters of policy connected with the management and administration of the Government owned and controlled railway system of this country, and as well the shipping, which is known as the Canadian Government Merchant Marine. I should hope that the work of this committee, if it were appointed, would be of a substantial and informative character; if it were not, it would fail to fulfil the terms which I have in mind at the moment. It is not my intention that there should be conferred

upon this committee supervisory or administrative powers over railway matters—and when I refer to railway matters, the House, I trust, will bear in mind that I have reference only to the system of railways known as the Canadian National Railways. I should hope that this committee would be the means of supplying a great deal of information to the public in connection with the government-owned system of roads; that it would be the instrument by which the management of this railway system could convey to the public, who are its owners, an account of their stewardship, and in this manner give a review of existing or contemplated policies of the Board. I should hope that this committee, if established, would establish between the Canadian National Railways and the Canadian public some such relationships as exist between an ordinary commercial enterprise and its shareholders. I should hope that there would be established, as between the management and Parliament, at least the relationship which ordinarily exists in commercial concerns between the management and the board of directors or the shareholders. Now, Mr. Speaker, I realize that asking for the creation of a committee with such wide powers is perhaps somewhat unusual in our parliamentary experience, and I therefore realize very clearly I trust that in order to induce Parliament to accept my proposal I must convince, or should endeavour to convince Parliament that a serious problem confronts us to-day. If I succeed in doing so I think it should follow that the proposal contained in the amendment should be granted, and that a committee, to whom should be granted unusual powers, should be set up to meet an unusual situation. In order to do this I must refer to certain matters relating to the Canadian National Railway system, and particularly to the economic condition of that system. I do so primarily for the purpose of impressing the House, if I can, with the gravity of the situation now confronting it.

A few days ago the Minister of Railways presented to the House what is known as the annual railway statement, which statement contained a great deal of valuable and important information regarding the Canadian National Railway system. I do not know that the statement which the minister gave could have been more complete without it becoming somewhat burdensome to himself and to the House. However, we learned from the minister that there are in Canada to-day 17,000 miles of railway controlled by the Government, and possibly this mileage shall later be increased by the acquisition of the Grand Trunk Railway. We learned that in 1919 there was a deficit of $48,000,000 on account of operating and fixed charges, that in 1920 there was an operating deficit of $37,000,000, and that in 1920 there was a deficit of $70,000,000 on account of operations and fixed charges. We further learned that 95 per cent of the gross revenue of the system was consumed by two items alone—wages and fuel. We also learned from the statement that it cost $1.24 and a fraction to earn a dollar during the past year. The minister on that occasion likewise gave to the House his statement of net earnings for the current year, the railway year being the calendar year. He estimates a deficit of $50,000,000 on account of operating and fixed charges, and including interest on advances to the Canadian Northern Railway he calculates that this deficit will be increased to $60,000,000. This is reached by taking into consideration a possible decrease in wages, in the cost of materials, and by effecting economies which I fancy he hopes to be able to successfully introduce. So you see that the deficit in 1919 was very substantial, it was very substantial in 1920, and I suggest there is little or no evidence that it will be any less in 1921 notwithstanding the minister's estimate—in fact everything known to us suggests a very much greater deficit than we had in 1920.

Now considering the commercial and trading conditions of the world, the conditions of the European exchanges, the decrease in the productive powers of Canada and all other countries, the fact that even in Canada during the past three or four months the producers of lumber, fish, coal, iron and steel have reduced production —I think it is probably a fair estimate to say that in the Prairie Provinces there will be a diminution in the production of wheat, largely owing to the fact that the cost of production is abnormally high, and the markets and prices are not very reassuring; —taking all these conditions into consideration I think it is fair to say that when the current railway year ends on December 31 this year we shall learn that a deficit considerably in excess of the deficit of 1920 confronts this country, and that I am sure will be regarded as a very serious situation. But the condition of a railway is not altogether revealed even by the operating results. It is true that the deficit of 1920 is, in itself, sufficiently staggering. It is also

I have no doubt, true and well known to hon. gentlemen that it is extremely desirable that a road should have more than a mere surplus of operating income; it is extremely desirable that it should build up a reserve. The Canadian National Railway system, in the face of the existing deficits, was unable to build up, or to add to, reserve. Further, the failure to have an operating income upon the credit side, the failure to be able to earn anything to add to a reserve, affects the credit of a railway company, and doubtless the borrowing capacity of the Canadian National Railway system has been disastrously affected by the result of the operations of last year. I think I am correct in saying that to-day the Canadian National Railway system would be unable to borrow any money in the markets of the world without the guarantee and backing of the Canadian Government. That being so, and I hardly think anybody can question my statement, I feel compelled to say, although very regretfully, that at the moment our National Railway system is practically bankrupt. In ordinary affairs an individual, or a commercial concern, is not considered bankrupt while they are able to pay and meet the demands of their creditors; but it is altogether different in connection with a railway system. As soon as a railway system reaches the condition that it is unable to borrow upon favourable terms it is bankrupt—because the operations of a railway never cease, it must be continually expanding. Further, we are all aware that during the past four or five years a great deal of money should have been spent upon maintenance, development and construction work, in connection with our railways. This has been deferred. I am not criticising anybody for so doing; I should say that that was good business policy. But nevertheless that fact must be taken into consideration in a review of railway conditions to-day. I make the statement, not authoritatively of course, but I think I am well within the mark, that no less a sum than $150,000,000 should this year be expended upon the Canadian National Railway system for maintenance, and improvements in order to prevent the impairment of our railway assets. That, Mr. Speaker, is a serious situation to contemplate, and I have not the slightest doubt that every hon. gentleman is impressed with its seriousness, particularly when coupled with the fact that we are facing for the current year such a large deficit.

Now, we can hardly hope to increase our railway revenues by a further increase in freight or passenger rates. It may be fairly stated, I think, that to-day our freight rates are at such a figure that they adversely affect the production of goods and our domestic and export trade. These high freight rates in turn contribute to the continued high price of commodities, thus lessening the ordinary exchange of goods and the total volume of the production of the country and their consumption, which in turn leads to unemployment. I have no doubt also that the fact that a great deal of maintenance work on our railways has been deferred also contributes to unemployment. And I think I may with greater confidence say that our passenger rates at least have reached that point when it would be inadvisable to further increase them. The statement of the Minister of Railways indicates a decline of 9.45 per cent in the number of passengers carried per mile in 1920 as compared with 1919. I think I am reflecting probably the judgment of the average member of this House when I say that our passenger rates might be reduced somewhat and thus stimulate the earning power of our railways. Therefore I say that we cannot well look to increasing railway revenues for the current calendar year by increasing freight or passenger rates; on the contrary not at all improbable that better financial results might be obtained by here and there a slight diminution in the rates.

Now, Sir, I do not refer to the financial condition of our railways with any degree of pleasure. It is not a condition that one would care to proclaim in Parliament in a malicious spirit or to injure his country; but facts must sometimes be faced boldly and courageously, and I think it is far better that Parliament and the country should realize the actual situation confronting us.

Mr. MACLEAN (York): And in other countries also.

Mr. MACLEAN (Halifax): Yes, I am going to refer to that. There is some comfort in the reflection that in other countries approximating conditions prevail. When one thinks of the great extent of this Dominion, of the sparseness of its population, of the lack of development of our natural resources, and of the physical condition of a great deal of the country through which our railway system operates, it is not surprising to find the present results. I am sure we all have hope for the future. This country has the capacity to expand com-

mercially and otherwise, and it certainly shall, but of course in the immediate future our problem is a very serious one. I do not think that our position should be prejudiced by the fact that the other great railway system in this country presents a very much better showing for the past fiscalyear. I have never been able to appreciate why a statement of the financial condition of the Canadian Pacific Railway Company can be expected to contribute to the solution of our own railway problem. There are many obvious reasons why that system is in such a relatively flourishing condition to-day. The two systems are unlike and cannot be compared. To my mind it contributes very little to clearing the general situation to find so many flattering commendations made of the one road and so many unreasoned and unreasonable condemnations of the other.

Of course, a great deal of the present situation is due to the conditions ensuing from the war, and, as has been suggested by my hon. friend (Mr. Maclean, York) opposite, that fact has left similar results in many other countries. It would be very interesting just for the moment to look at the railway situation in the United States, where conditions are much the same as here, except that that country has a much greater population and is more fully developed. In 1920 it cost the American railways on an average $93.59 for every $100 earned; in 1919 the operating ratio was $85.25; in 1918, $81.54; in 1917, $66.46. The net operating income of the United States railways of the first class dropped from the high level of $934,000,000 in 1917 to $62,000,000 in 1920. In January, 1921, the operating deficit of 143 railways in the United States was $3,000,000, compared with a net operating income of $42,000,000 just a year before, in January, 1920. This, of course, indicates the existence of fundamental conditions prevailing in the United States as in this country which affect very greatly the railway situation. In March of last year the American railways passed from federal control back to their owners, the transfer being made under the provisions of the United States Transportation Act of 1920. The legislators of that country evidently felt that the future of their railway systems was not too fully assured, because in the Transportation Act they made provision for a stated income from earnings for these railways—a provision which had not previously existed. At present the United States railways are entitled to a minimum dividend of five per cent upon the value of the road and a minimum of, six per cent. If an amount in excess of the six per cent is earned, the difference is divided between the railways and the nation as a reserve fund. The reserve fund belonging to the carriers is to be used by them for almost any railway purpose, while the proportion of the excess going to the United States Government is to be used by way of loans or advances to their railway systems. Further, the United States Transportation Act of last year provided for the voting of a revolving fund of $300,000,000, to be used for the purpose of aiding roads seeking financial support or assistance. That amount, I fancy, will meet but a small proportion of the applications for loans which will be made by the American roads.

Mr. ARMSTRONG (Lambton): May I ask the hon. member if he will be good enough to give an estimate of the amount that the roads of the United States will require to place them on a safe footing for the year?

Mr. MACLEAN (Halifax): Well, I have not in my reading observed any statement which would give me that information, but I fancy it would take considerably over one billion of dollars. I understand that the American railway carriers claim from the United States Government something over $900,000,000 to put their roads back where they were prior to their being under federal control, and it is asserted that that would not commence to meet their legal and valid demands. I refer to the railway conditions in the United States only for the purpose of indicating that there is a railway problem in that country just as there is in this, and by way also of opposing the possible idea that our condition is entirely due to circumstances for which this country alone is responsible.

Now, Mr. Speaker, what are the principal considerations which suggest the appointment of a committee, and how might such a committee function to the advantage of Parliament and of the country? The facts which I have just presented to the House in relation to the financial condition of our railways surely indicate the existence of a situation that must be considered, studied and dealt with by this Parliament and by the country. It involves the imposition of heavy taxation, and no intelligent and reflecting man will deny that the situation demands the gravest thought and study on the part of every Canadian who is interested in the present and future of his country. I suggest further that a large deliberative body or assembly such as this House of

Commons is hardly suitable for the effective consideration of this problem. That is an assertion which cannot safely be contradicted; in fact, one might postulate that proposition. Our experience also shows that for the purpose of reaching constructive ideas and informing the members of the House and the people generally, as well as in reaching a definite public policy for the future, a small parliamentary committee affords the best means. Therefore, Mr. Speaker, on general principles a committee of Parliament should be appointed to consider the railway situation in itself as well as in its relation to all the other interests of the country.

I should like also to suggest for the consideration of the House that Parliament requires information upon this question. I am not reflecting upon the knowledge which any hon. gentleman has or upon his capacity to obtain it and to utilize it when he gets it. But I think I may safely say that members of this House and the people of the country generally, outside of those who are engaged in the railway business as a vocation, are sadly in need of information on this subject. It is only when we are armed with knowledge that we can embark upon any definite policy for the future or that we can safely legislate. I think that one might say, without reflecting on past Parliaments, that a great many of our railway difficulties to-day are due to the fact that Parliament itself was not informed. The governments of the day thought that they themselves were informed, and possibly they were; but if there had been on the part of Parliament that degree of accurate knowledge regarding the matter with which the government itself was dealing, the government policy might have indicated greater wisdom than it did.

Newspaper correspondents are beginning to say that our railway affairs had better be handed over to business men, and that members of Parliament and the Government would consent to this transfer of duties. I have all my life been looking for an accurate definition of this omnipotent so-called business man who is taken from his hiding place every time the nation is in great trouble. For my part, I do not admit the capacity of these business men to deal with the situation any better than anybody else, unless they are informed upon the subject—and I doubt very much that they are so informed at the present time. However, that is a point which I feel I need not elaborate; it is a self-evident proposition that before we take further steps in connection with the railway problem in this country, Parliament should be informed. I am not emphasizing the fact that the Government should be informed. That is their duty; we assume that they will take every possible step to inform themselves, but I go further and say that it is equally the duty of Parliament to be informed. I say with little trepidation that a parliamentary committee can do more to inform Parliament and the country upon this question than any other body which can be suggested. The presence of the management of the Canadian National Railway system before a committee of Parliament for a few days annually could not fail to inform Parliament and the country. There will be made public facts which cannot be made public to-day by reports through the Minister of Railways or the Government. Foolish and absurd statements are being made day after day, predicted upon assumptions which are not based upon facts. If there is anything dangerous to the country at the present time in relation to a great and important public service, it is having Parliament and the country debating the problem upon facts which have not been established. Expert opinion could be brought before that committee to advise members of the committee, in the hope that that advice, if worthy of credence and acceptance, could be extended through the committee to Parliament, and thus gradually get out into the country, so that sound and intelligent public opinion could be formed upon this issue. A committee before which the management might appear would also afford an opportunity to the management to give to the country their views of the situation, and generally speaking, a standing committee of this House is the best and, I am almost bold enough to say, the only method by which Parliament and the country can be educated as they should be upon this problem at the present time.

We must not forget that when a Government owns and operates a railway with a deficit of $50,000,000 in 1920 and a probable deficit of $100,000,000 in 1921, it is not likely to receive fair treatment from the people. The quality of the management will not be fairly judged by the country unless that management have an opportunity of putting before the people their side of the story of their management. Further, in years past in connection with the railway problem, when, perhaps, it was largely the function of railways to exploit the country, we passed laws to protect the public against the carriers. The situation

is very much changed. The railway question will never again appear before the public in the exact form in which it did from ten years back to twenty-five or thirty years preceding that. The country to-day is the owner of a great system; the people are the shareholders; they must pay out of their pockets any operating deficits; they must provide capital for the continuance and operation of the road. While heretofore it was, perhaps, largely the work of Parliament and statutory bodies created by Parliament to protect the public against the carriers, it may be that now our true function will be to protect the carriers against the public. There is, at least, something in that statement.

At Six O'Clock the House took recess.

After Recess

The House resumed at Eight o'clock.

PRIVATE BILLS

SECOND READINGS

Bill No. 53, to incorporate The Fort Smith Railway Company.—Mr. Douglas (Strathcona).

Bill No. 51, for the relief of George Elmor Glossop.—Mr. Copp.

SUPPLY — CANADIAN NATIONAL RAILWAYS

PROPOSED REFERENCE TO SPECIAL COMMITTEE OF HOUSE

The House resumed the adjourned debate on the motion of Right Hon. Arthur Meighen (Prime Minister) for Committee of Supply.

Hon. A. K. MACLEAN (Halifax) (resuming): At six o'clock I was urging upon the House that in connection with the railway question it was desirable that Parliament and the country should be informed, and that by such means alone could we develop in this country a public opinion that would aid in the solution of the railway problem. I think it is a fact that there is to-day very little public opinion in this country upon the railway issue, largely because Parliament has failed in recent years to be informed itself, and through it the country. I was suggesting to the House that a committee to which would be granted very large and extensive powers, perhaps broader than those to which we have been accustomed in the past, would aid in the formation of constructive views in Canada, which would be found of some value in the early future. Now if we cannot get information and develop constructive ideas, and assist the public in developing sound constructive ideas upon the railway question, as things go on at present, how is this information to be obtained and disseminated throughout the country in order that the conditions I have suggested might be brought about? The Minister of Railways cannot inform Parliament upon this question, so big has it become. He would need to be a superman, if there is such a person, to do so. It would be an impossible task to impose upon any minister to keep Parliament and the country fully informed upon so vast and intricate a problem. The Government cannot do it. It is their declared policy deliberately to abstain from intervening in the administration of the railway, and, so far as I know, the Government are living up to that policy, and I trust they will continue to do so. One thing is certain, and that is that government ownership and government control could not last twenty-four hours in this country if there was direct interference in the administration of the railways by the Government or by members of Parliament. Therefore, the declaration of Government policy precludes Parliament or the country from being informed by the Government. That eliminates the two probable sources from which the necessary information could be obtained.

Possibly a good way of strengthening one's position in such a case as I am endeavouring to make out would be to give a few illustrations of what I think a committee of the nature I suggest might do. I may astound some hon. gentlemen in the House and possibly some members of the Government, when I state some of the problems which I think might very properly and very profitably be committed to the committee for inquiry and investigation. Take the Hudson Bay railway. I do not know if other hon. gentlemen have had the experience I have had in connection with this public undertaking, but I think in all my experience I have yet failed to meet a Canadian citizen who thought this project would be a success. Yet the two historic political parties of this country have, I think, approved the project. I am not saying it is inherently weak and destined to absolute failure, just because that has been my experience, but as far as I am concerned, I should hesitate to commit the country to the completion of that undertaking until I had further information about it. It has not yet been settled that the Hudson Bay route is a feasible or practicable shipping route. In

fact, the Hudson Bay port selected, is not now deemed by the former friends of the project to have been properly selected. The very successful export of a cargo of wheat from Vancouver a few weeks ago has also given to the Hudson Bay undertaking an altogether different colouring. I quite agree that it is futile to deliberate upon past mistakes, but something might still be saved if it were the judgment of Parliament and the country that the project should not go to completion. How are we to be informed upon the subject? I know of no other way, or of no better way, at least, than by committing the consideration of that question to a Parliamentary committee. I do not believe there is any other method which would so promptly and effectually develop public opinion one way or the other upon that question. I think that is a matter which might very properly be committed to a Parliamentary committee, which I believe could do splendid work in considering it.

I will give another illustration in which the people of my province and of the Maritime Provinces generally are much interested. I refer to the operations of the Canadian Government Merchant Marine. Parliament, of course, is cognizant of the fact that during the war the Canadian Government built a number of ships; it matters not what their number is, or their tonnage, or the motives which moved the Government to embark upon that policy. When the ships were constructed, it became necessary for the Government to adopt some method of operating them, and eventually they committed them to the Canadian National Railways for operation. That department did not seek the transfer of these ships; they were rather imposed upon them by the Government. I do not know that the Government is open to any criticism for so doing, but the Government have never formulated any definite and irrevocable policy as to the operation of these ships. Assigning them to the Canadian National Railways was only a temporary disposition of the matter. At the moment, I take it that the Government is free to vary their policy, established as I have indicated, and adopt a different policy, and if possible, a better policy. From maritime ports to-day, and also from American ports via our maritime ports, there are running four privately-owned steamship lines connecting with Newfoundland. These services have been built up in the course of years, after a great deal of trouble, risk, anxiety, and considerable investment of capital. All the requirements of the Maritime Provinces and of the rest of Canada and of the ports of New York, Boston, and St. John's, Newfoundland, were fairly well satisfied with the shipping facilities provided by these four privately-owned services to which I have referred. Recently the Canadian Government Merchant Marine have placed in that service three or four boats. Those boats are losing a great deal of money in that service. There has been a curtailment of traffic. The privately-owned lines are also losing money.

Mr. BALLANTYNE: May I ask my hon. friend how he knows that the Canadian Government ships are losing money on that route?

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: I know positively that nothing else is possible than the loss of money by the boats of the Canadian Merchant Marine that are now engaged in that Newfoundland service. I say to my hon. friend that nothing else would be possible, and I am so informed by men who know the shipping business just as well as those who are operating the Merchant Marine.

Mr. CASGRAIN: Or better.

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: I therefore accept it as a positive fact that my statement is correct and incontrovertible. But even if my hon. friend were right and I wrong, I submit it as a fair proposition that the Canadian Merchant Marine have no right to interfere with established companies who, in the course of years, have developed a service which is satisfactory to the people generally. It is unfair and unjust, and you cannot get the people of this country very long to support such a policy. These privately owned companies pay their taxes, and they are at the present time losing money. The Canadian Merchant Marine are losing money, and they ask the owners of these companies to help pay the deficit encountered in their operations. As a matter of sound policy, this is wrong, and it is not fair treatment to the people who are engaged in that service to-day. And I do not believe that the people of the country will take any different position from the one I have just stated in this connection.

However, it would be very difficult, I take it, for me to persuade hon. gentlemen on either side to abandon the present policy unless I were able to demonstrate conclusively the facts upon which I base my conclusions. I do not think that any mem-

ber of Parliament has the right to occupy the time of his fellow members and ask them to reach a conclusion unless he knows his subject and is able to demonstrate the soundness of the conclusion which he hopes to impress upon them. I can quite understand, if I ventured upon such a course in this Parliament, I might be questioned as to my facts, and I am not sure that I could obtain them very easily without the information available through a committee. If a committee were appointed with jurisdiction over the matter of shipping, I should be entitled, I assume, to summon before that committee the managers of the company and the owners of privately-owned companies operating in the particular area to which I referred a moment ago, to have the opinion of everybody, and a general exchange of views; and in the end, that committee, if composed of capable men, would be able to reach a very safe and sane conclusion. If their finding were a sound one, I feel sure it would be accepted by Parliament and by the Government. But I want to say to the Minister of Marine (Mr. Ballantyne), that I am referring only to one particular service; I am not urging that the whole fleet of the Canadian Merchant Marine should be withdrawn from service. I am sure, however, that a great many of these steamships might profitably be sold, particularly the smaller ones operating from eastern ports. It is far better, if you wish to develop commerce and have a successful merchant marine in this country, to dispose of these ships at favourable prices and on satisfactory terms as to payment, to Canadians, if they will take the ships, because the history of the world is abundantly clear that all commerce is after all developed by the initiative of private individuals and not by governments or by ships.

Mr. MACLEAN (York): So are high rates for all kinds of transportation.

Mr. MACLEAN (Halifax): There is no possibility of excessive freight charges to-day, with ten million tons of shipping more than before the war, two and a-half million tons of shipping being idle in the British ports to-day, and one thousand ships laid up in American ports. In these circumstances it is unlikely that the world will lack competition in the future. But, I repeat, the point I want to make is that it is extremely foolish and unprofitable for the Government to be operating boats at a loss on routes which are amply served by existing fleets owned by private individuals.

I do not propose detaining the House by citing matters which I think a committee might very well inquire into. If hon. gentlemen will permit me, I should like, in fancy, to see the heads of the railway management before this committee, if it is established. What is more natural than that the committee should have before them the general manager to go over the annual financial statement and thoroughly explain it, and to have matters which have not been submitted to Parliament placed before them? Would any public interest suffer, or would the railways be prejudiced by an exposure of all relevant and important facts? Would it not aid in the development of sound public opinion on such matters if this were done? There can be no difficulty in convincing one that great benefit would accrue from a discussion of such subjects as capital expenditure, the necessary money required to be voted by Parliament annually for operation, the question of the re-valuation of some of the roads, the elimination of particular services, and the closing down, temporarily, perhaps, of certain sections of railway.

I do not say that this committee should formulate and attempt to dictate policy to the Government, to Parliament, or to the country. All I urge is that it should be the instrument for disclosing full information that is much needed, all of which would go to inform Parliament, to educate the country, and thus gradually to evolve a sound public policy. The other day a motion was made by the leader of the Opposition (Mr. Mackenzie King), in which it was suggested that a complete disclosure of all information should be made to Parliament. As I said on that occasion, it may be that there was much to be said against that motion. It might well be a fair matter to commit to this committee the task of working out some other method of giving to Parliament all important or necessary information and thus perhaps avoiding a needless waste of time, at the same time giving to every one whatever was really necessary. The objection has been urged upon me privately that this matter should be referred to a special committee and not to a standing committee. I am not irrevocable in my judgment upon this. I am not particularly wedded to a standing committee in preference to a select committee, but I wish to point out that this will be a standing issue for some years. I think there will be much that a committee might do for more than one session, and more than the lifetime of

this Parliament, and I believe, therefore, that it will be better that this vast subject, in so far as it is to be treated by parliamentary committees, be referred preferably to a standing committee rather than a select or special committee.

A reference of the issue to a special committee at the present moment would, I fear, develop contests and antagonisms, that would not promote really useful and informative inquiry into the railway question; the very suggestion of a special committee suggests a contest. It has also been suggested that the present railway committee would suffice for my purposes. In answer to that suggestion I say that committee is too large, and its history and traditions are against useful work, particularly of the nature that I have outlined as being proper work for this committee. It has been urged, I think by the leader of the Opposition, that this committee should only inquire into such matters as were referred to it by the Government. There may be something in that contention, but its accuracy could only be developed later. I should think that if this committee were appointed, there is very little that it might not inquire into. I would hope that it being a parliamentary committee, and not a government committee, the House from time to time would exercise the power vested in it and refer to that committee anything which it desired to refer. I wish again to impress upon the House the fact that I desire this committee to be a parliamentary committee, not necessarily a committee for Government purposes.

It has also been intimated to me that the management of the National Railway system would object to the constitution of this committee. I can hardly understand such opposition coming from the management. I can hardly understand the mentality of responsible men who, in view of the general situation, would take that position. I am not sure that that is their view. If it is I can only say that in my judgment they lack a clear apprehension of the great task that is ahead of them and now before then. Does the Government imagine for one single moment that it can get this country committed to the policy of government ownership and government control for twenty-four months, or for twelve months, unless there is some method of keeping the country informed from time to time upon the issue? In prosperous days, with a railway earning its operating expenses and building up reserves, the public probably would be quiescent in the matter, and it would take very little to satisfy them; but I want to tell my right hon. friend who leads the Government that his credulity is almost laughable if he thinks that the country will permit him to conduct the National Railway system under its present policy—and I am not at the moment criticizing it—with the vast amount of taxation that must be imposed upon the people, unless he creates some avenues by which the people can be informed, by which the management and the public can be kept in touch with each other, and by which Parliament may know, as much as anybody else, about this question. If the management of the railway think that they can perpetuate themselves there, and at the same time carry on their duties in the background, without any means of seeking public approval of their policies and administration from time to time, and keeping that public informed, then I say it is very evident indeed they do not understand the problem which confronts them and the seriousness of the railway situation. I venture the opinion, Mr. Speaker, that if the chief officers of the Canadian National railways were to appear before a parliamentary committee for about ten days during a session of Parliament they would do more to establish themselves with the public than they can do by any other means to which they may resort to inspire or to obtain public confidence. I do not mean, Mr. Speaker, that this committee should engage in an inquiry into, and a discussion upon, all the trivial details of railway operation. I can quite understand you could not get a capable and intelligent railway manager to head the management of any railway system, particularly of a large system like this, if he were to be the subject of daily discussion in Parliament and of attack, even before a parliamentary committee, upon small trifling matters; it is very desirable that we abstain from criticism of that nature. What I seek to do, is to afford the opportunity for the management meeting a committee of the Parliament of Canada who represent the people so that, sitting together, they might discuss all the important matters relating to the railway administration, and I suggest, Mr. Speaker, that only through a parliamentary committee can this be done.

I want to say further, Mr. Speaker, that I doubt very much if the opinion of the railway management is as has been represented. I know it is not the opinion of all the important officers of the management. I do know that it is not the judgment of all the

nominated directors of the National system. I know that many of them feel that their position is absolutely untenable, and that the whole situation will break down unless some method is provided of bringing the management into contact with the public, unless some method be devised of putting the public into a sort of relationship with the management such as shareholders are in annually with the management of ordinary commercial concerns. I take very little stock, Mr. Speaker, in the suggestion that has been made to me several times that he management are against the proposal for a parliamentary committee. It is an untenable position to take, and I venture to prophesy that after the experience of one week before a parliamentary committee they would abandon that foolish position, if, at the present moment, they entertain it at all. But whether they do or not I say that if the management want to have the support of the public, and they do want the support of the public, some such proposal as this one of mine is necessary. There is no management alive to-day, no management procurable by the Government, which can manage a railway system unless it has the support, of a section at least, of public opinion, and it must also have the support of Parliament, or at least a very large section of it. Otherwise it would be absurd to occupy the time of hon. gentlemen in seeking to establish the possibility of its continuance.

I admit, Mr. Speaker, that my suggestion perhaps contemplates a commitment of powers to a parliamentary committee far greater than we have hitherto witnessed. I know that the British system of parliamentary government strongly maintains the principle that all power and responsibility rests with the government. That was strongly asserted several years ago, and text book writers have affirmed that principle throughout the years in any discussion upon the British system of parliamentary government. But it is true that in actual practice, even in Great Britain, very important matters are now being committed to parliamentary committees, and splendid work has been done by them. In the United States splendid work was done last year by the Senate committee, particularly in the preparation of what is now the United States Transportation Act of 1920—the Act which transferred the control of the railway systems from the Federal Control Act to the Act which I have just mentioned. As I say, splendid work was done there, and a perusal of the prolonged inquiry of the Senate committee would repay almost anybody, because the problems with respect to railways in the United States were very much the same as they are in this country. If there is any other possible way of bringing about a connection between an interested tax-paying and share-holding public, and it is better than this parliamentary committee and more likely to secure the results we seek, I should very gladly accept the suggestion.

Just one word in reference to the size of the committee which, I understand, the Prime Minister has intimated that he will appoint. It seems to me that that committee should not be a very large one; at the same time, I do not think it should be a very small one. It may be presumptuous on my part to make any suggestions in the matter at all, but inasmuch as I have perhaps made some astounding suggestions—at least, the Prime Minister may think I have—I might add just one more to the list without increasing the enormity of my offence. There is no doubt in my mind that if the operation of our railways is to continue under what is now virtually Government direction, with little prospect of any extensive construction during the next year or two, indeed, with a paring down of maintenance to the very limit, interprovincial jealousies will develop. Already instances have been observable in the press. I mean that when services are being curtailed, when sections of railway perhaps are to be abandoned temporarily or permanently, there is a natural tendency among persons living in the localities affected to believe that the railway management or possibly the Government are acting in a partial way. Therefore, if the Prime Minister will permit me, I would suggest that the committee should number about twenty-five or thirty-five members, and that in its constitution some respect should be paid to provincial representation.

I am sorry, Mr. Speaker, that I have detained the House so long in presenting this matter, although I do not wish hon. members to think that I have exhausted the arguments that can be advanced in support of my motion. In fact, I doubt if I have given to the House the strongest reasons for the appointment of such a committee. However, I trust I have given such reasons as will induce the Government and the House to accept the suggestion which my motion contains. I move:

That all words after "That" be struck out and the folloing inserted in lieu thereof:

"Rule 10 of the House of Commons, relating to the appointment of the Select Standing Committees of the House, be amended for the present session by adding to the Select Standing Committees of the House for the present session a Select Standing Committee on Railways and Shipping owned, operated or controlled by the Government; and that the Special Committee appointed to prepare and report the list of members to constitute the Standing Committees for the present session, be instructed to prepare and report the list of members to compose the Select Standing Committee on 'Railways and Shipping owned, operated or controlled by the Government' for the present session."

Mr. L. J. GAUTHIER (St. Hyacinthe-Rouville): Mr. Speaker—

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Before the hon. member speaks, it is the duty of the Chair to warn hon. members that an amendment having been proposed to the motion to go into supply, the discussion should, of course, be relevant to the amendment until the latter is voted on.

Mr. GAUTHIER: Mr. Speaker, I have listened attentively to the address delivered by my hon. friend, the senior member for Halifax (Mr. Maclean) and I must at once state that I am opposed to his motion, for many reasons. Everybody admits that our railway situation is a very distressing one, but that does not justify the hon. member's proposal for the formation of a committee which, if I have understood rightly his explanation, would be vested with more power than the House which had originated it.

There is another reason why I cannot agree with my hon. friend. He states that the tendency of modern times is to give all rights and powers to governments. I do not agree with him. Rights and powers belong to Parliament, and they are not to be surrendered to the Government; and surely we are not going to give away those rights and powers to a committee which will hear evidence, send for papers, and manage the road, and will then give Parliament whatever information it may see fit. We will not be any better off. The hon. member for Halifax says that his proposed committee will be subject to criticism. In other words, it will be taking the place of the Government, because the Government is charged with responsibility for the distressing condition of our railways, and under my hon. friend's suggestion this responsibility would be shouldered by the committee. I do not think the motion should be entertained. Why? I believe, Sir, that we would do well on this very question to take a lesson from the labour movement. What is the reason of the struggle between capital and labour? Labour contends that in every industry there should be a closed shop so as to eliminate competition in regulating the hours of work, the schedule of wages and the kind of work to be done. Every employee is looking for the acceptance of the closed shop idea, but my hon. friend is evidently desirous that the Canadian National Railways should be operated on the open shop system. I believe that the Canadian National Railway system has troubles enough without our adding to them by furnishing to a committee of twenty-five or thirty-five men information that may subsequently be secured by its competitors. If that is done, successful competition with other railways will be made very difficult.

My hon. friend has stated that the conditions as regards railways are the same elsewhere, and he has referred to the American railways. When the United States Government decided to conscript their sons they decided also to conscript the railways of the land. They controlled them for two years; they increased the rates to the amount of $750,000,000 each year, and they had a yearly deficit of $850,000,000. In the month of September last the railways were returned to their private owners, but the United States Government gave to the owners $500,000,000 as a bonus, because of the fact that roadbeds had been deteriorated, rolling stock had not been replaced, and motive power was no longer efficient. The United States Government decided to appropriate $600,000,000 for the purpose of enabling the railways to reimburse themselves during a certain period for the loss they would have to incur in putting their roads on as sound and efficient a basis as that on which they had been operated before. But my hon. friend was badly advised in connection with the Transportation Act passed by the United States Senate. It is what is known in railway parlance as the Esch-Cummins law. When the roads were given back to their private owners those in the United States who still believed in public ownership were responsible for the enactment of this law, providing that the bulk of railway securities should not return to the owners more than six per cent on the investment. That is why the railways on the other side of the line are in such distress. They cannot issue bonds for absorption by the public; when they did appeal to the public to absorb their securities they had to pay as high as seven, seven and one-half and eight per cent by way of

interest. When they make further issues of bonds they have to take into consideration the fact that the bulk of their securities must not carry more than six per cent. But notwithstanding this distressing condition there are six railways in the United States which are operating on a perfectly sound basis. For instance, when the Wabash system, which traverses part of Ontario, was given back to its owners in September, everybody versed in railway matters thought that it would have to go into the hands of a receiver. But there was appointed to the management of that road a man who knew how to direct its operations properly, and to-day the Wabash system is one of the six systems in the United States which is paying its way and which is putting aside every month an amount for equipment and maintainence which is necessary to the success of the railroad.

My hon. friend has stated that there is a difference between the Canadian Pacific railway and the Canadian Northern. I admit that there is a vast difference, but there has been a vast difference, too, in the management. In the course of my remarks I am going to give the reasons for that difference. Both these railways were put on the market by promoters. The promoters of the Canadian Pacific, however, after their preliminary work had been completed, put the road in the hands of expert managers, and the result was success. But in the case of the Canadian Northern, the promoters, having secured the construction of the railway, promoted the sale to the Government, and some believe they are now promoting the re-purchase of the system by them. If you will allow me, Sir, to give you the comment of the man on the street and to put it as I have heard it, it is this: the group of promoters of the Canadian Northern bled the country to build up their railways; they bled the country to sell their railway to the Government; they are bleeding the country through its operation, and they will again bleed the country when they re-purchase the road. Public opinion will not stand for that, as I shall prove before I am through with my remarks. The Government were compelled to take over 17,500 miles af railway, and they are waiting for the conclusion of the arbitration proceedings to take over the Grand Trunk. When they are attacked with regard to their policy of public ownership they turn on the Opposition and say: You are responsible; you built the National Transcontinental; you subsidized the Grand Trunk; you subsidized the Canadian Northern; it is your fault. But the Liberal Opposition reply: You were wrong in taking over these railways; you should have let them go into the hands of a receiver. But to my mind, Mr. Speaker, public men have no desire to lose their prestige, their reputation, their good name. They do not wish to propound policies which will result in the destruction of the parties which they lead; they are actuated by a desire to do what is right, and to do it at the proper time. Take, for instance, the Liberal party. In 1904 there had been two or three adjustments of Federal subsidies to the provinces and the older provinces were still endeavouring to secure better terms. The authorities in Ottawa thought that the demands were reasonable but that if they were met, the Federal Government would be exposed to a series of raids on the public treasury. About the same time the new management of the Grand Trunk, under the guidance of the late Mr. Hays, decided to ask for subsidies in order that they might tap the prairie provinces and secure an outlet to the Pacific ocean. The Government of the day decided that they would link together the appeal of the older provinces to secure better terms and the appeal of the Grand Trunk to get subsidies. Was that a wrong policy? Was the Government of the day composed of wilful wrong-doers? Not at all. This was at a time when two new provinces had been opened up on the prairies; it was at a time when an abundance of wealth was coming to this country, when an immense prosperity was flooding the country, and the men at the helm of the ship of state then decided that, at the same time as they were according better terms to the older provinces and as they were giving a favourable answer to the Grand Trunk, they would also answer the calls of the western population of Canada. What was the claim of the western population of Canada at that time? They said that the Canadian Pacific railway with its rolling stock was unable to take care of the needs of the western country; that the western country could not get service at proper rates. They were asking better service, competing lines, and the Government of the day decided to grant to the Grand Trunk subsidies to build the Grand Trunk Pacific, but on the understanding that the Grand Trunk would at the same time operate the National Transcontinental which was to be built with the

money of the people of this country. If you want to judge the action of the Liberal Government of 1904, you must go back to 1904. You cannot judge the decision and the action of that Government by the motives that you can impute to them in 1921. To do so would be unfair; it would be an injustice and you would be resorting to a policy of recriminations which would create a sentiment and feeling of unrest in the country. We are not here to say: "You are another." "I told you so." "Why did you not listen to me?" We are here to face problems as they come before us, without recrimination. If we want public men to be respected in the land, our first duty is to respect one another.

What was the argument of the Government in respect of their policy of public ownership? On account of the war, the railways were unable to meet their obligations, and the Government decided it was better to take over the railways and not to allow the companies to go into the hands of the receivers, because, otherwise, the credit of Canada would be hurt for all time to come in the money markets of the world. This is a sound reason; this is a reasonable argument; but there is more than that. The majority of the chamber were in favour of public ownership; they wanted to have this experiment, and

9 p.m. majorities rule in this House. I have stated before, and I have no hesitation in stating again to-night, that I am opposed to public ownership, because I believe it kills individual incentive to better one's condition. As soon as you have public ownership, you are falling into routine, and you can have no proper management unless you are lucky enough to find somebody who will be sufficiently strong to do his duty to the utmost, and such conditions are very hard to find these days.

Anyway the situation as I see it is this. The railways were built by parliaments of former days; they were taken hold of by the late government. Now we are face to face with this situation. Are we going to say: "Well, we will try to becloud the issue?" You cannot becloud the issue. Last year the railways had a deficit of $48,000,000; this year they have a deficit of $70,000,000, and next year the deficit will run up to $100,000,000. You cannot becloud the issue; you must face it like business men and try to secure the real remedy for the evil. What else could you do? You cannot sell those railways. Nobody will buy them. You cannot give them away for nothing. Nobody will take them. You cannot even give them away by paying somebody to take them. Everybody will be afraid of the expenditure. Are you going to sacrifice the money of the country? Are you going to let the railway deteriorate? Are you going to allow the rolling-stock to become obsolete as our locomotives are becoming obsolete? Are you going to let the motive-power, the rolling-stock, the road-bed, go to pieces? If that be the case, the deficits will be higher every year and you will never be able to dispose of the railways. You have the railways; manage them properly; keep them in the best of condition. If you are able to make a success of the business, all right; but if you can only make both ends meet, keep your railways in a state of efficiency, and when times are better, you will be able to dispose of them, regulating those railways by the Railway Commission, so that the people of this country will not have to pay rates which are prohibitive as the rates which we are paying now are. That is, to my mind, the only solution. We have, I admit, to face a tremendous problem; but are we going to say, after having gone on record for public ownership, that public ownership in the railway question is a hopeless task for Canada? You cannot do this unless you have given a fair trial to the experiment of public ownership of railways.

Who is responsible for the actual deficit because after all, if we had a surplus, I suppose the opponents of public ownership would not say much; I suppose we would not be looking for remedies if we had a surplus. We have a deficit. Who is responsible for that deficit? In railway management you have to take into consideration three factors—the management, the employees, and, in public ownership you have also to take into consideration the public. Of course, a privately-owned railway must also take the public into consideration, but under private ownership the public pays the rates and absorbs the securities issued by the railways. Under public ownership, the public pays the rates, and in our case, settles the deficits. Those are always the three factors, and they act accordingly.

Under public ownership you must have a management who can appeal to the employees. You must have a management that is founded on democracy; you must have a management that is not autocratic. Railway management under public owner-

ship must win the confidence of the employees. You cannot drive the employees by fear. The management must be respected by the employees, and when the public sees that the management is doing its best, that nothing is concealed, and that the operation of the road is successful, in its turn it also will have confidence in the management and in the employees. How can we expect the employees to have confidence in the present management of the road? They have been fighting each other since the beginning of public ownership. Actually, Sir, the Government through its management is paying every year an immense amount of money for freight which has been delivered to the Canadian National Railway system but which was never delivered again to the party to whom it was shipped. Things have gone so far, Sir, that the "Canadian Railroader," the official organ of the brotherhoods, is appealing to the employees to stop this pilfering of the freight trains. Can you blame the employees? They are doing what they see the management doing. If the management, after having had last year a deficit of $48,000,000, can come to this Parliament again this year with a deficit of $70,000,000, and still retain the confidence of the Government, what confidence do you think the employees can have in the management? More than that, if the management is permitted to manage the railway system in such a way as to compel the country to shoulder such huge expenditures and such excessive deficits, why should not the employees serve themselves while they have the opportunity? They do exactly as the ones above are doing, no more and no less. Do you believe, Mr. Speaker, that with a management of that kind we can make a success of public ownership? Mind you, I have gone on record, and I am not going to repeat myself. If I was only looking for political profit I would not say a word, but under democratic government, I believe in the majority ruling. The majority have asked for public ownership in railways. Give them public ownership, but do not kill public ownership, and do not kill the hopes of the men who believe in public ownership. I say it is the duty of the Government to change that. If the employees have no confidence in the management, how can the people have confidence in their public-owned railway? It is a failure. From one end of the country to the other newspapers are telling their readers that it is impossible to make a success of railway management under public ownership in this country, until now the people have lost confidence in public ownership. I believe that for the sake of the country—I have no right to ask the Government to do it for their own sake—the Government should change these conditions, and they cannot change them too soon, for not only is the Government going to suffer in the general dislocation, but the country is going to be ruined, and the country will not stand for that.

The management, I charge, is actually responsible for the situation of our railways. The road is managed by a gentleman who all his life has been affiliated with the group of promoters who promoted the Canadian Northern Railway, with its 65 subsidiary companies. Ordinarily, under railway management there is a main line, with feeders. The feeders help to swell the revenues of the main line. With the Canadian Northern, the feeders were only feeding the promoters; they never fed the main line. Conditions are the same to-day; even if they are not, people believe they are, and that is just as bad as if they were. When people look at the deficits on our national roads they will continue to believe that the feeders do not feed the main line; at any rate, they do not feed the coffers of the system.

Promoters cannot be railway managers. Promotion is an art, and railway management is a science. The promoter is looking for a quick turnover. He appeals to the schemers, the plungers, and the get-rich-quick people. But railway management is a science, and the scientific manager looks ahead for the application of principles which have been taught by experience. There is no comparison at all between the two. Promoters cannot manage. They can continue to promote, and they are actually promoting yearly deficits. But enough of that.

With the permission of the House I will speak in a single sentence my own mind on this question. Once a promoter, always a promoter. I say if the Government keep on with the present management of the Canadian National Railway system their responsibility will be very great. They are shattering the hopes of all those who believe that with competition in this country we can have better service with adequate rates. That will be impossible if the management remains in the hands of those who are actually managing our railway system. According to Mr. A. B. Johnston, the President of the Railway Association in the United States, "Transportation is a busi-

ness; it is the business of business men to put the transportation business on a business basis." I shall do my best to discuss the situation as one who would like to be a business man, who has studied this question with all his modest ability, and who is willing, whether his ideas prevail or not, to give them to the House with the satisfaction of having done his duty.

The management of every railway ought to replace without delay the obsolete locomotives that lie around every railway system on this continent. According to the figures which I have, there are on this continent more than 20,000 obsolete locomotives which cannot be consigned to the scrap-heap for the reason that at present they cannot be replaced. To build a modern locomotive to-day requires from $50,000 to $55,000; that is, if the figures I have been able to procure are correct. The technical experts on the railways in the United States, finding that they were unable to secure, by the issuing of bonds, the necessary funds to replace their present motive power, have devised means by which an obsolete locomotive, which to-day can draw only one-fourth of a regular haul, will, when remodelled, do the work of an engine that has cost $50,000 to $55,000. Now, this is no experiment; it has been accomplished in one of the eastern railways in the United States. The remodelling costs something like $22,000, and it converts an out-of-date locomotive into one of the most powerful engines on the road. The railways should have in their yards and in their shops proper scientific tools and equipment. I admit that the war is responsible for the fact that the railway shops are not equipped to do this kind of work; but if the railway companies would let contracts to the companies that remodel obsolete engines, I have no doubt that these concerns would be glad to do the work at practically half what it is costing the railways to carry on with their present rolling stock. If contracts were let for remodelling the locomotives that are in use now, within a few years the Canadian railways would have highly efficient motive power. But motive power is not the only question to be considered; I think that a scientific management should also see to the reduction of grades and curves.

Now, Mr. Speaker, the question of competition is a very interesting one. Railway experts assert that the troubles in connection with the present railway situation on this continent are due chiefly to duplication of tracks; but it seems to me that our Canadian railway concerns, in face of the unwisdom and the loss resulting from such duplication, are fostering this disease. It is a useless expenditure to have trains running practically alongside of one another, consuming fuel and paying wages to double crews. Under a scientific and proper management, many trains would be eliminated, and, with proper motive power, freight trains could be hauled with more tonnage and fewer employees. But, Sir, when the railway management have to face employees as well as Parliament, they are afraid to act, and while they are in a state of indecision, deficits are piling up every year. An important question, Mr. Speaker, is that of terminals. For the railway management as well as for the travelling public, I suggest that the same terminals should be used as far as possible by different lines, taking care, of course, not to prejudice the traffic of the owners of any terminal.

The question of letting contracts for rolling stock is to my mind one of the most important and most serious. Whenever the Canadian National Railways want rolling stock or motive power, they virtually advertise in advance through the appropriations voted in Parliament. Those who supply raw material, as well as the labourers, know that the management will be in the market; and the Canadian Pacific Railway, the only competitor our national railways have, are thereby given an advantage which they would not have in the case of a private competitor. If the Canadian Pacific Railway wanted to secure an appropriation for any purpose, they would get it at a meeting of the shareholders. But when a vote is made in Parliament for the Canadian National Railways for the purpose of securing motive power or rolling stock, their competitor—and I know this of my personal knowledge—immediately enters the market. What is their object in doing that? They are in the market to boost prices and not with any intention of letting contracts; and the prices of raw material having been boosted up, the Canadian National Railways pay more for their rolling stock than they should if they were properly managed. I was reading in one of the papers of Montreal yesterday that the Canada Car Company have no orders from the Government, although they know that the Government will soon be in the market to purchase rolling stock. Look at the National Steel Car Company. They have contracts for just three or four months in the year, and the labour men, knowing that they will have only three or four months' work, necessarily increase

their demands. The owners of dwellings also, knowing that their houses will be occupied only for three or four months, raise their rents; and the tradesmen in the vicinity, apt to be left with an immense stock on their shelves, naturally charge higher prices. So that the labour men have nothing to do but demand higher wages, because they have to pay higher rent and greater prices for the goods they buy. But there is something worse: the labouring man, working only three or four months in the year, loses a part of his efficiency and the Canadian National Railway system pays higher for its rolling stock.

May I be permitted, Sir, to place on Hansard the official figures of the rolling stock and motive power which were contracted for by the American and Canadian railways in 1920: locomotives 1,770, the cost amounting to $106,000,000. Passenger cars 997, at a cost of $23,000,000. Freight cars 73,593, the cost amounting to $221,000,000 making a grand total of $350,000,000. The Canadian National Railway system is paying for a share of this rolling stock and motive power, and I believe that it is time to have a system, a scientific system, which will do away with lots of the waste from which the national railways annually suffer; the management, to my mind, should try to secure the greatest efficiency combined with the strictest economy.

May I be permitted, Sir, to call the attention of the House to an experiment entered into by the large railway known as the Pennsylvania Railway system? When that railway was given back to its private owners there had been such a large expenditure, and such an immense amount of patronage, under public ownership, that in the first month after the resumption of private ownership the management of the road released from employment 15,000 men. There was trouble all over the line, but the management of the Pennsylvania appealed to the men. They told the men that they were looked upon as partners. The men were given committees of their own with equal representation with the management; and every month, all over the line, sub-committees are having their regular sittings. Every discussion is open, every question is settled; and when this joint committee has, by a vote of two-thirds, reached a conclusion, the matter is settled once for all over the entire Pennsylvania system. Sir, every newspaper in the United States has acclaimed this experiment, saying that owing to this plan there will be no more strikes on the Pennsylvania system. I wish hon. members to keep this experiment of the Pennsylvania railroad in mind because I want to use it as an illustration in connection with the proposal which I would have submitted to the House had I not decided to speak on the motion of my hon. friend the senior member for Halifax (Mr. Maclean). But being unable to present this resolution as I had contemplated, and calling for a vote on it, I will embody in my remarks all that the resolution contains, and this will be my contribution towards the endeavour to settle the vexing problem of our railways in Canada. I believe, Sir, that with proper handling the employees of the Canadian National Railway system might be taught that the McAdoo schedule and the Chicago agreement are unable to solve the problem as far as they are concerned. The McAdoo schedule of rates was launched on the eve of a presidential campaign in the United States. It was designed for a political purpose, but, Sir, it has created a situation which, in wages alone, has increased the pay-roll of the railways of America from $1,500,000,000 to $3,600,000,000 inside of four years. The employees using the McAdoo schedule went into convention and they adopted what is called the Chicago agreement. I shall give to the House a few instances of the effect of this agreement, and then hon. members will understand, I am sure, why the railway situation in the United States, as well as in Canada, is in a very distressing state. With the closed shop and the Chicago agreement, which are two different things, the labour element have adopted a policy which can thus be summed up: the least work done by each man means more work which will have to be done by others. Now let us see what has been the result of the Chicago agreement as recorded in the proceedings of the recent United States Railway Board which met in Chicago:

> The Pere Marquette Railway was compelled to pay $9,364 in back pay to four pump employees because their titles under these agreements were changed by a decision of the Director General.
>
> A car repairer on the Virginian Railway was paid $1,000 for work he never did. He was laid off with other employees because there was no work for him to do. When he became entitled under his "seniority rights" to be re-employed, he received back pay and overtime.

There are instances, Sir, where men, without working but because they were protected by the closed shop system and because they were influenced by the Chicago

agreement, have made raids on the treasuries of American railways. When these railways were operated by the government the patronage curse helped the employees along; but now that the railways in the United States have been handed back to their private owners the latter cannot stand for such doings; and surely, Sir, when private owners are unable to subscribe to the demands of the employees because they are excessive, the men, if they were properly talked to, ought to understand what is best in their own interests—surely they would obey and would follow the course which reason dictates? But actually, Sir, you cannot have that—it is impossible. The management is spending money and the employees want to spend just as much as the management is spending.

Sir, if I were permitted to occupy a few more minutes of the time of the House I would say that the remedy of our railway situation is this: you must take into consideration that in running railways there is the mechanical operation, and there is the technical operation. The mechanical operation in my opinion should be attended to by the employees, and they should be given proper representation on the commission. I cannot admit, Sir, that the right hon. gentleman who leads the Government can hope to make a success of our railways when those who are supposed to have the general management have not been to Toronto for twelve, fifteen or eighteen months or even two years. They cannot be held responsible, for they have never been trained for that work. They have not got even a smattering of the science of railroading. The sole management of the road is in the hands of one man, and in this man the country has no confidence whatever. If I may give good advice to the Prime Minister, I would say to him: Do away immediately with the present commission and substitute for it a commission of mechanical and technical experts. Have three men to look after the mechanical operation of the road; secure the services of three technical experts in equipment, maintenance and operation; have two purchasing experts, and appoint as chairman an expert railway manager vested with the fullest authority. Above all, Sir, to give confidence to the public have the books of this Canadian National Railway system audited by the Auditor General of Canada. He is not an employee of the Government; he is an employee of Parliament, and he has the confidence of the country. It may be objected that he will have to increase his staff. Well, let him increase it. Surely the auditors who are at present auditing the books must have increased their staff to look after this work, and it is just as well that it should be done under the guidance of the Auditor General. Then, Sir, in order that the idea of public ownership which was responsible for taking over this system may be maintained, the books after being audited by the Auditor General should on request of the members of this House, with the consent of the manager of the system and with the acquiescence of the Government, be brought before Parliament so that the country may see there is nothing to conceal. In that way you will restore public confidence.

Some hon. members are trying to make political capital out of this railway situation. I say it is too big and too distressing a problem to be so treated. Let us face it as business men. Let us appeal to the scientific railroad men who on the other side of the line have been able since last September to restore six of those roads from the verge of bankruptcy to a sound paying basis. "Oh," some hon. gentlemen will say, "Do not let us go outside of Canada for help." Sir, let me cite the example of the shareholders of the Grand Trunk, who were pretty nearly all Britishers living in Great Britain. They were tired of seeing the continued deficits of the Grand Trunk, and they went to Mr. Hays in southern California and hired him for five years, at an immense salary for that time, to rehabilitate the system. He came to Montreal with a full staff of technical experts and was given complete control of the road. What was the result? For the first time in the history of the Grand Trunk a dividend was paid on all its stock. It was worth while for the shareholders to engage Mr. Hays. And I say it is worth while for this country, if we are to make a success of public ownership, to take similar action, and if after doing so we are unable to make a success of it, then those who come after us will say that when Parliament decided to take over our railways it did not know its business and was unable to tackle a job which in the sequel was a hopeless task from the outset.

Right Hon. ARTHUR MEIGHEN (Prime Minister): Mr. Speaker, I wish to express my appreciation of the considerate and impartial manner in which the mover of the amendment (Mr. Maclean, Halifax) presented his case, and as well of the incisive,

forceful and well informed style of the hon. member who succeeded him on the floor (Mr. Gauthier). The amendment before the House by way of amendment calls merely for the appointment of a standing committee, and it is the amendment, of course, which is before us for consideration. It is before us for consideration in the same way and with as great thoroughness as if the judgment of Parliament were to be obtained upon it, notwithstanding the fact that the hon. member who moved the motion was fair enough to see and to state that, inasmuch as the general attitude of the Government towards it had been made known, while it appeared on the Order Paper as an ordinary motion he did not feel that it should be pressed to a conclusion by way of amendment to Supply.

Coming then before the House as a motion for a standing committee for this session, it is, I think, my duty to state with more definiteness and completeness than was necessary on a previous occasion what the position of the Government is with regard to the suggestion it contains. I agree wholly with the hon. member from St. Hyacinthe that the hopes entertained by the hon. member for Halifax as to what can be achieved by the mere launching of a committee of this House are rather chimerical and extravagant. Nevertheless, it occurred to me on my first study of the motion when it appeared on the Order Paper that it would be worth while to extend to a committee of Parliament the duty of studying some of the concrete phases of this railway question. Indeed, it must have occurred to many hon. members that some method should be found for spreading a little wider the heavy burden that more and more devolves upon us as the Parliament of Canada and for endeavouring to secure from hon. members what they are capable of doing through the instrumentality of committees. I am quite aware that in doing so care must be taken that no attempt is made on the one hand to delegate to a committee what it is the duty of Parliament as a whole to itself consider and decide upon, nor on the other hand to detract from the essential responsibility of the Government for the initiation of policy. Perhaps I may first refer to the general railway situation which naturally in this debate is before us to some extent. I am free to say that the results of operation, in so far as they are reflected in the financial returns, are not altogether what we would like to see. The deficit this year is very substantial; the deficit last year was substantial. There are special reasons why that deficit exists—reasons so powerful that I do not think any hon. member who studied the subject thoroughly could have reasonably expected that no deficit would appear. At the same time I do not think the whole outlook is anything like so appalling or so discouraging as seems to be indicated by both hon. members who have just spoken and by some in the House and out of it who have already given expression to their views.

It must be recalled, first of all,—and this among other facts was brought to the attention of the House in the statement of the Minister of Railways (Mr. Reid)—that there was considerable arrearage to make up in the way of additions to the scale of pay extending over a period of time that was not covered by the increase in rates which was intended by the Railway Commission to apply thereto. A very considerable share of the deficit, at least of the increase in the deficit, is attributable to that cause. Other causes might be looked to, but a more appropriate time will come when the details of the figures may be inquired into by this House. But looking by and large at the whole problem, it is by no means surprising that we in Canada should find ourselves at this time with railway difficulties of considerable magnitude to overcome. Now, why is that the case?

It is the case fundamentally and in the most important degree for this reason: as the result of conditions that are universal, every country in civilization to-day has railway difficulties of great magnitude to surmount. The mover of the resolution referred to the United States and also to England, and the hon. member for St. Hyacinthe brought forward most significant facts in respect to railway conditions in the United States to apprise the House of how tremendous is the problem that that republic confronts. Correspondingly great is the difficulty in which England finds herself in this regard. The reasons are not far to seek. During the progress of the war there was in both countries a mobilization of the railways under state control. The state undertook for the first time the handling of the traffic of the country. They were making an experiment, and naturally in the first years of the trial there would not be expected the same success that experience would bring about. May I remark in passing that I do not think there is a railway expert in any of the other countries engaged in the war who would not readily concede that in this country the

problem of handling the traffic was more thoroughly solved than it was in the United States, in England—indeed, in any nation of considerable importance. We had during the war most excellent traffic conditions in Canada; we had none of the most serious congestions which both in England and in the United States, more particularly in the United States, were encountered. In addition to the fact that there is a burden to be carried by reason of the struggle through the first years of Government operation on the part of these countries, railway wages and costs of material have advanced in these years at an unprecedented pace. The long series of McAdoo awards in the United States and of corresponding awards in England and in Canada has added tremendously to the burden of the railways and the cost of materials has also added to it, though not to the same extent. But both have put upon railway operation burdens that could not in the nature of things be compensated for by the increase in rates. You may increase rates to a certain degree and, as you go up, increase the returns of the road, but there is a point beyond which you cannot go; there is an elevation beyond which you cannot go and get any corresponding returns. There was, in a word, nothing to compensate in toto, or nearly so, in the way of increase in return due to elevation of rates, for the tremendous advance in labour and material costs. That was a universal condition.

Now, it would not be strange if in Canada we had something of an exceptional burden, a burden additional to that shared in common by other countries enjoying transportation conditions similar to ours. I do not know, though, that our burden is so very much greater proportionately. I do not know that the problem in the United States, proportionate to their population and their strength, is not to-day just as vast as ours. Surely the figures given by the member for Halifax and the member for St. Hyacinthe indicate that the financial burden they must surmount in that country this year and next year is fairly comparable in proportion to population with that which we must overtake. But I say that it would not be strange if we had something exceptional in this country. And why? In the first place, we have a country of tremendous extent. We have a large area, and the larger the area of a country proportionate to its population, the greater must be its railway burden and the more it must cost to transport the goods of that country. Consequently, it is only reasonable to suppose that until our population bears a higher proportion to our area we are probably going to have a bigger railway problem in this country than other countries have. It is only fair to bear that fact in mind in reflecting on the strength of the next point that I hope to make.

As I set about to state the next reason why we might expect to have an exceptional railway problem in Canada, I hope I shall be able to do so without seeking to make party capital out of it in any way. It does not matter to whom it is attributable. I have my own opinion as to whom it is attributable; others may have theirs. But that is not the point for the moment. The fact is that in this country we did anticipate unreasonably the railway needs of Canada and we did build prematurely so far as transcontinental lines go. By how many years, no man can estimate; by ten years, by twenty, possibly by thirty. But the fewer we can make it, the better. It should be the effort of every good Canadian and every public man who understands his duty to help make that period of years just as short as possible. I for one am by no means discouraged. I am more hopeful to-day than I have been for a long time that there will be no need of railway deficits in the course of some years; that we shall overtake the time when the mileage now constructed in this country may be used to advantage and when these great railway enterprises entered into in great degree for the purpose of opening up the country and for political purposes—honourable and high political purposes, too, some of them—when these railway enterprises will reach the stage when they are business enterprises as well. We are in the process of arriving at that point and all the efforts of this Parliament will be needed to hasten it. But struggle as we may we shall not reach that end for some time; we cannot in the nature of things reach for a few years at least the time when the railways now gathered into the Government system, built as they were for other than business purposes—that is to say, as investments that would be expected to bear a dividend within a reasonable time—will become business enterprises as well as political ventures.

It surely must be concluded that the present railway situation need cause no surprise, nor need it necessarily be attributable to faults of management. There may be faults, but that is not the issue in this

debate. Further, it need not be attributable to the fault of the system. The management doubtless has faults. Every management has faults. The system doubtless has faults. Every system has faults. But I do not know of any other system that could have been adopted in the railway impasse which existed in Canada than a Government-operated system. If anyone can point the way or can stand back two or three or four years behind the present time and from there point the way of any other system that could have been followed, I should like to hear it. I do not think there was any system open to adoption at that time, or that there is now, other than the system we adopted. It may be that the construction of the method of management might be improved. I am not prepared to discuss that point now; but, at all events, it does not necessarily follow that, because there are large deficits in operation, larger than those of last year, and the deficits of last year larger than those of the year before, the principle of management is wrong; nor does it follow from that alone that the method of construction of the corporation and the devolution of responsibility in the corporation is wrong. Much less does it follow that Government-operation in itself is unsound. So much by way of general comment on the railway situation.

I come now to a more specific discussion of the resolution and of what, in my judgment, might be expected of and delegated to a special committee of this House. The hon. member who moved the motion, the senior hon. member for Halifax (Mr. Maclean), emphasized the necessity for greater information, both on the part of members of Parliament and the country, as to fundamental railway facts of Canada. I would be only too glad if some practicable step could be taken by this House to spread wider the truth as regards our railways; in a word, better to inform the Canadian public. That would be a high and honourable object to seek. The hon. member thinks also that the committee could be instrumental in forming a liaison, a connection of some kind, between the railways and the public. I do not know that I have made any particular study of the functions of special or standing committees in relation to parliament; but if my experience is worth anything, it would lead to this conclusion, that you can scarcely make too concrete and definite the duties delegated to a special committee. The hon. member who moved the motion has been in this House for many years; he has sat on many committees, and I did not hear him make any favourable comment on the competency or value of any special committee. Indeed, he took care to say that the Railway Committee of Parliament, which, perhaps, is the most important committee that we have, is historically unfitted for such a task as he has in mind for this special committee. I do not know of any special reason why this should be so; but why is it that we delegate specifically duties to other committees, but that we should give this special committee almost unlimited powers and expect it in some roving commission style to do the impossible? The hon. member seems to have in mind that if we can just appoint a special committee of Parliament and throw the doors wide open on all sides and the windows open above and around, that committee is going to settle all troubles under the sun. It will settle the question, say, of what branch lines shall be built; it will settle the question of railway rates. He discussed that at some length, although that question is committed to the charge of a body of experts known as the Railway Commission. It will settle the question whether the Hudson Bay railway shall be completed. It will settle the question whether a set of steamers running in our Mercantile Marine between Halifax and Newfoundland shall be continued on that route, and if they shall not be continued, what we had better do with the steamers. After it has done that, it will become a sort of educational institution to inform the whole Canadian public about our railways, a sort of college, university, and correspondence school combined. Really, I do not see how a committee of Parliament could ever perform functions so extensive. Nor do I think that, sitting here as members of this House, debating a resolution, we are very likely to be able to determine in the best and most careful way just what it would be wise for a Standing Committee of Parliament on National Railways and Shipping to undertake. It is of the utmost importance that if a standing committee is to be created—and it seems to me well to create it for specific purposes that I will come to in a moment—and if it is to be continued as a standing committee, its powers, duties and responsibilities should be carefully and thoroughly thought out and committed to that committee in such form that it will know exactly what it is expected to do, what service it is expected to render to

10 p.m.

the House and, therefore, it will address itself to its task with the intention of really getting it done well. Consequently, I intend to set out what I think Parliament might well charge such a committee with, and included in that will be the task of studying and determining for recommendation to Parliament whether the committee could, for useful purposes, be continued, and if so, what those purposes should be.

In discussing a subject akin to this about a week ago in this House, I said that Parliament might well consider whether or not the committee should be charged with the duty of studying out the much discussed problem how on the one hand Parliament can be kept informed of all facts connected with the railways and their operation, the shipping and its operation, all facts that Parliament should be kept apprised of in order that Parliament may, with all the light that can be shed upon the subject, determine questions of policy as to both railways and shipping, and how, on the other hand, that can be done without exposing the management to such conditions of operation as make efficiency impossible. That is a real problem. It is something of which, if a committee can work out and frame and recommend to Parliament a solution, that committee will be discharging a real duty to this Parliament and rendering a real service to the country. I believe it can be done; I believe it must be done; and I think it will be done. We must find a method by which necessary facts, that Parliament must have brought out as to operation and everything else connected with the railways and shipping, may be made known to Parliament, and at the same time that this may be done without so shackling and restraining the operations of the road as to make business operation by a board of directors an impossibility. Unless there are restrictions—at least as to operations under way or very recent—unless conditions are imposed, unless something is done that will not expose the management from day to day to such disclosure in this House of its every act for the benefit of the individual here or the individual there or its competitor all over the country, or for the benefit of some political party, or of a political candidate here or a political candidate there—unless something is done so that the facts can be made known without those results, we may just as well give up for all time the possibility of a business management of the national railways of Canada.

I would like to ask, is there a director of that road who would suggest that such day to day disclosures can be contemplated? I know the management would never suggest it, and I believe, and firmly believe, that no man and no set of men capable of consideration for the management of a tremendous enterprise and responsibility of that kind could be secured to undertake the task if there was no restraint in that regard. Therefore, if that is committed to the committee, and the committee is empowered to secure every fact necessary for its determination on that policy, it is a task such a committee may well engage upon, and it would be an honour to any committee to be able to come to Parliament with a practical solution of the problem.

Furthermore, and this also has been referred to by previous speakers, there may be some question—I do not know whether there should be or not—as to whether the system of auditing that is now followed in respect of the operation of the national railways and shipping can be improved, whether it would be possible to have it done under the Auditor General, subject to his responsibility. I am not going to say whether a change would be better or whether it would not. I know there are very, very strong opinions that it would be impracticable to have it so done. But I think the committee might very well inquire—and the Auditor General could be a witness and anybody else that the committee wanted to give evidence on that point could be a witness—whether the system of auditing could be improved upon, and included in that is the question whether the auditing should be under the responsibility of the Auditor General or not, or perhaps jointly, or perhaps on the responsibility of a firm designated for the purpose subject to the ultimate responsibility of the Auditor General. That question might well be looked into.

Then I have heard it suggested that there might well be more detailed information as to the operation of the road appearing in the annual report than it is customary for ordinary railway corporations to embody in the annual report to their shareholders. So far the management of the road include in their annual report only what ordinarily is given by a corporation to its shareholders; such as the Canadian Pacific Railway, for example, gives to its shareholders. It has been suggested that under the speciai conditions appertaining to Government operation, it should be possible and would be desirable that more detailed informatio

be given in the annual report of the Canadian National Railways. That question might also be considered by the committee.

Then there would be the further subject for deliberation as to whether it would be well to establish this committee as a permanent standing committee, such as the Railway Committee, the Public Accounts Committee, the Banking and Commerce Committee, and if so, for what purposes it should be continued, that is, what should be its duties as a permanent committee. That subject also might well come under review. review.

I have merely outlined in brief what have occurred to me as proper subjects for the deliberation of the committee. I am not going to say that nothing else could be submitted to them. It might be conceivable that the general question of the devolution of responsibility within the managing body might also come up for consideration there. I have no comment to offer upon that suggestion. It can be reviewed when the motion that I shall give notice of to-night comes up for discussion. At present I am convinced that the four topics that I have hastily referred to might well be committed for consideration and report, and I am most thoroughly persuaded that if the committee addresses itself for the rest of this session to the review of those four concrete, distinct, and most vitally important questions, it will perform a service so great that it will not likely be hunting for other worlds to conquer.

There is one thing perhaps I should say, and it was suggested by a remark, I think, of the hon. member for St. Hyacinthe (Mr. Gauthier). It must never be thought that we should give to a committee powers or duties exceeding those we ourselves are ready to exercise. For example, if it is not in the interests of the country that we so hamper the management of the road as to render efficiency impossible by doing in this House what this House decided some few days ago it would not do, namely, bring out merely upon question or motion all information, no matter what it is; if that is not going to be done by Parliament, then Parliament is certainly not going to commit to a committee the power to do what in the public interest it is not right for Parliament to do itself. That could not be considered at all.

It was suggested in the debate, and I must say the suggestion was surrounded with uncertainty to me—I could not tell just what was intended by it—that if the word "Confidential" were used in respect to papers and documents that should not be produced, that would solve the whole problem, but the explanation of the word "Confidential" given by the senior member for Halifax (Mr. Maclean) was such that if it meant what he said, then the whole idea meant nothing at all. It would simply mean that there should be brought down in this House such documents as the Government thought it was in the interests of the country to bring down. With the idea so vague as that, I think it would be well to commit to the committee this question, and not leave it to the deliberation and decision of the Government in each individual case. That is impossible. Let us commit to the committee the decision as to what line of information, perhaps complete, if at the proper time, should be brought down, and the conditions under which it should come down, in order that Parliament may be put in possession of verything that Parliament should have to determine policy in relation to the railways and in relation to shipping. In the word "policy" I include finance.

I think it is wise just to repeat in one sentence my suggestion: That to a committee there be given the duty of inquiring into and reporting to this House on the four subjects I have outlined, and that one of these four subjects should be the working out with care and thoroughness what the powers and duties of that committee should be should its existence as a permanent standing committee be recommended to this House.

Hon. W. L. MACKENZIE KING (leader of the Opposition): I should like to ask my right hon. friend one or two questions before commenting on what he has said. Would he regard it as appropriate that there should be referred to the committee to which he has made reference the report of the Board of Directors—that the committee might consider any matter that is dealt with in that report?

Mr. MEIGHEN: I would consider it right that the report of the Board of Directors should be referred to the committee. The committee, of course, would consider it for the purpose of giving a decision on the subjects referred to it.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: What I am anxious to know is whether my right hon. friend thinks it would be proper for the committee to ask for information with respect to any matters that were suggested by that report?

Mr. MEIGHEN: Certainly, with a view to determining its decision on the duties committed to it.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: I am not concerned about the committee's powers to determine what its duties will be. The point I am after is the power of the committee to secure information, facts, and answers to questions. Now, the report of the Board of Directors would deal with a number of matters pertaining to railway management, control, and operation, and it would naturally suggest a number of questions. What I should like to know is this: Would that committee have the power to get from the management answers to any questions which its members might wish to put with respect to any of these matters?

Mr. MEIGHEN: If the hon. gentleman is not concerned with the duties of the committee, I am afraid there is not very much purpose in his question. The committee would necessarily direct all its efforts to the performance of its duties, and if it considered that any facts as to management were essential to enable it to determine these questions, it would have it within its powers to demand those facts.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: I am afraid that the replies of my right hon. friend are somewhat vague and evasive.

Mr. MEIGHEN: Not at all.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: I will not say I think he purposely wishes them to be so, but if I understand the tenour of his remarks, they mean that this is a committee essentially for the study of what powers a body of the kind should have. I desire to know whether or not I am right in viewing the remarks of my right hon. friend in that way.

Mr. MEIGHEN: It is not a committee for the study of what powers it should have. That is only one question. I very clearly outlined four. The committee would be entitled to any information which it thought was necessary in order to enable it to come to a decision. I cannot answer more clearly than that, and, as we are not in committee, I think we should proceed with the debate.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: I am prepared to proceed with the debate. Permit me, Mr. Speaker, to remind the House that the circumstance which occasioned this particular debate was a motion which was introduced a few days ago on going into Supply, in which we on this side of the House asked the Government to supply Parliament with information with respect to matters pertaining to the operation, management, and control of the Canadian National Railways; averring in this connection that the Government should be responsible to Parliament in the giving of information and accounting for public expenditures, so far as the Canadian National Railways and the Railway Department are concerned, in the same way as in respect to any department of government. We were told at the time that it was impossible for the Government to give us information in answer to questions asked in Parliament, and further, that it was impossible for the Government to give information by way of orders for the production of papers and documents asked for. Speaking broadly, there are only three possible avenues whereby Parliament can be informed with regard to the administration of public matters: one, answers to questions asked of the ministry; another, the production of papers; and the third, through some committee of Parliament which has power to obtain information and report upon the same to Parliament.

Having been denied the first two sources of information, we naturally expected, when my hon. friend, the member for Halifax (Mr. Maclean), had upon the Order Paper a resolution to the effect that Rule 10 of the House should be amended so as to establish a Select Standing Committee on Railways and Shipping, and when it was intimated by my right hon. friend the Prime Minister (Mr. Meighen), that in all probability the Government would accept something at least equivalent to what the hon. member had proposed, that we were to have at least one avenue whereby it would be possible for the people's representatives in Parliament to receive information in regard to matters appertaining to the control, operation and management of the Canadian National Railways. Instead of that, after listening to my right hon. friend this evening, we are now led to believe that all that the Government proposes is to appoint a committee for the purpose of studying and determining, for recommendation to Parliament, certain questions. That is an entirely different proposal from the one in which we are interested. What this Parliament wishes to obtain is information that will enable the public to understand, among other

things, how it is that a deficit occurred the year before last of $48,000,000 on these railways under Government management; how it is that that deficit was $70,000,000 for the past year; and how it is that in all probability it will be $100,000,000 for the present year. These are vast sums of public money which the people of the country have to provide by way of taxation, and the people will demand that the Government, in one form or another, shall be responsible for the accounting of every cent so spent, no matter whether it is paid out under some Board of Directors which the Government themselves may constitute, or paid out by a Government department direct.

Allow me Mr. Speaker, to draw the attention of the House to an important fact: Last year, when my hon. friend the Minister of Railways, made his statement to Parliament and announced, with surprise at that time, the enormous deficit of $48,000,000, we on this side naturally immediately asked for information that would help to explain that deficit. My hon. friend was quick in assuring us that as soon as the report of the Board of Directors of the National Railways was laid on the Table of Parliament we should be given ample powers of investigation in order to obtain all the information that was wanted. The hon. gentleman who sits beside him, the then Minister of Immigration and Colonization, the present President of the Privy Council (Mr. Calder), was also promptly on his feet to explain that the Government were anxious to get the Estimates through and that if we would only wait in our requests for information until the report of the Board of Directors were tabled, we could have all the committees we liked and the fullest investigation into the affairs of the railways. My right hon. friend the Prime Minister himself gave the House a definite assurance, in positive terms, that we could have all the information we desired in regard to matters appertaining to the report of the Board of Directors or to any other question concerning the operation, management or control of the national railways. Now, this year, when we have a deficit of $70,000,000, the Government changes its policy entirely, turns in a directly opposite direction, and informs us that we shall have no information whatever. They say: "We will give no information to the public by means of answers to question, or through the production of papers. We will not allow a special committee of Parliament to get that information; all we will do is to concede a committee of Parliament for the purpose of studying certain academic questions"—questions which my right hon. friend has elaborated at great length—" but we will not give the committee power to get facts with respect to the cost of materials, with respect to contracts, with respect to methods of management; in other words, we will give no information that will help to explain this enormous deficit." Now, that is a position which, in the sight of the people of this country, is absolutely indefensible.

Let me make clear the distinction between the Government's present attitude and their professed attitude of last year. I do not say that it was their true attitude, because, as circumstances proved, once the Government got under way with the Estimates, they quickly forgot their promises that Parliament would be amply supplied with whatever information was required. In Hansard, on April 26, 1920, as reported at page 1671, will be found the following questions I addressed to my right hon. friend.

> Mr. Mackenzie King: .....The Minister of the Interior said—and his remark was very significant—that while the Government would bring down a report somewhat in the nature of the report made by the Canadian Pacific Railway Company, Parliament or any committee of Parliament would have a right to investigate everything disclosed by that report. I think I have reported my hon. friend correctly in that regard.
>
> Mr. Meighen: That is right.
>
> Mr. Mackenzie King: But what about the things that are not disclosed in that report? That is just exactly what we want to get at through the questions we are asking.
>
> Mr. Meighen: If they have to do with the company, the hon. gentleman will have a right to information as to those also.

There is a statement which my right hon. friend made last year to this parliament. In regard to anything that had to do with the company, we on this side of the House, or members of Parliament generally, were to have right to the fullest possible information; but the doctrine laid down by my right hon. friend this year is that touching anything that appertains to the company we shall get no information. Only on such matters as relate to the department, and the relations between the department and contractors, for example, is this House to receive any information. Now, Mr. Speaker, we cannot bear too clearly in mind this complete change of front on the part of the Administration. This year they have brought forward a distinction, between the company's respon-

sibility in managing the railways and the Government's responsibility. They say that so far as the Government is concerned they have no responsibility other than as regards matters of a purely departmental concern; that anything pertaining to the management of the road through the company is something that concerns the company, and that Parliament is not to be informed upon it.

But the Prime Minister was not the only member of the Government who gave the assurance that if we passed the Estimates we would be supplied with any information as to the affairs of the company. His colleagues, in the House, as I have already mentioned, were all of one mind on that point. On April 26, 1920, the Minister of Immigration (Mr. Calder) as reported on page 1671 of Hansard, said:

> Every opportunity and every facility should be provided to this House to examine into every transaction. Everything that the management do may be brought under review.

Now we are told that nothing the management does is to be brought under review —the direct opposite. Again on page 1672 of Hansard my hon. friend is reported as follows:

> This House will have the fullest opportunity to inquire into every dollar's worth of expenditure that has been made by the National railways during the past year.

Let me read the statement again, Mr. Speaker, and contrast it with the position which hon. gentlemen opposite are taking this year. Mark this: the statement was made at a time when the deficit was forty millions. We have now a deficit of seventy millions, and it is threatening to become a deficit of one hundred millions for next year. When the deficit was forty millions my hon. friend said:

> This House will have the fullest opportunity to inquire into every dollar's worth of expenditure that has been made by the National railways during the past year.

More than that, the Minister of Immigration and Colonization went on to say:

> It simply means that there will be a time when the fullest opportunity will be presented to Parliament to inquire into every detail of the work of the Canadian National Railway system.

There we have three distinct statements and pledges: first, that everything relating to the management shall be disclosed; second, that every dollar's worth of expenditure shall be accounted for; third, that every detail of the work may be inquired into. And now we are told by hon. gentlemen opposite that neither as respects the management nor the expenditure nor details of the work are the members of this Parliament to have any information whatever.

But the hon. ministers I have just quoted were not the only members of the Government who spoke in this way. I see opposite me the hon the Minister of Finance (Sir Henry Drayton) and he, I think, will recall that he made a statement to the House at that time, as Minister of Finance, with respect to the attitude of the Government in giving information. That statement was made on April 26, 1920, and will be found at page 1680 of Hansard. It is as follows:

> The House will be given the fullest opportunity to examine the report when it is brought down. Select committees or any thing else you like. These committees will be a great deal more than the shareholders of the Canadian Pacific will get, but make thorough inquiry then if you will, so long as the detailed business from day to day is not of necessity more or less interrupted.

In other words, what the Minister of Finance assured us was that so long as we did not question the ministry from day to day with respect to matters which might affect the business management of the system, that if we would be content to wait until the report was brought down, we could ask for committees and those committees would get all the information that they might want on any question that they liked to ask. Now we are told that we cannot have a committee except for the purpose of an academic inquiry.

But, Mr. Speaker, the Minister of Railways also gave a pledge on behalf of the Government.

Mr. PARENT: You can rely on that one.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: Here is the pledge given by the Minister of Railways on June 25, 1920. It is to be found on page 4194 of Hansard and is as follows:

> I would think that in the future there would be no reason why a special committee of the House should not be appointed in connection with railways and let some of the officials come and explain the operations and give any information the committee may want.

Now, Mr. Speaker, what are we to conclude concerning the attitude of the Government at the present time when we have had the Prime Minister, the Minister of Finance, the Minister of Railways and other of their colleagues assuring Parlia-

ment before the Estimates are passed, that committees will be granted, that the fullest information will be conceded, that the House will get all the information it wants, and, then after the Government have succeeded in getting their Estimates through, they come back to Parliament the next year and tell us that we will get information in regard to any of these matters one way or the other?

Some hon. MEMBERS: Shame.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: Let me say, Mr. Speaker, that the people of Canada have a right to an accounting for every single dollar of public money that is being spent on the national system of railways, and no fiction, no subterfuge, on the part of my right hon. friend or his Government will serve as an excuse for that fundamental principle of responsible government not being adhered to if it is at all possible. What does my right hon. friend, or the Minister of Railways, say when we now ask them for information in regard to these roads? They say the Government has no responsibility; that responsibility belongs to the management. When we ask of the management they say "We have no responsibility, we are under the Board of Directors." At other times my hon. friends opposite also say to us "The Board of Directors are responsible." I think my right hon. friend said the other day that in this respect the Act would speak for itself. He disclaimed that any department of the Government was responsible and insinuated, though he did not say it, that by this Act, Parliament had made the Board of Directors responsible. Well, Mr. Speaker, let me read what the Act says in regard to the responsibility of the Board of Directors. It will be found in section 6 of the Statute 9-10 Geo. V., Chapter 13:

> 6. No Director of the Company shall be under any personal responsibility to any shareholder, director, officer or employee of the Company, nor to any other person, nor, except with the approval of the Governor in Council, shall be subject to any pecuniary penalty under the provisions of any statute, in respect of his office, or any act done or omitted to be done by him in the execution thereof.

In other words the Government virtually say "We will accept no responsibility," the Board of Management have no responsibility and the directors according to the Statute have no responsibility: in this way there are hundreds of millions of dollars of public money being spent without any responsibility one way or the other. My right hon. friend asks me: what is the explanation of the condition into which these roads have got; what is the explanation of this large deficit? It does not require any genius to make an answer or to give the explanation. Tell any man with hundreds and thousands of dollars to spend that he has no responsibility, that there is no responsibility in any direction, and you will very soon find money being squandered in all sorts of foolish directions —there is the explanation. We have departed from the fundamental principle of responsible government in the matter of holding the executive responsible for all expenditures of public moneys, and the minute you depart from that fundamental principle of government you bring the whole edifice to the ground. So, Mr. Speaker, the position we on this side take is that nothing will be satisfactory to the people of Canada except a return to the recognition of the obligation of the Government to account to the public for every cent of public expenditure. We will hold the Government responsible for the expenditure on these railways, and we will expect the ministry to find some way of giving Parliament the information which it has a right to have. Now I shall wait until we see what are "the concrete terms" —to use the words of my right hon. friend —in complete form which he suggests as to the means he proposes to give Parliament for securing information before stating what further action we will take. But I would tell my right hon. friend now that if he brings in a motion at all in accord with the statement which he made this evening, if he brings along the suggestion of a committee with only the right to study and report, it will not be acceptable to the people of this country and will be strongly opposed by those of us on this side of the House. We will not oppose it for the sake of offering any opposition to a committee. What we will demand is a committee with powers sufficiently wide to get information which the people have a right to be supplied with in view of the very serious condition that this problem has brought the country face to face with at the present time.

Right Hon. C. J. DOHERTY (Minister of Justice): Mr. Speaker, we certainly have just had the advantage of witnessing an exhibition of wrathful indignation. The hon. gentleman is so fond of these exhibitions that he apparently will not under-

stand the simple statement put before him tending to show the serious intention of this Government to take the necessary methods of seeing that this House does get the requisite information to enable it to act intelligently in the discharge of its responsibility for the voting and expenditure of public money. He conjures up an imaginary situation in which he says this House has been absolutely refused any mehod of getting that information, and then he waxes wrathful and threatens us with what he will not accept and what the people of this country, whom he assumes to be behind him, will not accept. Now, if he had only been able to sit with sufficient calmness to follow and intelligently to apprehend what the right hon. the Prime Minister placed before this House he would have found that what is being proposed and offered is a method of conciliating what I think, we are all agreed should be conciliated, namely, the right on the one hand of this House to get information with regard to the operations both of the railway system and of the shipping company necessary to its intelligently discharging its duty of determining to what extent the moneys of this country should be voted to enable the carrying on of these operations. The problem is to conciliate the obtaining of that information with on the other hand the preserving of such secrecy with regard to the details of the operations of these companies as may be essential to protect those companies, and, protecting them, to protect the public interest. That is the problem which is before us for solution. And what is it that the right hon. Prime Minister has indicated as being his intention? It is to provide a method whereby this House may be assisted and enabled to solve that problem. And how is the announcement met? With this outburst of wrathful indignation, loud sounding words and excited gesticulations, but not one word bearing upon the suggestion of the right hon. Prime Minister. All this outburst is about an imaginary refusal—an imaginary announcement that this House is never to have any information, in face of its having just been told that a committee will be constituted to devise the best methods of getting that information in such a manner as to conciliate those two public interests—in the first place, the public interest that this House should be able to intelligently supervise and control the expenditure of public money; and, in the second place, the public interest that the operations of the public's railways and the public's vessels should not be so carried on as to be under the eyes of all interested in competing with them and with absolute knowledge of every detail of their respective businesses.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I have said that that is what has been offered by the Prime Minister to this House. It would be more correct to say that this House has been asked to join in producing the means of solving that problem. Yet the hon. gentleman sees an utter inadequacy in the powers to be given this committee, and is indignant because the suggestion is not simply directly to name a committee to go out and ask and get an answer to every question that it may desire to put with regard to the smallest detail of the operations of these two companies.

Mr. CAHILL: What about the large details?

Mr. DOHERTY: With regard to the large details, the committee that it is proposed to create is asked to report to us as to what the information is that this House can be given, and, consequently, should be given consistently with the two public interests that I have pointed out, to report to us what is the best method of obtaining that information and of giving it to the House in view of the purpose of conciliating these two public interests; then to report to us upon the system of auditing that should be adopted and the extent of detail that should be given in the annual report, this for the purpose of enabling the House to decide what information should be obtained in the public interest and what is the best method of obtaining it; and, finally, whether and for what purposes the committee should be continued. Now, it is not proposed that this committee shall be the method of obtaining information for the general purposes of this House. If it were so, how illogical it would be on the part of this House—and that is what I understand the leader of the Opposition suggests ought to be done—having first decided that there should be some discrimination with regard to the information which the House should ask for and obtain, to proceed to appoint a committee that would exercise no discrimination whatever, but ask for anything and everything that any member of that committee might want. The hon. gentleman entirely misapprehends the proposal that has been put forward here. What the House is asked to do is to ascertain what is the best instrument whereby the information

that we ought to get can be obtained, and, through its committee, to state, having regard to the consideraions I have mentioned, what information ought to be made public. Then, there is the question of the best method of obtaining that information, and, finally, the best method of auditing the accounts of these different companies, so that the reports of the auditors may be accepted as statements of the proper condition of the companies in which we are interested. Last of all, there is the question of the permanency of the committee.

Now, save when he thinks it is necessary for oratorical purposes to work himself up into apparently uncontrollable indignation, the leader of the Opposition, I believe, earnestly desires to find a method by which he may consistently with the public interest get that information for which he so hungers and thirsts. All that this House is asked to do is to provide a committee to report to this House as to what is the best method of attaining that desirable end. Is that not a reasonable proposal? Surely the debate of the other day made it quite clear that two conflicting principles required to be conciliated if the public interest was to be served. And what is the present proposal? That we sit down and study with the aid of a committee what is the best way to conciliate those two principles so as effectively to serve the public interest. I am sure that any one who reflects for a moment will see how entirely uncalled for was the wrathful indignation of the hon. leader of the Opposition and will recognize in this suggestion a sincere desire to arrive at a practical method of finding a solution of the difficulties that present themselves and of achieving the necessary result of providing the House with the information to which it is entitled and of so providing it as not to bring about any deteriment to the public interest.

Mr. D. D. McKENZIE (Cape Breton North and Victoria): Mr. Speaker, unless we are entirely mistaken in the purposes of Parliament and in the constitutional rights of the people of this country, the representatives of the people have some purpose in coming here. Otherwise we on this side, acting under some illusion and under "indignation" as the Minister of Justice (Mr. Doherty) says, completely misapprehend the purpose of our coming here. Are we not to know anything at all? Are we not to ask any questions for conscience' sake? Are we to submit tamely to everything that the Minister of Justice passes out to us? I do not think, Mr. Speaker, that that is the purpose of the people of this country in sending us here, notwithstanding the lessons and reprimands which come to us from the Department of Justice. We on this side, while never over-satisfied with the analytical disquisitions of the right hon. Prime Minister (Mr. Meighen) always manage to understand pretty well what he means. He told us very clearly to-night what was intended by this commiteee. But the Minister of Justice was not satisfied with the English language as presented by the Prime Minister. He thought it was a jumble of words without meaning; that indignation was possibly provoked by their presentation, and, as a Daniel come to judgment, the Minister of Justice, in his lucid, clear-cut, well-determined sentences, told us exactly what the Prime Minister meant. The hon. leader of the Opposition (Mr. Mackenzie King) took high ground when he said that there really was nothing to the purpose in the speech of the right hon. Prime Minister. If there was any doubt as to the soundness of the position taken by the leader of the Opposition we have the most conclusive proof of its correctness in the commentary of the Minister of Justice.

Let me remind the Minister of Justice of what he said a very few seconds after he got through with his speech. He said: "The leader of the Opposition works himself into a fury of indignation, of wrath, over imaginary difficulties." That is his language. As a humble representative of the people of this country, I ask the Prime Minister and the Minister of Justice if a deficit of $49,000,000 last year in the operation of a public utility with which the people have to do, where the people have to furnish the money to pay every cent of that expenditure, where the freight rates of the country were raised 40 per cent over and above what they used to be, where enormous amounts of money have been dragged and extorted out of the pockets of the people of Canada for keeping this incubus going—I ask them if that was an imaginary thing. Yet, after this was all done and additional millions of dollars were filched out of the pockets of the people, the Government come back and tell us: "Last year we had a simple deficit of $49,000,000 which, in the estimation of so worthy a gentleman as the right hon. Minister of Justice, is a mere illusionary matter that no person should be concerned about; it is imaginary and not worth asking any questions about at all." I see a number of able business men sitting around and behind the Government. I should like

to ask them if, when they go back to their constituencies in all parts of the country, they are asked: "What is the condition of the railways; I am told that last year you had a deficit of $49,000,000; that this year you have a deficit of $70,000,000, and that next year you will have a deficit of $100,000,000"—if they will undertake to wave their constituents aside and say: "Oh, gentlemen, do not be illusionized by these things; they are merely imaginary. All you have to do is to imagine that there is no such a thing as a Government railway at all. All you have to do is to imagine that the Government railways made $65,000,000 of profit last year, and you have the money in your pocket." So the Minister of Justice says. I told the right hon. gentleman once before that we in the province from which I come are in the habit of having the greatest respect for the office and the person of the Minister of Justice, and I would feel myself rather confused if a man stood up and produced this Hansard at a public meeting, say in the town of Sydney Mines and said: "Why, you are talking about deficits; the right hon. Minister of Justice said last year that that was merely imaginary; that there was no such a thing at all." Will the right hon. gentleman say that that is really the fact?

I submit this to the usually fair mind of the Minister of Justice. It has been proven to the hilt that last year, before the Estimates were through, before we gave the money to Parliament and to the Government to spend, we were promised by one minister after another, by the Minister of Railways (Mr. Reid) by the then Minister of the Interior, by the then Prime Minister himself and, I am sure, by the Minister of Marine and Fisheries (Mr. Ballantyne), who is usually prolific in promises and very barren in performances, that every dollar that was expended of the money of the public would be accounted for. I am sure the Minister of Marine and Fisheries told us that every dollar of the public money spent in his department would be accounted for twice over. Those were the promises. Did hon. gentlemen expect members of the House and, in particular, members of the Opposition to believe them? I am sure they will not dare to say in this House: "We made those statements, but we did not expect you to believe them. We were not sincere." I am sure they will not dare to take that attitude. We believed them; we voted the money, and here we are this year with all this money expended and $70,000,000 more expended that we did not vote at all. The Government come back to us now in face of those promises, and the Minister of Justice, leading the van, says: "You will not get one word, not one iota, not one figure; you can just go and do your best about the matter; we will sit tight here, and you will not know one thing that is going on behind our closed doors; we are in the dark lantern brigade which you said we were in, and we will not flinch one inch from the position we take." Does the right hon. gentleman not think that is a subject for indignation, if there was indignation? Does he not think that is a reason why the people of this country should rise in their might and say: "What is the good of Parliamentary representation? What is the good of having the name of responsible government if these facts are not given to the people."

I can only repeat what the hon. gentleman who leads the Opposition says, and I think it is plain and simple. We still adhere to the doctrine of responsible Government, to the position that the minister of every department of Government must come down to this House and explain its expenditure. I do not think, when the business of this country is carried on under twenty departmental heads, we can say that they are overburdened and overloaded with work when we ask them to be able to come down to this Parliament and explain in reasonable detail what has become of the money of the country. If the Department of Railways has become top-heavy, if it is too big, if it cannot be handled by one man, why not divide the work up so that departments which have not so much to do will have some part of that work and give us details which are necessary in order to satisfy the people of Canada that their moneys are properly expended? I remember when we sat behind the Right Hon. Sir Wilfrid Laurier as Premier of this country and hon. gentlemen who are to-day on your right, Sir, were on this side of the House, we had to account for every dollar, and if a few thousand dollars were expended by way of ever-expenditure or anything of that kind, the greatest possible storm was raised until every dollar was accounted for. That was the proper thing. When a change of Government took place, when those hon. gentlemen went to your right, and when they have the purse-strings and the expenditure of the money of this country, is there any doctrine that can be thought of for one moment but that for every farthing of the money which they

expend, they shall account to the honest people of this country who are furnishing the cash and who have, for the time being, given the Government their confidence in the expenditure of that money? There is only one doctrine, one position, one stand that any sane community or representative can take in this House or in the country.

As regards the idea of appointing this committee, have we not enough committees already? I have not said anything so far about this committee; I do not care very much whether it is appointed or not. We have already a string of standing committees, and why should this public business not be sent to one of them? Every dollar that we are going to have inquired into before this committee is money belonging to public account, is it not? We have a Public Accounts Committee. If there is anything to be inquired into by way of the public accounts of this country, why does it not go to the Public Accounts Committee? Is that not what a Public Accounts Committee is for? Is there any money expended in connection with the ships, the railways, the Post Office, Public Works or any other department that is handled by the Government that is not public money? Therefore, if the Government desires a full inquiry into this question, should it not be sent to the Public Accounts Committee? It is not the function of any committee to do the business of the Government. If there is any inquiry which members of Parliament may require; if they are dissatisfied with any account that the Government has brought down, they may ask for a committee. But in the first instance it is the duty of the Government to be prepared to give every information that may be required, and if details are asked for by people who may be dissatisfied, then the question may go to a committee for a further investigation. But the floor of Parliament, and not a committee, is the place for hon. members to find out the facts. The idea of saying that there are no politics in the management of the road; that it is entirely free from politics, and then after all is said and done and you come to an inquiry and an investigation, the matter is to be sent to a partisan, political committee, because in this House you cannot get a committee other than a partison committee that will act in a partisan manner. I have been on quite a number of committees, and when a matter came to the test, I never saw anything but a clear-cut division on the partisan bias of each member of the committee, and that is what would happen in this case.

I submit therefore that instead the right hon. Minister of Justice should have devoted himself to answering the charges that were made by the leader of the Opposition, that promises were made last year to give this information, and that the information is not only not forthcoming now, but has been absolutely denied. The Minister of Justice tells us that the business of this committee is to perform the impossible. He tells us that its business is to provide intelligence for the Department of Railways, intelligence and wisdom for the Department of Marine and Fisheries, and efficiency for the management of our railways. If he can find a committee under God's blue canopy that will give intelligence to the Department of Railways, wisdom to the Department of Marine and Fisheries, and efficiency and executive ability to the railway management, I should certainly like to see the personnel of that committee.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON (Minister of Finance): Mr. Speaker, the fact that apparently I am particularly to blame in connection with the promise said to have been made last year—and I have no doubt it was made—impels me to throw myself very unexpectedly into this debate. But once in it, I think that we should all try to understand at the earliest possible moment that we are debating a very serious situation, a very serious question of policy and of principle.

It is easy to say "losses"; it is easy to say that public ownership is wrong; it is easy to throw the cheap gibe and the cheaper sneer. We are told that last year we only asked for so many millions, and that under public ownership this

11 p.m. year we are asking an enormously increased vote. I would like to point out one thing to hon. gentlemen, for we might just as well get down to the basis, and see whether their basis is right; they may be right by accident. I would point out that the tremendously increased vote this year is not the result of public ownership; it is not the result of anything that has been done by the committee now managing the national railways. The tremendous vote this year is the result very largely of private operation, private ownership and private management of the Grand Trunk Railway. We are asking a vote this year of $87,000,000 for the Grand Trunk itself, run and operated as a private company. Now, there is a

great deal of room for debate as to whether or not the people as a people can properly run, own and operate a railway, but there is no room for debate on one phase of that question, for it has been settled by every country that has tried it, and that is you cannot run a difficult, complex business organization such as a railway, covering an enormous mileage and touching the home life of the people in every city and town the whole country over, by direct parliamentary control. I do not think there is any room for debate on that question, and if there be no room for debate on that question, it seems to me we are perhaps not arguing the real point at issue, that point being whether or not public utilities can be operated through commission form or by trustees for the public in the interests of the public. That is really what we are arguing to-day. We are not arguing anything else. I put it to any hon. gentleman who has studied public ownership of public utilities by direct parliamentary control; has he ever found it result in anything except absolute failure?

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: Has any hon. member ever suggested direct parliamentary control?

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: I cannot very well distinguish between degrees of parliamentary control. I cannot very well distinguish between a system that would allow the Order Paper to be cluttered up every day with questions as to why a stationmaster was removed from some small station down there, or why a switch was not put in here or there—I cannot very well get away from that system without at the same time getting away from parliamentary control.

Mr. CAHILL: Will my hon. friend tell me whether under our system he could have any control if he had not parliamentary control. He either must have parliamentary control or no control at all. The people are responsible. My hon. friend cannot get away from that.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: That is a perfectly proper question, and I shall be very pleased to deal with it. As I was saying the issue here is really whether or not public ownership as we understand it, public operation as we hope to get it, is to be given a fair trial. I want to touch just for a moment on the point raised by my hon. friend from Pontiac (Mr. Cahill). I think there is a great deal of difference between bringing up all the little details of management, the small questions which inevitably always are, and always must be, questions for immediate and prompt decision by the management, and the larger and more important questions which arise out of the results of the management's operation and out of their annual report. Now last year—I am going to try and be consistent, and I think I am—

Mr. McKENZIE: You will find it very hard.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: Not as yet. I would find it very hard to reach the heights of fancy and joke that my hon. friend can, but so far I have not found it very hard to be consistent. Last year I said that I saw no reason why the report of the directors should not be dealt with by a committee. I conceive that to be a very different thing from worrying the management day in and day out for information as to the petty details of management. I am quite sure hon. gentlemen know very well how railways are run, and that I shall only be drawing to their attention something they know all about when I say that the function of a railway president is really the function of giving prompt and just business decisions. He is a referee of tremendous responsibility. He must dispose of an infinitude of questions in a very short time if he is to deal effectively with them, and for the life of him he could not tell you, a month after a decision was given, why he had done this or that in connection with some small matter of detail. The leader of the Opposition stated that there was no responsibility on the part of the directors. Well, I am sure my hon. friend wants to be fair, and he will find that the provision that is there made in the statute is one which is incorporated in many and many an Act for a public purpose, where duties are cast upon individuals who do not directly share in the profits of an enterprise. All that is stated there is that the directors shall not be personally responsible in damages for acts done in their capacity as directors, and you have that provision also in connection with the managers of many companies. It does not mean that they are not responsible for their management; they are responsible therefor just as much as any hon. gentleman is responsible to his constituents for what he does in Parliament. Now, if there be any better way, we ought to try to find it; and, after all, that is what we are trying to do.

Mr. SINCLAIR (Guysborough): To whom are these directors responsible?

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: They are directly responsible for the discharge of a high public trust.

Mr. FIELDING: Responsible to whom?

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: To the people of the country.

Mr. FIELDING: Through what channel?

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: Through this House.

Some hon. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: And they have made their reports accordingly.

Mr. PARENT: There are no details.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: The hon. member will find that there are complete details of everything that really goes to solve the question as to whether or not these men are efficient, and whether they are running this public enterprise properly. The yardsticks are all given. As a matter of statutory duty, these reports are filed every year. The full particulars of the different activities are all given,—passenger activities, freight, mails, express, and miscellaneous operations, together with operating expenses. They are all given, and if there be anything more that should be done, I would have thought that it would be done just as I suggested last year.

Mr. McKENZIE: To whom is their report addressed?

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: The report goes to the Minister of Railways and is by him tabled annually.

Mr. McKENZIE: Then he is responsible?

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: He simply tables the report.

Mr. JACOBS: Can these directors be brought before the Public Accounts Committee for examination?

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: I do not know that there is any reason why they should not be. Of course, I know many reasons why in some respects this is not desirable.

An hon. MEMBER: What are they?

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: If many small matters of detail are to be inquired into; if they are to be asked to give up the full information regarding their traffic arrangements, for example; if they are to be asked to disclose full information as to—

Mr. CAHILL: As to deficits.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: I did not catch that.

Mr. CAHILL: I said, information as to deficits.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: Oh, we will come to that later on. I was saying, if they are to be asked to disclose full information as to their business relations as directors in connection with their different industrial sidings; in other words, if they are to be asked to give up all that business information which every man in business for himself regards as his private property, and if they are to turn all this over to the advantage of a competitor, then there are many reasons why they should not appear before the committee for this purpose. On the other hand, if they are brought before a committee such as we now suggest, or any other committee, for the purpose of enquiring into their operations with a view to ascertaining whether economies could not be effected, and moneys saved in various ways, no reason in the world could be advanced against this. As to the deficit, that is certainly a matter that should be looked into. It is certainly a large operating result; it is certainly a matter about which very few persons can find anything for laughter; at least I cannot; it is certainly something which ought to be reduced, if possible.

Mr. JACOBS: Would not that be accomplished by going into the small details? Little drops of water make the mighty ocean.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: If the hon. member started counting the drops of water in the ocean, he would not be engaged very much longer in the process than he would be in trying to find out exactly what was wrong with the railways by going into little bits of detail here and little bits there. By the time he got them all collected he would have such a mass of material that it would be absolutely impossible for him or any one else to digest it. That is undoubtedly something which any railway president, or any other man who understood the operations of railways, would regard as ridiculous. Do you think that a railway president looks after matters of detail? Do you think that any man charged with large affairs, carrying on an enormous business running into millions, bothers about details himself? He has many persons under him to look after these matters.

Mr. PARENT: Suppose the appointment of an agent at some station might mean a clear profit of $15,000 a year to the railways, does not the minister think that an agent should be placed there?

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: I think that any one who was entrusted with the large responsibility of running the country's railways would be in a far better position to judge as to whether or not an agent should be put on at any particular station. That is something that is left in the hands of the management.

Mr. PARENT: I was suggesting a case where a clear profit of $15,000 would accrue.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: If there is any case such as is suggested by the member, it is not necessary to make trouble either in the House or with the management. All he has to do is to go before the Board of Railway Commissioners.

Mr. PARENT: It is not under their control.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: They are bound to appoint an agent where there are earnings of $15,000, not net but gross. The hon. gentleman is wrong; the lines are under the board. The board fix their rates, and while the statute does not give them, as a board, the right to interfere in detail matters of operation, through letters of the ministers of railways the board have exercised that jurisdiction. Certainly the railway management will not refuse to appoint an agent where such an appointment is necessary.

Mr. PARENT: If the hon. gentleman will allow me I can tell him that the chairman of the Board of Railway Commissioners says the contrary?

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: Well, I can only speak from recollection which is quite recent, as to the very general practice. I exercised the right and I exercised it at the request of the Government. But after all the Act is there and it will not be very long, I hope, before the anomaly is removed if the matter be in the position to which the hon. gentleman refers.

Mr. ROBB: Would the minister consider the purchase of supplies and equipment a fair subject for inquiry by the committee?

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: You would have that in the report and everything that is in the report, I think, is a perfectly fair matter for inquiry.

Mr. FIELDING: Would we be free to ask for copies of tenders?

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: I do not think that is something that ought to be done. Let me tell the hon. gentleman something that we know about. Let me tell him that after would-be contractors, who were trying to get a specific price for commodities, had failed to secure a contract—that contract having been let to a lower tenderer—questions were asked in the House as to the details of those tenders. It is a dangerous thing to try and run a competitive business in such a way, where the men you want to do business with know exactly what they have got to bid and how near they come to the prices offered by their competitors. It is certainly not the way that any railway company in the world that has ever made a success of its business has been operated. After all, what are we trying to do? What we are trying to do is to see if we cannot better the present condition, see if we cannot compose the differences that exist. I think those differences are largely differences which can be easily composed, because I am quite confident that so soon as we realize what the effect on the country as a whole would be if there is indiscriminate searching from time to time and day to day into the business of this large concern, we are all going to be together. We are trying to see what is the best thing to be done. When I said last year—and there again the difference can be so easily illustrated—that there was no objection at all to the fullest reference of the report, or anything else that was asked, to a committee, is there not the greatest difference in the world between that and the asking of questions—for example, such a question as was put the other day in the House as to why an agent was not at work for a given number of hours in a particular city?

Mr. LAPOINTE: My hon. friend has spoken of "the Board of Directors" of the Canadian National Railway. Has any board of directors been appointed under the law which was passed a few years ago? Has that corporation been organized to any extent at all, or are the railways managed, as they were then, under the Government by commissioners appointed by it?

An hon. MEMBER: By order in council.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: The hon. gentleman is quite correct to a certain extent; but I am afraid that in the main he is quite wrong. It is quite true to say that

the general Act has not yet been put into effect, but it is also entirely untrue to say that the railway system is governed by a commission. The Board of Directors are elected just in exactly the same way as the board of directors of any company would be elected.

Mr. McMASTER: Except there is only one shareholder.

Mr. PARENT: Not by the shareholders.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: Perhaps hon. gentlemen will allow me for one moment; I am now speaking in answer to a question. They are elected in exactly the same way as the directors of any other company; there is one difference and only one. That one difference is that instead of a certain portion of the public being interested in the election of the directors, the whole of the public are interested in it, and that instead of the shareholders—through their proxies as is usually done—electing the directors, the whole of the people elect the directors through the Government.

Some hon. MEMBERS: Oh, oh.

Hon. W. S. FIELDING (Shelburne and Queen's): The Minister of Finance asked a question a few moments ago, a very proper question, "What are we trying to do?" I will not undertake to describe what I think my hon. friends opposite are trying to do; I did that the other day and they thought I was not as courteous as I ought to be. But I will undertake to tell my hon. friends, and the Government, what we on this side are trying to do. We are simply trying to assert and to maintain the right of the people of Canada to receive an accounting—in gross or in detail as they please—through their representatives of every dollar of the public money that is spent. That is what we are trying to do—only that and nothing more. But that is something which is so plain and so simple that I am satisfied the people of Canada will readily understand it. But hon. gentlemen opposite are trying to make excuses for not doing that, and they are raising men of straw in order that they may knock them down. They are raising ghosts as to all the difficulties in the way. "Why," says the Minister of Finance, "if all these little details were brought down here what a trouble it would be." Well, I will not repeat the argument I used the other day. Our contention is that this matter should be dealt with precisely in the same way as it would be in the case of one of our own departments; there is no reason why the same principle should not apply. If the Prime Minister is going to move for a committee, and the proceeding will give to the House all the rights and privileges which it has as respects every other department of Government, that will be all right; but if he is going to say "We will give the House information regarding the Department of Public Works, but we will refuse it as regards the Canadian National Railways," I say that is wrong. We are going to stand on that and make that the issue in this House and if necessary before the country. The hon. gentleman, I say, raises a ghost for the purpose of trying to show that there are difficulties in the way. He says, "What good are these details anyway?" But take the position of the Department of Public Works or the Department of Railways, any or all of the departments of Government, and the way we act with respect to them. We have the right to demand the details as to every dollar of expenditure of the Public Works Department, but we do not do it. Why should we not have the same privilege as regards the national system of railways? We would have the right under our contention to deal with all these matters of detail, but we would not do it. Why? Because they are not necessary. To-day a question is asked regarding the Department of Public Works; in the matter of a contract for example, suppose a question is asked now about the price that is paid for coal? Well, the Minister of Public Works may reply, "I may say to the hon. gentleman that that matter is still under consideration. We have received tenders but we have not awarded contracts and we are not able to give the information"—a perfectly proper answer and the House would accept it. But if the same question is raised regarding the Canadian National Railways we are told, "That is a violation of all business rules," and we are not to know the price that the Government railway management paid for coal although we would be told what the Public Works Department paid for such a commodity. There is no earthly difference between the two. I suppose the Department of Public Works every year pays—I do not know the exact number but at a rough guess I would say ten thousand accounts. How many of them do we bring before Parliament? We do not bring them before Parliament once in a blue moon, unless something arises which calls for an investigation. We have the right to investigate every item, and we should have the right, but we do not exercise it. Why should we not have the same right in the case of the Government railways?

It is one thing to have the right to go into all these details, and in giving that right without any restriction or limitation you are carrying out the proper principles of parliamentary government; but when you deny and restrict that right; then you are departing from all the soundest principles of parliamentary government. I utterly fail to see any reason why we cannot apply to the railways of Canada the same principle that we apply to the public works or the marine and fisheries. I have not found any indication yet of any kind of information the bringing down of which could do harm to our railways. Not one of the hon. gentlemen who have spoken has given us an illustration of something we might ask for, but which the railway company might properly refuse to give. In a motion that we laid on the Table the other day we recognized the fact that at all times there are certain matters in connection with government which in the wisdom of the Government they may see fit to withhold. We recognized that fully, and we recognize it as fully in the matter of our railways as in the matter of the Marine and Fisheries or the Public Works departments. The Government have to be the judges of that, and the House will always recognize reasonable grounds refusing information of that character. What we on this side contend for is that the principle which applies to every other department of government should apply to the Canadian National railways. Not a shadow of ground has yet been shown to indicate that any harm would be done by bringing down any item of the information we have asked for. I take the illustration in regard to coal. I can understand that if we asked for information about tenders for coal the Minister of Railways would say: "This matter is under consideration, it is not settled, and the information cannot be brought down." But after the contract has been awarded, what earthly interest can suffer by the answering of a question as to what companies we got the coal from and what prices we paid for it? It is all nonsense to say that you are going to give information to your competitor, the Canadian Pacific railway. Your competitor certainly knows all there is to know in connection with railway matters. Do not be alarmed about the Canadian Pacific railway. The are pretty shrewd, wise fellows, and they know all that is of any value to know.

But the simple question I am answering is the question of the Minister of Finance. What we are trying to do, and what we are going to do with all our energy, whether we succeed or not, is to stand for the rights of the people of Canada to have either in gross or in detail whatever information may seem to be reasonably necessary in the judgment of any member of this House as respects the expenditure of every dollar of public money that the people of Canada are obliged to pay.

Mr. E. W. NESBITT (North Oxford): Mr. Speaker, I understand that the discussion has arisen through the resolution of my hon. friend from Halifax (Mr. Maclean) which asks that a special committee be apointed to inquire into the operation of the national railways; in other words, to dig into the operation of those railways with a view to recommending any improvement that they can suggest with reference to that operation. As to the whole of the details being given to the House, I was one of those that sat at that time on the opposite side of the Government when the Canadian Northern railway was taken over, and I absolutely insisted that the railways should be put under the management of an independent commission in so far as it was possible to put them under such a commission, I believe that that has been done. I believe that the present Minister of Railways (Mr. Reid) has carried out that policy to the fullest extent and that he has interfered as little as possible with the management.

Answering my right hon. friend who has just sat down, the hon. member for Shelburne and Queen's (Mr. Fielding), for whom I have the greatest respect, I remember last year when the discussion took place over the Minister of Railway's statement that the minister did not hesitate to give to the House any information in his power. I remember distinctly with reference to the question of coal that he gave the purchase price in the various sections of the country through which the railway operated. Nor do I think has this Government refused any reasonable request on the part of any member of the Opposition or on the part of any other hon. member with reference to the operation of our national railways. But you must bear in mind, Mr. Speaker, that we insisted that those railways should be operated as far as possible by an independent commission. That is being done. You cannot bring those men on to the floor of the House to

illustrate every little detail with reference to the operation of the system, and it is not customary for any corporation to give such details to its shareholders. I have had a good deal of experience on boards of directors, and I have never yet known the shareholders to ask for absolute details of operation.

Mr. PARENT: Why not?

Mr. NESBITT: Why not? Those details are open to them if they want to go and examine the books.

Mr. ARCHAMBAULT: That is what we want to know.

Mr. NESBITT: I have no doubt that details of the management of the national railways are open to any member of the House.

An hon. MEMBER: No.

Mr. NESBITT: Have you tried and have you been refused?

An hon. MEMBER: Yes.

Mr. CAHILL: The minister refuses everything.

Mr. NESBITT: I do not believe anybody has been refused. Let me repeat, I do not know any corporation that tells its shareholders the details of its operations.

Mr. PARENT: We know.

Mr. NESBITT: I doubt if you do.

Mr. PARENT: I do.

Mr. NESBITT: As to this proposed committee of the House consisting of members on both sides as I understand it, the hon. member from North Cape Breton and Victoria (Mr. McKenzie) tonight said that on special committees partisan discussion was just as likely to arise as on the floor of the House. I have sat on special committees appointed to discuss all kinds of questions since I have been in this House, and I will say for the Opposition, no matter which side of the House I sat on, that I never saw a question debated by any of those special committees from a party standpoint. Take the question of soldiers' re-establishment, the committee on which sat for two months. I have only this to say for the hon. members who sat with me on that committee, members of the present Opposition, that never by any chance was there a word or action that would suggest that we were discussing the question from a party standpoint. And the report was not brought in from a party standpoint. Any spectator who attended the meetings of that committee would not have known which party the members belonged to as far as the discussion was concerned. Therefore I believe that great benefit would be derived by the appointment of a special committee to thoroughly investigate the question of the operation of these national railroads and to report back to the House.

Let me repeat, that I know of no instance where the Minister of Railways in discussing the annual statement of the national railways last year refused to give any information in his power, and I doubt if he will now. I think you are raising a mountain out of a molehill in discussing this question, because I believe that, after all, we all view the matter from the same standpoint, and I am as certain as I am that I am standing here that there will be no difficulty on the part of the Prime Minister in selecting from this side of the House, and on the part of the leader of the Opposition in selecting from that side of the House, men who will forget whether they are Liberals or National Liberal Conservatives, and who as soon as they are appointed on that committee will forget their party prejudices and do the best they can to work out a solution of this very serious question confronting the country at the present time. I hope that that will be the view of the men who are appointed on that committee, and I am quite sure from my past experience that it will be their view, and I hope the Prime Minister will carry out his intention of appointing such a committee.

Mr. A. R. McMASTER (Brome): Mr. Speaker, it seems to me that the Minister of Finance (Sir Henry Drayton) asked a question the reply to which is really an answer to the whole discussion. He said, as I understood him, we could not have public ownership cocurrently with parliamentary control; I think that is a fair repetition of what he said. Now, if that is the case, it will be impossible for us to have public ownership, because we will not give up parliamentary control. I am not an enemy of public ownership; ever since I came to this House, and before, I have been attracted to public ownership. I have been seeking further light on the question and honestly and anxiously inquiring how the matter worked out in practice. I must frankly admit that until now nearly all the evidence that has been brought before me has been against public control and pub-

lic operation of railways. But let me say this: we have to have control of railways, and that control has either to be responsible or irresponsible. I do not think that any member of this House will say for a moment that that control should be irresponsible. Then it must be responsible, and to whom? In the ultimate analysis, to the members of this House. And if you cannot have public ownership which involves ultimate responsibility to this House, then public ownership will have to be given up. After all, public ownership is merely a matter of expediency. It may be wise or it may be unwise; it may be advantageous or it may be disadvantageous, but the control of the expenditure of public money by this House is a matter of principle, the very basis of our parliamentary institutions and of our British constitutional practice.

The gentlemen who have spoken on the other side have been at great pains to point out the possible dangers of parliamentary control. They have set up the imaginary bogey that if this House inquires concerning different details of management the Canadian Pacific Railway company will catch on. I think I can say with a fair degree of assurance that nothing of substantial importance happens concerning any railroad in Canada or in the northern part of the United States of which the Canadian Pacific Railway Company are ignorant. It is part of their business to know; I believe they know their business and are well advised as to what goes on with their competitors. After all, the operation of railways is not carried on in the dark, and it must be known what railways pay for their supplies just as the schedules are known upon which the trains are run. So far as rates are concerned they are fixed by a public board, and there is no possibility of one competitor hiding from another the details in that connection. But the point I wish to impress upon the House to-night is that the system of irresponsible control is one which may breed most unwholesome conditions in this country. I accuse no one of wrong-doing in the remarks which I propose to make to-night. But I say that the Government has placed the railways of this country in the hands of a small committee who are called directors but who are the creatures and nominees of the Government, and that a large number of these men are directors in companies which, if not selling to the railways, have in hand the goods to sell to the railways. I also wish to make this point, Mr. Speaker: these men are directors not only in the Canadian National Railways but also in such a number of other companies as to preclude their giving to the railways of the country that care and attention which the railway situation demands. Now, the other day the member for Essex (Mr. Kennedy) asked the following questions in the House.

1. What are the names of the gentlemen who compose the Board of Management of the Canadian National Railways?
2. What is the salary of each and what amount did each receive as expenses during the past year?
3. Are any of these gentlemen also directors of joint stock companies doing business in Canada?
4. If so, of what company or companies are they respectively directors?

To which the Minister of Railways (Mr. Reid) made the following replies:

1. D. B. Hanna, A. J. Mitchell, R. T. Riley, R. Hobson, Major G. A. Bell, Sir Hormisdas Laporte, Col. Thomas Cantley, A. P. Barnhill, E. R. Wood.
2. Director's fees, $2,000 each, and travelling expenses to and from their homes.
3. The Government has no information.
4. Answered by No. 3.

I would direct attention to the fact that the answer to number 2 was only a partial answer; the question, "what amount did each receive as expenses during the past year" was not answered, it being merely stated that they receive travelling expenses to and from their homes. Now, as a matter of elementary propriety and justice, the Canadian people, who are paying to Mr. Hanna $25,000 a year and to the other directors, who are not expected to give all their time to the consideration of railway matters, $2,000 a year and their travelling expenses, are entitled to know what other companies these directors are interested in, if for no other purpose than to know how far their attention is distracted from the railway problem which is in their special charge. As that information was withheld from the members of this House I examined the Financial Guide of 1920 and I discovered these facts, which I think, should be of interest to the House and perhaps of interest to the country. I find that Mr. D. B. Hanna, who, as I have said, receives $25,000 a year, if I mistake not, as manager of our Canadian National Railways, is also a director in the following companies: Canada Steamship Lines, Limited; Electrical Development Company of Canada, Limited; Canada Mortgage Investment Company; British-American Assurance Company; Western Assurance Company; Canadian North Prairie Lands Company; Brazilian Traction, Light and Power Company, Limited; Rio de Janeiro Light and

Power Company; Sao Paulo Light and Power Company. He is also president of the Canada Flour Mills. Mr. A. J. Mitchell is a director in only one company, the Western Canada Flour Mills. Mr. R. T. Riley is interested as a director in but two companies. He is vice-president of the Union Bank of Canada and vice-president of the Great West Life Assurance Company. Mr. Robert Hobson is a director in the Bank of Hamilton; he is a director in the Canada Locomotive Company, Limited; he is president of the Steel Company of Canada, Limited; he is a director in the Tuckett Tobacco Company, Limited, in the North Star Oil and Refining Company, in the Chartered Trusts and Executor Company, in the British Empire Trust Company, in the Dominion Power and Transmission Company and in the Toronto General Trusts Corporation. Major G. A. Bell is, I understand, a civil servant, and so far as I can learn, he is a director in no company whatsoever. Sir Hormisdas Laporte is a director in the Credit Foncier Franco-Canadien, in the Société d'Administration Générale, in the Frontenac Breweries Limited and in La Sauvegarde Life Assurance Company.

Mr. CASGRAIN: He is president of Laporte-Martin, Limited.

Mr. POWER: What do they do?

Mr. McMASTER: They sell wholesale groceries in Montreal.

Mr. PARENT: They do not sell liquor, do they?

Mr. McMASTER: I do not know. They probably will not after the first of May. Col. Thomas Cantley is a director in the Eastern Car Company Limited, in Brandram-Henderson Paints and Varnishes and in the Nova Scotia Steel and Coal Company, Limited. Mr. A. P. Barnhill is a director in the Eastern Trusts Company, in James Pender and Company, Limited, in the St. John Iron Works, Limited, and in the Telegraph Publishing Company. He is president of the New Brunswick Electrical Company. He is president of the Acamac Land Company, Limited. He is a director in the Fenton Land and Building Company, in the Westfield Land Company, in the Times Publishing Company, and in the New Brunswick Realty Company. Last, but not least, in the number of directorships he holds is Mr. E. R. Wood, who is a director in the British American Assurance Company, a vice-president of the Canada Life Assurance Company, a director in the Western Assurance Company, a director in the Canadian Bank of Commerce. One would have thought that the connection between that bank and the late lamented Canadian Northern railway would have been sufficient to have made the Government believe it was inadvisable to have a director of that bank connected with the railway lines of this country. He is a director in the Barcelona Traction, Light and Power Company, Limited; he is vice-president of the Brazilian Traction, Light and Power Company, Limited; he is a director in the Rio de Janeiro Light and Power Company, in the Sao Paulo Tramway Light and Power Company, in the Mexico Tramways Company, in the Toronto Railway Company, in the Toronto Power Company, Limited, in the Toronto Electric Light Company, Limited, and in the Electrical Development Company of Canada, Limited. He is a vice-president of the National Trust Company and a director in the Dominion Securities Corporation, Limited.

12 m.

The first point I want to make is that what we need in this country associated with our railways, if we are going to have this system of nominating a commission and calling them directors, is to see that those men are well paid and that they concentrate their minds upon railway problems. To have these men with all their diverse interests entrusted with this task is a very unwise thing for the country from that point of view. But there is another and, to my mind, a more serious aspect of the situation. As I have read the names of the different companies with which these different gentlemen are associated, I think hon. members will have noticed that there is hardly a requirement of any prime necessity needed by the railways which, if the management wishes, they cannot get from some company in which one of the directors is also a director. I do not know whether this has been done or not; I make no charges against any man without proof of wrong-doing under my hand; but I denounce in unmeasured terms the system such as exists here, because it is quite possible—I accuse no one because I have not the proof—that this forms a little family compact in which the interests of the railway are, perhaps,—I do not know—being sacrificed to the interests of these different companies. It may be perfectly true that Mr. Hanna, when he comes

to consider and to advise the company as to the extension of a line in the Northwest, may remain absolutely uninfluenced by the fact that he is president of the Canadian North Prairie Lands Company. I do not know where those lands are situated; but if we found that a line of the Canadian National railways was being pushed towards those lands, would it not be reasonable for one to be a little suspicious that, in pushing the railway in that way, Mr. Hanna may have, perhaps, unconsciously been affected by the fact that in doing so he would help the Canada North Prairie Lands Company, in which he is a director? As regards locomotives, supposing the National Railways desire locomotives; it may be, for all I know to the contrary, possible that when the Canadian Locomotive company tenders to the National railways for the supply of locomotives, Mr. Hobson knows nothing about the matter at all; that he declines to be present at the meeting of the board where the tenders are opened, and that he does not convey to the Canada Locomotive company any information that he may have as to the price that the Canadian National Railways are willing to pay for the locomotives in question. He himself may be absolutely beyond reproach in this connection; but it is a mistake for the Government of Canada to have, as one of the directors of the Canadian National railways, a gentleman who is also a director of the Canadian Locomotive Company, Limited.

The same principle is in issue when we find that Mr. Robert Hobson is president of the Steel Company of Canada, Limited. If the National Railways should consider it advisable on part of their line to adopt oil-burning locomotives, Mr. Hobson is also a director of the North Star Oil and Refining Company.

Sir Hormisdas Laporte, if the railway supplies its own dining cars, in those parts of the country which are not bone-dry, with light beer to drink, may supply beer of the Frontenac Breweries, Limited, for all I know. I do not know whether he does or not.

Mr. POWER: He does.

Mr. McMASTER: My hon. friend says that he does. I am quite innocent of the information myself. As regards a request for cars, if the railway management want cars, they can, without going outside of the circle of directors, obtain cars from the Eastern Car Company, Limited, of which their director, Col. Thomas Cantley, is also a director. If they need paint to paint the cars, Brandram-Hennderson, Limited, will no doubt be willing to supply them. If they need coal the Nova Scotia Steel and Coal Company, of which Colonel Thomas Cantley is also a director, will no doubt be prepared to sell to them. As far as Mr. Barnhill's connection with the railway is concerned, I do not know that any companies with which he is connected would be in a position to sell to the Canadian National Railways, because they seem to be mostly publishing companies and land companies. As far as Mr. Wood is concerned, he is a director in such a number of companies that it would appear to be impossible for him to give any real care and attention to the work of the Canadian National Railway system. Now under these conditions is it fair that we should have any limited right of investigation? If Mr. Hobson, Colonel Cantley, and the other gentlemen whose names I have mentioned are high-minded gentlemen, and I have no reason to believe them otherwise, will they not gladly embrace the opportunity to come before this committee and to show that in their administration of the Canadian National Railways they have always considered, first, the interests of the railway, and secondly, the interests of the companies of which they are directors. But I say that a far better system would be the system which I have urged, without success, I am sorry to say, in this House before, to keep out not only from the Government these interlocking directorates, as I unsuccessfully attempted to do, but also from a department of Government such as this Canadian National Railways' directorate is. I fully appreciated, I trust, as a law student when I sat at the feet of the Minister of Justice, that old French law phrase "Donner et retiner ne vaut," which I might express in homely English as "To give and to withhold at the same time is not worth a continental."

We have had promises of large rights of investigation, but these have been whittled down and whittled down and shaved down by the Prime Minister until, as stated by him, and as commented upon by the Minister of Justice, we find that the committee which the Government are now willing to give is a committee to look into the question of what information should be given by the railways to such a committee, secondly, can such information be given, thirdly, what is the best method of giving this information, what is the best method of

auditing, and for the investigation of what matters should the committee be appointed?

If a committee is to be appointed, and I frankly admit that there are certain advantages in the appointment of a committee, for a committee with the right to call witnesses and for papers could bring before it Mr. Hanna, Mr. E. R. Wood, and Colonel Cantley, in a way in which this House sitting in Committee of the Whole could not do, I say that nothing short of the fullest investigation will satisfy the members of this House who sit to your left, Mr. Speaker, and what is of a great deal more importance, will not satisfy the Canadian people whose money is being spent, and who are being heavily taxed. It must be a somewhat galling reflection to men in this country who are paying their income tax to remember that practically the whole, if not the whole, of what we raised for the year 1920 by the income tax will be absorbed by the deficit on the National Railways. We have adopted the system of public ownership, and we must give it a fair chance. Whether we wished to adopt it or not, the system has been adopted, and you cannot give public ownership in this country a fair chance unless the representatives of the people have access to full and complete information about all the operations under public ownership. You cannot give it a fair chance by leaving the control of your railway in the hands of men who have private interests which are not identical with the interests of the railway they are supposed to control and operate, and what we have to do in this House, and what the Liberal party will have to do in this country, is to create a public opnion which will say: We will get the best men that we can for this purpose, and we will see to it that they have no other interests to concern them except the public interest in regard to the railways of this country.

Mr. W. F. COCKSHUTT (Brantford): At this late hour I shall not detain the House more than five or ten minutes, I hope. The question that we are debating is perhaps the most serious one that this House will have to deal with during the present session. The country will be looking for the results of this discussion tomorrow, and I hope they will not be disappointed with the evidence that has been produced on the floor of the House as to the railway situation, and how it is to be amended. I for one have been considerably disappointed in the fact that very little light has been thrown on the situation by hon. gentlemen opposite who have criticized very severely the situation that exists at the present time.

I regret that the mover of the resolution (Mr. Maclean) is not in the House at the present time because I want to take exception to one or two things that he said. In the first place, he said that business men were no better than anybody else for a job like this, if as good. I do not know what his opinions of business men may be, nor where he got his information, but I venture to say that if the railway situation in this country can be improved, it will be improved by business men rather than by legal men, of which profession I understand my hon. friend is a member. The railway situation, above all, requires business management. I may say that I was pained to hear the report of the Minister of Railways some two weeks ago. I was bitterly disappointed at the result of the year's operations. I was one of the few in the House last session who asked for an increase of rates as a solution of the difficulty that then confronted us of a loss of $48,000,000 on the year's operations of the road. I thought at that time that an increase of rates, both passenger and freight, was due, and I urged on the minister on three different occasions, I think, that instead of throwing the matter open to the House as he did, he should make up his mind at once that an increase in rates was necessary in order to bring expenditure and income into line with one another. But that was not done until the autumn, when a very severe advance, something like 40 per cent, was made in the rates. I regret extremely that even after that increase of 40 per cent in rates, the difficulty was not by any means met. Instead of the railways showing an improvement as a result of that increase, a further deficit in operating expenses has taken place. I think that is extremely to be regretted. I am glad to see that the mover of the resolution has returned to the House.

As to the appointment of this committee, my hon. friend laid down several propositions with regard to what this committee should do, and what it should be. He said it should not be a large committee; I think he mentioned 25, if I remember rightly, but perhaps it was some other member. At all events, he said it must not be very large. He also said that boundaries should have something to do with the appointment. In other words, in selecting the members for that committee regard must be had to provinces. I want to tell the hon. gentle-

man that if he thinks he is going to run a national railway on provincial lines of that kind he is very much mistaken.

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: I did not say that at all.

Mr. COCKSHUTT: That is the way I got your words.

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: Nor did I say the committee was going to run the railways.

Mr. COCKSHUTT: You did not say it was going to run the railways, but you did say that in the selection of the committee, if I remember rightly, and I do not want to misinterpret you,—in any event, Hansard will show exactly what was said —provincial lines should be watched. In other words, I understood the hon. gentleman to say: "Don't pick out men in this House who, you may think, can investigate the railways satisfactorily, but see that every province in the Dominion of Canada gets some representation on that committee whether they are fitted for the job or not." That, at any rate, is the interpretation I place on the hon. gentleman's remarks, and it is far from my wish to misrepresent him. The hon. gentleman wants a lot of information brought out. Well, so far as I see, there is no objection to information being given. The Minister of Finance (Sir Henry Drayton), has told us that he stands up for the handing out of a large amount of information. But if my memory serves me rightly, in the old days, when my hon. friend sat on the other side of the House, as he is doing now, all matters of this kind were sent to the Public Accounts Committee; but when they got to that committee something happened. There was there what was known as the "blocking brigade"; some three or four self-constituted blockers saw to it that the information sought at that time by our side, who were in opposition, was not forthcoming. I think my hon. friend will recognize the term I have just used, and perhaps he knows some of the men who constituted that committee.

Mr. COPP: Give their names to the House.

Mr. COCKSHUTT: That is not necessary.

Mr. COPP: You had better give the names.

Mr. COCKSHUTT: I do not think the hon. member for Halifax (Mr. Maclean) wants them.

Mr. COPP: Well, then you might give them to me.

Mr. COCKSHUTT: I was addressing my remarks more particularly to the hon. member for Halifax who says that he wants all kinds of information.

Mr. COPP: I think it would be well for you to give the names.

Mr. COCKSHUTT: It is not necessary; the men are well recognized, and they were well known to every one in the House at the time.

Mr. COPP: I was not here then and I should be glad to hear the names.

Mr. COCKSHUTT: You did not get into the House in time, but you had a man representing you here that could speak longer and with more volubility on branch lines than the hon. gentleman himself. I have known him to speak for five hours on the question of branch lines, so what would you do if he attempted to deal with main lines?

Mr. COPP: Did he not deal with main lines successfully?

Mr. COCKSHUTT: No, he did not deal with main lines, but branch lines. That gentleman, Mr. Emmerson, used to have a field day every year on branch lines, and certainly he branched out in great shape. Now, my hon. friend from Halifax, who is undertaking to solve this question, apparently thinks that it is possible for this House to constitute a committee that could receive information that could not well be handed to the House. If the committee is not able to do that, I cannot see what particular function it will have. It is perhaps well, as the hon. member for Shelburne and Queen's (Mr. Fielding), has said that every dollar of expenditure should be investigated. I am not sure that that is not a sound business principle, and if it were possible it might be done even with regard to railways. But if that information is to be sought in order to feather arrows to be shot at political archery competitions, I do not think it would be wise. If that information is to be got in order to help us out of a difficult problem and make non-paying railways a paying enterprise, then by all means it should be granted. But I was considerably nettled to-night to hear the leader of the Opposition calling in such indignant tones for information, information, information!

Let me recall to my hon. friend's mind for a moment what occurred when these

troubles were initiated. By whom were they started? Why are we in this country staggering like weary Titans under this burden? It is because my hon. friend and the hon. gentleman who led him at that time were in a government that launched railway schemes upon the country fifty years in advance of their time. They were told that hundreds of times in the House; they were told that information had not been obtained to warrant this country in building a transcontinental road. What was the reply of the hon. gentleman's leader at that time? "We have mountains of information." Well, what did those mountains of information lead to? They led to the building of what has proved to be the greatest white elephant in the way of railways ever seen in this world. It was known that it would be so, because this railway was projected for purely political purposes, and was never intended as a business proposition, from the time of its inception. It was launched as a political railway for the expenditure of vast sums of money in this country, money which, I say, was wrongfully diverted from the coffers of the country; and if there is any gentleman who should be gentle, and willing to show a little charity and a little confidence in those who are trying to undo this tangle, it is the hon. gentleman who leads the Opposition and who, with his leader in the government of that time, shouldered on to the country vast expenditures not only on the Transcontinental, but on the Canadian Northern. When they put on that $35,000,000 of guarantee on the line traversing the north shore of lake Superior, they placed a heavy burden on the Dominion. And when they undertook to build the Grand Trunk Pacific, it was understood in the first place that it would cost $13,000,000, or at the utmost $60,000,000, and it actually cost $180,000,000. That was the second clamp they put upon the country. Now my hon. friend wants information. Well, I hope he is going to make better use of it than he and his friends did in the years 1903 and 1904, when they got mountains of information and built a railway of 1,800 miles in the wilderness that cannot be made to pay in our time by any board of directors, whether politically appointed or composed of the best business men you can get in this country.

I say we have 1,800 miles of railroad that cannot be made to pay, and it can easily be proved that no body of directors could make that piece of road pay. My hon. friend who leads the Agrarian party (Mr. Crerar) it is true, has a receipt all his own for making the national railways pay. I am sorry he is not here to-night to state it, but I have seen it several times in print, and it is worth while recalling to the House just what the hon. gentleman's proposition is. His proposition for making these roads pay is to recapitalize them. They have cost about one thousand million dollars up to date, but they are losing $70,000,000 on operation. Can any man in the Agrarian party or in any other party in this House, say how these railways are to be made to meet operating expenses by reduction in the capitalization? It cannot be done; and it is childish to suggest it. Whether you capitalize them at one thousand millions, or at one dollar, if they are running at a loss on operating expenses, recapitalization will do absolutely no good, and no one can seriously suggest such a thing. Now, what the country wants to know is what we as thinking men, are going to do to solve a very difficult and dangerous financial problem, and that is what I want to lend my attention to for a moment. In this respect I am somewhat inclined to agree for once with my hon. friend from Brome (Mr. McMaster). The hon. gentleman is not often right, and possibly he may be wrong now; but I really feel tempted to agree with him in this respect.

An hon. MEMBER: Do not do it.

Mr. COCKSHUTT: He says that the director of a big enterprise controlling some thousand million dollars of the people's money should be prepared to spend all his time, if necessary, in the public interest, in directing the expenditure of that money; and that is but reasonable. The board might be reduced to one-half, and should be comprised of the very best men that could be obtained. I would say that from the general manager down the best men possible should be secured. The general manager should have around him the most efficient staff that money could secure, and they should devote themselves soul and body to the problem of bringing this country out of the darknes and distress in which it is in connection with its railways. To that end, I believe that the policy which my hon. friend has stated with regard to the directorate might very well receive the consideration of the Minister of Railways. I do not want to criticise anything that has been done. It is easy to criticise when a difficult mess of this kind takes place, but I fear myself that the best results have not been obtained from the operation of these

roads. If I were assured of the absolute necessity for it, I would willingly vote another $70,000,000 or more. The Government know the inward operations far better than I do, who sit on the outside and am acquainted with very little that is going on within, but they should consider very carefully indeed whether the Department of Railways and the management of the great railways now known as the Canadian National Railway system, are bringing the best results to the people of Canada which we can reasonably expect. If they are I say support them loyally, endorse heartily everything they do with a view to getting us out of the difficulties we are in. But Mr. Speaker, in order to make these railways pay we have, in my opinion, to have a different spirit not only in this House but amongst the people of the country as well—that is a spirit of loyalty to our own property. By constantly knocking our own property we are not going to build it up. We ought rather to try and boost it, and make helpful suggestions all along the line; we ought to encourage it in the way of traffic, in the way of passengers, and in every possible way that we can. Let us be loyal to our own property and see to it that the best results are obtained from this railway system.

If the committee be appointed, I hope, in order that it may serve a useful purpose, the Prime Minister will make it as wide in its scope as it is possible for it to be, and I believe he will. Because I think it is reasonable—at least as long as deficits occur—to think that the House will want to know what particular expenditures have gone to make up those deficits. I do think that is a proposition that ought to be carefully considered. If the Government were bringing down a seventy million surplus to us each year we might not ask them quite where they got it all; but if they come down with a seventy million odd deficit and ask us to vote the money then I do think that we, as custodians of the public funds should know whether that money is being wisely expended. And if this committee is appointed I think it will act reasonably; it will not unduly harass any department by asking for unnecessary returns, and it will not expect to get information that is going to result in any damage to these roads and that should not be given out. Every one that is a member of a private company knows that there is a very small amount of the expenditure laid before the annual meeting. Even as regards expenditure in lump sums, the company do not tell where they bought the supplies, or how much they paid for them. That is not the rule. That is the experience in the case of private companies and I am a member of quite a lot of them. I do not know any company which gives that information; and in the case of this great system we ought not to ask for unreasonable information. I do not believe that members if they want to do what is right and want to assist the country out of the deep difficulty in which it is at present, will harass in any way the administration of this great national enterprise. I hope it will be successful, because I think the success of Canada is largely bound up in it. There is nothing at the present time that gives this country more concern than its railway problem and its shipping problem. We are glad to know that our mercantile marine is paying its way and has a surplus even if it is only a small one and we hope the Government railways will soon be in the same position. So far as I am concerned I heartily desire to co-operate in every possible way in making our great national highway the success it ought to be.

Mr. FRANK S. CAHILL (Pontiac): I wish to say a few words on this all important subject of the Canadian National railways. I was much interested in the remarks which fell from the Minister of Finance when he was discussing the question of parliamentary control. It seems to me that until we solve the problem of getting the members of Parliament and the people of the country educated up to what parliamentary control and public management mean, we are going to be in difficulties as regards our railway problem. There are a great many members of the House who are keenly interested in public ownership and are strongly in favour of it, but apparently have given no thought whatever to the question of public management. I remember very well that in 1918 when this subject was under discussion in the House the Government were quoting whole pages from a certain railway report, of which the Minister of Finance was partly the author to suit their own purpose, and leaving other pages, that did not suit their designs, untouched. In the case of the minister particularly interested in the subject, I was convinced that he had not quite arrived at a sound conclusion as to what might or might not be government control, even after the amount of attention he had given to it. Now, to any man who has given any thought to the subject it goes

without saying that it is impossible to get away from parliamentary control. By the very nature of our governmental institutions it is impossible to ignore parliamentary control unless you wish to hand the entire supervision of this enterprise over to irresponsible people—that is irresponsible as far as Parliament is concerned—and have no control whatever. You must have one thing or the other; you must have parliamentary control or no control. It is this choice that is confusing the people today. Which are we going to have? Are we to have no control or parliamentary control? Any company of gentlemen who are handling $300,000,000 of the peoples' money should be subject to some control—there should be some control over gentlemen who are handling that much public money. The Estimates provide for $165,000,000, and the railway system earns $125,000,000, making roughly an expenditure of $290,000,000 without allowing for any Supplementary Estimates. The gentlemen who have the control of our railways are, according to the Government, spending this money without restriction to the extent of $300,000,000. The people have come to realize that they have to deal with a serious problem; they have come to realize that first of all the Government and Parliament must take notice of this expenditure. They want to know what is the cause of the deficits. They want to know how these deficits can be eliminated, and the Government raiway system made to earn interest on the investment if possible. The Minister of Finance said this evening that you could not have members of Parliament asking about a station agent some place; but he will not say to me now that it is not legitimate for me to ask the Government why Parliament, through the irresponsible agency referred to, should expend millions of dollars on terminals at Halifax when these expenditures have never been approved by Parliament. The Government came down here and asked for a lump sum to take care of deficits. During the year they were engaged in spending $125,000,000 in any way they pleased, and I am of opinion they are spending a good part of it under the direction of the Minister of Railways. I do not believe that the Board of Management went to Halifax and entered upon an expenditure of several millions of dollars on that undertaking without first consulting the Minister of Railways. I believe that he was advised by the Minister of Railways and Canals.

Hon. Mr. REID: Might I ask the hon. gentleman what expenditures re refers to?

Mr. CAHILL: The expenditure referred to in the report of the Department of Railways and Canals.

Hon. Mr. REID: I might answer the hon. member in regard to that. Any expenditure on capital account I gave details of when the Estimates were going through, as to how and where it was to be expended. In so far as operating expenses are concerned, of course, they do not come before us.

Mr. CAHILL: I am not at all convinced that the minister would mind if I were to refuse to ask any more questions when his Estimates are before the committee, but if he will point out any place in his Estimates in previous years where he mentioned an investment on the Halifax terminals, I believe I would be almost willing to agree not to ask him any more questions on the subject of railways. I would do him that favour. That is one question, the question of contractors who are double-tracking and doing other work in connection with the railways, that comes under capital expenditure; there is no provision made for that in the Estimates except in lump sums such as the minister passed last year at half past two in the morning after delivering a number of speeches all day without giving any information whatever.

Now, the Government may say that it is up to the Opposition to ask for and get information. I think they are justified in saying that, for in my opinion it is the business of the Opposition to get information. But the Government have taken a great proportion of the expenditure of this country entirely out of parliamentary control. The Government come down here with a lump sum for deficits, and they give as little information as possible, and the money voted is spent in any way that the management may see fit, always bearing in mind that it has to co-operate with the Minister of Railways and Canals and his colleagues.

The minister came down and asked the members of this House for suggestions. We are willing to offer suggestions, we are willing to help solve the problem if that is possible; but before attempting to do that the minister will agree with me that the Government must lay their cards on the table, they must be fair to the people and not attempt to do what the Prime Minister has attempted to do to-day. The Prime Min-

ister agreed as a final result of all this discussion, after promising for several days what he was going to do, to appoint a committee. The function of that committee would be to recommend to itself what it should recommend to Parliament, and what Parliament should in turn recommend back to the committee. That in plain language is what the minister said, that this committee would have absolutely no function at all. But if I am not mistaken the Minister of Marine and Fisheries intends to come down to-night to ask the committee to pass Estimates for a department so closely related to the Department of Railways and Canals that it is not going to give us any information. His department, too, is excluded from furnishing any information pertaining to its expenditure. My hon. friend has been taught some bad lessons by the Minister of Railways and Canals.

The Government should make up their minds as to what they are going to do about this question. It is all very well to ask the Opposition for constructive criticism, but, as I pointed out to the minister last year, we would be very foolish to offer suggestions to a Government that would bungle them. The Prime Minister laughs, but he knows that there never was a Government of this country better able to bungle things. He will not disagree with that surely. This Government has lost more money on railways in the last five years, including this year's deficit, than the total expenditure by all the governments of Canada since Confederation, including the cost of the Intercolonial, the Transcontinental and the Hudson Bay railways. The loss to-day amounts to about $200,000 per day, and my hon. friend's remedy is to appoint a committee to investigate and see what they can do. That is not a solution for the country. The Government must first make up their minds what they are going to do as to furnishing information, about how much they propose to give and how they propose to give it. It is useless to say, "We are going to shift this responsibility on to a committee,"—a committee that will have no responsibility to any person and will merely report. The Government must take responsibility, and if they refuse to give information here, that is for them to answer before the country. But to say that they can appoint a committee to manage our railways, and then to refuse to give the report of that committee to Parliament, is too absurd for the people of Canada to accept. My hon. friend tried to make out that they are afraid of political control. I will give them a way that will relieve them of a great deal of political control. Bring the whole proposition before the people's representatives, they who vote the money for the enterprise, give it the widest publicity possible, and then you will have no political patronage. If every person is acquainted with what is going on you will have nothing to conceal. Apparently the Government now feel they have something which they must keep back, and the people feel the same way. The Government have given them the lead and the people believe the Government—in this case; in most cases they do not.

The only plan to get away from political patronage is to give the widest possible publicity. Give the Opposition the facts and the information, and you are always protected. If you give the public full information the public may then be able to assist you to obtain better results. If the Government continue muddling along as the Minister of Railways does, the railway deficits in future will be very much greater than they have been. It is too serious a problem for the Government to treat so lightly by appointing a committee that they say will do something. It is for the Government to give information, and the time and place to give it is here and now.

Some hon. MEMBERS: Question.

Mr. SPEAKER: Is it the pleasure of the House that the hon. member should have leave to withdraw his amendment?

Some hon. MEMBERS: Carried.

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

Mr. MEIGHEN: Mr. Speaker, have I a right to reply on the main motion?

Mr. SPEAKER: I think not.

Mr. MEIGHEN: Then I will ask leave of the House later.

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

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: What is the motion?

Mr. SPEAKER: That I do now leave the Chair for the House to go into Committee of Supply.

Motion agreed to, and the House went into Committee of Supply, Mr. Boivin in the Chair.

Civil Government—Marine and Fisheries—salaries, $360,810; contingencies, $68,870.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: May I ask my right hon. friend if it is his wish to sit all night?

Mr. MEIGHEN: No, not by any means. I do not wish to complain of the amount of time taken up in the discussion of railway matters, but I take this occasion to seek to impress on the committee the fact that this is the fifth day of April; that Supply has been called every day for several weeks, and that virtually no real business has been done. But on account of the railway question being up to-day, I do not think that I should ask the committee to sit longer to-night.

Mr. BALLANTYNE: In view of the lateness of the hour, then, I beg to move that the committee rise, report progress and ask leave to sit again.

Progress reported.

SUPPLEMENTARY ESTIMATES FOR 1921-22

A message from His Excellency the Governor General transmitting Supplementary Estimates for the year ending March 31, 1922, was presented by Sir Henry Drayton (Minister of Finance), read by Mr. Speaker to the House, and referred to the Committee of Supply.

CANADIAN NATIONAL RAILWAYS

REFERENCE TO SPECIAL COMMITTEE OF THE HOUSE

Right Hon. ARTHUR MEIGHEN: During the course of the discussion with regard to the Canadian National Railways, I promised that I would give notice to-night of a motion for the appointment of a committee. I am prepared to hand the motion in, in the regular way, but as in that case hon. members would have no chance to peruse it, I think it would be fairer, that I should read it to-night. In that connection I wish to say that the subjects here outlined are not given finally and conclusively as the subject to be under the review of the committee. In the course of my remarks, indeed, I said that such was not the case; necessarily the committee, in examining anything, will examine it with a view to determining its duties as committed to it. As regards the report that was referred to, it was on the table for many months and could have been referred to the appropriate committee at any time had anyone so asked. There is no objection to its being referred to this committee for all the purposes for which the committee is appointed. I say this merely by way of explanation of the motion of which I am giving notice. I give notice that I will move—the motion will appear in the Votes and Proceedings to-morrow:

That a Select Standing Committee on National Railways and Shipping be appointed for the present Session, and be instructed to inquire into the following questions:—

(1) What information as to operation of Canadian National Railways and Shipping as conducted by the Board of Directors and Management should, in the public interest, be brought down in Parliament on Question, Motion for production of papers, or otherwise,

(2) When, by what method, and under what conditions, if any, should such information be given, regard being had for the necessity of securing to Parliament and the Public all facts requisite for the determination of policy (including finance), and to the Board of Directors the best possible conditions and efficiency of management,

(3) What system of auditing should be adopted, and what extent of detail should be given in the Annual Report,

(4) Whether and for what purposes the said Committee should be continued, and that for the above purposes and for such other purposes as the Committee deem in the public interest there be referred to said Committee the Annual Report of the Board of Directors and that the said Committee have power to examine witnesses under oath to send for papers, persons, and records, and to report from time to time.

I am sorry to destroy the hopes of hon. gentlemen opposite.

An hon. MEMBER: What hopes?

Mr. MEIGHEN: The hopes that they built all their speeches on to-night, namely, that they would be denied the examination of the report.

On the motion of Right Hon. Mr. Meighen for the adjournment of the House:

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: What business will be taken up to-morrow?

Mr. MEIGHEN: The House will be moved into Committee of Supply on Labour and Railway Estimates; those are what we will take up first. There may be two or three Government orders that would be gone on with first, but not such as would likely be contentious. Notice was given to-day of a motion for interim supply, which, if the notice is sufficient will be gone on with.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: When was that notice given?

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: This afternoon, I think.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: I am not aware of it.

Mr. MEIGHEN: It would simply be handed in, I suppose.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: My right hon. friend speaks of going on with the Estimates of the Railway Department to-morrow. Possibly the motion of which he has just given notice had better be disposed of before we go on with the Railway Estimates. We would like to know before we discuss those Estimates what information we are likely to get from this committee when it functions.

Mr. MEIGHEN: I do not see the connection at the moment. However, I promised the hon. member for Quebec East (Mr. Lapointe) that he would have an opportunity to-morrow to make some remarks—I do not know whether or not he has an amendment—in relation to labour matters; so I have on that account mentioned labour, and doubtless he will take advantage of the opportunity.

Motion agreed to, and the House adjourned at 12.50 a.m. Wednesday.

Wednesday, April 6, 1921.

The House met at Three o'clock.

SOLDIERS' RE-ESTABLISHMENT AND PENSIONS

Mr. HUME CRONYN (London) presented the second report of the Special Committee on pensions, insurance, and re-establishment of returned soldiers.

Mr. CRONYN: Mr. Speaker, I move, seconded by Mr. MacNutt, that the second report of the Special Committee appointed to consider questions relating to pensions, insurance, and re-establishment of returned soldiers, which was presented this day, be concurred in.

Mr. SPEAKER: I must point out to the House that, in the absence of notice, this motion requires unanimous consent. Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt the motion.

Motion agreed to.

REPORT TABLED

Report of the Royal Canadian Mounted Police for the year ended September 30, 1920.—Hon. J. A. Calder.

GRAND TRUNK ARBITRATION—CORRESPONDENCE

Right Hon. ARTHUR MEIGHEN (Prime Minister): I desire to lay on the Table a copy of correspondence between the Government and the Grand Trunk Railway Company relative to the question of the extension of the time for arbitration. I thought that even though the correspondence was not complete, it had arrived at a stage when it was proper that the House should know where the parties stood. I may add that just a few moments before three o'clock there came to me a further letter in the nature of legal argument, but I received it too late to include it in what I now submit. When it is possible to put further correspondence on the Table that letter will appear.

RESIGNATION OF SIR THOMAS WHITE

Mr. SPEAKER: I have the honour to inform the House that I have received the resignation of the Right Honourable Sir Thomas White, K.C.M.G., as Member for the Electoral District of Leeds.

I accordingly issued my Warrant to the Chief Electoral Officer to make out a new writ of election for the said electoral district.

POST OFFICE ACT AMENDMENT

Right Hon. C. J. DOHERTY (Minister of Justice) moved for leave to introduce Bill No. 57 (from the Senate), to amend the Post Office Act.

Mr. LEMIEUX: Explain.

Mr. DOHERTY: The Bill has already been passed by the Senate, and it is not customary to explain such Bills on their first reading in this House. Unfortunately, I have not a copy of it under my hand, but there are three clauses, the principal one of which provides for a system of insurance in connection with registered parcels. The other two provisions, I am satisfied, are of minor importance.

Mr. LEMIEUX: Have they anything to do with the payment of ferry men?

Mr. DOHERTY: I cannot remember. I understood the Bill was here, and it should be here, having been sent from the Senate.

Mr. LEMIEUX: I know it is not customary to delay the first reading of Senate Bills, but, Mr. Speaker, if my motion of the other day had been adopted, we should have the Postmaster General here to explain the nature of his Bill.

Mr. SPEAKER: It is unusual for Senate Bills to be explained on their first

reading in this House. They receive a first reading as a matter of courtesy and as a matter of course.

Motion agreed to, and Bill read the first time.

QUESTIONS

(Questions answered orally are indicated by an asterisk.)

CANADIAN GOVERNMENT BONDS

Hon. Mr. FIELDING:

1. What amount of Canadian bonds was purchased by the committee of bankers acting for the Government in each of the fiscal years 1919, 1920 and to the present time in 1921?
2. What amount, apart from interest, was paid in each year for bonds so purchased?
3. What amount of such bonds was disposed of in each year by the committee?
4. What amount, apart from interest, was received by the committee in each year as the proceeds of such sales?
5. What amount of such bonds remained in the hands of the committee when the committee's operations ceased?
6. What disposal was made of the bonds so remaining in the committee's hands?

Hon. Sir HENRY DRAYTON:

1. The question asks for data covering "each fiscal year." Figures are not readily available in this form, but the following, summarizing the results of the two distinct periods of the committee's operations, substantially supplies the information desired:—

A. As to operations of committee from January 22, 1918, to January 20, 1919, when it was disbanded.

1. $70,329,050 (par value)
3. 64,549,400 (par value)
5. 5,779,650 (par value)

6. Taken over by Minister of Finance for sinking fund purposes at 99½ for 1922's and 99¾ for 1927's—ruling market prices.

2 and 4. After returning unsold bonds to the Department of Finance on the above-mentioned basis and crediting its accounts with interest earned by bonds on hand from time to time, the committee, whose accounts were audited and certified by chartered accountants, was able to show a surplus on operations of $124,088.64, after paying all expenses. No interest was charged in the committee's books on cash advances made by the Finance Department from time to time from surplus loan funds to enable it to carry on its operations and which amounted in the aggregate to $10,950,000.

B. As to operations of committee from August 26, 1919, when it was revived, to November 30, 1920, when it was again discontinued.

1. $299,206,650 (par value)

[Mr. Lemieux.]

2. $293,529,680.56.
3. $190,259,100 (par value)
4. $184,319,978.96.
5. $108,947,550 (par value)

6. Bonds of the par value of $19,719,250 being total accumulations of bonds of the taxable 1919 issue, have been placed in investors' hands since the committee wound up, leaving $89,228,300 held by Finance Department, all of which bonds are exempt from taxation and became available for sinking fund purposes.

The accounts of the committee covering this period of its operations were rendered in similar form to that of the first period, regularly audited and certified by chartered accountants. These accounts showed a surplus from operations of $714,253.88, after meeting all expenses. This result was arrived at after taking into consideration interest earned on bonds held, from November 24, 1919, to December 1, 1920, but disregarding any interest accruing after December 1, 1920, as well as interest amounting to $2,140,864.15 accruing on bonds to the par value of $34,972,750, which were purchased between August 26, 1919, and December 15, 1919, and especially segregated from the latter date, and after providing the sum of $1,160,308.94 to reduce book values of current account bonds to closing bid prices of the Toronto Stock Exchange on January 22, 1921. No interest was charged in the committee's books on cash advances made by the Finance Department from time to time to enable it to carry on its operations, and which amounted in the aggregate to $107,000,000. These advances were made from Victory Loan balances on hand.

VICTORY BONDS—EXPENSES

Mr. SINCLAIR (Antigonish and Guysborough):

How much money was spent or liability incurred by the Government during the calendar year 1920 in stabilizing the Victory Bond Market.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON:

This question is fully covered by the answer just now submitted to the question asked by the honourable member for Queens and Shelburne; and I assume that, on that understanding, the honourable member (Mr. Sinclair) will permit his question to be dropped.

CANADIAN NATIONAL RAILWAYS—FREIGHT, NOVA SCOTIA POINTS

Mr. SINCLAIR (Antigonish and Guysborough):

What has been the amount of freight business done (expressed in tons and dollars) for each year during the last five years at the folliwing stations on the Canadian Government Railways in Nova Scotia, namely:—Piedmont, Barney's River, Marshy Hope, James River, South River, Heatherton, Tracadie and Monastery?

Hon. Mr. REID:

Station	Year	Tons-Freight Outward	Tons-Freight Inward	Earnings Outward	Earnings Inward
Piedmont	1916	189	389	$ 241 04	$ 1,007 82
	1917	198	201	324 22	321 99
	1918	118	187	285 72	380 16
	1919	111	154	685 98	485 15
	1920	40	94	180 37	312 83
Barney's River	1916	126	568	247 48	546 20
	1917	126	522	263 38	529 77
	1918	182	297	523 43	331 34
	1919	163	297	432 34	735 81
	1920	70	156	250 90	549 00
Marshy Hope	1916	1,120	62	670 78	109 74
	1917	287	56	357 86	113 68
	1918	412	44	548 30	111 47
	1919	228	38	381 12	151 23
	1920	1,284	71	2,225 65	267 10
James River	1916	1,864	495	808 83	1,253 00
	1917	4,343	1,157	6,058 00	2,321 00
	1918	4,056	679	7,860 00	1,687 00
	1919	2,700	592	4,994 00	2,305 00
	1920	10,060	1,896	14,763 00	3,075 84
South River	1916	1,075	1,264	1,592 80	2,442 30
	1917	3,038	1,851	4,450 10	2,876 40
	1918	5,374	1,438	10,121 60	3,513 30
	1919	3,164	718	7,859 50	2,859 20
	1920	2,502	973	6,771 49	3,582 29
Heatherton	1916	365	1,886	889 90	3,750 80
	1917	415	940	1,242 20	3,472 00
	1918	953	1,164	3,362 60	3,316 29
	1919	880	1,556	2,893 30	3,743 45
	1920	1,635	953	4,625 33	3,612 06
Tracadie	1916	1,971	597	2,886 70	1,646 48
	1917	4,454	1,333	6,152 40	2,728 00
	1918	4,325	832	8,229 70	1,995 00
	1919	2,773	828	5,156 94	2,991 00
	1920	1,327	726	4,083 18	3,164 34
Monastery	1916	1,789	347	2,061 44	884 45
	1917	3,542	619	4,054 99	1,633 73
	1918	3,851	740	7,097 06	1,805 07
	1919	1,987	578	5,445 47	2,182 37
	1920	3,036	458	6,942 41	2,244 69

PRINTING BUREAU

ALLEGED DESTRUCTION OF PUBLIC DOCUMENTS

*Mr. BROUILLARD:

1. Has Judge Snider made any report in connection with the inquiry into the destruction of Government property at the Printing Bureau?
2. If so, what is the date of the said report, what action has been taken thereon, and when will the report be laid on the table of the House?
3. When will Judge Snider finish his inquiry?

Hon. Mr. MEIGHEN: Stand.

Mr. LEMIEUX: Mr. Speaker, I notice that question No. 15 has been on the Order Paper for several weeks.

Mr. SPEAKER: If any hon. member desires to direct attention to unanswered questions he should do so on the Orders of the Day. It is irregular to call attention to unanswered questions while questions are being answered.

CANADIAN NATIONAL RAILWAYS—CONDUCTORS AND BRAKEMEN DISCHARGED

Mr. DELISLE:

1. How many conductors and brakemen, employed on the Government Railway, from Quebec to O'Brien, have been discharged during 1920?

2. What are the names of said employees?

3. What was the reason for their dismissal? Were they granted a legal and impartial enquiry, as required by section 36 of rules entitled Rate of Pay and Rules, under the signature of F. P. Brady in behalf of the C.N.R.; M. G. Wilson in behalf of the Brotherhood of Railroad Trainmen, and M. Kelleher in behalf of the Order of Railroad Conductors?

4. What are the names of the spotters who made the case?

5. What was their occupation before they took up that work for the Government?

6. Were affidavits taken? If so, before whom were said affidavits sworn to?

7. Is it the intention of the Government to reinstate such employees?

Hon. Mr. REID:

1. 7 conductors, 6 brakemen and 1 baggageman.

2. Names of conductors: Jos. Elias Albert, J. Esdras Benoit, J. Elz. Cleophas Cote, Ls. Phillippee Cloutier, L. Azavedo Dupont, Levi Jos. Jess, F. R. Plouffe.

Names of brakemen: Jos. Albert, Jos. Brochu, Romeo Fournier, Romeo Gagnon, Vic. R. Mulligan, Frs. Ls. St. Pierre.

Name of baggageman: Romeo Picher.

3. Conductors J. E. Benoit, J. E. Cleophas Cote, L. P. Cloutier, L. J. Jess were dismissed on account of irregularities in handling of cash fares. Conductor J. E. Albert was dismissed on account of conviction for theft of railway property. Conductor L. A. Dupont was dismissed on account of insubordination. Conductor F. R. Plouffe was dismissed for violation of Special Rule "E" of Timetable No. 2, resulting in rear end collision. Brakeman Jos. Albert was dismissed on account of conviction for theft of goods in possession of the Railway. Brakeman Jos. Brochu was dismissed on account of unsatisfactory services established by demerit marks. Brakeman R. Gagnon, Frs. Ls. St. Pierre and baggageman R. Picher were dismissed for violation of Rule "G" (intoxicating). All of these employees were granted full and proper investigation as required by rules of schedules with Brotherhoods covering such cases.

Brakeman R. Fournier was dropped from pay-roll on account of not having returned for duty within a year's time as required by Railway regulations. Brakeman Vic. R. Mulligan was dropped from pay-roll on account of leaving service and taking up employment elsewhere.

[Mr. Lemieux.]

4, 5 and 6. The management take the ground that it is not in the public interest to give names or occupations of persons who gave first information as to irregularities in handling cash fares.

One case is still under consideration but the management state they have no intention of changing the discipline administered in connection with the balance.

JUDGE WILSON

Mr. MICHAUD:

1. Was Judge Wilson of the York and Sunbury County Court in the Province of New Brunswick superannuated by an Order in Council? If so, when?

2. Has any one been appointed to fill the vacancy? If so, when, If not, why not?

3. When was Judge Wilson notified of his superannuation, and by whom?

4. Who was recommended to fill the vacancy and by whom?

Hon. Sir HENRY DRAYTON:

1. Yes, by Order in Council dated March 8, 1921.

2. No.

3. Letters Patent granting annuity to Judge Wilson transmitted to him by the Department of the Secretary of State on April 1, 1921.

4. The vacancy has not yet been filled.

BONUS TO LIGHTHOUSE KEEPERS

Mr. FAFARD:

Is it the intention of the Government to grant a bonus to lighthouse-keepers for the year 1920?

Hon. Mr. BALLANTYNE: The matter is under consideration.

CUSTOMS REVENUE BY PROVINCES

Mr. BUCHANAN:

1. What was the total amount of customs revenue collected in the province of Alberta, each year, during the past five years?

2. What is the present estimated population of Alberta?

3. What was the total amount of customs revenue during the same period, in the other provinces of the Dominion respectively?

4. What is the estimated population of the other provinces of the Dominion?

Hon. Sir HENRY DRAYTON:

Alberta

1. Year	1916-1917.....	$ 2,572,304.56
"	1917-1918.....	4,012,656.92
"	1918-1919.....	3,432,315.98
"	1919-1920.....	3,638,574.27
"	1920-1921.....	4,104,028.32

2. The population of Alberta according to the census of 1911, was 374,663.

Nova Scotia

3. Year 1916-1917.....$ 4,682,337,83
" 1917-1918..... 4,380,547.65
" 1918-1919..... 4,159,820.58
" 1919-1920..... 4,947,776.40
" 1920-1921..... 4,317,322.56

Prince Edward Island

Year 1916-1917.....$ 143,978.06
" 1917-1918..... 129,600.47
" 1918-1919..... 127,025.25
" 1919-1920..... 150,290.11
" 1920-1921..... 197,115.75

New Brunswick

Year 1916-1917.....$ 3,975,869.89
" 1917-1918..... 4,294,261.27
" 1918-1919..... 4,343,357.31
" 1919-1920..... 6,166,790.67
" 1920-1921..... 5,303,210.48

Quebec

Year 1916-1917.....$41,599,152.45
" 1917-1918..... 42,995,617.72
" 1918-1919..... 43,613,682.91
" 1919-1920..... 55,646,738.93
" 1920-1921..... 55,794,843.12

Ontario

Year 1916-1917.....$72,713,607.47
" 1917-1918..... 79,986,726.97
" 1918-1919..... 77,374,637.37
" 1919-1920..... 90,610,034.54
" 1920-1921..... 81,756,396.36

Manitoba

Year 1916-1917.....$10,011,777.91
" 1917-1918..... 11,674,995.90
" 1918-1919..... 10,670,356.05
" 1919-1920..... 12,160,214.32
" 1920-1921..... 11,252,930.12

Saskatchewan

Year 1916-1917.....$ 2,892,181.88
" 1917-1918..... 3,806,410.92
" 1918-1919..... 2,860,403.00
" 1919-1920..... 2,699,284.31
" 1920-1921..... 3,442,124.55

Alberta

Year 1916-1917.....$ 2,572,304.56
" 1917-1918..... 4,012,656.92
" 1918-1919..... 3,432,315.98
" 1919-1920..... 3,638,574.27
" 1920-1921..... 4,104,028.32

British Columbia

Year 1916-1917.....$ 8,893,270.72
" 1917-1918..... 10,227,819.04
" 1918-1919..... 11,480,897.27
" 1919-1920..... 11,549,087.06
" 1920-1921..... 11,765,481.09

Yukon Territory

Year 1916-1917.....$ 155,362.81
" 1917-1918..... 118,012.25
" 1918-1919..... 74,004.24
" 1919-1920..... 58,881.02
" 1920-1921..... 47,129.80

4. The population of the other provinces of the Dominion as shown by the census of 1911, was as follows:

Prince Edward Island..	93,728
Nova Scotia	492,338
New Brunswick..	351,889
Quebec..	2,003,232
Ontario..	2,523,274
Manitoba..	455,614
Saskatchewan...	492,432
British Columbia... ..	392,480
Yukon..	8,512
Northwest Territories..	18,481

The new census of all the provinces will be taken during the present year. In the meantime, it is not possible to give an estimate of the present population of the several provinces, as the amount of error in calculating population for small areas is bound to be considerable.

CIVIL SERVICE BONUS

Mr. TOBIN:

1. What was the total amount appropriated by the Government, last year, for the payment of a bonus to civil servants during the fiscal year 1920-21?

2. How much was actually paid out of said total appropriation?

3. Was the amount paid out less than the total, if so, why?

4. By what amount will this appropriation be reduced, in order to equal the decrease of 25 per cent announced by the Government for the civil service bonus of 1921-22?

Hon. Sir HENRY DRAYTON:

1. Appropriated by Parliament for 1920-21, $12,500,000.

2. $9,523,802.88 as shown by the books of the Auditor General's Department to February 28, 1921.

3. The amount disbursed is the actual amount properly payable under the regulations governing the distribution of the bonus.

4. Twenty-five per cent.

DEPOSITS OUTSIDE CANADA IN CANADIAN BANKS

Mr. DEMERS:

1. What is the total amount of the deposits made in Canadian banks outside of Canada?

2. What is the total amount of loans made by Canadian banks outside of Canada?

Hon. Sir HENRY DRAYTON:

(As of February 28, 1921):

1. $305,778,387.00.

2. $353,458,003.00.

W. A. DONNER

Mr. CANNON:

1. Has a man named W. A. Donner, formerly manager of the Bank of Toronto, at Stayner, Ont., been discharged from the penitentiary where he had been sentenced in April, 1920, by Mr. Justice Lennox, for a period of three years?
2. How long has the said Donner been detained in the penitentiary?
3. For what reason and upon whose recommendation has the said Donner been discharged?
4. At what date was such release granted?

Hon. Mr. GUTHRIE:

1. Yes.
2. 8 months and 3 days.
3. The recommendation for the discharge of Donner was made by the Acting Solicitor General. It is not considered to be in the public interest nor is it usual to make public the reasons for the exercise of executive clemency in criminal cases.
4. December 22, 1920.

IMMIGRANTS REJECTED

Mr. STEELE:

1. How many immigrants were rejected at Canadian ocean ports in the calendar year, 1920?
2. How many at boundary ports?
3. How many were rejected on medical certificates?
4. How many deportations were made from Canada in the calendar year 1920?
5. How many of these deportations were on medical certificates?

Hon. Mr. CALDER:

1. 747.
2. 19,019.
3. 219.
4. 809.
5. 101.

W. H. CORNING—CATTLE PURCHASES

Mr. SINCLAIR (Antigonish and Guysborough):

1. Was any livestock purchased by the Department of Agriculture from Mr. H. Corning Yarmouth, N.S., during the years 1919 and 1920?
2. If so, (a) what number were so purchased; (b) of what breed; (c) what were the respective ages; and (d) what price was paid for each?
3. Was the tuberculin test applied?
4. If so, were any of these animals found to be tubercular and were any rejected on that account?
5. On whose recommendation was the said stock purchased?

Hon. Mr. TOLMIE:

1. No livestock was purchased from H. Corning, Yarmouth, N.S., during the years 1919 and 1920, but some were purchased from Mr. Howard Corning of Cheggogan, N.S., in March, 1920.

2. (a) Four head; (b) Guernseys; (c) and (d) 1. King's Blanche of Hillside, age 6 years, price $2,000; 2. Princess Daisy of Hillside, age 4 years, and calf, price $600; 3. Cabbage Rose of Hillside, 4 years, and calf, price, $1,000; 4. Princess Dairymaid, 3 years, and calf, price $400.

3. Yes.

4. No reactions to tuberculin test occurred.

5. Superintendent, Experimental Farm, Nappan, N.S.

FEEDING STUFFS ACT—INSPECTION DISTRICTS

Mr. ANDERSON:

1. What are the six inspection districts organized under the Feeding Stuffs Act?
2. Who are the inspectors in charge of these districts and what salary are they paid?
3. Who is the Seed and Feed Inspector for Halton, working under the District Inspector, and what is his salary?
4. Is Doctor McGill, Chief Analyst under the Commercial Feeding Stuffs Act of 1909, actually giving service now?

Hon. Mr. TOLMIE:

1. District No. 1, The Maritime Provinces; No. 2, Quebec; No. 3, Eastern Ontario; No. 4, Western Ontario; No. 5, Manitoba and Saskatchewan; No. 6, Alberta and British Columbia.

2. District No. 1, S. J. Moore, salary $2,640; No. 2, Jules Simard, B.S.A., salary $2,640; No. 3, T. G. Raynor, B.S.A., salary $2,640; No. 4, W. J. Lennox, B.S.A., salary $2,640; No. 5, J. E. Blakeman, B.S.A., salary, $2,400; No. 6, G. M. Stewart, salary $2,520.

3. A. J. Thomson, salary $165 per month.

4. The District Inspectors have been advised that they may receive analytical service from any of the laboratories under the direction of the Chief Analyst of the Department of Health.

CANADIAN NATIONAL RAILWAYS—HORNEPAYNE DIVISION

Mr. BROUILLARD:

1. Who has been appointed Superintendent of the Hornepayne Division on the Canadian National Railways?
2. What is the age of the said appointee and how many years of service as a railway man did he have?
3. Who recommended him?
4. Why was not a conductor or a locomotive engineer promoted to that position?

Hon. Mr. REID (Grenville):

1. J. J. Napier.

2. 39 years of age. Has been in service of Canadian Northern Railway since 1905.

3. The General Superintendent.

4. Mr. Napier was formerly a locomotive engineer.

WAR HISTORY

Mr. BOYER:

Has a translation been made of the volumes, published to date of "A History of the Organization, development and services of the Military and Naval Forces of Canada," edited by the General Staffs' Historical Section?

Hon. Mr. GUTHRIE: Yes, but the volumes have not yet been printed.

QUESTION PASSED AS ORDER FOR RETURN

Mr. GRIESBACH:

1. Has the Young Men's Christian Association associated with the Canadian Expeditionary Force in the great war submitted to the Government a statement of accounts showing all moneys received and expended by that body both by way of contribution from people in Canada and arising out of sales to Canadian troops?

2. If so, will he Government lay same upon the Table of the House?

3. If not, is it the intention of the Government to procure and distribute such a statement?

UNOPPOSED MOTION FOR PRODUCTION OF PAPERS

Mr. A. L. DESAULNIERS:

For a copy of all reports, petitions, letters, and other documents in conection with the removal of the postmaster at Pont St-Maurice, Champlain county.

DESTRUCTION OF PUBLIC DOCUMENTS

JUDGE SNIDERS REPORT

On the Orders of the Day.

Hon. RODOLPHE LEMIEUX (Maisonneuve and Gaspé): I wish to draw attention to the fact that question, No. 15, which has been on the Order Paper for three or four weeks, dealing with Judge Snider's report still remains unanswered although it deals with the matter of public importance. I understand that Judge Snider's report is in the hands of the Government.

Hon. T. A. CRERAR (Marquette): I do not wish to be considered discourteous by intervening at this juncture but we are unable at this end of the Chamber to hear anything of the doubtless very interesting proceedings which are at present going on. I would therefore urge my hon. friends sitting immediately to your right and left, Mr. Speaker, when they are discussing matters across the floor of the House to speak in a tone of voice which will be audible to us at this end of the Chamber so that we can glean some idea of what is being said.

Right Hon. ARTHUR MEIGHEN (Prime Minister): I am quite prepared to yield to my hon. friend's request, and I will do so on behalf of others as well as myself. As to the representation made by the hon. member for Maisonneuve I will make enquiries into the matter and let the hon. member know later.

PRIVATE BILLS

EXTENSION OF TIME

On the Orders of the Day.

Mr. S. W. JACOBS (George Etienne Cartier): Inasmuch as the time for filing petitions for private Bills expired during the Easter recess I should like to know from the Chairman of the Standing Orders Committee if it is intended to recommend a further delay in order that those who proposed filing petitions for Bills immediately after Easter shall have an opportunity of doing so?

Mr. H. M. MOWAT (Parkdale): I understand the practice to be, when petitions for private Bills are not presented within six weeks from the opening of Parliament, that when the petition is presented Mr. Speaker calls attention to the fact that it is too late, and then any honourable member interested may move that the petition be referred to the Standing Committee on Standing Orders for consideration and report.

SUPPLY—MINISTER OF LABOUR AND THE NATIONAL CATHOLIC LABOUR UNIONS

Sir HENRY DRAYTON (Minister of Finance) moved that the House go again into Committee of Supply.

Mr. ERNEST LAPOINTE (Quebec East): Before you leave the Chair, Mr. Speaker, I desire to make some remarks concerning a matter which I deem to be of great importance. I had intended to discuss this matter when the Estimates of the Labour Department were considered in committee, but as I do not know when those Estimates will come before us, and as there is a campaign, being carried on in the press in the meantime, I think it my duty to present the facts with respect to this question now, and offer such comments as I consider necessary. I will first state the facts of the case as I know them to be, and then repeat the version of them as given in the press.

On March 23, a delegation of the Executive Officers of the National Labour

Union waited upon the Minister of Labour in order to present to him the resolutions which had been adopted at the annual convention of the union held last summer in the town of Chicoutimi. I was asked by the President of the National Union, to accompany the delegates and introduce them to the Minister of Labour and I did so gladly. At the time I did not know what was the tenor of the resolutions which were to be submitted to the head of the Department of Labour. Indeed a representative of the Canadian Associated Press asked me in the morning, a few hours before the interview took place, what was to be the programme and what the resolutions were and I told him that I did not know. The delegates duly waited on the minister who was accompanied by his deputy. Resolutions on the various subjects which had been dealt with at their convention were sumitted and, for the information of hon. members I will read the press reports showing what those subjects were. My part in the proceedings so far was rather to translate to the minister the remarks of those of the delegates who could not speak English, and to the delegates, the remarks of the minister, who could not speak French. One of the demands made was that in the representation on all the boards, commissions, or committees concerning labour upon which labour representatives are called to sit, the members of this Union—which has a membership of forty thousand working men —should be given a share according to their number as compared with the number of the workers who belong to other unions. I thought myself that this was a fair demand, but I was not there to advocate anything. The Minister of Labour stated that this demand could not be granted, and, for what purpose I do not know, started a violent onslaught on the union, the officers of which were present. The minister denounced the union telling its officers that their work was nefarious and very dangerous and that the other working men belonging to the International Unions would refuse to sit at a conference if the members of the National Unions were invited to it. The Minister of Labour asked me my opinion. Perhaps I would not have said anything if he had not invited me to state my view. I then said that I could not agree with him, or the argument he was employing—that those arguments could be brought forward to persuade or induce a working man to join the union of which the minister is a member, or to which he is favourable, rather than another union; but the moment there are two sections of organized labour, the moment two unions exist, neither the Minister of Labour, the Department of Labour, nor the Government of Canada, has any right to set one against the other; both must be dealt with fairly and impartially. I went so far as to tell the Minister of Labour then and there that I did not think he was fairly representing the members of the international unions when he stated that they would refuse to sit at a conference with the members of the national union. I know too well the fairness of the working men of Canada as a rule to believe that the members of any international unions would be so intolerant, and I stated that if there was intolerance somewhere surely it was not on the part of those who wanted to co-operate with their brothers of the international unions, but on the part of those who refused that co-operation.

As I desire to be absolutely fair and to simply state the facts, I will read what appeared in the press afterwards. The following morning the Canadian Associated Press, which was represented at the delegation, sent to all the newspapers the following despatch, which I take from the Ottawa Citizen of March 24:

> That racial and religious strife are the possible outcome of the growth of the Quebec Catholic labour movement was the warning conveyed by Hon. G. D. Robertson, Minister of Labour, to a deputation representing these organizations which met him yesterday.
>
> The deputation came to submit its programme of legislation which it drafted at a convention held by the Catholic unions at Chicoutimi, Quebec, and the item which provoked the minister's warning was a request that the Catholic unions be given representation in the building trades conference to be held in Ottawa on May 3 next.
>
> "Last year I pleaded with your organization," declared the minister to Abbé Fortin, who headed the labour men, "to proceed very carefully along the lines you have been following, for if it once gets in the mind of the people that in your province for a man to get along in his work he must accept a certain religious guidance, it will not be conducive to the improvement of relations between your province and other parts of the Dominion.
>
> Must be of Certain Faith
>
> "You have charged discrimination by the department against your union, yet you make it necessary for a member of your organization to be of a certain faith. What would be the result if the Methodists, say in Ontario, should band together and ask the employers to employ only Methodists? I am sure that not only would the Catholics, but the Protestants as well, would rise against such a movement."
>
> Abbé Fortin charged the department with recognizing only the international trade unions, despite the fact that Catholic Federated unions

in Quebec numbered between 40,000 and 50,000 members. He urged that an equal consideration be given his organization, declaring that such is being done in practically every European country where Catholic, Socialistic and Protestant unions exist. He further contended that the labour section of the Peace Treaty made such provision.

Cannot Grant Request

Senator Robertson pointed out to the deputation that the Building Trades conference referred to had not been organized by the Government, but by members of the international unions and of the builders, consequently the minister could not dictate to either party that a third party should be admitted.

Furthermore, he explained, that the agreement of all nations subscribing to the Peace Treaty was that each country should recognize associations of employers and associations of labour which would give each class the greatest representation. In Canada, these organizations were respectively, the Canadian Manufacturers and the Dominion Trades and Labour Congress.

Ernest Lapointe, member for Quebec East, who introduced the deputation, protested against the decision of the minister in recognizing only the international unions.

Delegation's Requests

The requests of the deputation, in brief, were:

Federal aid to the shipbuilding industry.

Representation on all industrial commissions of inquiry.

That all official documents used in Quebec be printed in both languages.

Proportional representation in all elections, and that a commission be appointed to study this question and submit a report to the Government for its action.

Seizure of all undue war profits by the Governments.

Amendments to the Housing Act whereby money would be loaned at three per cent to individuals instead of the present rate of five per cent, and

The appointment of a public prosecutor to enforce the observance of all laws.

Reviews Requests

The minister briefly reviewed the requests stating that while he could not speak for the Government, he would give his personal views on some of the issues.

He did not see any likelihood of further subsidies to the shipbuilding industry. In this regard he declared that some 24 per cent of Britain's mercantile marine was now idle.

He then promised to submit the request for amendments to the Housing Act, although he observed that the money loaned at five per cent was borrowed by the Government at five and one-half per cent.

The deputation, which was introduced by Mr. Lapointe and Dr. Fontaine, M.P., Hull, consisted of Abbé Fortin, G. Hebert, president of the federation, A. Shields, A. Morin, Father Bonhomme and A. Myre.

The following day the press of Canada published an interview with Mr. Tom Moore, the president of the Trades and Labour Congress, endorsing the attitude of the Minister of Labour and asking that the National Labour Union should not be recognized by the Government. On the same day the Montreal Gazette published an editorial, to which the Minister of Labour later replied, and I intend to read his letter. This is the editorial:

SHOWING HIS HAND

The Minister of Labour, on Wednesday, received a deputation representing the National Catholic Labour movement in this province, whose members asked, among other things, that the organization be represented at the forthcoming conference of building trades representatives, to be held in Ottawa. The Catholic Federated Unions in Quebec, according to Abbé Fortin, a member of the deputation, has a membership of from forty to fifty thousand, and is therefore an important factor in the industrial life of this province. The Minister of Labour, the Hon. Gideon Robertson, appears to have adopted a very extraordinary attitude in dealing with this deputation. He seized the occasion to lecture the Union in regard to its religious complexion, saying that an impression that success in labour in Quebec was conditional upon holding a certain religious belief would not be conducive to improved relations between Quebec and other provinces. Then he proceeded to say that the coming conference was organized by the international unions and the builders, and that he could not dictate to either party for the purpose of admitting a third.

The Minister of Labour has, on a number of occasions, acted as if he were the Minister of Organized Labour; he now comes forward as the Minister of Organized Labour Internationally Affiliated. When provision was first made for the establishment of a Department of Labour in connection with the administration at Ottawa, such a situation as this was never contemplated; the idea and purpose was to create a department which would keep in touch with all classes of labour and would deal equally with all. Certainly it was never supposed that a Minister of Labour, in dealing with a labour body, would concern himself with the religious convictions of its members. The Catholic National Union in this province is none the less a labour organization because its membership is Catholic, nor is it the business of the Minister of Labour to dwell upon, or even consider, the religious belief of this labour body or of any other, Catholic or Protestant. The impression created, however, is that the minister's real objection to the Quebec unions is that they are national. Mr. Ernest Lapointe, who introduced the deputation, and Abbé Fortin, who headed it, seem to have been under no illusion in this respect. It was not the first time that these national unions had asked in vain for representation. The reasons for refusal vary, but the refusals do not. Moreover, the minister indicates clearly enough what is in his mind, and what his purpose is, when he emphasizes the fact that the building conference has been organized by builders and members of international unions. Is he not really concerned for the supremacy of the international organization? He says that all nations subscribing to the peace treaty have agreed to recognize associations giving each class (employers and labour) the greatest representation, and the labour organization in Canada, which conforms to this standard, is the Trades and Labour Congress. Here is internationalism again. There is nothing in the labour provisions of the peace treaty which authorizes more favourable treatment to one class of

labour than to another; the whole spirit of the treaty is to the contrary, and if Canada, as a subscriber, has agreed to deal only with the Trades and Labour Congress, it is the first intimation that we have had of it. The people of Canada have never sanctioned any such injustice and will not do so. As to the building trade conference, it is being held under government auspices, if it is not actually government financed, and if the Minister of Labour desired to secure representation for the Catholic unions, nobody will believe that his efforts would be unsuccessful.

In the Montreal Gazette of Thursday, March 31, appears a letter signed by G. D. Robertson, Minister of Labour. This letter is very long, but I think in all fairness I should read it in its entirety. I am sure that the House will bear with me while I do so. It is as follows:

National Catholic Unions

To the Editor of The Gazette:

Sir,—In your issue of March 24, 1921, and editorial appeared entitled "Showing His Hand" which charges the Minister of Labour with being the "Minister of Organized Labour Internationally Affiliated," which charge you base upon his statement to the National Catholic Union that he could not undertake to force the Federal Builders' Association and the Federal Building Trades Council who are holding a conference in Ottawa on May 3rd next, to recognize National Catholic Union delegates.

Your implied support to the impossible position taken by Mr. E. Lapointe (Quebec East) indicates utter ignorance of the facts, or else an endorsation of the National Catholic Union principles and policies. It is, therefore, proposed to relate some facts concerning International Trade Unions; the Trades and Labour Congress of Canada, and what it represents; the National Catholic Unions, and the policy and attitude of the Department of Labour toward each.

For forty years past craft organizations of workmen, with members in both the United States and Canada, have existed. They are known as International Trade Unions. Every person engaged in a particular trade or craft is eligible for membership, subject to certain requirements as to moral character, sobriety, etc. Catholic and Protestant alike enjoy equal rights and privileges. The constitutions provide that neither religious nor political affiliations shall affect in any way a workman's eligibility to membership. Many of the constitutions specifically forbid the discussion of religious or political questions within the union. Briefly stated, every workman has and should have equal rights and voice in the industrial field. Neither religious nor political affiliations should be a recommendation or a bar to obtaining employment.

To these principles the Minister of Labour heartily subscribes. Mr. Lapointe does not; does the Montreal Gazette?

The Trades and Labour Congress of Canada is and has for years, both by past and present Governements, been the recognized legislative mouthpiece of labour in Canada. It does not—as your paper has frequently asserted—represent Trades Unions only; neither does it speak for all the International Unions, a number of whom maintain their own legislative representatives. There are over 70,000 railway employees in Canada members of International Trade Unions who are not represented through the congress, including the organization of which the undersigned has for twenty-five years been a member. Therefore your oft-repeated inference, i.e., that the Minister of Labour was guided by the wishes of the Trade Congress, is obviously not a fact nor a near approach thereto.

The Trades Congress does, however, speak for many labour bodies that are not International in character, but purely local and purely Canadian, as the following facts will verify. At the Hamilton convention of the Congress, held in September, 1920, the 929 delegates present represented about 280,000 workers—232 came from the province of Quebec—five of these delegates represented five International Unions—nine represented four trade councils—218 represented 101 local unions in that province. These delegates represented 88,949 organized workers in that province, a large portion of which are Roman Catholics. The senior vice-president of the Congress is a Roman Catholic, resident in Montreal. Like the International Unions the Congress stands for equality among all workers, so far as their rights and privileges within their respective organizations are concerned, and also in their opportunities for employment regardless of religious or political affiliation of the individual. Both the International Unions and the Trades Congress are in accord with the principles laid down in the pastoral letter circulated in September, 1918 by the archbishops and bishops of the United States, signed by the late respected and lamented Cardinal Gibbons of Baltimore, Md. Except in Quebec, throughout all North America, Catholics and Protestants alike, other citizens as well as workmen, endorse the principles giving equal right to all, and everywhere—except in Quebec—millions of workmen, representing every shade of religious opinion, are able to work together in harmony.

To the universal application of these principles the present Minister of Labor subscribes. Mr. Lapointe does not—does the Montreal Gazette?

The National Catholic Union movement began at the city of Three Rivers in 1911, extending to Chicoutimi in 1912 and 1913. The published report on the subject, dated 1913, reads in part as follows:

"The object of the organization is the protection and development of the religious, social and economic interests of its members. The association is essentially Catholic and professes its belief in and entire submission to the instruction and direction of that Church. The qualifications for membership require a candidate to observe the Catholic faith, to be of not less than 16 years of age, and not connected with an International Union. There are both active and honorary members. The affairs are administered by an executive committee chosen by the council of direction. There is to be a general chaplain named by the Ordinary of the diocese. Each local branch also has a chaplain named by the Ordinary of the district. The constitution provides for small death and permanent incapacity benefits provided the member's marriage was legally contracted under the rites of the Catholic Church."

There were at that time nine branches, with a membership of 1,567. At that date there were in the province of Quebec 37,928 organized workmen adhering to the principle of absolute equality referred to in a preceding paragraph.

By 1919 troubles had occurred in certain localities, because of discrimination against

Protestants and Catholic workmen members of other trade unions. An attempt was made to minimize this difficulty by passing the following resolution, at at Three Rivers convention of September, 1919:

"(Resolution 19) Whereas certain rumors have circulated that the National Catholic Unions do not protect Protestant workmen in labor matters, this convention allows the adoption of a resolution protesting against such a statement and energetically states that it has protected and is still protecting Protestant workmen in all labor matters by issuing to them an adjunct membership card which guarantees to them all the protection they need."

Investigation shows that this adjunct membership card permitted the holder to pay dues but debarred him from any voting power in the Union.

Perusal of the constitutions reveals some interesting facts. That of the Catholic Union of the Quebec Printing and Book Binding Workers may be of interest to the Montreal Gazette. It reads in part as follows:—

"Chapter 1, Article 1:—

"There is founded in the city of Quebec between the Catholic workers following the printing and book binding trades, an organization which shall be designated as follows: The Catholic Union of the Quebec Printing and Book Binding Workers.

"Art. 2. The Union has for its immediate object the study, protection and development of the professional interests of its members; but it subordinates this proximate object to the exigencies of the superior interests of souls, society and religion.

"Art. 3. Because it is a Catholic labour organization, the Catholic Union of the Quebec Printing and Book Binding Workers;

"(a) Shall affiliate with the Action Sociale Catholique;

"It shall secure from it, after filling the usual conditions and upon presentation of its statutes and by-laws, a special diploma which shall be the warranty of the Catholicism of the Union;

"Said diploma may be cancelled or revoked in case the Union should cease to fulfil the conditions required for its affiliation;

"(b) It shall admit among its members Catholic workers only;

"(c) It shall have a Chaplain;

"(d) It shall remember,

"1.—That all human acts, those of groups as well as those of individuals, are subjected to the tribunal of conscience;

"2.—That justice and Christian charity are the two supreme mannitory rules or relations between employers and workmen;

(e). Recognizing that the Church alone has the right and is qualified to say where, in the so-called labour questions, is the true and the false, the just and the unjust, the good and the bad, what is permissible and what is not, the C.U. of P. and B.W. will comply entirely and conscientiously, in the pursuit of its object, with the teaching and instructions of the religious authority.

"(f). In order to still shows its character as a Catholic Union the C.U. of P. and B.W.

"(a) Puts itself under the protection of St. Joseph.

"(b) It shall cause to be celebrated every year, on the Feast Day of its Holy Patron Saint, a solemn mass with a sermon, all members endeavouring to attend and receive Holy Communion.

"(c) When a member dies the Union shall cause to be celebrated in the Church where the funeral takes place a high mass for the repose of the Brother's soul and shall be represented at said mass by at least two of its members.

"Chapter II.—Membership, admission and exclusion.

"Art. 4. The Catholic Union of Printing and Book Binding Workers of Quebec is composed of an unlimited number of members;

"Art. 5. To become a member of the C.U. of P. and B.W. one must:

"1.—Be an active Catholic.

"2.—Be at least 18 years old; follow (as linotype machine operator, case worker, pressman, feeder, binder, finisher and ruler) the printing or book binding trade since at least five years, or that of stereotyper since at least three years and hold a certificate of competency (as journeyman) delivered by the Union itself.

"All those who, being 16 years old have followed the printing or book binding trade for at least two years, may also be members of the Union, but as apprentices and without having any right to vote at meetings, if they otherwise fulfil the other conditions of admission.

"3.—Belong to no secret society or any organization the principles, tendencies and spirit of which do not agree with those of the union.

"Chapter III.—Executive Committee, Council, General Assembly.

"Art. 8. The Union is directed and administered by an Executive Committee, a Council, and a General Assembly of members.

"Art. 9. The executive committee is composed of the President, Vice-President—or in his absence the Assistant Secretary and the Treasurer of the Union, elected in February of each year and re-eligible at the expiration of their term of office, by the General Assembly of members of the Union, and the Chaplain of the Union, appointed by His Grace the Archbishop of Quebec.

"11. The Executive Committee is directed to administer the property of the Union, to dispatch daily and routine business, and to carry out the decision of the General Assembly, to the direction of which it remains subject and to which it gives an account of its operations and conduct. It is its duty to call regular meetings, or, if need be, special meetings of the Council and General Assembly and to settle itself all matters relating to such calls.

"III.—The Executive Committee meets once a week at the place, date and hour fixed by itself. As to special meetings of the General Assembly the President of the Union shall call them if four members of the Union request him in writing to do so.

"Art. 10. The Council is composed of the members of the Executive Committee and three Councillors elected in February of each year, and re-eligible at the expiration of their term of office by the General Assembly of members.

"The Council has all the powers necessary for the direction of the management of the affairs of the Union in particular:

"It admits, refuses, or excludes members, after consulting the General Assembly.

"It settles all matters in connection with the enforcement of the by-laws of the Union and the putting into practice of the principles which the Union recognizes as governing its action.

"Art 12. The Chaplain is appointed by His Grace the Archbishop of Quebec. He is a member of the Executive Committee, Council, and General Assembly. He takes part in all debates but does not vote. He may, however, require that any resolution be submitted to the Archbishop of Quebec and approved by him before taking effect, and any resolution adopted dur-

ing his absence must be communicated to him before being carried out."

The apprenticeship by-laws provide that:

"1. The selection of apprentices belongs to the employer, and no one shall be allowed, without his consent, to work in printing and book binding shops;

"2. All apprentices shall be at least 14 years of age and must have shown a sufficient knowledge of the French language to the satisfaction of both the employer and the union."

The foregoing clearly shows that the purpose is Church control of an organization of industrial workers. Note that no resolution can pass or be adopted without the chaplain's consent, who will in turn—if he is in doubt—submit same to the bishop, whose decision is final, regardless of the wishes of the membership. Note too that apprenticeship is required, and that the applicant must have the endorsation of the union as to his ability to speak French. No Protestant, and no Catholic connected with any other organization of workmen is eligible for membership. Why? Obviously because they cannot be satisfactorily controlled by the Church authorities.

May I relate just two instances of how the application of the National Catholic Union principles work out. During 1919 the Department of Labour received a complaint that it was difficult, if not impossible, for any but National Catholic Union members to get employment in the Davies shipyards at Lauzon. It was also observed that the dry dock operated by that company was built with public money and protested vigorously against Protestant or Catholics, not members of the National Catholic Union, being debarred from employment. On February 23rd, 1920, a French-Canadian Catholic filed complaint that two painters, members of the International Painters' Union, working on the Drill Hall at Quebec City, were dismissed by the contractors because they would not join the National Catholic Union. The complaint stated this was the second instance of discrimination against them. Briefly stated, the conflict arises because of the determination of Church authorities to autocratically control industry and industrial workers, discriminating against those who do not bow to their dictation.

To such a policy the present Minister of Labour will never subscribe; Mr. Lapointe does; does The Montreal Gazette?

Finally, your paper supports Mr. Lapointe in his endorsation of the National Catholic Union request for representation at the conference of the National Industrial Council of building employers and workmen. I wonder why?

The Dominion Association of Building Contractors and the trade unions representing the building trades in Canada, did, in 1919, lay the foundation for active co-operation between employer and employee in that important industry. They have established local industrial councils in several large cities with a central or appeal court to which local disputes unadjusted may be referred. On the Central Council each interest has equal representation, but no chairman. Both interests asked the Department of Labour for its co-operation in providing an official of the department to act as convenor of and preside at the central council meetings, but without any voting power, his advice on questions under consideration being solicited by both. The development of the Co-operative Industrial Council idea is growing and the object of the conference on May 3rd is to encourage it among those who have found it possible to work together in harmony. The delegates are being invited upon the nomination of the employers' and workmen's respective organizations. The National Catholic Union delegates would be gladly invited if the consent of the parties participating were obtained, but instead of approaching them the National Catholic Union make a demand on the Labour Department to force representation for them, which request was declined. Why did the National Catholic Union make this request instead of seeking to co-operate with the two parties interested? One reason is because in January 1919, it issued a statement from Quebec, which reads in part as follows:

"The National Central Trades Council of the District of Quebec assumes it its duty, under the present circumstances, to make the following statements:

"1. This Council represents in Quebec the national and Catholic labour movement. It voluntarily assumes responsibility for its own decisions and measures, but it has nothing to do with other labour groups whose principles, claims and programmes are not entirely its own.

"The National Central Trades Council of the District of Quebec is, moreover, absolutely a stranger to all the doings of the 'Labour party' of the Province of Quebec, and has no relation whatever with either the 'Trades and Labour Congress of Canada' or the Trades and Labour Council of Montreal.

"The National Central Trades Council of the District of Quebec is autonomous, of a national spirit, distinctly Catholic."

Having voluntarily cut themselves off from intercourse with all other labour bodies, knowing the impossibility of securing any recognition or co-operation from them, the National Catholic Union now demands that the Department of Labour force their unwelcome presence upon this conference, the only possible effect of which would be to destroy its usefulness. They knew the department could not lend itself to such a proposal, therefore a good opportunity presented itself for Mr. Lapointe to endorse a project calculated to provoke discord and, at the same time, blame the Government for it, and you lent the support of your paper to the trick.

I hope you will give this letter the same publicity as your editorial received.

G. D. ROBERTSON,
Minister of Labour.

Ottawa, March 27, 1921.

Mr. EDWARDS: Hear, hear.

Mr. LAPOINTE: I am glad to see that the Minister of Labour has at least the support of the hon. member for Frontenac (Mr. Edwards).

Mr. EDWARDS: He has.

Mr. LAPOINTE: The Montreal Gazette of the same day published the following editorial:

There appears elsewhere in this issue a letter from the Minister of Labour. On March 24th, The Gazette criticised the action of the minister in dealing with the request of the National Catholic Union for representation at

the approaching conference which is to be held at Ottawa between employers and employees in the building trades, and the letter purports to be an answer to that criticism. The minister asks that full publicity be given to it and, without pretending to understand his desire in that respect, we are acceding to his request. We are even prepared to go farther and would direct the attention of our readers to the letter, to its substance, its spirit, and its purpose; and we ask them to take seriously into their consideration the immeasurably harmful effects which must inevitably follow if the Minister of Labour is permitted by his colleagues to persist in the course which he has adopted. The point of our criticism was, and is this, that the National Catholic Unions represent an important industrial element in this province, that they went to Ottawa, as a labour organization seeking admission to a labour conference, that the Minister of Labour declined to interest himself in their request, and that, in refusing, he attacked the National Catholic Union on the ground of its religious complexion. If any ground for such criticism were lacking, the letter now published supplies it. We have now, over the signature of the Minister of Labour, "the policy and attitude of the Department of Labour" toward the National Catholic Unions of this province. The "policy and attitude of the Department of Labour" are the policy and attitude of the Prime Minister and the Government, unless and until repudiated by the Government.

Senator Robertson states that the Trades and Labour Congress has for years been the "recognized legislative mouthpiece of labour in Canada." by which, presumably, he means of organized labour, the class alone to which his attention appears to be given. That this Congress does not represent international unions only, is not in dispute and, with all respect to the minister, has not been disputed. Neither is it of any importance to know that some non-affiliated unions send delegates to the Congress. The tail does not wag the dog, and certainly so small a tail as that to which the minister alludes, could not be expected to resist the international leanings of the Trades Congress. Neither is it of any consequence, though the minister appears to think otherwise, that some international organizations, such as that of which he has been for twenty-five years a member, are not represented through the Congress, and the most painstaking examination of this fact fails to clarify the argument of the minister that "therefore" he is not guided by the Trades and Labour Congress, previously identified by him as "the recognized legislative mouthpiece of labour in Canada."

"Briefly stated," says the Minister of Labour, "every workman has and should have equal rights and voice in the industrial field." That has been our contention. "Neither religious nor political affiliations should be a recommendation or a bar to obtaining employment." That, again, is a sound principle; but why does not the Minister of Labour act upon it? He claims it to be the rule of international organizations and of the Trades Congress of Canada, but as to the latter, there is the explanatory addition "so far as their rights and privileges within their respective organizations are concerned, and also in their opportunities for employment, regardless of religious or political affiliation of the individual." If organized labour, as understood and represented by the Minister of Labour, accepts the principle of equal rights, as he says it does, irrespective of religious differences, why the exclusion of the National Catholic Unions from the Builders' Conference and why the attack upon these unions because of their Catholicism? Perhaps the answer to that question will appear.

The minister in his letter, is at pains to prove what does not require proof, namely, that the National Catholic Unions are Catholic. Have they not the right to be, and is the Dominion Government, through the Minister of Labour, to say that they have no such right? Are their members any the less industrious and efficient workmen, and is not industry and efficiency in labour the title to those equal rights of which the minister speaks? The minister charges these unions with having, in certain instances, discriminated against non-Catholic workmen, and in this he takes issue with the statements of the unions concerned. Discrimination upon grounds other than those of industry and efficiency is bad; but the evidence which the minister cites against the National Catholic Unions, in that respect, consists more of complaints than of conclusions and is not satisfying. On the other hand, the industrial record of Quebec where these unions are strongest, has been the envy and admiration of other parts of Canada where the actions and objects of organized labour enjoy the approval of the Minister of Labour.

All this, however, tells but a part of the story. The minister goes very far upon his dangerous road, and complains that the Catholic Unions are under clerical control. He offers a set of union rules as showing "that the purpose is church control of an organization of industrial workers" and he proceeds: "Briefly stated, the conflict arises because of the determination of Church authorities to autocratically control industry and industrial workers, discriminating against those who do not bow to their dictation. To such a policy the Minister of Labour will never subscribe." Here the Minister of Labour gets out into the open. He is opposed to the National Catholic Unions because, being Catholic, they acknowledge clerical authority in union matters because, as he says, they have cut themselves off from other organizations, because, as they say, they are "autonomous, of a national spirit, distinctly Catholic."

The desirability of clerical control in labour matters may, as a principle, be debatable; but, as between clerical control in Quebec, and the control of foreign office-holders or of their Canadian representatives, the choice is not difficult to make. The proof of the pudding is in the eating and the industrial record of Quebec, despite this "autocratic control of industry" by the church, or because of it, compares very favorably with that of other provinces. So good a judge of conditions as Sir Frederick Williams-Taylor, no later than Tuesday, described Quebec as the "home of the most peaceful, contented and productive population in the Dominion."

The minister will not pretend that it was not in his power to have granted the request of the National Catholic Unions regarding representation at the Builders' Conference. He taiks loosely of a "demand" that the department "force their unwelcome presence upon this conference" and, finally, goes the length of suggesting that the whole thing was a political plant by opponents of the Government. This fantastic proposition calls for no comment. If it were put forward seriously, why was not the "trick" treated as such at the time,

and what was the occasion for the attack upon the catholicity of the National Catholic Unions? That attack was made and has been repeated by the Minister of Labour as minister, and the Government should either repudiate it or take the responsibility for it.

When this letter and that article appeared in the Gazette, I referred to the matter in the House, and as I wish to quote exactly the facts of the matter, I quote here what I then said:

Mr. LAPOINTE: Before you proceed with this item, Sir, the Prime Minister (Mr. Meighen) said last night that he intended to proceed with the Estimates of the Labour Department to-day. The Estimates of that department have not been taken up previously, and I will object to their being proceeded with to-day. Before we proceed with the Estimates of the Labour Department, I have a few remarks to make about the hon. gentleman who presides over that department and about certain matters concerning it.

Then there was a meeting of the trades council in Ottawa, at which Mr. Moore, the president of the Trades and Labour Congress, and Mr. P. M. Draper, of that association, delivered speeches. The report of this meeting appeared in the Ottawa Citizen of April 2, 1921. I shall quote only a few words of what Mr. Moore said:

Attempted Supercession

"As long as the leaders of that movement confined their operations to their own province, we were not interested," said Tom Moore, "but we find that the National Catholic Union seeks to supersede the International Trades Union at the Dominion Industrial Conference. It attempted to do this a year ago, and is again renewing the attempt. To the everlasting credit of the Hon. Senator Gideon Robertson, Minister of Labour, he has held that religion shall not be mixed up with the labour movement. Because of this Mr. Lapointe, the member for Kamouraska, has announced his intention of taking the Minister of Labour to task on the floor of Parliament, and has said that he will challenge the Estimates of the Labour Department, in order to hold up the appropriation for the industrial conference, and force the Government to recede from the stand it has taken on this question."

Mr. P. M. Draper spoke as follows:

"Politicians have been guilty in the past of dividing our people on religious grounds in order to attain the seats of the mighty, but we don't want any of this kind of thing in our movement. We must send good men speaking both languages through Quebec to show them the issue underlying this dangerous movement, and I think when they understand they will tell their clergy, "You had better confine your attentions to our spiritual affairs, and leave us to look after our own business.' "

At that meeting a resolution was passed, a copy of which was sent to the members of the districts surrounding the city of Ottawa. I shall read one of its clauses:

[Mr. Lapointe.]

Whereas this Trades Council, appreciating the danger to the International Trade Union movement and the organized workers of this country, should the Minister of Labour be overruled in his correct attitude to the non-recognition of any factional or religious movement in coming Building Trades Conference or any other Government committee or commission—

Therefore this Council declares its full commendation of the position taken by the Minister of Labour, etc.

In justice to the National Labour Unions, I desire to read a very short interview given by one of its officers, which appeared in all the Canadian newspapers yesterday. It was dispatched by the Canadian Associated Press and reads in part:

Quebec, April 3.—The National Catholic Unions have known for a long time the sentiments of the Minister of Labour towards them, but they wished to ascertain the reasons for his attitude, said Abbe M. Fortin, general almoner of the unions, in an interview to-day. "The minister made known the reasons for his attitude at the interview we recently had with him in Ottawa and in his letter published in the press," added the abbe.

"The Minister of Labour continues to mix into matters that do not concern him," he continued. "Instead of giving a serious answer to the demands made by us at Ottawa he persists in entering into a discussion of a question, which as minister of the crown he should leave alone.

"We did not go to Ottawa to ask the minister's approbation for our unions and we do not see the necessity of knowing whether or not the principles of the National Catholic Unions please him or not. As Minister of Labour he has only to enquire whether or not our unions menace the public interest. He has, however, carefully avoided putting such a question as, during the past five years, the National Catholic Unions have been the ones which have contributed most to the maintenance of public order."

Refering to Senator Robertson's contention in his letter to the press that the church through the priests attached to the unions controlled the deliberations and policies of the unions Abbe Fortin said that the function of the almoners was to prevent the workers in the course of their deliberations, from breaking the doctrines of the church. "The Catholic workers like the others," he added, "deliberate freely and make whatever decisions seem good to them. The function of the almoners is that of councillors and not controllers."

My comments, Mr. Speaker, shall be few. I am not a member either of the National or of the International Labour Union. I am a friend of labour, especially of organized labour, and have endeavoured in my public career to acquaint myself with the various labour problems and the claims of labour, and the remarks I intend to make shall be imbued with a spirit of goodwill for the cause and the interests of labour. The argument I desire to offer I shall try to base entirely upon principles of justice and fairness, upon principles which must appeal to all men irrespective of their

creeds, their opinions, and their personal differences, and even to those belonging to either of the two labour bodies which are the cause of the present difficulty. We have in Canada a Department of Labour that was created by legislation of this Parliament about fifteen years ago. (My hon. friend, the leader of the Opposition (Mr. Mackenzie King) informs me that it is twenty years ago.) The duties and the work of the Department of Labour are prescribed by various statutes of this country. The department must work in such a manner as will ensure peace in the field of industrial activity. In various statutes relating to the department is a reference to unions and trade unions, and I may refer especially to the Industrial Disputes Act, which provides that when either the employer or a labour or trades union appeals to the minister regarding labour difficulties, a board of arbitration shall be appointed to settle the question at issue. The Minister of Labour is entrusted with the high and important duty of assisting in the maintenance of industrial peace in this country, and he must see that there is harmony as between employers and employees as well as among employees themselves. The very nature of his functions obliges him to be fair and impartial in his dealings with all sections of labour. If,—owing to lack of vision, narrowness of mind, bias, or otherwise,—he cannot be fair and impartial, his usefulness is gone and he is only a cause of trouble and discontent. When reference is made, in the statutes that I have just quoted, to "Labour Union" it is never said that it must be an International Union. It is not specified what sort of a union it has to be in order to get recognition from the Government or the Department of Labour. In none of these statutes can you see any proviso that such union has to be affiliated with the Trades and Labour Congress, or whether it has to recognize the jurisdiction of the American Federation of Labour. I do not wish to express any preference as regards the International Union to which the Minister of Labour belongs, or the National Unions which he has fulminated against. Both organizations have a valuable and most important work to perform, both have a large field of activity, both have the right to existence and recognition; and I shall not fall into the mistake which has been committed by the Minister of Labour of assailing or abusing either of these two labour bodies. I shall willingly go as far as to admit that personally the Minister of Labour is quite entitled to prefer the International Union to the other; but I say that in his public capacity, acting as the head of the Department of Labour, he has no right to discriminate against either union and to refuse to give it, in all his dealings with labour, proper and effective recognition, proportionate to its membership. Freedom of association is not a privilege which any Minister of Labour can destroy. Trade unionism is a natural and normal development in the field of industry. The working man when left alone, struggling single handed and individually, was in a painful state of inferiority in dealings with the industrial owner. He was frequently forced, on account of his weakness, to accept unfair conditions and unjust terms. Trades unionism has raised the standard of labour. Its aims are to realize for the working man a higher scale. It attempts to improve not only the material but also the moral, social and spiritual conditions of the members who compose it. It works not merely for the sake of mere life, it exists for the sake of good life. It is, indeed, a sort of mutual insurance body working for the betterment of the social and moral as well as the material conditions of the working man.

Now, Sir, in the realization of that ideal there are people who believe that religion has an important part to play. Others think that religion should be wholly ignored by, and excluded from, all that concerns labour associations. Some people believe that religion is a force in determining sociological work; that it is religious spirit which, more than anything else, teaches a man that his service must not only be for himself but for humanity—that he must view problems and difficulties in more than material aspects. They believe that religion and sociology are co-forces working in harmony both determining the destiny of man, and surely it is not a crime to believe in such association. Others believe that all labour unions should be absolutely neutral and purely business associations, and that they will achieve their end more successfully by remaining so; and they have the right to believe so, their opinion is entitled to respect. But, Sir, neither the advocates of the first nor those of the second system have the right to force their view upon the others, nor to impose their preference upon those who honestly differ from them in this most important problem. Even the Department of Labour, under its present head, has preached a doctrine different from that expounded now by the minister.

I hold in my hand a pamphlet issued by the Department of Labour entitled "Information Respecting the Russian Soviet System and its Propaganda in North America" in which it is said, on page 18:

> The National Catholic Unions are located in the Province of Quebec and are very anti-socialist.

It is not that phrase I want to refer to, but another one on the same page which reads as follows:

> Trade Unions which retain within their ranks men who use their membership to "bore from within," and destroy instead of support, are assuming a serious responsibility and risk. There is unquestionably need of an opportunity for work by the Christian Churches of every denomination.

So the Minister of Labour himself was inviting the co-operation of the Church. I do not desire to say a word as to the merits or demrits of the existing unions. I merely claim that so long as they exist side by side, so long as they are lawful organizations working for industrial peace in the land, they are both entitled to recognition from the Government, and the Minister of Labour has no right to side officially with one against the other, and to attack and grossly misrepresent either, as he has done in the case which I am now discussing. Our constitution guarantees equally to each citizen the protection of the law. Sir, the trade unions have had to fight for a great many years, and in some instances are still fighting, for existence and recognition. Why should the old ones try to kill the new ones? They are both tending towards the same goal, but believe in different agencies and methods of action.

The Canadian doctrine is, equality of rights under the law. When a man appeals for his rights he appeals to the principle of right, and what he appeals to for himself he must recognize as equally good in regard to others. Hence he is under a moral obligation to recognize the rights of others. The man who asks for "my" rights does not ask for them because they are his rights exclusively. When a man asks for his rights and gets them, and then because he is stronger than another man refuses to him the rights which he has claimed for himself, it is not right but might that is triumphant.

On February 21 and 22, 1921, a conference of employers and employees was held in Ottawa, and a report of that conference has been published by the Department of Labour under the title: Report of the Conference on Industrial Relations. In that report I find this passage in a speech delivered by the Minister of Labour, which I would commend to him if he were a member of this House. It will be found on page 58 of that report:

> I do not think any employer in this country questions a man's right to be a member of any fraternal soceity or church, and I think there are very few who even ask an employee whether he is a member of a trades union or not; but I think there is a tendency on the part of some employers to refrain from dealing with their workmen through their unions.

And he pleads with the employer for the recognition of those unions. How can the Minister of Labour reconcile that appeal with his own attitude with regard to the National Labour Union? I believe in self-determination in labour organization as in any other fields of activity. Workingmen have a right to honestly differ as to the character, the programme, and the activities of the associations which they desire to form or join.

I have referred to the religious element of the question, but there are other points of difference. I have here the platform of the Trades and Labour Congress as published in the Ninth Annual Report of the labour organizations for the calendar year 1919. In that platform there are many planks which, of course, every one is entitled to support. I wish to refer especially to a few of them. The first is free compulsory education; the second is the legal working days of six hours, and six days to a week; the third is government inspection of all industries; and so on. The eighth is abolition of the Dominion Senate. Well, it is a piece of humour that the Minister of Labour should be a member of the Senate when one of the planks of the Trades and Labour Congress is the abolition of the Senate. Article 15 of the platform calls for direct legislation through the initiative and referendum. And so on. But there is more than that. I see in the same report of the Department of Labour that prior to 1902 there were national unions in the province of Quebec which were affiliated with the Trades and Labour Congress, but they were expelled from the congress. Here is what the report says on page 42:

> As has been reported in previous departmental annual reviews of labour organizations in Canada, the majority of the independent labour units in the Dominion were to be found in the province of Quebec, and principally in the city of the same name. Some of the older national unions of Quebec were at one time affiliated with the Trades and Labour Congress of Canada, but by an amendment to the constitution in 1902, the congress denied recognition to national unions where international organizations of the same craft existed. This decision also deprived the

national unions from representation on trades councils chartered by the congress.

I see on page 131 that this article still exists in the constitution of the congress. Part of section 2 reads as follows:

Further, no national union or local unions comprising said national unions shall be entitled to membership in this congress when there is in existence an international union of their craft, nor shall any local union attached to a national body separated from their international organization, or any organization which has been expelled or rejected by the American Federation of Labour, be entitled to delegates in any central body chartered by this congress.

So, Mr. Speaker, apart altogether from the religious point of view, and purely from the national standpoint, all working men who do not believe in some of the planks of the Trades and Labour Congress, or indeed a subordination of their unions to the American Federation of Labour—and surely they are entitled to their opinion in that respect—have no alternative but to join an independent union, and the Minister of Labour and the Government have no right to interfere with the exercise of their discretion in the matter. On the other hand, those workingmen who believe that the larger organization is safer and more powerful for the protection of their rights and interests are entitled to their opinion also, and no Government or department of labour should interfere with them.

Now, Sir, the Minister of Labour has set forth the argument that he was governed by a clause of the labour agreement and the Peace Treaty concerning the International Labour Conference, to which each party to the League of Nations would send four representatives, and that two of those representatives would be appointed by each government, the two other representatives being appointed one to represent labour and the other to represent employers. He states there is a disposition that provides that the choice of the representatives of labour and of employers will be made by the organizations, when such exist in the country, which are most representative of the workingmen or of the employers. Well, that is no argument at all. At the International Labour Conference the representation of labour and of the employers was limited to one delegate each. I agree that it was the fairest method of choosing delegates at that conference to let the most powerful labour organization, or the one whose members were more numerous, choose the delegate for Labour, and to let the most representative of employers' organizations choose the representative of the employers. But is that a reason to deny recognition to the other labour unions at conferences where labour is represented by ten, twenty, or fifty delegates? Is that a reason to give to one labour union full control of the representation of labour at all conferences? I have here the Labour Gazette of November, 1920, a publication issued by the Labour Department, in which there is an article with regard to the Industrial Council in Belgium, exactly the same kind of body as that which is going to sit in Ottawa in the month of May next. On page 1508 of this issue of the Labour Gazette, I find the following with reference to the Council of Mines, a most important industrial council of Belgium:

The workers' representatives are appointed by the two industrial unions in proportion to their membership, the socialist union having eight and the Christian Roman Catholic union having two.

It is not only in Belgium that such unions are recognized. They are recognized in Ireland; they are recognized in Italy. No department of labour in any other country thinks of interfering with or denying existence or recognition to a particular branch of trade unionism. What is the purpose of a joint industrial council? I have here another report of the Department of Labour on the Industrial Councils, on page 31 of which I find what I consider to be the best definition of the duties of a joint industrial council. It is as follows:

First, to secure the largest possible measure of joint action between employers and work people for the development of the industry as a part of national life and for the improvement of the conditions of all engaged in that industry.

To make a joint industrial council successful it must represent as far as possible all the parties interested in that particular trade; there must be a fair representation of all the interests concerned if their decrees are to command willing and general assent. Each section has its own interests, slightly or greatly diverging from the interests of the other section. If consultation, joint conferences—indeed, self-government in industry—are to grow, it will be necessary that all separate interests have their fair share of representation, and it should be the business of Parliament to see that they get it.

Now, I think every member of the House will agree that any man of impartial mind presiding over the Department of Labour, any man qualified to fill that important office, instead of trying to crush and abuse any of the labour bodies of Canada, should

try to use some tact and diplomacy with the view of getting them together to cause them to co-operate with each other instead of being divided against each other. And when, Mr. Speaker, the officers of one of the unions which are excluded from government conferences or commissions go to the Minister of Labour and say: We are ready to co-operate with you and with the other labour bodies in Canada; we want to attend the conference; if our numbers entitle us to only one or two or three delegates, give us one or two or three that is all, we want to work with our brethern in the other labour associations—when they say that, the Minister of Labour should not tell them: The others refuse to go with you; the others will refuse to sit with you at any conference. But the minister did say that, and he approved of that attitude. I repeat that it should be the duty of the Minister of Labour to get these unions together, not to divide them, because it is only through co-operation at these conferences that all may get together and work for industrial peace and harmony in this country.

With regard to the statement of Mr. Moore that I said in the House that I wanted to prevent the adoption of the Estimates, of the Department of Labour, the Estimates to cover the expenses of the coming conference, in saying that, he deceived his hearers at that time, as the House well knows. I never said anything of the kind. It is not my purpose to try to prevent the holding of that conference. I believe in joint industrial councils in Canada, and I want this conference to proceed. I shall vote gladly for the appropriation of the amounts necessary to the holding of that conference. All I ask is that it be more representative. I admit that it is late to change what has been done, but I wish to lay down a principle to this House: what I ask is representation of all labour, especially of all organized labour, all labour belonging to any union, at all labour conferences held in this country.

I have endeavoured, Sir, to put the situation clearly before the House. Is there anything in it which justifies the strong words employed by the Minister of Labour and the denunciation which he made, speaking for the Government? for he took the trouble to say that he was speaking for the Government. Was there any political trick on my part on agreeing to introduce to the minister the officers of the National Union, not even knowing what resolutions they were going to submit to him? Did the Government support the Minister of Labour in this attitude? They are, of course, responsible for his words and actions. Moreover, the Minister of Labour stands high in the councils of the Government. I have in my hand the Labour Gazette of October 20, in which is reported a speech delivered by the Prime Minister (Mr. Meighen) before the Trades and Labour Congress at Windsor. The Prime Minister is reported at page 1333, to have said speaking of the Government:

> It has taken from the ranks of organized labour a vice-president of one of its largest organizations and has given him Cabinet rank. Never has a Labour Minister in Canada been accorded a more generous confidence from his colleagues and a freer hand in the administration of labour problems than has Senator Gideon Robertson. There is no department that requires ability of a higher type. A practical labour man, for the first time in our history, has been in charge, and after two years' trial I believe the almost universal feeling of Canada is that he has discharged his task with admirable fairness and with extraordinary capacity. He has done honour to the ranks from which he came and has compelled the confidence of men and women of every class.
>
> Senator Robertson's policy has been to work in co-operation with responsible labour organizations and with organizations of employers as well.

Surely my right hon. friend did not know at that time the attitude of the Minister of Labour with regard to the National Labour Union which I should consider, and I think he should consider, to be a responsible labour organization.

The two other members of the triumvirate, Robertson, Moore and Draper, in making the statements they made, utterly misrepresented the facts. When Mr. Moore stated, in the speech which I have mentioned, that the National Union came to Ottawa and asked that it supersede the International Union at the conference and before the Government, he stated what was absolutely untrue. When the National Union asked for one member or two members at that conference out of a membership of thirty, was that a demand for superseding the International Union? Let me tell Mr. Moore that it is only a question of justice that I am defending now, and when National Unions want to supersede International Union, as he says, I shall be behind Mr. Moore, or perhaps a little ahead of him, to defend the rights of the International Union. It is no wonder, when such statements and speeches are made, that resolutions may be passed at those meetings; but those who voted for those resolutions are not acquainted with the facts; they are being deceived, as the hearers

of Mr. Moore were deceived when they passed that resolution.

The attitude of Mr. Moore and Mr. Draper may be quite comprehensible. They are not few in Canada, especially in the ranks of labour, of international labour at that, who believe that Messrs. Robertson, Moore and Draper are ruling labour in an autocratic manner and desire to perpetuate by all means their domination and arbitrary methods. Either one or the other is a member of some commission or committee or board, and they do not relish the idea that some one else from some other organization should be recognized and should have a share of influence. This condition is not to the personal disadvantage of these gentlemen. They are travelling extensively at the expense of the country. Volume 2 of the Auditor General's Report shows that Mr. Moore, during the last fiscal year, has been a recipient of public money on a large scale. At page M-15 of that report, I see with regard to the Industrial Relations Commission, the following item:

> Tom Moore, Ottawa, commissioner; services, 69 days at $20; travelling expenses, $700, total, $2,080.

At page M-17, I see the following item:

> International Labour Conference, Paris and Washington, Tom Moore, president, Trades and Labour Congress of Canada: subsistence allowance, 84 days at $20; travelling expenses and disbursements, $594.20; less allowance from International Labour Office for attendance at London meeting, $818.35; total, $1,455.85.

A little later on I see, with regard to the Washington conference, apart from a substantial amount received by my friend Mr. Draper:

> Tom Moore, $614.43.

Thus members of the House will see that Mr. Moore, apart from his salary as president of the Trades and Labour Congress, is receiving a fine share of the public money of this country, and it is not surprising that he wants to keep as much as possible for himself the hen that lays the golden eggs.

As regards Mr. Draper, everybody knows that, besides being an employee of this Government with a good salary—and I am told that he got a promotion after the Windsor meeting of the Trades and Labour Congress of last fall—Mr. Draper travels extensively throughout the world as representative of labour appointed by the department, and he has been receiving a fair share of public money. In that connection, I am not sure whether it is quite proper that an employee of the Government should act in that dual capacity. I am not alone in suggesting that. I read in a very important British Review, the New Statesmen of February 5, 1921, at page 526:

> At one time it looked as if the Labour party might play a notable part in the evolution now in process, but it is rent by internal quarrels and its leadership is miserably ineffective. Mr. Tom Moore, the president of the Trades and Labour Congress, has many good qualities, but lacks vigorous initiative and belief in the efficacy of political action. However, the prime source of weakness of the Labour movement lies in the fact that his second-in-command, the secretary of the congress, holds a fat civil service position in Ottawa.

I know that there are many in the Labour movement who do not like this condition of things. In the Toronto Globe of September 15, 1920, I find a report on the deliberations of the Trades and Labour Congress from which I take the following excerpt:

> President Tom Moore refused to accept a resolution from delegates of the Toronto Labour Council to-day, when the convention opened, which called for the appointment of a special committe to investigate the disposition of $50,000 which Allan Barker, former president of the International Brotherhood of Maintenance of Way Employees, is said to have sent Mr. Draper to use to fight radical propaganda in Canada. The few radicals who are in the convention had hoped to make capital out of the charge.
>
> "I shall have to rule this out of order," said President Moore. "First, because it carries with it a veiled insinuation. If this were sent broadcast over the country it would give the impression that a charge was pending against Mr. Draper. Then, we have been advised by the maintenance of way employees that their internal affairs should not be discussed by the Congress. It says that there can be no charge against Mr. Draper and that it is satisfied with his conduct."
>
> Mr. Barker is charged with the misappropriation of funds of the brotherhood and his case will be heard shortly in Detroit.

It was said in the evidence at the trial that $50,000 of the funds of that association had been sent to Mr. P. M. Draper to fight radical propaganda. There are many in the Labour movement who believe that Mr. Draper and his friends thought that the best way to fight radical propaganda was to use those funds to insure their re-election as president and secretary of the Trades and Labour Congress.

As to the Minister of Labour, I shall have very little to say. I shall not even attempt to correct his misrepresentations with regard to myself. I can claim that I am fully as good a friend of Labour as he is. We both have had our hour of trial. When Senator Robertson was in Winnipeg at the time of the great strike, siding openly with the employers, and taking the

humiliating step of sending a frantic appeal to Samuel Gompers, the
5 p.m. head of the American Federation of Labour, to come and settle the difficulty out there, I was here on the floor of the House defending the rights of Labour to collective bargaining. When the Canadian National Railway Company was organized I took the responsibility of presenting the claims of Labour to representation on the Board of Directors, and the Government opposed my request with the implicit support and on the responsibility of the Minister of Labour. I desire to say as firmly as I can that by the attitude which the Minister of Labour has taken in the question I have been discussing, he has demonstrated that he is utterly unfit and entirely disqualified to occupy the high position of Minister of Labour in Canada. A Minister of Labour must be practicable in his plans, logical in his arguments, and absolutely fair and consistent in his undertakings. Above all, he must be impartial in his dealings with all sections of labour, organized and unorganized; all workmen must be equal before his department. The present Minister of Labour has proven that he lacks these elementary qualifications. He has shown himself devoid of the gift of tact, devoid of that broadmindedness and diplomacy which are necessary to achieve success in his department. Indeed, he has exhibited a deplorable lack of common sense. I have been told by people who are friendly to him that he did not realize the full extent of the responsibility he had as Minister of Labour, and I am fair enough to believe that that is true. But, Sir, that is no reason for keeping him there; it is no reason for the Government taking responsibility for his actions. I am sure that his actions in that respect are caused less by ill-will than—Mr. Speaker, I should like to use a polite substitute for the word ignorance.

That is all I have to say to-day. In closing my remarks I repeat what I have already said, that I base my arguments only and solely on the principle of justice, believing in the righteousness of the cause which I have defended, and believing that that is all-sufficient in the eyes of a population who love justice.

Right Hon. ARTHUR MEIGHEN (Prime Minister): Mr. Speaker, the subject on which the hon. member for Quebec East (Mr. Lapointe) has treated the House to quite a lengthy speech is one that most of us, in some of its features, would like to have introduced in Parliament as seldom as possible. It has not always proved practicable that it be wholly excluded from discussion in this chamber, and all that one can ask when such discussions must come, is that they be conducted with temper and moderation, and with scrupulous regard for the feelings of one's opponents.

The hon. member for Quebec East has sought to impugn, though his conclusions did not take the form of any resolution or amendment, the general administration for the Minister of Labour, and the basis of his charge is the conduct of that minister in relation to a certain application made by officers of a Catholic union in Canada for representation at a conference to be held in Ottawa next month. With a skill which undoubtedly the hon. member has developed to quite a height, he has succeeded most triumphantly in confusing the issue by a long statement of utterly impregnable principles, all the while assuming that one or other of these principles had been flagrantly violated by the minister. A more exact, careful and complete recital of the real circumstances in order to lay before Parliament just what the minister did, under what circumstances he acted and why he gave the decision that he did, would, I think, have been more appropriate than many of the lengthy extracts which the hon. member read.

Possibly a brief review of the Labour situation in Canada may be necessary to a full understanding of this matter. I do not pretend that I can speak with the amplitude of detail, or perhaps with the firmness of confidence in my facts that others could, but if I am wrong, I ask to be corrected on the spot.

Labour organizations in Canada have existed almost since the Confederation of Canada. We have here members of international unions in very large numbers, and we have numbers of unions that are wholly Canadian. These, for the most part, are represented in what is known as the Trades and Labour Congress, which is a congress of Canadian representatives of these unions created for the purpose of watching and, to the best of their capacity, influencing legislation along lines they believe to be in their interests. There has grown up also since 1911 what are known as National Catholic Unions, confined, so far as I know, to the province of Quebec, unions composed wholly of catholics and adopting constitutions differing, in this respect, entirely from those adopted by other unions. These have reached considerable numbers

in that province. The constitution adopted by one of these unions is quoted in the letter of the Minister of Labour, read by the hon. member when he presented his case.

Now, those unions which are represented in the Trades and Labour Congress are constituted on what is known as the craft basis; that is to say, all the members of a craft join together for union purposes, for the sake of advancing their interests, and for wide co-operative objects. There is within these unions no distinction of race, religion, or anything else; the only basis of union is occupation in a craft. All are treated alike and have the same rights. The National Catholic Unions in the province of Quebec have been organized along different lines. I do not say that it was not their right so to do; I have not the least doubt that it was quite legal. At all events, they have organized along different lines and are in no way associated with the unions that form part of the Trades and Labour Congress. They have indeed taken the position, as set out in the letter quoted by the hon. member, that they have no relation to, and nothing to do with, the unions that are reflected and represented in the Trades and Labour Congress, nor with the Trades and Labour Congress itself. That position also is within their right, and there is no need to take exception to it, for it has nothing to do with the arguments and the facts before the House to-day. I stated that the National Catholic Unions sprang up in 1911. They have grown in numbers until in 1920 their strength, I believe, is claimed to be 39,712. They embrace many persons who could not be properly described as workmen. Many of these unions are really not, in the strict sense, labour unions, although a great many others are. Some of them consist of what are known as research clubs; I have the names of one or two, such as "The Pius X Research Club, of Lévis," and "The Leo XIII Research Club, of Quebec"; and others. Of that 39,712, I understand only about 700 are actually engaged in the building trades.

The Trades and Labour Congress, of course, represents some hundreds of thousands. If my recollection of the memorandum presented me is correct, the members of the unions in the Trades and Labour Congress from the the province of Quebec total 89,000 or 90,000. While I do not think it matters as to the religious denominations of these 90,000 men in the Province of Quebec who are in unions represented in the Trades and Labour Congress, it must be manifest to all who know anything of that Province that by that by far a larger number of catholics will be in those unions than could be in the catholic unions, whose total membership is only 39,000. Consequently, it will be difficult to argue that, while an attitude might be unfair to one or other, a preference for either on the part of the present Minister of Labour must necessarily arise from any narrow or anti-catholic impulse. No one who knows that minister would for a moment suppose that he is capable of being animated by any such feeling. The one motive that actuates him most is a real sympathy for Labour, particularly for Canadian labour and union labour. That is what is deepest in his heart,—a desire to advance the interests of all labour in this country, and his sympathies are strongly with the workers of our country, tempered, of course, by a spirit of fairness and a loftiness of view that well comport with his position and that have been, in the years he has occupied his present office,—yes, and for years before,—of inestimable service to this country.

That being the general labour position, how does it come about that the present difficulty arises? I have set out that the Catholic unions exist; I have set out that the other unions also exist; and I have shown the distinction that obtains between the two. Now, I would never for a moment argue from that state of facts that there could be taken up on the part of the Government of this country, or of the Labour Department, a position which denied recognition to the one or the other. That is obviously an impossible position for the Government or the Labour Department to take. Nor has that department been guilty of refusing recognition to either. I purpose reciting the facts to show the truth of what I assert; many of the facts and some of the correspondence which he overloked might well have been submitted by the hon. member; but they would never at all have agreed with the conclusion at which he arrived, that there was failure on the part of the minister of any general recognition, or indeed of any specific recognition, that could, on logical grounds have been requested. What was the recognition asked for? It was in this respect, I think, that the hon. gentleman erred most. I think he led the House to believe that the officers of the Federation of National Catholic Unions

came to Ottawa, accompanied by himself, to make a general request for recognition, as he put it, on all commissions and, I think he said, on conferences appointed by the Government. If they came for purposes that were reasonable they would not have been denied. If they came for recognition in respect of anything they could fairly claim to be represented in they would not have been denied. What they specifically came for was this: A conference had been called on the part of two parties to an agreement. Now who were those parties? There has grown up in Canada, on the one hand, an organization known as the Federal Association of Building Trades, composed of various unions in different parts of Canada, who have got together, for purposes that I shall set out. On the other hand there has grown up an organization known as the Federal Association of Builders and Contractors—that is to say an association of the employers who employ the men—aggregated together in the other associations. An agreement was made some time ago between these two parties and out of that agreement real results have come. These results have been chiefly along the line of the establishment of Industrial Councils, at specific points through the country, between the employees in the building trades on the one hand—members of the General Association—and the employers members of the Employers' Association, on the other. There has evolved as well what you might call a Central Industrial Council—I think they call it an Industrial Conference—composed of five who are named by the various employees organizations, parties to the agreement on the one hand, and of five more named by the employers' organization, parties to the agreement on the other hand. Now it was desired by the two parties to that agreement that a conference should be held, in the belief that difficulties that might loom up in the future, and that they saw on the horizon, might be solved and smoothed away, and in the belief, I understand, that it would promote the further establishment and further usefulness of these Industrial Councils. That was the conference that was asked by these men—organized on the one hand, by the employees; organized by the employers on the other. Does any hon. gentleman know why that conference should not have been held? Does any hon. member know why these parties to a distinct individual agreement should be denied the right of having representatives come together for the purpose of exchanging their views? Does any hon. member know why the Minister of Labour should not have acquiesced in the demand for the assistance of his department when the parties came together for the purpose of calling that conference? If no one knows of any such reasons then there can be no criticism of the Minister of Labour.

What was the assistance asked of the Department of Labour? Was it that the minister should name the parties of either side to come to the conference? No, it was merely this—that in the case of this conference of the two parties to the agreement in question he should send the invitations to their nominees, and that he himself, or some officer of his department, should preside at the conference when held—the conference called for the 3rd of May. When matters were in that position a delegation came from the Federation of National Catholic Unions—those 39,000 people odd, of whom only 700 odd were in the building trades and none of whom were in the organizations represented by the employers who were a party to the agreement, and certainly none of whom were members of the employers' organization which constituted the second party to the agreement. They came down, and they came down accompanied by the hon. member for Quebec East. It was not the first time the members of this organization had come, but whenever they came they were welcome. I will read in a little while something that took place at a previous meeting between the representatives of the National Catholic Unions and the Minister of Labour. I will quote the verbatim report of what took place; and I say now that it will show to the hon. member for Quebec East and to every member of this House that the stand which the hon. member advocated looking to the smooth working together and co-operation of the Trades and Labour Congress on the one hand and of the Federation of Catholic Unions on the other—the stand which he says it is the great business of the Minister of Labour to take—is precisely the stand that the Minister of Labour did assume.

Mr. LAPOINTE: Not this year.

Mr. MEIGHEN: The question is not up this year; that is not what they came down for. They came down accompanied by the member for Quebec East although they had with them before—I do not know just how to refer to the gentleman but I want to do so in a correct way—

Mr. LEMIEUX: The Chaplain.

Mr. MEIGHEN: Yes the Chaplain, Abbé Fortin. He was down in 1920 at the head of the delegation, but this time they required the member for Quebec East to introduce them. So the hon. member came with them to the Minister of Labour.

Mr. LAPOINTE: I suppose my right hon. friend will take my word when I say I was invited to go there without at all knowing what the resolutions were going to be.

Mr. MEIGHEN: I do not doubt that at all. What I said was the delegation brought the hon. member with them and he introduced them although they were accompanied by the gentleman who led them in 1920. That is the fact. I do not say the hon. member knew the purport of the resolutions; I accept his word instantly when he says he did not. Anyway he came with them, and I believe another member of this House came with them as well.

Mr. LAPOINTE: Was there any wrong in that?

Mr. MEIGHEN: No, I do not say there was anything wrong. I would be the last to argue that it was wrong on the part of an hon. member to take advantage of every such occasion in his public life. Every hon. member wants to get behind him all the strength he can; I simply call attention to the grounds upon which he came. Now that is of interest when I go on a little further. I have stated the specific object for which they came. Did hon. members of this House get that to be the specific object from the speech of the hon. member? I do not think they did. The request of the delegation was denied by the Minister of Labour and the Minister of Labour took this ground: How can I say to these people who have the right to make their own nominations, "You must see to it that somebody else comes to this conference between these two said parties to the said agreement; I won't allow you to have that conference unless you do"? Had he the right to take that ground? I think my hon. friend knows he had not, and must have known it, especially in view of the fact that of the delegation which he introduced, representing 39,000 odd people, only 700 odd were in the building trades, whereas the parties to the conference were wholly of the building trade. Yet in spite of that the delegation asked the Minister of Labour to take the situation strongly in hand and say to these two parties to the agreement "You cannot get together unless the other parties come in as well." Was that a fair request to make? And after the Minister of Labour had stated his views, I am informed, and I am informed by the Minister of Labour himself, that the labour representatives present—those of the delegation who were themselves labouring people—did not take any exception to those views and that the opposition was first taken by the hon. member for Quebec East himself.

Some Hon. MEMBERS: Oh, oh.

Mr. LAPOINTE: Who says that?

Mr. MEIGHEN: The Minister of Labour.

Mr. LAPOINTE: The Minister of Labour is stating an untruth when he says that.

Mr. MEIGHEN: I had better repeat it so that it will be understood. My information from the minister is that the labour delegates there, those who were labouring people, did not take exception to his statement of the position when he refused to himself compel representation at the conference, but that the first to take exception was the hon. member for Quebec East.

Mr. LAPOINTE: Mr. Speaker, I insist upon my right to have my word accepted by the right hon. gentleman. The Minister of Labour could not understand the men who were there, and I had to translate to him what they were saying.

Mr. SPEAKER: Order. The Prime Minister has not refused to accept the statement of the hon. member. It is perfectly proper for the Prime Minister to state what the Minister of Labour said to him in respect to a certain occasion. What the hon. member has said in this House must be accepted. That is the rule of the House. His word is on record and will stand.

Mr. MEIGHEN: Now we have reached that point of the argument. The Minister of Labour did not take the stand he did in relation to refusing the request on the ground that this was a Catholic union, or that he had any fault to find with it. He took his stand on the ground that I have stated—a ground that I humbly submit, is utterly unassailable. I cannot for the life of me see how he could possibly have taken any other stand. I say he did not take that stand on the ground that he had to treat differently the workingmen engaged

in the building trade who happened to be members of a union who were parties to the conference and members engaged in the same trade who happened to be members of the Catholic union; not at all. On the contrary he stated: This is a conference between these two parties to an agreement which they have a right to hold, and they have a right to determine the way in which they will hold that conference. They have determined how they will hold it, and I have no right to interfere, especially as the unions you represent are not building trades unions particularly but only to the extent of two per cent of your members. What followed from that? Instead of trying to discriminate in favour of one as against the other, he followed that statement with a letter, which the hon. member did not read. I have the letter before me and will read it now.

Mr. J. E. A. Pin,
270 rue de la Reine,
Quebec, Que.

I presume he is the secretary of the union or of the delegation.

Ottawa, Ont., March 29, 1921.

Dear Sir,— The proposals contained in the printed memorial and submitted by your delegation last week have been translated and are receiving consideration. One of the requests made referred to a conference to be held in Ottawa on May 3 next, and to be participated in by employers and representatives of labour parties to the National Builders Industrial Council agreement.

Parties to the agreement.

You will recall it was explained to your delegation that the delegates to this conference were not being selected or appointed by the Department of Labour, but at the request of the employers' and workmen's organizations, parties to the Industrial Council agreement, the department had agreed to invite the delegates whom the respective parties might nominate.

Upon the occasion of the visit of your delagation it was made clear to them that the department could not assume to force upon the employers' and employees organizations, parties to the Industrial Council agreement, the presence of outside organizations of either employers or workmen, but that if your organization would communicate directly with the parties who were participating in the conference and obtain their consent to your being represented, it would be the pleasure of the department to extend invitations to any members of your organization who might be nominated.

That is what he stated to the delegation. I do not think the hon. member quoted that.

Mr. LAPOINTE: He never said that.

Mr. MEIGHEN: He did not state that?

Mr. LAPOINTE: No; and it is not in the letter he wrote to the Montreal Gazette.

[Mr. Meighen.]

Mr. MEIGHEN: I think it is in that letter. If so, I do not know where the hon. member will be then. But the Minister of Labour did not stop there. In his letter to this gentleman, who I think must be the secretary of the delegation, he also said:

Since then it has occurred to me that your people have perhaps overlooked the fact that the employers in the building industry who engage only National Catholic Union workers will not be present at the conference referred to. If in the opinion of your organization, and of the employers with whom your organization deals, it would be advisable to have a conference together, similar to the one to be held between employers and employees, members of the national building industrial council, it will be the pleasure of the Department of Labour to extend invitations, upon receipt of nominations, in exactly the same manner as is being done in the other case.

If a conference between the building contractors, who employ members of your organization only, and yourselves, is deemed desirable the department will be glad to co-operate with you in exactly the same manner as we are attempting to do with the other organizations of builders and workmen.

Now, I do not say that the hon. member ever had seen this letter before he spoke—

Mr. MURPHY: Is the right hon. gentleman reading the whole letter or just extracts?

Mr. MEIGHEN: No, I have read the whole letter. The latter part of the letter in which it is suggested that possibly the workmen in Mr. Pin's organization would like a similar conference with their employers, the minister does not claim to have stated to the delegates. He did tell them what is expressed in the first part, that if Mr. Pin's organization would obtain the consent of the parties interested to his organization being represented, he—(the minister)—would be glad to extend invitations,—in a word, if justice was being done by the parties to the conference, they who were not parties would be treated precisely the same even in relation to that conference. What more the Minister of Labour could do I am at a loss to understand.

Now the hon. member complains that the Minister of Labour has not taken the line of seeking to avoid friction between the Catholic unions and the unions incorporated in the Trades and Labour Congress. I say, on the contrary, that the minister has taken precisely that line, and has always taken it. He has felt that friction was bound to arise when organization took place along those lines. He has felt that it is better for labour to be all together, to present its case as one, not as two. He has

always tried to get them together but his efforts have not received much response, and I know he feels discouraged by the attitude of those whose cause the hon. member has espoused this afternoon.

Now let me read what took place a year ago at this meeting between the representatives of the Federation of National Catholic unions and the Minister of Labour. This is a verbatim report of what he said.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: Would the Prime Minister allow me to correct one impression before he proceeds? He has made reference to a letter which my hon. friend (Mr. Lapointe) is not supposed to have seen. As my right hon. friend (Mr. Meighen) has realized, the speech of the member for Quebec East had reference to a letter from the Minister of Labour which appeared in the Montreal Gazette on March 31. It was dated at Ottawa on March 27. The letter which my right hon. friend has just read, and which he says the member for Quebec East possibly had not seen, is dated March 29, two days after the letter was sent to the Montreal Gazette which details the whole ground of the controversy.

Mr. MEIGHEN: The minister wrote the letter on the 27th to the Montreal Gazette, and he wrote the letter to Mr. Pin on the 29th. The letter of the 27th could not embody the letter of the 29th.

A moment ago I was challenged by the hon. member when I quoted from the minister's letter of the 29th to Mr. Pin to the effect that he, the minister, had told the delegates that if they would obtain the consent of the parties to the conference he would be glad to extend to them invitations to this conference. The hon. member interrupted me to say that the minister had not said that at the delegation, and that what he had said at the delegation was in the Montreal Gazette. Very well. I read from the Montreal Gazette letter:

The delegates are being invited upon the nomination of the employers' and workmen's respective organizations. The National Catholic Union delegates would be gladly invited if the consent of the parties participating were obtained, but instead of approaching them the National Catholic Union make a demand on the Labour Department to force representation for them, which request was declined. Why did the National Catholic Union make this request instead of seeking to co-operate with the two parties interested?

Then he gives the reason why in his opinion they did not.

Mr. LAPOINTE: What about the other parts of the letter? That is not the only reason he gives.

Mr. MEIGHEN: I know that, but the hon. member said he did not give this reason in the letter. The hon. member's interruption reminds me of the man charged with a crime who, faced with the testimony of witnesses who said they saw the offence committed, contended that he could produce many hundreds who would swear that they did not see him commit the crime. I was about to read from the words of the minister at the conference in 1920. I do not really know what the name of the conference was ; I assume it was just a delegation similar to this one. It was held on January 20, 1920. I observe that Rev. Father Fortin was present, because I see one or two remarks put in by him. These are the words of the minister:

If I may be permitted—and I hope you will not regard it as presumption on my part to call one or two things to your attention—

We will see how this displays a "narrow", "partisan" and "anti-Catholic" mind. It is the language of the Minister of Labour.

Mr. LAPOINTE: Where is that report?

Mr. MEIGHEN: This is a verbatim report, taken in shorthand. Does the hon. member dispute it?

Mr. LAPOINTE: Where?

Mr. MEIGHEN: Here, where the conference took place.

Mr. LAPOINTE: Does my hon. friend refer to the conference of this year?

Mr. MEIGHEN: No, 1920. The minister said:

If I may be permitted—and I hope you will not regard it as presumption on my part—to call one or two things to your attention, for the consideration of your federation, and it is for the purpose of promoting harmonious relations in the labour world and in the industrial world generally that I presume to advance these thoughts for your consideration.

There have been established in the province of Quebec during the last few years what you have been pleased to term your National Catholic Unions. I had the pleasure and honour of being received by Bishop Gauthier and several other gentlemen, including Father Fortin, in Montreal some weeks ago to discuss some of the things that I am going to mention now. Throughout all of the rest of Canada, and indeed all Northern America, the wage earners, the workingmen, are organized into what they term their craft unions. That is, the carpenters have their organization; the machinists have theirs; the boilermakers have

theirs; the street railway men have theirs; each class of men in railroad service have their particular organization; and the bricklayers, the stonemasons, the garment-workers, etc. Those organizations are all, or nearly all, international in character. That may or may not be a good thing, but what I want to point out in the first place is that there is no distinction as to any race, nationality or creed in that whole labour movement numbering several millions of people. The movement that has started in your province, setting up what is termed the National Catholic Unions, is having a very disturbing effect in the minds of labour men generally—those who are affiliated with these other unions that have been in existence for years—particularly in your province; and unfortunately it is true that the feeling is not all of a friendly sort. I think that it is unfortunate that there should be any friction between men whose interests are identical. But if you continue to increase your membership in the province of Quebec among your own people, and the friction continues to grow by reason of certain provisions in your constitution, which may be misunderstood, misquoted, and misinterpreted in other parts of the Dominion, I honestly greatly fear that serious results will ultimately come out of what has been started, and I would like to make this suggestion to you gentlemen here. You have placed a number of important matters before Mr. Blondin and myself on behalf of the Government, for consideration by the Government, and I am therefore going to venture to ask you to give consideration to the proposal that I desire to make to you. It is that you should honestly and earnestly endeavour to find some method whereby your organization can work in more complete harmony with the other organizations representing labour in this country, and at least stop the growing friction that exists. Father Fortin was present when we had the conversation in Montreal, and we need not discuss the matter at the length we did there, because he is familiar with it; but I do respectfully submit, gentlemen, that there ought to be no religious distinction in the labour movement. In every trades union that exists in North America, Catholic and Protestant are alike welcome, and have equal rights, and the question of religion is never raised. The secretary of the Trades and Labour Congress of Canada is a most devout Roman Catholic; several of the executive of that congress are also of that religious faith, and they have the confidence and the admiration and the respect of their fellow workmen of all religious beliefs throughout the whole country, for they are elected by them.

Rev Father FORTIN: Well, Mr. Minister—

The MINISTER OF LABOUR: And what I wanted to say was that I do hope that as you proceed along your line of development you will earnestly endeavour to promote more harmonious relations between other organizations and your own, both your local unions and your federation, and if possible adopt the same principle that we are suggesting should be adopted between employer and employee, namely, by getting together with the executive officials of the other unions and endeavouring by conference to find some common ground on which you can work together in harmony,

That is exactly the policy which the hon. member says the Minister of Labour should promote.

[Mr. Meighen.]

Do not have them coming to me or to the Government—no matter who may happen to be Minister—and saying, "We won't participate in the Labour Conference if another organization is present." It is undesirable to have one organization representing labour coming to the Government and saying, "We want the eight hour day," and another organization coming and saying, "We do not." Unless there is harmony and unity of action, the Government is placed in a most embarrassing position in dealing with the presentations that are made. The Government has even been endeavoring, and with some success, to get labour and capital to sit down, talk together, and bring in joint recommendations. That is very desirable and has been useful where it has been done. Everything possible should be done to bring about a spirit of co-operation among all the organizations that are trying to improve the condition of the workingman in any part of this country. I think it is desirable that they should be pulling together instead of having any differences, and coming at different times and making opposite representations to the Government in some cases. I do not mean the remarks that I have made to be taken as in any way offensive, as I am sure you gentlemen will appreciate. I lived in the province of Quebec for some six years, and knew a great many of the people there and have great admiration for the French people. It is unfortunately true that in the distant parts of Canada our French-Canadian people are not properly understood, and in many cases not properly appreciated. Their ideas and aims are somewhat different from those of other people in other parts of the Dominion. At the same time I believe that it is absolutely true, on the other hand, that the majority of our people in the province of Quebec, do not fully understand the people in the other provinces of Canada. It is only by the meeting of representatives of all parts of the country, whether of labour or capital, that we become properly possessed of the right ideas, the ideas that should prevail for the benefit of the country as a whole. So I leave that thought with you for your consideration.

This is what I want to emphasize particularly.

If at any time it seems to your Federation desirable that a conference should be held between officers of your organization and officers of the Trades and Labour Congress of Canada, with a view of trying to arrive at some common ground on which you can work together in harmony, or at least so work that friction would be avoided, and if this Department can be of any service in bringing about such a conference, we would be delighted to co-operate with you in that way.

Even the words of the hon. gentleman (Mr. Lapointe) himself could not more clearly or more forcefully express the devotion that a minister ought to show to the cause of co-operation amongst labour, to the cause of the abolition of that friction amongst labour classes, and especially of the abolition of friction that involves from religious division.

The hon. member must realize that, in so far as any administrative decision went, the decision of the Minister of Labour as

regards this question of being represented at this special council was specifically, the only administrative decision that he made. But when the hon. member (Mr. Lapointe) got up to charge him with discrimination, he gave, as he expressed it to me, "without cost," his opinion. The Minister of Labour has opinions as to the wisdom of organizing workers along the special line, the religious line, such as at the basis of this Catholic Union. It is not that the Minister of Labour is anti-Catholic. His opinion would be just the same as regards the organization for labour purposes adherents of any other religious body in Canada, It would be just the same as regards a clerical party in this House of any religious denomination whatever. Such is the opinion; it is not an administrative act at all. The Minister of Labour, so far as administrative direction goes, takes the ground that in his eye all must be treated alike; there must be no refusal to recognize anyone. But he believes that the best line of labour organization is not the line that marks the confines of a religious sect. That is his opinion; surely to that opinion he has a right, and the opinion applies to such an organization, no matter by what special religious boundary it may be confined. I will give you his reasons. He states that in his experience as a labour man, as Minister of Labour, the inevitable result of workers organizing on religious lines is to give ground for complaints of discrimination and unfairness on the part of employees, Catholic or Protestant, who cannot or do not belong to this Catholic Union so organized or to this special organization of labour within lines of particular faith. In his judgment there inevitably arise claims of injustice to those men who do not, who cannot, belong because they are in other unions or because they are not Catholics. Furthermore he holds this opinion on the far broader ground, namely that the projection of lines of division amongst our people on religious grounds into the labour field—and I think he would say into other fields—is not for the ultimate good of Canada. That is his opinion. But because he believes that it would be better to organize along other lines that is no reason why he should not recognize organizations if they choose to take form, so long as such organizations are within, and entitled to the protection of, the laws of this country and so long as the purpose of the organization is in no way destructive. That being his position, what fault can be found?

There is, however, an organization of another character that arose in the West, and in the judgment of the minister it had much to do with the Winnipeg strike. I am rather sorry to see the hon. member trying to lead the House to believe to-day that in the great conflict that arose in winnipeg, his sympathies were wholly with those who precipitated that struggle there, some of whom were found guilty of grave crimes by unanimous verdicts of juries. I did not know that the hon. member would stand in this House and say that he was pleading their cause here when the Minister of Labour was in the West trying to restore order in one of the most trying and difficult situations that ever arose in Canada. I did not believe that he would stand in Parliament and try to prove his claim to sympathy with labour on any reasoning like that. I do not think that these grounds he will get very much sympathy from leading members of his party, whose views on that occasion were expressed quite freely, honestly, honourably and truly, quite on the other side.

I have described the position that the minister took; the position that he outlines in his letter to the Montreal Gazette. That position is wholly compatible with his lifelong effort to bring about the best possible relations between labour units as they appear in the Trades and Labour Congress and labour units as they appear in the Catholic union, and quite consistent with that policy, from which he has never departed, of recognizing the one in the same way as he would recognize the other and in giving no preference to either. That is the position he has assumed all along. In that position, is he wrong? In that position, I venture to say he is supported by the majority, even of the religious faith of those who belong to the Catholic unions, and by the majority of labour men. I know it is his firm opinion that the majority do support him in that position, and I think he is a competent judge as to what side the majority are on. In that position I have not the least doubt that he is supported by the great body of fair, impartial, unbiased public opinion in this country; and in pursuing that course I think he is serving the ends of labour, the ends of the Dominion, and deporting himself with dignity and usefulness in the high office which he holds.

At Six o'clock, the House took recess.

After Recess

Mr. J. E. FONTAINE (Hull): (Translation.) Mr. Speaker, I shall be very brief in my remarks, for on no account would I spoil the good impression made upon this House by the eloquent speech of the hon. member for Quebec East (Mr. Lapointe). I had the honour to accompany the delegates of the National Labour Union when they called upon the hon. Minister of Labour (Mr. Robertson); I heard all the proposals which were submitted to him; I heard their request which was to be presented at the industrial conference of employers and workmen, in Ottawa, on May 3rd next; a conference called by the hon. minister himself, and having for its object the bringing together of employers and employees with a view to securing a better understanding between them. They solicited the favour to send three of the thirty-seven delegates who will make up the conference, that is to say a quota proportionate to the 50,000 workmen they represented. Much to my surprise, Mr. Speaker, the hon. Minister of Labour, forgetting that he is the Minister of Labour for the whole country, whatever be the union to which they belong, refused their request, for the reason that these men are members of a Catholic National union. And here I mean to state, that the minister does not tell the truth when he says that the only protest against his refusal was that from the member for Quebec East. As a matter of fact the hon. member for Quebec East only served as an interpreter for the benefit of the Minister of Labour who does not understand French, and the delegates warmly protested, but in vain, as the minister's refusal was final.

When one looks over the political history of this country one encounters many politicians and other groups mixed up in intrigues having for their object to discredit all that is Catholic. I still remember the wars waged against Sir Wilfrid Laurier by certain fanatics; I have many times heard them say that they wanted no Prime Minister who received his directions from Rome and the pope, or other similar nonsense, but never before have I seen a minister of the Crown, supposed to represent all races and creeds of the country, forget himself to the extent of sinking to the level of the fanatical politicians I have just referred to. And this happens, Mr. Speaker, at the very moment when the Government try to have ministers elected in the province of Quebec, and tell us through their newspapers that they want friendly understanding and union to prevail in the country, and that they even regret not to see our province better represented in the Cabinet. I remember the account given of a grand banquet offered to the right hon. Prime Minister (Mr. Meighen) in Montreal, where he declared that he had never uttered a word or sentence that could offend the province of Quebec. Well, Mr. Speaker, here is a fact which speaks louder than mere words, and if the Prime Minister be sincere, if he wants us to believe in his courting, let him repudiate the conduct of his colleague, the Minister of Labour, and demand his resignation.

After all, why this objection to the Catholic labour unions? Is it not admitted by everybody that it was the province of Quebec that saved the situation, that put an end to the friction which after the war existed in this country between capital and labour? Indeed, when strikes were taking place in all the provinces of the Dominion —I still have in mind the famous strike in Winnipeg—the province of Quebec was calm and peaceful and was the bulwark of order and harmony. Mr. Speaker, the reason is that the people, especially the working classes, are permeated with deep religious sentiments and follow the wise and patriotic advice of their clergy. Although the honourable Minister of Labour is adverse to the presence of a chaplain among trades unions, I wish to state on the floor of this House that as long as they follow the advice of the clergy our workingmen will not go astray and Quebec will be admired by the people of this country.

Mr. GEORGE PARENT (Quebec West): Mr. Speaker, just a few days ago—last Sunday it was—I had the good fortune to be present at a gathering called under the auspices of the National Catholic Unions of Labour in the city of Quebec. At this meeting held in the Market hall there were about three thousand people present, and many more were unable to get in. This large number of people had gathered to hear a very prominent member of the clergy, Abbé Deponcheville. He addressed this gathering of Catholic Labour Unions and I must say that I was very much impressed with his speech, as I believe everybody present was on that occasion. Did he say anything against other labour unions? No. Did he say anything particularly in favour of Catholic unions? Possibly so.

When I left that room I asked myself, how are we going to face the situation which now confronts us in view of what we had been told a few days previously by the Minister of Labour, the Hon. Gideon Robertson? Coming to Ottawa the next day, much to my surprise I received from people belonging to other labour unions a resolution which I wish to place in part before the House, the tenor of which was exactly to the contrary of what I had heard at the meeting I had attended the day previous. It is a resolution of the Quebec Typographical Union, No. 302, and says in part:

That whereas this Union has taken cognizance of the stand taken by the Hon. Gideon Robertson, Minister of Labour, in connection with the National Catholic Unions of this province in their efforts to divide bona fide labour organizations by means of religious and racial prejudice—

If it were true, Mr. Speaker, that the Catholic Unions want to divide bona fide labour organizations by means of religious and racial prejudice, I for one would by no means support any organization that would have any such tendency. I do not think the Catholic unions have any purpose of that sort in mind. The Abbé Fortin, who also spoke on this occasion, said that if Catholic unions wished to be advised by priests, it was their own business. He said further: We went to Ottawa for this very purpose of telling the Minister of Labour that whenever a labour congress took place, or a conference on labour matters was held, we wanted the Catholic unions of labour, representing over forty thousand people in this Dominion, to be heard. That was all. That was mentioned at that meeting by Abbé Fortin. He repeated there what he said in Ottawa that that was all the Catholic unions were trying to get from this Government.

The Minister of Labour has written a letter to the press, published in the Montreal Gazette, in which he tries to becloud the issue, saying that if the labour unions could not be heard at the coming congress it was because they were Catholic.

A day or so later another letter was published by the same gentleman, but he did not go quite so far as he did before. Now, it is our hope that whatever may be the nature of these organizations in the province of Quebec, whether they be advised by legal counsellors or by priests, they shall be given the same right to be heard by the Department of Labour as is enjoyed by any other union in Canada. There are some forty thousand labour men in these Catholic unions, and they should have an opportunity of stating their views before any conference under the direction of the Minister of Labour. I will not go further on this subject because the whole field has been well covered by the hon. member for Quebec East (Mr. Lapointe), and everything that he has said concerning the whole matter I am pleased to endorse. I trust that the Government, taking his views into earnest consideration, and heeding the opinions expressed by some of us, will take such steps as will ensure to these Catholic unions the right of being heard by the Department of Labour.

Mr. EDMOND PROULX (Prescott): It seems to me that the Labour Department is exercising a discrimination against the National Catholic Unions. There was a labour conference in September, 1919, at which those unions desired to be represented, but they were refused the right. Now, they serve a certain purpose in this country, and the Department of Labour should have no policy which would operate against the interests of any union of labour, whether its members belong to one denomination or another. Those Catholic unions want to be represented now at another labour conference, and they are denied the right by the Minister of Labour. Why is that? Are they not citizens of this country? They number about 40,000, and there is no reason why they should not be heard in any conference under the auspices of the Department of Labour. I wish to put on Hansard the views of a prominent labour man, who has had a large experience in the employment of labour in this country for the last thirty years. This man is not a Catholic; he is a Protestant named A. A. Wright, and writing from 9 Victoria Square, Montreal, under date of April 1; with reference to the National Catholic unions, he says:

To the Editor of The Gazette:

Sir,—I read with a great deal of interest yesterday your very able criticism of the position taken by the Minister of Labour, as shown by his letter in the same issue. It may be of interest to you to know that prior to March, 1917, I had had over thirty years' experience in Ontario with unorganized labour in the lumber and shipping industries. During that period, the relations between the employing firm and their employees were of the most friendly character, and nothing but harmony prevailed, mainly from the absence of paid agitators. From March, 1917, to date, I have been closely connected with firms from Port Arthur to Halifax, the first two years of that period being connected with the construction of patrol vessels in the shipyards from

Port Arthur to Quebec for the British Admiralty, under the Department of the Naval Service of Canada. This was my first experience with labor organizers or leaders of the Metal Trades Federation affiliated with the International Unions, whose activities are responsible for all the unrest in labor circles. It was my first connection also with the Catholic workers organization in the Province of Quebec.

I have no brief for the clergy of the Roman Catholic Church nor for the labor organization among members of that church, but I am compelled to state that from personal experience that if compelled to take my choice between dealing with the Catholic Workmen's Union or with the leaders of the International Unions, I would unquestionably prefer dealing with the Catholic Workers Union and their leaders for the following reasons:

The leaders and advisers of the Catholic Workmen's Union teach the workers to live up to the teachings of the Christian religion, and to give an honest day's work for a fair day's pay. They impress on the workers that the only source of employment is from the men who are able to use the savings of the people intelligently in producing commodities required by mankind, and that they can only pay the men the highest wages possible to them after paying for raw material, overhead expenses and a reasonable profit, and the difference between that, and the value of the commodities produced, is all that can possibly be available for wages.

On the other hand, the International Unions teach their members that the capitalist is the enemy of the workingman, who has been exploiting his services for the accumulation of wealth and not giving the worker a fair share of what he produces.

The International Unions, through some of their leaders, do admit that men should give an honest return for the wages they are paid, and when advocating the eight hour day guaranteed that if employers would grant the eight hour day, they would get greater production than they had been getting in the ten hour day. From observation in the industries with which I have been connected, instead of doing this the men have been giving, up to a few months ago, less than half of the production in eight hours which they had formely been giving in ten, because the workmen were privately, and in some cases openly taught, that the less work a man does the more men will get employment and the more prosperous workers will be. Further, I have been told by first class Union workmen, when asked why they belonged to a Union, since they were men of such a type that employers will bid against one another for their services, that they are virtually compelled to belong to the Union because there is an aggressive minority which, throught secret dealings with foremen and other means would drive them out of the shops if they incurred the enmity of the Unions and refused to join, because it is absolutely essential to the existence of the Unions that they have enrolled among their members a large number of skilled men, as without them the Union could not exist and these men are used to enable the indifferent and undesirable workmen to get and hold jobs.

I think it is safe to state that fully 80 per cent of the members of the labor unions are honest, conscientious, law-abiding citizens who take little or no interest in agitation, and that of the 20 per cent, of aggressive members, possibly not over 5 per cent, are of the class which might be considered really undesirable citizens. When this is considered, coupled with the fact that organized labor affiliated with these International Unions does not embrace at the outside probably over 20 per cent, of all the workers in Canada and the United States, it should be evident that too much attention is being paid to those so-called labor leaders (who arrogate to themselves the right to dictate through the press and public platforms to our Government as to what Labour demands), by the Government, press and public. They should be absolutely ignored, as if this country, or any other country, is to prosper, the Government elected by the people should only pass and administer laws for the benefit of all its citizens, instead of catering to a noisy minority by passing and enforcing laws for the benefit of a small minority of citizens at the expense of the majority.

I think a comparison of the ethics taught by the Catholic Workers Union leaders, and those of the International Unions, will justify the decision of many employers who after careful consideration now refuse to sign any contract with leaders of the International Unions, but will confine themselves to making agreements with men who are working for them who are willing to live up to their contracts, and give honest service in return for the highest wages which the firm can afford to pay.

A. A. Wright,

9 Victoria Cquare,
Montreal, April 1, 1921.

Well, Mr. Speaker, it has always been my opinion since the International Union entered upon an aggressive campaign against the National Catholic Union that the former wanted to kill the movement undertaken by the latter. They saw that in the province of Quebec the National Catholic Union was living up to the principles of the Christian religion in making agreements with their employers and adhering to those agreements. You have not seen in the province of Quebec within the last few years any strikes worth speaking of, and even when strikes did occur they were very quickly settled. There has not been seen in the province of Quebec any such strike as the big one which occurred in the West. The members of the National Catholic Union are not members of the One Big Union. Nevertheless the Department of Labour has exercised discrimination in this matter, and I think the head of that department in so doing is acting at the dictation of the officers of the Trades and Labour Congress. I do not believe that the Minister of Labour wrote the letter which has been quoted here, I do not think he had the time to do so. I believe that letter was written by Mr. Tom Moore and Mr. P. M. Draper, the President and secretary respectively of the Trades and Labour Congress. The minister is taking

up the cudgels for these gentiemen and, I submit, acting unfairly towards the National Catholic Union. The members of that union number over 40,000. They are peaceful citizens who want to avoid strikes and to co-operate with their employers. We have heard much within the last few years about the necessity of having co-operation between employers and employees, and we cannot have industrial peace in this country without such co-operation. Well, the main principle of the National Catholic Union is that we should have co-operation along this line and they are carrying that principle into effect. If any employers who have made agreements with the members of the National Catholic Union were summoned and questioned before a committee of this House it would be found that all those employers are perfectly satisfied.

The Montreal Gazette is a very important newspaper, perhaps one of the most influential in the country, and in its utterances on this matter it knows whereof it speaks. That newspaper declares that the National Catholic Union should not be discriminated against and that it should be represented at any Labour Conference held in Canada, especially when the expenses of such a conference are met out of the public treasury. Has the International Union, I ask, any more right to come to this Parliament and ask that public money be devoted to meeting the expenses of a labour conference than the National Catholic Union? If the expenses of such a conference are met out of the public treasury, why should not the National Catholic Union be represented at it? My hon. friend from Quebec East (Mr. Lapointe) was perfectly justified in accompanying the delegation that waited upon the Minister of Labour to ask that the minister recognize the National Catholic Union. I hope the Prime Minister will reconsider the decision arrived at in this matter; and I appeal to the Minister of Justice, who represents the province of Quebec in this House and who knows the membership and the principles of the National Catholic Union, to see that justice is done to them, and that they should be given representation at the forthcoming labour conference to be held in this city. I make this appeal hoping that the Minister of Justice will use his influence towards remedying the injustice which has been inflicted upon that organization.

Mr. HENRI E. LAVIGUEUR (Quebec County): If I may be permitted I would like to say a few words on this subject. I have no intention of discussing the question at any length because my hon. friend from Quebec East (Mr. Lapointe) has very ably placed all the facts before the House, supplemented by the hon. memhber for Quebec West (Mr. Parent). I wish to say, however, that I endorse absolutely every word which has been uttered by both these hon. gentlemen. The treatment which has been meted out to over 40,000 of the most peaceful and honourable working men of the province of Quebec constitutes a great insult to our race—it is not only an insult to the labour classes of that province but it is also an insult to our race and our religion. During the course of a great number of years I have had the advantage of observing the work of the National Catholic Union in the city of Quebec. I have had the honour and the pleasure of knowing the most of their officers, and on many occasions it has been my good fortune to meet with them touching labour matters in the city of Quebec not only during the war but subsequent to it. The members of the National Catholic Union of Quebec comprise some of the most honourable and worthy people we have. In the city of Quebec during and subsequent to the war there were never any labour troubles owing to the praiseworthy action of the National Catholic Union, to say nothing of the international union whose members also do good work in the interest of the trade and industry of the country. Under the circumstances I could not let the opportunity pass without saying that I endorse every word that has been uttered by hon. gentlemen on this side, and I would have been greatly pleased and happy had I been called upon to vote for a resolution asking the Minister of Labour to tender his resignation in the Cabinet. The Minister of Labour has no mandate from the people, he is simply responsible to the Government, and, I repeat, by his action in this matter he has insulted our people.

Hon. W. S. FIELDING (Shelburne and Queen's): I do not wish to participate in the debate, I merely want to ask a question. For that reason I am sorry the Prime Minister is not in his place. When he was speaking this afternoon I had in my mind to refer to it but did not wish to interrupt him. In putting the question now I am merely asking for information. I understood the Prime Minister to say that the proposed conference will not be a general labour conference, but a conference of two groups—one representing the workmen and

the other the employers in the building trades. I think that is correct. The Prime Minister further said that the Minister of Labour was not in a position to admit any other parties to the conference. I think that is correct also. Then the question arises: If two bodies of men desire to have a conference why do they bring the Minister of Labour into the matter at all, why do they come to him for his opinion? There are conferences all over Canada every week between employers and working men, but why is the Minister of Labour drawn into this disagreeable matter? Perhaps the Minister of Justice can answer the question.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Before the Minister of Justice answers the question I would remind the hon. member that he has exhausted his right to speak, and that if he wishes to ask any further questions he had better do so now.

Hon. Mr. FIELDING: I only desire to ask one or two questions. I have stated the first one: Why has the Government been drawn into this matter, why could these parties not have their conference without bringing the Minister of Labour into the controversy? They did not need his permission. This conference, it appears to me, does not stand on any different basis from any other conference on the labour question in any part of Canada, and I cannot understand why the Minister of Labour and the Government are drawn into this very disagreeable matter.

Right Hon. C. J. DOHERTY (Minister of Justice): Mr. Speaker, if I understand the position correctly, and I think I do, it is this. A body representative of a large number of working men in the building trade and another body representative of employers likewise in the building trade came to an agreement that with a view to adjusting difficulties, actual or anticipated, that might arise in connection with their relations it would be desirable to have a conference. They asked, as I understand it, that the Minister of Labour should furnish an officer of his department to act as chairman of that conference and, in a sense, to help bring the parties together.

Mr. FIELDING: Could they not come together?

Mr. DOHERTY: They certainly could if they had thought proper to do so. But, as was pointed out by the hon. member for Quebec East this afternoon,—and I think he read from the statutes—the function for which the Department of Labour exists is to do everything in its power to facilitate and further the getting together of employers and employees, and thereby to ensure the maintenance of peace and concord in our industrial operations. Whether these gentlemen who desire to have the conference were right or wrong in the view that it would promote concord between them, they did request what they thought would be helpful, and the Minister of Labour desiring to meet any expressed wish for such co-operation, agreed that an officer of his department should preside over this conference and should issue the invitations. I am not prepraed to say that it was absolutely necessary, but it does seem to me that it was quite within the line of the duties of the Minister of Labour to meet such a request if it was at all possible to do so. I think that is the entire explanation of how the Department of Labour came to be connected with the matter.

Mr. FIELDING: And, incidentally, the Government pay the bill.

Mr. DOHERTY: Incidentally the Government, I understand, do pay the expenses connected with this conference. But I leave it to this House whether, if conferences of this kind conduce to bringing about and maintaining a good understanding between employers and employees, it is not the proper function of the Ministry of Labour to encourage them and to co-operate with labour.

Mr. LAPOINTE: To co-operate with all labour.

Mr. DOHERTY: Yes. But when particular bodies representative of large numbers of men occupying towards each other the position of employers and employees represent to the department that a conference between them would be conducive to the results I have mentioned, even if they do not embrace the entire body of employers and employees throughout the country, is it not worth while to co-operate with those who seek to confer together and help them to that end?

Now, that is the whole explanation of the mystery, if there be a mystery connected with the matter. That being so, so long as the department offers and is ready to extend the same co-operation to any other body of employees and employers, it seems to me fairly clear that there can be no question of discrimination. But the difficulty seems to have resulted entirely

from a misapprehension on the part of the applicants of the nature of the conference in question. It has been said that I know something about the people that compose these Catholic unions. I do, and I believe that they are reasonable people, people that are not seeking to make trouble, and I cannot but believe that if they had fully understood that they were asking for representation, not at a general labour conference but at a conference between two particular bodies of men of which they did not form part, they would have realized that there was no intention to discriminate against them, and that they were not the victims of the injustice which the hon. member for Quebec East and possibly they themselves seemed to believe that they have been subjected to. I am confident that when the members of these unions come to understand the misapprehension under which they labour they will realize that there was no refusal of recognition and no injustice done to them. I think that was made abundantly clear by the offer to them of the same good services of the department if they thought there was any conference which they could have with their employers that would tend to produce the same results of good will and harmony.

I do not think there is any substantial difference of opinion about the principles that ought to govern this matter. The right hon. the Prime Minister (Mr. Meighen) was quite in a postion to agree to the principles laid down by the hon. member for Quebec East. The difficulty seems to be that there was a misapprehension as to there having been a violation of those principles or a desire to ignore the particular request in question that led to the one administrative action which took place. Surely, as the hon. member for Quebec East himself pointed out, the questions that may arise out of the correspondence he read are, after all, abstract questions upon which people may honestly differ in opinion, and, as he pointed out, each one is entitled to entertain his own opinions and to act upon them so long as he is within the law. The Minister of Labour, like everybody else, formed his opinions upon those abstract questions which, after all, do not arise here for us to discuss or determine.

Mr. LAPOINTE: Will my right hon. friend allow me a question?

Mr. DOHERTY: Yes.

Mr. LAPOINTE: Will he take responsibility for what is stated in the letter written by the Minister of Labour to the Montreal Gazette?

Mr. DOHERTY: I am just pointing out that for the opinions of the Minister of Labour upon those abstract questions I have no responsibility. I have a responsibility for the administrative actions of this Government, and in view of the explanation of the Prime Minister, what was done in this particular instance, nobody, I think, can question. There are doubtless many abstract questions upon which action is not called for on the part of this Government in connection with which I might not be in agreement with my friend the Minister of Labour, or, possibly, with some of my other colleagues. But there is no necessity that we should be in agreement. In a country of this kind there are many questions upon which the patriotic duty is to agree or disagree, to respect each one's liberty, to entertain the opinions he entertains, and, so long as he is within the law, and to act upon those opinions. As I have pointed out, no substantial difference of opinion is involved here. But it is not conducive to any good purpose to endeavour to bring about an agreement concerning certain matters when we all know that we shall not succeed in the effort. Let us learn, after all, to respect our respective opinions, to respect the liberties of each man to form his own opinions upon such questions as are involved here, to respect the right of each man to act conscientiously upon his own opinion within the law, and we shall get along a great deal better. I trust that the hon. member for Quebec East may have performed this valuable service: that he has caused it to be made perfectly clear that in the action that was taken there was no refusal to recognize the status of any organization because of the religious belief of its members. That is a good thing to have made clear. As regards the particular action that took place, and as regards the particular conference, I think it is equally clear that there is no room for criticism. And for the rest, may we not hope that after this debate we shall realize perhaps more fully than we did before the wisdom of recognizing the liberty of opinion to which I have referred and the liberty of action within the law upon the conscientious opinions which each one may hold.

Mr. LAPOINTE: I hope the Minister of Labour will accept that doctrine.

Hon. H. S. BELAND (Beauce): Mr. Speaker, with all due deference and respect to the right hon. Minister of Justice (Mr. Doherty), I must say that notwithstanding his explanation, I am no clearer upon this subject than I was at six o'clock. Having listened intently to the able speech of the member for Quebec East (Mr. Lapointe) I had come to the conclusion that a labour congress or conference was to be held in Canada under the auspices of the Minister of Labour (Mr. Robertson) in the month of May next, and that it was to be a general and universal labour congress or conference. If that is the case, the point made by the member for Quebec East is unassailable—that is, that all labour unions in Canada should have been invited to participate in that conference. Now comes the right hon. gentleman who leads the Government with the statement that the labour conference is going to be held as between employers and employees in one particular trade, the building trade. If that is true, I do not see the necessity of inviting the unions referred to this afternoon, though, as has been admitted by the Prime Minister himself, a large number of persons engaged in the building trades are members of the national so-called Catholic unions. Even if only one thousand out of the thirty-nine thousand members of the National Labour Union were connected with the building trades, they should be represented at that conference.

Mr. DOHERTY: If the hon. member will allow me, I think he has not fully grasped the statement of the Prime Minister. It was that this was to be a conference between a certain association of employers in the building trades and certain associations of workmen in the building trades, certain distinct bodies, not a general conference even of the entire building trades of the Dominion.

Mr. BELAND: Well, my understanding of the Prime Minister's statement is not quite the same as that of the Minister of Justice. If I followed the Prime Minister closely—and I think I did—the conference is to be between one particular association of employers and one particular association of employees in the same trade, with a view to establishing all over Canada industrial councils not only in the building trades, but in all the trades. If that is not the case, why should the Trades and Labour Congress of Canada be getting so busy over it? The inference is that this conference is to be a Canadian national labour conference, the object, plainly stated, being to establish in connection with all trades in Canada such industrial councils as have been already established as between employers and employees in the building trades. If that is so, what is the ground for refusing admission to that conference of certain labour unions which may not be international in their character? What can be the solid ground upon which to base a refusal to admit to the conference any labour union which has been organized and is operating in accordance with the laws of the country? I do not see any. I repeat that if the Prime Minister comes forward and says that at the request of one particular association of employers and an association of employees in the same line of trade he is asked to call a conference in Ottawa to discuss matters pertaining only to the two bodies concerned, that is a different matter. But I do not so understand it. I think the conference will be national in its character and universal in its object—the establishment of industrial councils in all the trades in Canada. If that be so, the minister and the Government are wrong in refusing admission to the unions that have asked to be allowed to participate in that conference.

Motion agreed to, and the House went into Committee of Supply, Mr. Boivin in the Chair:

Railways and Canals,—salaries, contingencies, $230,025.

Mr. FIELDING: May I suggest to the minister that, in view of the notice given by the Prime Minister as to an inquiry into railway matters in another form, it would be wise for my hon. friend to defer for a day or two these Estimates? I do not want to press the matter unduly; but in view of the general discussion likely to be raised on that motion, we may be duplicating our work by going into railway matters to-night. I quite realize, of course, that it was mentioned yesterday evening that Railway Estimates would be taken up to-day.

Hon. Mr. REID: The Prime Minister intended going on with Labour Estimates this evening, but unfortunately it is impossible for him to be present. I could take up Civil Government and a few other items to which there could not be much objection. Some members want to get information in connection with the Railway Estimates.

Mr. FIELDING: With the promise of an early adjournment, the minister might, perhaps, make some progress.

Mr. PARENT: What salaries are generally paid to agents at various stations on the line?

The CHAIRMAN: Before this question is answered and before any other questions of a like nature are asked, I think it only fair, in order that nobody may be called to order, to point out that when we reach the item providing the large amount for the administration of the Canadian National Railways, these questions and all other questions concerning the administration of the Canadian National Railways will be perfectly in order and may be asked, and there will be no desire whatever on the part of the Chair to restrict any such questions. As regards the outside service or the administration of the lines by a commission, the Chair must now rule that questions concerning these are not in order upon an item providing for Civil Government, which is merely the payment of employees in the department at Ottawa.

Hon. Mr. REID: With reference to civil government, during the last fiscal year we had 104 employees and the salaries paid totalled $208,204.91. During the coming fiscal year our staff will be reduced to 95, and the total amount that we ask for is $201,425.

Mr. CANNON: What offices have been abolished?

Hon. Mr. REID: On page 96 of the Estimates the details in regard to every officer in the department are shown. The hon. member will see, by the details, the offices that have been abolished, because they are not included in the 1921-22 list.

Mr. CANNON: Who decided to abolish all these offices?

Hon. Mr. REID: There are some positions that we have abolished on the recommendation of the deputy minister, which recommendation is approved by the Civil Service Commission. We had a staff under Mr. Monsarrat that were not further required when the Quebec bridge was completed, and we took them over and used them in connection with the railways. We have abolished four or five positions there. On page 96 the hon. member will see the title "Head statistical clerk." Some employees in the Statistical branch were taken over by the Department of Trade and Commerce.

Mr. CANNON: If Mr. Monsarrat was on the Quebec bridge, would he not belong to the Outside Service?

Hon. Mr. REID: Yes. We brought him here, and he was here in the department after the Quebec bridge was completed.

Mr. CANNON: I understand that these changes in the staff were decided upon the recommendation of the deputy minister as approved by the Civil Service Commission?

Hon. Mr. REID: Yes.

Mr. CANNON: That is, the Civil Service Commission is the body which decides whether the staff shall be increased or decreased, and not the minister or the deputy minister?

Hon. Mr. REID: The deputy recommends the decrease of the staff or the abolition of an office, and the Civil Service Commission must approve.

Mr. CANNON: That is as regards the Inside Service. The Outside Service is also under the control of the Civil Service Commission?

Hon. Mr. REID: In exactly the same way.

Mr. CANNON: And it is the duty of the management of the railways to look after the employees on the railways?

Hon. Mr. REID: When the Civil Service Act was passed by Parliament, railways were excepted in so far as the Civil Service Commission was concerned.

Mr. CANNON: If the minister has no control over the Inside Service of his department, no control over the Outside Service and no control over the employees of the different railways, why have we a minister at all?

Mr. LAPOINTE: What are the duties of the minister?

Mr. FIELDING: In view of the very large portion of the hon. gentleman's department which has been transferred to the Board of Directors at Toronto, there must be much less work to be
9 p.m. done in his department than formerly. This year and last year the reduction in the staff has not been very great, but there may have been in previous years a reduction to correspond with the decrease in the work. Has there been any decrease in the staff at Ottawa, having in view the large part of the business now transferred to Toronto?

Hon. Mr. REID: I cannot say that there has been much reduction. Prior to the Government railways passing to the management of the Canadian National Railway system, the details of the work in connection with the Government railways were largely done at Moncton, so that the work was merely transferred from Moncton to the Canadian National railway management, and the work has not decreased as regards the Railway Department. On account of the system being enlarged by the taking over of the Canadian Northern, there is more correspondence and more work.

Mr. LAPOINTE: I see that last year there were four senior clerk-stenographers, and that this year there are ten. On the other hand, there were fourteen clerk-stenographers last year, as compared with eight this year. By what process have so many clerk-stenographers become senior clerk-stenographers with an increase in salary?

Hon. Mr. REID: The increase is due to the reclassification by the Civil Service Commission.

Mr. LAPOINTE: I thuoght the reclassification was to reduce the salaries.

Hon. Mr. REID: It increased the salaries.

Mr. PARENT: What are the duties of the hydraulic engineer?

Hon. Mr. REID: He has to do all the engineering work in connection with the canals, the Welland and St. Lawrance canals, for instance.

Mr. PARENT: He has to do with water-powers?

Hon. Mr. REID: Yes, and work generally in connection with the canals.

Mr. PARENT: Has he anything to do with providing water for the locomotives and things of that sort?

Hon. Mr. REID: No.

Mr. DUFF: Would the minister explain why the chief engineer's salary has been raised from $6,000 to $8,000?

Hon. Mr. REID: That is a typographical error, and I intend to move to reduce that by $2,000.

Mr. LAPOINTE: I notice that there are three secretaries to executives. What are the functions of these gentlemen, and who are the executives in the Railway Department?

[Mr. Fielding.]

Hon. Mr. REID: The deputy minister has a secretary, and so has the chief engineer, and the comptroller. These positions were classified by the Civil Service Commission in that way.

Mr. CANNON: I see we are asked to vote the salary of a solicitor and counsel, and further down in the list I see "assistant solicitor." I am very much surprised that the department should have these officials, because I understood we had taken over the legal staff of no less than three railroads. I understand these staffs are still at work and, extraordinary to relate, some of them are fighting the Government, but nevertheless we are supposed to pay the cost. If we have all these legal gentlemen why should we retain a counsel in the department, or if the departmental counsel is a competent man, as I trust he is, why not dismiss the others? The time has come for strict economy. In former years my hon. friend the minister would come to Parliament, and, with his very pleasant ways, get his Estimates through without much difficulty, but this year I think even his genial smile will not allow him to get his Estimates through so easily in view of the serious railway situation confronting this country.

Furthermore, I do not think it is reasonable for the minister to try and screen himself behind the Civil Service Commission. Whenever any information is asked as to the salaries of any of these officials, the minister says: That was done by the Civil Service Commission. Now the minister is either responsible or irresponsible. If he is responsible, he is the man who should give us the information. If he is not responsible, he should not be there at all. I should like him to give us a full explanation concerning the legal staff of his department.

Hon. Mr. REID: We have in the department a solicitor and an assistant solicitor. Their time is occupied very largely in drawing up leases and contracts, and doing other work of that kind. There is a large amount of that work to be done in the department. Very important cases that have to go to court are referred to the Justice Department, after a brief has been prepared in our department. These important cases that go to court are not in charge of our own counsel. We have always had a solicitor in the department for the departmental work, and I can assure my hon. friend that there is sufficient to keep him busy all the time.

Mr. CANNON: These men in the department are drawing up leases?

Hon. Mr. REID: And agreements and contracts.

Mr. CANNON: I do not think the minister can seriously contend that a man with the title of head counsel for the department, and the assistant counsel, are occupied simply in drawing up leases. I know something about legal work and about leases. We do not need a head counsel to draw up leases because it is simply routine work. The minister mentioned a moment ago that most of the legal work of his department was referred to the Justice Department, and was done, apparently, by the officials of that department.

Mr. REID: Oh, no. I say that some cases are referred to the Department of Justice, which is the legal department for all the other departments of the Government.

Mr. CANNON: Then why refer these cases to the Department of Justice if they are handled by the Department of Railways and Canals?

Hon. Mr. REID: The brief is prepared by the solictor for our department, who understands the matter, but if it is a very important case it may be referred to the Justice Department, who will pass on it finally. If you have a legal gentleman doing that work, he is entitled to the title of solicitor.

Mr. CANNON: This gentleman does not do any work in court?

Hon. Mr. REID: He is there to assist the counsel that acts for the Government. He would prepare the brief.

Mr. CANNON: Where cases go before the court, the Justice Department selects the counsel?

Hon. Mr. REID: But our department counsel prepare the whole case, as well as assist the outside counsel in court. A number of cases arise from time to time that must go before the court.

Mr. CANNON: Then if the department solicitor does all that preparatory work, why does he not go to court and save the expense of engaging another man?

Hon. Mr. REID: The hon. gentleman knows that the counsel employed in cases that go before the Exchequer Court or the Supreme Court is usually a gentleman who has had experience in these courts. Generally these men command a large fee. The salary paid to our solicitor is $5,000. You would not expect a man drawing that salary to have the same experience as a counsel handling very important cases involving a large amount of money.

Mr. CANNON: If, according to the statement of the minister, the departmental counsel is not competent to appear in court—

Hon. Mr. REID: He does appear in court.

Mr. CANNON: But the minister said a moment ago that we had to retain outside counsel because his own counsel had not enough experience and was not competent to appear in court.

Hon. Mr. REID: What I said was that he appears as solicitor assisting the senior counsel in court.

Mr. McMASTER: I quite realize that no large business enterprise can be properly carried on without the assistance of lawyers. That is a self-evident proposition. But what I want to be clear upon is this: Does the Railway Board now operate the Intercolonial?

Hon. Mr. REID: Yes.

Mr. McMASTER: That being so, why should we have counsel engaged in railway matters in Ottawa and also a large staff of counsel in Toronto?

Mr. LAPOINTE: And in Montreal.

An hon. MEMBER: And in Quebec.

An hon. MEMBER: And in Moncton.

Mr. McMASTER: Yes, in Montreal, Quebec, and Moncton.

Mr. PARENT: And Toronto.

Mr. McMASTER: I said Toronto.

An hon. MEMBER: And Brome.

Mr. McMASTER: No, not in Brome. The people in Brome are so honest and fair and sensible that we do not have lawsuits with the railways. I want to know why it is that we should have a large staff in Toronto when there are counsel in Ottawa.

Hon. Mr. REID: There are many cases in connection with the Intercolonial that are yet to come before the courts; and it is only a short time ago since the Canadian Northern was taken over. Probably in the near future however, we shall be able to reduce the staff. There are a number of cases in connection with the Intercolonial on which the solicitor is busy all the time getting ready his briefs. Those cases are about to go to the Exchequer Court.

Mr. FOURNIER: The minister says that lawyers are preparing leases. Are not the right of way agent and the assistant right of way agent competent to do this work?

Hon. Mr. REID: They are not solicitors. We have a right of way lease agent who is employed to value properties, but he has nothing to do with drawing leases.

Mr. CANNON: I understood the minister to say that the principal work of the departmental counsel is the drawing up of such agreements.

Hon. Mr. REID: That is one of his duties.

Mr. CANNON: The minister said it was his main work. My own experience as a lawyer in my constituency and around Quebec is different. Whenever the Transcontinental railway expropriates land in the county of Dorchester, or in neighbouring constituencies through which it passes; the agreements and leases are not drawn up by departmental counsel, but by friends of the Government. I want to call the attention of the minister to the fact that some of the gentlemen who do this work are most dilatory. I do not know whether they get paid on the basis of the time they take to do the work of the department, but I know that, in certain cases of expropriation in my constituency, farmers who entered into agreements had to wait for months before they could get their money from the department. I do not think the minister can fairly make the statement that leases and agreements are drawn up by this gentleman to whom we pay $5,000 when I know, as a matter of fact, that in the city of Quebec friends of the Government are engaged to do the work. I am not blaming the Government for throwing work in the way of their friends; but whenever I have advised any of my people in Dorchester, or any people in Quebec, to enter into agreements, I have observed that the department has never made the mistake of sending them to a Liberal notary. They always happen to strike a good Tory. Now, why should we go to the expense of getting outside help when we pay this gentleman for drawing up leases? Are the leases drawn up in Ottawa, and sent to these Tory notaries in Quebec—and I suppose it is the same all over the province—

An hon. MEMBER: All over.

Mr. CANNON: —are they drawn up in Ottawa and sent to these men merely for the sake of giving them a little money? The hon. minister cannot afford to bestow these gifts on his friends. His department ought to be run strictly on economical principles, and if we are paying $5,000 to someone to draw leases he ought to do the work. The Government, I submit, should change the present system and save money; but if they do happen to take outside legal help, as they have done of late, the minister ought to see to it that whoever does the work does it expeditiously and with satisfaction to those concerned. At present there is no satisfaction. For example, there was an expropriation in my constituency at St. Malachie, where a sand pit was taken over by the Transcontinental. Representatives of the Government went there and made a certain agreement, and a notary from the neighbouring parish who belongs to my hon. friend's constituency of Bellechasse (Mr. Fournier), a Mr. McKenzie, was engaged. This man has kept the parties waiting months and months.

Mr. PARENT: Is he a census commissioner?

Mr. CANNON: Evidently the Government was so well satisfied with his work in this connection that they have appointed him census enumerator in the same constituency. He is one of the strongest Tories, and while I do not blame the Government for giving their friends some work, I think they should have the courage to get up in the House and admit it. This gentleman received the documents for examination and study and although they were in his hands for months he kept the farmers waiting for quite a while. Now, such a condition of things should be remedied, and if Tory notaries do not give satisfaction, then the minister should try others, even though they may be Liberals, provided that they do the work.

Mr. McMASTER: As they will.

Mr. LAPOINTE: And as Liberals always do.

Mr. MICHAUD: When the Government railways were directly under the control of the minister, although we had difficulty in getting cases against the railways settled, yet there was more satisfaction to be obtained than is possible now since the railways have been placed under the direction of a corporation. Before the railways were transferred from the direct control of the minister to this body, I must admit

we had some satisfaction, such as it was; but now there is no hope whatever for any man of small means to get a case settled against the railways. We have had considerable trouble along the Transcontinental railway for about a year now. It takes about three or four months to get any reply, and then a claim agent goes over the ground to ascertain whether the railway caused any damage or not, and finally the claimants are told: "No damage was done, and you may go ahead and sue if you want to." A great many people living along the railway line have not the means to sue the Government railways to recover their claims, and I promised some of my clients to bring the matter up before the minister, seeing that we have no other means of reaching the Railway Board than through the hon. gentleman himself.

Hon. Mr. REID: Mr. Alward was the solicitor in charge of that work on the Intercolonial and Trancontinental and he is in that position still.

Mr. CANNON: Well he ought to lose it.

Hon. Mr. REID: As far as my information goes he is a good man. If I remember rightly he is a good Liberal too, at least he came from New Brunswick—

Mr. DUFF: Possibly a Unionist.

Hon. Mr. REID: No, I think he was appointed by the late Mr. Emmerson and he is a good man. I understand he is still in the same position and doing good work. He has, I think, been moved to Montreal. He was brought into the department by the late Mr. Emmerson and was promoted to Moncton by the late Mr. Cochrane. I understand he has now been promoted from Moncton to Montreal.

Mr. LAPOINTE: I understand my hon. friend to say that this gentleman is a law officer of the department and that he has been transferred from Moncton to Montreal?

Hon. Mr. REID: Yes. I repeat, that as far as I know, Mr. Alward is a good man. I cannot understand why there should be so much delay when this work is all under the same officer.

Mr. MICHAUD: Is he living in Montreal?

Hon. Mr. REID: Yes he has been moved from Moncton.

Mr. MICHAUD: He is living rather far away from his field of operations.

Mr. CANNON: I endorse absolutely everything that has been said by my hon. friend from Madawaska (Mr. Michaud). In my own constituency merchants have merchandise sent to them over the Transcontinental railway. The Government for reasons not apparent to me have adopted a rather extraordinary way of running their railway through my county. They have stations, but in most cases no station agents, so that the freight is very often lost and consequently merchants are obliged to make claims to the railway. These claims have to be sent down to Moncton, at least that used to be the practice and from there they would be sent somewhere else. Very often we did not know where the claim was sent, but the Moncton people would say "We have received your claim and have sent it to the proper authorities to attend to." Weeks and months would elapse, very often over a year would intervene, and we would have no other news about the claim. That was the condition which existed up to very recently. I know, for I sent a claim to Moncton on behalf of one of my electors in Dorchester. That procedure is absolutely unbearable. If the minister were to say "Well, our staff is not sufficient, that is why we cannot give as good a service as we would like" the committee would, in a manner, understand; but all over the country—in every small centre as well as in every large centre—the Government employs a number of lawyers. Some lawyers are supposed to look after the Intercolonial railway, others are supposed to look after the Transcontinental railway, and still others are supposed to look after the Canadian Northern; the Government has so many lawyers that we really do not know to whom to apply. As an hon. member near me remarks, nearly every Conservative lawyer that we know of has something to do with the government railways in one form or another. I want to draw the minister's attention to another fact which has relation to this special item. A very great hardship for people—not only in my own district but, I think, all over the province—is that the special Order in Council which was to be passed to give legal existence to the famous corporation constituted to look after the whole system of Canadian railways has not yet been passed, if I am well informed. So that every railway which has been taken over by the Government has retained its separate and distinct entity—each is a separate and distinct organization. That is another conditions of things that ought to be changed. If I have a claim against the old

Quebec and Lake St. John railway, why should I have to see the officers of that company when the railway was taken over by the Government several years ago. And the Quebec and Lake St. John railway has a special lawyer in my city—I know him—and has other lawyers in the region through which the line passes. The same condition exists in connection with the Quebec and Saguenay railway, and with respect to every railway taken over by the Government. Why does not the Government resolve once for all, to run the national system on business lines? Why not group all these railways together and have one corporation? The minister has very often said in the House, "I cannot give information that is asked for because that information should be given by the corporation." But that corporation does not exist; it has no legal existence. For instance, what authority has Mr. Hanna to run the Canadian Northern railway? He has no authority from Parliament, and if Parliament did not give him authority, where could he get his authority from? There is no corporation created by law to enable Mr. Hanna and his associates to run the Canadian National railways. Every railway which has been taken over by the Government is still a separate organization. I do not think that is a business way of running things. It is no wonder we have deficits. In the matter of the legal department does the minister for one moment contend that it is a proper policy for the Government to retain all these lawyers acting for the different railways? In my own city, if we have a claim against the Intercolonial we have to go to one gentleman. If we have a claim against the Canadian Northern we have to go to another; and if we have a claim against the Transcontinental we have to go to a third. Is there any sense in that? Why not group all these railways together and have one or two lawyers in each large centre attending to railway matters, and not employ six or seven as is done now? There is absolutely no reason to have lawyers attached to the Department of Railways because the work is done by railway solicitors and not by these gentlemen. The minister mentioned Mr. Alward. I have not the pleasure of knowing that gentleman personally. I do not know whether he is responsible for the system existing at Moncton. If he is as efficient and competent as the minister has said he surely is not responsible, because from the way things were run at Moncton we could not get any satisfaction no matter how hard we tried; we would have to wait months for the settlement of claims for such small amounts as $15, $25 or $30. Sometimes over a year and a-half would elapse before repayment was made. I think the minister should give consideration to that special branch of his department because it needs plenty of reform.

Mr. ROBB: The hon. member has spoken of the loss of freight. I have had some experience with lost freight and overcharges in the case of different railways and I have never had to employ a lawyer to settle the claim. The railway companies generally have their claims agents and if the claim is good it is attended to. I think the minister might now make a statement as to whether there are claims on the national system of railways, and whether these claims agents are doing their duty. If every claims agent is doing his duty there should be no necessity for employing lawyers in such cases.

Hon. Mr. REID: The railways, of course, have their claims agents who go round settling these claims. There may be occasions when they might have to go to the courts, but as a rule these cases are all settled by freight claims agents. The hon. member was talking about some land expropriations and also—

Mr. CANNON: And even about freight claims of very small amounts.

Hon. Mr. REID: Those claims go to the agent appointed especially to settle them. The hon. member asked why we did not consolidate all these subsidiary railways. That is impossible. The Canadian Pacific railway keeps alive all its subsidiary companies and operates them separately, as it were; for instance, the Quebec Central and the Kingston and Pembroke. It is the same with the Canadian National system. The railway the hon. gentleman mentions is part of the Canadian Northern system, although it is called the Quebec and Lake St. John. If judgments were obtained against that subsidiary line the Canadian Northern would of course be responsible.

Mr. BELAND: Are there three boards of management, one for the Canadian Northern, one for the Intercolonial and one for the Transcontinental? I understand very well what the minister has stated regarding the Quebec Central railway, which is leased to the Canadian Pacific and is still administered by its own board. Are we to understand that for each of these Government railways there is a separate board?

Hon. Mr. REID: No. What I wished to convey was this. The Canadian Northern railway for instance has a board of directors, and for any subsidiary companies that form part of the Canadian Northern system the same board of directors is appointed. For the Intercolonial, the Transcontinental and the Hudson Bay railways of course there is no separate board of directors because they have always been owned by the Government. The hon. member will recollect that when the Bill was passed for the consolidating of the Canadian National system we excepted those three railways so that any bonds could be issued against them, The board of directors of the Canadian National system were appointed managers of those Government railways, and in that way they are treated as one system.

Mr. PARENT: Now that we have had the legal aspect of the situation, probably we can get some information about the engineers. Quite a number of them are mentioned on page 96. Among all those engineers I am wondering whether I could find some one responsible for what has happened in the yards of the Transcontinental railway near St. Foy facing the Quebec bridge. A couple of years ago an artesian well was sunk there at considerable expense. A year or so afterwards some one dropped a big piece of steel into that well, with the result that its usefulness has been destroyed and the money expended is a total loss. I wonder if any one of these engineers could remove that piece of steel.

Hon. Mr. REID: The engineers mentioned on page 96 are not connected with railway work at all. Those now in the Railways and Canals Department are employed on engineering work in connection with navigation and highways. The engineer who dealt with this well at Chaudiere, as the hon. member stated would be connected with the Intercolonial railway. The engineers referred to in the Estimates are in the Inside Service.

Mr. PARENT: Undoubtedly somebody must be responsible for the acts of other engineers even if they work in the Outside Service. If the mistake was made by some of the men working under these engineers, they should report to the department, and the minister ought to know what is happening.

Hon. Mr. REID: If the hon. member will give me some information I will make inquifies about the matter. I have not heard of it before.

Mr. PARENT: I did not think the minister understood my question. I did not talk about Chaudiere at all, which is on the Intercolonial railway. I was speaking of St. Foy right opposite Quebec bridge on the main line of the Transcontinental. This artesian well was built to give the people on that side of the river a water supply. It was destroyed because it was part of the Transcontinental line, and the engineer even went so far as to sink a piece of steel in the well. Surely some one is responsible for this destruction.

Hon. Mr. REID: I will make inquiries and get the information for my hon. friend.

Mr. PEDLOW: I find thre is included in this list an assistant purchasing agent, a junior purchasing agent and senior supplies clerk. It certainly would indicate to my mind that there is a senior purchasing agent in charge of this branch of the service. Is there such an officer?

Hon. Mr. REID: We had a purchasing agent for the whole system, a Mr. Lavoie. When the Government took over the railway systems Mr. Lavoie was transferred to Toronto, and this is really the junior clerk. The Civil Service Commission gave him that title. Our purchases are now being made through a purchasing commission, but the services of a clerk are necessary in the preparation of the requisitions, and so on.

Mr. PEDLOW: I find that there are two purchasing agents in the list, one at a salary of $2,520 and a junior purchasing agent at a salary of $1,925. Does it require two men to make out the requisitions for this department?

Hon. Mr. REID: It requires one man and another to assist him.

Mr. PEDLOW: Then the name "purchasing agent" as given by the firm who classified the Civil Service would seem to be a misnomer. These officials are simply clerks.

Hon. Mr. REID: They have to understand purchasing, the nature of goods, and so on, in order to be able to prepare the requisitions and do the necessary work connected with the obtaining of supplies.

Mr. PEDLOW: Then they are merely requisition clerks, not purchasing agents. They fill out the requisitions for the requirements of one particular part of the service and pass them on to a purchasing commission in Toronto. If they are really purchasing agents, a salary of $2,520 would

be altogether too small. I find that a file clerk in this department receives a salary of $2,400. The work of a file clerk is of a routine character, and does not require very much brain power, ability or experience, but a capable purchasing agent can scarcely be obtained for the amount named in this item, $2,520. That is why I direct attention to the matter.

Hon. Mr. REID: I agree with the hon. member that you could not get an expert purchasing agent for $2,520. But the duties of these officials are more of a clerical nature, although, as I say, they must understand the nature of the goods, the making of the requisitions, and so on.

Mr. FIELDING: Are the requisitions for the Canadian National Railways made out in the office at Ottawa?

Hon. Mr. REID: No, just for the canals now.

Mr. FIELDING: Then these two clerks do not requisition for the Canadian National railways?

Hon. Mr. REID: No, for the canals only.

Mr. PEDLOW: There is another item here with regard to which I would like some information. The Griffenhagen firm or whoever made the reclassification have apparently not been consistent in assigning salaries to employees doing to same work in different departments. In the Interior Department, for instance, junior file clerks receive $615, $630, $660, whereas in the Department of Railways employees doing the same work are paid $1,300. File clerks in the Interior Department receive $1,005, $1,080 and $1,170, whereas in the Railway Department they receive $1,300. In the Interior Department senior file clerks receive $2,240 and $2,160 whereas the head file clerk in the Railway Department receives $2,400. Has the Minister any explanation to offer of the difference which exists in these cases?

Hon. Mr. REID: It was the Civil Service Commission and the officials of the department who took this matter up and arranged the salaries of these employees, I had nothing to do with it. For each of these positions, however, there is a minimum and a maximum salary, and some officials may have been longer in the service than others, which would result in a difference in the salaries paid. It is the first time it has been brought to my attention that the head file clerk in the Railway Department receives a higher salary than an official doing the same work in the Department of the Interior. If the hon. member would like to get an explanation of the matter, it can be obtained from the Civil Service Commission, and I will make a note of it and, if he so desires, give him the information the next time the Railway Estimates come up.

Mr. PEDLOW: I appreciate the position that the minister finds himself in with regard to the question I asked and the impossibility of his giving a satisfactory answer to it. But does it not strike the minister that there is something wrong in the work done by the Civil Service Commission? That is to say, a file clerk in each department does similar work; there is not much difference in the quality of the work or the requirements for doing it. A file clerk merely files documents, and the same talent, the same ability, would be required to perform the same work in each department, so that the salary for that class of work should be the same throughout the departments. No doubt one of the reasons why there is so much unrest and dissatisfaction amongst the civil service at present is because employees in one department find employees who are doing the same work in another department getting double the salary. I call the attention of the minister to this point, and I think it would be worth while inquiring into it for the general good of the Civil Service at Ottawa.

I understand the Railway Department is not going ahead with much new construction work during the coming year owing to the financial condition of the country. Why, then, does the minister require the services of these solicitors, a right-of-way agent and an assistant right-of-way agent? The services of these men might be dispensed with temporarily, if the department is not proceeding with the construction of new roads.

Hon. Mr. REID: We have a great deal of work going on all the time in connection with the St. Lawrence canal, the Welland canal, and river work. There is plenty of work to keep these men going. When we were looking after the Intercolonial, we had a solicitor and his staff at Moncton doing work, but this work is entirely different from the work in connection with the canals.

Mr. ROBB: I want to draw to the attention of the minister a matter which will come up later under another item, but inasmuch as the minister has referred to the

fact that these engineers are mostly associated with the canals, I want to draw his attention to a matter of urgent importance. It is the case of the road around Hungry bay in the county of Beauharnois. The minister will remember an arrangement made between the Government and the county to maintain that road as a dyke, and the road was well maintained and kept in excellent shape until the outbreak of the war when we economised wherever we could. It appears that we have been economising to the extreme, because the reports that are coming to me now are that the road is breaking away into the muck and there is danger of the water washing through. Therefore, it is of urgent importance that the minister instruct his engineers to attend to this matter without delay.

Hon. Mr. REID: I will take the matter up with the engineers to-morrow morning and see whether we have not provided something for repairs, and when my Estimates are taken up again, I shall be able to let the hon. member know just what the condition is.

Mr. DUFF: I see the minister has four travelling auditors, two at $2,640 and two at $2,520 a year. As most of the work in connection with this department has been taken over by the Canadian National Railway Board at Toronto, there surely cannot be sufficient work to keep four travelling auditors busy in this department. The minister might explain why it is necessary to have these four gentlemen, and if his explanation is satisfactory, I will accept it.

Hon. Mr. REID: These auditors are employed largely now in connection with highway work. The provinces receive grants from the $20,000,000 that was voted for highways, and we do not pay any accounts until our auditors have gone over them very carefully and certified that the expenditures are correct. They are really kept busy all the time even with that work. The Railway Department has also to audit the sums of money passing through the department between the Finance Department and the Canadian Northern and the Grand Trunk, as well as other expenditures in connection with the Railway Department. These men are, therefore, kept very busy.

Mr. DUFF: Do I understand the minister to say that accounts in connection with the Railway Department are first audited by auditors of the Railway Department and then sent to the Auditor General's Department where they are again audited? As regards the amounts advanced to the provinces for highways, I understand that the department send these auditors to the provinces to do the work. If the Dominion makes a grant of money to the different provinces, the least the provinces might do would be to send the accounts to Ottawa for audit, instead of the Federal department having to send auditors to the different provinces to audit these accounts.

10 p.m.

Hon. Mr. REID: I hardly think that would be possible. The hon. member will see that the provincial officers would have to bring to Ottawa all their books, vouchers and everything else connected with the transaction, so that it would be much cheaper and much more satisfactory for our auditors to go, say to Toronto or Quebec, and examine the books. In fact, the provinces probably would not let these documents out of their hands; and when our auditors go to the provinces, they are able to get the explanations from the provincial officials who understand the accounts. I think that is really the only way in which the work could be done. As regards the other question, every account that passes through the Railway Department is audited by our officials before it goes to the Auditor General. Our auditors check up and audit all these accounts, and it saves a great deal of trouble to every one to have these men do the work.

Mr. DUFF: I understand there are two sets of auditors, those in the Department of Railways, and then the regular staff in the Auditor General's Department. I am satisfied with the explanation given by the minister. The minister, however, said that a good deal of the work of these auditors is in connection with grants by the Dominion Government for highways. These grants only commenced a few years ago. Are these four auditors new appointees, or have they been in the department for years, previously doing work in connection with the railways when the Government had full control of the Government railways?

Hon. Mr. REID: These men have been in the department for some years. When the Intercolonial was taken over by the management of the Canadian National Railway system, there was less work passing through the department, but the highway work came on at the same time and these men fell into that work.

Mr. CANNON: Under the new condition of things created since the taking over

of all these railways and the establishment of the Canadian National Board at Toronto, what is the quantity and character of the work actually done by the department as regards railways?

Hon. Mr. REID: We have a good deal of work to do. There is a great deal of correspondence in the department in connection with the railways and, of course, we have control of all the canal work as heretofore.. Then there is work in connection with the accounts passing through the Finance Department and the Railways Department. These matters must all be looked into, and there is considerable correspondence in connection with them.

Mr. CANNON: If I understand the Minister rightly, the work is mostly clerical.

Hon. Mr. REID: It is more than that.

Mr. CANNON: Am I to understand from the minister that all the accounts coming from the different railways are sent to his department, and afterwards forwarded by his department to the Finance Department?

Hon. Mr. REID: No, we send our men out to audit the accounts.

Mr. CANNON: Suppose the Canadian National Railways have spent $15,000,000 during a certain period. Has the Department of Railways, or have any of these officials whose salaries we are now voting, anything to do with that expenditure? Are returns made to the department? Do the department's auditors audit these accounts of the different railways?

Hon. Mr. REID: Parliament votes a certain sum of money, and the items for which the money is voted are given in the Estimates. The Department of Railways follows these items and sees that the money is expended as Parliament provided. That is the duty of our auditors.

Mr. CANNON: The railways, according to the system which has been established, run for twelve months. Now, either they have a surplus or a deficit, as has been the case ever since the railways were taken over by the Government, at the end of that time. The amount to cover that deficit is supplied by a vote of Parliament. Is the Department of Railways kept informed every week or every month of the amount that is expended in excess of the amount provided by Parliament? For instance, did the minister know three or four months after the opening of the year that the deficit on the railways was a certain amount, or was he kept in absolute ignorance until the end of the year?

Hon. Mr. REID: We know how the accounts stand from month to month. They are audited every month. The Finance Department will not pay out anything until they have received the certificate from the Department of Railways and Canals that the money has been expended by the railways in accordance with the vote. Our officers go to the head office, or wherever it is necessary for them to go to make the audit, and on their report the Finance Minister issues the cheque.

Mr. CANNON: Do I understand the minister to mean that the board in Toronto cannot expend any money without the minister authorizing that expenditure?

Hon. Mr. REID: They can expend all the earnings without any certificate from the Railway Department, but they cannot get any money from the Finance Department until they get a certificate from the Railway Department that the work is necessary. Then the money is provided as the work proceeds.

Mr. CANNON: If I understand the minister rightly, there is this distinction to be drawn. The board in Toronto has the right to expend all the receipts of the railways, but they cannot expend any money in excess of those receipts until the expenditure has been authorized by the Government.

Hon. Mr. REID: They have to get a certificate from the Railway Department.

Mr. CANNON: Then this year, with a deficit of $70,000,000, the minister authorized the expenditure of every cent of that $70,000,000?

Hon. Mr. REID: Of course, we must authorize it. If the receipts are not sufficient, our auditor must go out and audit the amount over and above the earnings before the board can get any money from the Finance Department.

Mr. CANNON: That is the money is expended and the accounts are audited afterwards? Am I to understand that there is no official in the Department of Railways, not even the minister himself, with any authority to control the expenditure, and that the only thing the Railway Department does is to send out its auditor

and then the Government pays to the railways whatever amount the auditor finds has been expended in excess of the receipts?

Hon. Mr. REID: That is right. None of the officials or the minister has anything to do with the expenditure. That is left entirely to the management.

Mr. CANNON: Suppose there was gross mismanagement. In the face of evidence of such mismanagement has the minister no authority, or has no official in his department authority, to stop that mismanagement? Can the board continue to squander the money without the minister being able to interfere?

Hon. Mr. REID: The hon. member must understand that if any case of mismanagement or wrong-doing is brought to the attention of the Government, we could put an end to the management at any time, but we have had nothing of that kind brought to our attention.

Mr. CANNON: Does the minister maintain that even though the returns this year show such an enormous deficit, and even though the accounts are audited by his officials every week or every month, whichever it is, there is nothing wrong with the management, and that he has never interfered with the Board? Am I to understand that he has never interfered on any occasion at all?

Hon. Mr. REID: I have not yet had brought to my attention any case of wrong-doing so far as the railways are concerned; neither have I had any case of mismanagement brought to my attention. The fact that there is a deficit of $70,000,000 does not mean that there has been any wrong-doing. If it did, then every manager of a railway in the United States should be dismissed, because their railways show deficits. A deficit does not imply wrong-doing or even mismanagement.

Mr. CANNON: I am not talking about wrong-doing; I simply used the word mismanagement. Does the minister say that though he observed this deficit piling up every month he never interfered? Did he think everything was all right all through the year?

Hon. Mr. REID: We have a board of management operating the Canadian National railways. They were placed in charge, and have been operating the railway. I have not in any way interfered with them. I feel that if the operation of the Canadian National railways is to be made a success, as I hope it will, there must be no interference by the Minister of Railways or any other member of the Government. That is the position I take.

Mr. CANNON: I do not say that I disagree with the minister, although I think his experience might be very useful even to the board. Perhaps the minister is really too modest when he says he should not interfere. Sometimes interference might be effective. If the management of the Canadian National railways is exclusively under the board, why have a minister of railways at all? Let the hon. gentleman be minister of canals, or of any other department, because it would be a pity for him to leave the Cabinet; but why have a minister of railways when he has absolutely nothing to do with our railways? And there is a personal consideration in the matter. I do not see why the hon. gentleman should shoulder the responsibility for our railway situation and be held accountable throughout Canada for present conditions if, in fact, he has nothing to do with them. Why should he persist in keeping this portfolio when he has no authority whatever? I think he should change the name of his department, and restrict his activities to the canals of the country; the blame for the railway situation should certainly not rest on his shoulders if he asures us that he has nothing to do with the railways. In any event, what has he to do? I think that is a fair question, and it calls for a fair answer. This is an important matter, and I will repeat the question: Why have we a minister of railways? The minister does not answer, but I should like him to justify his retention of the title "Minister of Railways." When am I to receive an answer to this question?

Mr. McCURDY: Next sitting of the House.

Mr. POWER: What are the duties of the Minister of Railways?

Hon. Mr. REID: I have explained that.

Mr. CANNON: The minister explained it by saying that most of the work done by his department consisted in correspondence. Well, I am sure that the hon. gentleman does not do the correspondence himself, and I think that the committee ought to be told exactly what the powers and duties of the Minister of Railways are. The hon. gentleman said plainly a moment ago that he had nothing to do with the railways, and has never interfered with their administration.

Then, if the Minister of Railways has nothing to do with railways, what on earth is he doing?

Some hon. MEMBERS: Question.

Mr. FIELDING: I do not wish to interrupt the minister if he is about to reply to the hon. member. If not, I want to ask another question. Returning to the matter of highways, the minister says he has a numerous list of engineers and others employed, because of service in connection with the highways. I take it for granted that it is understood the arrangements between the Dominion Government and the provinces are to continue for the present year?

Hon. Mr. REID: Yes. The hon. member will recall that the Act provided a period of five years; the arrangement is being carried on this year.

Mr. FIELDING: So far as the Dominion Government is concerned, it is intended to continue the same system?

Hon. Mr. REID: Yes; the agreements were and are being made. We must pay our forty per cent so long as the Provincial Governments continue the work.

Mr. CANNON: Will the minister answer my question?

Hon. Mr. REID: I do not wish to be discourteous, but I cannot give any other answer than I have already given.

Mr. CAHILL: No occupation.

Mr. POWER: Is the minister content to remain in well paid inactivity, as Mr. Winston Churchill says?

Mr. CAHILL: I want some light in regard to the directors. Do I understand that these men are directors of the Canadian Northern railway only?

Hon. Mr. REID: And of the subsidiary companies also.

Mr. CAHILL: But not of the Intercolonial, the Transcontinental, or the National railways?

Hon. Mr. REID: No, because they are not a corporate company. They are owned entirely by the Government. The direction of these roads is under the management of the Canadian National railways.

Mr. FIELDING: They are directors of the Canadian National Railways Company?

Hon. Mr. REID: No, of the Canadian Northern.

[Mr. Cannon.]

Mr. FIELDING: Are there no directors for the Canadian National Railway Company?

Hon. Mr. REID: That Bill has not yet been brought into effect.

Mr. FIELDING: There is no such company as the Canadian National Railway Company?

Hon. Mr. REID: That is only a descriptive title. We passed an Order in Council providing that the title "Canadian National Railways" should be used until we brought into force the Act passed two years ago.

Mr. FIELDING: I understand that the term "Canadian National Railways" is descriptive of—

Mr. McGIBBON (Argenteuil): Mr. Chairman, I have been attempting to speak pretty often and so far I have not succeeded in getting the floor. Now I am going to stand up until I get what information I want. I think it is about time that the Minister of Railways and Canals had a few minutes' rest.

Hon Mr. REID: Hear, hear.

Mr. McGIBBON: Now, I have not very many complaints to make; I made them before the Government bought these railways. I had the courage to get up and warn them what was coming. I told them it was going to be a knock-out blow to the country, but they did not believe me. I told them that it would involve a debt not only on the present generation, but on unborn generations, and my words are now proving pretty nearly true. Not only have we not got the debt approximately discharged, but generations to come will be shouldered with a great burden. We have two lines of the Canadian Northern running through my country, as well as a canal, and I think there are sufficient employees on those two railways and the canal to win the next general election for the Union Government.

Mr. DUFF: That is encouraging.

Mr. McGIBBON: They have been making improvements from time to time, and whenever any work is needed to be done a good old Tory gets the job. Two bridges were built in that constituency about ten years ago, and the engineers at that time said they were going to build structures that would be strong enough to stand for all time. Now what do we find? Last year these splendid bridges were pulled down

and clumsy, cumbersome things put in their place,—bridges that have no strength whatever. What farmer, if he had a waggon that was not strong enough for his purposes, would, instead of fixing the wheels and axles, make an enormous body that would carry millions of tons?

Some hon. MEMBERS: Oh, oh.

Mr. McGIBBON: Well, the comparison is not so far fetched after all, in view of the nature of these bridges. I say, what farmer would neglect the wheels and axles and build a disproportionate body for his waggon? That is just the case in connection with these bridges. They are tremendous structures capable of bearing a heavier weight than a passing train, but they are placed on weak abutments. I am not an engineer, but I have common sense, and, in my opinion at least, these bridges are not as strong as they were before. It provides work, and the people are employed from one end of the country to the other—they all get jobs. However, I do not know where the money is coming from. I think it would be well for the Minister of Railways with such a big expenditure going on in the county which I represent to take a run down there and size things up for himself. I would be satisfied with his judgment if he would say that this bridge was good for a number of years yet until we get out of debt. Leave it alone for the present; it will carry us all right. But we never find the minister going down there and looking into these things, he leaves matters to the managing committee that is putting the country to such expense from day to day until such a situation is reached that the chances are ten to one if we will ever get out of it.

Mr. CAHILL: I wish to ask the minister a question in connection with these directors. I understand that these gentlemen are directors of the Canadian Northern and its subsidiary companies—

The CHAIRMAN (Mr. Steele): There was a ruling given by the Chair earlier in the evening that a discussion of such matters is at present quite out of order.

Mr. CAHILL: Matters of what kind?

The CHAIRMAN: Any discussion relating to the item under consideration will of course be quite in order. The item relates to detail of civil government.

Mr. CAHILL: I understand that the Deputy Minister of Railways is a director of the Management Board—is that your understanding, Mr. Chairman?

Hon. Mr. REID: I might say that—

Mr. CAHILL: I was asking the Chairman for his ruling.

The CHAIRMAN: The ruling of the Chair was that discussion of any matters connected with the Outside Service of the railway was quite out of order. Only discussion upon matters pertaining to the vote we are now considering is relevant.

Mr. CAHILL: Am I to understand that discussion pertaining to outside matters is relevant?

The CHAIRMAN: If the hon. gentleman did not grasp what I said I will repeat it. I say that discussion of matters pertaining to the Outside Service is not in order.

Mr. CAHILL: Will the Chairman tell me whether the deputy minister would be regarded as belonging to the Outside or the Inside Service? I see that he is a member of the Board of Directors of the Canadian National Railways, and I would therefore like to know if he is to be regarded in the Outside or the Inside Service?

Hon. Mr. REID: I would have to explain that. The deputy minister's salary as such is included in the item under civil government. His position as a director comes under another item, but of course I am willing to give the hon. member any reasonable information he wants. I have no objection to enlarging the field and discussing this or any other item, but the Chairman has ruled that the discussion must be limited to the item we are now considering. If we pass this vote the next item will enable hon. members to talk upon the activities of any branch of the railway system.

Mr. CAHILL: What does the minister mean by the next item?

Hon. Mr. REID: I mean that upon the next item we will take up you could discuss any question in connection with the railways system. I am not raising any objection to the present discussion, except that I think perhaps it would be well to adhere to the ruling that has been given.

Mr. CAHILL: I am quite satisfied, Mr. Chairman, to abide by your ruling but I want you to carve the deputy minister and tell me just what portion of him belongs to the Outside Service and what portion to the Inside Service? Then I can follow your ruling and not render myself liable to be called to order. I have no desire

whatever to dispute your ruling; in fact, I wish to follow it. I now wish to know whether the deputy minister, and the other directors of the Canadian National system appoint the management for the Government railways, or whether they are appointed by the Minister of Railways?

Hon. Mr. REID: That is a question I will have to answer myself, and the Chairman can then give such ruling as the case seems to call for. The question has been asked whether the deputy minister comes under this item. He is paid a salary as deputy minister in the Inside Service and that is included in this item. Then as a director he gets a certain amount but that appears in another item altogether.

Mr. CANNON: He gets a certain amount beside his salary?

Hon. Mr. REID: Yes, besides his salary. In the item we are now considering, the amount the deputy minister receives as a director is not included. When we come to the next item hon. members may ask any question they please about the deputy minister or any other of the other directors.

Mr. CAHILL: With your permission, Mr. Chairman, I wish to know what the minister means by "another item." I did not have any idea that we were to go on with any of the Estimates of the Department of Railways to-night. In view of the explanation given by the Prime Minister that a committee was to be appointed to deal with the railways I understood the Miniser of Railways would take up only the items relating to Civil Government. I now ask if it is the intention of the minister to go on with any other item.

Hon. Mr. REID: What I meant was, that if we passed the item relating to Civil Government and proposed to take up another item I would not see any harm in doing so. Then hon. gentlemen could discuss any matters in connection with the operation of our railways. If we remain in committee on the items of Civil Government then the ruling of the Chair must be borne in mind. I am not urging that the next item should be passed if we do go on, but I would then be in a position to give the committee information that was asked for with respect to any item that might happen to be discussed.

Mr. CALDWELL: What is covered by the item "Sundries, $10,000?"

Hon. Mr. REID: My deputy tells me that aplies to incidental expenses in connection with the department. He is now getting the details and they will be available in a moment.

Mr. CANNON: While waiting for those details I would like to again refer to the matter of the salary of the deputy minister. The minister has informed us that the deputy minister is also a director of the Canadian National Railways. I do not think that this is good policy or that it is a all in consonance with the principles of good organization. We are asked to vote this gentleman a salary as deputy minister, and the same official will go to Toronto and sit on the Board of directors and be independent of his own boss. How can we reconcile the two positions? I do not wish to attack the deputy minister, I am sure that he is a good official, but I say that he cannot satisfactorily hold the two positions at the one time. Let him be Deputy Minister of Railways and draw his salary as such, or if he prefers to be a director of the Canadian National Railways let him be that; but he cannot be both. Earlier in the evening the minister explained that all moneys expended by the Canadian National Railways are checked up by the department. Naturally one of those who sees to the very close checking up of those accounts would be the deputy minister, and if on the one hand he is paid to protect his department, on the other hand he is paid also to go to Toronto to spend the department's money. I do not think this anomaly ought to continue any longer. I do not see the reason why Mr. Bell, after being appointed a director, remains deputy minister. I would like the minister to give the committee an explanation on this point and say whether the arrangement works out well. I do not see how it possibly can. How can the deputy minister, after attending to his departmental duties, go to Toronto and act as a director absolutely independent of his minister?

Hon. Mr. REID: The deputy minister gets the usual director's fees. The other directors receive $2,000 each, and there is no reason why he should not receive that amount as well. As I stated a few minutes ago, a large amount of money that is voted by this House on account of the National Railways must be certified to by the board of directors. I think it is a good idea to have an official of the department at the directors' meetings to see that the moneys are properly expended and give any explanations that are necessary.

Mr. CANNON: The moment the deputy head of the minister's department sits on the Board of Directors, and a decision is taken by that board in which the deputy minister concurs, the department is bound. If that decision is not in the best interests of the country how could the department move to have it changed if the deputy minister as director has concurred in it and has shared in the expenditure? The hon. minister had not considered that apparently when answering me a minute ago. To sum up my objection,—the deputy minister represents the department at the board; therefore the department is a party to all decisions taken; and if bad decisions are taken and money is expended which should not be expended, the department is bound by those decisions and cannot exercise a proper checking up of the expenditure.

Hon. Mr. REID: Of course, the hon. member knows that a decision of the board would be final any way, but the deputy minister being on the board would not agree unless they were carrying out exactly what was intended by Parliament. If by any chance that board should do something other than what Parliament had authorized, of course, the deputy minister would inform the minister of the Government on his return, and the mistake could be corrected. I think it is a great advantage to have him on the board.

Mr. CANNON: Has the deputy minister ever disagreed with the decisions of the board?

Hon. Mr. REID: If he disagreed the board would do what was right, because they would not want him to report and recommend the Government to take action. The board might innocently take some action not in accordance with what should be done, and having the deputy minister present he would be able to give them information and advice and see that what Parliament authorized was properly carried out. If he made a report that the board had passed some resolution not in accordance with what Parliament had authorized, I think that some action would be at once taken by the Government.

Mr. CANNON: I do not understand the minister very clearly. At first he told us that decisions taken by the board were final. If such is the case, how could the deputy minister have them changed?

Hon. Mr. REID: The hon. member knows that the actions of the Board of Directors are supposed to be final, and are final unless they are not in accordance with what Parliament has authorized. Now, I say that if the deputy minister reported next day that such irregular action had been taken, the Government would have power to remove the directors. I am satisfied that the presence of the deputy minister to give advice and point out the intention of Parliament is of great assistance to the directors, and I have no doubt they would follow his advice.

Mr. McMASTER: How often does the Board of Directors meet?

Hon. Mr. REID: The Board of Directors have a regular meeting once a month. Of course, they may have special meetings now and again.

Mr. McMASTER: During 1920 how many special meetings were held besides the regular meetings?

Hon. Mr. REID: I have not that information now, but I will get it.

Mr. McMASTER: Are regular minutes of the Board of Directors kept?

Hon. Mr. REID: Yes, by the Board of Directors in Toronto.

Mr. McMASTER: Will those minutes show the attendance of the directors at the meetings?

The CHAIRMAN: Order. The hon. member for Brome (Mr. McMaster) perhaps was not in the House when this item was first reached, and the ruling was given that anything relating to the Board of Directors of the Canadian National Railways could be properly asked only on the item providing the expenditure incurred by that board, which, I hope, will be reached during the evening. The discussion which was brought up by the hon. member for Dorchester was of course more relevant because it related to the position of the deputy minister upon that board, and for that reason was allowed.

Mr. McMASTER: I think it would be proper to ask the minister to ask the deputy minister how often the board met.

The CHAIRMAN: That question was allowed.

Hon. Mr. REID: I said to the hon. member that I did not have that information, but that I would have it at the next sitting.

Mr. CALDWELL: I asked the minister a question a while ago with regard to the item of sundries. We cannot hear very well

at this end of the chamber, and I did not catch his reply.

Hon. Mr. REID: The amount is for temporary assistants and various small items, typewriters and things of that kind—small supplies.

Mr. CALDWELL: There is another item here for $13,000 covering printing and stationery. It seems to me that $10,000 is a pretty large item for sundries. If a man included in his statement of election expenses an amount of $10,000 for sundries, his statement would be questioned. The item appears to me to be too large to be allowed to pass without our having some information as to what it is intended for.

Mr. CAHILL: Is there a gentleman named Hayter in the Department of Railways and Canals?

Hon. Mr. REID: He is in the Auditor General's Department. I think he is the official who has charge of the railway accounting in that department. He has never been paid as an official of the Railway Department.

Mr. CAHILL: Who is Mr. Cope? Is he in the Railway Department?

Hon. Mr. REID: When Mr. Bell was promoted to the position of deputy minister, Mr. Cope took his place as financial comptroller of the department.

Mr. CAHILL: At page W-234 of the Auditor General's report, volume 3, 1920, I find some correspondence on the subject of the audit. I find that Mr. Hayter asks for permission to audit the Canadian National accounts, and the correspondence apparently concludes with a letter from G. A. Bell to the effect that all the cheques, vouchers and other documents relative to expenditure made by the Government railway under vote number 96 will be supplied to any person having authority to call for them. I would like to know what "Government railway" means in that connection.

Hon. Mr. REID: The Intercolonial and the Transcontinental.

Mr. CAHILL: The letter refers first to the Canadian National railways and afterwards to the Government railways. It would seem to be misleading in that respect.

Hon. Mr. REID: It says:

> I have been advised by the treasurer of Canadian National Railways that all the cheques, vouchers and other documents relative to expenditure made by the Government railway—

And so on. The Intercolonial and the Transcontinental have been known as the Government railways.

Mr. CAHILL: Under what item do we find the appropriation for the salaries of the managers of the Canadian National Railways?

Hon. Mr. REID: Mr. Hanna and his staff are paid out of the total earnings of the whole system—that is, the several railways that go to make up the Canadian National Railway system. There is apportioned to each part of the system its share of these salaries.

Mr. CAHILL: That cannot be, because there is a separate company there, the Canadian Northern. They employ certain gentlemen and the minister, in turn, employs certain gentlemen for the purposes of management; in this case they happen to be the same persons. Where is the vote for the payment of these men? The expenditure must be submitted to the Auditor General, unless you are cutting corners.

Hon. Mr. REID: The salaries of Mr. Hanna and his officials do not appear in the Auditor General's report. The report laid on the table of the House gives the total revenue and the total expenditure of all these railways, but the details are not at hand just at the moment. However, I will give the information to the House when we come to the particular item concerned, and as it is asked for.

Mr. CAHILL: Well, it is being asked for now.

Hon. Mr. REID: It does not come under this item.

Mr. CAHILL: That may be so, but we are voting the salaries of Civil Government employees in connection with the management of the Government Railways. As I understand it, the Government railways stand in the same position as the Canadian National; they did not change their status in any particular. That is, they bear the same relation to the Government and the people of Canada as they did before, except that the minister employs the same management as he has for the Canadian Northern system.

Hon. Mr. REID: Mr. Hayes was the manager of the Intercolonial before the Canadian Northern was taken over, and the Transcontinental was under Mr.

Brady. Both these managers reported direct to the Government. They resigned these positions when the other railways were taken over and assumed other duties in connection with the Canadian National Railway system. Then we appointed the board of Directors of the Canadian Northern,—what we now call the Canadian National,—as managers also of the Intercolonial and the Transcontinental, and the management was therefore taken over entirely by these gentlemen. Of course, the salaries and expenses in connection with the Canadian Northern system,—what we call the Canadian National system,—are all paid at Toronto and the details kept there. Any information the hon. gentleman wants, I can give to the committee in connection with any of these expenditures. If the hon. gentleman lets me know a little time ahead what information he wants, I can have it ready for him when I am on my Estimates again; or when I am on my Estimates, if he lets me know the information he wants, I can get it for him.

Mr. CAHILL: The other night the minister seemed to be under a sort of eclipse and no information was available. I am delighted to hear him say to-night that he is going to give any information that may be required. He told us this evening that the Canadian National Railway Company, the Bill for which was forced through this House, was never brought into operation. Therefore, there is no such thing as the Canadian National Railway Company; it is not a company; it has no standing, and it is not in a position to hire people and pay them, because it has no funds. Therefore, the employees, the civil servants in connection with the Canadian Government Railways, must be paid by some person. If that does not appear in this item, I should like to know where it appears.

The CHAIRMAN: It appears in item 126, for a loan not exceeding $50,000,000, which may be used "to meet expenditures made or indebtedness incurred at any time by or on behalf of the Canadian Northern Railway Company, the Canadian National Railway Company, or any company comprised in the Canadian Northern Railway system." If the hon. member will also look at item 341, he will find an appropriation there of $7,000,000 towards any deficiency in receipts and revenues necessary to meet working expenditures on the Canadian Government railways. He will see that there are two separate items, and his question would, of course, be in order when those items come up.

Mr. CAHILL: The minister stated that there was no such thing as the Canadian National. The Canadian Northern is a different proposition. We have a Canadian Government railway.

The CHAIRMAN: I cannot answer for the minister; I can speak only for the Chair. The ruling of the Chair is that the question and the discussion in answer to the question put by the hon. member are out of order at this stage.

Mr. POWER: Some time ago, in answer to the hon. member for Dorchester (Mr. Cannon), the minister made it quite clear that it was no part of his functions to interfere in the management of the Government roads. He also wished the hon. member for Dorchester to state whether he referred to cases of dishonesty or fraud. Would the minister interfere if he had brought to his attention a case of fraud or malpractice on the part of an employee on the Canadian National railways in the discharge of his duty?

Hon. Mr. REID: Matters of that kind have been brought to my attention, and I have immediately brought them to the attention of the Board of Management and they have always taken action. I would be very much surprised if, when a case of that kind was brought to their attention, they should not take action.

Mr. POWER: I asked that because complaints have been made to me with reference to one such case in which the directors would not take action.

The CHAIRMAN: I certainly cannot allow the hon. member to go into that case on this item.

Mr. POWER: I am not going into it.

The CHAIRMAN: It will have to come up under item 126 or item 341.

Mr. POWER: I do not wish to offend the Chairman in any way, but I would ask him to call me out of order when I am out of order. I was not going into this matter; I was asking the minister if I could bring such cases to his attention.

The CHAIRMAN: I will say that the hon. gentleman is out of order in asking the question.

Mr. POWER: I am quite satisfied that the Chairman can call me out of order whenever he likes, and he knows that. But

I am asking when I might bring this matter to the attention of the minister, and I do not see that there is any occasion for heat on the part of the Chairman of the committee. I understand, in answer to some question by the member for Dorchester, the minister stated that a reason for a decrease in this item was that Mr. Monsarrat had left the employ of the Government. Who has replaced Mr. Monsarrat.

Hon. Mr. REID: We have abolished that position.

Mr. POWER: Who controls the Quebec bridge?

Hon. Mr. REID: The Board of Directors of the Canadian National Railways.

Mr. COPP: Has the minister a purchasing agent in the department at Ottawa?

Hon. Mr. REID: We have an agent here, but he does not make the purchases direct as was done heretofore. Mr. Lavoie used to make the purchases before the Intercolonial and the Transcontinental came under the Canadian National Railway system. Mr. Lavoie was removed to Toronto. We have at Ottawa one or two men who prepare requisitions and attend to arranging items, and then the Purchasing Commission makes the purchases.

Mr. COPP: I notice in this item there is so much for an assistant purchasing agent and so much for a junior purchasing agent, but nothing for a purchasing agent.

Hon. Mr. REID: I explained a little while ago that the Civil Service Commission gave those men those titles. They were employed here as assistants under Mr. Lavoie who had quite a little staff when he was in the department. We had to keep those officials in the department to carry out the work in connection with getting requisitions ready for the Purchasing Commission.

Mr. COPP: What work do the assistant purchasing agent and the junior purchasing agent do? Is it in connection with the Government at Ottawa or in connection with purchasing for Government railways generally?

Hon. Mr. REID: Only purchases in connection with the canals. They have nothing to do with the railways in any shape or form. The purchases for the Intercolonial, Transcontinental, Canadian Northern and all those systems is done through Mr. Lavoie, the purchasing agent at Toronto.

[Mr. Power.]

Mr. COPP: In purchasing for the canals, do the assistant and junior purchasing agents have full authority, or do they just report to the minister?

Hon. Mr. REID: They have no authority to purchase at all. The purchases are made now by the Purchasing Commission which purchases for the several departments of the Government.

Mr. COPP: Are they members of that commission?

Hon. Mr. REID: No.

Mr. COPP: What are they here for if they have nothing to do?

Hon. Mr. REID: They prepare specifications and requisitions. There is a good deal of work in connection with getting specifications and all that sort of thing ready before tenders are called.

Mr. COPP: I see an item in regard to four travelling auditors.

Hon. Mr. REID: I explained that a few minutes ago, but I do not object to giving the explanation again. These men have been in the department for some time. They have a great deal of work to do. They were there when we had the Intercolonial and Transcontinental, and since those roads have been handed over to the management, the highways work has been transferred to our department. All the expenditures in connection with that work made by the different provinces have to be checked up by our auditors. Then they have the canal work as well. We also have to send them to Toronto to audit the expenditures that have been voted by the House. So they are fully employed.

Mr. CAHILL: Since the department is no longer managing our railways, what is the object of retaining a right-of-way agent?

Hon. Mr. REID: He is busy all the time in connection with the canals. Then there is purchasing to be done in connection with other works. Leases, for instance, are being granted almost daily for properties along the canal. I may add that this man used to do work in connection with the Intercolonial. He is a splendid man, a first-class man, and for that reason we have loaned him to other departments, the Public Works Department, for instance.

Mr. CAHILL: I am not making any objections to the man at all. I do not know whether he is a first-class man or a third-class man, but I cannot understand why

we should be passing this item for the Department of Railways and Canals when there is really no work pertaining to the railways for this man to do. If his work pertains solely to the canals, why not say so, and let us dispense with this discussion when the Railway Estimates are being considered. I understood that these Estimates pertained to both the railways and canals, but apparently all these officials whose salaries we are voting are doing canal work only, since the Government have washed their hands of the railways. Is the deputy minister considered as the deputy minister of Canals here or as the deputy minister of railways?

Hon. Mr. REID: He is Deputy Minister of Railways and Canals.

Mr. CAHILL: What are his functions as Deputy Minister of Railways?

Hon. Mr. REID: He has a lot to do in connection with the items we are passing. We are voting very large expenditures in connection with the Canadian Northern and the Grand Trunk, and the deputy minister is responsible for the work in connection with these items.

Mr. CAHILL: That would be in his capacity as director of the Canadian National Railways?

Hon. Mr. REID: No, as deputy minister.

Mr. CAHILL: Why do we need a comptroller and a secretary and the rest of these gentlemen, now the railways have been transferred to the company?

Hon. Mr. REID: The comptroller has charge of the expenditure. There is a comptroller in every large spending department.

Mr. CANNON: I see there are three "secretaries to executive". Who is the executive?

Hon. Mr. REID: There are three secretaries, one for the deputy minister, one for the chief engineer, and one for the comptroller.

Mr. CANNON: And the minister also has a secretary?

Hon. Mr. REID: Oh, yes. The Civil Service Commission has given this title to the secretaries of the three officials I have mentioned.

Mr. CANNON: It seems extraordinary that the comptroller, for instance, should be designated an executive. I understood the executive of a department to be exclusively the head of the department.

Mr. CAHILL: What are the duties of the bridge and structural engineer?

Hon. Mr. REID: That was Mr. Montsarrat. When the Quebec bridge was completed, it was decided to keep Mr. Montsarrat on for a year or two, in order to see that that work was all right. We kept him on, and two or three other gentlemen, and that was the title he had. He retired from the department on March 31.

Mr. CAHILL: Has he been transferred to the company?

Hon. Mr. REID: No, he has gone into private practice.

Mr. DUFF: We are asked to vote $202,000 for salaries, and $28,000 for contingencies, for the Department of Railways and Canals. The salaries are to be paid to ninety-five officials. It seems to me that as they cannot have the work to do that they had before the railways were transferred to the so-called company with headquarters in Toronto, there should be a reduction in the staff, unless the minister can show the committee that there is as much work to do in the department now as there was four or five years ago. The country certainly cannot understand why there should be as many officials in the department now as there were before the railways were transferred. I can understand that the minister is not in a position to give me the information to-night, but I should like him to tell the committee when his Estimates are up again, how many officials were employed in connection with this item under Civil Government in 1914-15, or, say, the year before the railways were transferred to the company.

Hon. Mr. REID: I shall be very glad to get that information. I may say to the hon. member that we made a reduction in the staff last year. I might also say that the highways work has been transferred to the department, which means the addition of a few more officials, at least.

Mr. CAHILL: I see that the head statistical clerk has been eliminated from this year's vote. Is there a statistical branch in the department now?

Hon. Mr. REID: Mr. Payne was head statistical clerk, but he has been retired from the Government service.

Mr. CAHILL: Is there no statistical branch in the department of railways now? Is there no statistical branch available to the Canadian people in any department at the present time?

Hon. Mr. REID: Oh, yes. About one or two years ago a Bill was passed transferring the statistical work of all departments to the Department of Trade and Commerce, and providing that a report should be laid on the Table every year showing the statistics for each department. The Board of Railway Commissioners also keeps statistics.

Mr. CANNON: I see that there is an official here called a records searcher. Am I to understand that the records are lost in the department and that he is supposed to search after them?

Hon. Mr. REID: We have one man, Mr. Ross, who has been in the department many years doing this work of turning up records as they are wanted. A great many applications are made by the public for documents, and this gentleman, who has been engaged in this work for a long time, hunts them up.

Mr. CANNON: Would it not be better to call this official "Keeper of Records"? Was the present title given by the commission?

Hon. Mr. REID: Yes.

Mr. CANNON: I wish the minister would have more control over the commission.

Hon. Mr. REID: So do I; I should be glad to.

Mr. CANNON: Any man who looked at the list and saw that this gentleman was a record searcher would naturally be under the impression that records were lost for which he had to search. If he keeps records, let him be designated accordingly. I see that most of the titles ascribed by the Civil Service Commission are quite inappropriate. It would be better for the minister to have proper titles for his officials so that people might know exactly what they were doing.

Hon. Mr. REID: I agree with the hon. gentleman. I have not been entirely satisfied with some of the titles given by the Civil Service Commission, but they have power in the matter.

Mr. CAHILL: I should like some information in regard to Mr. H. Forman, who appears at page "234-W" of the Auditor General's Report.

[Mr J. D. Reid.]

Hon. Mr. REID: He is treasurer in Toronto. I will have information in regard to him when we come to the next item.

Mr. CALDWELL: The Minister of Railways has told us that he has no control over the Board of Directors. He has said on two or three different occasions that the deputy minister attends meetings of the Board of Directors, and may exercise certain control over their deliberations. Does the deputy act under the direction of the minister? If he does, we can establish the connection and show that the minister in an indirect way, through the deputy minister, has control over the Board of Directors.

Hon. Mr. REID: I must answer, "no."

Item agreed to.

Progress reported.

On the motion of Right Hon. Mr. Doherty for the adjournment of the House:

Mr. FIELDING: What will be the business to-morrow?

Mr. DOHERTY: We expect to take up the Estimates of the Department of Marine and Naval Affairs, and of Railways, and the motion for the appointment of a committee in connection with railway operations.

Mr. FIELDING: That is a motion of which we require longer notice. I will not press my objection at the moment, but it really requires two days' notice.

Mr. DOHERTY: If it is not ripe for action, it will not be taken up.

Motion agreed to and the House adjourned at 11.20 p.m.

Thursday, April 7, 1921

The House met at Three o'clock.

PRIVATE BILLS COMMITTEE

Mr. MICHAEL STEELE (South Perth) presented the report of the Select Standing Committee on Private Bills.

PAPERS TABLED

Return showing quotations of different classes of Grand Trunk Railway Company's stock in January 1918, etc.—Hon. Mr. Reid (Grenville).

QUESTIONS

(Questions answered orally are indicated by an asterisk.)

CANADIAN NATIONAL RAILWAYS—EMPLOYEES' REMUNERATION

Mr. MURPHY:

1. What rates are paid now as compared with 1916 on Canadian National Railways, per month, per day, or per hour, for the following classes of employees:—Engineers, Firemen, Conductors, Trainmen, Shop Mechanics, Carmen, Agents and Operators, Freight Shed Men, Trackmen, Bridge and Building Men?

2. Have there been any particular changes since 1916 in working conditions, such as length of working day, overtime regulations, etc., which further increased compensation over changes in rates, if so, what are such changes for each of the classes named in question number one?

3. What would be the comparative monthly compensation as between now and 1916 paid each to engineers, firemen, conductors, and trainmen (allowing average overtime conditions), in the following classes of service:—Through passenger run, Local passenger run, Through freight service, Local freight service.

4. What are the monthly earnings as compared with 1916 for the following classes of employees working full regular working hours:—Shop Mechanics, Carmen, Agents and Operators, Freight Shed Men, Trackmen, Bridge and Building Men?

5. What would be the monthly earnings of the classes of employees named in question 4 if required to work the same regular working hours as existed in 1916 at present rates as compared with the rates paid in 1916?

6. Do any of the classes of employees named in the foregoing questions receive any compensation or privileges in addition to their rates of pay, such as commissions, free or reduced rental, living accommodation, fuel, light, transportation, etc? If so, in a general way what are such concessions and what are they valued at in individual cases?

Hon. Mr. REID (Grenville): The answer is a very lengthy one and would take about half an hour to read. The subject, however, is a very important one and if possible I would like the information to appear in Hansard.

Mr. LEMIEUX: Dispense with the reading of it.

[NOTE.—The answer to the foregoing question is given as an appendix to this days Debates.

TORONTO POST OFFICE—PROMOTIONS

Mr. HOCKEN:

1. How many promotions have been made in the Toronto Post Office since February 1, 1921?

2. Under what authority were the promotions made?

3. What are the names of the persons so promoted?

Hon. Sir HENRY DRAYTON:

1. Two. There may be certain officers in the Toronto Post Office whose rating was improved under the reclassification but these cannot be regarded as promotions.

2. Under the authority of the Civil Service Commission.

3. Miss E. A. Robinson and H. Davis.

REV. N. TAPPERT

Mr. ARCHAMBAULT:

1. Did the Government of Canada, at any time during the past six years, pay compensation to the Rev. N. Tappert, an American citizen resident, some years ago, in the city of Kitchener, for injury suffered at the hands of a mob?

2. If so, what was the amount of said compensation?

3. If not, was any demand for compensation made, at what date and by whom?

Sir HENRY DRAYTON:

1. No.

2 and 3. Answered by No. 1.

S.S. CANADIAN BEAVER

Mr. SINCLAIR (Antigonish and Guysborough):

1. Did the steamer Canadian Beaver sail from Halifax for Barbados on or about March 28, 1921?

2. Is this steamer equipped for passengers? If so, for how many?

3. How many passengers did this vessel carry on the said trip?

4. What is her deadweight tonnage and how many tons of freight did she carry from Halifax on said trip?

Hon. C. C. BALLANTYNE:

1. The Customs reports indicate that the steamer Canadian Beaver cleared from Halifax for Barbados on or about March 26, 1921.

2. No.

3. The department has no information.

4. The deadweight tonnage of the vessel is 3,972½ tons. The department has no information as to the quantity of freight carried on the voyage referred to.

CANADIAN NATIONAL RAILWAYS—FOREMEN AND ENGINES

Hon. Mr. LEMIEUX:

1. How many road foremen of engines are at present employed by the Canadian National Railways?

2. What are the wages paid to said employees?

3. What are the duties of said employees?

Hon. Mr. REID (Grenville):

1. Officers formerly known as Road Foremen of Engines are now called Assistant Master Mechanics. There are 32 now employed on Canadian National railways.

2. Various rates from $250 to $325 per month.

3. Assistant Master Mechanics deal with mechanical matters on Superintendents'

Divisions to which they are assigned, including supervision of enginemen and shop staffs.

QUESTIONS PASSED AS ORDERS FOR RETURNS

Mr. REID (Mackenzie):

1. What is the total number of persons in the employ of the Dominion Government, including both the inside and outside services, but not including the Canadian National Railways?
2. How many persons are in the employ of the Canadian National Railways?

Mr. WRIGHT:

1. How many employees has the Government in the British Isles?
2. What is the number of departments maintained?
3. How many employees has the Government in the United States?
4. What is the number of departments maintained?

PROPOSED GRAIN INQUIRY

On the Orders of the Day:

Hon. T. A. CRERAR (Marquette): Before the Orders of the Day are called I would like to ask a question of the Government with reference to a despatch from the special correspondent of the Montreal Gazette, appearing in that paper I believe on Monday last, to the effect that the Government has decided upon a grain inquiry, and that the two commissioners in the said inquiry would be Judge Hyndman, of Edmonton, and Mr. Staples, one of the present Board of Grain Commissioners. I would like to ask the Prime Minister if that statement is correct?

Right Hon. ARTHUR MEIGHEN (Prime Minister): The Government has not appointed any person on the grain inquiry, nor has there been any Order put through for an inquiry under the Act. Requests have been made to see if certain parties would accept; beyond that nothing has been done.

Mr. CRERAR: I would further ask if the Government has decided upon such inquiry, and if so when it will be undertaken?

Mr. MEIGHEN: The Government's decisions in these matters are embodied in Orders in Council, as my hon. friend very well knows from his experience and from his undoubted intelligence, and when the Order is passed it will appear.

Mr. CRERAR: Not a very illuminating reply.

Mr. ARCHAMBAULT: Do you expect anything else?

[Hon. Mr. Reid.]

SUPPLY—RESOLUTION FOR ONE-SIXTH OF AMOUNT REQUIRED FOR NEXT FISCAL YEAR

On motion of Sir Henry Drayton (Minister of Finance) the House went into Committee of Supply, Mr. Boivin in the Chair.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON moved:

Resolved that a sum not exceeding $71,499,703.70, being one-sixth of the amount of each of the several items set forth in the main Estimates for the fiscal year ending March 31, 1922, and one-sixth of the amount of the item for a provisional bonus allowance for the Inside and Outside services of the Civil Service, set forth in the Supplementary Estimate for the fiscal year ending March 31, 1922, be granted to His Majesty for the fiscal year ending March 31, 1922.

Some Hon. MEMBERS: How much?

Mr. CHAIRMAN: It would perhaps be better for the Chairman to again repeat the motion. It is made by the hon. Minister of Finance for one-sixth of the entire Supply for the present year. Is it the pleasure of the committee to adopt the motion?

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: Mr. Chairman, I think very strong exception should be taken to acceding to the request of the Government. We on this side of the House have repeatedly pointed out that the only way in which the public can exercise its control over expenditures is to have ample opportunity of discussing the Estimates in detail before any part of them is voted. We wish to preserve the public in that right, particularly as the expenditures are mounting up as never before in the history of this country, the total Estimates for this year thus far presented being between $500,000,000 and $600,000,000. We have had very little opportunity of discussing these Estimates, many items of which are liable to be subjected to considerable criticism and, we hope, considerable reduction. Without giving the House full opportunity of considering all the Estimates, we contend that we should not be called upon to vote blindly one-sixth of the total amount as the Government is asking.

I would point out that at the conclusion of last session we drew the attention of the Government to the circumstance that in order to give Parliament the opportunity it should have to control public expenditures, it was desirable that Parliament should be called earlier in the new calender year, if not before the close of the year preceding, and we received assurances from members of the Government that such

would be done. The fact that Parliament was not called until the middle of February is no fault of hon. members, it is entirely the fault of the ministry. Under these circumstances, Mr. Chairman, standing on the broad principle of the right of the people to a full knowledge of what is to be done with the money which they are obliged to pay in the form of taxation, we must take strong exception to granting the portion of the Supply asked for and so depriving the House of the opportunity of discussing the items in detail.

But in taking this stand we have no desire in any way to embarrass or penalize the Civil Service because of any neglect on the part of the Government, we will be perfectly willing to consider any arrangement with a view of providing what may be necessary in the way of salaries both for the Inside and Outside Services. As respects other expenditures, however, we contend that except as agreed upon, this Parliament should have the full right of examining in the closest detail every item of the Estimates before voting any portion of them.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: Mr. Chairman, it is quite correct that the hon. leader of the Opposition (Mr. Mackenzie King) did draw the attention of the Government to the advisability of having the business brought down at an earlier date, and I think it has been. It is quite true that he also, during last session, took exception to the practice of voting interim Supply. His objections are objections which apply to a principle that has obtained for many years, and I am very much afraid that, apart altogether from what we might like to do, the exigencies of parliamentary government mean that this principle of interim Supply is something which we will have to continue. It is not a new principle that is being now attacked, nor is it a principle which is confined to Canada. It is something which has to be done in every country where parliamentary government is carried on and the public moneys are dependent upon the votes of deliberative associations or parliaments.

In view of the objection raised by my hon friend on the matter of principle, I have taken the trouble to look up one or two precedents to see just exactly what this principle is and what it is founded upon. I will read in the first instance from "Procedure in the British House of Commons," by Redlich, a leading authority. This is what he says:

There is no need here to add anything to what has already been said about the former (Supplementary Estimates), but it is necessary to study a little more closely the mode in which the House of Commons provides for current necessities before the final Estimates are adopted. The peculiarity consists in the fact that a grant on account, a temporary provision for national financial administration, has been converted into a necessary organic part of the year's finance. As the financial year closes on the 31st March, and Parliament does not receive the Estimates until about the beginning of the same month, it is absolutely impossible for the year's Supply to be granted before the year begins. Moreover, the traditional arrangement of parliamentary business makes the extension of the debate on Supply over the whole length of the session, or at all events over the greater part of it, an indispensable necessity of political tactics and parliamentary management. On the other hand, the Government must have money by the first of April, and can only get it from Parliament. The annual provision required is not made, as in most Continental countries, by giving temporary authority to levy taxes and incur expenses on the same footing as in the old year, nor is there a grant of an aliquot part of the estimated total as in the case of the twelfths of the French budget. The method adopted brings out clearly the financial supremacy of the House of Commons which grants votes on account, advances on the basis of the Estimates laid before the House.

At one time, Mr. Chairman, we had not as much difficulty in connection with interim Supply as we have had of recent years. When our fiscal year ended on June 30, as there was that much longer time greater progress could be made with the Estimates. But even under the old regime—and I have not thought it necessary to go back more than a certain number of years—when the fiscal year ended on June 30, I find that in the session of 1899 interim Supply was passed in connection with the following dates: Parliament opened on March 16, closed on August 11; main Estimates were tabled on April 24—over a month after Parliament opened—and the interim Supply was voted on July 5. Then again, in 1903, we had an interim vote of one-fifth and the dates were: Parliament opened on March 12, closed October 24; main Estimates tabled March 16, interim Supply voted on July 8. In the following year, 1904, there was an interim Supply Bill. Then the fiscal year is changed, and the change becomes effective in the year 1906-07. In 1907 the interim Supply Bill was for one-fifth. In 1908 there were two interim Supply Bills, the first for one-eighth and the second for one-eighth. In 1909 the interim Supply voted was one-fourth; in 1910, one-fourth. In 1911 there were two, the first—

Mr. CANNON: May I ask the minister where this resolution is to be found on the Order Paper?

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: It is not on the Order Paper. The resolution is brought up in the ordinary way in committee, notice having been given the night before last.

Mr. CANNON: I understand that the minister is now introducing a resolution upon which a Bill is to be based.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: This is in Supply. It is a motion for interim Supply.

Mr. CANNON: It will be a Bill for interim Supply?

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: A motion for interim Supply, on which, of course, a Bill will subsequently be founded, just as a bill is subsequently founded on the main motion for Supply.

Mr. CANNON: Then I rise to a point of order. If a bill for interim Supply is to be based on the resolution, I submit that the resolution should have been preceded by notice. There has been no notice of the resolution; it is not on the Order Paper, and I submit that any discussion of it at this stage is not in order.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: Unless I am entirely wrong, the hon. member will find that notice of a motion of this kind has never been given. Notice is not given of motions made in Committee of Supply; they all come under the general motion with reference to Supply.

Mr. CANNON: There is a distinction to be made. To-day the Speaker left the Chair without motion and we automatically went into Supply; if we had taken up the Estimates of one special department the minister at the head of that department could have introduced a resolution and no notice would have been necessary. But this is altogether different. The minister in introducing a resolution now is laying the foundation for a money Bill, and such a resolution should be preceded by notice. We have had no notice and I submit that the procedure followed by the minister is altogether irregular and that the committee at this stage cannot consider the resolution. This is a resolution preceding an interim money Bill; it is not the ordinary going into Supply to consider the Estimates of one particular department.

The CHAIRMAN: Does any other hon. gentleman desire to speak to the point of order before a decision is given?

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: I should like to say, Mr. Chairman, that I have been unable to find any cases in which such notice has been given as the hon. gentleman suggests. The practice followed is the practice indicated by the law officers of the Crown as being the correct one.

The CHAIRMAN: The point of order, as I understand it, which has been raised by the hon. member for Dorchester (Mr Cannon) is that as the House to-day went automatically into Committee of Supply and we are not considering the Estimates of any particular department, this resolution should have been preceded by notice. There is nothing in the rules of the House, nothing in the procedure and in the precedents reported by different authors on the subject, which in any way indicates that a resolution for interim Supply—in other words, a vote on account—must be preceded by a notice of motion of any kind. The Estimates were submitted to Parliament with a message from the Governor General; they were referred to the Committee of Supply and the entire Estimates are before that committee to be dealt with as the committee may see fit. If the Committee of Supply desires to vote at one time ont-fifth or one-sixth of the total amount, the committee certainly has that right. Therefore, so far as the question of notice is concerned, no notice is required, and I would so rule. The hon. member for Dorchester did, however, draw attention to the fact that to-day the Speaker—

Mr. MEIGHEN: I did not hear the hon. member raise the other point to which you are now proceeding, Mr. Chairman, as to this being Thursday; I would like to have spoken to it. I feel that a reading of the rule would make it clear that it was not intended to apply to prevent a motion for interim Supply being made on Thursday.

Mr. FIELDING: Why?

Mr. MEIGHEN: I will give the reason in a moment. If the Chair held that that was the rule, I do not know that the Government would be at any disadvantage, because if it is the meaning of the rule that we cannot take a general vote on a fraction of Supply on Thursday or Friday unless all departments have been in Supply previously, then necessarily if we were to move a motion for interim Supply on Tuesday, on Thursdays and Fridays, after that we could go on with anything. It would work both ways, and I think that was never intended.

Mr. FIELDING: I shall not deal now with the general question of notice; I shall, if I am permitted, deal with that a moment later. Under the rules—rules, by

the way, for which I do not think we on this side are particularly responsible, but rules which in its judgment the House at the time of their adoption deemed wise—the House may go into Supply on Thursday and Friday without any delay, without any debate. But there is a condition attached—that you cannot take up in the Committee on those days the Estimates of any department which have not previously been under consideration. Now, there are a number of departments the Estimates of which have not yet been under consideration. I think I am correct in saying that, though I know the right hon. gentleman would endeavour to get around the rule by taking an odd item here and there and in that way bringing in all the departments. Now, if we could not under that rule take up a given item in any one of these departments whose Estimates have not previously been considered, I do not see how we can take them all in bulk. It seems to me that a motion of this kind can only be adopted by general consent or agreement.

Mr. MEIGHEN: I simply want to emphasize again the fact that if that view is held, it necessarily follows that on Thursday and Friday we can go into Supply on any department at all.

Mr. FIELDING: We will argue that when it occurs.

Mr. MEIGHEN: There is no question at all that that follows; that there is no escape from it. I do not think that would be fair to the House, though it certainly would be a great advantage to the Government.

The CHAIRMAN: As this further point has now been discussed by the right hon. Prime Minister (Mr. Meighen) and by the hon. member for Shelburne and Queen's (Mr. Fielding), I must point out that Rule 17c states, in part:

> On Thursdays and Fridays. . . . Mr. Speaker shall leave the Chair without putting any question, provided that, except by the consent of the House, the Estimates of each department shall be first taken up on a day other than Thurday or Friday.

There are in the Estimates which are now being considered in the interim Supply vote the Estimates of all departments, and the hon. member for Shelburne and Queen's has pointed out that the Estimates of a number of those departments have not yet been considered. For that reason, they cannot be considered on a Thursday or a Friday without the unanimous consent of this committee and the Chair is obliged to so rule.

If the committee desires the Chairman to continue the ruling and decide the question of what may happen later—

Mr. FIELDING: I submit that the Chairman ought not to be asked to decide now what he will do next week. I do not desire to take technical grounds of objection. I would like to assist the Minister of Finance (Sir Henry Drayton) if I could in this matter, because I know from experience the embarrassments suffered on occasions of this kind. The real difficulty is, of course, that the Government—and perhaps other governments have done likewise—have been slow in summoning Parliament. Parliament should be called early, and the idea of Parliament being summoned to meet early in February and expected to get a Supply Bill through before the end of March, is unreasonable. I have no doubt, however, my hon. friend can cite previous cases where Parliament has not been called early. We all want to see that members of the Civil Service at Ottawa—and I would not confine this to Ottawa; wherever there is a wage earner in the employ of the Government—should receive their salaries. Because they are not usually rich men. I think a reasonable view of the matter would be that the hon. gentleman should ask by common consent of the House—and I do not want to oppose him—for a vote on account, with the condition that it will be applied only to wages, salaries and things of that sort. Let me state my reasons for taking this ground. As an illustration, suppose there are large sums which have been appropriated for the railways, concerning which there is much contention, and let us suppose that we on this side have good grounds for opposing any one of those appropriations. We desire an opportunity to discuss them, to divide the House upon them—I am only supposing; —we may be wrong, but that is our right, and we ought not to have any interference with our right. Here we are, going to make a vote of those very appropriations to which, perhaps, we are opposed in toto. That is not reasonable, and I would suggest to the hon. gentleman that he might get over this difficulty by agreeing, either now or at a later stage, that the Supply for which he is asking now should be applied only to salaries, wages and purposes of that kind. That would be a fair proposal.

My hon. friend is sometimes sensitive—I will not say unduly sensitive—in the matter of notice. This is a matter of which we have had substantially no notice at all. Last night when we asked about the busi-

ness of to-day, we had no intimation given to the House that this matter was to come up, although it appears that some mention was made of it on a previous occasion. It does not appear on the Order Paper, nor on the Votes and Proceedings. I do not take the technical objection that it is not on the Order Paper, but I do not know of a motion of this kind having ever been brought up before without a previous understanding with the leader of the Opposition. I do not say that that is necessary; but I speak from experience, and I am quite sure I am correct when I say that, in all my experience, no motion of this kind was ever before made without a previous understanding between the Minister of Finance and the leader of the Opposition. No mention of this matter was made last night when we asked about the business of the day, although we may be told that some mention was made of it the other day and we can find it if we look at Hansard. I do not, however, wish to take a technical objection; my desire is to assist the Minister of Finance, and my suggestion, which I make entirely for myself, is that we agree to give the Government this Supply with the distinct understanding that it shall apply only to salaries, wages and urgent matters of that kind.

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: I have had a good deal of experience in matters of this kind, both in Opposition and while a member of the Government. It is perfectly obvious that you can get a vote on account only by consent, because on every item with respect to a vote on account, you could take up just as much time as you could in passing the entire Estimates. Therefore, it goes without saying that this must be by consent. The point to which the hon. member for Shelburne and Queen's (Mr. Fielding has called attention is one that has arisen in the past, and it has always been met by this understanding—in numerous cases in my experience, both while in Opposition and while a member of the Government—on the part of the Government of the day, that any vote on account of any particular item shall not in the least prejudice the right of the Opposition to attack that item and to move for its reduction or its total removal from the Estimates.

Mr. FIELDING: In the meantime, it might have been spent.

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: Only a very small fraction. At all events, whether the method to which I have alluded is right or wrong, it is one that has always been pursued in the past. It is quite correct, as the hon. member for Shelburne and Queen's has said, that there is a conference in these matters between the leader of the Government and the leader of the Opposition, and I gathered that there had been a conference with regard to the matter in this particular instance.

Mr. FIELDING: I understand, not.

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: If that is not the case, my hon. friends have the matter before them now, and if they desire that there shall be a further delay until a further conference or a conference takes place, that course should be pursued in such an instance. I should like to say that I myself tried once, in Opposition, under what I thought were somewhat serious circumstances, the policy of refusing any vote on account, and before ten days were over, I got very tired of my position, because I heard, I think, from every province and from nearly every community in Canada on the subject. I should be very sorry to see the policy, which has been followed in the past, permitting a vote on account in the public interest and for the public service, to be abondoned in this Parliament for the first time.

Mr. LEMIEUX: It is always a pleasure to listen to the right hon. gentleman, and I wish we would hear him speak more often. He has just reminded the House that he has done some little obstruction in the past. In one instance he succeeded, unfortunately, and as a result he is somewhat responsible for the state in which the country is to-day. I wish to tell my right hon. friend and the leader of the Government (Mr. Meighen that no one on this side, during the great crisis through which the country is passing, is desirous of obstructing the country's business; but the country has a right to expect that the affairs of this House shall be conducted in the old traditional way. What is the principal function of this House, if it is not the control of the expenditure of public moneys? It is the traditional function of Parliament to control the expenditure of public moneys. We are to-day passing through the most serious financial crisis through which this country has ever experienced, and we are asked to rush this interim Supply on account without any scrutiny. We have to face huge deficits, and the amounts asked in the Estimates are beyond the means of the Canadian people un-

less we resort to extreme taxation measures. Yet, the right hon. gentleman (Sir Robert Borden) comes with a smile and pleads and says: "I have tried obstruction on similar lines in the old days; I have not succeeded. People soon began clamouring for the money." My hon. friend will not hear to-day from the country what he says he heard ten of fifteen years ago about expenditure. Then the people were willing to spend money; they knew the country was rich, but this is not the mood of the Canadian people to-day. They want to see reduction in military expenditures, reduction on the merchant marine and on the naval programme; reduction in expenditure on the Mounted Police. I repeat again: I do not care to resort to obstruction. This is not a time to play politics.

Some hon. MEMBERS: Oh, oh.

Mr. LEMIEUX: If the Tories are willing to play politics, the Liberals and the Progressives are not. Further, I would like to make this statement: In view of the deficit of $70,000,000 which was proclaimed throughout the whole country the other day by the Minister of Railways and Canals, some one in this House should have the courage to demand that that deficit shall not be met by additional taxation, but by a reduction in the Estimates. In view of the financial situation in which the country finds itself to-day, that is the only way in which that deficit ought to be met. I, for one, am not afraid of what may be said in the back concessions about the expenditure of public moneys. I am listening to the voice of my conscience.

Some hon. MEMBERS: Oh, oh.

Mr. LEMIEUX: Who is the man that has not a conscience? Mr. Chairman, I will have the courage to back up my words, and I shall await the verdict of the House. If not I personally, some on in authority on this side of the House will propose a serious cut in the expenditure this year. I am ready to reduce the amount provided in the Estimates by at least $50,000,000. We are asked to vote one-sixth of the total Estimates and I understand from the right hon. gentleman (Mr. Meighen) that there will be no expenditure on items which might be considered contentious. I accept his word, as I would the word of the Minister of Finance (Sir Henry Drayton), but I say that this is not the proper way to conduct the public business. Let us get back to normal. We have lost our bearings for the last six years. We have been rolling in millions since the war, and the right hon. the member for King's (Sir Robert Borden) is largely responsible for the reckless expenditure of public moneys during the war. It is well to-day that he should help by his advice and by his presence the unfortunate heir to the legacy which he has left to the country. I say, let us return to the normal, and I am here only repeating what several hon. members who are supporters of the Government and what the people at large are saying. It is time we should get back to a common-sense basis in this country. We have been spending too recklessly. Surely, it is time to stop. My hon. friend the Minister of Marine and Fisheries, who was elected chiefly because he was a business man, has practically lost all his reputation in that respect since he joined the Government. Once more, let us get back to normal. Let us live no longer in a fool's paradise. The trouble to-day, Mr. Chairman, is that we do not control the expenditure; we do not scrutinize in detail the items in the Estimates, but pass them holus-bolus. In a few days the Budget, I suppose, will be delivered, and after some weeks' discussion we shall have reached the dog-days and every member will be anxious to get home. Then the people of this country will be burdened once more with a bill of expenditure which can only be met by more taxation. Mr. Chairman, I protest against that mode of procedure. I say, let the Committee of Supply of this House of Commons get back to its traditional function of scrutinizing every item, and reducing the expenditure where that is necessary. Then hon. gentleman opposite may come and ask us to pass certain non-contentious votes, if they be such that the House of Commons will agree to them. But as a representative of the people, and as a taxpayer, I protest against the high-handed procedure which the present motion, if carried, will occasion.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: I must thank the right hon. member for King's, the ex-Prime Minister (Sir Robert Borden) for reminding the House and indeed the Prime Minister himself, that courtesy and conference should be a part of the proceedings of this House. Let me say in reference to what my right hon. friend has said that I have always understood that in matters of interim Supply there would be something in the nature of a conference between the leader of the Government and the leader of the Opposition before anything of the kind was sprung upon the House. In the present case, no conference of any kind has taken place between the right hon. the Prime

Minister (Mr. Meighen) and myself, or between the hon. the Minister of Finance (Sir Henry Drayton) and myself. The motion this afternoon is the first intimation I have had of any intention on the part of the Government to bring up to-day an interim Supply vote.

In order that the House may fully appreciate the significance of the action of hon. gentlemen opposite in attempting to rush this matter through, may I direct the attention of hon. members to the fact that the amount we are asked to vote now, if one-sixth of the Supply as set out in the Estimates, is little less than $100,000,000. We came into this House without the slightest warning one way or the other that we should be asked to vote $100,000,000 and we are told by hon. gentlemen opposite that by virtue of the force of their majority they intend to rush that amount through this Parliament without affording any opportunity whatever for consideration of the expenditures involved thereby. If my right hon. friend is going to rely upon might as his means and method of carrying on the business of this Parliament he may do so, but I tell him that all such methods of might are Prussian methods. I propose that we on this side of the House shall take our stand in accord with British methods—

Some hon. MEMBERS: Oh, oh.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: Hon. gentlemen opposite do not seem to appreciate what is meant by the word British. I wish to tell them that wherever there has been a Parliament carried on in accordance with British traditions, it has stood for the rights of the people in protecting them against extravagant expenditure on the part of the Government. It has stood for the rights of the people's representatives in Parliament to control public expenditure and the public purse, and that right has always been exercised in Committee of Supply by allowing the freest latitude to hon. members to discuss every single item in the Estimates before the money with respect thereto is appropriated by Parliament. There are only two methods of conducting public business: one is the method of relying upon reason, upon discussion, upon conference; the other is the method of relying upon might, upon force. There is no other alternative. Hon. gentlemen opposite have not even attempted the first method. They have not even accorded us an opportunity of considering whether the particular vote they are asking Parliament to accede to to-day should or should not be granted, either in whole or in part. I say, Mr. Chairman we on this side of the House will not consent to vote any $100,000,000 by virtue of the force of the majority which the Government has behind them. We will expect at least something in the nature of a conference between the two sides, or there will be no acceptance of the proposal to vote any such amount.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: I would like to join with my hon. friend in what he says as to the exercise of courtesy in this chamber. I would like to see some at least of our important business discussed without perhaps quite as much heat, and perhaps a little more fairly. There is no doubt about one thing, and that is that we should give proper notice, but I had understood that the hon. gentleman had absolutely refused to have anything to do with interim Supply. I may be wrong, but unless my ears are very far from being perless my eyes are very far from being perfect, he solemnly declared in this House this very session that there would be no interim Supply. So under the circumstances I did not know of any other way of bringing up the matter than the one in which it has now been brought up. But I want to say this: if, notwithstanding my hon. friend's declaration of weeks ago, he is not to-day willing to discuss this question, I certainly do not want to take him by surprise, and I would be willing to have the matter stand. But before it does stand I think we ought to understand a little more clearly just where we are and what we are at.

In the first place, I wonder if we can get away from dealing in extravagant statements.

Mr. CANNON: I did not wish to interrupt the minister, and I am prepared to accord him every courtesy to which he is entitled. On the other hand, I desire to remind the committee that the chairman has ruled this discussion out of order.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: The chairman did not exactly rule that the discussion was out of order. He ruled that the resolution could be considered only by unanimous consent. The [illegible] clearly given [illegible] hon. [illegible] proceed [illegible] sumed [illegible] mous co[illegible]

Mr. CA[illegible]

The CH[illegible] to any motic[illegible]

sent, any hon. member has the right at any time, before the motion is carried, to object to the discussion. The hon. member for Dorchester (Mr. Cannon) having objected, I must maintain his objection; but in all fairness to the hon. Minister of Finance (Sir Henry Drayton) I think that by unanimous consent he might be allowed to conclude his remarks and we could then proceed to some other item.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: Before leaving the question of notice, the right hon. the Prime Minister (Mr. Meighen), calls my attention to the fact that on the night before last notice was given that we intended to bring up this question. That notice was given in this way:

> Mr. Mackenzie King: What business will be taken up to-morrow?
> Mr. Meighen: The House will be moved into Committee of Supply on Labour and Railway Estimates; those are what we will take up first. There may be two or three Government orders that would be gone on with first, but not such as would likely be contentious. Notice was given to-day of a motion for interim supply, which, if the notice is sufficient, will be gone on with.

I may say that instructions were given to the law officers to give notice, but they say that it is not necessary, and should not be given, and that is consonant with the ruling given to-day by the chairman.

> Mr. Mackenzie King: When was that notice given?
> Sir Henry Drayton: This afternoon, I think.
> Mr. Mackenzie King: I am not aware of it.
> Mr. Meighen: It would simply be handed in.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: Go on; read the whole of it: "I suppose."

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: (Reading):

> Mr. Mackenzie King: "I suppose" my right hon. friend speaks of going on with the Estimates of the Railway Department to-morrow. Possibly the motion of which he has just given notice had better be disposed of before we go on with the Railway Estimates. We would like to know before we discuss those Estimates what information we are likely to get from this committee when it functions.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: There is no statement there that this matter would be definitely taken up.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: There is an intimation there to the effect that a motion for interim supply would be proceeded with.

Mr. FIELDING: For the next day's business. The intimation we received last night was different.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: Perfectly true, but I do not know that that was evasive. The statement of the Prime Minister was plain—

Mr. LAPOINTE: As all the Prime Minister's statements are.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: —and I do not think that hon. gentlemen will receive the greatest degree of courtesy in this House if idle charges of evasion are to be hurled across the floor. The language I have quoted is plain and speaks for itself. Now, let us see if we can get down from extravagant figures and come to actual facts. Heaven knows the figures are large enough. But the resolution does not call for the one hundred million dollars which the hon. gentleman refers to, although it does call for a very large sum. It calls for an amount not exceeding $71,000,000 odd, being one-sixth of the total,—to be exact, $71,499,703.70.

4 p.m.

Now, the charge is made with some heat by the hon. member for Gaspé (Mr. Lemieux), that we are not following British practice or tradition. Well, this is the only thing they do in the British Parliament every year. It is always done, and it is the only way they can get along. I do not ask my hon. friend to take my word for it; I read to him just a few moments ago the authority on the subject, showing just exactly what is done in the British House. But because we are following the example of the Mother of Parliaments, we are charged both by the hon. member and by the leader of the Opposition, with being un-British in our methods. The hon. member for Shelburne and Queen's (Mr. Fielding), says that we should call Parliament sooner. Well, when he called Parliament sooner, he adopted exactly the same practice as is now being followed. He had charge of the country's finances in the year 1906-7. Parliament was called on November 22, 1906, and in that session there were two interim Supply Bills passed, although the House was called in November.

Mr. LEMIEUX: There was a surplus that year.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: I do not know whether there was a surplus or not, but I am dealing with one particular complaint that is made, and I am pointing out that, although it is suggested that if Parliament were called in November there would be no necessity for these things, nevertheless hon. gentlemen opposite did call

Parliament in November and in this particular year to which I have referred they passed not one but two votes in interim Supply. Again, in 1909-10, Parliament was called in November, and a quarter of the Estimates was passed in interim Supply; and in the next year, 1911, the first interim vote was one-sixth, and then there was a further vote of three-twelfths of the remainder. In fact, this became an absolutely settled practice, and I appeal to hon. gentlemen opposite whether I am not following fairly good precedent when I do what has been done by the hon. member for Shelburne and Queen's. I have the statements made during the debate in 1903, and although I do not propose to read them in extenso, the answers then given by the hon. gentleman himself completely meet the very objection that is made to-day as to salary. He pointed out, for example—well, perhaps I had better quote his exact words on that point:

> All the matters that can be discussed in connection with those votes will, of course, still remain before the House; and we will have to take these up item by item for the purpose of obtaining the remaining four-fifths of the Estimates. So that the course we now propose does not in any way restrict the fullest and freest discussion. It simply facilitates the granting of a partial supply, which will be very much needed before the end of the present month.

The point was raised as to items in connection with which there might be objection and trouble, and at that particular time the views were just exactly opposite to what they are to-day on the part of some hon. gentlemen. In that instance the right hon. the ex-Prime Minister (Sir Robert Borden) said:

> I would not care to be in this position that because we have voted this one-fifth, in order that some portion of it might be expended on public works, for example, any gentleman on this side of the House should be precluded from the right of moving to strike out the whole item.

As to this the hon. member for Shelburne and Queen's says:

> Of course in any particular case after we have acted upon the Supply Bill to the extent of one-fifth, it would be too late to strike out the item in that case. But I hope no such case will arise. At all events, I quite agree with the hon. gentleman's wish to have full freedom of discussion and of action in the matter, and that he merely facilitates the passing of this resolution because it is necessary to make supply for the public service. I quite appreciate that and in that spirit only is the matter agreed to.

As I say, it came up every year and on two occasions I find the hon. gentleman referred to the whole thing as purely pro forma—it was a matter of so long standing, in fact, such regular standing. I am sure the hon. gentleman will appreciate the fact that there are other things which have to be paid for besides wages. Coal has to be paid for, supplies have to be paid for, and work that is going on has to go on. He refused before to take anything but his regular vote which would enable him to do these things; I am very much afraid that at the present time we will have to refuse to take anything except what will enable us to do business and continue to pay bills. Now, Mr. Chairman, I would suggest that this motion be postponed and taken up in committee again to-morrow.

Mr. ARCHAMBAULT: Amen.

The CHAIRMAN: Sir Henry Drayton moves that further consideration of the resolution be postponed.

Mr. CANNON: How can a motion be postponed when it has been ruled out of order?

The CHAIRMAN: The debate on the motion is postponed. If it is the desire that the motion be withdrawn and presented again this procedure may be adopted.

Mr. MEIGHEN: The motion may as well be withdrawn. The only thing I have in mind is this: While I do not question the correctness of the ruling by you, Mr. Chairman, having regard to its exact wording, I do say that very embarrassing situations in the future will arise therefrom. It is evidently something that was not taken care of in the framing of the rules, as is very frequently the case. It undoubtedly will mean, as you, Mr. Chairman, were about to intimate, that the consideration of a vote of even one-fourth of the total Estimates as interim Supply, will virtually wipe out the whole effect of the rule and we could then go into Supply on Thursday and Friday and consider the Estimates of any department without any previous notice. Because of that fact I warned hon. gentlemen of the risk they were taking in raising this question and having it ruled accordingly. I think hon. gentlemen will agree with me that it was never intended that the rule should have this effect; it was only intended to enable a vote against a department to be introduced at the opening of the Supply of that department. This could not be done on Thursday or Friday, because there is no motion to go into Supply except on Monday, Tuesday and Wednesday. That is the reason why this ruling affects the whole

situation. I do not ask for any decision now, I would like to give some thought to the subject, and I think that possibly we can come to an agreement, perhaps to reverse the ruling, or at least in some way to establish a precedent which will not have the effect and the consequences that the ruling is going to have. However we can consider the matter to-morrow.

Mr. FIELDING: I would point out to my hon. friend the fact that when there is a motion made for Supply there is not associated with it any rule in reference to any department, and the rule in that respect, may I say is defective.

Mr. MEIGHEN: I know that, but the point was raised in the discussion, and the point was taken care of by this means when the closure rules were discussed. I know there is no special department mentioned. According to the practice any member of the Opposition is in a position to move an amendment against a department, or reflecting on it in an way at all.

Mr. CANNON: What is the decision?

The CHAIRMAN: The motion is withdrawn.

Department of Marine—Shipbuilding programme—amount required for the construction of vessels in accordance with Government programme, $8,330,000.

Hon. Mr. BALLANTYNE: Before the members of the committee enter upon the consideration of this item I may perhaps be allowed to say a word or two in reply to certain observations that were made by the hon. member for Red Deer (Mr. Clark) and the hon. member for Maisonneuve (Mr. Lemieux) when I presented to the House a week ago last Tuesday, the annual statement as to the earnings of the Government merchant marine. I am sure the hon. member for Red Deer will find no fault with me if I correct a statement he made as to the amount of the contracts that had been let—as he put it, up to Armistice Day, November 11, 1918. If there is one hon. member in this House for whom I have the highest regard it is the hon. member for Red Deer. I admire his parliamentary style and his eloquence, and above all I admire his consistency. While the hon. member and myself do not agree on public questions, I want to pay him this tribute —that ever since I have been a member of Parliament he has been thoroughly consistent on all public questions that have come before us. The hon. member for Red Deer opposed the Government shipbuilding programme which I had the honour to submit on April 4, 1918. He said frankly and freely that he did not believe it was a wise expenditure, or that the policy contemplated was wise. In taking that stand the hon. member was consistent and I want to assure him that I appreciate his consistency. However, I want to correct the hon. gentleman in regard to a certain point. He said that the value of the contracts, as let on November 11, 1918, was $16,000,000, and in the hon. gentleman's opinion the Government should have called a halt at that time. I wish to inform the hon. member for Red Deer that the value of the contracts let on Armistice Day, November 11, 1918, was not $16,000,000, but $45,000,000. That is the only correction I desire to make in the hon. gentleman's statement.

Mr. CLARK (Red Deer): Does my hon. friend recall the speech he made somewhere about December 5, of that year on the occasion of the launching of the first two ships?

Mr. BALLANTYNE: Yes.

Mr. CLARK (Red Deer): Did he not mention in that speech the figure of $16,000,000?

Mr. BALLANTYNE: The hon. member is quite right. The $16,000,000 represented the value of the contracts that had been actually signed by Order in Council at that date, but the Government had closed up $45,000,000, although formal Orders in Council had not been passed; therefore I can see quite plainly how the hon. member got the figure of $16,000,000 instead of $45,000,000.

Mr. SINCLAIR (Guysborough): The minister refers to Orders in Council, but I would like to know if on November 11, 1918, contracts had not been let for $45,000,000.

Mr. BALLANTYNE: Here are the actual figures: Value of contracts signed on or before November 11, 1918, $29,299,991.40; value of contracts approved by Order in Council on or before November 11, 1918, but not signed, $16,359,703. The commitments therefore on November 11, 1918 amounted to $45,659,694.40.

Now, Mr. Chairman, I turn from my hon. friend from Red Deer to my good friend who represents the constituencies of Maisonneuve and Gaspe (Mr. Lemieux). I will not reply to him with the same warmth which he displayed towards me, nor will I make the same unfair insinuations. The hon. member for Maisonneuve and Gaspe,

after I had concluded making my statement the other day, with his usual eloquence and with a great deal of heat, informed this House that he was in favour of the Government shipbuilding programme for war purposes only, and that when Armistice day came the Government should have cancelled all the remaining contracts. Indeed, he could not understand how the Government went on spending so many more millions on shipbuilding. He paid the Minister of Marine another compliment on that occasion. He said he could only explain the continued expenditure by assuming that it was due to the pigheadedness of the Minister of Marine. While I admire the eloquence and the many abilities that my hon. friend is endowed with, I cannot pay him the tribute that I paid the hon. member for Red Deer a moment ago and say that he is always consistent on the various problems that from time to time come before this House. Apparently the memory of my hon. friend from Maisonneuve and Gaspe is not very good. A moment ago we heard him say how much he was impressed with the debt of this country, and that his ability and influence would be exercised in this House to have the Estimates reduced by $50,000,000. But in May, 1919, when the vote was before this committee for $30,000,000 to continue the Government shipbuilding programme, if the hon. member's view then was the same as it is now, this House would have expected him to take advantage of that most favourable opportunity to rise in his place and say: I am opposed to the Government shipbuilding policy; I favoured it, of course, while the war was on, but now I want the Government to call a halt to the wild extravagance of the Minister of Marine. Let me remind the hon. member for Maisonneuve and Gaspe that the armistice was signed on November 11, 1918, and I brought before the House an interim vote of $30,000,000 in May, 1919.

Mr. LEMIEUX: When was peace signed?

Mr. BALLANTYNE: Does not my hon. friend know when peace was signed just as well as I do? If the hon. member for Maisonneuve and Gaspe meant what he said the other day on the floor of this House, that he was absolutely opposed to one cent of the public money being expended on shipbuilding after Armistice day, then his duty was plain in May, 1919, when the $30,000,000 vote was in committee—one would have expected him to oppose the vote. With the enormous debt at that time staring the House and the country in the face, that was a grand opportunity for the hon. member to have said: I want $30,000,000 of the public money saved.

Now, Mr. Chairman, let us see what the hon. member said on that occasion: A few moments ago he stated that I had lost my business reputation in the commercial metropolis of Montreal. The mere say-so of my hon. friend is by no means conclusive. The business reputation that I have established in Montreal during a period of thirty-five years cannot be marred in the slightest degree by anything that my hon. friend may see fit to say in the heat of debate.

Mr. LEMIEUX: The president of the Bank of Montreal said it, though.

Mr. BALLANTYNE: Did he? I will not read the eulogistic remarks concerning myself uttered by the hon. gentleman in May, 1919, because they would make me blush.

Mr. LALOR: Read them.

Mr. BALLANTYNE: No.

Mr. DUFF: Give them to me, I will read them.

Mr. BALLANTYNE: But here is what I want to put before the committee, the actual words of the hon. member for Maisonneuve and Gaspé as they appear on page 2312 of Hansard of May 8, 1919, long after Armistice Day,—a golden opportunity, I repeat for my hon. friend to have saved this country $30,000,000,—and no doubt the committee will be interested to know what he said on that occasion. Here are his words:

> I do not offer any criticism of the contract between the Naval Department and the Dominion Steel Company which was mentioned this afternoon. I have not seen that contract, and I have the word of the Minister of Marine and Fisheries, that it may be altered or even dropped. I do not purpose to let politics interfere with my views on the questions of trade and transportation, for I am a Canadian, first, last and always, and I sincerely approve of the policy of any Government which will promote our shipbuilding and improve our transportation facilities.

That was on May 8, 1919.

> I happen to reside in Montreal during several months of the year, where I represent one of the constituencies most interested in shipbuilding. The county of Maisonneuve has within its boundaries the establishment of Canadian Vickers Limited, and I think it is to the credit of the Laurier administration that we have that great shipbuilding plant. Canadian Vickers Limited employ thousands of men, and they have been able to build up an industry which some years ago was considered as only a dream and impossible of realization.

Then the hon. member goes on to talk about navy matters, I will pass over that part.

Mr. LEMIEUX: Perhaps you had better read it all.

Mr. BALLANTYNE: Certainly, if the hon. gentleman wishes me to. I quote further:

I cannot forget that in 1912 when the question of a Canadian navy was being debated in this House doubts were expressed as regards the practicability of that policy. The Prime Minister (Sir Robert Borden) himself stated, in a now famous speech, that not in twenty-five, or even fifty years perhaps, could we expect to build a Canadian navy. And we had the candid advice of Mr. Churchill, who told us—with some ingenuousness I should say—that we could not find reveters in Canada, and there were so many swamps that we could hardly lay keels for the proposed Canadian navy. Sir, let us not refer to that debate, because really it is enough to make us lose confidence in some of the statesmen of the Mother Country. We have passed the period when the British Government could at their own sweet will thus impose their views on credulous colonials. We have had the satisfaction since that time of establishing shipyards on the Pacific and Atlantic coasts, on the river St. Lawrence, and on the Upper Lakes, and the British Commissioners who were appointed some years ago to study the trade conditions of the British Empire, reported that Canada was fully equipped for shipbuilding and had nothing to fear from competitors. I have under my hand the report of those commissioners, published in February, 1917, from which I read the following:

"Before leaving the subject of the overseas communications of Canada we may allude very briefly to the capacity which the Dominion has for shipbuilding. We visited yards for ship construction and ship repairing both on the Pacific coast and at Montreal and we were struck with the activity generally prevailing at all places. There is also considerable shipbuilding work on the Upper Lakes."

I do not know what the commissioners would say if they came back to Canada to-day. Had they come last year they would have seen how our shipyards kept the wheels of industry running at full speed during a very crucial period. But Canada must not be satisfied with her war industries only. During the war Canada established her ability to do things; she must go on now and adapt herself to peace conditions, profiting by the development which has taken place during the war.

I stand for a moderate and wise policy of shipbuilding for Canada—

Mr. LEMIEUX: Hear, hear.

Mr. BALLANTYNE: The hon. member will not think I am unfair to him when I say I had always known, until recently, that he entertained the same views with regard to shipbuilding in Canada that I did. The hon. gentleman went on to say:

—and if the Acting Prime Minister, under section 2 of the Bill, intends to apply some of that money for the promotion of shipbuilding and the improvement and development of our Canadian transportation facilities, I shall vote for the amount which is being asked this evening.

Nothing, in my judgment, has proved more adequately the ability of the Canadian people to do things than the enormous development which has taken place in our shipyards during the last three or four years. It is urged that the Minister of Naval Affairs (Mr. Ballantyne) took away from the Imperial Munitions Board a business which that board was carrying on at our Canadian yards. It seems to me that the answer given by the hon. gentleman is a common-sense one. During the war Canada gave to the Mother Country the exclusive use of her shipyards, in which ships were built of British registry. Our ships were also commandeered. Of course, it was for the common cause. But the moment war ceased, the moment we come to peace activities, it is only common sense that Canada should take control of these shipyards—

That is, after the war.

—and build her own ships with her own men and her own money, with a view of improving her shipping and transportation facilities.

Mr. LEMIEUX: If my hon. friend will allow me, what does he find in that speech?

Mr. BALLANTYNE: I find in that speech, in the plainest language, that the hon. member for Maisonneuve and Gaspé did not on May 8, 1919, by his voice or by his vote dissent from an appropriation for an additional $30,000,000 to continue the ship-building policy of the Government, though my hon. friend said a few days ago in this House that he favoured ship-building only during the war, and censured me as Minister of Marine, and the Government of Canada, for spending any money on the construction of ships after the Armistice day, November 11, 1918. If the hon. member entertained at that time the views which he apparently entertains now, his only course on that occasion was to make the speech that he made on the floor of this House a few days ago; to say: the war is over; my support of the Government's policy is withdrawn; I am opposed to the appropriation of this additional $30,000,000 for the continuance of the ship-building policy of the Government. I read in that speech not what the hon. member said the other day, but warm and full endorsation of the expenditure of $30,000,000 on ship-building. More than that, by his voice and vote on that occasion he supported to the full a continuance of the Government's ship-building policy. I am at a loss, therefore, as all other hon. members in this House must be, to understand the inconsistency of my hon. friend. I know that he has been a long time in public life. I am aware that he has spent his summers

down on the beautiful shores of the river St. Lawrence at Murray Bay, and as he went out in canoes and boats a great deal he has a more thorough knowledge than I have of how to trim his sails according to the breeze. My hon. friend, therefore, trims his sails according to the breeze that is now blowing in this House and condemns the Minister of Marine and the Government for proceeding with their ship-building policy after November 11, 1918, although six months subsequent to that date he gave the Government his entire support for the expenditure of $30,000,000. He told us on that occasion—and I concurred in what he said in that regard—of the existence of a large shipyard in the constituency of Maisonneuve employing some 3,500 men.

Mr. LEMIEUX: In order that there may be no misunderstanding, I may say that I would repeat at this very hour the very words that the minister has just read

Mr. BALLANTYNE: Well, I leave it to the judgment of the House and of the people as to what meaning can be taken from the speech that my hon. friend delivered on May 8, 1919.

The senior member for Halifax (Mr. Maclean) speaking the other day with regard to the railways, expressed opposition to the running of Government ships between Halifax and Newfoundland and stated that the ships on that route were losing money. With that statement I disagreed and I asked him how he knew that to be the case, whereupon the hon. member said that the source of his information was, in his opinion, as reliable as the operating company. I took the trouble to have my secretary telephone to the manager of the Canadian Government merchant marine and ask him whether or not the Government ships on this route were making a profit, and the reply was that they were. Another reason why the management want those ships to run from Halifax to Newfoundland in winter time is to keep up the connection between the routes operated by the ships which run between Montreal, Charlottetown and Newfoundland during the season of open navigation on the St. Lawrence.

Now, Mr. Chairman, that is all I wish to say at this stage. If there is any information that hon. members desire I shall be happy to give it to the best of my ability.

Mr. DUFF: Mr. Chairman, we have all listened with a great deal of attention to the second speech which the hon. Minister of Marine (Mr. Ballantyne) has felt it necessary to make with regard to the Canadian Government merchant marine. Evidently he was not satisfied with the statement which he made to the House when the House re-assembled on Tuesday last after the Easter recess. There has been a good deal of talk about extending to hon. members of this House certain courtesies in regard to public matters. Whilst I do not complain because we on this side were not notified on Tuesday last until practically within an hour of the meeting of the House, that the Minister of Marine and Fisheries (Mr. Ballantyne) was going to take up this important question, we on this side are more courteous than he is. Last evening, after the debate on the motion of the hon. member for Quebec East (Mr. Lapointe) I had intended to go into the question of the Canadian Government Merchant Marine, before the House went into Supply, but I found that the Minister of Marine and Fisheries was absent, and consequently I deferred my remarks to a later date. I also, Sir, did not know to-day that this very important question was coming up. But I am glad to say that I think, in my feeble manner, I am able to deal with this question at the present time and show whether the minister's statements are correct or not. As regards the minister's statement of a few minutes ago, that the hon. member for Maisonneuve (Mr. Lemieux), in his remarks this afternoon with regard to the Canadian Government Merchant Marine in any way reflected on the business ability of the Minister of Marine and Fisheries, I have always found, in my short life, that "birds come home to roost," and it would be well, before the minister says anything about the business or political career of the hon. member for Maisonneuve, that he reflect carefully on what he might have said himself; and it would be better for the minister, instead of going in public places and making remarks about hon. members of this House, that he make those remarks on the floor of Parliament and in the presence of the said members, and say what he has to say like a man.

I noticed this afternoon, when the hon. member for Maisonneuve was speaking about the large amount of money which the Government had spent on this merchant marine and the reasons for economy, the Minister of Marine and Fisheries laughed very long and loudly. This may be a matter in which the minister may see something to smile at, and if the true story of this merchant marine were known, I think the minister could very well laugh; but the people of this country are not in that position;

they recognize that the building and operating of this merchant marine are serious matters, and consequently, I can assure the minister that they are in no laughing mood.

The Minister of Marine and Fisheries, in his speech on Tuesday last, went into the history of the building of those Government ships, and in order to bolster up his case he had to call to his assistance some words which were said by the hon. member for Red Deer (Mr. Clark) and the hon. member for Maisonneuve (Mr. Lemieux). It is not my desire, nor my intention to take up the cudgels for those hon. gentlemen; they are ready and able to do so themselves. But at this time, it is a very poor defence for the Minister of Marine and Fisheries to use the words of the hon. member for Red Deer, or the hon. member for Maisonneuve, or any other hon. member, when the war was on or shortly after it was over and before peace was declared.

What is my understanding of the history of this merchant marine? I might say that when the minister asked this House in 1918 for a vote of $20,000,000, I voted for it, or I did not oppose it. I want to say, however, that I never favoured the building of a Government merchant marine. I am in favour of a merchant marine, a Canadian merchant marine; but I am not now, nor was I then in favour of this Government going into either the building or the operating of ships. If I understand the matter correctly, the first intimation the members of the House and the people throughout the country received with regard to the programme of the Government was sometime in the spring of 1918. At that time the minister, after no doubt awarding contracts by Order in Council, asked this House to pass a vote of $20,000,000. It seemed to me that before this policy was adopted by the Government, the very least they might have done before giving the contracts was to ask this House to support the policy. This money was voted, because the war was on at that time and because every man in this country, whether he was interested in or knew anything about the shipping business or otherwise, realized that, owing to the fact that the German submarine was operating, not only in the waters of the Atlantic, but in the North Sea, and destroying thousands and hundreds of thousands of tons of British shipping, it was necessary for the Canadian people to do something. Not only did the Government go on with this programme; but private capital all over the coastline of Canada, both on the Pacific and the Atlantic, decided to do everything in its power to build ships in order to help out the situation. In practically every town facing the Atlantic coast in Nova Scotia and New Brunswick, shipyards sprang up almost over night, and private industry provided private capital and built shipyards and ships. In 1919, as the minister said, further money was asked for by the Government and voted by this House. At that time the Canadian people felt that this shipbuilding programme should stop, and had the minister consulted the business men, and the financial men of this country, he would not have gone on with his programme. The right and proper thing for the minister to do on that occasion, after war was over and peace was declared, was to go to the shipbuilders to whom he had given contracts and endeavour to settle with them, giving them damages, and to get them to complete their contracts and go on with the shipbuilding business with their private money, and make contracts in the open market. That is the businesslike way to deal with the matter, and that is what the minister and the Government should have done.

The minister, in his speech the other day, gave as one reason why he entered into this shipbuilding programme and kept it going was to give work to returned soldiers. That is not a very good excuse. It is quite true a few returned soldiers were employed in those yards; but anybody who knows anything about shipbuilding is well aware of the fact that skilled workers are required to build steel ships, and the ordinary man who went over to France and fought heroically for his country, knew nothing about building ships. Consequently, the arguments of the minister that the continuance of his programme was to give work to returned soldiers must fall to the ground.

If the minister or his department had been properly informed, they would have realized, in the year 1919, that it would take only a very short time for the world tonnage to be back to its normal level or beyond it. Every shipping man in this country, in Great Britain and every other country, knew, in 1919, that every shipyard in the world was busy replacing the tonnage that had been sunk during the war. Whilst in 1914 there were 45,000,000 tons of shipping throughout the world, to-day there are 65,000,000 tons. Therefore, the minister and his department were improperly informed, or they would have been aware of this fact, and, consequently, they would have trimmed their sails to suit the occasion.

The minister told us, either in 1919 or 1920, I forget which, when he was criticised for going on with this programme of building ships when there was no necessity, that he could sell them at a good profit. I am sure if we could get down to the inner consciousness of the minister he would certainly admit that he made a very grave mistake in not selling the Government ships in 1919 or 1920 if he could have sold them then at a profit or even at cost. That would have been the business-like thing to do, and I say that the minister was derelict in his duty in not disposing of these ships at that time, when he could have sold them at a profit or at cost. That is the course any good business man would have taken. The minister after the armistice should have endeavoured to get out of the contracts, and make the very best settlement he could of a bad bargain.

In order to prove my case, perhaps I may be allowed to show that another department of this Government did the very thing which I have just stated should have been done by the Minister of Marine and Fisheries. If hon. gentlemen will turn to page 22 of the twenty-eight annual report of the Department of Trade and Commerce, they will find this:

> Negotiations were then entered into between this Department and the two furnaces, with the result that after many conferences and meetings, the Government offered and the contractors accepted the sum of $460,000 in the case of the Midland Iron & Steel Company and $200,000 in the case of the Parry Sound Iron Company for the cancellation of their production on July 31, 1919, agreeing however to take care of all loading and storage charges until August 31, 1920.

Now if the Minister of Trade and Commerce and the officials of his department thought that in view of world conditions in 1919, it was good business to cancel certain contracts they had made during the war for war purposes, I think the members of this House and the people of this country will agree with me that the Minister of Marine and Fisheries should have done the very same thing and cancelled the various contracts which he had made. Another reason which the minister gave in his speech was that it was necessary or good business to build these slow tramp steamers in order to get the products of our fields and mines and fisheries from Canadian shores to Great Britain and foreign countries. I do not think there is anything in that argument. Hon. members have no doubt received through the mails a copy of the statement of the Canadian Pacific Railway. If they will look at that statement, they will see the number of steamers employed by that company, and if they will look at the report of the Department of Trade and Commerce they will see what a small proportion of the goods routed over the Canadian Pacific either to Montreal, Halifax, or any other port in Canada, are carried by Canadian Pacific Railway steamers. If they look at the report of the Department of Trade and Commerce they will also see what a small quantity of freight is handled by these slow tramp steamers for which this country has had to pay such a high price.

We have also been told about what these Government ships have been doing for our export business; but what do we find? All the ships have been doing practically is interfering with other companies already in existence. We were told that these ships on the Pacific Coast were carrying lumber, which any old wind-jammer could have carried. That is the kind of business they are doing, and consequently the argument the minister puts forward that these ships were necessary to transport to their destination cargoes carried over the railroads is not a sound one, as every man who studies the subject will agree.

If hon. members will turn to page 5 of the report of the Department of Trade and Commerce for 1920, they will find that last year our exports amounted to $1,239,492,098, and we remember that the minister in his speech a few days ago told us in sonorous tones that the ships of the Government merchant marine carried last year $50,000,000 worth of these goods. I need not stress that point, but the figures show conclusively that the ships of the Merchant Marine are carrying only a small proportion of the trade of this country, and in doing so, I say they are interfering with other lines which could carry the goods far better than the slow tramp steamers which the Government has built.

The minister also told us, if I am not mistaken, that another reason why these ships were built was to expand our foreign trade. Now the ordinary person would think that it was wise for Canada to have ships to help expand her foreign trade, but are these Government ships expanding the foreign trade of this country? I say they are not. I say they have not expanded our foreign trade to the extent of $1,000,000 more than other lines were doing before these ships ever took the water. Let me tell the committee what these Government ships are doing. I doubt if the minister knows, but I am going to try and

enlighten him, because I think somebody should put the matter up square to him. Here is an item I found in a good Tory paper, the Halifax Herald, and I would ask the minister to listen very attentively to this:

The steamer Canadian Pioneer—

I presume that is one of the Government's boats.

—left here (Halifax, N.S.) Saturday for Newport News, to take on bunker coal there, and then proceed to Gibraltar to load grain for Italian ports.

Did you ever hear anything like that before, Mr. Chairman? I will repeat the quotation, so that the House will be fully seized of the situation:

The steamer Canadian Pioneer left here (Halifax, N.S.) Saturday for Newport News, to take on bunker coal there, and then proceed to Gibralter to load grain for Italian ports.

Mr. SINCLAIR (Guysborough): Newport News? Where is that?

Mr. DUFF: In the United States where hon. gentlemen opposite did not desire any truck or trade. But they sent their steamers there, light from Halifax, when the coal mines of Nova Scotia were crying for orders, and although the bunker coal from North Sydney or Sydney Mines or any other part of Nova Scotia is just as good as any that Newport News can offer. The Minister of Marine and Fisheries is responsible for daring, I say, to send that steamer from Halifax, without bunker coal, to Newport News, without one dollar's worth of cargo in her hold, to bunker there.

Mr. BALLANTYNE: I would like to inquire whether the hon. gentleman believes everything he reads even in a Tory paper.

Mr. LEMIEUX: That is a bad one for the Tories.

Mr. DUFF: I would just as readily believe this statement in the Halifax Herald as some statements which have been made by certain persons in this country. Before I get through, I am going to prove that this statement is just as correct as certain statements made within the last fortnight. This item in the Halifax Herald goes on to state that after taking on bunker coal at Newport News this steamer is going to come back, in order to get to Gibraltar to load wheat for an Italian port, passing within fifty miles of Halifax or Louisburg. That is the kind of foreign trade the minister is developing. I can give a hundred other instances to show that these ships do not carry Canadian cargo, but go to all parts of the world developing trade for the benefit of foreign countries. The minister, last week apologetically endeavoured to show cause for the condition in which the Canadian Government Merchant Marine appears, and he told the House that the Government programme was over and that no more contracts would be let—in other words, the Canadian Government did not intend to build any more ships. The minister claims that the hon. member for Maisonneuve (Mr. Lemieux) is inconsistent, but it seems to me that this charge can very properly be laid at his own door. Because if these ships, as he says, are developing foreign trade, why should we stop building them? If his argument is sound, that sixty-three ships built under contracts let have developed export trade to the advantage of this country, we should go on building, and instead of having sixty-three, we should have a thousand. But it is quite certain that the minister's contention is wrong and that these ships, far from developing Canadian trade, are going hither and thither developing trade for foreign countries.

I would refer for a few moments to some of the contracts entered into by the Government with certain shipyards in this country. My own idea is that there is an Ethiopian in the woodpile somewhere in connection with some of these contracts, and although I have not been able, so far, to locate him, I am on the look-out and some day I hope to land him. Now, although the war has been over two years; and notwithstanding the fact, in view of the general state of business to-day, that other people have been endeavouring to cancel contracts and stop building ships, the minister has virtually allowed the keel of a new ship to be laid in Halifax in the last few months. And thereby hangs a tale. The Halifax Shipyards Company I have not a word to say against. My whole complaint is against the Minister of Marine; I consider that the Halifax shipyards people are good business men, and they certainly put one over on the minister. What has the Government done within the last two years? A contract was entered into with the Halifax shipyards to build three ships, if I mistake not. Now, the Halifax shipyards was a new concern. In the latter part of 1917, or early in 1918, there was no such concern as the Halifax shipyards, and when they incorporated they did not buy out an old shipyard; they built an entirely new one. Practically before a

blow was struck, the explosion occurred in Halifax, and you will remember what occurred then. Almost the entire city was wrecked, some 2,000 persons, in round numbers lost their lives, while about 20,000 suffered in one way and another as a result of the disaster. I will not discuss the subject now, but I may remark, in passing, that most of the business places in Halifax, and the buildings and wharves suffered. There was in Halifax what is known as the Graving Dock Company, owned principally by English capitalists but managed by a gentleman in that city. This dock
5 p.m. was built some twenty years ago and has given excellent satisfaction to the shipping not only of this country but of Great Britain and the United States. Practically all the year round vessels come to Halifax for repairs. During the explosion this dock was partly wrecked. After people had fairly well recovered from the shock, the manager of the dock suggested that the Government should take it over, and he offered it to them, if I am correctly informed, for $1,250,000. Negotiations were entered into, but the Government refused to pay this price. A few days afterwards, however, an Order in Council was passed confiscating the property for the sum of $1,100,000. The owners of the dock protested and took the matter to the Exchequer Court where it hung fire for something like two years. Now, the people of this country will agree that it might have been good business for the Government to take over this dock for their own purposes; and, at all events, had they done so probably little fault would have been found with them. But what happened? Almost immediately after they passed the Order in Council confiscating this dock, the personal property of the owners, they turned it over to the Halifax shipyards. I say that there is absolutely no excuse for that. It was not necessary for the business of the Halifax shipyards. Shipyards in other parts of the country built ships without owning any dry dock, but the thing was done for some reason; there are certain interests in this country who are pretty close to the Government and are also close to the men interested in the Halifax Shipyards.

Mr. BALLANTYNE: As the hon. gentleman seems to be shooting somewhat wide of the mark, let me tell him now that all dry docks in Canada come under the Public Works Department. The Hon. F. B. Carvell was Minister of Public Works at the time. He was the man who carried through

all these negotiations, and neither myself nor any one else connected with the Marine Department had anything whatsoever to do with this matter.

Mr. DUFF: I am delighted indeed to hear the minister say that this is a matter with which the Public Works Department, and not his department, had to do. But I knew that; there was no necessity for the minister to make that statement. Now it is also true that the Hon. F. B. Carvell carried on "negotiations". I would not call it "negotiations" to seize a man by the throat and take his property. However, I do not know that I should hold Hon. Mr. Carvell any more guilty than I do the Minister of Marine. As I have already said, I only wish I could get ahold of the Ethiopian in the woodpile.

Mr. BALLANTYNE: Why don't you get him?

Mr. DUFF: I am looking for him every day. I say there was some reason why the Minister of Marine sat round the Council Board when the Order in Council was passed expropriating the Halifax Dry Dock and handing it over to private interests, and it is of no avail for that hon. gentleman to come here and try and excuse himself and argue that the Public Works Department or Mr. Carvell is responsible. I say such a thing as that is not fair to the late Minister of Public Works; the Minister of Marine must take his own share of the responsibility.

Mr. BALLANTYNE: Certainly.

Mr. DUFF: Why don't you do it then? To show you what feeling this expropriation and the subsequent proceedings created in the Old Country where the people lived who had their money invested in this dry dock at Halifax, I shall quote from a report of a meeting of the Halifax Graving Dock Company, Limited, held in London, and which is headed—

The Halifax Graving Dock Company, Limited

Dominion Government and the Company Expropriation of the Property

Criticism of Award

I need not read very much, I am only going to read one short sentence. It is from the annual report of the shareholders of that concern which was adopted unanimously. The sentence in question is:

It is not too much to say that such action constituted an abuse of the War Measures Act and is a piece of sharp practice on the part of the Dominion Government.

I fully agree with what the shareholders of the Halifax Graving Dock Company said at their meeting in London when they asserted that this proceeding was a piece of sharp practice. It certainly was sharp practice on the part of the former Prime Minister and his colleagues to take this graving dock from a private company and hand it over to another private company within a few days. If the Government had kept this dock themselves and used it for war purposes there would have been no criticism, or at any rate very little. I say the Government had no right to take this property from a private company and hand it over to the Halifax Ship Yards Limited.

An hon. MEMBER: Carried:

Mr. DUFF: I regret that hon. gentlemen opposite show they are not interested in this matter. I know by their actions that they do not care anything about the discussion of a serious question like this. If they are not interested I hope they will abstain from noisy interruptions or else leave the chamber. It is a foolish policy for hon. gentlemen opposite to cry "Carried" when another member is addressing the House on such a serious matter.

Now, Sir, before I leave the matter of the Halifax Dry Dock, and my criticisms do not seem to be accepted very gracefully by hon. gentlemen opposite, I wish to again refer to the same "Ethiopian." There has been created what is known as the British Empire Steel Corporation which is putting the value of the Halifax Dry Dock at $7,250,000 whereas they paid the poor English shareholders who formerly owned the property, only $1,500,000, including interest and all. That is the way these things are done and therefore I say there is some reason why some people closely connected with the Halifax Shipyards and the Government of this country—

Mr. BALLANTYNE: Don't throw veiled insinuations across the House. Be frank and fair, and if you think I have been connected with the Dominion Steel Company, or the Dry Dock, in any way, be good enough to say so and produce your evidence. Surely my hon. friend knows enough of etiquette, and understands the sentiment of the House sufficiently well, to refrain from continually casting veiled threats across the floor. I repeat, if the hon. member has any evidence that I have been, directly or indirectly, connected with the Dry Dock Company or with the British Empire Steel Corporation, or any other members of the Government either, let him say so.

Mr. DUFF: If the cap fits anybody they can wear it.

Some hon. MEMBERS: Oh, oh.

Mr. BALLANTYNE: That is not the question.

Mr. DUFF: It is rather amusing to hear hon. gentlemen applauding. Let these hon. gentlemen go ahead and clap; it is all they can do. But it certainly is amusing to see the Minister of Marine getting up every second or third day in the House and complaining, when an hon. member says anything, that they are referring to him. He may, of course, think that he is the whole Government but we on this side do not. We know exactly what he thinks about himself and the great ego which he has developed during the last three years. Well, I can assure him that there are other people in this country and in this Government—bad as it is, and God knows it is bad enough—besides the hon. Minister of Marine and Fisheries. Consequently I cannot see why he should take the matter directly to himself when I make any reference to the Government. However, if he wants to do so it is not my fault.

The minister last week presented to Parliament what purported to be a statement showing the operating expenses of the Canadian Government Merchant Marine for the year 1920. Now, Sir, in order to give the House and the country the full details of the mismanagement of this business, and to show them exactly what has happened, it is necessary for me not only to discuss the minister's statement of last week but to draw attention to what the minister said last year when this matter was discussed in the House. He then told us that he was going to put on Hansard the proper statement of the operations of the Canadian Mercantile Marine for the year 1919. I regret to say that no such statement appears in Hansard. The statement in question, beyond a very few items, was such as no business house or no person with any knowledge of business would issue. Just before the session ended, however, and when it was so late that there was no chance to discuss the affairs of the Canadian Government Merchant Marine, a little book which is called the "First Annual Report of the Government Merchant

Marine Limited" came into my hands. Within the covers of that booklet are two statements and two statements only, and in order to give the full financial story of the Canadian Government Merchant Marine and its operations, it is necessary for me to put this statement on Hansard:

Canadian Government Merchant Marine Limited
Operating Department Balance Sheet
as at December 31, 1919.

Assets

Current Assets:		
Cash in banks and on hand		$432,476.39
Dominion of Canada Victory Loan, 1919		500,000.00
Accounts receivable		502,155.18
Advances to captains, crews and agents		23,270.88
Insurance claims, estimated amount recoverable		24,893.35
Interest receivable accrued		$ 4,583 33
Inventories of stores and supplies		1,959 71
		$1,489,338 84
Insurance unexpired		505,284 27
Fixed Assets:		
Office furniture	$7,611 10	
Automobile	890 93	
		8,502 03
		$2,003,125 14

Liabilities.

Accounts payable	$ 530,632 84
Balances of Uncompleted voyages.	415,724 92
Surplus—Profit for period from March 2 to December 31, 1919.	1,056,767 38
Contingent Liabilities—none ascertained	—
	$2,003,125 14

I want first to call attention to the fact that in that balance sheet no item appears for interest paid to the Department of Finance on the cost of these ships. According to the total given by the minister, the cost of the vessels will figure at about $25,000,000, and the interest would be about $1,021,680. But in this balance sheet no such item appears as having been paid, although the minister distinctly told us in the statement which he presented to this House that he had paid to the Department of Finance, if my memory serves me right, a sum of $500,000 for interest on these vessels. If my figuring is correct, instead of $500,000, about $1,000,000 should have been paid. When the minister read certain figures last year to the House he told us, after I had asked him about depreciation—he would not tell me at the time, but he brought down the information in the evening—that he had put to rest for depreciation 5 per cent of the cost of the vessels which were then in operation. Of course, I accepted his statement that that had been done. It seems to me, with my limited experience of finance, that if any amount was put to rest for depreciation—$1,238,400—it would appear in the statement of assets and liabilities. Therefore I should like the minister some time within the very near future to tell me and this House and the country where that depreciation is to be found. That is one reason why we want the information in regard to the Government railways and ships. I want to see the bank book, I want to see where this depreciation is put to rest, and I want the officials who made up this statement to come before a committee of this House and show where they have placed $1,238,400 for depreciation. I say again that on the face of this statement no such amount has been set aside. Now, Sir, there is in this pamphlet an operating account which I desire to also place on Hansard for the purpose of reference not only by hon. members but by the people. This is the account:

Operating Account

For the Period from March 2, 1919, to December 31, 1919

Closed Voyages—			
Revenue from vessels			$2,770,049 09
Other revenue—			
Commission and Agency Fee on landing of ss. Juil		$ 869 66	
Interest		8,715 23	
			9,584 89
Total revenue			$2,779,633 98
Expenses—			
Operation of vessels		$1,621,999 46	
Operation of wharf		16,475 91	

OPERATING ACCOUNT—*Concluded*

For the Period from March 2, 1919, to December 31, 1919—*Concluded*

General expenses—			
Office salaries	$41,013 44		
Printing and stationery	6,825 15		
Advertising	2,740 10		
Cables, telegrams and telephones	3,404 95		
Miscellaneous	9,612 78		
Loss on Exchange	794 81		
		64,391 23	
			$1,722,866 60
Operating Profit closed voyages			$1,056,767 38
Open voyages—			
Balance open voyages accounts	$415,724 92		
Complete statement of disbursements, and operating expenses on account of these voyages has not been received, but it is estimated the result will show a net profit of approximately			$ 350,000 00
Total profit for Period			$1,406,767 38

It will be seen that an amount, which is not stated, is deducted for disbursements and operating expenses on account of these voyages, and so on, and the balance is said to represent an estimated profit on the open voyages of $350,000, making a total profit for the period from March 2 to December 31, 1919 of $1,406,767.38.

This statement, which I assume has the approval of my genial friend the Minister of Marine and Fisheries, shows, although there is no provision made either for interest of $1,000,000 or for depreciation of $1,238,400, that there is a net profit of $1,406,767.38, including open voyages. Evidently, Sir, I am justified in using the larger figures, because these great experts who are managing these steamers should have known before figuring on a profit of $350,000 on open voyages that the profit was in sight and would stay in sight.

I would now like to refer for a moment to Hansard of 1920. The reason I refer to this more particularly is that the Minister of Marine a few moments ago in his heat accused the member for Maisonneuve of not being consistent, and of saying things that he should not have said. He is not the only man in this House who is inconsistent.

Mr. LEMIEUX: I am not inconsistent.

Mr. DUFF: Of course you are not. I am saying what the Minister of Marine said you are.

Mr. LEMIEUX: I know that.

Mr. DUFF: Where the assets appear on the balance sheet we find, as I read a few minutes ago, cash in banks and on hand, $432,476.39, and Dominion of Canada Victory Loan 1919, $500,000—counted, I presume, as cash, but not the actual value as stated here. I asked the minister for the amount of profit set aside to rest account for depreciation. This is his answer at page 623 of the Hansard of 1920:

Mr. BALLANTYNE:

I am sorry I cannot give that information at the moment.

That was in regard to rest and depreciation.

I have given the gross earnings and the net earnings, and explained how these sums were arrived at, but just how much has been set aside to rest account I cannot say.

I know that up to to-day the organization has in the bank, in the shape of cash and Victory bonds, the large amount of one and one-half millions, but just what portion of that has been set aside or depreciation I cannot at present state.

Now, Sir, in the statement put on Hansard by the minister he said that he had on hand in banks on account of the Canadian Government Merchant Marine $1,500,000 in cash and Victory bonds, whereas the statement from which I have been reading and which was issued under the signature of D. B. Hanna gives only the sum of $432,000 cash and $500,000 Victory bonds —a slight difference of $600,000. The minister should be the last person to talk of other hon. members being inconsistent.

Mr. STEVENS: Would the hon. member give the date of Hansard from which he quoted?

Mr. DUFF: I gave it once, but if the hon. gentleman will listen I will give it again: page 623, March 23, 1920.

Mr. STEVENS: I thank the hon. member for his courtesy.

Mr. DUFF: I am very glad to have the thanks of the hon. gentleman; I appreciate

them very sincerely. Now, in 1920 the minister, when he was giving to the House a statement of the results of the operation of these steamers and when he gave a certain portion of the two statements I have read, at the conclusion of his remarks prophesied that there would be a greater profit for 1920, and I would like hon. members to bear that in mind as I proceed with my remarks. But I am going to prove that the minister was a false prophet; he was one of the prophets spoken of in Jeremiah who cried "Peace, peace, when there was no peace", for he was crying "Profits, profits", last week when there were no profits. Although the minister shows a profit in his statement, I am going to prove that he did not give the House a correct statement of the affairs of the Canadian Government Merchant Marine, and that there was no profit.

In the statement made by the minister on March 29, 1921, which appears at page 1334 of unrevised Hansard, I find the following:

Operating Account for 1920

Gross Revenues closed voyages..		$10,027,442 77
Operating expenses..		8,733,917 22
Operating Profit Closed voyages.		$ 1,293,525 55
Deduct—		
Depreciation. $667,665.46		
Outstandin liabilities..	22,000.00	
Incorporation expenses..	5,400.00	
		$695,065 46
Net earnings closed voyages		598,460 09
Net earnings on voyages closed since January applicable to 1920..		183,000 00
Total net earnings.. ..		$781,460 09

If hon. gentlemen will figure it up they will find that the minister allows only 1.56 per cent for depreciation. In the ordinary course of events, as every shipping man in this country knows, 5 per cent is a sufficiently small amount to allow for ordinary depreciation—not the difference between the cost of the ship and what a similar ship might be purchased for, but what is known as ordinary running depreciation or wear and tear. But instead of 5 per cent the minister allows only 1.56 per cent for depreciation.

Mr. BALLANTYNE: Two per cent.

Mr. DUFF: In a moment I will give the minister the figures.

Mr. BALLANTYNE: Perhaps I can save the hon. gentleman that trouble. He is no doubt basing his calculations on the capital cost of the ships as shown in that statement, whereas the depreciation is figured only according to the time that the ships came into commission.

Mr. DUFF: That is fair; I accept that. We will take the minister's word that it is 2 per cent. Now, Sir, in the same statement there appears an item: "Outstanding liabilities, $22,000". I admit that it is impossible for the minister to know the full details of this organization, but I do offer this criticism: although the outstanding liabilities of the Canadian Government Merchant Marine are given in this statement as $22,000, in the city of Halifax on December 31, 1919, his company owed about $100,000.

Mr. BALLANTYNE: I do not like interrupting my hon. friend so frequently—

Mr. DUFF: Go ahead; we want to get all the information we can.

Mr. BALLANTYNE: I want the hon. gentleman to finish his speech. But I would like to direct his attention to the fact that the accounts as I presented them a few days ago were audited not only by the Canadian Government Merchant Marine, but also by the well known firm of auditors, Marwick, Mitchell & Company; so I rather think they should be regarded as authentic.

Mr. DUFF: I noticed that. I did not know about the Canadian Government Merchant Marine audit, but I noticed a certificate by this firm of Marwick, Mitchell & Company. The minister prides himself on being a business man; I do not. But the minister must agree that it was impossible for Marwick, Mitchell & Company or anybody else to know what the liabilities of the ships were on December 31, 1919. All the auditors do is audit the books and papers which are laid before them on information which they can get in the office of the company in the city of Toronto or in the minister's office down here. It is impossible for Marwick, Mitchell & Company to know that the outstanding accounts of the Canadian Government Merchant Marine in the city of Halifax amount to $100,000. Why, there are outstanding accounts in practically every port at which these ships call. Everybody knows that; the captains of other ships come home from foreign ports and say that the bills of the merchant marine are not being paid. It is impossible, therefore, for the accountants or auditors to tell whether the outstanding liabilities are $22,000 or $22,000,000. I say, then, that the amount given under the head of outstanding liabilities is too

small and that if it was put at its proper figure, the amount of profit given by the minister as being made by his ships in 1920 would be considerably reduced.

I have shown that according to the statements of the minister, of the officials of the Canadian Government Merchant Marine and of this well known auditing firm of Marwick, Mitchell & Company, the Government ships were supposed to make certain profits within two years. The minister expects the statement of Marwick, Mitchell & Company, of course, to be correct.

Now, coming back to the minister's statements, I find the following:

Operating Accounts for 1919 and 1920

Cr.

By profit to Dec. 31, 1919 (closed voyages)		$1,056,767 38
By profit to Dec. 31, 1919 (open voyages)		350,000 00
		1,406,767 38
By profit from Jan. 1, 1920, to Dec. 30, 1920 (closed voyages)	$598,460 09	
By profit on open voyages to date	183,000 00	781,460 09
		$2,188,227 47

I would like the hon. gentleman to bear that in mind, that if we read from his two statements, in the two years he shows on paper a profit of $2,188,227.47. Of course, I might say that that is not a profit at all, and everyone knows that no such profit exists. It will be interesting for hon. members to know what become of this $2,000,000. Before I go on to the minister's statement which is found on page 1334 of unrevised Hansard, March 29, 1921, and which is known as the consolidated balance sheet, I want to give to the House a statement which I mave made out of the actual condition and position of the operating account for the two years:

Operating account, 1920,
Credit: By profit on closed voyages, $598,460.09.

I give only the net profits because I realise, and the officials of the department must realise, that the amount which they put down on paper of $183,000 for net earnings after January for voyages which are not closed, is purely imaginary. There are upon the ocean to-day scarcely any ships making a profit, and the minister's ships certainly cannot make profits with empty holds and running from one port to another without cargoes. Therefore, I am taking the net nearnings on the 1920 operating account of $598,460.09. The debits are as follows:

To interest on cost of ships in commission—$2,724,474.00.

Which is a charge against the operating revenue of the ships for 1920.

To interest on advances for uncompleted ships	$421,699.10
To business profits tax, 1919,	742,650.00
To income war tax, 1920	62,580.00
Total	$3,951,403.10

Leaving a loss on operating account for 1920 of $3,352,943.01. This is the actual state of affairs. Instead of there being, as the minister says, a credit balance of $2,188,227.47, there is a debit balance of loss in operation for the one year alone of $3,352,943.01. I would like to explain the figures I have given in the debits. As regards the interest of $2,724,474, on cost of ships in commission, I have figured the interest at 5½ per cent, on information which the minister gave to the House a week ago last Tuesday. If my memory is correct, the ships cost an average of $192 per ton, and the tonnage of ships in commission is 259,783 tons. I have figured this amount at 5½ per cent, which shows that the Canadian Government Merchant Marine owes the Finance Department in 1920 for interest on cost of ships, $2,274,474. It is also a well known fact that the Finance Department, through the Marine Department, have advanced to shipbuilders throughout this county on account of ships, that are not yet completed but which are in course of construction, certain sums of money known as progress payments. I have figured in this connection that, if we allow only six months' interest, there is due to the Finance Department $421,699.10 on uncompleted ships. That is an amount of over $3,000,000 which these ships owe in interest. I have charged a business profits tax for 1919 of $742,650, and my reason for charging this amount is twofold. One reason is that the business done by these ships is the same as business done by a private corporation. Instead of this business being done, if done at all, by the officials of the Department of Marine, for some reason or another the Government saw fit to put the business into the hands of a private corporation, with the result that, as a private corporation, they have to pay to the Government a business profits tax of $742,650. Of course, they are not going to pay it because they do not have to, and it would not matter very much if they had to pay it, because they would be only taking the money out of one pocket and putting it into the other. But it is quite proper for me, in making up this operating account, to

charge them with a business profits tax which a private company would have to pay. I got this amount from a very reliable source, and I think it is correct. I also figured income war tax for 1920 for the same reason. Therefore, instead of there being a credit balance on the two years' operations of $2,188,227.47, as the minister says, there is a direct loss to the country on operating expenses for one year of $3,352,943.01. Nobody can contradict these statements and I am sorry I have to give these statements to the House; but my figures are practically correct, and this is the showing the Canadian Government Marine made in the two years of its operation. Never before in the history of any shipping concern was there such an opportunity of making money. In the first year that these ships were launched, private ship owners, after allowing for depreciation, interest, taxes and every other expense necessary, and after paying their shareholders 7 per cent or 10 per cent, made millions and millions of dollars. Yet the Minister of Marine and Fisheries, with a great deal of gusto, tells this House that he has made a paltry $1,056,000, which shows only on paper and which was never made by the corporation. The shipping business went wrong or bad only in September, 1920. What were the minister's ships doing from January 1, 1920, to August 31, 1920? Practically every ship was engaged in profitable work up to August 31, 1920, and it was only during the last four months of the year that the Government ships should have made a loss. I say that the Government ships were badly managed and the Government have no right to carry on the work of endeavouring to operate ships built in Halifax and Vancouver, registered in Montreal and managed in Toronto. A beautiful combination surely!

I want to go a little further to show the credence that can be put in the statements of the Minister of Marine and Fisheries. An ordinary business man, or I would think a man who boasts about his business, before presenting a statement to his shareholders, or to his directors, or to the country, would have gone over these statements and seen that they were correct, before placing himself in the position in which he is placed to-day before the people of this country.

But, Sir, he also presented a second statement to the country, which I should like to place on Hansard. On page 1334 of Hansard of March 29, 1921, appears the statement of the Assets, as follows:

Canadian Government Merchant Marine Limited and Subsidiary Companies

Consolidated Balance Sheet as at December 31, 1920

Assets

Fixed Assets—		
Vessels at cost	$50,005,892.71	
Less depreciation reserve	815,841.32	$49,190,150 39
Plant and equipment at cost	$ 27,243.25	
Office furniture at cost	29,128.66	
	$ 56,371.91	
Less depreciation reserve	2,818.60	53,553 31
Total		$49,243,604 70
Current Assets—		
Cash in banks and on hand	$ 426,816.02	
Accounts receivable	1,750,161.36	
Advances to captains, crews and agents	54,605.09	
Adjusted losses due by underwriters	67,860.82	
Insurance claims, estimated amount recoverable	686,805.51	
Interest receivable accrued	4,583.33	
Inventories of stores and supplies	44,821.84	
Dominion of Canada Victory loan, 1934	500,000.00	$ 3,535,653 97

Now with reference to this delightful statement of Marwick, Mitchell and Company, if hon. members will turn to the same Hansard from which I have just quoted they will find that the total assets have not been added up. Instead of showing the total assets as $52,779,258.67, as any proper statement should show, they say that the fixed assets are $49,243,604.70, and the current assets $3,535,653.97, which gives a total of $52,779,258.67.

Then under the heading of Liabilities we have this:

Liabilities

Capital Stock—	
Authorized 10,000 shares of $100 each $1,000,000, issued 4,709 shares of $100 each	$ 470,900 00
Votes payable—	
Due Dominion Government secured by mortgages on vessels	49,535,892 71
Current Liabilities—	
Accounts payable	1.712,803 03

Open Voyages—	
Balances of uncompleted voyages	963,820 65
Surplus—	
Contingent liabilities (none ascertained)	1,004,233 01
	$53,687,649 40

Owing to an error in the printing, I presume, the amount $1,004,233.01 appears opposite "Contingent liabilities (not ascertained)" instead of opposite "surplus." According to the minister's statement the surplus should be $1,004,233.01. On operating expenses the minister showed a profit of $2,188,227.47, whereas according to his own statement which I have just read, there is a profit of only $1,004,233.01 on the two years' operations. The minister certainly brings very peculiar statements to the House and I would recommend that instead of getting up in heat and objecting to statements made by the hon. member for Maisonneuve or any other hon. member he would be more careful himself. I have compiled a statement from the minister's figures which I have just read, and I will place it on Hansard in a moment. I have just shown that the minister according to his own figures shows a profit of $1,004,-233.01. Now, I am going to show that according to his own figures there is no such thing as a profit of $1,000,000. Now that is a pretty broad statement to make. If the minister will add up the liabilities—leaving out the surplus—shown on page 1334 of Hansard, and subtract the total from the assets, he will find that according to his own figures, the figures of Marwick, Mitchell and Company, or of Mr. Hanna, or of his own officials, who should have gone over this statement to see that it was correct, instead of a profit of $1,004,233.01, he has only a surplus of $95,842.28. Now what do his officials mean, what does Mr. Hanna mean, what do Messrs. Marwick, Mitchell and Company mean, who pretend to have some reputation in this country as auditors and accountants, by showing a surplus of $1,004,233.01 when there is no such thing? Here is the statement I wish to put on Hansard, compiled from the minister's own figures, and it shows that the surplus for the years 1919 and 1920 is only $95,842.28 instead of $1,004,233.01:

Canadian Government Merchant Marine Limited and Subsidiary Companies

Consolidated Balance Sheet as at December 31, 1920

Assets

Fixed Assets—		
Vessels at cost	$50,005,892.71	
Less depreciation reserve	815,841.32	$49,190,051 39
Plant and equipment at cost	$ 27,243.25	
Office furniture at cost	29,128.66	
	$ 56,371.91	
Less depreciation reserve	2,818.60	53,553 31
Total		$49,243,604 70
Current Assets—		
Cash in banks and on hand	$ 426,816.02	
Accounts receivable	1,750,161.36	
Advances to captains, crews and agents	54,605.09	
Adjusted losses due by underwriters	67,860.82	
Insurance claims, estimated amount recoverable	686,805.51	
Interest receivable accrued	4,583.33	
Inventories of stores and supplies	44,821.84	
Dominion of Canada Victory loan, 1934	500,000.00	$ 3,535,653 97
		$52,779,258 67

Liabilities

Capital Stock—	
Authorized 10,000 shares of $100 each $1,000,000, issued 4,709 shares of $100 each	$ 470,900 00
Notes payable—	
Due Dominion Government secured by mortgages on vessels	49,535,892 71
Current Liabilities—	
Accounts payable	1,712,803 03
Open Voyages—	
Balances of uncompleted voyages	963,820 65
Surplus—	
Contingent liabilities (none ascertained)	95,842 28
	$52,779,258 67

The surplus for the years 1919 and 1920 therefore according to the statement of the Government is $95,842.28 and not $1,004,233.01.

I would point out in passing that the figure $49,190,150.39, under Fixed Assets, as it appears in Hansard is evidently intended for $49,190,051.39, as the total shows, and I have therefore made this correction in the statement above.

Mr. BALLANTYNE: I am sorry that there is an error in the statement as it appears in the unrevised Hansard. The figures in Hansard are not the figures I handed to the reporter here. Hansard has left out under Current Assets, on page 1334, deferred charges, insurance unexpired, $908,390.73. The total assets should be $53,687,649.40.

Mr. DUFF: That total includes the $908,390.73 for unexpired insurance?

Mr. BALLANTYNE: Yes. While I am on my feet I also wish to correct another error in Hansard. Under the heading of "Liabilities" the item of $1,004,233.01 should have appeared directly opposite the word "Surplus," instead of opposite the words "Contingent Liabilities (none ascertained)."

Mr. DUFF: I understand that. While I am willing to accept the minister's correction, I am anxious to learn that the ships are losing as little money as possible, and the country should have had this correction immediately. But it only shows again that someone in the minister's department is not doing his duty, and when Hansard came out the next day somebody should have gone over the figures and called them to the minister's attention.

Mr. BALLANTYNE: They did.

Mr. DUFF: Why did you not correct them?

Mr. BALLANTYNE: I did, right away.

Mr. DUFF: When did you correct them?

Mr. BALLANTYNE: My secretary drew my attention to them immediately and a letter was sent to Hansard calling attention to these errors and asking Hansard to be good enough to correct them.

Mr. DUFF: The minister should have called the attention of the House, and not of Hansard, to the fact, because we do not receive revised Hansard until the next fall. The minister should certainly want to get a proper statement before the country, and I say that someone has been derelict in his duty in failing to have these figures corrected in the House the next day. As the minister now comes in and shows that there should be added to the assets an item of $908,000 for deferred insurance, I must accept his statement as it appears on page 1334 showing a surplus of $1,004,433.01. But I intend in a few moments to dissect both assets and liabilities, and I will show to the House that the minister, instead of having, on his own figures, a profit on operating account of over $2,000,000, from the two years' business, can only show on paper a profit of $1,000,000, and this, as a matter of fact, is really not a profit.

At Six o'clock the Committee took recess.

After Recess

The Committee resumed at Eight o'clock.

Mr. McMASTER: Before the hon. member (Mr. Duff) who has the floor resumes his speech I wish to put a question to him. In his remarks this afternoon he told us that the graving dock at Halifax was expropriated by the Government for the sum of about $1,500,000 including interest. He then told us that the dock was turned over to the Halifax Shipyards, Limited, and that they turned it over to the British Empire Steel Corporation for $7,000,000. I do not recollect his having told us at what price the Government—after having expropriated the dock from the British company for $1,500,000—turned it over to the Halifax Shipyards Limited.

Mr. DUFF: I am sorry I omitted to state that because it is a very important feature. The expropriation of this property has had very serious consequences, not only to the shareholders of the Halifax Graving Dock Company but to the people of the Maritime Provinces who have been using this dock. I may say that the Government, after taking the property from the Halifax Graving Dock Company by force, which they did during the war, made an agreement with the Halifax Shipyards Limited to deliver this dock to them at a rental of $62,500 for the first year, with the understanding that sometime during the year the Halifax Shipyards Limited would pay to the Government $1,250,000 for the whole property. Now since my hon. friend has asked me the question, I wish further to state that up to within a few weeks ago the Government had not collected from the Halifax Shipyards Limited that $1,250,000 although they last year paid to the Halifax Graving Dock Company the amount that was awarded the latter by judgment of the Exchequer Court. Consequently, that is another reason why the members of this House and the people of Canada should condemn the Government—for not having collected this money from the Halifax Shipyards Limited after the first year had expired.

Hon. Mr. REID: If the money has not been paid, then I take it for granted the title of the Halifax Dry Dock is still vested in the Crown, and therefore the Government has not only the security of the dry dock as it was when expropriated, but all the buildings and construction that are on the property.

Mr. DUFF: There were no buildings or construction on it. As I remarked this afternoon it is a separate and distinct property from that of the Halifax Shipyards Limited. There was no good reason why the Government, of which the Minister of Railways (Mr. Reid) was a member at the time, should, at the instance and on the advice of somebody in their ranks, have decided to take the Halifax Graving Dock Company by the throat, a company composed of English investors of capital in Canada who came here twenty years ago and, in an endeavour to build up industries in the Dominion, invested their money in the Halifax Graving Dock. I say that at the instance of somebody in the Government the Minister of Railways and his colleagues deliberately passed an Order in Council expropriating the property of this private corporation known as the Halifax Graving Dock Company.

Hon. Mr. REID: I suppose the hon. gentleman is aware that Mr. Brookfield gave a written signed option on this property at $1,250,000 and that afterwards he asked more. The claim went to the Exchequer Court and the court placed its valuation on the property.

Mr. DUFF: I am delighted to see the Minister of Railways in his place to-night. I remember that last year when we were discussing matters in connection with the Canadian Government Merchant Marine the Minister of Railways was sent for and he favoured the House with information that he had at that time in his department regarding the merchant marine. I am delighted to have him back here again to-night, but let me tell him he was not present this afternoon unfortunately when I explained the whole situation. I know exactly what occurred. The minister is quite correct when he says that Mr. Brookfield, the Managing Director of the Halifax Graving Dock Company offered the property to the Government for $1,250,000. But does the minister know that this offer was made by Mr. Brookfield within a fortnight after the great explosion which took place in Halifax, when two thousand inhabitants of the city were killed and twenty thousand wounded and injured? The population of Halifax at that time were in an awful state of mind, in fact the Minister of Marine, a short time afterwards when he came back from a visit to that city, said "they were in hysterics." That is the expression which he employed; he said they were quite hysterical. Is it any wonder they were hysterical when a great part of the city of Halifax had been practically destroyed? It was then that Mr. Brookfield went to Mr. Carvell, or some other member of the Government, and offered this property for $1,250,000. But Mr. Carvell, on behalf of the Government, did not accept the offer of Mr. Brookfield. Then the Halifax Graving Dock Company started repairing the property and getting it in shape to do the work for which it was intended. The strange part of the situation is that afterwards the Halifax Shipyards Limited was formed—that company having established itself within one hundred yards distance of the Halifax Graving Dock. They purchased a piece of property and thereon built a shipyard. Before that time the shipyard was not in existence. Then it was that the minister—due to some influence which I have not yet discovered although I am endeavouring to find out the reason—acted as he did. I do not blame the minister because evidently he did not know what was happening. Seemingly he cast his vote for the passing of that Order in Council in good faith. Nevertheless I cannot relieve him from his share of the responsibility for the deliberate expropriation of the property of private individuals and the turning of it over to the Halifax Shipyards Limited. I do not, as I say, blame the minister, but I say some influence was at work which resulted in the property of the Halifax Graving Dock Company being expropriated by the Government for $1,100,000—not $1,250,000 but $1,100,000. Mr. Brookfiefild and his associates would not accept the offer and they entered an appeal in the Exchequer Court and the matter dragged on for two years. In the meantime some influence was brought to bear on the Government which resulted in the handing over of this valuable dry dock in the city of Halifax to the Halifax Shipyards Limited at a rental of $62,500 for the first year and the understanding that the total purchase price of $1,250,000 was to be paid within a year. The money has never been paid, and the people should know that the Halifax Shipyards Limited, through the operations of the dry dock, have made a profit of some $300,000 since they took the dock over.

Mr. JACOBS: Have you a list of the directors?

Mr. DUFF: The directors are all English; it was an English concern financed with English capital. As I said this afternoon, it is certainly poor advertising for Canada for the Government to deliberately

take the property of British shareholders and turn it over to a local private concern. I want to say further with regard to the Halifax shipyard, that this property was expropriated by the Government without any just cause or reason, and notwithstanding that Mr. Brookfield, the manager of the company, endeavoured before the award was made to have an investigation into the whole affair, for some reason or other the Minister of Railways and his colleagues would not grant any inquiry.

Hon. Mr. REID: I never heard of the matter.

Mr. DUFF: I know. I am appealing to him because I think he is a fair man. I want to say to him that there is something wrong with this transaction. I do not know who is to blame, but if the minister will follow the trail—I am on the trail myself, but I have not reached very far yet, I am sorry to say—and will connect the Halifax Dry Dock Company with the Halifax Shipyard Limited and the British Empire Steel Company, he may find that the latter company or the Halifax Shipyards were asking $7,250,000 for this dry dock property for which they paid $1,250,000; and this House, the country and I will be grateful to him if he will straighten out this tangle. I would like him to go to the Prime Minister's office and to the office of the Minister of Marine and look over the correspondence which has passed between the directors of the Halifax Dry Dock Company and the Government, for although legally the Halifax Dry Dock Company can go no further, since the award of the Exchequer Court is final, I say that in all fairness and common decency an investigation should be held and Mr. Brookfield and the Halifax Dry Dock Company should be allowed to present their case to the Government which innocently passed this Order in Council for expropriation.

Before the House rose at six o'clock I was placing on Hansard a number of statements in connection with the operations of the Canadian Government Merchant Marine. I had read from Hansard a statement, placed there by the Minister of Marine on March 29, and the minister called to my attention the fact that somebody had made a mistake in the figures which were then given. Of course, Mr. Chairman, I was very glad to have the correction. He showed that owing to the omission from that statement of an item of $908,000 for the deferred insurance the figures which he gave on that occasion showing $1,004,000 profit were correct instead of my calculation from that statement as it appeared showing a paper profit of $95,000. Of course, it was not my fault that the mistake was made. I do not think the minister should be held responsible, but I do think that somebody in his department should have looked over that statement the day after it appeared on Hansard and made the necessary correction.

Now, in order to go further into this matter and to show, as I tried to show before six o'clock, that instead of having any surplus the minister has a deficit, I shall have to bring some more figures to the attention of the committee. Before doing so I would like to call attention to the fact that in the operating account for 1920, at page 1334, the minister allows for depreciation $667,665.46. But if hon. members will look a little further down, on the consolidated balance sheet statement they will see that there the minister allowed $815,841.42 for depreciation. The difference between those two amounts is $158,175.96. Where is that $158,000? It does not appear in the 1919 statement of the minister, and how can he bring forward in his consolidated balance sheet for 1920, $815,000 for depreciation when in his operating statement he has only $667,000, whereas the difference should appear in the 1919 statement? That shows, as I said before recess, that neither the book-keeping of the minister's officials nor of Mr. Hanna's officials, nor the auditing of Marwick Mitchell & Company's staff is to be depended upon.

Mr. McGIBBON (Muskoka): The hon. member for Lunenburg is right.

Mr. DUFF: I am glad to have the commendation of the hon. member for Muskoka. If my figures are correct—and they are correct—this difference should have been charged off in 1919 and should be shown in the statement for that year.

In order to place the matter properly before the House and to show fair-minded members both on this and on the other side—because this is not a political question; it is something in which we are all concerned—and reasonable men like the hon. member for Muskoka the way in which this business is being conducted, I want to give to the committee an actual statement of the assets and liabilities of this company as they stand at the present time. I have gone over the accounts very carefully, Mr. Chairman, and I have made up a statement, and if the Minister of Marine and hon. members will follow me they will

find that I have taken the figures in the consolidated balance sheet on page 1334 in some cases in order to make up this statement. I should like to place it on Hansard:

Assets

Vessels in commission at cost	$50,005,892 71	
Less depreciation as per ministers statement	815,841 32	
	49,190,051 39	
Less depreciation on market value of ships 259,783 tons at $150	38,967,450 00	
		$10,222,601 39
Plant and Equipment as per statement office furniture, etc., after deducting 5 per cent for depreciation		53,553 31
Cash in banks and on hand		426,816 02
Accounts receivable	$1,750,161 36	
Less loss in collecting	175,016 13	
		1,575,145 23
Advances to Captains, crews and agents		54,605 09
Adjusted losses due by indemnities		67,860 82
Insurance claims estimated amount recoverable	$686,805 51	
Less amount not collectable	190,000 00	
		496,805 51
Deferred insurance		908,390 73
Interest receivable accrued		4,583 33
Stores & supplies		44,821 84
Victory Bonds 1934.	$500,000 00	
Less depreciation	25,000 00	
		475,000 00
Loss		58,669,906 22
Total		73,000,089 49

Liabilities.

Capital stock, 4,709 shares at $100	$ 470,900 00
Due Dominion Government, Capital acc	49,535,892 71
Due Dominion Government, Interest acc	2,724,474 00
Interest for 6 months on amounts advanced on uncompleted ships $15,334,513 at 5½	421,699 10
Current liabilities	1,712,803 03
Amounts due on uncompleted voyages	963,820 65
Loss in value of uncompleted ships 114,470 tons at 150	17,170,500 00
	$73,000,089 49
Loss to country	$58,669,906 22

There is the actual standing of the Canadian Government Merchant Marine on December 31, 1920—no profit on current account; no profit on operating account; no profit on any other account, but an absolutely loss to this country in depreciation of the value of ships and in the operation of those ships, of $58,669,906.22.

Now, before I leave that statement, as I have placed in it some items which do not appear in the statement given by the minister, I wish to make a brief reference to them. I have added to the statement made by the minister, interest, in the liability column, amounting to $2,724,474. This is the interest on the investment of 1920, which the Canadian Government Merchant Marine owe to the Finance Department. They also owe to the Finance Department six months' interest on $15,334,513, amounting to $421,699.10. I have also placed in the liability column loss in value of uncompleted ships, 114,470 tons at $150. If hon. gentlemen will turn to the minister's statement of March 29, 1921, as found in Hansard of that date, page 1331, they will see that the minister stated that there were uncompleted at that time two ships of 10,500 tons each, nine ships of 8,300 tons each, and five ships of 3,500 to 3,900 tons each, making a total deadweight capacity of 114,470 tons. Hon. gentlemen may well ask me why in the liability column I placed an amount of $17,170,500 as the loss in value of these uncompleted ships. Well, Sir, with your permission I would like to prove my statement. These ships were contracted for by the Minister of Marine without calling for tenders, without asking the public to make an offer for the building of them at a certain price, with the result that instead of costing the market price, the ships cost anywhere from $215, if my memory serves me correctly, to $167.50 per deadweight ton. But in his own statement as found on Hansard the minister says that these ships cost, on an average, $192 per ton. The House will notice that I have deducted for depreciation in value, $150 per ton, leaving the small sum of $42 per ton as the value of these ships.

Mr. BALLANTYNE: I do not know whether or not my hon. friend has taken off enough.

Mr. DUFF: I thank the minister very much for that suggestion; perhaps I have not, but I am willing to leave the public to judge between the minister's statement of March 29 and mine. It would be more dignified on his part if the minister, instead of throwing slurs across this floor, would allow me to finish my statement.

I said, Sir, that some hon. members might wonder why I deducted $150 per ton from the prices which the minister says is the average cost of these ships. It is a large amount, but I think I can prove conclusively to the committee that any hon.

gentleman can at the present time go into the open market and buy new ships—not tramp steamers such as the minister has on his hands, most of which can make only eight or ten knots an hour, but steamers which can make from twelve to fifteen knots an hour, at anywhere from £9 per ton, which, in the exchange market to-day, would be about $37 to $38, to $60 or $75 a ton, according to the manner in which the ships are fitted up.

Hon. Mr. REID: May I ask the hon. gentleman whether he refers to second-hand ships or to the making of a contract for the construction of new ships of the type that he mentions?

Mr. DUFF: That is a fair question. I mean that the Minister of Railways can go into the open market and purchase ships which were launched within the last six months and which have not been sold, in the English market or in the Scotch shipyards, at £9 per ton deadweight. Now, Sir, let me prove my point. This is from the American Shipping Register:

If the United States Shipping Board were to fix a price for the sale of the steel tonnage with regard for the world market figures ruling to-day it would be forced to offer the cargo carriers with $35 a deadweight ton as the top price. One of the most recent sales in the United Kingdom on a new 6,750 deadweight ton freighter, completed in 1920, was recorded at £60,000. This was at approximately £9 a deadweight ton. The depreciation in the value of tonnage is indicated by the comparison with £14 a deadweight ton at the end of the past year. Before the British are able to dispose of the ex-German tonnage it would seem that the Inchcape syndicate will be almost giving away the more antiquated and seaworn cargo carriers.

That is for December 31, 1920.

It seems doubtful if any considerable number of these ships could be sold to-day to American companies even if they were offered at nominal figures.

This is an extract from the Shipbuilding and Shipping Record of January, 1921.

Ship Sale Market

Few years have closed with the ship sale market in a more depressed condition than that of the year just past. Striking illustrations of this deplorable slump were evidenced at a ships' auction at the Merchants' Hall, Baltic Exchange, London, on December 15, when C. W. Kellock and Company offered for sale two very attractive vessels, one of which was practically a new ship. This vessel, the War Fig, a cargo steamer of about 4,050 tons d.w., fitted with geared turbines, and ready for immediate service, was put into the bidding at £10,000, and despite much eloquence on the part of the auctioneer, the bidding failed to reach the reserve price, and was eventually withdrawn at £34,000.

[Mr. Duff.]

This would be a rate of $35 per ton.

The second vessel, the ex-enemy steamer Chemnitz, with accommodation for about 49 first-class and 16 second-class passengers, of a deadweight capacity of about 8,300 tons, twin-screw triple-expansion engines, and built in Germany in 1901, was submitted at £10,000; but it was soon evident that there was little desire to purchase, and bidding ceased at £17,000, at which figure she also was withdrawn.

This would be a rate of $9 per ton.

Consideration should be given to these facts; here, in the instance of the War Fig, we have a vessel equal to a new ship and ready to load a cargo as soon as she is fixed, passed over so lightly that the highest figure bid was but little more than £8 per ton d.w., a strange commentary on prices ruling a year ago.

This is another letter from a ship-broker in the town of North Sydney, a gentleman who, in his business, like any other shipping man, is offered ships from day to day. He says:

I note that according to the minister's statement these vessels cost $190 per deadweight ton. To-day I have a letter from London offering a 2,000-ton steamer built in 1920 for which an offer of £14 per ton would be accepted.

A price of £14 per ton, as the Minister of Railways knows, was equal to about $56 in 1920. I would like the House also to remember that this offer of $56 per ton, was for a 2,000-ton steamer, and the Minister of Railways must know that the smaller the deadweight capacity or the smaller the steamer, the higher the price or cost of building per deadweight ton. Consequently, if a steamer of 2,000 deadweight tons would be offered for $56 per ton, it follows that a steamer of 5,000 or 8,000 deadweight tons, of which we have some in the Canadian Government Merchant Marine, could be purchased at a much less figure. This is another letter from a prominent shipping man:

I notice that a new steamer has recently been purchased in the United Kingdom at £9 a deadweight ton. This would be practically $40, whereas the Canadian Government Merchant Marine cost, I understand, from $180 to $200 a deadweight ton. I understand that they have either built or contracted for 63 steamers, and the average deadweight I suppose would be about 4,500 tons, or a total of 292,500 tons. Take the average cost, say at $190. This shows a difference over the English price to-day of $150 a ton, or a depreciation in value already, which the Government will have to write off if they are to operate these steamers in competition with the cheaper British steamers, of $43,875,000.

The minister will have noticed that all I wrote off was $38,000,000; yet my friend, who is a man who knows something about

shipping, who every day receives quotations from the United States and England, says that the Government has made a loss, by depreciation in value of these sixty-three steamers, of $43,875,000. I think the House will agree with me that this is a serious state of affairs. What do the people in this country think of this matter? It might be well, perhaps, although it will take a little of the time of the House, for me to go into this matter.

Before I do so, however, I might, if the committee will allow me, go back for a moment to the statement which the minister made with regard to the other figures contained in my statement. Accounts receivable, as given by the minister, amounted to $1,750,161.36. In the statement which I have made up, I have deducted from that 10 per cent or $175,000, for the reason that if the Government agents have allowed, on freights, $1,750,000 to be outstanding, I cannot understand how they are going to collect that amount without a loss of 10 per cent, which I have allowed for loss in collecting. These freights should have been collected long ago, and it is too much to place in the assets of the company, $1,750,000 for accounts receivable. I doubt very much if that is not purely an estimate and not an actual statement of the fact. A little further down in the minister's statement he shows insurance claims, estimated amount recoverable, $686,805.51. The only conclusion to which I can come is that the insurance claims are for either actual or partial losses on some of these boats. I presume one boat or, perhaps, more than one got into difficulties somewhere, and after the officials of the Canadian Government Merchant Marine received from their agents, in the foreign or local port where the accident occurred, the bills and accounts in connection with the repairs, those accounts were sent to a marine insurance adjuster who would make up his statement. Until such time as the Canadian Government Merchant Marine, Limited, receives from the adjuster an actual adjustment of what the different insurance companies will pay, it is impossible for the officials of the Canadian Government Merchant Marine to give to this House and to the country or to make a fair estimate of what they are to receive from the different insurance companies for repairs on the different steamers. I doubt very much if some of the officials of the Marine Department know enough about marine insurance to know how much should be deducted. But men in this country, with experience in marine losses and the way in which such losses should be written off and the amounts that should be deducted for the difference between the amount of insurance and the value of the ship as she appears in the insurance policy, must come to the conclusion that the merchant marine, instead of being able to collect the $686,805.51, will collect a very much smaller sum. I said a moment ago that I was doubtful if some of the officials in the Marine Department knew how a marine adjuster's statement should be made up. A few weeks ago I asked a question about the damage sustained by the steamer Canadian Recruit which went ashore in the Gulf of St. Lawrence last year. If hon. members will look at the answers that I received, they can only come to the conclusion that practically a whole clean-out is required in the Marine Department, nothing more and nothing less. The officials in the Marine Department or in the department at Toronto who have charge of this work, do not know their business, or they would never have given the answers which I received in regard to this matter some time ago.

The minister was good enough to call to my attention the fact that an item of deferred insurance, $908,390.73, had been left out of his statement. I presume that the amount is figured on the insurance premiums which the company is paying on the insurance written on the different ships, but no other concern in this country ever takes any notice of what is known as deferred insurance in regard to ships. In an ordinary business on land, if a private corporation or a private individual paid $20,000, $30,000, or $40,000 in insurance premiums, and if only one month of the insurance had run, they would be perfectly justified when making up a statement for the shareholders or the bank in showing that there were still 11 months' premiums to run off, but that is never done in the case of shipping companies. Why? Simply and solely for the reason that when you insure a ship, say, for $700,000 and pay, let us say for the the sake of illustration, $50,000 in premiums, if that ship is lost tomorrow, you do not collect the $700,000 plus the 11 months' insurance which has never been run off. Certainly not. You collect the $700,000, and the insurance company makes you pay by note or cash the $50,000 in premiums for the whole year. Consequently, I say that any person who understood the shipping business would not have placed in that statement of assets

$908,000 for deferred insurance. While I have allowed that in deference to the statement of the minister, it is not right or proper that the amount should appear in the statement of assets.

Then the Minister of Railways or the Minister of Marine and Fisheries, or somebody else, due, I presume to the loyalty which is bubbling out of the hearts of the members of the Conservative party, or the Unionist party, or the National Liberal and Conservative party, when the Government called on the people of this country to invest their savings in the 1934 Victory loan, subscribed $500,000 for the bonds of that issue, for I notice by the statement of assets that somebody holds $500,000 of the Dominion of Canada Victory loan, 1934. Now either the Minister of Marine and Fisheries or his officials, or Mr. Hanna or his officials, or the auditors, Messrs. Marwin, Mitchell and Company have placed in that statement these Victory bonds at par. Now if they were making up a private statement for the minister or for his bank, for instance, to show how he stood with the world, Messrs. Marwick, Mitchell and Company would immediately say if they were shown in the statement of assets this item of $500,000 for bonds of the 1934 Victory loan: We cannot allow that to pass; the bonds are only worth $475,000 to-day, or $95 to the $100. Consequently, we can allow you on that item a credit of only $475,000. So there is a difference there of $25,000.

I think I have covered the matters in connection with this statement pretty thoroughly, but there is one thing I would like to say to the Minister of Marine and Fisheries, especially in view of the fact that the statement issued by the Department of Marine and Fisheries was not what it should have been, and also in view of the fact that the people of this country for the last year or two, and especially during the last six months, have known that the shipping business was in a bad state. Whether or not the Government was justified in building ships, everybody knew the Government must be losing money, because every private individual in the business was losing money. Now, I might be excused for going out and saying about a private company in which I was interested that I was afraid there would be a deficit, and that things were not so rosy as they should be, but with regard to this Government enterprise I say it does not lie in the mouths of the officials of the Marine Department to say twenty-four hours before the minister issued his statement, that there were people in this country who were pessimistic about the merchant marine situation. I say that the officials of the Government should mind their own business, and not give out statements to the newspapers, as did some official in the Marine Department, the day before the minister issued his statement. Let me read what somebody in the minister's department said:

> "There's a great disappointment awaiting those who have predicted a deficit" in connection with the operation of the Canadian Merchant Marine. Parliament Hill, the press and the public of Canada, considering the showing of the national railways, have steeled themselves for further heavy losses when the promised merchant marine statement is brought in by Hon. C. C. Ballantyne: "A knockout," the Canadian Press Limited comments, "awaits the pessimists who have confidently predicted an operating deficit." Both the statements quoted as the "official verdict" of the department, and the tone of the press dispatch, have given offence. They imply that members, press and public have been hoping for a deficit.
>
> The fact is that any little hope will come as water in a desert of deficit. If the Canadian Government Merchant Marine shows a profit, with all the facts in to date, then there will not be disappointment, but national gratification. "Do they imagine that people actually like to hear of stunning losses"? demanded one member tonight.

The latter part is the comment of one of the newspapers in this country, and I think everybody will agree with its statement that if the merchant marine shows a profit when all the facts are in, there will not be disappointment but national gratification. I say it does not lie in the mouth of any official of the Marine Department to give out such a statement to the Canadian Press, implying that there are members of Parliament in this country, whether on the Government or the Opposition side, who would be delighted to hear of a deficit in the operations of the merchant marine.

Mr. BALLANTYNE: If my hon. friend will allow me to interrupt him for a moment, the only statement given out to the press officially was by my secretary, who sat in the gallery under strict orders from me to give out nothing to the members of the Press Gallery until I rose to speak, and then all that was handed to the members of the gallery was what appeared officially on the pages of Hansard. Surely my hon. friend is not going to attribute to any one connected with the merchant marine responsibility for the various newspaper articles which have appeared. I think his fairness of mind will surely grant that.

Mr. DUFF: I am trying to be fair, but it is useless, absolutely useless, for the minister to try and apologise for any of his officials. The country will not—I will not say believe him, but I say it is useless for him to try and apologise for his officials. Let me point out to him that this despatch is dated March 28, and his statement was not made to the House until March 29. So how can he say he gave instructions to his secretary not to give out anything until after he had made his speech, when this statement was given out from his Department twenty-four hours before he ever rose to speak.

Mr. BALLANTYNE: What is the name of the paper?

Mr. DUFF: It is a paper which supports the minister, the Halifax Herald. The item I have read is contained in a despatch dated March 28, from Ottawa, and was an interview reported by the Canadian Press Limited. The Canadian Press Limited is subsidized by the Government, and we all know they would not give out anything against the Government unless they had received it from one of the minister's officials. Now let us see what else the press of this country say about this merchant marine. Here is another despatch from Halifax. The reason I am reading despatches from Halifax is because Halifax is one of the greatest shipping ports in the world.

Mr. BALLANTYNE: I suppose you have the Toronto papers there as well, the Globe, for instance?

Mr. DUFF: If the minister will send for the Globe and will mark any passage he wishes me to read, I shall be glad to quote it in full and make my comments. I have not the Globe nor have I seen its reference as referred to by the minister. Whatever the Globe said or did not say does not affect the situation. In Halifax we are differently situated. The Globe, I understand, is printed in Toronto, and with all due deference to its editor and those who are associated with it, I must say that they are not in as good a position to size up the situation as are the Halifax newspapers, and newspapers on the Pacific coast. I shall now give an extract from the Halifax Herald. The article is headed "Some Appetite," and underneath this caption is the picture of a great big elephant—a white elephant. Below the picture are the letters "C.G.M.M." which I take to mean "Canadian Government Merchant Marine." One foot of this elephant stands on "Canadian shipping enterprise;" another foot stands on "West India trade," squashing its unfortunate body to death, while another foot is trampling the life out of "private ship owners." On the trunk, and before the feet of this useless beast are scattered the seventy million dollars of the people"s money which the hon. Minister of Marine has wasted. Now for the substance of the article:

> Conservative Halifax business men—men who have been in the shipping and exporting business in this city for the past twenty-five years, are outspoken in their criticism of the present management of the Canadian Government Merchant Marine. A prominent Halifax business man—a man who has been on the water front for years—gave The Herald the following statement yesterday:
>
> "The number of steamers built and being built for the C.G.M.M. is understood to be 65. These steamers each run from 3,000 to 10,000 tons deadweight capacity. It would be probably safe to say that they average 5,000 tons deadweight capacity each, and it is understood that the contract prices were from $180 to $200 per deadweight ton or an average of $190 per deadweight ton. It is not comforting news for the taxpayers of Canada to read in British Shipping papers that recently a new German built steamer was sold in England for nine pounds sterling per deadweight ton, or at to-day's rate of exchange, slightly under $40.00 as against $190.00 for the Canadian steamers.
>
> "It is alarming to look further into these figures; 65 steamers at an average of 5,000 tons each amounts to 325,000 tons which at a cost of $150 dollars per deadweight ton more than to-day's price in England, means that their reduced value today is forty-eight millions seven hundred and fifty thousand dollars. Had these steamers been sold, as they should have been, when the war was over there is no doubt but that this loss would have been considerable less, probably not one-half of the present depreciation, and the country is now saddled not only with this loss, but with also a probable tremendous yearly loss in operation."

After reading this article in the Halifax Herald, I had occasion to discuss the question of the merchant marine with some of the best business men along the water front of that city. I asked them what they thought of it and they unanimously agreed that there was no question at all as to the absolute correctness of the figures quoted; they all agreed that they were within the limit. Now, let me give the minister a little more food for reflection. Here is an article headed "Must Face Facts". The minister will no doubt be anxious to know the source from which I shall quote, and I am confident that the newspaper in which the article appears would not say anything detrimental to this Government if it were possible for its editor or its proprietor to say anything in their defence. This article also appears in the Halifax Herald, a supporter of the

Government. As I say, it is headed "Must Face Facts", and this is what it says:

According to a despatch from the capital, the people of Canada must begin now to prepare themselves for one more unpalatable pill in the form of a second extensive deficit in a government-operated department. The ministerial prestidigitators unable to produce the doves and rabbits from the departmental hat, have evidently no alternative but to lay the headgear on the table and wait. The Canadian Government Merchant Marine, it is feared, "will show correspondingly heavy losses"—the relative factor being the Canadian National Railways.

"It is realized," says the despatch, "that all has not been prosperity with this branch of the service, and an announcement of a deficit would not be surprising."

Thus, the shadow is precursor of the event. Canadians will be disappointed, but they will not be astonished, at the failure of the merchant marine. This is the logical outcome of the government embarking in a competitive business on its own account without due regard to what the venture entailed.

On the 27th February, 1920, Hon. C. C. Ballantyne announced that the Merchant Marine would be constructed at a cost of $20,000,000. Eight months later, the entire estimate had increased to $72,890,476.03. The fleet has not yet been completed.

Contracts for the government-owned vessels were placed at the peak of ship-building prices. An instance may be taken from the Canadian Explorer and the Canadian Mariner where the contract price was over $190 a ton. Between the placing of the contract and completion of the ships, costs had fallen and, according to well-informed shipping interests in Halifax, steamers are now being built in Great Britain at prices ranging from no more than $63 to $75 a ton. That is to say, a ship built in Halifax, or any other place in Canada at the price prevailing when the contract was entered into ($1,636,050) and of the same type as the locally-built vessels, would now cost approximately $512,000, at the highest.

If this means anything at all, it means that the government-owned vessel has depreciated over $1,000,000 before it strikes the water at all. Basing its rates on fixed charges—interest, depreciation and insurance—and placing the principle of these charges as the actual cost of the vessel, usually rated at 13 per cent, the government ship must earn roughly $136,000 in order to clear its overhead, while the privately-owned ship is earning $65,000. This is the handicap of the Canadian merchant marine, and with the commissioning of the larger and more expensive vessels, the handicap is aggravated.

The figures quoted do not pretend to detail with any attempt at accuracy the actual obligations devolving on the vessels, for they do not take into account current expenses, nor do they embrace the money necessary to outfit and equip in order to make them operative at all. They are employed merely to indicate relatively the situation of the Canadian Government Merchant Marine as contrasted with that of private companies.

There are of course remedies, but before any measures can be applied the government must be prepared to accept the initial depreciation as a dead loss.

[Mr. Duff.]

Perhaps the minister would also like to hear more regarding the cost of these ships, and their present value. Let me read from an article taken from a London newspaper of February 26, under the heading "The Shipping Position":

Nearly 10 per cent of British shipping laid up—freight falling in 12 months by 75 per cent—five ships needed to do the work that four ships did seven years ago—running costs up by 300 per cent over the pre-war level—clearances of British steamers less than in 1890—coal exports a third of what they were in 1913.

Such are a few of the facts that may be gleaned from the very gloomy reports issued in the last few weeks by the Chamber of Shipping and the Liverpool Ship Owners' Association. The story that the shipping experts have to tell is perhaps no more depressing than any story told by any trade association at the present time, but shipping is the microcosm of international trade, and these unhappy facts reflect more clearly than any recent document the condition into which the business of the world has fallen. British shipping grew and developed in freedom—freedom from the paralyzing restrictions of government, freedom to bring merchandise without hindrance to our ports, freedom to do business wherever business was to be done. The depression is attributed in large measure to government interference, and in the broadest sense it is true, shipping will recover in the proportion that politicians leave trade to flow in its own channels.

That, to my mind, is quite right, and so long as any member of the Government cherishes the notion that he can operate ships better than private individuals, just so long shall we have exactly the conditions that we find to-day.

The newspaper goes on to say:

If the ship owners can convince the politicians that what we need is not guidance but freedom, they will have done the country a very great service.

Well, Sir, the only way that the shipbuilders can persuade the politicians to give them freedom is to tell the members of the Cabinet, who are now usurping the functions of government although they promised to go to the people and get a fresh mandate after the war, that the quicker they resign their positions and give the people a chance to express at the polls the opinion they entertain about them the better. I might also, perhaps, in order to be fair, quote what some authorities in this country and elsewhere say about the value of ships. One gentleman who is more familiar than others with shipping operations, by reason of his connection with that great corporation, the Canadian Pacific Railway, is Mr. Bosworth, and he stated a few days ago, when asked about the value of ships at the present time, that new ships were worth from $50 to $75 per ton. I quite understand that Mr. Bosworth would naturally put the best side for-

ward, and in view of the fact that the Canadian Pacific company own and operate a number of ships he certainly would not state the value of these ships at less than they actually were. I think, therefore, that when Mr. Bosworth put a value of $50 to $75 per ton on ships it will certainly convince any person who wants to be fair that he was placing a limit on the value at the present time. Another gentleman who is greatly interested in shipping is Mr. Robert Dollar, whose name is very familiar to every person who reads the magazines and newspapers of this country. Mr. Dollar is a large ship owner and a short time since, when consulted with regard to the slump in shipping, gave his opinion that at the very outset ships were worth only $72 per ton. I think therefore that when, in making up my statement, I figured an appreciation of $150 per ton on the present Canadian Government Merchant Marine I made a fair presentation of the facts.

Now, Sir, there is a further matter to be considered in connection with this shipbuilding programme. However before I enter into that I wish to quote the opinion of another newspaper. The minister was anxious to hear what the Toronto Globe had said, but as he has not got that information I will read to him the opinions of another journal. The minister knows very well that the Montreal Gazette is a newspaper favourable to the present Government. I think I am within the judgment of the House when I say that the Montreal Gazette would not make any statement detrimental to this Government with respect to the management, the operation, or the building of the Canadian Merchant Marine, nor would it with respect to anything connected with the Government. The minister will remember that after the Peterborough election this good Tory newspaper came out and demanded the Government's resignation; but it found that the Government would not resign, but was determined to hold office in spite of the wishes of the people and in a very few weeks afterwards the Montreal Gazette was found trying to apologize for the Government and the Government's action. Still, Sir, I think I am quite justified in quoting what the Montreal Gazette says about this particular matter. The editorial is dated January 8, 1920, and is headed "The Canadian Marine." The article says:

It is interesting to learn, from official sources, that the Canadian marine is being operated at a cost lower only than that of the Japanese merchant vessels. The statement as printed is not, however, convincing; according to the report credited to the Marine Department the monthly cost of wages and board of the crew of a United States Government ship is $6,711, while that of a Canadian Government ship of like tonnage and dimensions is only $2,303, or about one-third that of its American competitor for international trade. Even poor old Britain's ship owners seem to have not yet mastered the art of efficiency and economy in the management of ships, as the cost of operating a British vessel of the Canadian Mercantile Marine class is set forth as $3,645.09 per month. Do not overlook the nine cents. So that taking the American cost for comparative purposes as 100, Britain manages to plough the sea with her ships at an expenditure of 54 per cent, Canada at an expenditure of 34 per cent, and Japan, because of cheap oriental labour and the addiction of its crews to rice, at an expenditure of 17 per cent of that of the United States.

The article goes on to say:

However gullible the public may be, they are not so credulous as to believe that a vessel operated under the auspices of the Canadian Government can be navigated at a cost 20 per cent, less than that of a British vessel. The ownership of some 66 ships by the people of Canada is a quite serious matter, second in importance only to that of the ownership of 22,000 miles of railway. There is a lot of money involved in the matter, a capital expenditure in the neighbourhood of $75,000,000, and a current operating account which may produce a surplus, but we fear will involve a heavy deficit upon proper accounting. The policy of the Government was admirable enough at the time of its conception. There was a dearth of ocean shipping caused by the depredations of submarines, and the creation of a shipbuilding industry was timely in the way of providing employment for many hundred persons, as well as promising of permanence. The use of the vessels in the promotion of foreign trade was also alluring, and it is to be said that many markets have been exploited through the agency of the Government Mercantile Marine. Nothing can be gained, however, by concealment of what we believe to be a fact, namely, that the continued ownership and operation of these ships is likely to prove costly. Conditions have swiftly changed. From a dearth of tonnage three years ago, there is now an excess. Many vessels have been tied up for want of freight. Rates are declining, and a business hazardous in private hands becomes more so when managed by a government.

In this connection there is an interesting article in the last issue of Bradstreets, from which we quote:

" The reports that come from the shipping business, whether from the freight or the construction side of that industry, point to the world as a whole having more than made up the losses of war, and there are now more ships than there is freight offering. Rate cutting is widespread, but as we noted in the case of some staples a while ago, lower freights seem to bring out only a small business, owing, it is said, to the reduced international trade moving. On the construction side of the case it may be said that with hundreds of ships tied up,said to be one-quarter of the entire fleet, the Shipping Board finds it hard to get business for its vessels, which are handicapped in the world competition for business by acts of Congress which were devised, apparently, for the purpose of making shipping expensive rather than cheap. The board according to Admiral Ben-

son, has 200 of one type of ship tied up, and a consular report cabled from London says a big slump is noted in the British shipping trade at all ports. From the shipbuilding side of the matter the situation is no better. Japanese shipyards are reported to have comparatively little to do, and a Tyne river (British) shipbuilder is quoted in the day's news as saying cancellations in that line were never more numerous, he instancing one concern that had sixteen cancellations."

It is, therefore, a discouraging situation in which the Canadian mercantile fleet is placed Like the National Railway, deficits are likely to be the order of the day and the people may prepare to bear no small monetary burden as the price of the policy justifiable in its inception, but as to the wisdom of the continuance of which there may well be misgiving

That is what the Montreal Gazette says.

Hon. Mr. BALLANTYNE: I suppose the hon. member would have no objection to give to the House the very favourable editorial published by the Montreal Gazette the day after I made my statement in the House?

Mr. DUFF: I have not that editorial in my possession. If the minister will supply me with it I will be very glad to read it.

Hon. Mr. BALLANTYNE: It is there.

Mr. DUFF: Where.

Hon. Mr. BALLANTYNE: In the Montreal Gazette.

Mr. DUFF: Will the minister be good enough,—because I am very busy with the delivery of my speech as I have prepared it,— to send a page out and get the issue of the Montreal Gazette to which he refers, and I will be very glad to read the editorial. I said a moment ago that the Montreal Gazette asked the Government to resign after the Peterborough election, but after influence had been brought to bear on that paper it pulled in its horns and since then has been apologizing for the actions of the Government. Now, Sir, I will read what another newspaper says with respect to the Government's shipbuilding operations. It is contained in a despatch sent out from Ottawa and says:

The minister gives only one side of the C.G.M.M. story for the year ended December 31, 1920, that is, when it affirms a net operating profit of some $781,460. A man running a gasoline ferry would hardly be expected to strike a balance of profit and forget to debit the account with interest on the money he borrowed to buy the boat.

Nor would he be expected to forget that his boat was wearing out and that some time he would be faced with the necessity of buying a new one. But that is what the minister does.

Because he does not know any better.

An hon. MEMBER: That is pretty severe.

[Mr. Duff.]

Mr. DUFF: I know it is but it is absolutely correct. While I am waiting for the minister to pass me the Gazette referred to, I should like to avert for a few moments to what another member of the Government said with regard to the merchant marine. After the Minister of Marine had made his statement last Tuesday, and after some very fair criticisms had been made by the hon. member for Red Deer (Mr. Clark) and the hon. member for Maisonneuve (Mr. Lemieux) the Prime Minister was compelled to come to the defence of his minister. Now, if there is anything the Prime Minister knows absolutely nothing about it is shipping conditions in this country, and I say that he had no right to intervene in the debate on a subject of which he is absolutely ignorant. I will prove to the satisfaction of hon. members that the Prime Minister did not know what he was talking about when he made the remarks which appeared on Hansard of March 29, at page 1346. He endeavoured to save the face of the Minister of Marine and the Government and in endeavouring to combat the arguments advanced by the hon. member for Red Deer and the hon. member for Maisonneuve he said:

I am sorry that, as things have turned out, hon. members opposite were found prepared for a very dismal presentation whereas, as a matter of fact, the statement made by the Minister of Marine reflects anything but a disastrous situation—possibly it is not as rosy as many of us expected when the programme was launched, certainly not as rosy as there were just reasons for expecting at that time, but on the whole fair and satisfactory.

Now when I said a few moments ago that some official in his department had given out a statement to the Canadian press the Minister of Marine denied it. Perhaps after all he was right; it may have been the Prime Minister who gave out that statement.

An hon. MEMBER: It sounds like it.

Mr. DUFF: Yes.

I am sorry that, as things have turned out, hon. members opposite were found prepared for a very dismal presentation, whereas, as a matter of fact, the statement made by the Minister of Marine reflects anything but a disastrous situation—

Well, Mr. Chairman, if the Prime Minister can get any comfort from the present condition of the merchant marine as shown either in the operating account or in the capital account, then I say he is welcome to that comfort, but I can assure him that the people will not agree with his statement that that condition of affairs is satisfactory. And I should like to know why

the Prime Minister dared to interfere in the debate to say to hon. members either on this side of the House or the other that they were "prepared for a very dismal presentation" of the facts. Is that a fair statement to make? I say the Prime Minister was not justified in so speaking.

The Prime Minister also made another statement which I would like to quote because I want to show conclusively that he did not know what he was talking about. It will be found at page 1348 of Hansard of the same date and is in these words:

> Well, they are at least earning a good sum over operating expenses,—and you cannot make any trains do that over the Trascontinental railway, nor over the Grand Trunk Pacific railway. Those ships are at least earning some million odd dollars over operating expenses, and after allowance for depreciation and every other just allowance that need be made they are still able to pay a small percentage upon their actual cost,—

I say, Sir, that the Prime Minister had no right to make such a statement in view of the fact that these ships are not making a profit. They never have made a profit,—indeed, they are making a loss which this country is ill able to stand. I do not want to use hard language, but there are times when we have to be candid, and the Prime Minister would not have made these statements unless he was entirely ignorant of the facts connected with the merchant marine.

I have to thank the minister for the article, not from the Gazette but La Presse. I am only sorry that it is not in the original French version. I see it has been translated, and before I proceed to read it I want to say that I would not be surprised if the minister's department or the English translator has made the same blunder as was perpetrated in regard to the pilots. We all remember the answer we got from the minister in which he said that certain "decayed" pilots were receiving a bonus. It is only another instance of the way in which the Marine Department is conducted. There seems to be no person there who knows anything about its affairs.

Mr. BALLANTYNE: Hear, hear.

Mr. DUFF: That is absolutely right, from the minister down. This is what La Presse says:

> The detailed and precise exposé. . . .

It should have read exposure.

> . . . made yesterday in the House of Commons by the Minister of Marine regarding the operation of the Canadian Government Merchant Marine shows that last year's operations yielded a net surplus of $781,460.

> This surplus amounts to only half the surplus for the preceding year, but this is due to the world crisis of last year. Canada did not escape the effects of this crisis, which owing to the dearth of maritime freight caused many vessels in Great Britain and the United States to remain idle in the harbours.
>
> The surplus acquired by the Government merchant marine represents a revenue of 2.35 per cent on the capital invested, a figure insufficient to meet the interest on that capital, which amounts to 2,750,000.

What a great showing that is, to be sure! Is it any wonder that the minister sent this article over to me? Here is his own statement sent across the floor of the House, in which I read that this merchant marine of his made a profit of 2.35 per cent on the invested capital. Is not that great? He is paying 5½ per cent interest on his capital and not allowing a cent for depreciation, and he is proud of the fact that he made 2.35 per cent.

> This therefore means that a loss of about $2,000,000 must be put down to exploitation.

That shows again, Mr. Chairman, that the minister would never have had to do this if he was seized of the facts. It shows, as I have said a dozen times in the course of my speech, that neither the minister nor his officials know what is going on in the department and are not conversant with Canadian shipping conditions.

Mr. BALLANTYNE: Read on.

Mr. DUFF: Do not worry; I will read on. I want to repeat that about the exploitation:

> There is no reason for recrimination any more than there is for being alarmed. The Canadian Government Marine is an enterprise at its beginning and it could not be expected to escape the vicissitudes which accompany all new initiatives.
>
> From the figures quoted in the House by the Hon. Mr. Ballantyne it would appear that the cost of operating our vessels has been reasonable and compares favourably with that of foreign shipping.
>
> It should not be overlooked, on the other hand, that the cost of construction of these vessels, built during the war, has been excessive; that was a general law during the war period. There is therefore no need to be astonished beyond measure that the profits of exploitation are insufficient to meet the interest on this excessive capital.
>
> On the whole, credit should ge given this enterprise and we should be resigned to support the cost of such an initiative which must be considered an economic necessity, Canada being destined to reap great advantages from the same within a short time.

Evidently there is somebody in this country who is not seized with the facts regarding world shipping, somebody who is willing to pay that tribute to the merchant

marine and the results which the minister has obtained.

An hon. MEMBER: He did not know any better.

Mr. DUFF: Of course he did not know any better; that is the whole trouble. He took the minister's figures, and that is why he made the statement that he did. But there is not very much comfort for the minister in this article. It is not necessary for me to deal with it in detail, because I have already covered these points. If my hon. friend will look at Hansard to-morrow and refer to my previous statements, he will find that I have answered all the points brought forward by La Presse and that La Presse has not one leg to stand upon so far as anything favourable to the Canadian Government Merchant Marine is concerned.

With regard to the costs of building these ships, to which I have referred, I may say that the worst is yet to come. The minister made certain contracts, on his own initiative, and without calling for tenders, with certain shipbuilding concerns in this country. For one reason or another, which I shall not discuss at the moment, these shipyards were compelled to go into liquidation, and by reason of the loose manner in which the Minister of Marine had the contracts drawn he is now compelled to have other ship-building concerns take over the half-completed ships from these different shipyards to be finished on a cost plus basis. Instead these ships costing the country $190 a ton, therefore, they will cost nearly $250 a ton before the minister gets through with his contract. Now, Sir, what is the result of all this effort on the part of the Government to build these ships at the highest possible prices and endeavour to operate them in competition with private enterprise? I agree that we should have a merchant marine; I agree that we should have a Canadian merchant marine, but a marine built with private capital. There was no good reason why, after a certain stage was reached, the minister should not have disposed of these ships, should not have sold them in such a manner as not to interfere with the operations of private concerns in this country.

I omitted to mention, Sir, that not only are we going to suffer a loss of about $59,000,000 on the operation and depreciation in value of these ships, but the minister and the Government have another serious matter to deal with. It will be remembered that the minister made a contract with a certain steel company in this country for the delivery of 250,000 tons of ship plates. As a result of the Government not taking delivery of all these plates—if I am correctly informed the Government took delivery of only 45,000 tons instead of the full order of 250,000 tons—the Government are going to have a lawsuit on their hands. This company claim that in good faith they went ahead, spent $5,000,000 in putting up a plate mill, bought the steel and prepared to turn out the 250,000 tons of steel plates. The Government have not been able to carry out their contract and the company are now asking from the Government, if I am correctly informed, $15,000,000 to $18,000,000 by way of damages.

Mr. BALLANTYNE: Oh, no.

Mr. DUFF: How much?

Mr. BALLANTYNE: It is hardly worth my while rising to answer such exaggerated statements.

Mr. DUFF: Will the minister tell us how much?

Mr. BALLANTYNE: Yes, I will tell my hon. friend with pleasure. The Government have cancelled the contract, as the hon. member states, but we have no claim whatever from the Dominion Iron & Steel Company. If they are entitled to compensation for the cancellation of the contract by the Government, the Exchequer Court will determine the amount of that compensation. But it will be nowhere near the amount my hon. friend has mentioned.

Some hon. MEMBERS: How much?

Mr. BALLANTYNE: I cannot tell what decision the Exchequer Court will come to. But my hon. friend might just as well say $100,000,000 as to say $15,000,000 to $18,000,000.

Mr. LEMIEUX: What claim is made by the Dominion Iron & Steel Company?

Mr. BALLANTYNE: Cancellation of contract.

Mr. LEMIEUX: What amount do they claim?

Mr. BALLANTYNE: They have not claimed any amount.

Mr. DUFF: I stated that on account of the cancellation by the Government of their contract with the Dominion Iron & Steel Company, it was the purpose of that company to claim from the Government some $15,000,000 or $18,000,000 by way of damages, and the minister immediately said that was not correct. When he rose

I assumed that he was going to tell us something; that he was going to inform us that there was absolutely no claim on the part of the company.

Mr. BALLANTYNE: No, no.

Mr. DUFF: There is no claim, perhaps, so far as the minister knows for the moment. What I say is that the Dominion Iron & Steel Company are going to make a claim for $15,000,000 to $18,000,000, and when such claim is made the Government will have to pay it, whether through the Exchequer Court or otherwise. The minister does not say that the Dominion Iron & Steel Company are not going to make a claim; therefore I am right in saying that owing to the cancellation of the contract the company intend to press their claim at no distant date. It is useless for the minister to get up and try to camouflage the situation.

Mr. BALLANTYNE: When any hon. member grossly exaggerates figures, it does not do the Government any harm and it does not do the people any harm, so that when he says that the Dominion Iron & Steel Company are going to claim the exorbitant sum of $15,000,000 to $18,000,000 I am perfectly satisfied to let it go at that.

Mr. DUFF: The minister said there was no claim; how does he know whether my figures are excessive or not? It does not lie in his mouth to say that the claim will not be from $15,000,000 to $18,000,000. When this matter is pressed and the Government has to pay the bill—and a sweet bill it will be, too—another $5,000,000 or $10,000,000 or $15,000,000, whatever the award of the Exchequer Court may be, will be added to the $59,000,000, the amount of loss which the country has sustained in connection with the Canadian Government Merchant Marine.

Mr. BALLANTYNE: I am sorry to interrupt the hon. member when he is making a speech. I have had, of course, discussions with the Dominion Iron and Steel Company. The mill itself cost about $5,000,000. The claim, if any, that the Dominion Iron and Steel Company would have would be in regard to the remaining portion of the contract that the Dominion Government did not take, and there are 200,000 tons yet to be taken, supposing that the Government had not cancelled the contract. Does the hon. member mean to state that they would make fifteen to eighteen million dollars on 200,000 tons of plate?

Mr. DUFF: I do not know that I need—

Mr. McGIBBON (Muskoka): Follow it up.

Mr. DUFF: The hon. member is not satisfied. I am very glad. If I remember aright, the minister made an excessive contract with these people of something like $83 per ton on this business. What I say is that the Dominion Iron and Steel —and I got the information from people who seem to know—are reported to be going to claim for the full value of the 200,000 tons of steel, and damages for having to put up an expensive plant at Sydney. Whether the amount is $5,000,000, or $10,000,000, or $15,000,000, they certainly have an action for damages against the Government, and that action will be decided in their favour in the Exchequer Court or some other way. Consequently, whether that amount is $5,000,000, or $10,000,000, or $15,000,000, the amount must be added to the $59,000,000 loss which the country has to swallow, because we have in the Government men who do not understand the shipping business.

As well as losing this vast sum of money to the country, owing to the fact that the Government have entered into the shipping business in competition with private enterprises, they have practically ruined all private shipping interests on the two oceans. I know, perhaps, more about the Atlantic coast than the Pacific; but during the war men with small means invested practically their last cent in wooden vessels in Nova Scotia. These vessels were built at a high price, because the people of Nova Scotia and New Brunswick wanted to do what little they could to help the Empire in the war. The result is that to-day these ships are lying at anchor with nothing to do, because Government ships, which are losing thousands and thousands of dollars every day, have taken the business away, not only from steamers, but from sailing vessels. That is the joke of this whole tragedy, because the sailing vessels can sail faster than the minister's slow tramp steamers; they can beat his steamers in any voyage they want to make. But the Government steamers are taking away the business from the wooden ships of Nova Scotia and New Brunswick, with the result that large numbers of wooden ships are tied up in the ports of those provinces with nothing to do.

This Government—and I am now referring to competition with steamers—are running their steamers in competition with steamers or lines of steamers to which the

country is paying subsidies voted by this Parliament. Let me refer the committee to the routes which the minister mentioned in his speech and on which these vessels operate. At page 1332 of Hansard, these routes are mentioned. I will not read them all:

Fortnightly sailings Canada to Liverpool.
Fortnightly sailings Canada to Barbados, Trinidad and Demerara.
Three-weekly sailings Canada to Nassau, Kingston and Belize.
Monthly sailings Canada to Pernambuco, Santos, Rio de Janeiro, Montevideo, and Buenos Aires.

This afternoon the minister mentioned that he is running a line of ships between Halifax, N.S. and St. John's, Newfoundland, although I cannot find it in this list. If you refer, Sir, to page 46 of the Estimates, you will find that this country is paying a certain steamship line to run a service between Halifax and St. John's, Newfoundland, $35,000. Yet these gentlemen, who are in charge of the Government merchant marine, are deliberately putting steamers on the same route in competition with the boats to which they are paying a subsidy. In addition to the line to which the Government are paying a subsidy on the Halifax-Newfoundland route and which is operated by a private company, the Furness-Withy Company, there are also two other companies operating steamers between Halifax and Newfoundland. There is a British company known as the Red Cross Line. What does that mean? These private companies have built up this business in the last number of years. They operated their ships during the war, and you, Sir, will no doubt remember the Red Cross ship which was sunk by a submarine off New York on her way from Newfoundland to New York, via Halifax. During the war they took the good with the bad and the bad with the good, but they have kept up a satisfactory service between Halifax and St. John's, Newfoundland. The Canadian Government Merchant Marine, however, because they know nothing about shipping and do not know what to do with their steamers, put their steamers on this route to interfere with private business and private ownership. What else did they do? In the Estimates at page 46, this item appears in the subsidies column:

Canada and the West Indies or South America, or both, steam service or services between, $340,666.66.

At the invitation of this Government some four or five years ago English capitalists—and I want to show how this Government treat people in England who are willing to invest their money in this country, and yet when the time comes to flap the flag, they are the Imperialists and Loyalists and we on this side are whatever they like to call us—a reputable English concern, decided to put on a line of boats between Halifax and West Indian ports, giving a fortnightly service to several ports in the West Indies. One of the considerations was that the Government should pay them a subsidy of $340,666.66 a year. Yet we find now that this Government, not knowing what to do with their boats, deliberately placed these slow tramp steamers in competition with the boats of the Royal Mail Packet Company. Not only do they take part of the freight away from that company, frieght which the Government under that contract should endeavour to give to them, but they are also interfering with the wooden vessels of Nova Scotia and New Brunswick. To show you, Sir, the information in the possession of this Government with regard to this important matter, let me quote what the Minister of Trade and Commerce (Sir George Foster) said when my hon. friend (Mr. Ross) asked him why the Government were running steamers in competition with this company which is being subsidized by the Government. It is well that the people of this country should know what kind of men we have at the head of the different departments of Government. I say that these men ought to get out, and the quicker they get out, the better. Listen to this:

Mr. ROSS: I am very much inclined to agree with my hon. friend (Mr. Cahill) with regard to this particular item. It seems to me that when we are spending $340,000 a year subsidizing boats for a service to the West Indies, and when vessels of the Canadian Merchant Marine make thirty-two trips, apparently, to the same ports that these vessels serve, we might very well effect some economy here.

Sir GEORGE FOSTER: Not to the same ports; they are thousands of miles apart.

There is only one conclusion, and that is that the Minister of Trade and Commerce, a servant of the Crown and of the people, is absolutely ignorant of where the boats go which are owned by the Canadian Government and the ones subsidized by his department. There is no other conclusion to come to, and I say that no one is fit to hold a portfolio or to be in charge of a department who would make such a statement of that kind to the House.

The minister was also anxious to put on Hansard a statement as to the kind of

business the boats were doing, and the kind of cargoes they were carrying. Oh yes, these boats were expanding our export trade. Beautiful! It certainly reads very nice to the unitiated, but let me dissect the matter for a moment or two. One of our steamers that goes to Cuba, and the exports have consisted mainly of pulp and paper, malt, flour, hay, lumber, fish, potatoes, whiskey, oats and cement. This cargo was carried in the steamer called, if I remember rightly, the Canadian Mariner. Now I am going to make a humble suggestion to the Minister of Marine and Fisheries. I would suggest that he change her name, and that he do as he did last fall, get the hon. member for King's, the ex-Prime Minister, to rechristen her. We all remember how when the ex-Prime Minister and the Minister of Marine went down to Halifax to christen a boat, before she was christened she slipped into the water. She did not want the right hon. gentleman to christen her.

Mr. JACOBS: Was she a self-starter?

Mr. DUFF: This steamer which was carrying the products of this country in the shape of whiskey was the Canadian Mariner, if I remember correctly.

Mr. LEMIEUX: The Canadian "Walker".

Mr. DUFF: She should be re-christened the Canadian Bootlegger. Here we have a Government passing prohibition legislation and using their own ships of the Merchant Marine to take whiskey from this country to Cuba. Consequently, I say the minister would be well advised if he could get the hon. member for King's, N.S., to re-christen her the Canadian Bootlegger.

Mr. McMASTER: How did she come back from Cuba?

Mr. DUFF: She came back light. I want to give a little more information as to how these Government steamers interfere with the legitimate business of private concerns. Before coming to that, however, I wish to say that a night or two ago the hon. member for Halifax, in speaking to his motion for a committee to investigate the National Railways and shipping, made certain statements by way of illustrating his argument, one of which was that the service operated by the minister from Halifax to St. John's, Newfoundland, was losing money in view of the fact that freights had declined, and that the ships were sailing back and forth with practically only half a cargo. The minister in his usual way—I need not describe it because you all know how he does it; evidently his conscience has been pricking him lately, for he cannot sit still—the other evening when the hon. member for Halifax said that these Government boats were losing money, got up and asked, "How do you know they are losing money?"

Mr. BALLANTYNE: Hear, hear.

Mr. DUFF: Hear, hear, absolutely. The Minister of Marine and Fisheries was quite right. The hon. member for Halifax does not know they are losing money, but will the minister tell me those boats are not losing money?

Mr. BALLANTYNE: Yes.

Mr. DUFF: Well, I have to take his word, but if he were outside the precints of this House, I would say that he did not know what he was talking about. These boats are losing money, thousands of dollars a day. When I get through I would like the minister to give me a statement of how they are making money. It is impossible for them to make money when they leave Halifax with half a cargo and come back with their propellers racing from the time they leave St. John's until they get to Halifax.

There is another matter. We may as well have the whole story. The minister told us last year that the Government did not employ brokers to get business for their ships. Now that was a very bad admission for him to make, because the only way to handle ships properly is to have brokers in the different ports to get business for them before they arrive. If you have no broker, and have to wait until the ship arrives in port, she will likely have discharged her inward cargo, if she has any, long before the captain or somebody else, for the Government have no agents, can get an outward cargo for his ship. Here again I find the minister did not know what was actually being done by the officials who are mismanaging this great company. We find that somebody—I do not know whether it was Colonel John Cooper, or who—in an endeavour to promote business for the Government boats entered into an arrangement with certain New York shipping interests to come into what is known as the New York Shipping Pool. Now a gentleman who does not know anything about shipping, and who goes to New York among the shipping sharks to enter into an arrangement with them, well, all I can say is Heaven help him. Somebody entered into an arrangement on behalf of these 47 or 63 boats, whereby they

agreed not to cut rates, that is to say, the Canadian boats were to take no lower rates from Canadian ports than the New York boats were getting from New York ports. The result was that thousands of barrels of apples from King's county and Annapolis county, and good apples they were too, and no doubt from Ontario as well, which were ready to be shipped to the London market and were offered to the Canadian Government Merchant Marine, had to be refused because they had entered into this agreement with the New York pool. Were these apples shipped on Canadian steamers, on British steamers, on United States steamers? No, on Norwegian steamers. Here is a list of the ships that were chartered because the officials of the Government merchant marine did not know their business and refused these shipments of apples from Halifax to the Mother Country:

Steamers Chartered for Apples

		Barrels
Caxambu..	$1.50	14,000
Angelica Maersk..	2.00	12,000
Knut Hamsun	1.75	20,000
Lisa Brodin..	1.75	15,000
Marstenen..	2.00	15,000
Anders..	1.75	15,000
Danefelt..	10s.	14,000
Vesla..	2.00	10,000
Lorentz W. Hansen.. ..	1.50	18,000
Harald..	1.50	8,000

Now, Sir, I have not the total number of barrels or the total amount of freight, but I know that we had ships owned by the Canadian Government Merchant Marine leaving Halifax day after day with practically no cargoes, and going to other ports, although they refused Canadian products at $1.50, $2 and $1.75 per barrel for apples; and they allowed Norwegians to come here and take away the Canadian business. Yet they try to make out that they know something about running ships.

An hon. MEMBER: Why did they refuse Canadian products?

Mr. DUFF: Because, in the first place, they had an agreement with the New York Shipping Pool; and in the second place, they do not know their business.

Mr. BALLANTYNE: Hear, hear.

Mr. DUFF: I am glad to hear the minister say "hear, hear;" he is evidently coming to his senses.

Mr. McMASTER: You have converted him.

Mr. DUFF: I am not the first person who has converted him, I am sorry to say.

[Mr. Duff.]

Now, here is what a large shipowner says with regard to these steamers:

I suppose that complaints are like "water on a duck's back" to the present minister and his friends, but unless a change is made, it looks to me as if the shipowners of this province are going to be wiped out. I thought these ships were built first as a war measure and secondly to develop Canadian exports. It is rather amusing to note the development of Canadian business as brought about by these steamers. With the exception of one or two routes they are simply running on trade routes established and operated by shipowners of this province before Mr. Ballantyne and his shipbuilding friends were ever heard of—

Listen to that; there is an insinuation there, I am sorry to say.

—before Mr. Ballantyne and his shipbuilding friends were heard of. Take for instance the West India Route, for which the Government pays the Royal Mail Steam Packet Company a subsidy of $330,000 a year, and which trade was developed by the enterprise of a local firm. Mr. Ballantyne's steamers are now running in fierce competition with this line. Can Mr. Ballantyne or any one else explain the wisdom of this, or how much this line tends to develop Canadian trade? For the past century our Canadian schooners—

That is to say, wooden vessels.

—have looked after the molasses business, which the steamers, to a certain extent, let them do to a certain extent, as they got the sugar carrying. I understand from Barbadoes' advices that Mr. Ballantyne's steamers are making every effort possible to get every puncheon of molasses they can, thus taking away the business from us. For many years our Nova Scotia and Newfoundland vessels—

Again, wooden schooners.

—have done practically all the fish carrying to Brazil and the Argentine, and have always done it satisfactorily. Now, Mr. Ballantyne's steamers are bidding for this business, and will probably succeed in taking it away from us, as rates on some routes do not seem to matter; whereas on other routes they have to join the North Atlantic Pool and have their rates dictated to them from New York.

I might also add that the estimates of the Minister of Trade and Commerce, in addition to the West India and Newfoundland trade, provide subsidies to vessels going to South Africa, Australia and other places, and yet the Government are putting ships on these routes on which they are paying subsidies to other lines. It might be interesting to know what some of these ships are doing. Here is a short extract from a good Government paper, the Montreal Gazette. This article reads as follows:

The fact that the Canadian Government vessel Canadian Explorer, en route from Australia to Vancouver, was able to relieve the population of Fanning Island, is gratifying; but the remainder of the Vancouver despatch

which says that the Explorer brought only a few hundred tons of cargo, and a large quantity of mud ballast—

Mr. LEMIEUX: What?

Mr. DUFF: Mud ballast.

—is not quite so cheering. Carrying mud around the Pacific ocean is not a money-making enterprise even for Government ships.

Did the Minister of Finance hear that?

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: No.

Mr. DUFF: Then, before he decides to pay over to some one this $8,000,000, I should like him to read my speech to-morrow.

Some hon. MEMBERS: Oh, oh.

Some hon. MEMBERS: It would take too long.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: We should never get through with it.

Mr. STEVENS: We might, perhaps next week.

Mr. DUFF: I venture to say that the people will read my speech just as much as any speech of the hon. member for Vancouver (Mr. Stevens). I am not interested in building elevators, dry docks, or wharves. Now, this article in the Montreal Gazette, says that this steamer came back —I presume from Australia—carrying three hundred tons of cargo, which would be only about 10 per cent of her carrying capacity, and the rest, mud ballast. It is indeed quite cheering. The Government steamers take lumber from Vancouver and other Pacific ports, cargo of a kind which ordinary sailing vessels could carry, thus taking the bread out of the mouths of the owners of sailing ships; and they come back, after a sail of twenty-five or twenty-six days, carrying nothing but mud ballast.

Mr. BALLANTYNE: Shame.

Mr. DUFF: It is a shame, and I cannot express my indignation in parliamentary language; but the minister will, no doubt, conceive what I may not express. Here is another Cuban story:

Luck even in the discharging of her liquor cargo was with the Halifax built steamer Canadian Mariner. This novel occurrence for the port of St. John was consummated by the Canadian Government Merchant Marine who shipped the last case of the cargo Friday night. A close watch was kept during the unloading process and the C.G.M.M. officials are delighted to report that they got the cargo through without a single loss. This was the maiden round voyage of the Mariner with Captain Starratt in command. She took on her cargo at Genoa and other Italian ports and Captain Starratt reported that the voyage had been a very successful one. Her cargo consisted of 2,000 cases of Italian wine and several thousand cases of vermouth and other liquors.

Now, here is a ship coming all the way from Italy and other Mediterranean ports with 2,000 cases of wine and several thousand cases of vermouth.

Mr. JACOBS: Was there mud on that steamer?

Mr. DUFF: No, but she had water ballast. Now, this shows conclusively that these ships are not loaded.

Mr. JACOBS: No, not the ships.

Mr. DUFF: I have heard of the crews of other ships being loaded, but no one can truthfully make such a charge against the ships. This was about the time that the prohibition law passed by this Parliament, went into effect in the city of St. John. Here is another despatch from Halifax, headed "Steamer Just 'Ducks In" as Dry Line Closes."

An hon. MEMBER: A Government steamer?

Mr. DUFF: Yes. The article says:

Perhaps it was jealousy on the part of Neptune and Aeolus which led them to threaten the bibulous followers of Bacchus in Halifax and Nova Scotia with the loss of 18,000 cases of good Scotch whiskey which was shipped on January 15 from Glasgow, for Halifax, by the Canadian Runner. More probably it was just a friendly joke as they did not carry their threat into effect.

An hon. MEMBER: Another Government steamer?

An hon. MEMBER: What is the name—"Rum Runner"?

Mr. DUFF: No; "Canadian Runner." The article continues:

Whatever it was, for thirteen of the fifteen day voyage of the Runner they gave her one rough time of it as can be inferred from the fact that ordinarily she would have made the run in nine or ten days. Meantime, while she was battling with tempestuous winds and mountainous seas the thirsty ones of Halifax were breathless in an ocean of doubt.

"Would the 18,000 cases of joy water arrive in time," was the question which was whispered in dark places and empty cellars.

When at six o'clock Sunday evening the Runner anchored in the harbour more than one good citizen wended his way to church with a lighter heart and joined in the hymns with a lustier voice than was his want.

And further on:

Ordinarily the C.M.G. steamers remain in the stream until morning but—

I presume on the advice contained in a telegram or marconigram from the officials of the department—

An hon. MEMBER: Sympathetic souls.

Mr. DUFF: (reading)

The good ship was tied up at Pier 23, south end terminals, by 11 o'clock, ready to be unloaded at first dawn of Blueyear's Eve. All yesterday, from morning until dark, a full force worked at full blast to place those 18,000 cases safely ashore, stopping only when it was accomplished.

An hon. MEMBER: Where was that whiskey bound for?

Mr. DUFF: I do not know, it may have been intended for Nova Scotia. But here is a Canadian Government steamer, owned and paid for by the people of this country with only a part cargo. I do not care very much what she brought although the Government should because they are prohibitionists; but I do say it proves conclusively that these Government steamers cannot pay when a ship worth a million and a half of dollars leaves the port of Glasgow and crosses the ocean with the small cargo of 18,000 cases of joy water. Now let us go a little further and see how our merchant marine is developing Canadian trade. Developing Canadian trade forsooth! Here is another newspaper extract:

Steamer Canadian Voyageur, Captain Sprosen, leaves on Monday for Baltimore, having been chartered to load there for Tampico. The Voyageur, since her arrival here several weeks ago, has had her machinery thoroughly overhauled and is now in first-class condition again for long voyages.

I would like to call the attention of the House to the fact that this steamer left for Baltimore which, as we all know, is a port on the Delaware river in the United States. The Canadian Voyager left Halifax without a pound of freight in her hold to develop Canadian trade, remember, and proceeded to Baltimore having been chartered there to load for Tampico. Now where is Tampico? It certainly is not in England. I would not mind her going to Baltimore to load goods for the Mother Country but this vessel loaded goods from Baltimore, a United States port, for Tampico, Mexico.

An hon. MEMBER: Was that whiskey too?

Mr. DUFF: No these were goods that were manufactured in the United States and taken down to Tampico, in Mexico, yet the Minister of Marine gets up and with a straight face and serious mien endeavours to impress the House and the country with the idea that these Government steamers are being built and operated to develop the foreign trade of Canada. Here is another illustration:

The only steamship arrival Good Friday was the C.G.M.M. freighter Canadian Rancher, Captain Dickson, from Liverpool via Swansea. She is at Pier 23, south end terminals, to discharge 300 tons of general cargo, loaded at Liverpool, and then moves up to the Dockyard to land 1,000 tons coal she took on at Swansea for the Admiralty.

Now see the way in which the gentlemen in charge of this business are looking after the interests of the mercantile marine. Just imagine any private shipowner sending a steamship of the Canadian Ranger's size from Liverpool, England, to Swansea, Wales. She loaded 300 tons of cargo at Liverpool and then she was to proceed to Wales to take on board 1,000 tons of coal for the Admiralty. The point I want to make is that 1,000 tons of coal only occupies about one-seventh of the ship's freight capacity, and yet these bunglers send her from Liverpool with 300 tons of cargo in her hold down to Swansea to load 1,000 tons of coal to bring to Halifax. Any person in the shipping business knows that it is the grossest kind of mismanagement to send a ship from one port to the other unless there is a good paying cargo available. For instance, this ship, in order to get out of Liverpool, had to pay her disbursements and port charges there on 300 tons of cargo for which she received a very small amount of compensation; yet these bunglers sent her down to another port where her port charges and disbursement accounts would eat up not only the freight on the 300 tons of goods but also the freight charges on the Admiralty coal. These are the men who come here and ask us to vote $8,000,000 to enable them to build more ships under their present shipbuilding programme.

Some hon. MEMBERS: Shame.

Mr. DUFF: I now want to read an extract from the proceedings of the British Chamber of Shipping. I have here an account of the forty-fourth annual meeting of the British Chamber of Shipping of the United Kingdom held in London on February 25. I am quoting this in order if possible, to impress upon the House the reason why it should not vote this money, and the mistake we all made in sanctioning previous votes for this purpose. I will not quote the whole of the proceedings, but at this meeting the president called upon Mr. Howard Houlder, a large shipbuilder, to move a certain resolution. The resolution is in part as follows:

This Chamber desires to place on record its recognition of the success of the steps taken in furtherance of the British Government's policy of restoring the complete freedom of the mercantile marine, and its conviction that the best interests of the communities of the world will be served, only be leaving shipping entirely to private enterprise and by opening and keeping open all ports of the world to international shipping without discrimination.

That was the resolution. In the course of his remarks this shipowner said:

Now, with regard to the second section of the resolution, which is, that this meeting is asked to express its conviction that the best interests of the communities of the world will be served only by leaving shipping entirely to private enterprise, and by opening and keeping open all ports of the world to international shipping without discrimination, in my judgment —the only way in which our maritime supremacy can be maintained is by leaving the management of the business of shipping to private initiative and the enterprise of individuals.

Further on Mr. Howard Glover said this:

Of course, bureaucracies can do anything, and the Americans have proved that they have been able to produce a mercantile marine, but they find themselves to-day with a fleet of ships which I should think it would not be an exaggeration to say are not worth a fifth of what they cost, and even at that value there is not the remotest chance of making a halfpenny profit. What the American nation are going to do with those ships Heaven only knows. I, for one, am of the opinion that if our Government had been composed of real statesmen, six months after the armistice they would have got rid of nearly all their controls and realized their stocks. They would have made a colossal loss, but the liquidation of those stocks would only have added to the losses already sustained through the war.

I would like to commend these words to the Minister of Marine and the members of the House. These gentlemen in Great Britain spoke quite truly when they said the Government would have acted wisely by handing over the ships to private control immediately after the war. It is quite true that lately they have done so, and the Americans are in favour of doing it every day, but our Government and the men in charge of this matter are going on running these ships wnthout cargo and not knowing what they are going to do for future business.

What is the remedy for this condition of affairs? I think I am voicing the sentiments of the great majority of the people of Canada when I say that they realise whether the policy was a good one when it was inaugurated or not, that the only right and proper thing for the Government to do is to dispose of these ships as early as possible either by sale or otherwise. As I said a moment ago, what is the prospect this year for the Canadian Government marine? Is it going to make a profit or is it going to make a further loss?

I have made up a statement which I am going to put on Hansard and which I am willing to leave to the judgment of the business men of this country. I have gone into this matter carefully after consultation with shipping men who know their business, and they agree with me that my estimates are fair and reasonable. I am going to show that the operation of our merchant marine for 1921, will result in a loss. I do not believe that the minister or the Government realise what is going to be the result of their operation for 1921. As I said this afternoon, during the first eight or nine months of 1920 freights were almost as high as they were at any time during the war, and private capital invested in shipping gave a good return. I have proved conclusively to this committee that the Minister of Marine and his officials have made a staggering loss in 1920 when freights were high and business was good up to August or September and they had only three bad months. In view of that result, what is going to happen to-day when freights have gone down 200 and 300 per cent, when business is scarce, and when the operating cost has depreciated very little? It is true that wages are a little lower, but practically all the supplies required for running these steamers such as coal, oil, and everything else are, as the minister stated, at very high prices, and these prices are not likely to decline in the very near future. This is the statement that I want to place on Hansard:

Estimate of operating account for 1921:

	Dr
Operating expenses of 63 ships for 12 months at $875,000 per month.	$10,500,000
Interest on $70,000,000 at 5½ per cent..	3,850,000
Depreciation on present value..	750,000
Making a total of..	$15,100,000
	Cr
Credit by probable revenue based on present assets..	8,500,000
Leaving a loss on operation for the year 1921 of..	$ 6,600,000

It will be noticed that I have only allowed depreciation on the present value of the vessels. If I had figured depreciation on the actual value the amount to be debited would be very much larger, but in order to be fair, as I deducted from my statement this afternoon the present value of the vessels from the original cost, I feel it is

only fair that I should in this statement deduct depreciation to the extent of not more than $750,000. I am not going to prophesy, as my genial friend the Minister of Marine did last year. It will be remembered that he said he was going to have a greater profit in 1920 than in 1919. Of course, in a sense he was right, because he had no profit in 1919, nor had he any in 1920. Consequently I cannot very well criticise his prophecy,—take nothing from nothing and nothing remains. But this year on operation alone, in addition to the $59,000,000 decrease in value and the damage they will have to pay to the Steel Company for cancellation of contracts, the country is faced with a loss on operation of $6,600,000.

There are several things which the Government might do with these boats. The first I would suggest is that they take them out of the control of the present Minister of Marine and Fisheries and give them to some other minister to look after, the Minister of Finance for instance. But undoubtedly they should sell the ships—clean up and take their loss. That would be the right thing to do. I am justified in making that assertion when I read in the same Conservative journal, the Montreal Gazette of December 29, an editorial advising the Government to do what I have just suggested. This is the editorial:

The Example of France

The French Government has introduced a bill which is of interest to all those nations that undertook to meet the requirements of war conditions by the construction and operation of merchant fleets. France, during the war, both built and bought a large number of vessels with which to make good the losses sustained through the operations of German submarines, to transport troops and to carry to the shores of France supplies and equipment for the armies and food for the civilian population. The fleet so acquired was operated during the war and has been operated since by the French Government. The time has now come to determine what shall be the future of these ships, and the Government has come at once to a decision; the fleet is to be sold.

* * * * * * *

The course which France is taking in respect to these vessels is significant. France is an ultra-democratic country, in which the popular will is quick to find expression and scarcely less quick in exerting its influence upon legislatures. If the French Government has come to the conclusion that the state-owned merchant fleet must be sold, it has done so in the interest of the French taxpayer. In other words, the ministry believes that these ships cannot be operated as a State fleet except at a loss, and it is not prepared to place the French taxpayer in the position of having to make good that loss. When due weight is given to the fact that the Government of France has had the advantage of expert advice, based upon long experience in marine transportation, the importance of the step taken may be appreciated.

What is being done in France is being done in other countries similarly situated, and notably in Great Britain, the greatest of maritime nations and the one best equipped of all for deciding between what is profitable and what is not profitable in shipping and the operation of ships. Great Britain has been steadily disposing of tonnage acquired during the war. These things must, surely, mean something to Canada, which has embarked upon an ambitious programme of ship-building and ship-operation. The lesson of experience in older countries has something to commend it as against the theories of inexperience in Canada, and what is taking place elsewhere should not be unworthy of attention and study on the part of those who are apparently determined upon committing this country to a dangerous experiment. Prudent counsel takes count of what is going on in other countries and Canada should stop, look and listen before making what may prove to be a mistake far transcending any of those that have yet held back the progress of the Dominion. What can be said with certainty is that the example of France warrants delay and investigation before the shipping programme of Canada is accepted at the value put upon it by its advocates. If it is found upon such investigation that Canada knows more about the operation of ships than does iether France or England, and that there are conditions peculiar to this country which assure success in a venture from which more experienced countries are turning aside, well and good, but the investigation should be made and the facts put before the public fully and clearly, so that those who must ultimately pay the bills may know exactly and definitely what is being done in their name. Canada cannot afford to rush in where older nations fear to tread.

Marine transportation companies in Great Britain, as elsewhere, are meeting the necessity of writing down war costs in order that ships may be operated successfully under normal traffic conditions. Long established private companies may take that course, with the consent of their shareholders, and the loss is their own. The application of the same method in respect of State-owned ships is a very different thing and cannot be resorted to under anything like the same conditions. The loss in such case falls upon the general public, the taxpayers, and the more heavily it falls the better is the apparent showing of the operation of the ships, for which credit is duly taken by those responsible for such operation. The French Government has rejected that expedient and, in the interest of the Freach public, is preparing to sell its ships. Canada goes serenely and confidently on. Labour in Canada, also does its part and is at this moment insisting that Government ships must not be constructed at anything less than the maximum war cost of labour, and the Government, if the Minister of Labour has his way, may be expected to yield to the demands of labour in this case, as it has done in others. The outlook is not encouraging. The whole question of the merchant marine calls for the most thorough discussion and examination and, if these are forthcoming, Canada may be saved from the worst consequences of a risky venture. If it is found that all is well, so much the better; no harm will have been done.

Now, I am sure that the members of this House and the people generally will

read with a great deal of interest that sensible and seriously-worded editorial, which shows conclusively that France and England are getting clear of their publicly-owned ships by passing them over to private individuals. This Government should do as France has done; should get clear of their ships at the first opportunity. A week ago there were twelve Canadian Government merchant ships swinging at anchor in the port of Halifax—one-fifth or twenty per cent of the total ship programme, one-quarter of the total number of ships afloat, swinging at anchor in the port of Halifax without anything to do. A day or two afterwards the management were compelled to send one of these ships to Baltimore and other places with no freight, for the purposes of taking American products to foreign ports. It is well known that instead of bringing imports from foreign ports to Canada these ships are engaged in bringing sugar from Cuba to New York. Is that encouraging Canadian trade? Yet it is stated every once in a while that it is for the encouragement of Canadian trade that these ships are operated. As a second expedient I say that money would be saved if these ships were put at anchor as they arrive in the port of Halifax or elsewhere. If that were done, thousands of dollars of expenses incurred in connection with their operation at the present time would be saved. Then, there is another thing that might be done; they could be put in the hands of competent shipping men, in Halifax, St. John or Vancouver. There are men in any of these ports who are better qualified to handle the ships of the Canadian Government Merchant Marine than the men in Montreal or Toronto who are handling them at present. It would be far better and much more satisfactory to the people if the Government would decide to give these ships to the shipping people in Halifax, St. John and Vancouver, as well as Montreal in the summer, with the request that they operate them and pay the Government a commission on any earnings in excess of expenditure. In any case, the best bargain possible could be made in that regard. We should, therefore, either sell the ships, lay them up, or hand them over to someone else for operation.

I should like to refer to another matter in this regard, and it has to do with what the people think about this business. About two hours ago the Minister of Marine offered to send me a copy of the Montreal Gazette in which he said a laudatory article appeared the day after he made his speech. I have not yet received that paper from the minister. I do not know whether it is not in the reading room or whether the article to which he refers did not appear in the Montreal Gazette; in any case, it is very strange and very significant that the minister did not hand it to me, in view of my request that he do so. But as he has not allowed me to read that article I would like to give him some further food for thought. A few weeks ago the Royal Bank of Canada held its annual meeting at which the president made some very significant statements. Let us see what faith he has in the Government policy of operating and owning a merchant marine. He said:

> Government control has practically disappeared during the year just past—wheat, paper and sugar being the commodities to be freed from regulation. Government ownership of transportation systems has developed. Without any advantage to the public in efficiency or rates, the operation of our national railways during the last twelve months has resulted in a loss which will probably more than absorb the amounts collected on Excess Profits and Income Taxes for the year 1919. Unless government methods of operation are more efficient in this country than they have been in others, taxpayers in Canada may find the maintenance of their railroads and fleet more expensive than pension charges and other legacies of the war combined. Of a total of $6,400,000,000 spent by the United States during the last year, $1,037,000,000 went to pay the cost incurred by the Government in its control of the railroads. The present waste is obvious and the remedy should be speedy and effective. The needs of the country call for businesslike administration of its assets. If this be afforded, we can attack our problems with added confidence.

The Royal Bank of Canada knows more about the Canadian Government Merchant Marine than the Government itself does, because they have agencies scattered all over Canada, and, moreover, due to their progressiveness, they have agencies at practically every port in foreign countries where the ships of the Canadian Government Merchant Marine call. Certainly the agents of that company furnish reports to the president and directors as to what is going on in regard to the cargoes which the Government ships carry to and from these various ports, and generally, the business which these vessels do. In issuing this warning, therefore, the president of the Royal Bank is perfectly justified in condemning the whole project. Now, Sir, the Minister of Marine sometimes makes prophesies which are not fulfilled.

Mr. LALOR: Carried.

Mr. DUFF: I may say to my hon. friend that this item is not going to carry to-night.

An hon. MEMBER: It will carry in the morning.

Mr. DUFF: It will be perhaps carried some morning. The minister visited Halifax some time ago and he made a promise to the people of that city. I have here a newspaper article which makes reference to that promise. The minister or somebody connected with his department gave his pledged word that the ships built in the port of Halifax would be registered at that port. Is that correct?

Mr. BALLANTYNE: Quite correct.

Mr. DUFF: The minister admits that he gave his word, and the word of a minister of the Crown and a member of the Privy Council should not be lightly broken. Here is what the Halifax Herald says in this connection:

> The contempt with which the Department of Marine has broken the pledged word of its chief administrator to the great port of Halifax has stirred up a feeling of bitter resentment. To advertise the port of Montreal with the products of the port of Halifax is an imposition which intensifies the feeling that the Maritime Provinces are being deliberately ignored at Ottawa. For Hon. C. C. Ballantyne, Minister of Marine and Fisheries, to establish himself an enthusiastic propagandist for Montreal, and no less at the expense of breaking promises, is an embarrassing situation for a minister of the Crown, responsible to all the people, and not to interested citizens in Montreal only.
>
> Mr. Ballantyne perhaps has not yet realized the fact that as a member of the Government he represents the entire Dominion, wherein the ports of Halifax and Vancouver have played a part of relatively equal importance to the port of Montreal.
>
> The duty of the maritime members is plain. If they can get no satisfaction from the Minister of Marine, they must push their claims further. At all events they must not be satisfied with being put off by any more tinsel excuses.

I presume he means the Tory members.

> And the Nova Scotia Senators.

That paragraph appears in the Halifax Herald, because the Minister of Marine and Fisheries, as he stated, told the citizens of Halifax that when the ships built in that port were launched, they would be registered in Halifax. This is a further despatch with regard to this matter:

> A letter read from the Acting Deputy Minister of the Department of Marine with reference to the registration of the C.M.M.S. Canadian Mariner. The board of trade had a promise from the Minister of Marine that the ships constructed in Halifax would be registered at this port, but it was found the Mariner had been registered elsewhere and the council of the board protested. The letter from the deputy minister stated it was entirely due to an oversight and that it was originally intended she should have been registered here, but in future the vessels built in Halifax for the Canadian Merchant Marine will be registered here. The board will ask for the transfer of registration of the Mariner.

This means that not only did the Minister of Marine and Fisheries promise that ships built in the port of Halifax would be registered in that port; but after his attention was called to the fact that one of the ships had been registered in Montreal, one of the officials of the department wrote to the board of trade of that city and promised that the next ship would be registered in Halifax. What do we find? We find that the minister or some one in charge wrote to the people of Halifax because, in answer to a question I put, I find that ships built in Halifax have been registered in Montreal. I could understand the Minister of Marine and Fisheries following a policy of registering ships in the city of Ottawa, because Ottawa is the headquarters of the Government, and the minister would be quite within his right in registering these ships in the capital of Canada. But if these ships are to be registered in any port outside of the city of Ottawa—and I say this for the Pacific coast as well as the Atlantic coast—ships built in Prince Rupert or Vancouver or elsewhere have just as much, if not more, right to be registered in those ports as to be registered in Montreal. Ships built in Halifax, Montreal or Quebec, or other ports should be registered in the ports in which they are built so that, if this is to be the great advertisement the minister says it is to be of Canada in foreign countries, people in foreign lands will be given to understand from the name of the port in which a boat is registered being painted on her stern, that these ships are built, not in one port, the port of Montreal, but in every port on the Atlantic and Pacific oceans. The minister, therefore, is wrong in deliberately, for some reason, taking the credit away from Halifax, Vancouver or some other port and having the ships registered in the port of Montreal.

Mr. DAVIDSON: Carried.

Mr. DUFF: The hon. member for Digby and Annapolis had better be careful. I remember reading in Hansard an interruption he made ten years ago, and he has not been heard from since. Therefore, he need not interrupt me to-night and call "carried." The hon. member for Red Deer (Mr. Clark) referred to this whole project as a "painted ship on a painted ocean." That, of course, was very significant, and when I read the remark of the hon. member for Red Deer, I wondered if

he intended to convey two different meanings. It is, of course, good business for some people to have Canadian Government ships, and these ships have to be painted with large quantities of paint. Therefore, I was wondering if the hon. member for Red Deer, when he referred to them as "painted ships on a painted ocean," realized the fact that paint was one of the articles which the ships required in great quantities.

We have ships registered in the port of Montreal, built in Halifax, Vancouver, Three Rivers and other cities throughout Canada, and managed in the city of Toronto. As I said before, if these ships are to be managed properly and if the Government are determined to keep these ships, they should immediately hand them over to some good reliable men in Halifax, St. John, Montreal, and Vancouver, and allow them to run the ships properly and with the least loss possible.

The latter part of the minister's speech the other night reads something like a valedictory. I was reminded, as I read his concluding remarks, of people who were likely not to remain for very long in their present status or location. We know that in colleges every year, when students get through their course and are about to go out into the world, on a certain day one of the students is asked to pronounce a valedictory. As I read the minister's concluding remarks, I was strongly reminded that he realizes he is not going to remain in possession of his present portfolio very long, or else that the Government is not going to remain in power very long. Before he concluded, in addition to endeavouring to get some comfort from the speeches of the hon. member for Maisonneuve (Mr. Lemieux) and the hon. member for Red Deer (Mr. Clark), he also tried to convey to certain persons words of commendation. I have no fault to find with that. The minister can say on the floor of this House that officials in his department have done good work in connection with this programme. Perhaps they have, and perhaps they have not. But I do not think, after the experience which we have had in the past two years in regard to this matter, it is necessary for the minister to endeavour to bolster up his case by giving words of encomium to certain persons. I think the people realize that they have been misled with regard to this shipbuilding policy. In two years the country has suffered a loss of something like $60,000,000 owing to depreciation, bungling and mismanagement in the operation of these steamers. The question arises: Is this Government going to keep on in this ruinous course? In the interest of the country—and I am not speaking politically; I am endeavouring to show as well as I can the reasons why the Government should halt in their programme—the Government should have endeavoured two years ago to make arrangements with the shipbuilders, to pay them damages, and to let them build ships on private account; and even at this late date, when there are several ships yet to be built, the Minister of Marine and Fisheries or the Government would be well advised if they would make the officials in charge of this matter go to the builders and make the best possible of a bad bargain. The people of this country do not want either Government-operation or Government-ownership of ships. The experiment has been a failure. Every right thinking man in the country realizes that, and the quicker the Government take such losses and close up this bad deal the better for the country.

Mr. H. H. STEVENS (Centre Vancouver): Mr. Chairman, we have listened very patiently for approximately five hours to an hon. gentleman who has launched a particularly vicious attack at the head of the hon. the Minister of Marine (Mr. Ballantyne). He speaks, I believe, with the full authority of the hon. leader of the Opposition (Mr. Mackenzie King), and of the party that he represents in this House. I assume that because my hon. friend the leader of the Opposition chose him from among all the members who surround him to travel through Canada a few months ago, and at every meeting my hon. friend from Lunenburg (Mr. Duff), who has just taken his seat, delivered a speech very much along the line that he has delivered to the House to-night, a speech characterized by exceedingly wild statements, a speech which if one could say that innuendo were reason, coarse sneers logic, and the circulation of unfounded rumours fact, might perhaps be characterized as a speech. I listened with a great deal of patience, and I asked my hon. friend only one question during the whole five hours he spoke. I asked him the date of a document he was reading, and he immediately turned and read me a brief lecture. I listened for these five hours with patience, and I tried to follow the ramifications of his argument, if I might dignify it by that term, and out

of it all this is what I gleaned so far as any statement that is worthy of attention is concerned: that he himself personally, and speaking also officially for the Opposition, is unqualifiedly opposed to the Government ownership and operation of a merchant marine in Canada. If I am misquoting him or mis-stating the facts in any way, I am always willing to be corrected.

Mr. DUFF: You are quite right as far as I am concerned.

Mr. STEVENS: I am therefore on fairly sound ground to commence with. It is a debateable question, Mr. Chairman, whether any government should enter into the ownership and operation of any great public utility, but it does not follow that because a government does enter into it, that the minister in charge is therefore a crook, or that to use my hon. friend's own phraseology, the minister and the officials of his department know nothing; those were the words he used. I say that because the Government launches into a scheme of that kind, it does not follow that the minister is in any sense guilty of dishonesty or of any dishonourable act. Throughout my hon. friend's speech from beginning to end there was one desire permeating every sentence and argument that he presented, and that was to cast some aspersion on the minister, to try and insinuate that the minister in some way or other, or the members of his staff, were indentified with sinister influences and were despoiling the public treasury of this country.

I am going to do something which I think his speech does not merit, and that is take some of his statements and show to the House their unworthiness, and at the same time the untrustworthiness of his alleged or supposed argument. In the first place, my hon. friend complains, and very bitterly, that certain ships of the Canadian Government Merchant Marine left Canadian ports, went to United States ports, and took on there a cargo for a foreign country. Now he condemns that.

Mr. ARTHURS: Do not go away. Come back.

Mr. DUFF: I will go if I like, and I will stay if I like. I will be back tomorrow.

Mr. STEVENS: My hon. friend apparently is afraid to remain and listen to any hon. gentleman who attempts to meet his argument. I am going to direct my remarks, in his absence, to his leader because, after all, the leader of a great party has some responsibility in regard to the statements of his followers, and my hon. friend who has just left the chamber hurriedly has already confirmed my statement that he spoke with the authority of his party. I was saying that my hon. friend complained because the Government ships went to the United States and took on cargoes there for foreign countries. He made the statement this afternoon that a certain ship, the Canadian Pioneer, left Halifax, went to Newport News, from there went to Gibraltar, and took on a cargo of grain for some Mediterranean port. That information was given to the House on his authority as one who knows shipping, and the minister was condemned, held up to ridicule as one who did not know his business. Now, even if his statement were a fact, there would be nothing extraordinary in a ship doing that, because it is quite a common thing for ships operating on the high seas to go in ballast to a point where there is a cargo. But his statement is not a fact in any sense of the term. The fact is this—and we have the official statement from Montreal; we have had lots of time to get it from London since my hon. friend mentioned it—that the Canadian Pioneer on that occasion went to Galveston, Texas, loaded a cargo of grain, took it from there to Greece, there to discharge her cargo and load a full cargo in return.

Mr. SINCLAIR (Guysborough): Wil my hon. friend give me the date of the voyage he is referring to?

Mr. STEVENS: I am referring tc exactly the same voyage that my hon. friend from Lunenburg referred to this afternoon.

Mr. GORDON: What was the date of it?

Mr. STEVENS: April the 2nd.

Mr. SINCLAIR (Guysborough): Is that the date of the sailing from Canada?

Mr. STEVENS: My hon. friend from Antigonish and Guysborough and I have been in this House together for ten years, and I do not think he would charge me, any more than I would charge him, with evasion.

Mr. SINCLAIR (Guysborough): I merely wanted to get a fact.

Mr. STEVENS: The date is April 2. We have it officially from the office of the Canadian Merchant Marine. The information was secured officially from that source

for the House in view of the extravagant statement made by my hon. friend from Lunenburg. But that is merely incidental to the argument I am making. My hon. friend, after condemning the Government because these vessels went to the United States and took a cargo from there to some place else, next condemns the Government because the ships took business offering in Canadian ports to other Canadian ports. He condemned that because, as he said, it put the local shipping out of business. On the one hand, he condemns the Government for sending the ships out of the country, and, on the other hand, he condemns them for doing business in this country. I merely state that to show how absolutely distorted is his argument. Then, to cap his argument in that regard, he brought forward this point; he said that the reason why the shipping of this country is so hard hit at the present time is because there has been a great reduction in freight rates. That is correct; it is the one correct reason. The shipping of Canada is not necessarily hurt because of the Canadian Government Merchant Marine. It is hurt because all over the world the movement of corgoes has stopped. In the last forty years there has perhaps not been a period when trade was so disconcerted throughout the world as it is to-day, when shipping, in the most unforeseen manner, is exceedingly plentiful.

Now, I come to another point raised by the hon. member in respect of which he particularly directed his attack upon the minister. He says that this country is going to be called upon to pay a loss to the Dominion Iron and Steel Co., of $15,000,000, plus damages. I took particular note of his statement, and I know that I am correctly quoting him. He would not accept the statement of the minister that no claims had been filed, and that if any claim is filed it will be a question to be determined in the Exchequer Court as to what the damages should be. Let us examine the facts. The Government and the country need not fear facts; but what we do resent is hon. gentlemen getting up in their places and spreading broadcast throughout the country inuendoes and insinuations that are not based on anything approximating fact. The facts are simply these: During the war period, or at least towards the close of the war, the Government, with the approval of nearly every hon. gentleman opposite, entered into a contract with the Dominion Iron and Steel for ship plates to start the shipbuilding industry in this country. It was established in order that we might roll these plates here for the shipbuilding industry, which at that time looked as if it might become a permanent one. There was no great criticism of this undertaking. I grant that there was some criticism from the other side, but many hon. gentlemen opposite stood in their places and supported it, and it was regarded as being perfectly proper at the time. The war closed earlier than was expected, and in the process of building the plant more time perhaps was occupied than had been foreseen; but in any case, we came to the point where the Government felt that it was not desirable to take the balance of the order, and for various reasons cancelled it. That contract stands cancelled. Now, up to this time no claims have been made. What are the possibilities? I say that we have no right to indulge in surmise as to what they are, but let us face them frankly, nevertheless. There are two hundred thousand tons of steel plate still undelivered. At the price the Government contracted, this would amount to about $15,000,000. My hon. friend from Lunenburg (Mr. Duff), either with deliberate design to mislead the country, or with a density of ignorance hardly pardonable in an hon. member, jumped to the conclusion that the Dominion Iron and Steel would be entitled to the full $15,000,000 of recompense, plus, as he said, damages. No hon. gentleman who has had any experience whatever in regard to the cancellation of contracts will fail to recognize at once the fallacy of the hon. member's statement. It will readily be realized that a contractor whose contract has been cancelled can claim only the possible profits on his transaction, and can make no claim for undelivered goods. He cannot claim for the whole amount of the contract, but for the established profits on the contract. The full amount in this case is about $16,000,000.

Mr. GORDON: Do you say he could not recover for the balance of his contract, and take proceedings for that?

Mr. STEVENS: Certainly not under circumstances where the contractor himself was a contributing party to the failure.

Mr. GORDON: How did he contribute to this loss?

Mr. STEVENS: In some respects he was derelict in the fulfilment of the terms of the contract; but the point I am getting at is that no claim was made. Now, I

do not want to detain the House at any great length, but I desire to deal with one or two of the points raised by my hon. friend. The hon. gentleman, with considerable recklessness, entered the field of accountancy and auditing, and he held up to ridicule one of the most reputable firms of auditors in this country. Marwick, Mitchell and Company, one of the most reputable firms of auditors in Canada, whose audit will be accepted by any bank, by any private concern, and, I think, by any court, audited the statement of the Canadian Government Merchant Marine, and their audit followed upon that of the officers of the company. Yet my hon. friend stands in his place in this House and sweeps that audit completely aside as utterly unworthy of the attention of the House; and instead of the figures submitted in that statement, audited by that company, produced statements of the most absurd and ludicrous character, placing them on Hansard as establishing and, as he said, proving facts. Let us examine some of his opinions. He very cooly deducts $150 per ton from the cost of the vessels, and writes it off this year. How does he arrive at that conclusion? One might possibly recognize his right to do so if he could establish some sound basis. He took pains to read to the House this afternoon quotations of the market value of ships offered for sale. Among those he fuond one at £9, built in 1920, a ship of a certain type and size, and without any comparison between the value of that ship and ships of the Canadian Government Marine, without offering one scintilla of evidence as to whether that ship which he gave in illustration was up to the standard of the Canadian Government ships, he adopts that lowest figure as the figure at which Canadian ships should be valued. He also quoted a ship at $9 per ton built in 1901, twenty years ago, and offers that to the House as evidence of the depreciation of Canadian Government Merchant Marine ships by $150 per ton, and cooly writes that off this year's operation, or, as he said, charges it against operating cost for this year.

11 p.m.

But my hon. friend in making that calculation was guilty of another ludicrous misstatement. He gave another statement shortly afterwards—well, when I say shortly afterwards, I really mean an hour or two—in the same speech, in which he prophesied or ratheid affirmed that there would be a loss next year of a certain figure. Fixing the loss for next year, he included interest on $70,000,000, the total amount that had been spent in these ships He shows the country a loss and for this year writes off $150 a ton on the ships; and in calculating the ship earnings for next year, he charges operation with the full cost of the ships, $192 per ton. That is my hon. friend's idea of auditing and accounting. There is another point in this regard. The hon. gentleman took a statement of the minister and showed that there was depreciation marked there this year of some $670,000, which the minister's officials had written off as fair depreciation at 2 per cent on the first year's operation. Then my hon. friend says that because there is an item in the assets of $800,000 odd, therefore the minister is trying to deceive the House. As a matter of fact, the statement shows clearly that this $800,000 odd is made up of depreciation written off this year, plus the sum of $150,000 written off last year, carried to reserve account, which is an entirely different thing from depreciation account. The depreciation which is written off was carried to this reserve account which is a perfectly proper thing to do, and the auditors in so doing were doing what any proper firm of accountants would do. And yet that was made the subject of an attack on the Government, by the hon. gentleman. It was given as evidence that the Government's business was not being conducted in a proper manner.

My hon. friend went on and told a story wherein he spoke of there being a woodpile with an Ethiopian in it, and he drew a picture of himself circling around this woodpile with an axe in his hand—I am simply giving his own figure of speech. What is the Ethiopian and what is the woodpile in the case?—a certain deal made in regard to the dry dock in Halifax. I am not going into the details for I think it can all be answered with one statement. The hon. gentleman made a charge against the Government—I want to use his own words if I can. He said, "They took the owners by the neck and wrung their property from them." This was his own picturesque and classic language. And then he said further, that the owners of the dry dock had no recourse whatever against that proceeding. The answer to all his argument in regard to the Halifax dry dock situation is this: the dry dock company had the right of appeal to the Supreme Court against the decision of the Exchequer Court. If they were not satisfied that right of appeal was open to them. They did not take advantage of it, they have not yet done so, and there is no evidence that they desire to do so.

That is a complete answer to the hon. gentleman's argument. They did not take, nor attempt to take, advantage of the proper course open to them. As I have already said I am not going into the details of this transaction which was carried out a couple of years ago by Hon. Mr. Carvell. There is this point to make, however, that in the closing years of the war this dry dock was not operated as it was thought it should be operated. For that reason Mr. Carvell then Minister of Public Works, exercised his right to take it over. But in any case the right of appeal was never exercised by the dry dock company, and as far as I know the payment has not yet been made for the purchase of the dock. Therefore the story about the Empire Steel Corporation falls helplessly to the ground without a scintilla of evidence in support of the innuendoes and the insinuations made by the hon. gentleman in his speech.

Now another point. The hon. gentleman complains, and complains bitterly, that these Government ships are interfering with private shipping, that they are doing no good, and the hon. member repeatedly said that on the Pacific ocean these vessels were carrying lumber which could be carried by any "windjammer"—using again his own phraseology. The hon. gentleman is not now present, but I will go on anyway and finish my reply to him because it is but a little task. I have here an extract from the Vancouver Province of March 16, and it will be interesting to hon. gentlemen to listen to me while I read it. In my estimation it is an illustration of one of the strongest arguments in favour of the establishment of the Canadian Government marine:

GREAT ORDER FOR EGYPT

B. C. Mills Get Contract for Many Millions of Railway Ties

Two Government Ship Cargoes Leaving Vancouver in April

British Columbia mills to-day commenced to cut an order of eight million feet of ties for the Egyptian State railway. The ties will be shipped late in April to Alexandria on board two steamships of the Canadian Government Merchant Marine.

Announcement of the conclusion of the negotiations regarding this order was made this morning by Mr. Arthur E. Salsbury of the Canada Overseas Trading Company.

This order in all probability is a forerunner of further and larger contracts for British Columbia mills, as the Egyptian State railway is understood to be preparing for a large building programme.

The responsibility for success of the negotiations can be equally divided between Mr. Salsbury, Mr. B. C. Keeley of the C. G. M. M. Limited and Mr. J. G. McConville of the Associated Timber Exporters of British Columbia, together with valuable assistance rendered by Hon. T. D. Pattullo, Agent-General F. C. Wade and Provincial Lumber Commissioner William Turnbull.

I have a word or two further to say in regard to this article. Here is an absolutely new field of operation; it is a business that Canadian lumbermen have not been able to touch hitherto. I know something about it because I had some connection with business of that kind in years gone by. It has been almost impossible for Canadian lumbermen to get into the Indian and Egyptian lumber markets and they have been trying to do so for years. I have in my possession a letter which states that it was largely through the instrumentality of the agent of the Canadian Government Marine office that this order was landed, that the information in the office, and the official's knowledge of the business led to the landing of that order and the opening of a new trade, the forerunner, as has been well said, of large orders. That is exactly what we want. It is exactly one of the things that we have been endeavouring to bring about in Canada for years. I know that on the Pacific coast one of the difficulties of the Canadian export business in lumber has been the shipping ring at San Francisco, and which it has been impossible to break. I am told by those who intimately know the business that the so called North Atlantic Shipping Ring was not in it with the San Francisco concern. I could go at length into the operations of this ring but I will not do so to-night. I will simply state for the benefit of hon. members present the fact that during recent years—during the last ten or twelve years—the export of lumber from British Columbia fell off at an alarming rate until it had almost disappeared. Now, through the instrumentality of the Government Marine Service, we are making rapid strides. I should also say through the instrumentality of the Robert Dollar Company—that is now established in Vancouver instead of San Francisco——through the instrumentality of these two agencies we are making tremendous strides in re-establishing our lumber trade on the Pacific. In addition I have this further information—that the Canadian Government ships on the Pacific are going out fully loaded. I grant you that the times are getting very hard, and it may be that some of the ships in the near future will not have cargoes: but during the past year down to within a month ago the Canadian Government ships were carrying full cargoes out of the port of Vancouver. This, I mention as a sample argument

in favour of the Government's programme —the programme being not only for the purpose of the development of trade, and the development of the shipbuilding industry—which has been of tremendous value to Canada—but also as as a compliment, shall I say, to the Canadian National Railway System. What we are faced with is this: By such attacks as the hon. gentleman made during the last five hours the Canadian Government ownership of railways and of marine will be damned before it has had an opportunity to establish itself. We all know that it is a new venture. In some respects you might term it an experiment. In some respects, perhaps, it will not show the result that we hoped for, but by the statement which has been presented by the minister we at least can say that it has shown an operating profit.

My hon. friend attempted to lead the House and the public to believe that he had discovered something when he brought forward the fact that the Government merchant marine had not paid interest on capital. Why, the hon. minister in his statement said so. He said that the balance sheet showed an operating profit, and he gave figures which are beyond all peradventure. There they are, and they are correct. They have not been disturbed in the slightest iota by this five-hour harangue of the hon. member for Lunenburg. He gave the House not one scintilla of new information. The Minister of Marine stated when he made his announcement to the House—I have his statement here—that the balance sheet did not provide for interest on capital, but that the net profit of some $700,000 odd would show a return of about two per cent on the capital cost. I submit that where you have that profit on these ships, some of them running only a few months and few of them running for more than a year, that that is not a bad showing in face of the complete collapse of the shipping market. I ask hon. gentlemen, particularly my hon. friends of the Agrarian party—who are not, I think, ill-disposed towards Government ownership, but who have looked askance at this particular venture—to weigh carefully their words and arguments before they condemn the showing made by the Canadian Government marine in the brief time it has been in operation.

My hon. friend's solution is to dispose of these vessels "by sale or otherwise." That was his intelligent suggestion to the committee a few moments ago after speaking about four and a half hours. He said, "Now what about a solution? Dispose of these ships by sale or otherwise." I submit that that is not a very helpful proposal. If it is the official declaration of the criticism of hon. gentlemen opposite, made through the mouth of the responsible representative of that party, then it is of very little help to the Government and to the country in solving this problem. "Dispose of the ships by sale or otherwise." Suppose we take the hon. gentleman at his word and, as I said a moment ago, dignify a statement of that kind as argument, if you please. He added further, that the existing contracts should be cancelled and the ships disposed of by sale or otherwise. What does that mean? It means loss and ruin to the yards that are now building the balance of this shipping programme—a programme launched in good faith, a programme aproved of by my hon. friend from Maisonneuve, a programme which he supported—not in war time, as he said the other day, but in peace time as a desirable peace programme. My hon. friend is sitting there and I want him to listen to me. He stated that it was a desirable programme in peace time. The other day he made an attack on the minister and said that he was in favour of it in war time, but not in peace time. This programme was endorsed by my hon. friends opposite as well as by hon. gentlemen on this side as a desirable programme. I venture to say that all of us perhaps would have acted differently if we could have seen all that was going to happen; but we did the best we could in the light of the information we had at that time and on the prospects which were in view. Now it does not become my hon. friend from Maisonneuve to join in such criticisms as his colleague has made and attack the Government because in peace time they carried on this programme. I say that if the Government followed their advice it would mean loss and ruin to these yards that had heavy commitments, and also to their subcontractors in this country who also had heavy commitments. You cannot build a 10,000-ton ship in a day. There must be preparation, you must buy your plates and angles and machinery from all parts of the country, and much of it out of the country, orders have to be given months and months ahead, and to undertake the work of building two, four, six or eight of these ships is a tremendous financial commitment. Not only that, but sub-contracts are let to other business firms, and it would mean the ruination of these firms, too. It would

at once create a panic and throw into the unemployment market of to-day tens of thousands of men, not only the men directly operating at these plants but those operating with these other concerns subsidiary to them and also connected with the contracts.

This is a practical question. It is not a question that we can toss aside and say: Cancel the contracts and sell the ships. My hon. friend from Lunenburg speaks of this matter as if he were dealing with something out of a ten-cent store. We are dealing with a programme which has been debated in this House for four sessions—debated by hon. gentlemen on both sides. Some of them, including notably my hon. friend from Red Deer and one or two others took exception to it, but the great bulk of opinion on both sides of the House was behind the venture. I think we all felt that it was a heavy responsibility, but there was a feeling that it was the right thing to do, and we did it. Now I say it does not lie well in the mouths of these hon. gentlemen to round on the Government because at this juncture there happens to be a universal collapse in the trade of the world, creating temporarily a condition of which it is difficult to exactly foresee the outcome.

I counsel both the minister and the House that we should hold on to these assets. He is an unwise man who will sell out his plant when there are no buyers. It is a mighty poor business principle for a manufacturing industry when things become dead and the market is upset to say, "Well, here is my plant. I will sell it at any cost." That is a very vicious principle. What is the principle that a sane business man will follow under such conditions? He will conserve these assets, realizing that this particular slump which we are now passing through cannot possibly continue for any lengthy period, and that the time will come when these ships will in all probability not only earn a profit on operating expenses but pay a dividend as well.

Now, I want to say, I think the minister as well as every hon. gentleman will agree with me,—and I say it not for the sake of escaping captious criticism on the other side—that we must be prepared to write off a severe loss on the capital cost of these ships. It is quite true that the prices paid when these contracts were let is in excess of those now obtaining; that is obvious; but to say that we must write off $150 a ton out of this year's expenses is manifestly absurd. We must devise a scheme to nurse this project along, to conserve the assets, and to so administer our property that it will be operated as successfully as possible.

Another consequence of abandoning this project would be the repudiation by the Government of all its contracts entered into in good faith by both parties, and entered into with the approval of this House. Now, in case I should be tripped up and be told that the contracts in detail did not come before this House, I will at once recognize that point, but I say that the policy was adopted in good faith and approved generally by hon. gentlemen on both sides of the House. I have not the figures, and I do not think it is necessary for me to state them in detail, but in the United States the Government absorbed losses running into hundreds of millions of dollars through cancellation of contracts. Their shipbuilding programme was not carried out with a business ability at all comparable to the business ability displayed by our Marine and Fisheries Department. This Government's shipbuilding programme was carried out in a manner that puts to shame the programme carried out by some other countries. Now, if we create a similar situation and the Government cancel the contracts we will have to also absorb great losses. I think that is a point we might consider. I am not prepared to support it, but I do say that it is a point that hon. gentlemen might advance —whether or not it is advisable for the Government to cancel the contracts, pay the loss, and let the thing go. I submit that that would be unwise; our loss will be less in the long run if we carry out these contracts, accept the ships, and see the programme through. If the contracts were cancelled there would not only be the loss in dollars and cents, but there would be an indirect loss, and there would be also the moral effect resulting from the repudiation by the Government of its contracts at this time. These are serious problems, problems that we cannot lightly deal with or thrust aside.

The hon. member for Lunenburg in his speech attacked the minister because of his statement that one of the attractive features of his programme was the supplying of work to the un-employed, particularly to returned soldiers. Now, I want to endorse heartily the minister's view in that regard. The minister did not say that was the sole object of his shipbuilding programme. He did say, however, that that was one of its objects—and it was. I know one yard in Vancouver that employed over

twelve hundred returned soldiers; indeed, it is employing them to-day, though perhaps not quite so large a number. Another yard employed about 450 returned soldiers, so that some 1,500 returned soldiers were employed in these two yards at Vancouver alone, to say nothing of the number indirectly employed. The hon. member for Lunenburg took the minister to task, however, I thought it did not very well become the hon. gentleman to cast aspersions on any policy having anything to do with returned soldiers in this country. I am sorry that my hon. friend is not in his seat. I am sorry that he left the chamber —left it, I think, because he knew there was something coming to him.

Mr. McMASTER: Oh no, he left the chamber to correct the report of his speech.

Mr. STEVENS: Well, that is a good idea; I hope he doctors it up pretty well. But I wish he were in his seat, because if he were I would remind him that it was hardly wise for him to meddle with any question involving returned soldiers or the war. It is very doubtful whether the hon. member for Lunenburg would have secured his seat in this House had he not distributed promises of exemption to young men in his county and counselled them to defy the law of Canada and not to register and report. Not only that, but he counselled young men also to break their parole who had been apprehended because they were defaulters. That, I say, is a pretty serious thing. The hon. gentleman has during the last four sessions been handing out all manner of insults to members on this side who dared to open their mouths, who asked him even a civil question; has cast aspersions on the Minister of Marine nearly every time he has been in the House; has been seeking to convey to the minds of the public the impression that some underhand work was going on. I say it does not become an hon. gentleman who won his seat in the House in the way that he did to indulge in any such reflections on other hon. gentlemen. I am sorry that he is not here. He may have gone up to revise the report of his speech, but it has been an act of common courtesy for many years in this House for an hon. gentleman to remain in his seat and take a reply to remarks that he has made. In this case the hon. gentleman made a speech lasting five hours; and I hope that my hon. friends opposite who are friends of his will give him a lesson in what is due to this House in the way of common courtesy.

The hour is late, Mr. Chairman, and it is useless for me to go on with any further remarks. I do not know that any good can come from a further analysis of the statement of the hon. member for Lunenburg. But I should like to say that we ought to approach this question of the Canadian Government Merchant Marine with a patriotic desire to make good, not with the idea of offering captious cricitism or of saying, in effect: Oh well, you are in that mess now, you can carry the burden. I ask the hon. member for Maisonneuve (Mr. Lemieux), whom I have known quite intimately for the last ten years and who is generally pretty fair, to revise his rather severe criticisms of a few days ago and turn back to the Hansard report of his speech of only two years ago, after the armistice, when he made what I considered to be a very fair statement to this House. I would ask the member for North Cape Breton (Mr. McKenzie) if he were in his seat; the member for Lotbinière (Mr. Vien), and one or two others—my hon. friend from Guysborough (Mr. Sinclair) and several of those hon. gentlemen who went into this business with their eyes open just as we did and knew exactly what they were doing—I ask them to assist in arriving at some sane solution of this problem, a solution involving not the scrapping of the whole scheme, but the upholding of this policy until it has an opportunity of demonstrating its value to Canada. Great Britain's supremacy of the sea was built upon just such a beginning as this. She made sacrifices; she paid amounts enormously in excess of what she really needed to have paid the Dutch for shipping at that time. But she established the policy of carrying her own goods in her own bottoms and passed very rigorous laws in support of it. The United States, with less success, has tried to do the same thing. As for Canada, about forty years ago or thereabouts we did occupy a very favourable position, as my hon. friend from Guysborough knows, so far as shipping is concerned; when wooden ships were more fashionable than steel we had a very high place in the shipping of the world. We lost that position because of the complete change in the type of shipping. Now we are launching into shipping in a modern way, and I again invite hon. gentlemen opposite to join in constructive criticism having in view the one object of making good the venture, in the inception

of which they joined us, of the Canadian Government Merchant Marine.

Mr. SINCLAIR (Guysborough): The hour is late, and there is no hope that this debate can be closed to-night. I do not think it is advisable that the minister should endeavour to push a large item like this through with but a short discussion, particularly when so many hon. members are anxious to express their views with regard to this important question. The minister will not sleep any the sounder for having heard what I shall say, and I suggest that we adjourn the discussion until some future day when it is convenient for him to bring it up again.

Mr. BALLANTYNE: The hour is not yet late, and I think all hon. members will admit that on this side we have been very patient in listening for some five hours to the hon. member for Lunenburg. I think it is only fair to ask the committee to sit a while longer and see if we cannot make some progress.

Mr. SINCLAIR (Guysborough): Of course, if my hon. friend wants a lengthy debate we shall have to try to accommodate him, but I do not think he will be able to pass this item to-night.

I listened with much interest to the speech of the hon. member for Vancouver (Mr. Stevens), but I regret that he found it necessary to resort to personal abuse of the hon. member for Lunenburg (Mr. Duff). I have sat with the hon. member for Vancouver Centre (Mr. Stevens) for a good many years, and I think this is the first time I have heard him depart from the usual amenities of debate in the way that he has done to-night. The conduct of the hon. member for Lunenburg (Mr. Duff) is a matter for himself to deal with, and he is well able to look after himself. If the hon. member for Vancouver Centre will give him an opportunity of discussing his record in the war and placing it opposite my hon. friend's record in the war, the hon. member for Lunenburg will, I am sure, have no objection to undertaking the task.

We are all very much indebted to the hon. member for Lunenburg for the mass of facts that he has placed before us to-night. We may not agree with all that he said, but he quoted many authorities that we will not question. He has given us figures that we are at liberty to examine and criticise; he has given a great deal of study to this question, and I am sure the House should feel indebted to the hon. member for Lunenburg for the careful way in which he has gone into this question and the large collection of important facts which he has placed before us.

My only excuse for intervening in this debate is the gravity of the situation that faces the country in its financial affairs. It has been admitted that we are building ships now at a much higher price than the ships are worth when they are completed. The hon. member for Vancouver has admitted that; he has admitted that we are having to write off a very large amount of our capital cost of those ships, and it is an extraordinary situation that we are voting more money and going on building new ships, knowing that when we have them completed and have paid an average of $192 a ton for them, they will not be worth anything like that figure in the market. That is the situation, and it seems to be very unbusinesslike that we should proceed with a programme like that, with the fact staring us in the face that when we get through with it, our ships will not be worth more than perhaps 25 per cent of what we are spending on them.

The entrance of the Government into this programme is a different matter altogether. The war was on at the time, and there was a certain amount of excuse, but I think I can show that this programme of shipbuilding was not a war measure. The minister, in his speech the other day, stated that this programme started as a war measure. I think I can show that it was not a war measure, and I wish to take issue with my hon. friend on that statement. To begin with it came too late to be of any service. The eleventh of June is the date that I have as the date that the first keel was laid, and the first launch took place on the 23rd November, 1918, or about twelve days after the armistice, so that not a single ship built under this programme of $70,000,000 was of any service whatever in the war. But that is not all. Shipbuilding was going on at the time in Canada. The Government was urged by members of the Opposition during the early years of the war, to embark on a shipbuilding programme. Those of us who were in the House in 1914, 1915 and, I think, 1916, will remember that hon. members on this side of the House frequently drew the attention of the Government to the fact that British ships were being sunk at an enormous rate by German submarines and that Canada should do something towards helding Great Britain, helping the Admiralty, in that matter. The Government,

however, took no steps during those years, but I think it was in 1916 that the Munitions Board took up the question of building ships in Canada. They started to build ships in Canadian yards, and in 1917, if I remember rightly, every shipyard in Canada was busy building ships for the Munitions Board. It was absolutely unnecessary for my hon. friend to enter upon this expenditure at that time, because the yards were all busy for the Munitions Board under the authority of the Imperial Government, and his advent into the business only brought about confusion, because it confused the good work that was being carried on by the Munitions Board. My hon. friend can hardly say, considering that fact, that his advent into this business was a war measure. If he had stayed out of the business altogether, the Munitions Board would have gone on with the work; they would have kept Canadian yards busy, and every ship that would have been constructed by the Munitions Board would have been at once handed over to the Admiralty for use in the war. If my hon. friend had been successful in building even one ship before the war closed, his ship would also have been handed over to the Admiralty for use in the war. It made no difference to the Admiralty whether a ship was built by the Munitions Board or by my hon. friend's department. Consequently, the excuse that the war had something to do with starting this programme will hardly hold when we remember the circumstances under which this programme commenced.

The second point to which my hon. friend referred—I am speaking now of the speech delivered by the minister the other day—was that the ships were necessary on account of our owning the railways; that is, owing to the fact that we have a large railway system consisting of some 22,000 miles of railway in this country, we ought to have these ships on the ocean to carry our traffic. That argument is not sound. The seven seas are covered with vessels that are quite ready and willing to compete for the traffic that is carried to the sea by Canadian railways. It is not at all necessary that the railways should embark on a programme of shipbuilding and shipowning. The railways of Great Britain, the railways of the continent of Europe and many railways in the United States have not embarked on the building of freight vessels. Some of them have fast passenger vessels, and if my hon. friend had introduced a programme of putting fast passenger vessels on the Atlantic or on some parts of the oceans connected with his railways, there would be a good deal to be said in favour of it. But that is not his programme; his programme is building what we ordinarily characterize as slow tramp vessels. I notice, in looking over the list, that about eleven knots is the best speed of the vessels he has had built, and some of them are slower than that. There is no justification for building those vessels in order to carry traffic that is carried over our Canadian railways, because as I said before, the ocean is covered with ships belonging to private companies, ready and willing to compete for that traffic and at a lower rate than that at which my hon. friend can carry the freight in Government ships. These great railway systems in the United States and Europe that have no freight vessels connected with their systems have found no inconvenience in that regard; they are able to make arrangements for any traffic that they have to carry. If the minister delivers a shipload of wheat in the elevators at any part of the coast of Canada, all he has to do is to go to the market in New York or London, and give his broker an opportunity of getting the lowest rate that is going for the ships that are looking for that kind of traffic. He will find that in that way he will get a lower rate.

Mr. NICHOLSON (East Algoma): If the principle enunciated that it is unnecessary to have ships in connection with the National system of railways, is correct how was it that the former Government in entering into the contract with the Grand Trunk for the operation of the Transcontinental and the construction of the Grand Trunk Pacific insisted as a part of the contract that the Grand Trunk or the Grand Trunk Pacific must construct ships for operation on both oceans in conjunction with the railways?

Mr. SINCLAIR (Guysborough): I understood those to be passenger ships. If my hon. friend looks into the matter I think he will find that there was an attempt made at that time to have a line of passenger ships just the same as the Canadian Pacific Railway has.

Mr. NICHOLSON (East Algoma): How is it then that the Canadian Pacific finds it necessary to operate a fleet of between 60 and 70 ships of all kinds, but largely freight ships, on both oceans?

Mr. SINCLAIR (Guysborough): The Canadian Pacific has a fleet of ships many of which I believe, were first built as passenger ships. Some of the old passenger ships, I understand are now being used as freight vessels. But that makes no difference to my argument. My argument is that a railway system does not need ships at all and that argument has found favour with the great railway systems of the United States and of Europe. Whatever the Canadian Pacific or any particular railway system might have done, my point is that it is absolutely unnecessary for a great railway system to have ships on the ocean to carry their traffic, because there are already so many ships ready to compete for that traffic at a low rate. Why do not the great railway systems in the United States and Europe put their money into the building of ships like we have done? It is simply because they have not the money to spare. They need the money for the operation of their railways, and dear knows, we need it for the operation of our railways.

Mr. STEVENS: Is it not because the Interstate Commerce Commission will not permit American railways to give a through rail and water rate which is just the opposite to the system in Canada?

Mr. SINCLAIR (Guysborough): That is a comparatively recent regulation in the United States.

Mr. STEVENS: Oh no, it has been in force for years.

Mr. SINCLAIR (Guysborough): There were great railway systems in the United States before that regulation came into effect, but they did not adopt the principle that has been adopted by this Government, of putting large sums of money into ships to be operated in connection with the railway. The Canadian Pacific have done so, but I think you will find if you inquire from men who know most about the Canadian Pacific Railway, that their shipbuilding programme has not been their most profitable venture. If you will look at the report of the Canadian Pacific Railway that was issued a few days ago, you will find that they have a capital investment of something like $43,000,000 and if you look at the profit they made, and allow for sinking fund and interest on their money, you will find that the shipping end has not been a very profitable venture for that compeny, any more than it has for the Canadian Government.

Hon. Mr. REID: All of these Government ships were built on account of war conditions. What would my hon. friend think of a suggestion of this kind; that a number of these vessels be operated permanently in connection with the Intercolonial or the Canadian National Railway system in carrying coal from Sydney and the lower provinces to Halifax and St. John's in the winter, and to Montreal and Quebec and even as far as Toronto in the summer?

Mr. SINCLAIR (Guysborough): My hon. friend appears to think that I would be influenced by the fact that the coal comes from Nova Scotia.

Hon. Mr. REID: Oh, no, what I meant was that in that way we could bring the coal cheaper than if we had to pay a private steamship line a profit.

Mr. SINCLAIR (Guysborough): The way to work up a coal trade with foreign countries is to get cheap transportation, and my view is that you will never get that by Government ships. Government operation of railways has not given us cheap transportation, either here or in the United States or Great Britain, and the history of Government operation of ships will be the same. If we want to deliver coal to Mediterranean ports, as we had an opportunity of doing last year if the Government had not interfered and put an embargo on the export of coal, we must have cheap transportation to the Mediterranean.

Hon. Mr. REID: That is not the question I asked. I am speaking of bringing coal to Montreal and Quebec and even Ontario. What would the hon. member think of making these Government ships part of the Intercolonial system and using them for bringing coal to Montreal and Quebec, and Toronto perhaps, instead of bringing the coal from the United States.

Mr. SINCLAIR (Guysborough): It is rather strange that when the programme for the Canadian ships was drawn up, which the minister announced to the House on March 29, my hon. friend the Minister of Railways did not make that suggestion to his colleague. The ships of the Canadian Government Merchant Marine are now travelling on distant voyages all over the world, to India, South Africa, New Zealand, and Australia. It is strange my hon. friend did not induce his colleague to include in his programme the bringing of coal up the St. Lawrence. I do not know whether that is practicable or not. There

are some reasons why I would think it was not. I question very much if the ships would do for the coal trade. It was discovered in trying to promote the coal trade between Nova Scotia and Montreal that you must have specially built ships that can be easily discharged, with large hatches, and with a great many appliances that are lacking in the Government ships. The Government ships, in the first place, are not economical. Too many of them are small ships. I find that about 30 of them are under 5,000 tons. Now it is an axiom in the freight business in these days that to make a commercial success of carrying a large and heavy cargo like coal or lumber, or any other product that requires a good deal of room, you must have a ship of at least 8,000 or 10,000 tons. If you consult the managers of the Dominion Coal Company they will tell you that the small ships they were using in the early days did not pay, and that the ship that has a chance to pay in that sort of trade is a 10,000-ton ship.

The Minister of Marine must have taken the advice of some marine engineer, I suppose, but it is a puzzle to me why he built so many small ships of 3,000 or 4,000 or 5,000 tons, when he intended to use them for ocean trade and expected them to pay their way. It is a fact that something like about thirty of the ships being built under the Government programme are too small to be a commercial success in any trade of that kind. They are good enough to travel around in as yachts, with a little freight, which is all that is offering in these times when freight is scarce. But if you want to make money, if you want to carry on a business that will pay its way, then you must have larger ships than my hon. friend has built. Now, I spoke of the reason that was given for the ownership of railways, and the reason that my hon. friend gave the other day for the building of these ships was that it was advancing the export trade of the Dominion. As a matter of fact, is it building up the export trade? It does not seem to be successful in any case, because the balance of trade has been increasing against us during the whole time that my hon. friend has been going on with this programme. I know he carries a certain amount of goods away from Canadian ports, but these goods could be carried in other vessels as cheaply as he is carrying them. His advent into the Newfoundland trade was referred to in this debate, and we may consider that phase of the subject for a moment. There were no fewer than four private lines carrying on trade between the Maritime Provinces and the island of Newfoundland last December. Freight was scarce, and none of them were making money. They had to cross to Newfoundland with half cargoes, and in that state of affairs, with these four private lines struggling to buy coal, pay wages, and keep their ships afloat, my hon. friend comes in and enters his ships into competition with these four lines. He does not reduce the freight, so far as I have heard; he charges the same rate of freight as is charged by the private lines. The effect of his entrance into the business there has simply been to make it unprofitable, not only for himself, but for all concerned, and that certainly is not developing trade. Is my hon. friend developing Canadian trade? If he is, should we not expect to find the balance of trade in our favour? I want to read a short paragraph from a newspaper that generally supports the programme of my hon. friend; I refer to the Financial Post. Here is what the paper says:

> During 1919, our surplus of exports was $151,037,000 while in 1920 we have actually imported $151,145,000 more than we have exported, a change for the worse of over $300,000,000, and a complete reversal of our trade position.

Now, that is the result of my hon. friend's operations in connection with steamships. The Minister, with his forty or fifty odd ships, has been trying to develop our export trade, but he has developed it in the wrong way, in one year, to the tune of $300,000,000. That is the report we get from the blue books and from the press. If a Canadian merchant has a cargo to ship, it is the easiest thing in the world to get ships. All he has to do is to ask for one and he will get it at the lowest rate. He can get ships at a lower rate than the minister can build or run one, so that our export trade would be developed just as well as if my hon. friend were out of the business altogether. The minister has given us a list of the routes to which he intends to send his ships during the coming year. He informs us that he is developing new routes of trade, and the first on the list is Liverpool. Did the hon. gentleman never hear of Liverpool before? Is that a new route? For the last hundred years ships from my province have been going there carrying Canadian exports, and they are doing it still. But my hon. friend gives Liverpool as one of these places; then he gives London, Cardiff, Havana and Australia as new routes. Is any one of them new? I question if my hon. friend can find a port in any part of the world, that is

to say, an important commercial port, where Canadian ships have not already been. Why, in the province from which I come, the people are as familiar with the names of Shanghai, Negasaki, Singapore, and Hong Kong, as they are with the port of Montreal, for during the last fifty or sixty, or seventy years sailors of that province have been going to these places.

Mr. BALLANTYNE: I do not want to interrupt the hon. member, but I think he will understand that my statement was that these were new routes opened up for the Canadian Government Merchant Marine. He will give me credit, I think, for knowing that these ports are old established ones, and are well known.

Mr. SINCLAIR (Guysborough): Where are the new ones?

Mr. BALLANTYNE: If you read Hansard you will see.

Mr. SINCLAIR: I have the list but I cannot see a single port that has not been frequently visited by Canadian ships in the last fifty or sixty years. I have observed in the press frequently the statement that my hon. friend was opening new ports. The newspapers that are writing up his shipping programme are very kind to him and represent him as a sort of Christopher Columbus, going over the world finding new places for Canada's export trade. I do not want to detract from the honours of the hon. gentleman, but he cannot find any new port in this list, any port that I would call new, at any rate. I read in a Canadian newspaper last autumn the statement that my hon. friend had sent one of his ships up the river Platte to Buenos Aires, and it was stated as a wonderful thing that for the first time in the history of Canada a Canadian ship had carried a Canadian cargo to this place. A Canadian captain happened to be in my office at the time and I read the statement to him. He was amazed, and the remark he made was that some years ago, as master of a ship, he carried a cargo of lumber from St. John to Buenos Aires, and that when he arrived at that port, there were no fewer than ten Canadian ships at anchor there, all having carried cargoes from this country. These statements are made in newspapers by men living a thousand miles from the sea who do not know what has happened at Canadian seaports in the years that have gone. My hon. friend has not so far been successful in developing Canadian trade to any extent.

Mr. BUTTS: Has any vessel from Guysborough ever carried a cargo to Buenos Aires?

Some hon. MEMBERS: Never mind him.

Mr. SINCLAIR (Guysborough): If my hon. friend really wants to develop trade, he will find that private vessels can carry cargoes as cheaply as his vessels can, or more cheaply. My hon. friend claims that he made a profit in the year 1920. My hon. friend from Lunenburg dealt with that question, but I want to refer to it very briefly. I am not going to enter into details about my hon. friend's figures, but he admits himself, in the statement he presented to the House the other day, that his capital account at the end of the year stood at $53,687,649. The question is, does his balance sheet show a profit? Before we speak of a profit we have to provide for sinking fund and interest—those are the two things that we must make provision for before we make a profit. Shipowners do not consider they make a profit at all until they lay aside enough to pay for sinking fund and for interest. Has my hon. friend complied with that rule, well known to business men everywhere, in regard to the shipping industry? I do not profess to know a great deal about the shipping industry, but I know a little. I know it is the practice of business men, who put their money into ships, to charge five per cent as a sinking fund, and it is necessary to charge five per cent if you expect to come out at the end without going bankrupt. One of the most perishable things in the world is a ship, and a steel ship is also perishable. If the greatest care is not taken it will rust very quickly. Government officers are not apt to sit up all night looking after these things, and if you do not take the greatest care in painting a ship and taking the rust off, the hull of the ship will go in a very short time. The machinery cannot last very long anyway, and the boiler will have to be renewed every ten years. In order to do this you must have a sinking fund. If you are going to renew your ship at the end of twenty years, or whatever period she lasts, you must have a sinking fund of at least five per cent. Taking that principle to start with my hon. friend says he spent $53,687,649. The depreciation at five per cent would amount to $2,685,324.

What about the capital? Where did the capital come from? It did not come down from the skies without anybody being responsible; the capital came from the Canadian people. Every dollar of it was borrowed from the Canadian people at five

and a half per cent, and if my hon. friend is going to go on with a sound enterprise he must pay that interest out of his business. The interest on his expenditure at five and a half per cent amounts to $2,952,820. Adding these sums together what do we get? We get a fixed charge of $5,637,144. But my hon. friend made some earnings. He tells us that he has done so and we are glad to give him credit for all the earnings he has made. He claims that he has made $1,293,525. If you subtract that from the fixed charge that I have mentioned it leaves a deficit of $4,343,619. That is to say that my hon. friend, when he charges his five per cent depreciation and his five and a half per cent interest on the operations of the past year, comes out with a deficit of $4,343,619—that is about $12,000 a day for the year that he was running these ships. If that deficit was experienced last year, what will it amount to next year? Does any one expect my hon. friend to make the same rate of profit in the year 1921 that he made in 1920?

My hon. friend from Lunenburg drew attention to the fact that the slump in freights took place in the autumn and summer of 1920. That is true; I could give my hon. friend numerous figures to prove that fact. I am somewhat familiar with the oil trade and I can give him an instance like this—where 74 cents a case was paid for oil shipped from Port Arthur in Texas to the West Indies. In the summer of 1920, as late as August and September, or even later than that, the rates went down, so that oil was carried from Port Arthur in Texas to the West Indies for 35 cents a case, or an absolute loss to the ships that were carrying it. That shows you there was a slump in that instance of more than fifty per cent in the freight. The same thing has happened in other trades as well as in the oil trade, so that my hon. friend will not be able to make the same money in 1921, that he made in 1920. Instead of losing $12,000 a day, as he did in 1920, I would not be surprised if he lost as much as forty and fifty thousand dollars a day in 1921.

My hon. friend from Vancouver (Mr. Stevens) did not say very much about the price of ships. He admitted, if I understood his speech, that we must have a considerable capital loss, and that we have to write it off. I was glad that he was frank enough to make that statement because everybody knows it. There may be a difference of opinion as to what that capital loss will be, but there are certain factors that no one will dispute. These ships were built at a very expensive rate. They were built at a time when the building of ships cost more than they cost at any other time in the history of the present generation. That was the time my hon. friend the Minister of Marine took to let his new contracts, because between the date of the signing of the armistice and the meeting of parliament—between November 11, 1918 and the meeting of Parliament in the winter of 1918, my hon. friend let eighteen new contracts without authority from Parliament, without tender and without competition. These contracts were let at an exhorbitant, profiteering rate, at a figure which the minister himself says was about $192 a deadweight ton. Now prior to the war the ruling rate on the Clyde and at the large shipbuilding ports in England, was not more than $50 a ton. So that my hon. friend paid four prices for his ships—he paid four times as much as was paid prior to the war. Those ships have to compete with the vessels that were built at $50 a ton, for there are millions of that tonnage still on the sea—a great deal of it was sunk, but there are millions of tons left. My hon. friend has to compete now with ships that were built at $50, his ships having been built at $192 a ton. You can therefore understand how difficult it will be for him to make a clean sheet and keep his head above water in hard times like we are having at present.

Now in reference to the value of these ships I want to read an extract from a paper called "Shipping," published in New York. The date of the article is March 25, 1921 and it is to the following effect:

> If the Shipping Board were to fix a price for the sale of the steel tonnage with regard for the world market figures ruling to-day, it would be forced to offer the cargo carriers with $35 a deadweight ton as the top price. One of the most recent sales in the United Kingdom on a new 6,750 d.w.t. ex-German freighter, completed in 1920, was recorded at £60,000. This was at approximately £9 a deadweight ton.
>
> The depreciation in the value of tonnage is indicated by the comparison with £14 a deadweight ton at the end of the past year. Before the British are able to dispose of the ex-German tonnage it would seem that the Inchcape commission will be almost giving away the more antiquated and seaworn cargo carriers. It is extremely doubtful if any considerable number of steel ships could be sold to-day to American companies even if they were offered at nominal figures.

There is no doubt at all that the price which can be obtained for ships at the present time has depreciated enormously. I would not venture to put down a figure

as I do not know what it would be. It might not at present be practicable for my hon. friend to carry out the suggestion of my other hon. friend from Lunenburg to sell the ships, although it might be possible to sell them on some kind of terms. If my hon. friend had followed the example of Great Britain what would he have done? Why, Sir, within ten days after the armistice the Government of Great Britain announced their policy to return all their freight carriers to private ownership, and they have since done so. The United States tried to do the same, but they asked too high a price and the private owners would not take the vessels. If the Canadian Government had followed the example of Great Britain and had shut down all further building at the time of the armistice and disposed of the tonnage they had then contracted for, they could have saved millions and millions of dollars to the people of this country. My hon. friend did not take that course. He was very optimistic then, but I noticed a different note in his speech the other day. He did not seem to be so optimistic as he was last year and the year before; in fact, his tone was somewhat apologetic. He began to tell us the reasons why he went into this venture and tried to blame hon. members on this side of the House for having some part in it. But my hon. friend has got to take the whole responsibility himself. He is the man who inaugurated this system. He had the reputation of being a level-headed business man, and people trusted him. He has this merchant marine on his hands now, and it is for him to decide what is the best thing to do. We on this side of the House will assist him in any way we can, because the country is very much interested in what he is going to do. If he continues to operate these ships as he is operating them at the present time in competition with other private lines and with subsidized lines, there is no telling how many million dollars we may lose. It might be better for him to tie these vessels up. Thousands of ships all over the world are tied up because that is more profitable than to operate them. It is a question for my hon. friend to look into. It looks to me as very improvident, that as requested the other night by my hon. friend the Minister of Trade and Commerce (Sir George Foster), we should be asked to subsibize a vessel running to Auckland, New Zealand, to the extent of $340,000 to beat us off that route. We are starting in the pace with a handicap against us to that extent. If my hon. friend will look at the returns made to the Government by his officers of the trade between Australia and New Zealand and Canada he will find it is very small indeed. His competitor, the New Zealand Company, has worked up that trade and is running better ships than his, ships that make 16 and 17 knots while his can only make 11, and the total trade last year was about 35,000 tons by measurement, and less than 1,000 tons by weight. That is the trade that existed last year on that route. If he got it all it would not give him one cargo for the five freighters which he is going to put on this route between Vancouver and Auckland. One can readily understand that a man sending out a ship to run across the Pacific ocean 6,000 miles burning expensive coal, without any cargo to carry, would find it far better to tie his ship up at the wharf at Vancouver or somewhere else and wait until there was some business to do. But the insane part is that the Government is paying a competitor that is likely to get the trade $340,000 to prevent its own merchant marine from getting any business on that route during the coming year. That is true not only of New Zealand trade but of the trade with South America and with Newfoundland, for we are paying $35,000 to subsidize a line of steamers to this island. In all these cases we are in competition with lines that we are ourselves subsidizing. That is the most unbusiness-like proceeding imaginable and would not be attempted by any private concern. I should like to know if my hon. friend would put his own money into this venture? He is reputed to be a rich man.

Some hon. MEMBERS: Not a cent.

Mr. CANNON: He never would.

Mr. SINCLAIR (Guysborough): I question if he would put his own money in this venture.

Mr. BALLANTYNE: He is too poor.

Mr. SINCLAIR (Guysborough): What position does he occupy? He is trustee for the Canadian people. If I understand anything about the doctrine of trusts, it is that a trustee has to be more careful about trust money than about his own. That doctrine does not seem to influence my hon. friend at all. He does not seem to think there is anything wrong in taking this trust money now and building ships at the rate of $192 deadweight ton

when he knows that when those ships are launched they will not be worth more than a quarter of that amount. It is hard to say how far this may go. We are committed to an outlay of $70,000,000 I suppose to complete our present contracts. But, as I have pointed out, last year we actually lost four or five million dollars in our shipping operations, if we allow depreciation and interest on our money, and we will lose a great deal more next year; indeed, instead of $70,000,000 it may easily become $100,000,000. I would impress upon my hon. friend the importance of looking into this matter and applying his best business ability to its solution. Now, if my hon. friend is willing that we should adjourn this debate to some more christian hour, when we will not all be so tired, I should like to get his consent. I have a few more remarks that I may wish to make, but I need not make them to-night.

Mr. BALLANTYNE: I am quite willing to agree to the request of my hon. friend if he and his colleagues will allow one small item to go through. I have seen the leader of the Opposition, and he has kindly consented to it. I would ask the committee to revert to item 206, ocean and river service, examination of masters and mates, $20,000.

Ocean and River Service—examination of masters and mates, $20,000.

Mr. CANNON: That has nothing to do with pilots?

Mr. BALLANTYNE: No.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: What is the explanation of the increase of $2,000?

Mr. BALLANTYNE: It is the usual increase of the civil government Estimates and other incidental expenses.

Mr. PARENT: Are pilots interested in the item of masters and mates?

Mr. BALLANTYNE: No.

Item agreed to.

Progress reported.

On the motion of Hon. Mr. Ballantyne for the adjournment of the House:

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: Is my hon. friend in a position to inform us what business the Government will take up to-morrow?

Mr. BALLANTYNE: The business for to-morrow will be the motion for the appointment of the special committee on Government Railways and Shipping, and any Estimates which we are entitled to take up.

Motion agreed to and the House adjourned at 12.26 a.m. Friday.

APPENDIX

[The tables comprising the answer referred to on page 1673 are given below. The answer was to the following series of questions asked by Hon. Charles Murphy (Russell):

1. What rates are paid now as compared with 1916 on Canadian National Railways, per month, per day, or per hour, for the following classes of employees:—Engineers, Firemen, Conductors, Trainmen, Shop Mechanics, Carmen, Agents and Operators, Freight Shed Men, Trackmen, Bridge and Building Men?

2. Have there been any particular changes since 1916 in working conditions, such as length of working day, overtime regulations, etc., which further increased compensation over changes in rates? If so, what are such changes for each of the classes named in question number one?

3. What would be the comparative monthly compensation as between now and 1916 paid each to engineers, firemen, conductors, and trainmen (allowing average overtime conditions), in the following classes of service:—Through passenger run, Local passenger run, Through freight service, Local freight service.

4. What are the monthly earnings as compared with 1916 for the following classes of employees working full regular working hours:—Shop Mechanics, Carmen, Agents and Operators, Freight Shed Men, Trackmen, Bridge and Building Men?

5. What would be the monthly earnings of the classes of employees named in question 4 if required to work the same regular working hours as existed in 1916 at present rates as compared with the rates paid in 1916?

6. Do any of the classes of employees named in the foregoing questions receive any compensation or privileges in addition to their rates of pay, such as commissions, free or reduced rental, living accommodation, fuel, light, transportation, etc? If so, in a general way what are such concessions and what are they valued at in individual cases?

Hon. J. D. Reid (Minister of Railways and Canals) in reply to the foregoing questions furnished the statements which follow.]

CANADIAN NATIONAL RAILWAYS

Comparative Rates Paid 1921–1916

EASTERN LINES—CANADIAN NORTHERN SYSTEM

QUESTION No. 1

—	Per month	Per Day	Per Hour	Remarks
	(Minimum Wage) (See Remarks)			
Engineers—	$ cts. $ cts.	$ cts $ cts.	$ cts. $ cts.	
Passenger.....1921	166·40 to 176 80	6 40 to 6.80	1.28 to 1.36	Based on 100 miles or less, 5 hours or less to constitute a day (20 miles per hour).
1916	104.78 to 116.74	3.74 to 4.49	37·4c.to 44·9c	Based on 100 miles or less, 10 hours or less to constitute a day (10 miles per hour). NOTE.—As the average speed of Passenger trains exceeds 20 miles per hour the difference between the 20 miles per hour in 1921 and 10 miles per hour in 1916 mostly affects cost of Branch Lines service and arbitrary allowances. In Branch Lines service the elapsed time at 20 miles per hour may at times exceed the miles run and in such cases the allowance is increased through the change from a 10 mile per hour basis in 1916 to a 20 mile per hour basis in 1921.

CANADIAN NATIONAL RAILWAYS

Comparative Rates Paid 1921–1916

EASTERN LINES—CANADIAN NORTHERN SYSTEM

QUESTION No. 1

—	Per Month (Minimum Wage) (See Remarks)	Per Day	Per Hour	Remarks
Engineers—Con.	$ cts. $ cts.	$ cts. $ cts.	$ cts. $ cts	
Freight.....1921	185.12 to 207.48	7.12 to 7.98	89c. to 99·6c.	
1916	114.14 to 126.10	4.12 to 4.85	41.2c. to 48.5c.	
Way Freight..1921	198.64 to 221.00	7.64 to 8.50	95·5c. to$1.06·2	
1916	126.62 to 133.90	4.51 to 5.15	45·1c. to 51·5c.	
Yard.....1921	183.04 to 187.20	7.04 to 7.20	0·88c. to 0·90c.	
1916	100.10 to 107.90	3.85 to 4.15	38·5c. to 41·5c.	
				NOTE.—Rates per month all based on guarantee of 2,600 miles.
Firemen—				
Passenger.....1921	124.80 to 137.28	4.80 to 5.28	0·66c. to 66c.	
1916	59.80 to 72.80	2.30 to 2.80	0·23c. to 28c.	
Freight.....1921	137.28 to 160.16	5.28 to 6.16	0·66c. to 77c.	
1916	65 00 to 78.00	2.50 to 3.00	0.25c. to 30c.	
Way Freight..1921	147.68 to 170.56	5.68 to 6.56	0·71c. to 82c.	
1916	68.80 to 82.90	2.65 to 3.15	26·5c. to 31·5c.	
Yard.....1921	145.60 to 148.72	5.60 to 5.72	0·70c. to 71½c.	
1916	61.10 to 65.00	2.35 to 2.50	23·5c. to 25c.	
				NOTE.—Rate per month all based on guarantee of 2,600 miles. 1921—basic day— 8 hours. 1916—basic day—10 hours.
Conductors—				
Passenger.....1921	210.00	7.00	93c.	Based on Monthly Wage guarantee.
1916	135.00	4.50	60c.	Based on Monthly wage guarantee.
Freight.....1921	167.44	6.44	80½c.	Rate per month based on guarantee
1916	104.00	4.00	40c.	of 2,600 miles.
Way Freight..1921	180.96	6.96	87c.	Rate per month based on guarantee
1916	117.00	4.50	45c.	of 2,600 miles.
Yard.....1921	180.96	6.96	87c.	Rate per month based on guarantee
1916	93.60 to 104.00	3.60 to 4.00	36c. to 40c.	of 2,600 miles. 1921—Basic day— 8 hours. 1916—Basic day—10 hours.
Brakemen—				
Passenger.....1921	150.00	5.00	66·6c.	Based on monthly wage guarantee.
1916	76.50	2.55	34c.	
Freight.....1921	133.12	5.12	64c.	Rate per month based on guarantee
1916	69.42	2.67	26·7c.	of 2,600 miles.
Way Freight..1921	143.52	5.52	69c.	Rate per month based on guarantee
1916	78.00	3.00	30c.	of 2,600 miles.
Yard.....1921	168.48	6.48	81c.	Rate per month based on guarantee
1916	85.80	3.30 to 3.70	33c. to 37c.	of 2,600 miles.
Baggagemen..1921	154.80	5.16	68c.	Based on Monthly Wage guarantee.
Passenger.....1916	82.50	2.75	36·6c.	
Agents and Operators				
Agents.....1921	$135.00 to $238.00	$5.19 to $9.15	65c. to $1.14	Rates per hour 1921 based on 8 hour day
1916	$ 66.00 to $175.00	$2.54 to $6.73	25·4 to 67·3c.	Rates per hour 1916 based on 10 hour day
Operators.....1921	$125.00 to $170.00	$4.80 to $6.54	60c. to 81·7c.	Rates per hour 1921 based on 8 hour day
1916	$ 60.00 to $ 90.00	$2.31 to $3.46	23·1 to 34·6c.	Rates per hour 1916 based on 10 hour day. In certain Yard Offices the 8 hour day was in effect in 1916 and produced a rate of 43c. per hour.
Freight Shed Men—				
Foremen.....1921	$155.00	$5.96	74·5c.	Basic day— 8 hours.
1916	$ 90.00	$3.46	34·6c.	Basic day—10 hours.
Checkers.....1921	$127.50 to $141.50	$4.90 to $5.44	61·2 to 68c.	Basic day— 8 hours.
1916	$ 60.00 to $ 65.00	$2.31 to $2.50	23·1 to 25c.	Basic day—10 hours.
Stowers and Loaders.....1921	$116.48 to $119.60	$4.48 to $4.60	56c. to 57·5c.	Basic day— 8 hours.
1916	$57.20	$2.20	22c.	Basic day—10 hours.
ruckers and Porters.....1921	$110.24 to $114.40	$4.24 to $4.40	53c. to 55c.	Basic day— 8 hours.
1916	$54.60	$2.10	21c.	Basic day—10 hours.
Assistant Shed Foremen....1921	$145.00 to $150.00	$5.58 to $5.77	69·7 to 72·1c.	Basic day— 8 hours.
1916	$80.00	$3.08	30·8c.	Basic day—10 hours.

CANADIAN NATIONAL RAILWAYS

Comparative Rates Paid 1921-1916

EASTERN LINES—CANADIAN NORTHERN SYSTEM

QUESTION No. 1

—	Per Month	Per Day	Per Hour	Remarks
Machinists—				
Repair Shop.....1921	$ cts. 163 20	$ cts. 6 80	cts. 85	Monthly wage based on 24 days work per month at 8 hours per day (44 hours per week).
1916	92 50	3 70	37	Monthly wage based on 25 days work per month at 10 hours per day.
Running Shops.....1921	176 80	6 80	85	Monthly wage based on 26 days work per month at 8 hours per day.
1916	96 20	3 70	37	Monthly wage based on 26 days work per month at 10 hours per day.
Carmen—				
Carpenters, Loco., Coach and Bench.....1921	162 35	6 80	85	number of employees in the Car and Locomotive Departments are still working under step rates provided for in agreement for employees in the service at the time agreement was made; and scale up from rate for first year, to rate for fifth year, when employee is then paid the 80c. or 85c. rate.
1916	78 00	3 00	30	
Air Brake Testers.....1921	152 80	6 40	80	
1916	75 40	2 90	29	
Painters, Loco., Coach, and Wood Machinists.....1921	162 35	6 80	85	
1916	75 40	2 90	29	
Carpenters (Freight).....1921	152 80	6 40	80	
1916	72 80	2 80	28	
Upholsterers.....1921	162 35	6 80	85	New employees must be paid the full rate of 80c. or 85c.
1916	65 00	2 50	25	
Air Brake Cleaners, Car Repairers and Oilers..1921	152 80	6 40	80	Car Inspectors in 1921 paid on basis of 8 hours per day, and time and one half after 8 hours and double time after 16 hours. In 1916—Were paid a monthly rate for 11 hours work per day, overtime at time and one half up to 16 hours and double time after 16 hours.
1916	59 80	2 30	23	
Car Inspectors, First Class1921	152 80	6 40	80	
1916	85 00	3 27	29·7	
Car Inspectors, Second Class.....1921	152 80	6 40	80	
1916	70 00	2 69	24·5	
Car Inspectors, Third Class1921	152 80	6 40	80	
1916	60 00	2 31	20·5	

—	Per Month	Per Day	Per Hour	Remarks
Trackmen—				
Section Foremen.....1921	$137.80 to $145.60	$5.30 to $5.60	66¼c. to 70c.	Basic day— 8 hours.
1916	$66.30 to $78.00	$2.55 to $3.00	25½c. to 30c.	Basic day—10 hours.
Sectionmen.....1921	$100.88	$3.88	48½c.	Basic day— 8 hours.
1916	$46.80 to $52.00	$1.80 to $2.00	18c. to 20c.	Basic day—10 hours.
Foremen, Extra Gangs....1921	$144.30 to $166.40	$5.55 to $6.40	69·3c. to 80c.	Basic day— 8 hours.
1916	$66.30 to $100.10	$2.55 to $3.85	30c. to 38½c.	Basic day—10 hours.
Assistant Foremen, Extra Gangs.....1921	$137.80	$5.30	66¼c.	Basic day— 8 hours.
1916	$66.30 to $70.20	$2.55 to $2.70	25½c. to 27c.	Basic day—10 hours.
Crossing Watchmen.....1921	$96.72	$3.72	46½c.	Basic day— 8 hours.
1916	$40.00 to $45.00	$1.33 to $1.50	11c. to 12½c.	Basic day—12 hours.
Bridge and Building Men—				
B. and B. Foremen.....1921	$163.80	$6.30	78·6c.	Basic day— 8 hours.
1916	$97.50 to $104.00	$3.75 to $4.00	37½c. & 40c.	Basic day—10 hours.
Carpenters.....1921	$141.44 to $149.76	$5.44 to $5.76	68c. to 72c.	Basic day— 8 hours.
1916	$65.00 to $84.50	$2.50 to $3.25	25c. to 32½c.	Basic day—10 hours.

CANADIAN NATIONAL RAILWAYS

Comparative Rates Paid 1921-1916

EASTERN LINES—CANADIAN NORTHERN SYSTEM

QUESTION No. 1—Con.

——		Per Month	Per Day	Per Hour	Remarks
Bridge and Building Men—Con.					
Bridgemen	1921	$120.64 to $141.44	$4.64 to $5.44	58c. to 68c.	Basic day— 8 hours.
	1916	$58.50 to $78.00	$2.25 to $3.00	22½c. to 30c.	Basic day—10 hours.
Pump Repairer	1921	$199.20	$6.64	83c.	Basic day— 8 hours.
	1916	$ 85.00	$3.27	32·7c.	Basic day—10 hours.
Pumpmen	1921	$110.00 to $116.00	$4.23 to $4.46	52·9c. to 55·7c.	Basic day— 8 hours.
	1916	$50.00 to $57.50	$1.92 to $2.21	19·2c. to 22·1c.	Basic day—10 hours.
Signalmen at Interlocked Crossings	1921	$110.80 to $123.80	$4.26 to $4.76	53·2c. to 59·5c.	Basic day— 8 hours.
	1916	$55.00	$2.12	21·2c.	Basic day—10 hours.

CANADIAN NATIONAL RAILWAYS

Changes in Working Conditions, 1921–1916

EASTERN LINES—CANADIAN NORTHERN SYSTEM

QUESTION No. 2

Engineers—

Basic day decreased in 1921 as compared to 1916. In passenger service from 10 hours to 5 hours. In Freight, Work and Yard Switching, from 10 hours to 8 hours.

NOTE.—The five hour day referred to in Passenger service is brought about by the increase in allowance of miles per hour used in computing the basis for overtime. In 1916 this was computed at 10 miles per hour and in 1921 at 20 miles per hour. The increase affects the cost of all terminal time, as well as overtime. The adoption of a guaranteed monthly mileage on assigned runs affects runs which are only in operation 3 days per week.

Engineers in through freight service making more than 5 stops to pick up or set out cars belonging to their own train are paid Way Freight rates for full trip. In 1916, paid only Through Freight rates.

Short Run Clause adopted whereby Engineers are paid 100 miles, or a minimum day for a trip, the mileage of which is 50 miles or less, and where it is over 50 miles, 100 miles is paid for first leg of run, plus terminal switching and overtime earned. In 1916 this would be paid for as continuous service, 10 miles per hour from the time of starting until return to terminal, plus terminal allowances and switching and overtime, if any earned.

Yard Service.—Continuous time now paid for the 20 minutes Engineers are allowed for meals. In 1916 they were allowed 1 hour for meals, without pay.

Firemen (All Services)—

Same remarks apply as to Engineers.

Conductors—

Passenger Service.—Overtime now paid in addition to monthly guarantee. In 1916 overtime could be used to make up monthly guarantee.

Short Turn-around Service.—Overtime now paid after 10 hours (8 hours within 10 hours). In 1916 overtime paid after 12 hours (8 hours within 12 hours).

Freight Service.—Basic day changed from 10 hours in 1916 to 8 hours in 1921, increasing the overtime rate from 10 miles per hour to 12½ miles per hour.

Brakemen and Baggagemen—

Same remarks as to Conductors.

Agents and Operators—

1921.—Overtime and work on Sundays and Holidays paid at rate of time and one half. When called for duty outside regular hours are allowed a minimum of three hours straight time at present rates. The cost of a call outside regular hours is from $1.80 to $3.42 which includes the first two hours service.

1916.—Overtime and work on Sundays and Holidays paid at pro-rata rates. A call for work outside of regular hours was 50c. per call which included the first hours' service. Telegraphers residing in station dwellings required to attend a schedule train due at his station within three hours of his regular hours of duty was only allowed 30c. for the call, which covered one hour's service.

Freight Shed Men—

Working day changed from 10 hours in 1916 to 8 hours in 1921, requiring us to pay overtime after 8 hours at time and one half.

Trackmen and Bridge and Building Men—

Working day changed from 10 hours in 1916 to 8 hours in 1921. Paid time and one-half after 8 hours in 1921. In 1916 only after 10 hours.

CANADIAN NATIONAL RAILWAYS

Comparative Monthly Compensation paid Engineers, Firemen, Conductors and Trainmen, 1921–1916, allowing Average Overtime Conditions

EASTERN LINES—CANADIAN NORTHERN SYSTEM

QUESTION No. 3

——	—	Mileage Allowance per Day	Total Miles	Rate	Amount	Increase
Engineers and Firemen. (Train).	*Compensation—*			$ cts.	$ cts.	$ cts.
(Through Passenger Service. Trains 1 and 2, between Capreol and Foleyet. Daily Distance 148 Miles. Average time on duty per day 7 hours 10 minutes.)	Engineer....1921	188	5,640	6 56	369 98	
	1916	168	5,040	3 90	196 56	173 42
	Firemen....1921	188	5,640	5 12	288 77	
	1916	168	5,040	2 45	123 48	165 29
(Local Passenger Service. Trains 31 and 32, between Cobourg and Toronto. Daily except Sunday. Distance 158 miles return. Average time on duty per day 11 hours 50 minutes.)	Engineer....1921	294	7,644	6 48	495 33	
	1916	215½	5,603	3 90	218 52	276 81
	Firemen....1921	294	7,644	4 96	379 14	
	1916	215½	5,603	2 45	137 27	241 87
(Local Passenger Service. Trains 76 and 75, between Westport and Brockville. Daily except Sunday. Distance 88·8 miles. Average time on duty per day 9 hours 30 minutes.)	Engineer....1921	260	6,760	6 40	432 64	
	1916	155	4,030	3 79	152 74	279 90
	Fireman....1921	260	6,760	4 80	324 48	
	1916	155	4,030	2 35	94 70	229 78
(Through Freight Service. Trains 203 and 204, between Toronto and Parry Sound, Daily. Distance 143·4 miles. Average time on duty per day 12 hours 25 minutes.)	Engineer....1921	186·1	5,583	7 28	456 44	
	1916	177·5	5,325	4 34	231 10	225 34
	Fireman....1921	186·1	5,583	5 52	308 18	
	1916	177·5	5,325	2 60	138 45	169 73
(Local Freight Service. Between Joliette and Hawkesbury. Daily except Sunday. Distance 66·7 miles Average time on duty per day 13 hours.)	Engineer....1921	189	4,914	8 04	395 08	
	1916	139	3,614	4 84	174 92	220 16
	Fireman....1921	189	4,914	6 08	298 77	
	1916	139	3,614	2 90	104 81	193 96

—	—	Miles	Rate	Amount	Increase
Conductors and Trainmen— (Train)	*Compensation—*		$ cts.	$ cts.	$ cts.
Through Passenger Service. Trains 1 and 2, between Capreol and Hornepayne. Daily. Distance 296·4 miles.	Conductor....1921	4,500	.....	210.00	
	1916	4,650	.....	135.00	75.00
	Baggageman..1921	4,500	.....	154.80	
	1916	4,650	.....	82.50	72.30
	Brakeman....1921	4,500	.....	150.00	
	1916	4,650	.....	76.50	73.50
Local Passenger Service. Trains 31 and 32 between Cobourg and Toronto. Daily, except Sunday. Short turn-a-round Passenger Run. Distance, Round Trip 157 miles. Average time on duty per day 8 hours 10 minutes. Elapsed time 14 hours 10 minutes.	Conductor....1921	.....	.....	304.90	
	1916	.....	.....	143.65	161.25
	Baggageman..1921	.....	.....	224.74	
	1916	.....	.....	87.75	136.99
	Brakeman....1921	.....	.....	217.60	
	1916	.....	.....	81.38	126.22

(In 1921 overtime paid after 10 hours exclusive of the monthly guarantee. In 1916 overtime paid after 12 hours and used to make up monthly guarantee).

CANADIAN NATIONAL RAILWAYS

Comparative Monthly Compensation Paid Engineers, Firemen, Conductors and Trainmen, 1921-1916, Allowing Average Overtime Conditions.

EASTERN LINES—CANADIAN NORTHERN SYSTEM.

QUESTION No. 3—Con.

—	—		Miles	Rate	Amount		Increase
Conductors and Trainmen—Con. (Train)	*Compensation*—			$	$		$
Through Freight Service. Trains 203 and 204 between Toronto and Parry Sound. Daily. Distance 147·3 miles. Average time on duty per day 10 hours 40 minutes.	Conductor....	1921	5,043	6.44	324.77		
		1916	4,770	4.00	190.80		133.97
	Brakeman....	1921	5,043	5.12	258.20		
		1916	4,770	2.67	127.36		130.84
Local Freight Service. Between Capreol and Parry Sound. Daily except Sunday. Distance 127 miles. Average time on duty per day 11 hours 50 minutes.	Conductor....	1921	3,302	6.96	229.82		
			1,586	6.44	102.14		
						331.96	
		1916	3,302	4.50	148.59		
			780	4.00	31.20		
						179.79	152.17
	Brakeman....	1921	3,302	5.52	182.27		
			1,586	5.12	81.20		
						263.47	
		1916	3,302	3.00	99.06		
			780	2.67	20.83		
						119.89	143 58

CANADIAN NATIONAL RAILWAYS

Monthly Earnings of Shop Machinists, Carmen, Agents and Operators, Freight Shed Men, Trackmen and Bridge and Building Men, 1921-1916.

EASTERN LINES—CANADIAN NORTHERN SYSTEM

Based on Regular Working Hours only.

QUESTION No. 4

Shop Machinists—		
Repair Shops	1921	$163.20
	1916	$92.50
Running Shops	1921	$197.20
	1916	$107.30
Carmen	1921	$152.80 to $172.00
	1916	$60.00 to $94.81
Agents and Operators—		
Agents	1921	$135.00 to $238.00
	1916	$66.00 to $175.00
Operators	1921	$125.00 to $209.24
	1916	$60.00 to $103.84
Freight Shed Men—		
Foremen	1921	$155.00
	1916	$90.00
Checkers	1921	$127.50 to $141.50
	1916	$60.00 to $ 65.00
Stowers and Loaders	1921	$116.48 to $119.60
	1916	$57.20
Truckers and Porters	1921	$110.24 to $114.40
	1916	$54.60
Assistant Shed Foremen	1921	$145.00 to $150 00
	1916	$80.00

CANADIAN NATIONAL RAILWAYS

Monthly Earnings Shop Machinists, Carmen, Agents and Operators, Freight Shedmen, Trackmen and Bridge and Building Men, 1921-1916

EASTERN LINES—CANADIAN NORTHERN SYSTEM

Based on Regular Working Hours only

QUESTION No. 4—Con.

Trackmen—		
Section Foremen	1921	$137.80 to $145.60
	1916	$66.30 to $ 78.00
Sectionmen	1921	$100.88
	1916	$49.40 to $ 52.00
Extra Gang Foremen	1921	$144.30 to $166.40
	1916	$66.30 to $100.10
Assistant Foremen Extra Gangs	1921	$137.80
	1916	$66.30 to $ 70.20
Bridge and Building Men—		
Bridge and Building Foremen	1921	$163.80
	1916	$97.50 to $104.00
Carpenters	1921	$141.44 to $149.76
	1916	$65.00 to $ 84 50
Bridgemen	1921	$120.64 to $141.44
	1916	$58.50 to $ 78 00
Pump Repairers	1921	$199.20
	1916	$85.00
Pumpmen	1921	$110.00 to $116.00
	1916	$50.00 to $ 57 50
Signalmen at Interlocked Crossings	1921	$110.80 to $123.80
	1916	$55.00

CANADIAN NATIONAL RAILWAYS

Monthly Earnings of the Classes of Employees named in Question 4 based on rates paid 1921, but working Regular hours in effect 1916, as compared with rates paid in 1916

EASTERN LINES—CANADIAN NORTHERN SYSTEM

QUESTION No. 5

A 1921 represents monthly earnings of employees based on regular hours in effect 1916 (10), at 1921 rates per hour.

The application of 1916 conditions would mean paying employees in the service two hours per day more than at present, as the basic day would become 10 hours; this, however, would permit of a reduction in the number of employees from the requirements under the eight hour day.

B 1921 represents monthly earnings of employees based on the present daily wage for 8 hours being continued for a ten hour day, which of course would mean a reduction in the rate per hour.

		"A"	"B"
Shop Machinists—			
Repair Shops	1921	$212.50	$163.20
	1916	92 50	92 50
Running Shops	1921	221 00	176 80
	1916	96 20	96 20
Carmen—			
Carpenters, Loco. Coach and Bench	1921	221 00	162 35
	1916	78 00	78.00
Air Brake Testers	1921	208.00	152.80
	1916	75.40	75.40
Painters (Coach & Loco.) Wood Machinists	1921	221.00	162.35
	1916	75.40	75.40
Carpenters (Freight)	1921	208.00	152.80
	1916	72.80	72.80

CANADIAN NATIONAL RAILWAYS

Monthly Earnings of the classes of Employees named in Question 4, based on rates paid 1921, but working Regular hours in effect 1916, as compared with rates paid in 1916

EASTERN LINES—CANADIAN NORTHERN SYSTEM

QUESTION No. 5—Con.

		"A"	"B"
Carmen—Con.			
Upholsterers	1921	$221.00	$162.35
	1916	65.00	65.00
Air Brake Cleaners, Car Repairers and Oilers	1921	208.00	152.80
	1916	59.80	59.80
Car Inspectors (1st Class)	1921	228.80	152.80
	1916	85.00	85.00
Car Inspectors (2nd Class)	1921	228.80	152.80
	1916	70.00	70.00
Car Inspectors (3rd Class)	1921	228.80	152.80
	1916	60.00	60.00
Agents and Operators—			
Agents	1921	$169.00 to $296.40	$135.00 to $238.00
	1916	$66.00 to $175.00	$66.00 to $175.00
Operators	1921	$156.00 to 212.42	$125.00 to $170.00
	1916	$60.00 to $90.00	$60.00 to $ 90.00
Freight Shed Men—			
Foremen	1921	$193.70	$155.00
	1916	90 00	90 00
Checkers	1921	$159.12 to $176.80	$127.50 to $141.50
	1916	$60.00 to $65.00	$ 60.00 to $ 65.00
Stowers and Loaders	1921	$145.60 to $149.50	$116.48 to $119.60
	1916	$57.20	$57.20
Truckers and Porters	1921	$137.80 to $143.00	$110.24 to $114.40
	1916	$54.60	$54.60
Asst. Shed Foremen	1921	$181.22 to $187.46	$145.00 to $150.00
	1916	$80.00	$80.00
Trackmen—			
Section Foremen	1921	$172.90 to $182.00	$137.80 to $145.60
	1916	$66.30 to $78.00	$66.30 to $78.00
Sectionmen	1921	$126.10	$100.88
	1916	$49.40 to $52.00	$49.40 to $52.00
Extra Gang Foremen	1921	$180.18 to $208.00	$144.30 to $166.40
	1916	$66.30 to $100.10	$66.30 to $100.10
Asst. Foremen Extra Gangs	1921	$172.90	$137.80
	1916	$66.30 to $70.20	$66.30 to $70.20
Bridge & Building Men—			
B. & B. Foremen	1921	$204.36	$163.80
	1916	$97.50 to $104.00	$97.50 to $104.00
Carpenters	1921	$176.80 to 187.20	$141.44 to $149.76
	1916	$65.00 to $84.50	$65.00 to $84.50
Bridgemen	1921	$150.80 to $176.80	$120.64 to $141.44
	1916	$58.50 to $78.00	$58.50 to $78.00
Pump Repairers	1921	$215.80	$199.20
	1916	85.00	85.00
Pumpmen	1921	$137.54 to $144.82	$110.00 to $116.00
	1916	$50.00 to $57.50	$50.00 to $57.50
Signalmen at Interlocked Crossings	1921	$138.32 to $154.70	$110.80 to $123.80
	1916	55.00	55.00

CANADIAN NATIONAL RAILWAYS

Compensation or Privileges in Addition to Railway Pay Received by Employees

Question No. 6—

Agents and Operators—

Agents are allowed living quarters in stations and free fuel and light for which they pay from $2 to $5 per month. The money value of this, if the Agent had to secure lodgings and supply his own fuel, would be approximately, for rent, $10 per month, and for fuel and light, $9 per month.

Agents are also allowed Commission for handling Express and Telegraph business. This is difficult to average on a monthly basis as the amounts vary from $5 to $100 per month.

Agents and operators are granted free transportation for themselves and family at least once a year, and two weeks holidays per year with pay.

Trackmen—

Section Foremen are allowed to occupy Company's dwellings at reduced rentals of $5 per month. The money value of this, if they had to provide their own lodgings, would be approximately $10 per month.

Trackmen are granted the same privileges as all other employees in respect to free or reduced transportation for themselves and family.

CANADIAN NATIONAL RAILWAYS

Comparative Rates Paid 1921–1916

CANADIAN GOVERNMENT RAILWAYS—EASTERN LINES

QUESTION No. 1

—		Per Month Minimum (See Remarks)	Per Day	Per Hour	Overtime Per hour	Remarks
Engineers—						
Passenger	1921	$166.40 to $176.80	$6.40 to $6.80	$1.28 to $1.36	$1.28 to $1.36	Basic day 100 miles or less (5 hours or less) 20 miles per hour.
	1916	$97.50 to $110.50	$3.75 to $4.25	37½c. to 42½c.	37½c. to 42½c.	Basic day 100 miles or less (10 hours or less) 10 miles per hour.
Through Freight....x	1921	$185.12 to $207.48	$7.12 to $7.98	89c. to 99¾c.	$1.33½ to $1.49⅝	xBasic day 100 miles or less (8 hours or less) 12½ miles per hour.
	1916	$106.60 to $117.00	$4.10 to $4.50	41c. to 45c.	41c. to 45c.	Basic day 100 miles or less (10 hours or less) 10 miles per hour.
Way Freight....x	1921	$198.64 to $221.00	$7.64 to $8.50	95½c. to 1.06¼	$1.43¼ to $1.59⅜	Basic day 100 miles or less (8 hours or less) 12½ miles per hour.
	1916	$113.10 to $123.50	$4.35 to $4.75	43½c. to 47½c.	43½c. to 47½c.	Basic day 100 miles or less (10 hours or less) 10 miles per hour.
Yard Switching....x	1921	$183.04 to $187.20	$7.04 to $7.20	88c. to 90c.	$1.32 to $1.35	Basic day 8 hours or less.
	1916	$94.90 to $109.20	$3.65 to $4.20	36½c. to 42c.	36½c. to 42c.	Basic day 10 hours or less.
						x1921 Overtime paid at time and one half.
						1916 Overtime paid at pro-rata rates per hour.
Firemen—						
Passenger	1921	$124.80 to $137.80	$4.80 to $5.30	60c. to 66¼c.	90c. to 99⅜c.	Basic day and overtime conditions for Engineers apply also to the Firemen in the various classes of Service.
	1916	$65.00 to $73.58	$2.50 to $2.83	25c. to 28·3c.	25c. to 28·3c.	
Through Freight	1921	$137.28 to $160.16	$5.28 to $6.16	66c. to 77c.	99c. to $1.15½	
	1916	$70.98 to $78 00	$2.73 to $3.00	27·3c. to 30c.	27·3c. to 30c.	
Way Freight	1921	$147.68 to $170.56	$5.68 to $6.56	71c. to 82c.	$1.06½ to $1.23	
	1916	$77.48 to $84.50	$2.98 to $3.25	29·8c. to 32½c.	29·8c. to 32½c.	
Yard Switching	1921	$145.60 to $148.72	$5.60 to $5.72	70c. to 71½c.	$1.05 to $1.07¼	
	1916	$63.18 to $74.62	$2.43 to $2.87	24·3c. to 28·7c.	24·3c. to 28·7c.	
						NOTE.—Rate per month based on 2,600 miles.
Conductors—						
Passenger Service	1921	$210.00	$7.00	93¾c.	87½c.	Basic day 150 miles or less (7½ hours or less) 20 miles per hour.
	1916	135.00	4.50	64·3c.	45c.	Basic day 139 miles or less (7 hours or less) 20 miles per hour.
Through Freight	1921	180.32	6.44	80½c.	$1.20¾	Basic day 100 miles or less (8 hours or less) 12½ miles per hour.
	1916	104.00	4.00	40c.	40c.	Basic day 100 miles or less (10 hours or less) 10 miles per hour.

CANADIAN NATIONAL RAILWAYS

Comparative Rates Paid 1921–1916

CANADIAN GOVERNMENT RAILWAYS—EASTERN LINES

QUESTION No. 1—Con.

——	Per Month Minimum	Per day Minimum	Per Hour	Overtime Per hour	Remarks
	(See Remarks)				
Way Freight.....1921	194.88	6.96	87c.	$1.30½	Basic day 100 miles or less (8 hours or less) 12½ miles per hour.
1916	117.00	4.50	45c.	45c.	Basic day 100 miles or less (10 hours or less) 10 miles per hour.
Yard Switching.....1921	194.88	6.96	87c.	$1.30½	Basic day 8 hours or less.
1916	$93.60 to $104.00	$3.60 to $4.00	36c. to 40c.	36c. to 40c.	Basic day 10 hours or less.
Baggagemen—					
Passenger Service.....1921	$154.80	$5.16	69c.	64½c.	Basic day 150 miles or less (7½ hours or less) 20 miles per hour.
1916	82.50	2.75	45·8c.	27½c.	Basic day 117 miles or less (6 hours or less) 20 miles per hour.
Brakemen—					
Passenger Service.....1921	$150.00	$5.00	66⅔c.	62½c.	Basic day 150 miles or less (7½ hours or less) 20 miles per hour.
1916	76.50	2.55	42½c.	25½c.	Basic day 119 miles or less (6 hours or less) 20 miles per hour.
Through Freight.....1921	143.36	5.12	64c.	96c.	Basic day 100 miles or less (8 hours or less) 12½ miles per hour.
1916	69.42	2.67	26·7c.	26·7c.	Basic day 100 miles or less (10 hours or less) 10 miles per hour.
Way Freight.....1921	154.56	5.52	69c.	$1.03½	Basic day 100 miles or less (8 hours or less) 12½ miles per hour.
1916	78.00	3.00	30c.	30c.	Basic day 100 miles or less (10 hours or less) 10 miles per hour.
Yard Switching.....1921	181.44	6.48	81c.	$1.21½	Basic day 8 hours or less.
1916	$85.80 to $96.20	$3.30 to $3.70	3c. to 37c.	33c. to 37c.	Basic day 10 hours or less.

1921—Overtime in all classes of service outside of passenger service paid for at time and one half.
1916—Overtime in all classes of service paid at pro-rata rates per hour.
NOTE.—Rate per month in Passenger Service based on Minimum Wage guarantee.
Rate per month in Freight service—1921—based on guarantee of 2800 miles.
1916—based on guarantee of 2600 miles.

CANADIAN NATIONAL RAILWAYS

Comparative Rates paid 1921-1916

CANADIAN GOVERNMENT RAILWAYS—EASTERN LINES

QUESTIC . No. 1—Con.

—		Per Month Excl. of Overtime or Sunday	Per Day	Per Hour	Overtime Per hour	Remarks
Repair Shops—						
Machinists	1921	$162.35	$6.80	85c.	$1.27 to $1.70	Basic day, 8 hours.
	1916	85.62	3.37½	37½c.	56¼c. to 75c.	Basic day, 9 hours.
Running Repairs—						
Machinists	1921	$176.80	$6.80	85c.	$1.27½ to $1.70	Basic day 80 hours.
	1916	97.50	3.75	37½c.	56¼c. to 75c.	Basic day 10 hours.
Carmen—Repair Shops—						
Cabinet Makers	1921	162.35	6.80	85c.	$1.27½ to $1.70	Basic day 8 hours.
	1916	75.35	2.97	33c.	49½c. to 66c.	Basic day 9 hours.
Coach Loco. and Bench Carpenters	1921	162.35	6.80	85c.	$1,27½ to $1.70	Basic day 8 hours.
	1916	73.07	2.88	32c.	48c. to 64c.	Basic day 9 hours.
Coach Loco. Painters, Varnishing and Lettering	1921	162.35	6.80	85c.	$1.27½ to $1.70	Basic day 8 hours.
	1916	79.92	3.15	35c.	52½c. to 70c.	Basic day 9 hours.
Wood Machinists	1921	162.35	6.80	85c.	$1.27½ to $1.70	Basic day 8 hours.
	1916	70.78	2.79	31c.	46½c. to 62c.	Basic day 9 hours.
Painters Freight Car	1921	152.80	6.40	80c.	$1.20 to $1.60	Basic day 8 hours.
	1916	57.20	2.25	25c.	37½c. to 50c.	Basic day 9 hours.
Carmen—Running Repairs—						
Air Brake Tester	1921	166.40	6.40	80c.	$1.20 to $1.60	Basic day 8 hours.
	1916	68.90	2.65	26½c.	49¾c. to 53c.	Basic day 10 hours.
Car Repairers	1921	166.40	6.40	80c.	$1.20 to $1.60	Basic day 8 hours.
	1916	$65.10 to $70.20	$2.50 to $2.70	25c. to 27c.	37½c. to 54c.	Basic day 10 hours.
Car Inspectors	1921	166.40	6.40	80c.	$1.20 to $1.60	Basic day 8 hours.
	1916	$78.65 to $82.22	$3.02½ to $3.16¼	27½c.	41¼c. to 55c.	Basic day 11 hours.
Freight Shed Men—						
Freight Checkers	1921	$127.50 to $141.50	$4.90 to $5.44	61¼c. to 68c.	91¾c. to $1.02	Basic day 8 hours.
	1916	$67.50 to $72.50	$2.59·6 to $2.79	25·9c. to 27·9c.	38·9c. to 41·9c.	Basic day 10 hours.
Stowers and Loaders	1921	$116.48 to $119.60	$4.48 to $4.60	56c. to 57½c.	84c. to 86¼c.	Basic day 8 hours.
	1916	$62.40	$2.40	24c.	36c.	Basic day 10 hours.
Freight Truckers and Porters	1921	$110.24 to $114.40	$4.24 to $4.40	53c. to 55c.	79½c. to 82½c.	Basic day 8 hours.
	1916	$52.00 to $58.50	$2.00 to $2.25	20c. to 22½c.	30c. to 33¾c.	Basic day 10 hours.

QUESTION No. 1—Con.

Trackmen—

Example as to cost of Crossing Watchmen in 1921, as compared with 1916.

Crossing where continuous service required for the 24 hours (exclusive of Sunday).

1921—3 men 8 hours each at $96.72 per month			$290 16	
1916—2 men 12 hours each at 67.60 per month			135 20	
Increase 114½ per cent, or				$154 96

If Crossing only required protection during 10 hours in each 24 hours, cost would be—

1921—1 man, 1 day	$3.72			
Overtime, 2 hours	1.39½	$5.11½ x 26	$132 99	
1916—1 man, 1 day	2.00 x 26		52 00	
Increase 155 per cent, or				$80 99

CANADIAN NATIONAL RAILWAYS.

QUESTION No. 1.—Con. COMPARATIVE RATES PAID 1921-1916. CANADIAN GOVERNMENT RAILWAYS—EASTERN LINES.

		Per month exclusive of overtime	Per day	Per hour	Overtime Per hour	Remarks
Trackmen—						
Section Foremen, Yards	1921	$139.10 to $145.60	$5.35 to $5.60	66·7c. to 70c.	$1.00¼ to $1.05	Basic day 8 hours.
	1916	$71.50 to $ 78.00	$2.75 to $3.00	27½ to 30	41¼c. to 45c.	Basic day 10 hours.
Section Foremen on Line	1921	$137.80	$5.30	66¼c.	99⅜c.	Basic day 8 hours.
	1916	$ 67.60	$2.60	26c.	39c.	Basic day 10 hours.
Sectionmen, Yard	1921	$100.88	$3.88	48¼c.	72⅜c.	Basic day 8 hours.
	1916	$ 53.30	$2.05	20½c.	30¾c.	Basic day 10 hours.
Sectionmen on Line	1921	$100.88	$3.88	48½c.	72¾c.	Basic day 8 hours.
	1916	$ 52.00	$2.00	20c.	30c.	Basic day 10 hours.
Extra Gang Foremen	1921	$143.30 to $166.40	$5.55 to $6.40	69·1c. to 80c.	$1.04 to $1.20	Basic day 8 hours.
	1916	$ 80.60 to $ 97.50	$3.10 to $3.75	31c. to 37½c.	46½c. to 56¼c.	Basic day 10 hours.
Asst. Extra Gang Foremen	1921	$137.80	$5.30	66¼c.	99⅜c.	Basic day 8 hours.
	1916	$ 67.60	$2.60	26c.	39c.	Basic day 10 hours.
Track and Bridge Watchmen	1921	$100.88	$3.88	48½c.	72¾c.	Basic day 8 hours.
	1916	$ 52.00	$2.00	20c.	30c.	Basic day 10 hours.
Crossing Watchmen	1921	$ 96.72	$3.72	46½c.	69¾c.	Basic day 8 hours.
	1916	$ 52 00	$2.00	20c.	30c.	Basic day 10 hours.
Track and Crossing Watchmen	1921	—Eight consecutiv	e hours to const	itute a day.		
	1916	—Ten hours in eac consecutive.	h 24 hours to co	nstitute a day.	Hours may be inter	mittent and need not be
Bridge and Building Men—						
B. & B. Foremen, Shops	1921	$169.00 to $172.90	$6.50 to $6.65	81¼c. to 83¼c.	$1.21·7 to $1.25¼	Basic day 8 hours.
	1916	$92.30 to $96.20	$3.55 to $3.70	35½c. to 37c.	53¼c. to 55½c.	Basic day 10 hours.
B. & B. Foremen, Road	1921	$163.80	$6.30	78¾c.	$1.18⅛	Basic day 8 hours.
	1916	$ 87.10	$3.35	33½c.	50¼c.	Basic day 10 hours.
Carpenters (Skilled Mechanics)	1921	$141.44 to $149.76	$5.44 to $5.76	68c. to 72c.	$1.02 to $1.06	Basic day 8 hours.
	1916	$63.70 to $71.50	$2.45 to $2.75	24½c. to 27½c.	36¾c. to 41¼c.	Basic day 10 hours.
Steel Bridge Foremen	1921	$163.80 to $188.50	$6.30 to $7.25	78¾c. to 90·5	$1.18·1 to $1.36	Basic day 8 hours.
	1916	$87.10 to $111.80	$3.35 to $4.30	33½c. to 43c.	50¼c. to 0.64½c.	Basic day 10 hours.
Bridgemen, or Rough Carpenters	1921	$120.64 to $141.44	$4.64 to $5.44	58c. to 68c.	87c. to $1.02	Basic day 8 hours.
	1916	$53.90 to $59.80	$2.05 to $2.30	20½ to 23c.	30¾ to 34½c.	Basic day 10 hours.
Painter Foremen	1921	$157.30	$6.05	75⅝c.	$1.13⅛	Basic day 8 hours.
	1916	$63.70 to $87.10	$2.45 to $3.35	24½c. to 33½c.	36¾c. to 50¼c.	Basic day 10 hours.
Painters	1921	$141.44	$5.44	68c.	$1.02	Basic day 8 hours.
	1916	$53.30 to $66.30	$2.05 to $2.55	20½c. to 25½c.	30¾c. to 37¾c.	Basic day 10 hours.
Mason and Concrete Foremen	1921	$163.80	$6.30	78¾c.	$1.18⅛	Basic day 8 hours.
	1916	$83.20 to $109.20	$3.20 to $4.20	32c. to 42c.	48c. to 63c.	Basic day 10 hours.
Masons	1921	$141.44	$5.44	68c.	$1.02	Basic day 8 hours.
	1916	$70.20 to $96.20	$2.70 to $3.70	27c. to 37c.	40½c. to 55½c.	Basic day 10 hours.
Pump Repairers	1921	$199.20	$6.64	83c.	$1.24½	Basic day 8 hours.
	1916	$90.00	$3.46	34 6/10c.	51 9/10c.	Basic day 10 hours.
Pumpmen	1921	$110.00 to $116.00	$4.23 to $4.46	$52.7 to $55¾	79.3c. to 83·5c.	Basic day 8 hours.
	1916	$57·50 to $63.50	$2.21 to $2.44	$22·1c. to $24·4c.	$33·1c. to $36·6c.	Basic day 10 hours.

Pumpmen—1921—Eight consecutive hours to constitute a day.
1916—Ten hours in each twenty-four hours (not necessarily consecutive) to constitute a day.

CANADIAN NATIONAL RAILWAYS

Changes in Working Conditions, 1921-1916

CANADIAN GOVERNMENT RAILWAYS—EASTERN LINES

QUESTION No. 2

Engineers and Firemen—
1921. Basic Working day changed as follows:—

Passenger Service—
Basic day, 100 miles, (5 hours or less) at 20 miles per hour.

Short Turn-Around Runs, Suburban Branch Lines, etc.
In 1916 were paid at 10 miles per hour. Overtime paid after ten hours, where time exceeded the mileage. Now paid on basis of eight hours work within 10 hours, and for all overtime after 10 hours, as well as for all mileage made during the day.

Mixed, Freight, Yard and Work Service—
Basic day 100 miles, 8 hours or less, at 12½ miles per hour.
Overtime—1916—all classes of service based on 10 miles per hour at pro-rata rate per hour.
Overtime—1921—Passenger Service, 20 miles per hour at pro rata rates per hour.
Mixed Freight, Yard and Work Train Service—18¾ miles per hour, equal to time and one-half.

Preparatory allowances at Initial Terminal.
1916—No arbitrary allowance rule in effect.
1921—30 Minutes arbitrary allowance for preparing engine for road trip.

Conductors and Trainmen—
Passenger Service.

Short Turn-Around, Suburban, Branch Lines, etc.
1921—Overtime paid after 8 hours within 10 consecutive hours and for all time after 10 hours.
1916—Overtime paid after 8 hours within 12 consecutive hours and for all time after 12 hours.
The spread of hours reduced from 12 in 1916 to 10 in 1921, after which overtime accrues.

Mixed Freight and Yard Service—
1921—Overtime paid at time and one-half or 18¾ miles per hour.
1916—Overtime paid at pro-rata rates or 10 miles per hour.
1921—Basic day 8 hours—100 miles, or 12½ miles per hour.
1916—Basic day 10 hours—100 miles, or 10 miles per hour.
Increase in cost of overtime, exclusive of increase in rates per day—87½%.

Agents and Operators—
Basic day—1921 8 hours, overtime at time and one-half.
1916 10 hours, overtime at pro-rata rates.

Special Calls—1921—Minimum allowance, 3 hours pro-rata.
Sunday 1916—Minimum allowance, 30c. which included the first hour's service.

Special Calls—1921—Minimum allowance, 3 hours at 65c.—$1.95.
1916—Minimum allowance, 50c. which included the first hour's service. If living in Railway dwelling, was only allowed 30c. for each call, to include first hour's service.

Starting time—1921—Between 6.30 and 9 a.m.
1916—Between 6.00 and 8 a.m.

Trackmen and Bridge and Building Men—
Basic Day—1921—8 hours.
1916—10 hours (except Watchmen).
Overtime—1921—Time and one-half, after 8 hours.
1916—Time and one-half, after 10 hours.

Pumpmen, Track and Bridge Watchmen, Crossing Watchmen—
1921—8 hours continuous time to constitute a day.
1916—10 hours in each 24 hours to constitute a day. Hours of work need not be continuous but may be intermittent. This manner of working meant paying for service of work performed only.

CANADIAN NATIONAL RAILWAYS

Changes in Working Conditions, 1921-1916

Canadian Government Railways—Eastern Lines

Question No. 2—Con.

Carmen—

Repair Shops.
1921—Basic day 8 hours.
1916—Basic day 9 hours.
Running Work.
1921—Basic day 8 hours.
1916—Basic day 10 hours—Except Car Inspectors.

Car Inspectors.
1921—Basic day 8 hours.
1916—Basic day 11 hours.

Overtime—

Repair Shops.
1921—Time and one-half after 8 hours and Sundays and Holidays. Double time after 16 hours.
1916—Time and one-half after 9 hours and Sundays and Holidays. Double time after 18 hours.

Running Work (except Car Inspectors).
1921—Time and one-half after 8 hours and Sundays and Holidays. Double time after 16 hours.
1916—Time and one-half after 10 hours and Sundays and Holidays. Double time after 18 hours.

Car Inspectors.
1921—Same conditions as other Carmen.
1916—Time and one-half after 11 hours. Double time after 18 hours.

Shop Machinists—

Repair Shops.
1921—Basic day 8 hours.
1916—Basic day 9 hours.

Running Shops.
1921—Basic day 8 hours.
1916—Basic day 10 hours.

Overtime—

Repair Shops.
1921—Time and one-half after 8 hours, Sundays and Holidays. Double time after 16 hours.
1916—Time and one-half after 9 hours. Double time after 18 hours.

Running Work.
1921—Time and one-half after 8 hours and Sundays and Holidays. Double time after 16 hours.
1916—Time and one-half after 10 hours, and Sundays and Holidays. Double time after 18 hours.

CANADIAN NATIONAL RAILWAYS

Comparative Monthly Compensation paid Engineers, Firemen, Conductors and Trainmen, 1921–1916, allowing average Overtime Conditions.

CANADIAN GOVERNMENT—EASTERN LINES.

QUESTION No. 3.

—	—		Mileage Allowance per day	Total Miles	Rate	Amount	Increase
Engineer and Firemen— (Train)	*Compensation*				$ cts.	$ cts.	$ cts.
(Through Passenger Service.— Trains 1 and 2 between Moncton and Truro. Daily distance 125 miles. Average time on duty per day, 5 hours, 30 minutes).	Engineer	1921	145	4,350	6.64	288.84	
		1916	130	3,900	4.25	165.75	123.09
	Firemen	1921	145	4,350	5.20	226.20	
		1916	130	3,900	2.83	110.37	115.83
(Local Passenger Service.— Trains 21 and 22 Springhill Jct. to Moncton and Return. Daily except Sunday. Distance 130 miles. Elapsed time 14 hours, 30 minutes. Actual time on duty, 7 hours, 15 minutes).	Engineer	1921	192	4,992	6.48	323.48	
		1916	135	3,510	4.25	149.18	174.30
	Firemen	1921	192	4,992	4.96	247.60	
		1916	135	3,510	2.83	99.30	148.30
(Through Freight Service.— Between Moncton and Truro. Distance 125 miles. Average time on duty per day 14 hours, 22 minutes).	Engineer	1921	200	5,200	7.84	407.68	
		1916	140	3,640	4.50	163.80	243.88
	Firemen	1921	200	5,200	6.00	312.00	
		1916	140	3,640	3.00	109.20	202.80
(Local (Way) Freight Service— Average Run. Distance 90 miles. Average time on duty per day, 12 hours, 48 minutes)	Engineer	1921	196	5,096	7.80	397.48	
		1916	128	3,328	4.75	158.08	239.40
	Firemen	1921	196	5,096	5.92	301.68	
		1916	128	3,328	3.25	108.16	193.52
Conductors and Trainmen— (Train)							
(Through Passenger Service.— Trains 9 and 10 between St. John and Halifax. Daily except Sunday. Distance 278 miles. Time on duty, 10 hours, 35 minutes).	Conductor	1921	.....	4,819	4.67	225.05	
		1916	.....	4,819	3.25	156.62	68.43
	Baggageman	1921	.....	4,819	3.44	165.77	
		1916	.....	4,819	2.35	113.25	52.52
	Brakeman	1921	.....	4,819	3.33	160.47	
		1916	.....	4,819	2.15	103.61	56.86
(Local Passenger Service— Springhill to Moncton and return. Daily except Sunday. Distance 130 round trip. Elapsed time 14 hr., 30 min. Time on duty per day 7 hr., 15 min.).	Conductor	1921	$10.94	.....	.....	284.44	.....
		1916	4.50	.....	.....	135.00	149.44
	Baggageman	1921	8.06	.....	.....	209.56	.....
		1916	2.75	.....	.....	82.50	127.06
	Brakeman	1921	7.81	.....	.....	203.06	.....
		1916	2.55	.....	.....	76.50	126.56
(Through Freight Service— Between Moncton and Truro. Distance 125 miles. Average time on duty per day, 13 hr., 52 min.).	Conductor	1921	197	5,122	6.44	329.86	.....
		1916	139	3,614	4.00	144.56	185.30
	Brakeman	1921	197	5,122	5.12	262.25	.....
		1916	139	3,614	2.67	96.49	165.76
(Local (Way) Freight Service— Average run. Distance, 90 miles. Average time on duty per day, 12 hr., 48 min.)	Conductor	1921	190	4,940	6.96	343.82	.....
		1916	128	3,328	4.50	149.76	194.06
	Brakeman	1921	190	4,940	5.52	272.69	.....
		1916	128	3,328	3.00	99.84	172.85

CANADIAN NATIONAL RAILWAYS

MONTHLY EARNINGS OF SHOP MACHINISTS, CARMEN, AGENTS AND OPERATORS, FREIGHT SHED MEN, TRACKMEN AND BRIDGE AND BUILDING MEN

1921—1916

CANADIAN GOVERNMENT—EASTERN LINES

QUESTION No. 4—

Practically the same as Canadian Northern System—Eastern Lines

CANADIAN NATIONAL RAILWAYS

MONTHLY EARNINGS OF THE CLASSES OF EMPLOYEES NAMED IN QUESTION FOUR BASED ON RATES PAID 1921 BUT WORKING REGULAR HOURS IN EFFECT 1916, AS COMPARED WITH RATES PAID IN 1916

CANADIAN GOVERNMENT—EASTERN LINES

QUESTION No. 5—

Practically the same as Canadian Northern System—Eastern Lines.

CANADIAN NATIONAL RAILWAYS

COMPENSATION OR PRIVILEGES IN ADDITION TO RAILWAY PAY RECEIVED BY EMPLOYEES CANADIAN GOVERNMENT RAILWAYS—EASTERN LINES

QUESTION, No. 6—

Station Agents—

Agents entitled to occupy station dwellings (with free fuel and light) for a nominal rental of from $2 to $5 per month. The value of the rent would be approximately $10 per month. The value of free fuel and light would be approximately $9 per month.

Agents and Operators enjoy in common with other Railway employees, free and reduced transportation.

Trackmen—

Section Foremen are allowed use of section dwellings free of charge. They are allowed same transportation privileges as other employees, and in isolated territory, and along the Transcontinental railway trackmen are granted market passes so as to enable them to purchase at points where prices are the most reasonable.

Friday, April 8, 1921.

The House met at Three o'clock.

CANADIAN NATIONAL RAILWAYS—EMPLOYEES' REMUNERATION—SUPPLEMENTARY ANSWER

Hon. J. D. REID (Minister of Railways and Canals): Mr. Speaker, since answering the question yesterday asked by the hon. member for Russell (Mr. Murphy), I have received from the Vice-President of the Canadian National Railways a further memorandum giving additionnal information, and I should like to have this placed on Hansard to complete the answer already given. Therefore I would ask the consent of the House for that purpose.

Mr. SPEAKER: It would be the right of the hon. minister when questions were called to have this additional answer to the question submitted placed on the Table and subsequently printed in Hansard; but I can see it would be of great advantage to have it printed in Hansard of to-day rather than wait until questions are called on Monday. I therefore trust that under the circumstances the House will offer no objection to the supplementary answer being incorporated in to-day's Hansard. Is it the pleasure of the House that this shall be done?

Some Hon. MEMBERS: Carried.

[NOTE.—The statements referred to above are printed as an appendix to this day's issue of Debates. EDITOR.]

CANADIAN NATIONAL RAILWAYS

REFERENCE TO SPECIAL COMMITTEE OF THE HOUSE

Right Hon. ARTHUR MEIGHEN (Prime Minister): Mr. Speaker, I beg to move the following resolution:

That a Select Standing Committee on National Railways and Shipping be appointed for the present session, and be instructed to inquire into the following questions:—

(1) What information as to operation of Canadian National Railways and Shipping as conducted by the Board of Directors and Management should, in the public interest, be brought down in Parliament on Question, Motion for Production of Papers, or otherwise.

(2) When, by what method, and under what conditions, if any, should such information be given, regard being had for the necessity of securing to Parliament and the public all facts requisite for the determination of policy (including finance), and to the Board of Directors the best possible conditions and efficiency of management.

(3) What system of auditing should be adopted, and what extent of detail should be given in the Annual Report.

(4) Whether and for what perposes the said committee should be continued, and that for the above purposes and for such other purposes as the committee deem in the public interest there be referred to said Committee the Annual Report of the Board of Directors and that the said committee have power to examine witnesses under oath, to send for papers, persons, and records, and to report from time to time.

Mr. Speaker, the subject matter of the resolution has been under debate in the House fully on one occasion and partially on another; consequently there is little necessary for me to add by way of explanation in moving the resolution. The committee that I propose is designed to perform, if it can, a very difficult but a very necessary task, and I think it well that the appointment should be made at the earliest possible date—to-day if it be the will of the House—so that the committee may have the most ample opportunity to call witnesses, make all necessary investigations, secure the best opinion available, and report.

When the matter was first under discussion some ten days ago on the motion of the hon. the leader of the Opposition (Mr. Mackenzie King) in amendment to Supply, I intimated that I felt the House might well consider the appointment of such a select committee as was already foreshadowed in the motion of the hon. member for Halifax (Mr. Maclean) and that there should be committed to it, first, the duty of finding and reporting upon the best method of bringing into this House the necessary information as to the National railways, the time and the conditions, and whether or not there might be any information that, for a time at least, should not be brought down. On April 5, when the hon. member for Halifax moved his motion, I took occasion in the debate more specifically to set out what I thought might be the duties of the committee. At page 1660 I used these words:

I have merely outlined in brief what has occurred to me as proper subjects for the deliberation of the committee. I am not going to say that nothing else could be submitted to them. It might be conceivable that the general question of the devolution of responsibility within the managing body might also come up for consideration there. I have no comment to offer upon that suggestion. It can be reviewed when the motion that I shall give notice of to-night comes up for discussion.

And I commented on the four topics that I had then suggested. Later in the debate when I gave the notice I said:

During the course of the discussion with regard to the Canadian National Railways, I promised that I would give notice to-night of a motion for the appointment of a committee. I am prepared to hand the motion in, in the regular way, but as in that case hon. members would have no chance to peruse it, I think it would be fairer, that I should read it to-night. In that connection I wish to say that the subjects here outlined are not given finally and conclusively as the subject to be under the review of the committee. In the course of my remarks, indeed, I said that such was not the case.

Consequently the attitude of the Government throughout has consistently been to give Parliament the fullest right of review as to what in the public interest can well be taken in charge by this committee for the purposes of report. In view of comment that had been made to the effect that the annual report would not be brought down, at least for all purposes—although I had stated previously that it would be laid before the committee and would be used for all purposes that the committee had to serve—it will be observed that by incorporating in the motion an additional purpose the committee gets the annual report for that purpose as well, which virtually puts it in the power of the committee to use it for any purpose it desires.

Now, I have noted somewhere that comment was made, to the effect that the duties, as indicated in this resolution, are purely academical. I am afraid that I am not able to understand the applicability of that adjective to these duties. The House has discussed many times, not only this session but in previous sessions, the very question that is embodied in the first charge to the committee. That question is about as far from the academic and is about as intensely and markedly practical as any question possibly could be—what actual information as to operation of Canadian National Railways and shipping as conducted by the board of directors and management should in the public interest be brought down in Parliament on question, motion for production of papers, or otherwise. That is the first question, and really it is very difficult to understand how anyone who reads it can have the faintest idea that it is academical. It is a question as to just what facts relating to operation may be brought down. The Government has always taken the view that this at least must be said: the actual operating data, the facts connected therewith, the managing of the road, must not, until a certain time passes— at least during the period of operation to which they apply and until the annual report covering them appears—must not be producible to the competitor of the road, to the public, to competing tenderers, and all others. As respects these business facts of operation, this corporation must have the same rights as any other, must have the same opportunities as any other, to make a success of its system. In the judgment of the Government, that is vital; it is essential; without it there is no use going on. If these are to be destroyed, then the time has come to turn our backs upon government operation of a system of the magnitude of ours. Any attempt to expose and place the management in the position that has been sought in this House is, whether so intended or not, an attempt to paralyze government operation of railways. Consequently it is an intensely practical question as to what information can be given without prejudicing the management of the system, without prejudicing its efficiency; when it can be given, and under what conditions, if any, and by what method—possibly through the committee itself. That covers the first two duties as outlined in the resolution.

The third reference entrusts to the committee the obligation of looking into the question whether we can have a better audit system. It has been suggested—as I recall it, chiefly by the hon. member for St. Hyacinthe (Mr. Gauthier)—that some audit system might be evolved under which there would be an ultimate if not an immediate responsibility on the part of the Auditor General. I know of practical objections that have been raised to this. I do not feel myself competent thoroughly to discuss it; I would like to hear evidence upon it. It will be for the committee to hear such evidence as it may desire and to come to a conclusion thereon. The Board of Management has in the past adopted in its annual report the principle of following the same lines and adopting the same system and going into the same detail as in the case with the Canadian Pacific in disclosing its operating facts, its business year to its shareholders. It might be that under a Government system operated by a board of directors a fuller annual report should be necessary and desirable. That question also can be reviewed by the committee and if this motion passes the House expresses its desire that the committee should make a recommendation thereon.

Lastly, the committee will inquire and will report—I have no doubt that after it gets the evidence and the facts necessary to enable it to report on the first three it will need little more as to the last—as to what functions a standing committee on

national railways and shipping should have. It might come to the conclusion that the work could be done by the regular railway committee of this House. On the other hand, it might not come to that conclusion; it might think that a closer supervision could be exercised by a select standing committee charged with this duty and this duty alone. That is for the committee to decide. I am sure hon. members will agree if they think the matter out in a business way that the House and the Government, after they have had the advantage of a report from a careful and thorough committee, will be in a much better position to decide these questions which go to the very root of the success of the management of this system.

The motion also states that the committee shall have before it the annual report and it will be for the committee to decide what investigation they desire to make based on that annual report. The committee is left to decide for itself, what can be done or how it can be done without impairing the rights of the management in connection with the operation itself. It is conceivable that the committee might, without achieving any end in the public interest, seriously embarrass the management of the road. It could were it so disposed, but it is inconceivable that unless commissioned to do so it would be so disposed.

Now, I need not add again what I have said often, that no committee ever appointed by this House has been entrusted with more important, and, I doubt not, more difficult duties than those which are being assigned to this one; certainly no more practical duties were ever assigned to any committee. I say again that there might be some other functions performed by the committee, but I think there is about enough here to occupy its time during the rest of the session—for a good part of the rest of the session, anyway.

When I was speaking on this subject last Tuesday I mentioned that the suggestion had come that the committee might inquire into the question whether any improvement in the scheme of management could be made, and report to the House thereon. The suggestion came that possibly some board might take the place of shareholders in an ordinary company. I do not know that that is practicable; I am inclined to think it is not. But, if the House is of the view that any useful object could be served by adding that as one of the functions of the committee, namely, inquiry and report—and the inquiry the committee makes on the other subjects would help it to report, perhaps, without any further investigation—as to whether there could be any improvement in the general plan or scheme of management, it could be added to the duties of the committee. I need not suggest to the House that it would be wholly improper to commit to a committee the duty of examining into the efficiency of an official. If we adopt that course we may give up hope of ever getting officials who will be big enough or able enough to manage a system of anything like the magnitude of the Canadian National Railways. The responsibility for the appointment of the directorate must rest with the Government and the Government alone, and we must not expose officials of the road acting under the directors to review without specific cause by any other body. If we do, we may abandon hope of ever having either officials or directors fit for their duties.

I need scarcely add that the task of managing a system of this magnitude, surrounded by the difficulties that inevitably surround government management, is in itself none too inviting; it is easy for hon. members to believe that the task of securing just the man you may want in each post is easier than it really is. Therefore I say to the House in all seriousness, having had some acquaintance with the problem for many years, that we must take care to be fair to those who are entrusted with this great duty. We must take care that they are placed in a position that will enable them to perform their task to the best of their ability. We must take care that we do not prejudice the interests of the country by pursuing a course in this House, or in a committee of this House, that does injustice either to the system or to the management.

I have again presented to the House, in very brief form, my reasons for moving for the appointment of this committee. The reasons for it have been argued at very considerable length by the senior member for Halifax (Mr. Maclean). He, however, did not have any definite ideas as to just what the committee should do. I do not think it would be the part of wisdom to place in the statement of the duties of the committee any omnibus clause, making it their task to do almost anything that they take it into their heads to do. If you do that, you simply turn them out into a wilderness, and you are not going to get any results at all. That has not been the

custom of this Parliament. One cannot emphasize too strongly the wisdom of making concrete, practical, and definite, the duties of any committee of this House. If you do so, then you will secure concrete, practical, and definite results; but if your commitment in the first place is vague, open, and aimless, then you are likely after you get your report, to find yourselves where you began, or you may get no report at all. Consequently, I think, with the suggestion that the duties as embodied in the motion are open to amendment if any practical, concrete amendments can, in the judgment of the House, be made with advantage, it would be wise to take care that, whatever may be the purpose, we do not add terms that are likely to destroy altogether the usefulness of the committee.

Mr. SPEAKER: Before the leader of the Opposition (Mr. Mackenzie King) proceeds, I deem it my duty to draw the attention of the House to the circumstance that a strict application of the rule would leave only a fragment of this motion debatable, because the House will bear in mind that one portion of it was debated by the leader of the Opposition, on going into Supply, on a motion for the production of papers appertaining to the railways. It will be borne in mind that, on a subsequent motion of the senior member for Halifax (Mr. Maclean), this subject was widely debated, and as the House is aware, there is a rule that the same subject may not be debated twice in the same session.

The Chair is also not unmindful of the circumstance that the Prime Minister (Mr. Meighen), in the course of his remarks, infringed the well-known rule that there may not be reference to a previous debate of the same session; but no exception was taken to that on the part of the Chair, for the reason that the Prime Minister was dealing largely with the question of policy. Over and above all that, I have had in mind this circumstance, that the motion has to do with a subject of tremendous importance, of such great importance that it seems to me in the public interest, that technicalities (if I may use that term) of the procedure of this House should not interfere with the widest possible discussion of this subject. At the same time, while hon. members are debating the motion, I hope they will not be unmindful of these rules and will infringe upon them no more than the circumstances will warrant.

Hon. W. L. MACKENZIE KING (leader of the Opposition): Mr. Speaker, in the few remarks which I wish to make in reply to my right hon. friend (Mr. Meighen), I shall endeavour not to take a wider range than he has taken with reference to the motion which he has presented to the House. As my right hon. friend has reminded us, the circumstances under which this motion is presented to the House to-day, will be fresh in the minds of all hon. members, and need not be reviewed. In a word, we have been seeking, in this House, to find a way in which Parliament may be informed with respect to expenditures on the Canadian National railways. We, on this side of the House, have taken the broad position that, as regards expenditures on railways owned and controlled by the Government, the responsibility upon the Government is precisely the same as it is with respect to expenditures by any department of Government.

The customary methods whereby information is supplied to Parliament, so far as I am able to see, are three in number. Information can be supplied in answer to questions of the Ministry; it can be supplied by orders for the production of documents, or it can be supplied through a committee of Parliament appointed for the purpose. With respect to the Canadian National Railways and also the Canadian Government Merchant Marine, the Government have taken the position that it is not public policy, or, at any rate, it is the decision of the Ministry, not to give information with respect to these matters where the questions asked appertain to the management or control of the roads or the ships, and where it will be necessary to get an answer from the companies, so-called, which are conducting these great public services. As hon. members of the House well know, the Government, in conducting these public services, have adopted, in each case, the method of creating a corporation for the purpose of carrying on the particular business. We, on this side, take the position that the Government are perfectly within their rights in adopting any method they think will carry out most efficiently the purposes for which Parliament is voting public money. On the other hand, we maintain that, with respect to whatever method they adopt, they cannot relieve themselves of the responsibility which, at all times, must rest upon ministers of the Crown to account to the people's representatives in Parliament for every dollar of public money which has been voted by Parliament for any public purpose.

Naturally, when my right hon. friend gave notice that he intended to move in

this House for a committee to consider this aspect of public expenditure, we, on this side, were only too glad to have the Government intimate at last that they were prepared at least to consider some way of giving the public information in regard to public expenditures. We, therefore, welcomed the suggestion of a committee, whether it were a select standing committee or a special committee, which would give promise, at least, of Parliament being supplied with necessary information.

May I point out that the Government have taken three distinct attitudes towards this important matter of supplying Parliament with information with respect to the Canadian National Railways and the Canadian Government Merchant Marine? Their first attitude, the attitude taken last session, shortly after Parliament had been informed of a deficit of some $48,000,000 on the Canadian National railways, was that Parliament would have the fullest information, the fullest powers of investigation, the right to get details on any particular phase of management, operation or control of the National railways, all that was asked was that Parliament should wait until the report of the Board of Directors was laid on the table of the House. In other words, we were asked, when voting the Estimates of moneys required for the coming year, to wait until that report was laid upon the Table, and then once the amounts were voted we would be given the right to the fullest information; we would be able to get answers to any questions that we might wish to ask.

The second attitude which the Government have taken is the one which has been apparent throughout the whole of this session; it has been to deny to Parliament any information with respect to these public services except with respect to such matters as might come within the very circumscribed field of correspondence between the official departments, and other persons, as contrasted with the companies. In taking that position, the Government have found themselves running counter very strongly, to opinion, not only throughout the country, but even in this House, and, I think, among their own supporters. The consequence is that we have now a third attitude, that, namely, of offering to Parliament a committee to find out what means and methods, if any, should be adopted for giving information to the public with respect to these great public services. We contend, Mr. Speaker, that the first of these attitudes, is the only position which the Government are justified in taking; that as long as we are dealing with the expenditure of public moneys, the responsibility must rest upon the Government to give the fullest possible information, and that the Government have no right to restrict the powers of Parliament with respect to obtaining information to which it is entitled by referring the matter to any committee to determine one way or the other.

May I say that when my right hon. friend expressed his intention of moving for a committee, we naturally awaited its precise terms with eager expectation. Looking, however, at the terms as they have now been formally set forth, we find that the committee proposed is not so much a committee formed for the purpose of giving Parliament information, as it is a committee for the purpose of placing restrictions around the giving of information to Parliament. We say that is an entirely wrong position. What the Government should aim at is not a method of restricting the giving of information to Parliament in regard to great public services, involving expenditures amounting to hundreds of millions of dollars, but to find a way whereby the fullest information possible can be given to Parliament with respect to these all important matters.

May I, in this connection, draw the attention of the House to the different clauses of the proposed resolution. My right hon. friend suggests that this committee should first of all be instructed to inquire:

> What information as to operation of Canadian National Railways and Shipping as conducted by the Board of Directors and Management should, in the public interest, be brought down in Parliament on Question, Motion for production of papers, or otherwise.

Mr. Speaker, we do not require a committee for that purpose. This House has the right to any and all information on any matters of great public interest and concern. That is the position we take, not that a committee should be formed to find out what information should be brought down. We contend it is the duty of the Government to bring down anything that is asked for by hon. members of Parliament, or to take the responsibility for not so doing. The Government are not obliged to bring down information if they do not wish so to do, but they have to take the responsibility for refusing to bring down information. That is the position we take. We contend that the Government cannot

relieve itself of an obligation, fundamental as respects every ministry, to be accountable to Parliament for any and every transaction of a public nature, and to give to Parliament the fullest and amplest information whenever that information is requested. We say that any attempt to restrict that right by throwing on to a committee of this House the duty of finding out what information should or should not be brought down, is simply depriving this House of a right which it has, and which it must continue to hold, if it is to continue to exercise a right which the representatives of the people in Parliament are expected at all times to possess.

The second question which my right hon. friend proposes the committee should inquire into is this:

> When, by what method, and under what conditions, if any, should such information be given?

There again, Mr. Speaker, is precisely the same point. This committee obviously is not for the purpose of enabling Parliament to get full information in regard to the great public services, but to determine when, by what method, and under what conditions, if any, information is to be given. We contend that the information ought to be given without restrictions, excepting where the Government itself is prepared to take the responsibility for withholding the information, and we cannot relieve the Government of their first and fundamental duty in that regard by sanctioning any reference to a committee which will, even impliedly, restrict the rights and powers of this House.

The next question which the committee is to inquire into is:

> What system of auditing should be adopted, and what extent of detail should be given in the Annual Report.

That is a matter that may very properly be taken up by a committee, but it does not help towards a solution of the great question that is before this country at the present time. It does not enable us to get information with respect to the manner in which the deficit of $70,000,000 on the Canadian National Railways has been brought about. Now that is the very information that we want to obtain; that is the information that the people of this country want at the present time; and if there is to be any solution of the railway problem in this country it will only be found by Parliament and the public having the fullest knowledge and the amplest information possible on which to base their suggestions. So any reference to a system of auditing, while it may be very useful in some other connection, does not help us at all in regard to the main situation that is before the country at the present time.

The last reference to the committee is this:

> Whether and for what purposes the said Committee should be continued—

Here, again, is a matter wholly aside from the main question. The resolution goes on:

> —and for such other purposes as the Committee deem in the public interest there be referred to said Committee the Annual Report of the Board of Directors and that the said Committee have power to examine witnesses under oath, to send for papers, persons, and records, and to report from time to time.

Let me say with reference to this particular clause, which refers to the committee the annual report of the Board of Directors, what I think the House pretty generally recognizes, that a select committee has no powers to deal with any matters except such as are referred to it by Parliament. Now the resolution as drafted sets forth a number of subjects which are to be referred to the proposed select committee. By implication it follows that matters not explicitly set forth in the resolution will not come within the scope of the powers of the select committee. Instead, therefore, of the select committee, in any probability, functioning with regard to the obtaining for this Parliament of information with respect to the all important matters on which we have been seeking information, the committee undoubtedly will take the position that its powers are restricted to the matters that have been expressly referred to it by this House of Commons.

What we feel, Mr. Speaker, is this, that instead of placing a number of restrictions upon the duties of the committee, instead of limiting its powers, there should be conferred on it by this House of Commons the amplest and fullest powers to inquire into all matters pertaining to the control, operation, and management, of the Canadian National Railways, and of the Canadian Government Merchant Marine, these being the two important public services and issues with which the time of this Parliament is likely to be most occupied during the present session.

That, Mr. Speaker, I think, covers the point of view which we on this side take with respect to the motion of my right

hon. friend. Let me, as regards the matters referred to the committee, supplement what I have said by quoting the remarks of my right hon. friend made the other day when speaking of the committee with respect to which his motion is now made. On the 5th of April, as reported at page 1660 of Hansard (unrevised), my right hon. friend said:

> It must never be thought that we should give to a committee powers or duties exceeding those we ourselves are ready to exercise. For example, if it is not in the interests of the country that we so hamper the management of the road as to render efficiency impossible by doing in this House what this House decided some few days ago it would not do, namely, bring out merely upon question or motion all information, no matter what it is, if that is not going to be done by Parliament, then Parliament is certainly not going to commit to a committee the power to do what in the public interest it is not right for Parliament to do itself. That could not be considered at all.

That statement of my right hon. friend must be read in conjunction with the clause in the motion which he has just put before the House setting forth the scope of the committee's work. Clearly my right hon. friend has intimated that he does not propose to allow this committee to elicit information of a kind which the Government has refused to give to the House. We contend that a select committee should be formed for the purpose of getting for Parliament, through that source, the information which has been denied to us through other channels, and in that connection, we think, the committee should have the widest possible powers which this House can confer upon it.

Let me mention in passing that while my right hon. friend's motion refers to railways and shipping, he confines the references in the several paragraphs of the motion only to matters pertaining to the national railways. We think that the same duties and powers should be given to the committee with respect to the Canadian Government Merchant Marine.

Mr. MEIGHEN: That is intended.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: I am glad we have been able to enlarge the scope of the committee even that much. I wonder if it is also intended that the committee should have the power to engage counsel and transportation experts to assist it in connection with its work. It must be apparent to hon. members that in view of the magnitude, and of the technical nature in many particulars, of transactions pertaining to the Government merchant marine and the Canadian National Railways, and with the time of hon. members occupied as it is certain to be between now and the end of the session, it will be impossible for any committee of this House to elicit information that will be of real service to the House unless they have the right to retain counsel, and particularly transportation experts, to assist them in carrying out their duties. I propose, therefore, in the amendment I am about to move, to suggest that these larger rights and powers be conferred. The powers of the committee should not be restricted in any way, but should be the amplest which Parliament can give.

As my right hon. friend says, it will probably take to the end of the session for any committee to deal with the several problems he has outlined. What does that mean? It means that, as respects the Canadian National railways and the Canadian Government marine, we shall end this session without obtaining any inforwithout obtaining any information at all with regard to the facts upon which we have been seeking light. We shall get a report from a committee setting forth, notwithstanding my hon. friend's objection to the term, an academic statement of certain methods of proceeding. But we shall not get the facts and the information which will account before the public for the enormous deficits that have been incurred during the last few years, and which will probably be still larger next year; nor shall we get the light needed to enable us to deal intelligently with the whole railway and shipping situation. In the circumstances, therefore, I beg to move, seconded by my hon. friend from Shelburne and Queen's (Mr. Fielding):

> That all the words after the word "session", on the second line, to the end of the question, be omitted, and the following be inserted instead thereof:
>
> That such committee shall have power to inquire into all matters in any way relating to the railways owned or controlled by the Government of Canada whether under the direction of the Department of Railways and Canals or under any corporation in which the Government are stock holders, whether relating to the construction or operation, from the date of the appointment by the Government of the Board of Directors of the Canadian Northern Railway Compay down to the present time; and similarly to inquire into all matters in any way connected with the Canadian Government Merchant Marine, either in respect of the construction or operation of the ships, and that such committee shall have power to send for papers, persons, and records, to engage counsel and transportation experts, and to make such reports and recommendations from time to time as, in their judgment, will be calculated to promote the public interest.

In connection with this amendment, I hope the House will not lose sight of the fact that the country is demanding to-day full light upon the circumstances which have occasioned a deficit of something like $48,000,000 last year and $70,000,000 this year on the National railways; also that Parliament is being asked by the Government to vote for railways and canals for the ensuing year a sum amounting to over $167,000,000, while thus far we have not been able to get any information of a substantial or vital character in regard to the operation, the control, and the management of these public services. It is to enable Parliament and the country to obtain the fullest light possible on these vast expenditures of public moneys that this amendment has been drafted in the comprehensive form in which it appears.

Hon. Sir HENRY DRAYTON (Minister of Finance): I am very glad to know that there are some things in connection with which I can join my hon. friend (Mr. Mackenzie King) in hearty accord. We do agree that the present situation, having particular regard to the railways, their deficits, and their general operation, is of grave importance. But we differ slightly as to the way in which we should endeavour to get something done to meet the difficulty; and it is by reason of the fact, among others, that the Government is impressed with the gravity of the situation and is fully alive to its importance, that we are so anxious to have the best possible committee that can function upon this subject entrusted with the determination of perfectly plain and simple issues upon which we may base some concrete answer and give some concrete information that may be of assistance to the House. In the first place, I do not know that it makes so much difference, in so far as this motion is concerned, as to just exactly what the Government has been doing in connection with the giving of information. Whether what we have been doing is right or wrong, we desire to see if matters cannot be handled in a better and more simple manner and in a more concrete form than heretofore. My hon. friend is entirely correct, in one respect, in his statement as to the Government's course. He says that last year it was understood that the fullest information was to be given to the House just so soon as the report was laid on the Table. Well, the position is the same to-day; it has not been varied in the slightest. The reports have been tabled and they are not only open to hon. members, but they may be sent to any appropriate committee, on the request or the motion of any hon. gentleman. But the fact is that this year, as last year, no action has been taken by the Opposition in connection with the annual report with a view to obtaining information which they thought necessary for their purposes. This year, it is said, we have refused all information; but the position is exactly the same as it was last year, so far as the reports are concerned. Now, if I understand the tenor of my hon. friend's remark's,—and I have tried my best to follow them—what he wants, apparently, is that the Government should bring down any information that is asked for or else take the full responsibility for declining to do so.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: Hear, hear.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: My hon. friend says "hear, hear." Well, if that is the position, why is he worrying? Why is he annoyed? Why is he vexed? We have refused to bring down information and we have taken the responsiblity for that refusal; we ought to be perfectly happy. But we want to do something more. We do not want to leave this matter to the arbitrary exercise of any government right of refusal. We do not want to take that position if it can be found, having regard to the tremendous values of these properties and the great task of properly managing them, that information can from time to time be brought down to any greater extent than has been the case in the past. We should like to remove the subject from a position with which my hon. friend would appear to be entirely content.

The motion is drawn for the purpose of including both the railways and the marine service. And it is not only drawn with that intention but it carries that intention into effect, because it is the same committee, it is the same board of management, the same directors manage both systems. Both systems are covered, the same directors are covered, and the same jurisdiction is given to the committee over the marine as over the railways. Then I am afraid that my hon. friend likes very much the present situation. He likes having it left so that information is asked for and information is refused. And the reason why I think he was perfectly sincere in his statement that he thought that that ought to be the position is fortified by the amendment that he now brings down—and I only had the opportunity of looking over it while my hon. friend was speaking.

After all how does the question come up? The whole question comes up with the request for information—that and nothing else. I notice that my hon. friend's amendment strikes out all reference to this burning question of information altogether. It is struck out entirely—apparently there is no immediate hurry for information in this committee. In place of it—in place of a clear, a defined field of operation—a field is left which is of itself so great that unless some particular programme be laid down I do not know when any report could be expected; certainly not for a long time, certainly not within any reasonable period—and my hon. friend lets the committee loose on that large field. Well, I do not know what that is for, what the idea is—whether it is to be a general fishing expedition or whether they were to go back and find out why at one time railways that had to be built went in a certain direction, or whether some farm crossing in a certain concession was taken up that ought to be left and what it is for, matters far removed from the present difficulty that, I take it, we are all honestly anxious to have solved. No matter how far removed these questions may be my hon. friend proposes that they be all left to the committee with full powers for a general fishing expedition.

Now I think my hon. friend was wrong in another direction. He says that instead of finding excuses for not bringing down papers, the object of the Government ought to be to find a way to give the fullest information to Parliament. That is exactly what we are trying to have done; that is exactly the concrete thing that is left to that committee. I do not know any other way whereby you could pursue anything like a course of action, which would not hurt business, to let you know where you are, or any method more likely to bring it about, than leaving the concrete question to that committee.

Then my hon. friend says the committee wlil have no powers except in connection with these three matters—the papers containing information, the method of bringing them down and the audit. Well, I would like to point out that the whole report was referred to the committee. The whole of that report is in the hands of the committee and that being so they have the right of going into anything and everything they want arising out of that report. My hon. friend will find nothing having regard to the conduct of its business which is not directly or indirectly covered by that report.

A further thing that my hon. friend points out is that there is nothing in the resolution giving them the information which they very much desire—namely, information as to why the deficit is as great as it is. Well, I dare say that hon. gentlemen opposite have better memories than I have, but does any one remember any questions being put on the Order Paper asking for reasons as to why the deficit is so large? Nobody ever heard of it. On the other hand, we have heard of questions put for the purpose of showing that the deficit ought to be greater, questions put for the purpose of ascertaining why some agent is not working twenty-four hours a day, why the office is not open twenty-four hours a day, or why at some point there is not a regular station instead of a flag station—these are the questions that are being asked.

4 p.m.

Mr. McMASTER: May I interrupt my hon. friend? Does the Minister of Finance not remember questions put on the Order Paper asking what other directorships were held by the directors of the Canadian National Railways, and what business has been done with the companies in which they were interested?

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: I do not know that is any answer to the question I put. I do not know whether the object in making such an interrogation on the part of my hon. friends was to find out whether or not the men of business being put on the National system were men so little known to the business world that no other business organization had any confidence in them. But that is not a question as to why the deficit is as great as it is and what can or ought to be done with regard to reducing it.

Mr. SINCLAIR (Guysborough): Does my hon. friend remember a question like this—whether the coal used in the running of the mercantile marine was bought by tender or by private contract,—and a refusal to give any answer?

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: My recollection upon that point—and I speak entirely subject to correction—is that the question was put at one time as to whether the coal was bought by tender or not, but the question also went further and desired information as to the tenderers. My recollection is that the answer was that coal was bought by tender, but information as to who the tenderers were was refused. However, that may be, what I submit with very great confidence is, that it would be impossible

for us to ever ascertain why railways do not pay by asking questions across the floor of the House—that is absolutely impossible. On the other hand it well may be that if we had a committee properly manned and properly constructed—as I have no doubt this committee will be—with fixed and definite objects ahead of it, much good can be done.

Now the query is also made by the hon. gentleman as to whether counsel may be retained. Well, I have had a good deal to do with railway matters and I do not know that I ever found any farmer who appeared before the Railway Board—either in a rate case, or in a cattle case, or any other kind of a case—handicapped because he did not have a lawyer. After all, the issues here while they are very serious and very great are not legal. I would say that the committee could get along very well without the assistance of counsel.

There are lawyers in the House, and I have no doubt some of them will be on that committee, and it would occur to me that the expense of counsel is entirely unnecessary. Then, so far as traffic experts are concerned, again I do not know that it is necessary to take very much evidence from them. We want to get at the actual facts relating to transportation and the like. The committee may be able to get an expert who is not associated with or interested in either one system or the other —they may, but I would doubt it. It would occur to me that the best thing to be done on the question of retaining counsel and traffic experts is to leave it open, so that the committee can if the necessity occurs come back to this House and ask power to retain such assistance.

Now, Mr. Speaker, our position is simply this. We are sincerely anxious to see something done. We do not think that a general fishing inquiry as to what has happened in railway circles in Canada is going to help us very much in deciding what ought to be done at the present time. On the other hand, we have a direct commitment to this committee of something definite, and calling for a definite answer, which answer may, and we hope will, be of great assistance toward a solution of our railway problem.

Hon. W. S. FIELDING (Shelburne and Queen's): Mr. Speaker, I am glad that this question, which is one of tremendous importance, is at this moment narrowed down to what I may call very small bounds—narrowed down to points which the public will clearly understand, and about which I believe there can be no possibility of misapprehension. It seems to be the general wish of the House that a committee should be appointed to inquire into these matters. The question is as to what power shall be given to that committee. When it is appointed it will undoubtedly contain a majority of members supporting the Government. Now, just how that committee shall exercise the powers that may be assigned to it we are not to determine; we shall have to take the risk of that.

The motion of the right hon. Prime Minister (Mr. Meighen) gives the committee certain specific and limited powers. I am not a lawyer, but somewhere in the dusty bins of the legal profession I think there is a maxim which says, that the expression of one thing is the exclusion of another; and if you specify in a statute or public document a number of things, you thereby exclude all others. If I am wrong in my legal doctrine, no doubt some one will correct me. At all events, if it is not law it is common sense. The motion of the Prime Minister assigns certain subjects to the committee; that means that no other subjects can be considered by it. The amendment moved by my hon. friend the leader of the Opposition takes in everything. I want that noted. Every thought and word that is in the motion of the Prime Minister is included in the amendment. But we go further. Ah, that is the point. The hon. minister says: No, you must not go further. Why go further? We have a great difficulty before us, a tremendous financial problem involving a very large deficit last year, a much larger deficit this year, and rumour says even larger again in the coming year. In regard to that I make no charge; I make no accusation against any of the managers of the road—I do not even find fault; I do not know what all the trouble is. If I am asked: Have you a particular solution to offer for this great problem?—I say frankly, I do not know. In that respect I do not differ from other members probably. But if we are asked to provide a solution, surely the first thing we must do is to get all the information possible; all the information, not on this, that or the other point, but on all points which in any way relate to this transaction, or which can have any bearing whatever in remedying the condition of things which we all desire to remedy.

Again I say I am not finding fault with the management, I make no accusatons. In

anything I have had to do with any of the gentlemen connected with these railways I have invariably received every courtesy and consideration, and the last thought in my mind is to suggest that there is any wrongdoing. Here is the position: an enormous deficit of $70,000,000,—equal to the total expenditure of Canada only a few years ago. Now, this tremendous financial problem calls for serious reflection, and reflection of an impartial character; in other words, a non-partisan study. It is that which we desire. But surely members of the Government must see that when they start out by putting restrictions on the investigation and saying: You may investigate that particular thing, but you must not investigate something else, surely that is a position they cannot defend before the people of Canada. Our proposal is to appoint this committee and give them unlimited powers. My hon. friend the Minister of Finance (Sir Henry Drayton), and I think the Prime Minister also, said that unless you give this committee some particular instructions to do some particular thing nothing would come of it. That is a very queer doctrine. We often appoint committees in general terms. I have in my hands the terms on which we appointed the committee on pensions. According to my hon. friend's contention, since we gave that committee no instructions they will do nothing, but we know they are giving attention to that very important subject, and I have no doubt are arriving at a solution which will be of great value. Here is the motion:

> That a Special Committee be appointed to consider questions relating to the pensions, insurance and re-establishment of returned soldiers, and any amendments to the existing laws in relation thereto which may be proposed or considered necessary by the committee; with power to send for persons, papers and records, to print from day to day its proceedings and the evidence taken, for the use of the committee, and to report from time to time; and that Rule 11 be suspended in relation thereto.

That, in different words, is exactly what we are proposing now. We say: Here is a great problem. Appoint your committee and give them unlimited powers. I think the Prime Minister made one remark in that connection, which I fully endorse. He said that it would be in the power of the committee to embarrass the management of the road, but, he added, "it is inconceivable that they would do so." I accept that view. I say that this committee appointed in general and unrestricted terms would neither embarrass the management nor be disagreeable and insist on calling people whom it is unnecessary to call. It would be in their power to do a great many things, but I agree with the doctrine of the right hon. Prime Minister that it is inconceivable they would do them. Why not, then, give the committee all the power that is possible? I cannot for the life of me see the need of restriction, to say that they are not to be given a free hand, but must report on certain particular things and those only. By our motion we say: Let them report on whatever in their judgment is best calculated to bring about a solution of this problem. That is the great duty. at every stage we should have a full open inquiry, trusting the committee to be reasonable, to exercise their power as members of Parliament with a sense of their responsibility to their constituents, to this House and to the country; and to report whatever in their judgment is fair and reasonable. Everything that is contemplated by the motion of the right hon. Prime Minister is included in our amendment; let there be no mistake about that All he asks we are asking too, but we say if there is anything more that can be brought to the knowledge of this committee, by all means let us have the benefit of it, and leave the committee unrestricted in any way, shape or form. The matter seems to me so simple that I really could not debate it at any length; the principles are too plain and too clear. It is a question whether we shall have a restricted and limited inquiry, or whether we shall give an absolutely free hand to this committee to bring their best judgment to bear upon this question, to exercise their responsibility to their constituents, to this House and to the country and invite all available information, giving the House every possible suggestion that the judgment of the committee may tell them is going to be helpful towards a solution of this problem. We by our amendment enable them to do that, but they are told by the motion of the Prime Minister that though they may have notions in their mind of some solution of this problem they must not say anything about them, because they do not come within the four corners of his resolution. It is a question between full inquiry—that is what the country wants—and restricted inquiry. Again, I say that I make no charge or complaint. We are confronted with a great financial problem which is disturbing the country, and justly disturb-

ing the country. I approach it in every spirit of fairness to all concerned. I complain of nothing; I find fault with nothing. I say that what we all need is information. Let us get the fullest information that is possible and then try to find a solution.

Right Hon. C. J. DOHERTY (Minister of Justice): The hon. gentleman (Mr. Fielding), echoing in that regard, if I am not mistaken, the hon. leader of the Opposition (Mr. Mackenzie King), persists in speaking of the committee for the appointment of which the leader of this House (Mr. Meighen) has moved as a committe to provide restriction upon information. The hon. gentleman suggests that his proposed amendment remedies that alleged defect by providing for the appointment of a committee with a roving commission to get all or any information whatsoever about anything great or small connected with the operation or management of the railways or of the shipping. In taking that position, hon. gentlemen are simply refusing to consider the first problem that presents itself; their motion simply begs the real question. The committee for which the right hon. leader of the House asks is a committee to study the problem of how we may remove the obstacle which presents itself to the obtaining of information. While we must recognize the right of this House to have all information necessary to the intelligent performance of its duty of controlling the expenditures made out of the moneys of the people, on the other hand it is the duty of the House to protect the people from any injury that might come to them through the making public of all the details of the operation of their business carried on in competition with others. Now, that is the problem we have to face, and the purpose of the proposed committee, far from being to restrict the information to be obtained, is that the Government may obtain the judgment of that committee as to the best method of obtaining all possible information without involving the particular injury that I have mentioned.

And what position do hon. gentlemen take in regard to that? They say: Our principle is that, whatever may be the injury to the public interest, we must have all information about every detail in connection with the operation of these roads, and we refuse to give one moment's consideration to the question whether the obtaining of information may not be infinitely more damaging to the public interest than our doing without it. I ask this House, is that an intelligent position? Is that the position that ought to be taken by a Parliament desirous of really protecting the substantial and material interests of the people of this country? Is it not quite clear that our first duty is to determine to what extent it is essential that information should be obtained? It may be conceded that there is an absolute right to obtain all information, but it is not always wise or prudent to insist upon absolute rights. Certainly no one would speak in high praise of the action of an agent or trustee, who, because he had an absolute right to obtain and to give broadcast to the public certain information, would insist on exercising that right, even though his doing so would ruin the interests of his principal or of the persons for whom his trust existed.

Now, what we are asking this House to do is, first, to submit to the committee the question how we are going to get the necessary information without causing detriment to the public interest. Surely hon. gentlemen should at least be willing to consider that question.

Mr. FIELDING: Will the committee not consider it?

Mr. DOHERTY: We are asking the committee to consider it. The hon. gentleman objects to our asking the committee to consider it.

Mr. FIELDING: No.

Mr. DOHERTY: He says we must say to the committee: We do not want your opinion or your report as to what information ought to be obtained; we send you out to obtain all information that it may occur to you to ask for. The hon. gentleman seems to misapprehend the purpose of the appointment of this committee; it is to enable us to determine a preliminary problem that necessarily must be determined before we proceed to the obtaining of information. Suppose the committee were appointed under the terms of the amendment and proceeded to obtain, as the hon. gentleman boasts they are going to be authorized to do, any and all information concerning the details of the operation of the road; it would be only after they got and made public certain information that we should realize that that information should not have been made public at all. There would be no remedy; after all information had been obtained, we should proceed to judge whether or not certain details should or should not have been made public. I appeal to the common sense of this House: is it not reasonable to endeavour to regulate the action not only of this committee but of its successors, if it should be determined

that it shall continue in existence—is it not the part of simple common sense to determine first what information should be got and what is the best way to go about getting it? Then it will be time enough—

Mr. ARCHAMBAULT: Does my right hon. friend contend that it is necessary to appoint a committee to inquire into what information should be given to the House?

Mr. FIELDING: That is what the motion says.

Mr. DOHERTY: The contention is this —I have tried to make it clear—that it is desirable that we should consider the nature of the information that it is desirable, in the particular situation that arises, should be asked for, obtained, given to the House and made public. Possibly that committee may arrive at the conclusion and may advise that there should be no limit, no restriction. I am not anticipating what their decision will be.

Mr. ARCHAMBAULT: Does my right hon. friend contend that it is necessary to appoint a committee to inquire into what information should be given to the House? Will that committee specify what information should be given to the House?

Mr. DOHERTY: It would be exceedingly useful—

Mr. ARCHAMBAULT: I want a straight answer.

Mr. DOHERTY: It is going to go just as straight as the line that runs from my eye to the hon. gentleman.

Mr. ARCHAMBAULT: Will my right hon. friend make an effort to make the matter clear?

Mr. DOHERTY: I have struggled to make things clear —

Mr. ARCHAMBAULT: We will admit that.

Mr. DOHERTY:—and I have been astonished at the obtuseness which I find myself up against. I however, have rather an inclination to think that the hon. member who is owning to obtuseness, only thinks it useful or, perhaps, a little bit amusing—

Mr. ARCHAMBAULT: No, I am most serious.

Mr. DOHERTY:—to claim a little more obtuseness than he really possesses. To give him a straight answer, when people are faced with these two considerations which the public interest requires them to give thought to, on the one hand the right of Parliament to obtain all the information that is necessary to enable it properly to perform its functions, and, on the other hand, the interest of the people of Canada to be protected against unnecessary and unwise disclosures to the whole public of the business operations of the people of Canada, I think it is useful and the part of wisdom and common-sense to sit down and consider the best methods of reconciling those two things, both of which you want to respect and both of which it is your duty to respect. That being so, I think this committee is a useful method of studying that problem. It is not for me to anticipate what the report of the committee will be. They will be put in a position to ascertain all the circumstances, all the conditions, to obtain information and advice with regard to the question of just how far it is disadvantageous to the carrying on of the businesses of this country that there should be absolute revelation of all the operations, and they will be able to report to this House the opinion, the conclusion to which they have come, in view of what they have so ascertained. The House then will have the benefit of that advice in determining—because ultimately, of course, the report of this committee must come to this House—what in its judgment is the nature of the information that ought to be obtained and to be insisted upon. The Government, in the determination of that question which, the leader of the Opposition (Mr. Mackenzie King) says, should rest entirely with the Government and be dealt with entirely on the Government's responsibility, will have the advantage of the advice of this committee and of the views held by Parliament and expressed as a result of its consideration of the report of this committee.

There is the problem that presents itself, the problem that must be determined, before we start out to obtain indiscriminate information with regard to the carrying on of those business operations. As I have said, I put it to the common-sense of this House whether it is or is not wise that we should examine into the question of what information should be obtained?

What objection there can be to that question being considered, I confess I am at a loss to understand. We are face to face with a simple determination to refuse to recognize the existence of that question at all, to refuse to give it thought, to refuse to consult about it, to refuse to look into it at all, and simply to fall back on the absolute assertion: We have a right to

have every information without regard to the possible effects that I have pointed out, and we propose to appoint a committee to go out and gather in that information, exercising simply, without any control from this House, whatever powers of discrimination it may have itself. The amendment seems to me to be just another means adopted to avoid doing what common sense calls upon us to do, and it is difficult to avoid the conclusion that the inspiration that is behind the moving of that amendment is a desire to conserve and to preserve a grievance of which we may have perpetual iteration in this House. If the hon. gentlemen want information, surely they ought to be willing to consider the best methods of getting it. If the hon. gentlemen do not want information, then it would seem to me they are, by this amendment, adopting the proper course to reach that result,—because by this amendment they persist, in face of the vote of this House that there is discrimination to be made between the information to be obtained and that which should not be obtained, in refusing to recognize that necessary discrimination; and they insist upon maintaining the position that we are to have nothing but the abstract affirmation that we are to have anything that any member of this House chooses to ask for and that we are to authorize this committee to ask for and obtain any information which, in their judgment, they may consider that they are entitled to ask for.

Mr. VIEN: Does my right hon. friend seriously believe that, through the instrumentality of the committee now proposed, any valuable information will be forthcoming to this House?

Mr. DOHERTY: I very seriously believe that, through the instrumentality of this committee, this House has every prospect of obtaining the necessary material to enable it to decide what its attitude should be upon this question of obtaining information with regard to the operation of the Canadian National railways. And when this House has obtained that material, the advice of the committee, it will be able to lay down rules, which, in its judgment—

Mr. VIEN: And to avoid all information.

Mr. DOHERTY: Of course, the hon. gentleman is entitled to his opinion upon the subject, and he will have an opportunity of exposing it when I get through.

[Mr. Doherty.]

But it strikes me as extraordinary that it should be suggested that consideration of the best way to obtain information is a means to avoid getting any information at all.

Mr. VIEN: Surely.

Mr. DOHERTY: The logic of that conclusion I have difficulty in perceiving. It seems to me that there is perhaps a misapprehension. There are two things that require to be done, and one requires to be done, it seems to me, before the other. The first one is to determine what is sought to be determined by the report, or, at all events, upon the report or by the advice of this committee; that is to say, the problem of how we are to proceed with regard to obtaining information respecting this public service. The second one will be, when the first problem is solved, to proceed to obtain that information in accordance with the conclusion reached upon the first question. The present motion of the right hon. the Prime Minister is for a committee to enable us to solve the first problem, and I am confident that this House will see the wisdom of our reaching a solution of that problem as a preliminary—

Mr. VIEN: What objection is there to giving to the committee itself the power to obtain the information that it is suggested the committee should have? Why not let the committee obtain the information and submit it to the House?

Mr. DOHERTY: That takes away from this House any power to control the determination of the question what information ought to be obtained. The House would be abdicating entirely its own judgment. This committee is not going to pronounce final decisions. It is going to make a report to this House to enable this House to decide; and it does seem to me that what my hon. friend is asking is that this House abdicate any exercise of judgment on its own part as to what information should or should not be obtained, and put absolutely in the hands of the committee the determination of that question, with the possible result that they may determine it in a manner to which this House would not assent, and may, in virtue of that determination of their own, proceed to obtain and give to the public information which it might be perfectly manifest, and which the judgment of this House might be, should never have been given to the public.

This House, after all, should retain the control of the ultimate determination of

this preliminary question as to what information should be obtained, and the best method of obtaining it. There will be nothing lost by our protecting ourselves in the exercise of that right, and hon. members who will not be on that committee will have the opportunity of passing in review the decision of the committee—if one may call it a decision, or at all events, the conclusion to which the committee will have come—and possibly acting upon it, possibly modifying it, or possibly coming to the conclusion that there is error with regard to it. This House will then have acted the part of a wise man, that is to say, will have considered the preliminary problem first, and before it starts out to secure the information, either directly or through the committee, will have formed an intelligent judgment on which it can base an intelligent rule as to how it is to be guided in the obtaining of that information, the extent to which it should go, and the best methods in the public interest to procure that which is necessary; and preserve from publicity, on the other hand, anything which it is in the public interest should be withheld from publicity.

Mr. CLARK (Red Deer): May I put a question to my right hon. friend? If, as he seems to contemplate, the committee should be restricted in its own search for information, how can it give to the House an opinion of any value on information which it does not itself possess?

Mr. DOHERTY: The committee is not restricted in the slightest degree with regard to the obtaining of information useful for the purpose of reporting on the questions that are submitted to it. It may have whatever information in its judgment be deemed necessary to enable it to report to this House as to the nature of the information, generally speaking, that should be given, and the best method of obtaining it, and as to the other matters that are submitted to it, including the report of the Board of Directors and all matters that come up in connection with it. They are not restricted in any way.

Mr. VIEN: That is without the scope of the reference. The reference does not give to the committee the power to collect information, but only to report on what information should be supplied by the Government to the House.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order. I must remind hon. members that the House is not in committee.

Mr. DOHERTY: There are four distinct purposes for which this committee is constituted, and upon which it is asked to report. The motion after enumerating those things upon which the committee is to report, says:

> —and that for the above purposes and for such other purposes as the Committee deem in the public interest there be referred to said Committee the Annual Report of the Board of Directors and that the said Committee have power to examine witnesses under oath, to send for papers, persons, and records, and to report from time to time

Where is the restriction upon their obtaining any information whatsoever that can in any way be useful to enable them to attain the purposes for which they are appointed. Surely, you could not get any wider terms. Surely, hon. gentlemen who are making these objections have not looked closely into the terms of the motion.

Mr. FRANK S. CAHILL (Pontiac): Mr. Speaker, this is a question on which the Government and the Opposition would naturally find themselves divided. The Government in seeking to restrict the powers of the committee are asking just what you would expect them to ask. They act on the principle: Mistrust the people and give them as little information as possible. We, on the other hand, believe in this principle: Trust the people and give them the fullest possible information. It goes without saying that Parliament itself must finally be responsible for the conduct of the Government railways. it is impossible to get away from that fact. To this committee which the Prime Minister is proposing to-day we are asked to delegate work that should have been undertaken by the Government itself more than four years ago, when they took over the railway system. At that time the Government should have determined on a policy as to the management of the railway. I say that the Government are going beyond their powers when they say that to give certain information would not be in the public interest and therefore they withold it. It is taking away from the people's representatives their rights, and that cannot be permitted, and will not be permitted by the people when they have an opportunity to pronounce their verdict. Either Parliament must control or there is irresponsible control; it must be one or the other,—if Parliament does not control, there is no control. We must therefore get back to Parliamentary control. Then the question arises, what information should be given to Parliament? In former days the Govern-

ment gave practically all information as to expenditure and the management of the roads under their control, but when the Act was passed incorporating the Canadian National Railways, the Government took out of the control of Parliament certain expenditures which they said would not be submitted to the Auditor General's Department. Since that practice has been in vogue, we find that the management have been losing enormous sums of money. At that time we objected to that principle. We maintained that every expenditure should be audited by the Auditor Generals Department but the Government took the opposite view, and since then they have not given the information that the people of this country are entitled to. As a consequence rightly or wrongly, the people of this country have lost confidence, not only in the Government, but in the management of the railways. They feel that there must be something wrong when the deficits run up to such huge proportions.

The Minister of Finance said this afternoon that we had not been asking questions. Well, one of the reasons why we have not been doing so this session is the fact that the Government intimated that they were going to find some means of giving the House information. The resolution of the senior member for Halifax (Mr. Maclean) was on the Order Paper for some time, and until it was disposed of we felt that we should give the Government an opportunity to state their case and tell us what they purposed doing on the question of information. Now they come with the proposal to shift the responsibility from their own shoulders and place it on a committee which shall be restricted in its operations. Well, we ask in turn that the committee have the fullest powers to go into everything connected with the railway management and control. The argument advanced by members of the Government against this proposal has been that they do not want to give away the secrets of management. Let me tell my hon. friends that the people of this country are not looking for secrets to failure they are looking for secrets to success. If any secrets concerning the failure of the railway management are vouchsafed, I am quite satisfied that they will not be adopted by any railway operated under private management.

Mr. Speaker, I have no hesitation in saying that I would not for a moment support the Government in any way if I had the assurance that they were going to the country within a few months. But they have given us no such assurance; on the contrary, they have quite plainly signified their intention to hold on until the expiration of their term, which means another two years. During that time they will have squandered another $300,000,000 of the people's money on these railways. With that possibility facing us I think it is the duty of every citizen of Canada to try to find a solution for this serious problem; not that I want to assist the Government particularly, but because I am anxious to do what I can to help the people of Canada. We ought to have a committee with the fullest possible powers to send not only for railway experts but for people from the business world whose opinions and advice might be of assistance. The committee, I think, should be given power to send for any person whom they might desire to consult; if they are restricted in any way we cannot hope for any results.

Every one will agree that the Government are still trying to deceive the people, and I believe they have no intention of attempting to solve the problem. It is ridiculous to say that the committee should not cross-examine the management and ask them questions relating to any phase of the railway situation. The management must come and ask for money, and the Government should want some reason and some explanation as to how that money is to be spent. If the management refuse to answer that question, then the Government should refuse to give the money; for the people have taken the stand that no moneys should be spent on the railways except under parliamentary control. The Minister of Finance said that we had not asked for the report of the Railway Board. I do not think the report has been tabled this year. Am I right?

Hon. Mr. REID: I laid on the table of the House the annual report of the Minister of Railways, which contains the annual report of the board up to December, 1919. The other report, up to December 31, 1920, has not yet been laid on the Table because it takes some months to get all the figures together. It will be tabled in the course of a few days.

Mr. CAHILL: The Minister of Finance (Sir Henry Drayton) then, was wrong if, according to the Minister of Railways (Mr. Reid), the report has not yet been laid on the Table.

Hon. Mr. REID: It will be tabled in a week or so.

Mr. CAHILL: But in the meantime we have not had an opportunity of perusing it. Now, the Minister of Finance also said that we did not ask questions last year regarding the management. We attempted then to ask questions on that subject, but the invariable answer of the Minister of Railways was that it was not in the public interest. He would not give us any answers; he always gave the stock reply, "it is not in the public interest." Now they propose to appoint a committee the majority of whom will be supporters of the Government, and the result will be that any information will be blocked. It is the duty of the Opposition to ask for information, as it is the duty of the Government to give that information or take the responsibility for refusing it. The Government intimated that they would like assistance in this matter. Well, we are willing to lend them assistance if they will lay their cards on the table, play square, and give us a committee that will have full authority to investigate the very matters in regard to which the minister asks for advice. If they do not do that, I cannot see how they can ask the Opposition to offer suggestions or give assistance to help them out of the hole in which they find themselves.

Hon. J. D. REID (Minister of Railways): I shall say just a few words on this question. At the outset, I must say that the Government have made an honest attempt to keep the operation of the railways out of politics, but this amendment, to my mind, would have no other effect than to put the whole subject back again into that sphere.

Mr. VIEN: In what way?

Hon. Mr. REID: Well, it is an omnibus resolution intended to embarrass the administration of the railways and to throw the whole thing back into politics. The Government are now submitting a resolution, and if hon. gentlemen desire to help the situation, let them consider the different matters contained in that resolution, and after full investigation of them the committee can come back, if they so desire, and ask for powers to go further.

Mr. MURPHY: Does the minister say that the Government will enlarge the scope of the subject to be submitted to the committee?

Hon. Mr. REID: I say that the committee can bring in their report to the House and ask for authority to deal with further questions if they want to. That has been done many times.

Mr. MURPHY: And voted down.

Hon. Mr. REID: It has been done several times, and no one knows it better than the hon. member himself. Now, the leader of the Opposition, in my opinion, has endeavoured to convey to the public the impression that the Government have been refusing to answer almost every question that has been asked since they undertook the control of the railways. But if hon. members will be good enough to consult Hansard they will discover that during the last two or three years, or since the railways were taken over, the only questions in regard to which information has been withheld are those in connection with which it has been felt that disclosure of the facts would not be in the interests of the operation of the roads, and therefore of the public. If this committee is appointed I am satisfied that the management will be able to explain the reasons why that information should not be given. Why not let them go to the committee and explain just why it is not in the public interest to answer those particular questions. After hearing their views it will then be for the committee to decide whether the information should be given or not. I am satisfied that if the management appeared before that committee and expressed their views in regard to many questions that are put on the Order Paper, even the interrogators themselves would admit that those questions were not fair, bearing in mind the effect and disclosures sought would have on the proper and efficient operation of the system, and therefore were not in the public interest. That is one reason why I am most anxious to have this committee appointed—in order to demonstrate to the committee itself, as well as to the public, that we are justified in taking the position that there are questions which should not be answered.

There is another impression that the remarks of the leader of the Opposition would be likely to create in the minds of some people. It is, that since these railways have come under the control of the Government no information whatever has been given to Parliament with respect to their operation. That impression is an erroneous one because the annual report of the Department of Railways brought down last year, as well as the annual report tabled this year gives details of the operations not only of the system as a whole, but also of each particular branch of it.

The total earnings and the total expenditures are set out in that report as well as many other details. As regards the Intercolonial it is as complete a report of the operations and expenditures, under the respective heads, as was ever given. The Auditor General's Report gives very full details of the operation of the Intercolonial system. Hon. gentlemen will find there exact details of the amount paid to every single individual employed on it. His name appears there, the amount paid to him, and what it was for. But several volumes equally large would be required to give all the details of the expenditures on a system of railway comprising 23,000 miles. It may be that the committee will decide that that should be done. If they come to that conclusion they can report to Parliament and their recommendation can be carried out. But what I had in mind was this: A blue book is laid on the table, just the same as in the case of the report of the Department of Railways, setting forth the details of the operations of the whole Government Railway System—the Canadian Northern, the Intercolonial, the Transcontinental, and all the branch lines. If the leader of the Opposition desired any further information he could have asked that this report be referred to one of the committees of the House, and we should then have seen whether any information had been refused by the Government. Now, when the Estimates of my department were under consideration in Committee of the Whole last year I presented all the information that was desired with respect to it—I never refused any information that was asked for. I do not think there is any hon. member but will corroborate that statement.

Mr. CAHILL: What about insurance?

Mr. ARCHAMBAULT: What about coal?

Mr. CAHILL: No, let us take the question of insurance first.

Hon. Mr. REID: My hon. friend apparently does not want the coal question answered, but I would say to the hon. gentleman who put the question, that if he will turn to page 4252, of Hansard of last year, he will see there a detailed statement containing the names of those from whom coal was bought for every part of this system, the number of tons that were purchased, and the price that was paid. Last year an hon. gentleman also wanted information about ties. Well, a reference to page 4251 of the same volume will show that full information was given on that subject also. Let me quote what was then said:

Mr. Cahill: I want to find out who the tenderers are, how the contracts are let and to whom they are let. I want to know the number of ties they bought in 1919 and what they paid for them.

Mr. J. D. Reid: On July 21, 1919, tenders were advertised for our requirement of ties for the whole system. We advertised for 1,000,000 ties to be delivered on the Canadian National lines in British Columbia.

In answer to this advertisement we received tenders from twenty-eight firms, the lowest tenders being:

The answer then goes on to give the lowest tenders that were accepted. Now I ask my hon. friends in all fairness, was there any refusal on that occasion to give the information that was sought?

Mr. FOURNIER: Is there information regarding the number of rails that were taken out of the road-bed of the Transcontinental and where they were sent to?

Hon. Mr. REID: I have not now the information before me, but if my hon. friend would like to have it I will certainly get it for him. I have never refused to answer questions of this kind. Yet hon. gentlemen are trying to create the impression in the public mind that the Government are refusing such information. My hon. friends seek to obtain information on transactions that are going on during the present year, and I contend it is not in the public interest that such information should be given except in the manner that was customary prior to our acceptance of office, and when the Intercolonial was the only railway under Government control. That information, however, was given after the annual report had been made and the transactions for the year had been closed.

5 p.m.

Mr. CAHILL: Now, what about the insurance on the railways?

Hon. Mr. REID: Does the hon. gentleman refer to the insurance being placed at the present time?

Mr. CAHILL: No, last year.

Hon. Mr. REID: I was under the impression that I gave the hon. member that information, but perhaps I am mistaken. At any rate I see no reason why we should not tell my hon. friend what insurance there is and where it is placed. Only the other day I was asked what insurance there is on the hotel in Winnipeg. Without any

hesitation I told the hon. member who asked the question what the amount of the insurance was, and the names of those with whom it has been placed. I also stated that tenders were called for, and if I did not say so then I wish to say now that public tenders were invited for that insurance and we accepted the lowest tender.

Mr. CAHILL: Has the same plan been adopted all over the system?

Hon. Mr. REID: I am informed by the general manager that wherever it can be followed that system is in force on the Canadian National system, not only as regards insurance but with respect to every article purchased.

Mr. CAHILL: When was that system adopted?

Hon. Mr. REID: So far as I know it has always been the system.

Mr. COPP: May I ask when the tenders for insurance were called?

Hon. Mr. REID: I do not wish to appear discourteous to the hon. member, but I really have not that information. I will be very glad to get it.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: I must remind hon. members that the House is not in committee, and that therefore the questions which are now being asked of the hon. minister are not strictly relevant to the discussion before the House. We are discussing the powers to be given to a committee; we are certainly not discussing the administration of the Canadian National railways.

Mr. VIEN: May I say on that point of order, Mr. Speaker, that the minister affirmed that no information was refused to the House? In that respect he was subject to correction.

Hon. Mr. REID: If I made any statements that the hon. member thinks are not correct, of course he can make any reply he wishes. But the statements that I am making now are absolutely correct. Now, another impression that I would get from the speech of the hon. leader of the Opposition is that he would like it to go out to the public that the loss of $49,000,000 last year was, through interference by the Government increased this year to $70,000,000. If the hon. gentleman wishes to do justice to the operation of the Canadian National railways, in the public interest he should have also stated what he knows himself, for he has had it told him in this House and in the press, that some of the causes for this great increase in the deficit were: First, the McAdoo award, which compelled the railways of Canada to further increase the wages of their employees, and that increase being retroactive, the Canadian Government railways, if my memory serves me right, had to pay about $20,000,000 to its employees for the period between the first of May and the first of September,—a period during which there was no possible chance of getting any increased return from traffic, because the increased freight rates took effect only on September 1. Second, there is a very heavy increase in operating costs on account of the greatly enhanced price of fuel; the hon. leader of the Opposition knew this also. Third, during last year the Canadian National railways had to do exactly what the Canadian Pacific railway had to do, that is, increase the expenditure on maintenance, in other words, attend to what is called deferred maintenance; this also the leader of the Opposition knew. We had to expend a very large amount on that account, which, of course, is charged to operation. When those several amounts are taken into account, the reason for the greater deficit is obvious, and but for these additional expenditures the loss in operation would not have been as much this year as for the previous year's operation.

Another impression needs to be corrected. One would think that the taking over of the operation of the Canadian Northern railway means that that railway is losing $70,000,000. But the leader of the Opposition knows that $20,000,000 of that loss is caused by the operation of the Grand Trunk Pacific, and that $7,000,000, for the reason I have given here, is caused by the operation of the Transcontinental; or a total of $27,000,000 of that loss is due to the policy of the leader of the Opposition and his party when they were in power.

Mr. VIEN: Mr. Speaker, may I rise to a point of order in view of the ruling which was given at the beginning of this discussion? I have no objection at all to the minister continuing along that line, but it must be understood that we will be at liberty to follow him. At the very opening of the debate the Speaker ruled that the question of the policy and the history of the national railways, and particularly the question of responsibility for the present conditions, were not to be discussed. The minister is now discussing them. If he

desires to do that, well and good, but I think it should be clearly understood that we are to be allowed to follow him along that line.

Hon. Mr. REID: Mr. Speaker, I will promise the hon. member not to trespass any further along that line.

Mr. VIEN: But, Sir, I want it to be clearly ruled that we will be authorized to follow the minister to the same extent so far as we are concerned.

Hon. Mr. REID: Mr. Speaker, I am extremely anxious to have this committee appointed and, if it is necessary, to bring before it every member of the management who understands the railway situation, in the hope that we may find out from them if it is possible to operate our railways in any better way. I am anxious to let this House know, by the management explaining to the committee, why it is not in the interests of our national railway system, and, therefore, of the public, that some of the information—and it is only of very limited amount—should be given. I think that the statements about information not being furnished are hardly fair to the management or in the interests of the operation of this system. In every case I have endeavoured to give all the information that any hon. member has requested, unless the management honestly felt that it would not be in the public interest to give it. When we have this committee functioning, I am sure hon. members who are now criticising the management, as well as the Government, for not giving certain information will change their minds, and, instead of creating an impression throughout the country that the operation of the road is not being carried on in the public interest, they will join with us in trying to make it a success. With that co-operation, I am satisfied, the Canadian Northern Railway system, with all its subsidiary companies, will in a few years prove one of the greatest assets we have not only in the development of this country but in bringing down freight rates to the lowest possible point.

Hon. RODOLPHE LEMIEUX (Maisonneuve—Gaspé): Mr. Speaker, I do not intend to delay this discussion. I am in favour of the amendment moved by my hon. friend the leader of the Opposition. I do not understand all this wrangle about the motion in itself and the amendment which has been offered. But it is easy to understand why, under such circumstances, the parliamentary institutions of Canada are falling into disrepute. Facing as we do a problem of such appalling magnitude, it seems to me, Sir, that all parties should unite with a view to seeing that light is freely given to the taxpayers of Canada on this vexed question.

I repeat that I do not understand this wrangle. Here is a motion moved by the right hon. Prime Minister (Mr. Meighen), a motion granting a committee. It is rather involved and restricted in its terms. I hear the hon. member for Shelburne and Queen's (Mr. Fielding) say: I am quite ready to accept the motion, provided the suggestion of the hon. leader of the Opposition is also accepted. It seems to me, Mr. Speaker, that the two motions which are before you are complete in themselves, so to speak. The Prime Minister grants a special committee to investigate railway matters but restricts its powers, and the leader of the Opposition, by his motion, offers to widen the scope of the inquiry. I object to the action of Parliament being restricted in any way in connection with this proposed investigation. No one, so far has averred that there is anything sinister behind it. For my part, I know the general manager and president of the Canadian National Railways, and speaking with a sense of at least some responsibility I have nothing to reproach Mr. Hanna. I will go further and say that under the circumstances under which he was handed the management of our railway system, he was perhaps the only man available. I do not see, therefore, what there is to fear from the investigation. I do not like the style adopted by the right hon. Prime Minister in his motion. It is much too involved; and the scope of the investigation too much restricted. Why all this mystery, Mr. Speaker? What the people expect is a full investigation in order that we may know how we can get out of the terrible muddle in which we find ourselves. I agree, therefore, with the attitude taken this afternoon by the hon. member for Shelburne and Queen's; I support the principle of the motion of the Prime Minister, but the powers of the committee are not wide enough, and I accept the principle involved in the amendment, that of affording to Parliament all facilities necessary to a full inquiry.

Mr. Speaker, the House must face the issue squarely. The time has gone by when parties could play politics with such a grave situation; for my part, I do not intend to do so. The Minister of Railways (Mr. Reid) had to confess the other day that he was face to face with a deficit of $70,000,000 in respect of the government-owned railways,

and one of the best informed heads of his department came out in the press next day stating that the real deficit is $138,000,000. This is a serious gap, and how can we know who speaks the truth in the matter and who does not? We have, as I said the other day, become so accustomed to dealing in millions and even billions during recent years that we have lost all sense of proportion. But the people are beginning to feel the pinch, and they are clamouring for a halt in that carnival of expenditure. It is useless for any hon. member on either side to re-open old sores. It is of no avail to use the old argument: You are another. Having sat in the House for twenty-five years, I am, with others, partly responsible for the situation in which the country finds itself to-day as regards the railway question, and I do not wish to shirk my responsibility. If I have erred, Mr. Speaker, I wish to improve matters. But in order to improve matters, we must find a solution—How shall we solve the problem if not by the experience and the wisdom of those experts who will be heard before the committee? But let us vest in that committee the necessary authority to examine thoroughly the books, the correspondence, the orders and the management generally of the whole system. Is that a fair attitude to take? I think it is.

I say further that Parliament must not only save the railway system of Canada; it must above all save the credit of the nation—for the national credit is involved in the solution of this problem. Why should not the Prime Minister, with all his ability and his undoubted courage—why should he not, as they say in England, "take the bull by the horns" and give this committee the fullest powers? What can we learn with such restricted powers as are outlined in this motion? If he maintains the attitude which he has taken, what will be the result of the investigation? A committee will be appointed composed of members from both sides of the House, and with the restriction of the scope of the inquiry there will be a lack of unanimity. The committee will submit a minority as well as a majority report. This will not be because either side refuse to shed light upon the subject, but because they will be prevented by the very wording of the motion itself from inquiring fully into the administration of the railway system. Mr. Speaker, it is imperative that we should secure a unanimous report from that committee. It should be composed of the best men on both sides of the House. I exclude myself at once; I have but limited knowledge on railway matters. But the committee should be selected from the most experienced men in the ranks of the three parties, men who know and who can speak with authority. I am not afraid to trust hon. members on both sides if you give them the necessary power to probe this whole situation.

Just now, the situation is very much embroiled. You do not meet two men on the street, but they will at once ask you: "What are you going to do with the railway problem and where is Canada drifting?" You have only to throw up your hands, to shrug your shoulders; you do not know what will be or what can be done. My right hon. friend has accepted the idea propounded in this House by the senior hon. member for Halifax (Mr. Maclean), and he has granted at last a committee with a view to disentangle the problem. Why not do at once the right thing? Why not give that committee all the powers which Parliament has undoubtedly the right to grant? Parliament, we all know, is defined by the authorities as being the great inquest of the nation. I trust the wisdom, the patriotism of members on both sides of the House; I trust their good judgment, their loyalty to Canada, and I say that to give that committee the widest powers would not imperil the railway situation, as my right hon. friend seems to fear it would.

As I read to-day press reports from the other side, I hang my head in shame. When I see the bondholders of the Grand Trunk congregating at the various banking institutions in London, clamouring for their dividends and the rumour being spread throughtout Great Britain that Canada will not pay, I say that I hang my head in shame. This is the first time in the history of Canada that it is said, with some semblance of authority, that Canada does not meet her obligations. Do you not believe, Sir, that if the amendment of the leader of the Opposition is voted down if that committee is not given the widest powers, people in England, and in the United States will say: "Canada by its Government wishes to dodge the issue; does not face it squarely; there is something so rotten that the public must not know the truth, the whole truth and nothing but the truth." I say again: Give the widest powers to that committee.

Remember, Mr. Speaker, that there is no sentiment in business, and that capital is easily frightened. Remember that if in 1849, the captains of industry in Canada

were shaken in their faith in their country, it was because they realized that there was no sentiment in business. Let not the faith of the Canadian people be shaken in their institutions, if you wish to maintain this country as it has been maintained in the past. Sir, I am reminded, whilst we are witnessing in this chamber, the wrangle about the scope of the inquiry on the most momentous issue that has ever confronted the Canadian people, of the words of that great French orator at the time of the revolution, when to avoid a financial collapse, the states general were deliberating the urgency of levying a quarter of the national wealth of France: "Bankruptcy is at your door, and you are still deliberating." Far be it from me the thought that bankruptcy is at the door, but we are in a very serious crisis. We are facing the most complex situation that has ever confronted Canada, and when we are asking that the whole matter be probed to the bottom and a way found out of this trouble honourably for the credit of the country and to alleviate the burden of the tax payers we are stopped by a motion, involved, restricted in its terms. This is not the proper way to settle this difficulty. Again, I appeal to my right hon. friend to amend his motion, have it adopted unanimously by the House of Commons, then strike the strongest committee possible, go to work and thus relieve public anxiety.

Hon. T. A. CRERAR (Marquette): Mr. Speaker, the motion moved by the leader of the Government (Mr. Meighen) and the amendment moved by the leader of the Opposition (Mr. Mackenzie King) have, at any rate, this much in common, that they both propose reference to a committee, of matters relating to our Canadian National Railways and our Canadian Government Merchant Marine. In the discussion that took place in this House a few days ago upon a motion moved by the leader of the Opposition, I took the ground that the floor of Parliament was not the place to receive answers to questions relating to every detail of the administation of our national railways or merchant marine, nor was it the place in which to move for Orders for Returns in regard to any particular phase of the business or administration of those enterprises. At that time, I took the position that, in my judgment, the whole matter should be referred to a committee with power to make to this Parliament such recommendations as it saw fit. The reasons for that position to some degree at any rate, I think I made clear at that time. If we are to have brought down in this House returns that will bring up discussions, going into every aspect of detail of the administration of those great enterprises to which this country is committed, I can see no possibility of securing efficient or successful management, for this reason, if for no other, that no self-respecting man, who has the capacity properly and adequately to manage those enterprises, will sit down under the cross-fire of debate in this House where, for political reasons, in the expectation possibly of political gain by either side of this House, his administration may be challenged, may be criticized, and he has not the power, nor the opportunity to make explanation or defence. No self-respecting management will submit to that, and consequently, the first essential, if we are to secure the efficiency in management which those enterprises require, is that we free the management from that possibility. But when I took that position, I took also the position that the matter should be referred to a committee and the opportunity given for full inquiry.

If I may refer again to what I was saying a moment ago, discussion of these details across the floor of this House will lead in itself to no useful purpose, nor give any effective aid to the solution of this question. Take the Canadian Pacific Railway, the best managed road for its size in the world, at the present time,—I think that claim can be made without fear of successful contradiction. But if you place the management of the Canadian Pacific Railway in the position that every detail of its business, every contract entered into, every purchase made, every station-house built, and the case of every man dismissed on the system, can be reviewed in Parliament, the efficiency that now exists in that corporation would not last for twenty-four hours. The railway would go down. Consequently, we must clear ourselves from this disability in the consideration of this great question. Now at the time I took the position I did, on the occasion of the resolution introduced by the leader of the Opposition, my hon. friend asked me a very definite question. He said:

Mr. Mackenzie King: The hon. gentleman has intimated to the House that he is favourable to the resolution standing in the name of my hon. friend from Halifax (Mr. Maclean) which is that these matters might be referred to a select committee. Is it my hon. friend's understanding in that connection that such a committee shall have the right to ask any ques-

tions with respect to these railways that may be thought in the public interest and have it answered?

Mr. Crerar: If I am in order in answering the question, Mr. Speaker, I would say that I certainly think so.

Having taken that position, I find myself now faced with the question of deciding between the motion moved by the leader of the Government, and the amendment moved by the leader of the Opposition. The motion moved by the leader of the Government undoubtedly restricts the inquiry in some degree. I think that is clear. The difference between the motion and the amendment moved by my hon. friend the leader of the Opposition lies in this, that the amendment of the leader of the Opposition embraces a wider scope of inquiry than the reference in the motion moved by the leader of the Government. Now, it does seem to me that when this matter is referred to the committee, it would be wise to give the committe power to inquire into any phase or aspect of the business that in its judgment may be deemed advisable, and I understand that this is the purpose of the amendment moved by my hon. friend the leader of the Opposition. Believing that, I shall support the amendment. In all the discussions we have had on the railways in this House, we have had as yet very little in the nature of constructive suggestions as to how we shall overcome the difficulties that face us in reference to this business of railways and shipping. My hon. friend from St. Hyacinthe (Mr. Gauthier) who spoke the other evening, did in my opinion offer a few constructive suggestions. I would like to see this committee when it gets to work, consider this question solely from the point of view of the national interest. Let us, if we can, drop all partisan spirit in connection with this matter. The criticism I have to offer, if I may offer it here now to my hon. friend the leader of the Opposition, is this, that while he has criticised a great deal so far, he has offered no constructive suggestions as to how this serious problem can be solved. If I may take the liberty of saying so, my hon. friend the leader of the Opposition runs some danger of leaving the impression on the country that he is more concerned with making political capital out of this problem than he is with finding a solution for it. I do hope, Sir, that when the committee come to consider this matter, they will approach it free from any spirit of that kind.

There are a great many matters that have to be settled in connection with the national railways. I shall not at this moment, because I do not think I should be strictly in Order to do so, attempt to discuss them, but when I face this fact, that last year our national railways lost $49,000,000, that this year the taxpayers of Canada are called upon to put up $70,000,000 to make good the fixed charges and operating deficit on the national roads, when I contemplate, as was indeed mentioned in this House the other evening that the loss for the coming year may be even greater, I am impressed with the gravity of the situation. To my mind the solution of this railway problem constitutes one of the greatest problems that this country has been called upon to solve in the last fifty years, and it cannot be solved unless it is approached by all with the single-minded purpose of finding the best solution of it. It must be approached as a business proposition. We are called upon to pay in Federal taxes in this country $582,000,000, for that is the amount the Government have placed in the Estimates now before Parliament, and there are still the Supplementary Estimates to be brought down; I venture to say that if the total burden of taxation on the Canadian people could be estimated—I have made no close estimate of it, because I have not had the facilities for doing so—I think it would be found that for federal, provincial, municipal, and school purposes the Canadian people are to-day paying little less than $1,000,000,000 a year. On top of that, we have annually to send out of this country from $225,000,000 to $250,000,000 for interest on investments in Canada from abroad. When we take all these facts into consideration, we cannot escape the gravity of the situation. I do hope that the members who compose this committee, when they get to work, will sit down with the single-minded purpose of finding the best possible solution for this question. And if they do, they can find it. There is no question so difficult that it cannot be solved, but this question can only be solved if we approach it with the high purpose and in the spirit which I am convinced the Canadian people are demanding of this Parliament to-day.

Right hon. Sir ROBERT BORDEN (King's, N.S.): Mr. Speaker, I regard this motion which has been proposed by the Prime Minister as a very important one, but not altogether for the reasons which have been advanced by some hon. members who have addressed the House. There has

been from time to time, especially during the present session, the question raised as to the amount and character of information with respect to the operation and management of the Canadian National system of railways that ought to be afforded to the House of Commons in the public interest. I think every hon. gentleman who has addressed the House has realized that this is a question of very considerable concern not only to this Parliament but to the people of this country. The hon. member (Mr. Crerar) who has just addressed the House spoke in that sense the other day, and again this afternoon. I entirely agreed with the view which he expressed on both occasions, that if you are to drag the details of management of this system of railways into the discussions of this Parliament in every conceivable way, or even into the discussions of a committee of this House appointed for this purpose, you would not only place the operation of the system under a very grave handicap, but also find it exceedingly difficult to obtain a man with the requisite ability at the head of the management.

The next thing I have to say as to the position taken by my hon. friend the member for Marquette (Mr. Crerar) is this: He apparently is of the opinion that you ought to be able to do immediately in committee what, according to his own judgment, it would not be proper to do in the House of Commons. But I should like to remind him that if you once make these matters the property of a committee of this House you make them at once the property of the House itself, and every question which in his judgment ought not to be raised in this House would naturally come before the House, for the reason that it would have been raised and investigated by the committee. Therefore, I am disposed to think, with all respect, that the position which he took the other day in the House was the correct one, although not altogether consistent with the position he has taken to-day.

I regard this committee as of the highest possible importance. It is in the first place to define a principle which will be for the guidance not only of this Parliament but perhaps of other parliaments in the years to come. It is to define a principle according to which the Government of the day will be relieved from the invidious position of saying that this information may be accorded because it is in the public interest but that some other information shall not be accorded because it is not in that interest. I am sure my right hon. friend the Prime Minister (Mr. Meighen) made it clear, both the other day and to-day, that he does not regard it as right or proper that the Government of this country should be the sole judge in that respect; and I certainly understood, when this motion was proposed the other day, and further, when it was moved this afternoon, that the purpose of the committee was not in the first place to make an investigation, but was, first of all, to define a principle, and thereafter the committee would proceed to make its investigation according to the principle so stated and fixed. It seems to me that the public interest would be perfectly and absolutely guarded if that were carried out, and it can certainly be carried out under the resolution as proposed by the right hon. the Prime Minister. But for the moment I am at a loss to see how it could be carried out if the House were to adopt the amendment moved by the leader of the Opposition (Mr. Mackenzie King). That amendment is based upon a principle, stated very frankly by the hon. member for Shelburne and Queen's (Mr. Fielding), that every item and every detail with regard to the operation of the Canadian National system of railways shall be brought up, and if necessary taken up in the House.

Mr. FIELDING: Will the right hon. gentleman permit me to interrupt him? I did not state that they should necessarily be brought up, or taken up in the House. I pointed out that in respect of other departments we did not bring such matters up unless some emergency arose.

Mr. McMASTER: They "may" be brought up.

Mr. FIELDING: Certainly they may be brought up.

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: "May" be?

Mr. FIELDING: Yes.

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: I suppose it is hardly worth while to confer upon a committee a power which it is not intended that that committee shall exercise. If we are to give power to the committee, our action to that end is surely in vain if the committee is not to exercise that power. It is intended that the committee shall exercise the power given it, and, moreover, it would be its duty so to do. I therefore venture to think that the proposal presented to the House by the Prime Minister is along right and sane lines, namely, to confer upon the committee, in the first instance, the

power and duty to establish a principle as to the information which may properly be brought down in the public interest, and then, having dealt with that question, to come to the House if need be for such further powers as will ensure that principle being carried into effect. So far as I am concerned, I propose to support the resolution which has been moved by the Prime Minister and to vote against the amendment proposed by my hon. friend the leader of the Opposition, for the reason that the investigation ought not to precede the definition of the extent to which the committee shall go, but that the definition should first be made and then the investigation proceeded with along the line so fixed.

I should like to add one word further. There are many aspersions cast in these days upon the principle of national ownership, and very many gloomy forebodings as to what the future of the Canadian National system of railways will be. The efficient management of the Canadian National Railways will be a test of Canadian democracy, and I have a very confident hope that the spirit and intent of the Canadian democracy will make that management efficient. At the present time it is beyond question that we have a greater railway mileage in this country than our population can very well sustain. We embarked upon a project of three transcontinental railways with a small population—I think the United States had a population of forty millions before they embarked on the project of a second transcontinental line. We have not too great mileage for our area, although it is out of proportion to our population. But is there any hon. gentleman in this House, who has given attentive consideration to the question and who will not reach the conclusion that when our population doubles, when we have eighteen millions of people instead of nine millions, the Canadian National system of railways, if operated intelligently and efficiently, and free from partisan interference in the meantime, will be a great national asset in the years to come? I have no more doubt about that than I have of my own existence, and I hope—in this I echo the words of my hon. friend the member for Marquette—that both sides of the House, all parties in the House, will join in a sincere and earnest effort to give to that great system of railways the efficient, honest and unbiased administration that will make it a national asset of enormous value in the years to come.

At Six o'clock the House took recess.

After Recess

The House resumed at Eight o'clock.

Mr. THOMAS VIEN (Lotbiniere): Mr. Speaker, when introducing his statement on the financial condition of our railways for the operating year ending 1920 the hon. Minister of Railways (Mr. Reid) invited suggestions and co-operation from both sides of the House as to the best methods of extricating the system from the difficulties into which it had become involved. But in order to come to his assistance and to render him the help of which he stands so much in need, we require the information which we have sought to obtain by the many questions we have placed on the Order Paper. To some of these questions answers have been forthcoming, but as to the balance we have been refused any information. We have also made other attempts to obtain particulars. A resolution was introduced by the hon. leader of the Opposition (Mr. Mackenzie King) to the effect that documents and letters should be produced and witnesses summoned to inform the House in relation to our national railways. Later on the senior member for Halifax (Mr. Maclean) introduced a resolution to appoint a committee with full powers to summon witnesses and collect all necessary data. The Government prevailed on the hon. member to withdraw his motion and promised themselves to introduce a resolution for the creation of such a committee as that suggested by him. But, Sir, the resolution which is now the subject matter of this discussion will not fulfil the purpose that the hon. gentleman had in view. Far from giving to the House the required information, this resolution is one of those numerous side-tracking devices of the hon. Minister of Railways to dodge the issue and prevent the information sought from being laid before the House.

We have been accused this afternoon of introducing party politics into this matter. I think, Sir, that no accusation was less deserved by the Opposition. I do not believe there is a single hon. member, and surely not one on this side of the House, who is not desirous of treating this matter on broad national lines with a view to finding the best methods of getting the country out of this serious difficulty. I do not believe there is a single member on this side of the House who is not sincerely anxious to help the Government, and who would not be glad to-day to be able to congratulate

the hon. minister on a profitable operation of the road during the past year. But the financial report presented by him is appalling. It shows that we are face to face with a deficit of at least $70,000,000, without taking into account $75,000,00 of bonds issued for the renewal of the rolling stock; and if we are to accept the statements of some of the employees the deficit is really $120,000,000 or $130,000,000. To any lover of his country this distressing situation immediately removes the question from the sphere of party politics. It can be treated only in the light of our national interests. And notwithstanding the taunts that the Opposition has been playing a party game on this great question, I am going to deal with it purely and simply in the light of our national interests.

To my mind, Sir, the crux of the whole question is not whether we shall derive any political gain by discussing it, but whether we can ascertain the best methods of helping the Government to get out of the difficulties in which they have become involved. To help the Government what must we have? We must have full information; the House must be put in possession of all the facts. How can we judge the question otherwise? We sit to-day as a tribunal. We are the representatives of the electors of this country, who are the shareholders of our national railways, and the Minister of Railways, representing in this House the management of the system, has laid before us a financial statement which discloses a tremendous deficit.

Comparisons are made between the national railways and the Canadian Pacific Railway. My hon. friends opposite say that they will not give us any fuller details than the Canadian Pacific Railway management would be willing to give to their shareholders. Sir, the position of the directorate of a company which comes before its shareholders with such a statement as that presented by the Minister of Railways is quite different from that of the directorate of the Canadian Pacific Railway, which has presented to its shareholders a financial statement showing a substantial surplus on the year's operations, the result of sound and progressive management. Were the minister in a position to lay before us a financial statement similar to that of the Canadian Pacific Railway Company, the House and the people might congratulate him and rest assured that the administration of the railways was of a satisfactory character. But the conditions are very different. I do not believe that the shareholders of the Canadian Pacific would be satisfied with the manner in which that road was managed if the directorate laid before them a financial statement similar to that submitted by the Minister of Railways. I think they would require some information; I think they would press the directorate for fuller details than those which have been submitted to us. But when the Government refused to the House the other day the information of which it was in need, public sentiment was aroused; from one end of the country to the other newspapers friendly to the Government took up the question and intimated that such a condition should not prevail; that the Government should lay before the people, through the House of Commons, all information necessary to enable the legislators to find a remedy for the great evil which existed.

The right hon. gentleman has felt the pulse of public opinion. He says to-day: I am desirous that all information that is required shall be laid on the Table, but there is some information which we cannot give, which it would be against the national interest to make public; therefore we will appoint a committee and instruct it to make inquiries as to what information should be made available to the House.

This committee will not be instructed to call witnesses in respect to the management of the railway. The Minister of Justice, answering that point, says that they will. Well, paragraph 4 of the resolution says that the committee shall have the right to examine witnesses under oath, to send for persons, papers and records and to report from time to time. Sir, for an hon. gentleman who was several years on the bench and who is to-day Minister of Justice of Canada, I think his legal interpretation of the resolution is not to be commended. I am sure that the right hon. gentleman did not read the resolution aright. I am sure that he did not deliberately attempt to lead the House into error. But he did make an error. The reference as it reads on the Order Paper does not assign to the committee the duty of investigating the management of the Canadian National railways; they will be entitled to summon witnesses and call for papers, but only on such questions as may involve the determination of what information concerning the Canadian National railways and shipping should be furnished to the House. It is quite clear that the committee will not investigate the management of the Canadian National railways. It will simply report to the House what informa-

tion the House should seek, and as has been suggested by one of the ministers, if the actual information is to be obtained by the committee, a further step will have to be taken to that end by the grant of further powers. The method adopted by the Government is the surest method of avoiding what they want to avoid, the laying before Parliament of any information whatever. The committee will sit from time to time. Their investigation may be quite protracted. After they have sat for months; after the Government have passed all their Estimates and have advanced their legislation to a sufficient degree, the committee will lay on the Table a report advising the House to seek such and such information. Then a full discussion will take place in the House as to what further reference should be made to that committee, and after another protracted discussion the committee will be instructed to summon witnesses and obtain further information—but by that time prorogation will be at hand. I am afraid, therefore, that the information which we now require to enable us to form a sound judgment upon the question before the House will not be forthcoming during the present session. Sir, if the Government are absolutely sincere in their purpose they should not hesitate to accept the proposal of the leader of the Opposition. If they really want to lay the required information before the House during this session, now is the time to refer the matter to the proposed committee and to give them such powers as will enable them to collect the information. Under the method adopted by the Government, however, such a course will be impossible.

In discussing the resolution this afternoon, two words fell from the lips of the Minister of Finance (Sir Henry Drayton) which made clearer the real purpose underlying the resolution now before the House. He said: "Information was sought and we refused it; we take fully responsibility for doing so." But mark his following words. "But not to appear arbitrary we now propose this committee." What did the Minister of Railways (Mr. Reid) say? He said: "Before this committee we will bring the management who will say why the information should not be given." You have there in two words the whole principle underlying the policy of the Government in presenting that resolution. The Minister of Finance says: "We refuse the information; we take the responsibility of that refusal; but to save appearances, not to appear arbitrary, we propose a committee to report on what information will be given." Then the Minister of Railways says: "We will bring the management of the Canadian National Railways before the committee to say why the information should not be given." Therefore, the committee, after it has concluded its work, will not be in a position to give such information to the House. Is it not a farce to treat such a serious matter in such a light way? If the committee were armed with full powers, it could judge what information the management should lay before the House. Why not entrust it with that work? As the right hon. member for King's (Sir Robert Borden) said, we now instruct the committee to lay down the principles which will direct the operations of this House in respect of our Canadian National railways. If we can instruct a committee to lay down the principles which will direct our deliberations on such an important matter, why should we not entrust it with the work of collecting this information. This committee would be non-partisan; it would be, I am sure, willing to give to the Government all possible assistance and to collect such information as would enable the House to judge soundly and fairly the big questions which are at present involved. We knew that information was not forthcoming. The Minister of Railways, who is very busy at present—

Hon. Mr. REID: I am listening to every word.

Mr. VIEN: I hope so.

Mr. ARCHAMBAULT: With only one eye open.

Mr. VIEN: Not with both ears anyway.

Hon. Mr. REID: Yes, with both ears, and I have my eyes open at the same time.

Mr. VIEN: The Minister is really a marvel; he says that he can listen to two members at the same time. The minister told the House this afternoon that he had refused no information; that he had given an answer to all questions put. Why then should he object to give to the committee which will be entrusted with the work, whatever information that committee may require? But the minister was not accurate in his statement. There were put on the Order Paper quite a few questions which could not be answered. I put some questions that the minister did not answer, and

I am going to refer to them. But the greatest fault of the minister is not that he did not answer some questions; other questions he answered, but did not answer correctly. Of the two, I do not know which I prefer—his refusal to answer questions or the incorrectness of the answers that he gave. I put on the Order Paper this question by which I was trying to obtain some information as to financial results per division:

1. How many divisional points are there on the Government railways, and what are their names.
2. In each of the said divisional points, during 1919 and 1920, what were gross receipts, the operating costs, and the surplus or deficit?

This was a pertinent question. The Minister of Finance this afternoon complained of the fact that we did not inquire as to the cause of the deficit. My question was in relation thereto; in an endeavour to find out where the deficit came from, I tried to obtain from the minister the results by divisions. In answer he said:

Railway accounting does not provide for earnings being shown for each divisional point.

My information was to the contrary. I went back to my informant, because I had seen financial statements so drawn, and my informant said: "Well, you were wrong in your question; a divisional point is purely and simply the chief place of a division." For instance, Fraserville is the chief place or divisional point of one division. The same is true of Rivière du Loup. Parent is a divisional point, and "the old foxy minister," my informant said, "took advantage of the form of your question, and he did not answer because you asked the financial statement for each divisional point. Put your question otherwise." I did so; I put my question in this way:

1. How many divisions, or operating divisions,—

So that the matter might be quite clear to the minister.

—are there on the Canadian National railways, and what are their names?
2. What was the result of operations for each of the said divisions in 1919 and 1920?

I was not more lucky. The answer was this:

Railway accounting does not provide for receipts, expenses, surplus or deficits being shown by divisions.

The minister is wrong. This is a falsehood. He did not wittingly answer so, but I tell him it is a falsehood. He told me that the accounting was not kept by divisions; I tell him that it is—

[Mr. Vien.]

Hon. Mr. REID: Of course, as the hon. member states, the answer that I gave was that given by the management from the head office. When this committee meets my hon. friend will have the opportunity of getting further information, and I am sure it will be proved to him that my answer was absolutely correct.

Mr. VIEN: I shall prove that it was not.

Mr. SPEAKER: Order. I hope the hon. member will bear in mind some remarks from the Chair in the earlier stages of this debate. I am sure he will agree with me that there has been no disposition on the part of the Chair unduly to restrict the discussion. I would ask the hon. member to indicate clearly how the line he is now pursuing has reference to the question before the Chair, because obviously it would be inadvisable, inexpedient, and unprofitable to discuss railway problems in general on a motion for a committee.

Mr. VIEN: I have strictly adhered to your ruling, Sir, as laid down at the opening of the discussion. I am following closely on the footsteps of the hon. minister, who said that he had refused no information, and am trying to make clear to the House that he has refused information in some cases, and in others given wrong information. Moreover, Sir, during the time you were replaced in the Chair, the hon. ministers notwithstanding your ruling, trespassed on many grounds on which we did not intend to enter. I would not like their statements to be spread broadcast throughout the country unchallenged, and what I am now trying to do is to challenge some of the statements of the hon. Minister of Railways. I shall try, however, to confine myself closely to one or two points.

There was, to my mind, a very serious condition of affairs in connection with the Canadian National railways in the northern part of the provinces of Quebec and Ontario. The condition was this. A number of railway conductors were operating trains in northern Quebec and northern Ontario, running through a country entirely settled with French-speaking people. Most of the passengers on these trains were lumber-jacks, going to and from the camps, and the farming population, most of whom could not speak English. The conductors could not speak French. Moreover, my information was that a considerable number of these conductors were drunk half the time.

Mr. ARCHAMBAULT: In Ontario?

Mr. VIEN: In northern Ontario and northern Quebec. I tried to obtain from the minister the names of these conductors, not to intimate to the House that they were drunkards, but so that our information might be complete and be of some assistance in discussing railway matters. From Quebec westward there are a number of stations which have no resident station agents. The result is that the passengers cannot purchase their tickets until they are on the train. Then one of two things happens. Either they pay the conductor on the train when he is drunk and he puts the money in his pocket, or he does not collect the fare at all. My information is that in two specific instances people boarded the Canadian National train at Cochrane and came down to Quebec without having their fares collected, and that in another case the conductor was drunk. So in order to obtain data which would be of some information to the House I put the following question on the Order Paper:

How many railway conductors are employed on the Government railways in Quebec?

The answer was 296. I asked also:

What are their names?

The answer was:

It is not considered to be in the public interest to publish the names of these conductors.

You see my point, Mr. Speaker. The minister said this afternoon that he had never refused any information, but here, in reply to my question, he says that it is not considered in the public interest to publish the names of these conductors. I say that it was in the public interest to know the names of these conductors so that we might find out by personal investigation, as no official information was forthcoming in the House, whether or not these conductors were reliable, and whether or not they should be dismissed. So on these two points it will be seen that the minister did not give full information to the House.

The deficits of which we now complain are due to several conditions. Some of these conditions apply generally to all railways. The general industrial and commercial conditions, for instance, affect the railways in the United States just as they do the railways in Canada, and affect private-owned railways just as they do public-owned railways. Then such factors as increased pay-rolls, and increased cost of material, affect all railways, but these conditions will re-adjust themselves when normal times return. Wages will be re-adjusted, as well as the cost of material, but there is another cause of our deficits which it will be more difficult to remove.

I refer to the question of management, and this also involves the question of state ownership. This question was touched upon slightly this afternoon by the hon. member for King's (Sir Robert Borden), who tried to justify state ownership. It was not our intention to discuss state ownership to-night, but I do not think we should allow his statements to go unchallenged. There are in this country friends of state ownership and there are also enemies of state ownership. The friends of state ownership belong mainly to the western provinces and to the province of Ontario. The other provinces are more conservative in this sense, and are opposed to state ownership. The friends of state ownership, Mr. Speaker, have no greater enemies than those who have introduced the principle into our legislation and those who were entrusted with the management of our national railways. If state ownership had been given a fair trial it is possible that we might have adjusted our national conditions to this new venture; but the management which has operated since the introduction of this policy will make, I think, for the prompt return to private ownership. It was quite easy to forecast that the present situation could not be avoided under the management that was provided for our national railways.

How did this situation come about? The Canadian Northern became insolvent and we took it over and nationalized it; and after that we entrusted the management of the Canadian National railways to the very group of men who had run the Canadian Northern into bankruptcy. They had not been able successfully to manage their own property, but when we took it from their hands as a private concern and assumed all their obligations, we put them in charge of the railways as public property. And that is a point intimately connected with the question now before the House. We want to have full and precise information as to how this group of men came to manage our railways in such a way as to create a deficit of $48,000,000 last year, $70,000,000 this year, and a predicted deficit of $100,000,000 next year. Mr. Speaker, the whole management has been altogether unwise, and no business man in this country could have followed a more foolish course. The Minister of Railways (Mr. Reid) tells us that we shall have a committee before which we shall have the management of the national railways to

tell us why the information should not be forthcoming. Of course, they will try to convince Parliament that it is not in the public interest for them to submit any information. They have to hide the ways and means by which these deficits are created, and naturally they will try to prevent any information tending to throw light on the subject from getting to the public knowledge. We want the management of our Canadian National railways to give us, not, as the Minister of Railways says, reasons why information should not be forthcoming, but an account of their stewardship and reasons why they have not managed our railways to better advantage. We want them to give us some satisfactory explanation of the deficits that are making such inroads into the public treasury. All true Canadian patriots are greatly concerned over the state of affairs to-day.

Some hon. MEMBERS: Oh, oh.

Mr. VIEN: They are very much exercised over conditions, Mr. Speaker, notwithstanding the senseless laughter I hear on the other side. I see one hon. member laughing. Well, the situation is too desperate for any serious-minded man to indulge in laughter.

9 p.m.

Mr. McMASTER: He does not sit on our side.

Mr. VIEN: The people are worried to see our national heritage being squandered, and stolen, and wrecked, and yet an hon. member can find something in the situation to laugh at. Evidently the facts do not appeal to the hon. gentleman in their true light. However, he has given us the measure of his intelligence and his patriotism. Sir, those Canadians, whose ancestors settled in this country generations ago, and battled with adversity that future generations might have a country in which they could live happily and in prosperity, cannot look with equanimity upon the wreckage of the early hopes of their forefathers. It is painful to see our national heritage jeopardized in this way by the Government, who see nothing wrong in entrusting the management of our railways to the very men who ran their own property into bankruptcy, men who are evidently above Parliament and who can refuse this House the information of which it is badly in need. It is high time that we appointed a committee, not for the purposes of party politics but solely for the national welfare, who will work effectively and devise some policy that might extricate the country from its present difficulties. It is useless appointing a committee merely to report to Parliament as to what information should be sought and what should not. We must appoint a committee armed with powers and able to summon witnesses and conduct a thorough investigation, behind closed doors if necessary, but an investigation that will provide us something as a basis for intelligent discussion and sound legislation. In my opinion the resolution is purely and simply a sham; it is nothing but camouflage and will only serve to distract the attention of the House from the real issue under discussion. It will create a committee whose report will be purely and simply a "whitewash" for the Government, and will preclude this House from getting the information which it badly needs. On these grounds I cannot support the resolution of the Government, and I think that if they were sincere they would gladly welcome the amendment of the leader of the Opposition. For all the reasons I have given I am ready to support the amendment and to vote the resolution down.

Mr. E. W. NESBITT (North Oxford): I have been a strong advocate of the appointment of the proposed committee for some time, although I confess that the reference is not worded exactly as I would have worded it. At the same time it affords the committee an opportunity, especially under the fourth clause, to make a great many inquiries. The annual report of the Board of Management will be laid before the committee, and I am inclined to think that by the time the committee have inquired into its contents they will have gathered a great deal of information. I have no hesitation whatever in thinking that should the committee, when organized, find that the reference restricts their investigations in any way, and they ask the House to enlarge their powers, the House will be very glad to meet their wishes. Whether they will be able to formulate a report satisfactory to themselves will depend upon the information they bring out during the inquiry. I have no doubt whatever that the reference is quite wide enough to enable them to get all the information they require, at any rate to commence with. I am not in favour of appointing counsel for the committee or of bringing traction experts to testify. In the majority of cases traction experts, in my judgment, would talk over the heads of the committee. I take it that

the committee will consist of business men selected from both sides of the House, and it is the operation of the national railways that will form the subject of inquiry. The members of the committee will be perfectly competent, in my judgment, to elicit the necessary information without the guidance either of counsel or traction experts. Should this not prove to be the case it will be the easiest thing in the world for the committee to agree that they need legal and technical advice and upon a representation to that effect the House will, no doubt, comply with their wishes.

I have sat on a good many special committees and the experience gained in that way leads me to support the present proposition. Through the medium of a committee information can be obtained very promptly without consuming hours of talk. If the House itself were to undertake to probe the details of the management of the national system of railways, and were to spend an hour or two, or a whole afternoon, in discussing why a station master was dismissed, or why ties were not laid in certain spots at a certain length, or why the management did not buy coal from John Jones in place of Thomas Oliver, or similar questions, Parliament might just as well sit for the whole year, instead of for only a few months. For the reasons I have given I am very much in favour of a committee being appointed, and I am quite sure their deliberations will result in the presentation of information that will be very valuable, even if it does not reduce the deficit on the operations of this railway system, as I hope it will.

I agree with everything that has been said as to the desirability of carrying on the inquiry from a non-partisan standpoint, and I was sorry to hear one hon. member state this afternoon that the appointment of such a committee even under the powers given by the reference, would mean that there would be a majority and a minority report. Personally, I do not think that observation should have been made. In my opinion predictions of that kind should not be indulged in. None of those who are chosen as members of the committee should be influenced by such a spirit as that, because it is useless for hon. gentlemen to become members of this committee if they are going to make up their minds in advance as to what conclusions they shall reach. In my opinion, those hon. gentlemen who are honoured with a seat upon the committee should go to their deliberations with open minds, they should discuss any matters which may come before them in a quiet and businesslike way, and make their report to the House after due consideration. I hope that is the policy that will be followed in this case.

Mr. S. W. JACOBS (George Etienne Cartier): I am in favour of the amendment and intend to vote for it, my reason therefor being that I feel it is something that will appeal to the people of this country, whereas the resolution of the Prime Minister cannot appeal to any person who has made a study of the railway and shipping problem as it presents itself to-day in Canada. The resolution has, to my mind, been rendered ineffective at the very moment of its birth. No matter what conclusion is arrived at it is not going to give satisfaction, because it appears to me to be something which is made purely for the purpose of shelving the important question now before the House. For instance, the first clause of this resolution states that the proposed committee will inquire into:

> What information as to operation of Canadian National railways and shipping as conducted by the Board of Directors and Management should, in the public interest, be brought down in Parliament on Questions, Motion for Production of Papers, or otherwise.

What information should be brought down to Parliament? I ask myself how the people outside are going to view this highly important question. What information should be brought down to Parliament on "questions, motion for production of papers, or otherwise?" I venture to say that not one person outside really knows what that means. To parliamentarians, of course, it simply means that the Government is asking a committee of this House to tell them what they ought to do. The Government practically abdicates its functions and asks a committee—the majority of whom will be from their side of the House—to tell them what they shall do. Well, Mr. Speaker, water never rises above its own level. How is it possible that this committee, the creatures of the Government, can tell the Government what information shall be brought down to Parliament "on question, motion for production of papers, or otherwise"? The second paragraph says:

> When, by what method, and under what conditions, if any, should such information be given,—

"If any." That is simply placing a fence around the committee before any question is submitted to it at all. And I ask again

what the people outside the House will think of that. The third paragraph reads:

What system of auditing should be adopted, and what extent of detail should be given in the Annual Report.

I feel like saying, as did a celebrated character in Shakespeare, "A plague on both your houses." What does the public care about auditing and the extent of detail of the report? They will look at what is called the "demnition total." They will not care what system of auditing has been adopted. Then the fourth and final paragraph:

Whether and for what purposes the said committee should be continued, and that for the above purposes and for such other purposes as the committee deem in the public interest there be referred to said committee the Annual Report of the Board of Directors.

Just imagine! We have the annual report of the Board of Directors before us now, but we are still in Egyptian darkness with regard to the entire situation. Yet we expect that a committee which we are going to appoint—is going to study the annual report of the Board of Directors and tell us what we shall do! Well, my experience of the annual report of any board of directors is that usually it is a recital of what the board does not do rather than of what it does. We have the annual report of the Board of Directors here, we have a Government, at the head of which is one of the most astute and agile minds in the country, and we know something at least about auditing and details,—and yet this is what the committee are going to study! In my opinion we have wasted an entire day of valuable time at a considerable cost to this country, and we have arrived nowhere.

Now, this amendment which is proposed by the leader of the Opposition contains something constructive. It reads:

That such committee shall have power to inquire into all matters in any way relating to the railways owned or controlled by the Government of Canada whether under the direction of the Department of Railways and Canals or under any corporation in which the Government are stockholders, whether relating to the construction or operation, from the date of the appointment by the Government of the Board of Directors of the Canadian Northern Railway Company down to the present time; and similarly to inquire into all matters in any way connected with the Canadian Government Merchant Marine, either in respect of the construction or operation of the ships, and that such committee shall have power to send for papers, persons, and records, to engage counsel—

[Mr. Jacobs.]

That appeals to me.

—and transportation experts, and to make such reports and recommendations from time to time as, in their judgment, will be calculated to promote the public interest.

Put these two documents side by side, the proposed resolution and the amendment, and ask yourself, Mr. Speaker, which will appeal to the man in the street, to the people outside—because, after all they are the people who pay the piper, and surely they have a right to call the tune. I venture to say that if any hon. member on the other side of the House were to back up this resolution on the hustings proposed by the Prime Minister and ask that it be preferred to the amendment, he would be considered a candidate for a lunatic asylum. There is no comparison between the two. One proposes to do something constructive, to get at the root of the trouble, to explain to the public what is the difficulty; and the other is a sterile resolution which, as far as I can judge, appears to have been drawn by the hon. Minister of Justice—I recognize his hand.

We are told, and told rather seriously, that it is not in the public interest that everything should be known in regard to the operation and management of these two enterprises. When a person is sick and goes to a physician, he tells the physician what it is that he is suffering from, and the physician then diagnoses his case and prescribes the remedy. But suppose the patient were to say to the physician, "I suffer from this, that and the other thing but I also suffer in another way, and I cannot tell you what it is because I feel that you may possibly lose confidence in me and not consider me to be such a gentleman as you thought me before, for telling you what I am suffering from." How is it possible, Mr. Speaker, to diagnose a case and prescribe the necessary medicine unless you know what the patient is suffering from? Yet our friends on the opposite side of the House tell us: "We will only let you have such information as in the public interest we can let you have." What is the public interest in this case? The public interest is the interest of the public in this country, the men who pay this $70,000,000 or $80,000,000 a year deficit, and who are going probably to have to pay $100,000,000 next year; they are the people who form the public, and they are interested in knowing all the facts. The public interest, as I understand from this resolution, is that of the management of the national railways. Apparently it is feared that some information may come out which may not be favour-

able to the management; they are the people who want to save their skins.

Now, I challenge my hon. friends on the opposite side of the House to give me one instance of what they consider would be damaging to the public if it came out in the investigation before this committee. What is this insidious trouble that is preventing the Government from bringing it before the public? We are the public, we represent the public, and we say we are satisfied to know what it is all about. We want to know what the difficulty is. We care not at all about the interests of the management of the system; we want to know what it is that this line is suffering from which results in such enormous deficits every year. I challenge the Government again to tell me what possible item could there be which might not be in the public interest if it came out. My hon. friend from Quebec East (Mr. Lapointe) says that the Canadian Pacific may copy our methods! As we say in French, C'est pour rire; or in English, it is to laugh. As my hon. friend from Pontiac (Mr. Cahill) said toéday, the Canadian Pacific Railway Company copy the secrets of success, they never copy the secrets of failure. What is there in the Canadian National Railway system which if to-day given out to the public would enure to the advantage of the Canadian Pacific Railway or any other company or person?

When a person is suffering from the dread disease of tuberculosis, Mr. Speaker, the doctor prescribes sunshine and fresh air, and that is what you want here. We are suffering from hemorrhages at the rate of $70,000,000, and we want sunshine and fresh air to cure us. Nothing, Mr. Speaker, was ever accomplished in the way of a public enterprise by hole-in-the-corner methods. These gentlemen on the other side are merely temporary stewards of the affairs of this country; they are here to-day and to-morrow they will be elsewhere. But the people are here all the time, and they are demanding in no uncertain tones that a full investigation be made into the affairs of these enterprises, in order that they may ascertain whether it is possible to stop this ensanguination; whether it is possible to get these government lines on the proper track in the same way as other successful lines.

Will the Government tell me in what possible way we can be in a worse position than we are to-day? It is declared by those on the other side who are supposed to know that the public interest would not be served if certain information was brought out. Well, even if it were brought out, would the result be the loss of more than seventy or eighty millions a year? Should we lose then ninety millions a year? I say that it would be well if we lost one hundred millions a year if the result would be to enable us to put a finger on the sore spot and obtain some relief from the situation.

The hon. member for Marquette (Mr. Crerar)—I do not see him in the House this evening—took high moral ground this afternoon. He spoke words of wisdom, and his manner of uttering them was such as a statesman would be supposed to employ in the delivering of weighty opinions. He told us that he had a complaint, not against the Government who were charged with the responsibility of the operation of these railways and who are the chief offenders in this matter, but against the leader of the Opposition. He complained that the leader of the Opposition had put before the House no constructive suggestion in regard to the operation of these two Government enterprises. Well, it seems to me, Mr. Speaker, that he should not have passed so lightly over the head of the Prime Minister, who, after all, is the most serious offender in this matter. How is it that the Prime Minister and the Minister of Railways threw themselves on the mercy of the country when in the House a few days ago they told us they were willing to receive suggestions from any and all sources in regard to the operation of these Government enterprises? Was that a constructive policy, Mr. Speaker? Why did the hon. member for Marquette not deem it necessary to advert to this so-called constructive policy on the part of the Government? Then, strange to relate, the hon. member passed over himself, the leader of a party which, though not yet great, is potentially great, a party which at least hopes to be great and hopes very shortly to be seated on the other side. That is a very noble ambition; I am sure that many of the people are of the opinion that anything would be better than the aggregation we have on the Government benches at the moment. Well, the hon. member for Marquette did not suggest any constructive policy. He did say a few weeks ago, when he was discussing this subject that the only solution of the problem now before the country was to revalue the assets of the national railways. That was the constructive policy which the Agrarian party put forward. Well, what is the use of revaluing this property? What purpose would be served? I venture to say that if

it were suggested that a provision for the revaluation of the property should be inserted in this resolution, the Prime Minister would not allow it to go in, on the ground that it is not in the public interest that a revaluation should be made. The only ostensible reason why the property should be revalued at the moment is that we might make it enticing to some party or syndicate who would went to purchase it on the basis of that revaluation. Does my hon. friend from Marquette want to sell out so soon to a private syndicate? It is only a few months since the whole of the aggregation sitting close to us—but not of us—were proclaiming in the loudest tones that the only salvation of this country was public ownership. Now the leader of their party states that he wants a revaluation of the lines. This is his constructive policy, and then he puts it up to the leader of the Opposition to declare the constructive policy of the Liberal party in this regard. Now, I have a great regard for the leader of the Opposition. I have followed him and I hope to follow him for some considerable time. But I am not prepared to say that he is a superman, and it would certainly require more than an ordinary human being to bring some order out of the chaos which at present prevails, at least until we have before us such facts and figures and such information as would be brought out by a committee operating as the leader of the Opposition suggests. "Are you guilty or not guilty?" asks the magistrate of a prisoner in the dock. The prisoner replied: "Well, how can I tell until I have heard the evidence?" That is the position in which we all find ourselves. We would like to hear the evidence; we would like to know something concerning this matter before we find the Government guilty, although we have very shrewd suspicions that they are guilty.

In 1916 I was one of the counsel employed in connection with the Meredith-Duff Commission appointed to inquire into matters affecting shell contracts with which the names of several ministers of the Crown had been connected in some way. The matter was brought up in the House by Mr. Kyte, I believe, in a very strong speech. The Government decided, of course, that no investigation would be granted, but within a week or ten days, and after hearing what the country had to say, they retracted their steps and were glad indeed to grant a commission with the fullest powers of investigation. No question was raised about the public or private interest, although it is to be borne in mind that we were investigating the matter of munitions, of shells, of explosives, in the midst of the war. We were obliged to bring before the commission of inquiry some matters the disclosure of which might have been considered at that time to be highly dangerous, in view of the fact that all this information was going abroad to the enemy. Information was brought out concerning the places at which these shells were being manufactured, the quantities that were being turned out, how they were being delivered across the ocean, the prices that were being paid for them, and various technical details in that connection,—all of which, it could have been said at that time, might furnish valuable information to the enemy. But in view of the fact that the public were demanding this investigation and that the honour of certain members of Parliament was at stake, the fullest and freest investigation was made and a report was submitted accordingly. Now, if during war time we were able to go into such a delicate matter as that to which I have referred, why should information not be given to the House and to the country in regard to the important and momentous question which we are now considering? I venture to say that if a plebiscite were taken on the question whether this information should be given or withheld because its disclosures is not in the public interest, by ninety-nine to one the people of this country would declare that they wanted information of the fullest character no matter what the result would be. They would want us to hew to the line no matter where the chips were to fly. It is not at all surprising, therefore, that we should insist upon the amendment proposed by the leader of the Opposition and refuse to accept the proposal put forward by the Government.

It is evident—and the extent to which this is true is a source of surprise to me—that hon. gentlemen on the other side will follow blindly the lead of the Prime Minister on this question and, as is most probable, vote accordingly. The matter which we are discussing is one of the most important which has come before the country for some considerable time. Probably they feel that they have very little to lose. "Those whom the Gods wish to destroy, they first drive mad," and my hon. friends feel that, as long as they last and as long as they occupy the Government benches, they will hang together with their friends on the Canadian National Railway. They alone are the people interested in not disclosing

information. They alone are attempting to burk this inquiry before it is started.

Mr. T. M. M. TWEEDIE (West Calgary): Mr. Speaker, the discussion in connection with this resolution has gone pretty far afield, and it has been presented to the House in different forms on many occasions since the opening of the session. While I do not purpose discussing in detail many of the matters which have been referred to, I must ask the indulgence of the House to-night while I refer to one or two matters.

The leader of the Opposition (Mr. Mackenzie King), in his endeavours to bring these matters before the public, has no doubt served a public purpose, and the various discussions which have taken place have been of the utmost importance in that they have impressed upon the people of this country the financial condition in connection with the national railways which are operated by this Government. If the people generally throughout the length and breadth of this land have followed these discussions, there can be hardly a man or a woman in Canada who does not recognize the fact that government operation and government control of railways have resulted in a heavy deficit. Notwithstanding the fact that that information came to the public in connection with the operation in 1919, when there was a deficit of some $45,000,000, I do not believe that there was spread over this country the gloom which hon. members of the Opposition would lead us to believe there was, because, notwithstanding the fact that we had a deficit then this Government has been besieged with requests from every part of the Dominion to carry on to a greater extent public works which were commenced or which were delayed during the war. Not later than January of this year there met in the city of Edmonton the United Farmers of Alberta, and notwithstanding the "blue ruin" which they, the Opposition, pointed out, they have submitted to the Dominion Government a whole series of resolutions in connection with railway construction, insisting and urging the Government still to carry forward with the utmost speed the policy which they have carried on in the past in connection with railway construction. The hon. member for Marquette (Mr. Crerar) must have received a copy of these resolutions and, if so, he will know that the very first thing which they enacted by resolution was:

> That, in the opinion of this Union, No. 1 U.F.A., the time has arived when, for the best interests of Canada, her railways should be nationalised over all lines.

As regards respect and admiration for the Canadian Pacific railway, the hon. member for Marquette expressed himself clearly in the words of adulation and praise which he uttered in this House this afternoon. The Canadian Pacific railway, as he stated, is a railway which has the best management and operating staff of any railway in the world. With this I quite agree, and would even go farther. The Canadian Pacific railway was a railway which, from the very inception of the road, started its management and operation with such an eminent and capable man as Lord Mount Stephen; it has always maintained this high standard in the selection of its officials and it has attained greater degrees of excellence in its management and operation than has ever been attained by any other railway in this country. But while the hon. member for Marquette took great care this afternoon to express to the House his views in relation to the Canadian Pacific railway he stopped short of the real vital question, with which the people of Canada are concerned. Members of the House directly opposite us say that they are opposed to the nationalization and government operation and control of railways. The hon. member for Marquette, who stands up in this House and lauds the management of the Canadian Pacific railway and points out that it is without a peer in this country, was by that same convention which passed that resolution, approving of the immediate nationalization of all railways, approved as leader of the Agrarian party in the Dominion of Canada. Let him state in this House whether or not he, as leader of the Agrarian party, is in favour of the immediate nationalization of the Canadian Pacific railway and let him make his position clear to the people. Personally, I have no hesitation whatever in expressing my views in regard to that road. This Government should make its decision absolutely clear that it has no intention to undertake in any way, shape or form the nationalization of the Canadian Pacific railway, but that it is its opinion that we should keep our hands off one of the best organized, best administered and best managed railway corporations in the world. We shall be pleased to have the leader of the Agrarian party state clearly, irrespective of the views of the party which he leads throughout Western Canada, what his views are in connection with that problem.

We have heard a great deal about this deficiency in connection with the operation

and management of the Canadian National railways; but the proper comparison has never been made, and I trust that it will be made at some time before the close of this session of Parliament. Hon. members opposite have taken a deficit of $45,000,000 last year and a deficit of some $70,000,000 this year, and they say that, because there was a deficit in each of those two years and because there probably will be a deficit next year, this country is facing blue ruin, because it has taken over the operation of the national railways. If they wish to be fair in that question, their comparison should be made, not with the Canadian Pacific as it exists at the present time, but with the Canadian Pacific when, some thirty or forty years ago, it was a pioneer railway in this country. We all recall that, when that great organization, of which we are all now so proud and which we lend our voice in this House to praise, was passing through pioneer days in the Dominion of Canada, insolvency faced it, even though under private management, and if the Dominion Government had not come to the aid of that corporation, insolvency would have been its state. There is not in the Dominion of Canada a single railway corporation which has not received aid from the treasury of the Dominion Government, and the time came, in connection with the Canadian Northern railway and the Grand Trunk railway, for us to say whether or not we should still continue giving further aid to those roads, or whether we should take and appropriate them to the Dominion of Canada and spend our money on that which is our property.

A great deal has been said back and forth about the question of government ownership; but the question of government ownership in connection with railways has never come properly and fairly before the House. Government ownership was not the result of the expression of the will of the people; it was not the result of any overwhelming desire on their part that these roads should be taken over; but we found ourselves in a position that we must take these roads over in order to protect the investment of the country.

On a former occasion, when this matter was being discussed, we had the privilege of hearing the hon. member for Dorchester (Mr. Cannon) deliver in this House an address in which he said that the West had been practically purchased by the Dominion; that Western Canada was the vassal of eastern capital; that they were supporting us and that the Dominion treasury was being bled for those people. I want to tell the hon. member for Dorchester that Western Canada is no vassal of eastern capital; that Western Canada is not dependent upon Eastern Canada for support; but that Western Canada is delighted to receive the investment of eastern capital, and eastern capitalists are pleased to invest their funds in the West, because they feel that there is no other part of the whole Dominion and very few parts in the world where they can receive better returns for the money they invest than Western Canada.

So far as the railway problem in Western Canada is concerned, they go on to say that these railways have been built for the development of Western Canada, and that as a result we have these deficits growing larger from year to year, and they will grow still larger in the future. But, Mr. Speaker, if at the time these Transcontinental lines were constructed a safe and sane policy had been carried out by the Government under the Right Hon. Sir Wilfrid Laurier, if he had followed the policy which was advocated by the Hon. Andrew G, Blair and had refused to come to the assistance of the Canadian Northern Railway Company, refused to embark upon the construction of the Grand Trunk Pacific and the Transcontinental, we would be absolutely freed from the position in which we find ourselves to-day. If they had confined themselves, as they started out to do, to the construction of railway lines in the Prairie Provinces of Alberta, Saskatchewan and Manitoba, I believe that under present conditions every foot of railway in the Dominion of Canada would be self-supporting, and that there would be no charge against the public treasury for maintenance, operation, or overhead charges in connection with any of the roads. Throughout the provinces of Alberta, Saskatchewan and Manitoba we must originate practically all the freight which must take care of the Grand Trunk Pacific, the Transcontinental and the Canadian National. That is the burden which was unfairly and unjustly imposed on the West. Those roads go through the wilderness of northern Ontario, through the wilderness of Quebec, and through part of the wilderness of the province of New Brunswick. They serve these three eastern provinces, yet hon. gentlemen will get up in this House and charge the deficit on these roads to the three Prairie Provinces, when the roads are their own children, and run through their own territory. I submit that these deficits are not chargeable to the West, but to the three

older provinces, from which came the majority who forced upon the Government the programme which compelled them to build these lines as a matter of political patronage. But these matters will be gone into at some other time at great length. I just wish to say now that there is not one private road in the United States, I believe, but what has passed through the bankruptcy court, or at all events very few. So far as deficits and the matter of insolvency are concerned, the position which we have in Canada to-day corresponds exactly with that which existed in the United States. I believe that the Government did its duty when it took over the responsibility of the administration of these roads.

I wish to say a few words in connection with the resolution of the Prime Minister which is now before the House. Great exception has been taken to it, and an amendment has been moved by the leader af the Opposition. I wish to point out to the leader of the Opposition the inconsistency of the stand which he as a party leader in this House takes in connection with his amendment. On March 15, we were discussing, at the instance of the leader of the Opposition, the question of the public accounts of this country and he complained bitterly on that occasion that only three volumes of the Auditor General's report had been placed before the House, and that they could not investigate the financial condition of the country until they had the fourth volume. He says, on page 946 of Hansard:

> Mr. Speaker, before this motion carries I should like to point out to the Government the impossibility of this House proceeding intelligently with a consideration of the Estimates until it has before it the full report of the Auditor General.

He goes on:

> A part of that machinery is the Consolidated Revenue and Audit Act which has a special provision respecting the presentation to Parliament of the Auditor General's Report.

Then on page 949 he says:

> That is the point of which we are complaining at the moment. There is not an opportunity to intelligently discuss these Estimates until we have in its completed form the Auditor General's report of the preceding fiscal year, and until we have several other reports which have already been asked for, and concerning which we can get no definite information from the Government. I think, Sir, that until we get a definite assurance from the Government that we are going to have a proper opportunity of discussing the Estimates with reports in their complete and full form we would not be justified in proceeding at the present moment with the consideration of any portion of those Estimates.

What is his position briefly? He says we cannot have a meeting of the Public Accounts Committee because only three volumes of the Auditor General's Report have been laid upon the Table and we have not got the fourth. We will assume for the purposes of argument that his reasoning on that occasion was just. What do we find his position to be at the present time? Has he any details of the operation of the Canadian National railways? Have there been submitted to the Auditor General or to any one else the detailed accounts of the business of those railways? Why, Sir, that is just what they have been complaining of in this House, complaining that they have not received those details. Yet the hon. gentleman stands up in his place in this House, and notwithstanding the fact that only a short time ago he said, we must have all the details before the committee can intelligently discuss this matter, he says now, let us have a committee to go into all the accounts of the Canadian National railways, when he has not before him one vestige, not one detail, he says, except the report which was laid on the Table. Is he sincere when he says that in the interests of the people of Canada we must investigate the transactions of the Canadian National railways? What is the genius of his mind which on one occasion says, I cannot examine without facts and figures, and on the other occasion says, I do not need anything before me, all I want is the committee? Does this House want any further proof that his amendment means simply and purely one of two things? It means either a fishing excursion in which he wishes to get a little group of men around the table and then produce from his vest pocket or from the vest pocket of some other hon. member, some bit of gossip which he may have picked up on the street and then say to the witness, Tell us all about that. Can it be that that which he has alleged to be the policy of the Government, that which he has so consistently denounced in this House, in alleging the denial on the part of the Government of information to the House of Commons, is the proper course to pursue, or does he wish to lead the people to believe that this House is suppressing information which should be given out? Mr. Speaker, whichever one of these alternatives he accepts, I submit that neither of them should justify this House in supporting the amendment which he has introduced. As between the resolution and the amendment the difference is this: The hon. the Prime Minister says

that this is something new in the history and development of this country, that the operation of transcontinental railways was never before contemplated and that we want instructions. All that the resolution asks is for the committee to determine whether information shall be given, when that information shall be given, and what shall happen in connection with the auditing of the accounts. The leader of the Opposition says, we must have all the information. His amendment is definite, it is conclusive. Mr. Speaker, I submit that this House should appoint that committee to consider the question of whether or not the information should be given. We should call before that committee representatives of the management of the road, in order that they may point out to us the difficulty there would be in making the whole thing public. We should also call before that committee representatives of the men, in order that they may lay their views before the committee as to what the effects of this publicity would be. These questions should be considered by the committee and reported on to the House.

As to the question of auditing, if my hon. friend the leader of the Opposition wishes to accomplish the purpose which he has in view, it should be accomplished only in connection with the Audit Act and the Consolidated Revenue Act of this country. There should appear in the public accounts every single dollar of expenditure in connection with that road, and the accounts should be audited and approved by the Auditor General and submitted to the House. Is either of these courses wise? Do we want to allow a committee of this House to investigate every transaction in connection with the railways? Why, a man out in British Columbia may have a team of horses killed and the board may determine what compensation he shall receive; but he may be dissatisfied and he immediately communicates with the member of Parliament representing his constituency and that member brings the matter up before the committee. Under such circumstances the whole session of Parliament might be taken up in determining whether or not such people were properly compensated or not. Do you want these questions investigated by that committee? Do you want the committee to go into such matters as, for instance, the removal of a roundhouse at a certain place, the discharge of one of the section hands, the question of a conductor who is drunk on duty or negligent in his duty, the expropriation of a right-of-way, and so forth? Do you want every single question of this nature brought before the committee?

I quite agree with the remarks of the hon. member for Jacques Cartier (Mr. Lafortune) in his reference to the hon. member for Marquette (Mr. Crerar). The hon. member for Marquette says that we do not want all these things to be gone into, and that is the reason why he opposes bringing down the papers and documents. He does not want these matters discussed in the House. But the hon. member must know that if the committee were given the discretion to consider whatever questions they saw fit, every single one of these things could be discussed by the committee and the House; so that when he advocates a wide open door it simply means the institution of a political campaign in connection with the administration of the railways. The hon. member for Marquette said he did not believe that all these things should be inquired into but that we should inquire into questions of policy. Did he move any amendment? He made no suggestion, so that his position is simply this, that we should throw the door wide open, carry all our political quarrels into the committee on railways, and simply debauch the administration of the railways of this country. I know of no rock which is more likely to wreck the ship of government control in connection with our railways than permitting the House of Commons to get its hand on the adjustment of these various matters. The effect of such a policy would be to destroy the authority of the management and of the officers of the roads. They might make a decision in some matter and the party concerned would simply say:

10 p.m.

"Your decision is not final; I have another court of appeal. I can go to my representative and he will bring the matter before the Railway Committee of the House." Now, Mr. Speaker, we are at a crisis in connection with the administration of our railways, and this House must determine once and for all whether or not it is going to tolerate any committee that will inquire into private differences and private arrangements, and all these minor transactions in the operation and management of the railways. I believe that the constitution of the railway employees now is such that, while the management might possibly not object to interference of this kind, the men themselves would undoubtedly oppose it very strenuously, because, having got any

matter in contention adjusted with the management of the railways, they would not want this or any other government to intervene. Nothing fairer can be suggested to the House than the resolution of the Prime Minister that this matter should go to a committee for consideration as to what the extent of inquiry shall be, and the House could then either adopt or reject the report of that committee and perhaps establish a final policy for all time.

Mr. F. L. DAVIS (Neepawa): To paraphrase the language of a British statesman of about a century ago, we are to-day like fishermen sitting on an empty chest by a bottomless pool of deficiencies seeking for a method of management. Our trouble to-day is that we have endeavoured to engraft upon the methods and practices of responsible government the advantages of corporate management, and the fact that the Government has had to bring down this request for a committee is evidence that that graft has not been a successful one. And now we are asked to examine it and decide what is to be done in the matter. As I have sat listening to the debate to-day, I have been trying to imagine this concern as a body of shareholders considering the report of their directors upon a deficit in the operations of the company. Now, why have we not been able to examine the situation just as such directors would? The reason is quite plain. Here we are playing a bigger game than that played by the directors of any company; we are playing a different game. These deficits on shipping and railways are after all but one-sixth of the whole field of management that comes under our control. Consequently, every question which may come up in relation to this subject, if it can throw discredit upon the government of the day, is a matter of public importance to the Opposition. Not only is that true of the existing House, but it would be well for us to keep in mind that some day there will come a change in the government of the country and then what is now set up as precedent may continue to operate to the grave disadvantage of the country in general and of this enterprise in particular. In examining the resolution of the Prime Minister, it seems to me that, were it not for the many speeches that have been made as limiting the sense and scope of the inquiry, the wording of the first sentence would carry us far on the road towards what the amendment asks for:

> (1) What information as to operation of Canadian National Railways and Shipping as conducted by the Board of Directors and Management should, in the public interest, be brought down in Parliament on Question, Motion for Production of Papers, or otherwise.

Now, two or more years ago when we considered this matter the case was hypothetical. We had not then the reports of the company for examination; we had not the record of government ownership. To-day we have that record, and in my opinion the country will absolve us from any charge of party politics and will say that we have been wise if, in view of deficits amounting to more than $120,000,000 in two years, we turn the whole management upside down, shake it apart and see what has happened. I cannot see that it is wise to approach this question in any other way, and taken in its widest sense and devoid of the interpretations that have been put upon it by Government speakers, that is what that first sentence means. How can you judge of the conduct of the Board unless you go into all matters with which they have had to do?

Now there are one or two things that cause grave discredit to the Government, or at any rate to the management of the railways, at the present time. A gentleman at one time sat in this House whom the Prime Minister of that day read out of the party who to-day is a purchasing agent for the national railways in the city of Chicago. If such things can happen it points directly to some political connection between the management of the railways and the party of which he was a member. In consequence I take it that we have to go the whole road in connection with this examination; and if it were not, as I say again, for the speeches which have been made in limitation of this interpretation I would take that first sentence to mean that very thing. Again, as was pointed out, I think, by the Minister of Justice, in the fourth clause of the resolution there are words going to the same extent:

> —and for such other purposes as the committee deem in the public interest there be referred to said committee the Annual Report of the Board of Directors and that the said committee have power to examine witnesses—

And so forth. But with the interpretations which have been put upon the report, and no answer having been made to the hon. member (Mr. Jacobs) who spoke a moment or two ago asking for instances of what should be exempted from examination by this committee, I am inclined to believe that the Government do mean something by their

language other than what I would take the broad meaning of the resolution to be. Now, finally, I would say this with regard to the matter. It could all be fixed with the addition of perhaps a dozen words if the resolution read:

> That a Select Standing Committee on National Railways and Shipping be appointed for the present session and be instructed to enquire into all matters relating to Government Shipping and Railways, and to report upon the following questions—

And so forth. Then I would be entirely content with the reference. We are playing a bigger game here—and the country realizes the fact—than merely managing a railway; we are managing a country, and the expenditures for this railway system represent only a sixth part of this year's estimates of expenditures. That being the case we cannot examine the situation apart from the political position, and the result is that we have apparent limitations put upon the meaning of this reference. Now, if the matter could be read in the light that I have suggested, I would support the resolution. But just as I stand at present I shall have to vote for the amendment, although I shall never consider it as a precedent for the House going, every year and on every possible occasion, into the management of these railways. But with the experience that we have had I think we must now investigate the management in order to satisfy the country. Should the Government accept the interpretation of their resolution which I have suggested I would be pleased indeed to vote for their commitment and a confining of the investigation to those purposes which, in the long run, must be the purposes sought by the House.

Mr. G. B. NICHOLSON (East Algoma): Having sat through most of the afternoon and evening listening, as intently as I might, to the remarks that have been made on the resolution and amendment before the House, I have been forced to the conclusion that many of the hon. members who have spoken, and have taken the position that they have with regard to each proposition, were either not in the House when the Prime Minister made his statement in relation to the scope of the inquiry he suggested the committee should have, or else they have not read the amendment proposed by the leader of the Opposition. In addition to the four clauses specifically set out in the motion, the Prime Minister stated that he was willing to accept an amendment that would provide that the committee might inquire into what was the best system of management for the Canadian National railways—into the whole question of the general policy of the Government in relation to the management and operation of these railways. The Prime Minister stated definitely that if the resolution did not now provide that, he was willing to accept an amendment that would make it just that wide—that is that a committee of the House—let me repeat it—might inquire into the whole question of policy in relation to the management and operation of the Canadian National railways. The amendment moved by the leader of the Opposition sets out, not that the policy shall be inquired into, not that we shall determine whether we have decided on the correct management of the Canadian National railways, but that every detail of the management of the Canadian National railways must be investigated by this committee.

Mr. FIELDING: No, that is not the amendment.

Mr. NICHOLSON: Very well, I will read the amendment, and I will accept correction if I am wrong in my interpretation. It says that such committee shall make inquiry into all matters in connection with the operation of the Canadian National Railways. What does "all matters" mean, if not all details? What is there excluded when you inquire into all matters in regard to operation?

Mr. FIELDING: If my hon. friend will permit me, he stated a moment ago that the amendment required the committee to go into all the details of the operation of the railways. That is not in the amendment. We have the power to go into all the details of the returns of every department of the Government but we do not do it; but if any proposal were made that the power of Parliament to do that should be restricted we would oppose it. My hon. friend used the expression—

Mr. SPEAKER: Order. I must remind the hon. gentleman that he has not the floor and presumably the only reason for his rising was to submit a question.

Mr. FIELDING: Only with the consent of the hon. member for East Algoma, and I thought I had it.

Mr. NICHOLSON: I am perfectly content.

Mr. SPEAKER: It is not within the competence of the hon. gentleman for East

Algoma to give consent nor is the hon. member for Shelburne and Queen's in order in making an argument.

Mr. FIELDING: I rose to explain the point of difference between the hon. gentleman's interpretation of the amendment and my own, but I am content.

Mr. NICHOLSON: I am sorry to be forced to disagree with my hon. friend, but if the amendment means anything it means that the committee would be appointed for the purpose I have indicated. If the committee does not carry out the purpose for which it is appointed then we had better not appoint a committee at all. The terms of the amendment are that the committee is to be appointed to inquire into all matters in connection with the operation of the Canadian National railways. Now, the hon. member for Marquette (Mr. Crerar) spoke in relation to this matter, and in the first part of his speech he laid down a perfectly sound policy. I would ask that hon. gentleman particularly to pay attention to what I say for I think we are very largely in agreement. He laid down the perfectly sound policy that if we are ever going to have successful management of government-owned railways we must keep them clear of political influence; if we are ever going to be able to go out and get the right class of men to manage and operate these railways we have to place that confidence in them that will enable them to feel that we are going to let them do their work just as if they were employed by a private corporation. These were not his words, but I think he will agree that I have given a fair interpretation of what he said. Now he immediately turned round and followed that up by saying that while you cannot expect to bring these men into a situation that would make it possible for their acts as operating officers to be the subject of debate across the floor of this House, nevertheless, we should appoint a committee of Parliament who will have power to inquire into every matter in connection with the details of the operation of the Canadian National railways. Again, I think that is a fair statement of the position taken by the hon. gentleman. Now that is where the fundamental difference occurs between the proposals of the Prime Minister, and the proposals set forth by the leader of the Opposition. The first clause provides, that a committee shall be appointed to inquire into how far it is wise for Parliament to go in delving into the details of operation of the Canadian National railways. That is what it means, to determine how far it is wise for us to go if we are to have successful management of our railways. The second clause is to ascertain by what method this information shall be given to the House and to the public. The third is to determine what system of auditing shall be adopted. The fourth, the broad clause, provides for referring the annual report of the board of directors to the committee, that they may inquire into it. And, finally, the Prime Minister says: If this is not sufficiently wide, we are ready to accept an amendment that will make it possible for the committee to inquire into what lines of policy may be followed in developing a better system for the management of the Canadian National railways.

I should like to submit one or two questions in relation to inquiring into the details of operation, because I submit that right there is the rock on which Government ownership is going to wreck itself, if it wrecks itself at all. We must either have management of the Government-owned railways independent of politics of we cannot operate such railways successfully. If you open the door, as being suggested, to inquire into every detail of operation of these railways, how are you going to keep that operation free from politics?

When this committee meets and starts to inquire into this question in detail, and some point arises such as has been referred to in this and in previous debates—as to why one station has one agent and another two agents; as to why a section foreman was dismissed on some part of the line; as to why there are two trains running where somebody thinks there should only be one; as to why ties were purchased from one man and rails from another, and so on—in connection with the operation of these lines all over the country, who are we going to ask for detailed information? I submit that the very first man the committee would appeal to would be the president of the Canadian National railways. He would be brought before that committee to answer these questions. But what information would he be able give to the committee? He would say at once, "I know nothing whatever about any of these matters, and I am not in a position to answer your questions. You will have to bring such and such an officer who is in charge of that particular work in the department." And before you get through with the investigation you will have the

whole operating staff herein Ottawa answering questions, and then the Parliamentary committee would not know anything more about the operation of the railways than they did before, simply because they are not competent to pass judgment on matters of operation. That is the situation. The whole discussion would seem to indicate that it is in the minds of some hon. members that some one individual somewhere can be brougnt here and by being asked a series of questions can give to the House all this detailed information. Does anyone suggest that the president of the Canadian National railways is in personal contact with all of the diverse activities in connection with operation? In the first place, the system is divided into two parts, the eastern and the western, each with its general manager. These are the next executive officers we would bring here. The eastern lines are divided into a certain number of grand divisions or districts, and those in turn are divided into sub-districts. All the general superintendents or assistant general managers of these divisions would be the next group of men we would bring here. It is needless to labour the point further. Anyone who has any appreciation of a business of that character will see at once that to embark on such an investigation would not only lead the committee and Parliament into a hopeless maze, but would create a situation that would make it impossible for the Canadian people to get men to undertake the management and operation of their railways.

We must all admit that we are faced with a difficult situation, and that it is not easy to determine just where we must begin and where we must end in connection with how far Parliament can go in respect to these matters. It may be that this committee can serve a useful purpose in so far as getting some light with regard to how much detailed information Parliament may secure and how much it is unwise for it to expect to secure. But let we repeat, that if there is a man in this House who expects that Canada is going to develop a system of publicly-owned railways efficiently operated, and that the officers of such railways are going to be dragged before parliamentary committees to explain why they did this or that particular thing in connection with details of operation, you may make up your minds once for all that our Canadian National railways instead of becoming a success will eventually bankrupt the country. You can never operate under those conditions.

[Mr. Nicholson.]

The hon. member for Lotbiniere, Mr. Vien) in speaking on this subject indicated what is in the minds at least of some hon. members in regard to all these questions of detail when he said that there were 208 —I think that was the number; perhaps it was 228—conductors on a certain section of the Canadian National railways and they were going out on their trains in a state of intoxication, that they were stealing the public money, either not collecting it or putting it in their pockets, and so on, and the desire of the hon. member and of others who are supporting the position he takes was that the names of those conductors should be brought before the House of Commons for debate in order that we might dismiss them if found delinquent. Well, if that is the function of Parliament in connection with the operation of the Canadian National railways, the best thing we can do is to dismiss the officers whom we now have endeavouring to operate these railways. How long does any hon. member expect you would keep a self-respecting superintendent or general superintendent if the House of Commons is going to bring his employees before it and determine whether he is maintaining proper discipline or not? And yet that is what is stated on the floor of this House that we should have an investigating committee for, in order that information of that character should be secured and we should dismiss employees.

Mr. BUTTS: Turn out the bosses.

Some hon. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

Mr. NICHOLSON (Algoma): The question was asked, what is there in connection with the operation of the Canadian National railways that in the public interest cannot or should not be given. The answer to-that can simply be summed up in this way. If there is going to be successful government ownership of railways there must be independent management. I am not for one moment saying that the present management is all that it should be. It may be wholly wrong. When the general question of what has already taken place and the position we at present find ourselves in comes up for debate, I may take advantage of the opportunity and say something with regard to that.

The principle, nevertheless, is this: so long as this managing body is retained, and until Parliament determines that it no longer has our confidence, we cannot ask it to appear before a committee of the

House or before the House itself and answer questions with regard to details of operation and management. I am inclined to think, knowing, as I do, some of the junior officers of the Canadian National railways, that the very moment you asked them to do that they would hand in their resignation. The hon. member for Marquette, I am sure, would say they would not be self-respecting men, not men with the capacity to do the work we expect of them, if they took any other position.

Is this proposed committee to sit in camera, as has been suggested? Has the House of Commons authority to appoint a committee to go off into some room, lock the doors, examine witnesses and obtain a lot of information and then determine what part of it shall be furnished to the House? Every single item of evidence taken by any such committee is the property not of the committee itself but of the House of Commons. The whole report and the evidence upon which it is founded will be the subject of debate in the House; every particle of detailed information will be threshed out here. Officers will be attacked, as was suggested this afternoon, with regard to matters concerning which they cannot defend themselves, and attacked, too, by men who know nothing about the subjects with which they deal. There is only one way out of this difficulty; accept the proposal of the Prime Minister. If this resolution is not wide enough, make it sufficiently wide so that the committee may inquire into the whole question of the management of the Canadian National railways. The question whether or not we have a proper system of management is a proper one for a parliamentary committee to inquire into, and is a proper subject for this House to debate. There are genuine differences of opinion on the question whether we are employing the best system of management. Here is exactly the difference between the resolution proposed by the Prime Minister and the amendment of the leader of the Opposition: one involves the question of principles, the other a question of details. If we want to set the principles to one side and go into the details; if we want to inquire how many section-men are working at a certain point; how many telegraph operators there are at certain stations; how many ties were laid in certain mileages—if we want all these things, then let us vote for the amendment. But if we want to inquire into the principles underlying the whole question of the government ownership and operation of these railways, let us adopt the resolution proposed by the Prime Minister. Personally, I have no difficulty whatever in making up my mind on this point. I have contended ever since I have been in the House —not as an arden advocate of public ownership of railways, but as one who has had some slight connection with the operation of railways—that you will never operate successfully a publicly-owned railway or any other kind of railway so long as it is subject to political interference and political influence. That is what is contemplated in the amendment proposed by the hon. leader of the Opposition, and for that reason I will vote against it.

Mr. JOSEPH ARCHAMBAULT (Chambly-Verchéres): Mr. Speaker, I have only a few remarks to make in support of the amendment of the leader of the Opposition purporting to enlarge the scope of the committee which is to inquire into matters affecting the operation of the Canadian National railways and the Canadian Government Merchant Marine.

In my humble opinion there is only one point to consider, and it is this: who are the proprietors of the Canadian National railways and the Canadian merchant marine? Are the proprietors entitled to information with regard to the management of these Government enterprises? That is the only question to be decided, the only question before the House. The management of our railways issue a report showing a deficit of $70,000,000 this years—the deficit last year was $49,000,000—and ask for a vote of $165,000,000. Surely we have the right to inquire into the circumstances which are responsible for this condition. Surely the information should be laid before the House in order that we may be able to ascertain the cause of these large deficits and endeavour, to the best of our ability, to remove that cause.

Let me illustrate my thought. If the Canadian national railways or the Canadian merchant marine were a private corporation in which you, Mr. Speaker, were a shareholder, and if the management brought down a report showing a deficit of $70,000,000 for the operations of last year and asking for a fresh budget of $165,000,000, surely it would be your right to have all the details and all the information made available in order that they might be examined and considered. You would ask for instance, what the company were paying for locomotives and for various kinds of equipment; what amount was paid out by way of salaries to the different employees of the company; how many em-

ployees there were, and so on; and having all these facts you would compare these amounts with the expenditure made by other companies on account of locomotives, equipment, salaries, etc. As a shareholder you would be entitled to and would insist upon being furnished with all this information, and if the directors of your company dared to take the attitude that the Government is taking to-night, dared to refuse this information, you would, through the medium of the courts, force the company to furnish it.

It may be said that in the case of a private company these facts and details are given only to the shareholders. True, but is it not a fact that the people of this country are the shareholders in the Canadian National Railway system and the Canadian Merchant Marine? This excuse, therefore, is a preposterous one.

Now, Sir, why are the Government refusing to give that full information to which we are entitled, not only as shareholders, but according to every sound principle of responsible government? Prior to this debate to-day only one reason was given, and that by the Prime Minister, to the effect that if all these details were laid before the House and before the country, the Canadian Pacific Railway Company would obtain and profit by them. I cannot imagine Lord Shaughnessy, or Mr. Beatty, or Mr. Wanklyn straining their necks and ears in order to get pointers on a policy which has been pregnant with deficits. I cannot imagine these successful and talented officials trying to gather sagacity or wisdom from the National railway board, trying to incorporate into their management the methods of a manager who has already wrecked a railway company. If this excuse of the Government was sound, it might be a very strong argument against government ownership of railways, because it would prevent the people of this country from ascertaining the facts in relation to the expenditure of their money, a principle for the recognition of which many great constitutional battles have been fought with the ultimate victory of the people for the recognition of this undeniable right.

There is another reason. Why should the Department of Railways or the Department of Marine be different from other departments in relation to which we are entitled to all particulars regarding expenditures? But to-day the Prime Minister (Mr. Meighen) gave us another reason and it is as unsound as the first one. The Prime Minister said—and I took his words down:

[Mr. Archambault.]

"The committee will inquire into what can be done and given without impairing the rights of the management." I may say that I expected that reason from the Prime Minister, but I expected it sooner than to-day. Surely, it is only natural and within the scope of the mentality of this Government that they should do everything to protect the interest of their protegés, the management, but nothing to protect the rights of the people of Canada. In the opinion of the Prime Minister, nothing should be done or given that might impair the rights of the management, even if the rights of the people of Canada are impaired by that being done. It is an unsound, reactionary, Tory principle. The rights of the management! Why, I was under the impression that the members of the Canadian National Railway Board were high salaried employees of the Government and of the people of Canada, and nothing else, and as such that they were entitled to fair treatment and their pay envelopes at the end of every week. I fail to understand what other rights the directors of the Canadian National Railways have as such and by what process of reasoning the Prime Minister can come to the extraordinary conclusion that by giving information to this House, they would impair the rights of that board.

I was greatly amused this afternoon to listen to the Minister of Finance (Sir Henry Drayton) and to witness the noticeable uneasiness which he displayed in trying to rescue his leader. So uneasy was that hon. gentleman that he made the most amazing statement that no questions were ever put by the Opposition asking for the cause of the deficit on the Canadian National Railways. Surely every hon. member remembers that last year there were put on the Order Paper at least fifty questions in an endeavour to ascertain the cause of the deficits on the Canadian National Railways. All those questions were not answered. But if the mind or the memory of the Minister of Finance is not very good, I will remind him that as recently as March 31 of this year there were put on the Order Paper some questions relating to the causes of the deficits of the Canadian Mercantile Marine. I put one of those questions myself and it will be found at page 1443 of Hansard. My question was this:

Mr. Archambault:

1. What was the initial cost of the steamships Canadian Squatter and Pioneer and when were they first put into commission?

2. How much was spent in repairs to each of these ships since she was built up to December 31, 1920?

3. What was the gross amount earned by each of these vessels for the calendar year 1920?

4. What was the gross amount of expenditure of every description in connection with the operation of each of these vessels for the calendar year ending December 31, 1920?

5. What were the net earnings of each of these vessels from the date when she was first put into commission up to December 31, 1920, after deducting all expenditure of every description?

6. What were the net earnings of each of these vessels for the calendar year 1920, after deducting all expenditure of every description?

7. How many tons of coal did each of these vessels consume during the calendar year 1920. and what was the average price paid therefor?

The hon. member for Antigonish and Guysborough (Mr. Sinclair) asked the same question regarding the steamer Voyageur. The hon. member for Lunenburg (Mr. Duff) asked the same question regarding the steamships Canadian Conqueror, Canadian Commander and Canadian Planter. What was the answer of the Minister of Marine and Fisheries? His answer to the first question was the original price paid for the ships, but we did not get any other information in regard to all the other questions. Does my hon. friend not believe that in asking the Government to tell the House what the Government is paying for coal, what the Government is paying for repairs, how much money was spent on repairs on each of those ships, the members of this House wanted to be enabled to examine these figures, to compare them with the prices paid by other similar companies so that they might find out whether the deficits were incurred through the Government paying too high prices for coal or having too many and unnecessary repairs done on their ships? The Minister of Finance, however, tells this House that hon. members on the other side have not asked any questions regarding the deficits of the Canadian National Railways and the Canadian Merchant Marine.

The Minister of Justice (Mr. Doherty) admitted this afternoon that the purpose of the committee was to inquire into what information should be given to the House. I heard my hon. friend make that statement. I repeated my question and my hon. friend answered, in his own way, it is true, but his words meant that the purpose of the committee was to inquire what information should be given to the House. Why, Sir, what is the need of such a committee? We do not need a committee for that purpose. The Government may indeed need it in order to delay giving information, or to stifle enquiry and try and shift the responsibility for so doing, but let me tell the members of this House and the country at large that we on this side do not need such a committee. What we desire is the information necessary to determine the cause of the appaling, extravagant and Highwayman-like expenditure of the people's money. Sir, for these reasons I shall vote in favour of the amendment of my hon. leader.

Mr. BUTTS: Would my hon. friend allow me to ask him a question? What does my hon. friend estimate the cost of operation of a 10,000 ton ship per month?

Mr. ARCHAMBAULT: I have great respect for my hon. friend who has just asked me a question, but not at all times. I am always delighted to answer any questions of his when he is serious, but I am sorry that he is not so to night. I have no desire to be discourteous, but I do not care to enter into a discussion with him at the present moment.

Mr. BUTTS: You do not know anything about it do you?

Mr. C. A. FOURNIER (Bellechasse): I should like to interject a few imperfect remarks into this debate. When one speaks of railway matters in this country, one might as well make up his mind that he is speaking of the very life of Canada, for there is no use disguising the fact that the solvency of Canada is very gravely challenged to-day by the present railway situation. I would agree to a committee being appointed with full powers to look into the railway situation and get all the information, but I am not in favour of a committee that will only ask for information that it will not get. If that is to be the bright feature from which Canadian democracy is to draw solace, I am not in favour of a committee of that kind.

When the Minister of Railways (Mr. Reid) submitted his annual statement on March 17, I felt a little pity for him, because he had the inglorious task of disclosing to the House another deficit on the year's operations of $70,000,000. But is that $70,000,000 the actual deficit? It is because I want to make sure that I favour the appointment of a committee with full powers to inquire and ascertain just what the deficit is. If the minister were in the House to-night, I would challenge him, as I did at the second session of 1919, when this House was sitting in the Victoria Museum, to deny that the deficit, this year instead of being $70,000,000, is nearer

$132,000,000. What can a committee do that has no powers at all? Can it change the capital liabilities of the different lines? Can it change the fixed annual charges? Not at all. I would also like to see a committee appointed that would inquire into the management, I think that is absolutely necessary. After all, Mr. Speaker, I think the great fault in the National railway system is the centralization of the management in the city of Toronto. I grant you that Toronto is a beautiful city; but it is also a peculiar city. It is endowed with many gifts, I grant, but it has a fatal defect. It is an intellectual city, a cultured city, a hospitable city. In matters literary, and in matters military, Toronto can always be depended upon to use discernment, but in matters political the vision of Toronto has always been distorted. We have the proof of that in connection with railway matters. It has always been a failure, and always will be.

If we had a committee with full powers to inquire into railway matters, Mr. Speaker, it would find out that on the Intercolonial, for instance, we have absolutely no modern bookkeeping methods. The Intercolonial is divided into three divisions—from Montreal to Mont Joli, from Mont Joli to Moncton, and from Moncton to Sydney and Halifax. Last year the Intercolonial had a $5,000,000 deficit, but yet the division from Montreal to Mont Joli had a $2,000,000 surplus. This year the very same thing is repeated. There is almost a $2,000,000 surplus on the division from Montreal to Mont Joli.

Mr. McMASTER: Is Bellechasse in that division?

Mr. FOURNIER: Yes, it is. Then I would point out that the superintendent of that division is handicapped in having always to await orders from Toronto. His name is Mr. E. L. Desjardins, and the general superintendent is Mr. J. E. Morazain. I can commend these men to the minister. They are the only two who are showing results on the Intercolonial Railway, and I think the minister would do well to get a few more French-Canadians of their calibre as railway men. All the train despatching orders for the division come from Toronto. From Chaudière to my parish it is only 18 miles, and you cannot send a train out unless the locomotive hauls a certain amount of tonnage. Well, during the winter, when it is 10 or 15 below zero, a locomotive with a load of 60 cars cannot clear the sidings, and to accommodate such trains it would be well to lengthen the sidings. It takes 8 hours to make that 18 mile run, with such tonnage, and time and a half to go to the end of the run. If this matter were inquired into I am sure that it would result in a great deal of money being saved in demurrage. I do not wish to criticize the increase in rates that has been granted by the Railway Commission, except to say that they did not use discretion in granting increases on commodities that could not stand the increase, such as brick and lumber. These increased rates have paralized the building industry. That is another matter that the committee might well look into.

The people of this country are called upon to pay an appalling amount to make good the losses on these railways, and they might as well open their eyes to the situation. Mr. Speaker, the burden imposed upon the public treasury by the mismanagement of the national railways cannot be characterized in fitting terms. War expenditures have accustomed the public to fabulous sums, but the figures in connection with the railway situation cannot be mitigated by familiarity with reckless expenditure. The deficit in 1919 totalled some $48,000,000; this year it is stated to be $70,000,000, but I contend that it is nearer $133,000,000. The people, I say, might just as well realize that this great system of railways is nothing but an old cripple which they have taken on their backs. Last year when the Minister of Railways submitted his statement he had not very much encouragement to offer the House and the country, but he did promise that proper steps would be taken to apply business methods. Now, the Minister of Railways is a politician, and as such he stated that the only way to overcome deficits in connection with our railways was to increase the revenues, and the only way to increase the revenue is by increasing the rates. The deficit on the national railways does not fall on private shareholders but on the Canadian people, who have to meet it in taxation whether in the form of customs duties, income tax or taxes levied on the profits of business, and a deficit on the railways made up in this indirect way, which has to take the place of inadequate transportation rates, is unfair to the people.

The minister said last year that the management of the railways had urged the adoption of business methods and an advance in rates, but speaking for the Government, he got rid of this dilemma by

passing it on to Parliament and to the people. The rates were increased during the last year, however; but after all, notwithstanding these increased rates, the increased rates produced 19 per cent more revenue and advanced wages absorbed 16 per cent. It is all very well for hon. gentlemen opposite, when they talk about the railways, to say that we on this side are at fault because we have over-built; but I return the compliment and say that if we have over-built they have over-bought. Now, in view of the fact that the minister is not disposed to give us the information we want, we are obliged to take our own figures. I remember that in the Grand Trunk debate I submitted a detailed statement of operations and I challenged the Minister of Railways and the then Minister of the Interior, now Prime Minister (Mr. Meighen) to refute them, but the right hon. gentleman declined to take the challenge up. I am sorry he is not in the House, but I shall have an opportunity at some time to repeat my challenge. Mr. Speaker, no one will buy these railways, and the only thing we can do in the circumstances is to appoint a committee, secure all the information we can, and make the best of a bad job. I wrote a letter to Mr. Hanna asking that the Ocean Limited be allowed to make a regular stop, as it had always done in the past, at St. Charles de Bellechasse. Any one who knows anything about the railways in the province of Quebec knows that this is an important station, also an initial station, but the Ocean Limited, instead of stopping at this station, simply slows down. I kept a record, covering a period of six months, of people who wanted to take the train to Montreal, but they had to take the Canadian Pacific railway from Quebec and then proceed; and although I did not give Mr. Hanna the figures, I may say that in six months the Canadian National Railways lost in this way the sum of $8,000. I told Mr. Hanna that I was prepared to do all I could to make the Canadian National Railways a success but he paid no heed to me. All these things could be inquired into if we had a proper committee.

11 p.m.

It would be interesting to go into the question as to why the Canadian Northern people, when they handed their railway over to the Government, were allowed to keep strips of land along their line for which the Canadian National Railways today are held up; and it would also be interesting to know who disorganized the Transcontinental. If the Transcontinental had been operated for the purpose for which it was built it would have been a great success. From the West to St. John it would have meant a shorter route by 440 miles. But instead seventy per cent of the production of western grain is taken to New York. I asked the Minister of Railways this afternoon who had lifted the rails of the Transcontinental and where they had gone to; and there are other things of great interest which would be brought out before a committee. I will not go further into these matters to-night. I shall have an opportunity to explain these and other things later on when the Estimates of the Minister of Railways are under consideration; but when I make this statement about the rails being lifted on the Transcontinental I make it on my own responsibility as a member of Parliament, and when the member for Bellechasse makes a statement he is prepared to substantiate it. The management of these railways has disorganized everything. This board disorganized the shops at Rivière du Loup by taking about 114 men from their homes there and planting them at the St. Malo shop, Quebec. Is that what my hon. friends opposite regard as a constructive measure? It is to inquire into matters of this kind that we want a committee. If the Government is not ashamed of the way in which these railways are being managed let us have a thorough investigation. Let us get at the facts and I am prepared to do my share in futhering the necessary investigation.

Mr. MICHAEL CLARK (Red Deer): I am extremely reluctant to keep the House, for even a minute or two, from a division so late upon a Friday night. I do not know that I should have intervened at all, because my position was stated perfectly from my point of view by my hon. friend from Marquette. If it had not been that my hon. friend (Mr. Jacobs) who represents the George Etienne Cartier division of Montreal made what I conceive to be a somewhat unjust attack upon my hon. friend near me. He charged him in so many words with having offered no constructive suggestions in regard to railroads in this country. Well I am not altogether sure that I agree with the constructive suggestions that my hon. friend from Marquette has made in their entirety as to their usefulness with regard to the railroad situation, but I had observed his doings carefully enough to notice that he

had at many points in this country advocated a re-valuation of the railways for specific purposes. He did that in the city of my hon. friend from the division of George Etienne Cartier. In the same city he advocated a wise and well directed policy of immigration as a policy which might help the railroads of this country out of their difficulties. I mention these things to bring to my hon. friend's information up to date, and to repel his charge that my hon. friend from Marquette has not made constructive suggestions.

Sir, the course of the debates on railroad matters within the last two weeks has been a little peculiar, and has debarred us from discussing the railroad question at large or I might have extended the constructive suggestions of my hon. friend considerably at the present moment. I will not do so however, because I have regard to the ruling which you, Sir, gave out at the beginning of this debate this afternoon, that the platform upon which we could speak to-day was a very narrow one. I am quite sure that with different occupants of the Chair this debate has gone far beyond the limits which you yourself, Sir, had in your mind at the moment, and I desire at this hour of the night to keep strictly to the question which is before the House. Now that question, like all new questions of this magnitude, presents a very great national difficulty, and I want to reiterate a statement which I have given expression to myself, and to emphasize it as it was expressed to-day by my hon. friend from Marquette—a sentiment to the effect that our railroad difficulties are far too great for us to approach them except in the spirit of helpfulness and co-operation with a view to getting the nation through them.

The question before us to-day, in the form of the two motions upon which we shall presently decide by a vote, is a very difficult question. There are two considerations that are in the minds of all of us who are thinking earnestly upon the subject, and I think that is the case with every hon. gentleman in this House. We must have regard in the first place to the necessity of the management and directors of the National roads having that freedom and secrecy from day to day—and I emphasize the phrase "from day to day"—which are in the possession of the management and directors of all business corporations. Now, if the House was, as was proposed two weeks ago, to seek for itself, as a House of Commons, to exercise the power of so overlooking the management and the directors of the National roads from day to day that they could pursue the ordinary course in regard to a Government department, then I am advised that the biggest railroad men on this continent would not take the job, because they would consider that they were foredoomed to failure owing to their operations being hampered and restricted in that way. For what would happen? I assume that even on occasion we should have some question directed to the Government on the Orders of the Day. They would either have to have that information, or they would immediately have to trouble the management about it when perhaps they were engaged in some other very important business. We should have questions put upon the Order Paper from day to day, we should have all the devices known to members of parliament, which would lead to the railroads being made a political football—all the devices usually used by members of parliament, I fear too often with a view to party or personal advantage rather than to the success of this great business enterprise which is being handled in a new way by this young country and is, I want to repeat, presenting us with problems of the very greatest difficulty.

On the other hand, there must be present to the minds of all of us another necessity which, to my mind, is equally urgent, and that is the necessity of Parliament and the people—who are the shareholders of these roads—being possessed of the means of exercising a vigilant oversight over the handling of their property. If they have not the means of that oversight, Mr. Speaker, it is clear even to a tyro in matters of business, that slackness in the management will inevitably creep in, that business evils will creep in, and—as some have anticipated—our deficiencies, our deficits, will rise instead of falling as the days go by. Well now, the Government have thought it wise to make an attempt along that line by proposing in the first place, that we should relieve ourselves of the difficulties to which I first alluded by appointing a committee of this House to make inquiries under certain very definite restrictions.

May I say at once, Mr. Speaker, that I cannot see what would be the use of that committee at all operating under those restrictions. It is proposed to confine the work of this committee to making up their minds what information, if any, should be given to the House of Commons, and the methods by which that information should be com-

municated. Well, I am bound to say that if that be all the committee is to do, that is something which the House of Commons surely has the power to decide for itself here and now. And, holding that view, I shall vote for the amendment.

I asked my right hon. friend, the Minister of Justice (Mr. Doherty), when he was speaking, how a committee could possibly decide on what information ought to be communicated to the House if the committee itself knew nothing about the information at all or was to be restricted in the information which it did have. If the committee is to be restricted in respect to the information which it possesses, it would baffle the human intelligence of this committee to form a sensible opinion on what information should be given to this House. The committee would meet in ignorance, it would deliberate in ignorance, and it would decide in ignorance if it were restricted in the way in which this motion proposes. So that I repeat I cannot see what the use of a committee working under these restrictions would be at all. On the other hand, if they choose, as doubtless the Government will, a committee of men of parliamentary experience—most of our committees do have hon. gentlemen of considerable parliamentary experience chosen by preference—and, in addition hon. members who have devoted their attention largely to railroad matters, then I am with the demand that they should have the power to get what information seems to them wise as a parliamentary committee.

I would only add, in conclusion, that I should think they would exercise those powers with discretion. I understood my hon. friend from Shelburne and Queen's (Mr. Fielding) to say in his remarks to the House to-day that we should rely on the discretion of such a parliamentary committee conducting its inquiries with a view to the two necessities which they would have peculiarly placed upon them—the necessity, on the one hand, of not unduly hampering the management and directors of the road; and, on the other hand, the necessity of bringing to Parliament at least sufficient information to enable it to exercise a vigilant oversight of those who are managing this great national property.

Mr. G. W. ANDREWS (Centre Winnipeg): Mr. Speaker, like my hon. friend who has just taken his seat (Mr. Clark), it is my purpose to be very brief at this stage of the debate. I find myself in sympathy with the resolution before the House, but before recording my vote I should like to ask my right hon friend, the Prime Minister (Mr. Meighen), two questions, which he will have an opportunity to answer when closing the debate. In the first place, I would call to his attention the fact that when the Minister of Railways (Mr. Reid) was presenting his report to this House he referred specifically to the high wages paid the railway employees as being one cause of the large deficits. I should like to ask my right hon. friend if I am right in assuming that the wage earners of the railroad will be given an opportunity to present their side of that question before this proposed committee? The second question I would ask my right hon. friend is this: Will the gentlemen who recently came from Winnipeg to present their case before the Board of Railway Commissioners relative to railway rates be given an opportunity to re-state their case before this committee?

Mr. MEIGHEN: Mr. Speaker, in answering the hon. member I would like also to make a few remarks anent the amendment itself. The fixing of wages or of rates could not, no matter whether the amendment or the motion passed, come within the jurisdiction of the committee. The first matter is necessarily in charge of the Canadian National Railway Company on the one side and the Canadian Pacific Railway Company on the other; and the control of rates is delegated by statute specifically to the Railway Commission. But the men employed on the road could personally or through their organizations give evidence before the committee as to anything that the committee is deputed to ascertain, and among the things deputed to it the question of the form of the annual report and what it should disclose would be something upon which they could be called and could give evidence, as well as on any other subject within the purview of the committee. I do want to say a word too, as to the peculiar position this House would be in if it accepted this amendment. I do not know that I can make it any clearer than it was, to me at least, stated in the speech of the right hon. gentleman the member for King's, N.S. (Sir Robert Borden). It will be recalled that in previous debates—and I do not wish to refer to them again in extenso—it was very generally conceded, and particularly by the hon. member for Marquette (Mr. Crerar), in language that to my judgment was precisely right, that unquestionably there is information as to operation in respect to which the management must

have the same secrecy and control as the management of any other system, and which information, as expressed by the hon. member for Red Deer (Mr. Clark), will not be subject to disclosure in Parliament while the operation is going on. For example, supposing we should have to disclose in Parliament the shipments made by a certain firm of their particular line of goods, manufactured perhaps in Chicago or at some other point served by our roads, will any hon. member for a moment suggest that this House would be justified in publishing that information? But it is a matter of operation and is within the meaning of this amendment. And so with other matters. I am told that if the management were to make known the differentials as to the rates given, it would make operation impossible, that is, they would not get the business and the loss would be disastrous to the system. I can pass from one thing to another, and in each instance I can assure the House that if the information is disclosed it will add millions of dollars to the deficit. There is no question in the world about it. I do not need to argue it with the hon. member for Marquette, who has himself stated in language that he would be expected to use as the manager himself of a large business concern. Now, we will suppose this amendment passes. Then where are we landed as respects this very information that the hon. member says cannot be disclosed without disaster? What is the duty of this committee, if it is appointed, what is it entrusted to do, yea, deputed to do by this Parliament? Is it deputed to bring in a recommendation as to anything? Has it any definite purpose? None whatever; it is not asked to do anything; it is not asked to help us in any respect whatever. It is simply asked to inquire into—what? Into all matters that in any way relate to the railways owned and controlled by the Government. It was suggested by the hon. member for Shelburne and Queen's (Mr. Fielding) that the committee would not take the position of permitting anything and everything to be inquired into. But suppose some member got up in that committee and said: I want to know these things that the member for Marquette (Mr. Crerar) says should not be known; that the hon. member for Shelburne and Queen's says it could not be conceived that any committee would disclose. Suppose that member of the committee said: I want to call a witness to find that out—who could rise in the committee and say, "no"? This House told the committee to get the information.

Mr. CRERAR: May I ask my right hon. friend a question to elucidate the matter? Would it not be entirely proper for the committee to exercise its discretion in the matter?

Some hon. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

Mr. MEIGHEN: No, decidedly it would not. Hon. members say "hear, hear," but they know it would not. It is in the motion; that is why the motion is worded as it is—worded to say that the committee may ascertain anything that the committee deems it necessary to inquire into. If this amendment passes the committee is deputed to inquire into everything connected with the road, and no chairman of that committee and no member of it would be doing his duty who would get up and say that the committee had any right to prevent the disclosure of anything whatever relating to that railway. How would he have the right? Upon what would he base his right? Would he say: I know better; I know that will do harm? Oh, the reply would be, Parliament has told us to inquire into everything; that is what we are here for. Parliament has not given us any discretion; it has told us to go so far as we deem necessary. Parliament does not tell the committee to go as far as it may deem necessary for certain purposes. No purpose is set out in this amendment. The committee are to be sent out into the wilderness and told that they have power—indeed it is their duty to go into anything that anybody wants to go into—and hon. members boast that that is the power which is given to the committee. And once any information under such a reference gets before that committee it is before this House; it is in the press the same day. Everything may be done that hon. members have said must not be done if we are to have any regard at all for efficient management and for the success of the system.

Now, I do not think the hon. member for Marquette understood—there is a habit in this House of sprniging these things suddenly—he did not understand that that was the effect of the amendment. But that is the effect, and that is precisely why the amendment was worded as it is. The only thing that approached an argument in this matter—I do not want to use the language discourteously—or that appealed to me as being most within the region of relevancy was something urged by the member for Sunbury and Queen's.

Mr. FIELDING: Will the hon. gentleman try to get that right, now? It is Shelburne and Queen's.

Mr. MEIGHEN: I beg the hon. gentleman's pardon; I shall be glad to give it the right designation. There will be a member for Sunbury very soon, but he will be on this side of the House.

Mr. FIELDING: The hon. member is not going to give him a chance.

Mr. MEIGHEN: There will be no mistaking him.

Mr. FIELDING: When he comes.

Mr. MEIGHEN: And he will come. My hon. friend's contention was with regard to pensions. The committee, he said, was given carte blanche to make any recommendations to the House that it thought best with regard to pensions and civil reestablishment. That is true, and if the same course could safely have been pursued here it would have been done. But the reason why it could not safely have been pursued here is just the reason which was urged in such strong terms by the hon. member for Marquette; as regards pensions, those reasons would not apply at all. It is because there was the necessity for protecting the management in the running of their concern that restraint was necessary here where no restraint was necessary in respect to pensions. There was nothing that could not be disclosed with respect to pensions at any time without hurting anybody, and that is just the difference.

Now, let me repeat: if we adopt a resolution establishing a committee which shall have power to inquire into all matters relating to the railways owned and controlled by the Government, that makes it a committee so to do, and in order to get information on any subject all a member of the committee has to do is assert in the committee that the subject into which he wishes to inquire relates to the railways owned and controlled by the Government, and he has no right to be stopped. Does the hon. member say that in the Pensions committee, which had a similar deputed power, any one could have prevented an inquiry into any matter relating to pensions? Certainly no one had the power to do so, and the chairman of the committee would have been derelict in his duty if he had prevented any such inquiry. It is the same here.

Mr. TRAHAN: Will the right hon. gentleman permit me a question?

Mr. MEIGHEN: Certainly.

Mr. TRAHAN: Does he think that when a committee has the right to exercise a certain power, it is obliged to exercise it?

Mr. MEIGHEN: Why, no, it is not obliged to do it; for that matter, the committee does not need to meet. No one is going to exercise physical force to make them do it. But what I say is that if any member of the committee wished to go into any matter, the chairman of the committee, under the authority given in the amendment, has no right whatever to resist it.

Mr. STEVENS: Would the right hon. gentleman permit me a question before he leaves that point? A few moments ago an hon. member brought to the attention of the House a question regarding the closing of a small station in the province of Quebec, a question which he wanted to argue before the committee. Could that be done under the terms of the amendment? He declared that that was exactly what they wanted to do.

Mr. MEIGHEN: There would be nothing in the world to prevent its being discussed and information brought out concerning it, so long as it related to the road.

Mr. CRERAR: If the committee gave its consent.

Mr. MEIGHEN: Under the amendment the committee has no discretion.

Mr. FIELDING: Will my hon. friend permit me a question? If the Committee on Public Accounts should endeavour to get information respecting the private and confidential business transactions which a merchant carries on with a customer, what would happen? The committee have the power to go into that, but they will not do it; neither would the committee in this case be unreasonable.

Mr. MEIGHEN: It does not matter how private and confidential it is; if it affects the public business and a member of the committee takes an affidavit that it does, the Committee on Public Accounts does not prevent him from going into it.

Mr. FIELDING: They have the right to refuse, and would always do it.

Mr. MEIGHEN: Not at all, if the public interest was affected. I never knew it to be refused, and I sat on the Public Accounts Committee for many years. It

is for Parliament to say what shall be within the discretion of the committee. If there is no need for restraint, there will be none; if there is need for restraint, it is for Parliament to say so when it constitutes the committee.

Mr. CLARK (Red Deer): May I ask my right hon. friend if the committee under the Government's resolution would have the right to seek any information at all about the management of the road?

Mr. MEIGHEN: Yes. I am glad the hon. member rose, because I know that he too is under a misconception. The hon. member at the close of his speech indicated that there was some restraint put on the committee in the reaching for evidence to enable it to come to the conclusions that are therein set out. Under the main motion the committee is under no restraint at all; it can inquire into anything it thinks necessary to inquire into that will assist it in arriving at conclusions on the subjects that are set before it.

Mr. CLARK (Red Deer): If the committee is to have the power to seek information, why restrict it?

Mr. MEIGHEN: The committee has definite objects; it has the discretion to say whether any inquiry is necessary to enable it to reach the objects set out. That discretion is given it by resolution. But in this amendment no objects whatever are set out; the committee is simply given the duty of inquiring into anything at all that relates to the railways.

Mr. CRERAR: If the committee sees fit.

Mr. MEIGHEN: The amendment does not say that; it provides that anything relating to the railways may be gone into. If there were any object set out and it was provided that the committee could decide whether or not it was necessary to go into anything in order to reach that object, that would be all right. But no purposes are set out here; it is merely a blind resolution. It turns the committee out in the dark, and all the committee has to do is to hunt around and see if it cannot find something for no purpose which the committee knows anything about. That is put forward in order to get in this House some votes that will, if possible, vote down the Government's motion.

My contention is that the Government has submitted this motion in good faith for definite, concrete purposes and has made it as wide as there was any possibility of making it, if any regard is to be had for the wisdom of leaving the management some opportunity to make the road a success. If no regard is to be had for that, as hon. gentlemen immediately opposite argue, then certainly there would be no need for any restraint; but if regard is to be had for that, then we have made the very least possible restraint that you can make. I have submitted this, I know, not with any hope that I will change the vote of any hon. member who has declared himself; I could not expect that; but I lay it before the House in the hope that I will change their minds or, at least, give them some grounds for reflection whether they are on solid ground or not, and certainly with the hope that I will convince them that the Government has nothing in the world to conceal for its own purposes; that it has submitted this in the utmost good faith as the furthest step that can be taken, and the best designed to get real and useful results for the country.

Hon. CHARLES MURPHY (Russell): Mr. Speaker, my contribution to this debate will be a brief one, and I will endeavour to confine myself strictly to the point at issue. In the latter regard I know that I will have your cordial good wishes.

Adverting to what was said by the hon. member for Red Deer (Mr. Clark) in the last of his many admirable speeches, may I point out to him, with all respect, that as regards the fears which he has expressed of what would happen if we had what is called parliamentary control, or House of Commons control, of the railway systems of this country, his argument proceeded upon the basis that such a thing apparently had never existed. The Prime Minister (Mr. Meighen) enlarged upon that and pictured, for the purpose of creating bogeys to frighten his friends angularly opposite, some terrible things that might ensue. For over fifty years we had parliamentary and House of Commons management of the Intercolonial, and none of the things which were pictured here this evening and this afternoon has ever happened.

Mr. MEIGHEN: All of them happened.

Mr. MURPHY: There was no interference with people; there was no disclosure of information that militated against the Intercolonial. Matters were carried out in a regular and businesslike way through the responsible department. The head of that department made his statement to Parlia-

ment, came before Parliament and was interrogated in the usual way regarding the details of his administration of the department and of the railroad committed to his care, so that we are not at all without precedent in connection with that phase of the matter.

Mr. CLARK (Red Deer): May I ask my hon. friend if the business results have been satisfactory?

Mr. MURPHY: The business results that were obtained were eminently more satisfactory than those that have been obtained since this House abdicated its functions and appointed this irresponsible board. The Prime Minister would have been more effective in the argument that he addressed, particularly to his friends angularly opposite, although towards the conclusion of it he gave up hope of affecting their votes—

Mr. MEIGHEN: I did not start in time.

Mr. MURPHY:—if he had spoken before the right hon. member for King's (Sir Robert Borden), because that right hon. member's argument destroyed, in advance, the effect of the argument of the Prime Minister. My right hon. friend has just interjected that he did not start in time. His remark reminds me of an Irishman who came running into a railway station just as the train was moving out and who made a similar remark. His friend said: "You did not run fast enough." The Irishman replied: "I ran fast enough, but I did not start soon enough." This was the case with my right hon. friend in attempting to affect the votes of his friends angularly opposite.

Hon. Mr. REID: It was a Scotchman who said that.

Mr. MURPHY: If the Government really desired, through a series of questions to be submitted to a committee to give effect to what is in the mind of the Canadian people at the present time in regard to the railway situation, these are the questions that ought to be submitted to their proposed committee:

(1) What is the total amount of the present railway deficit?
(2) What are the causes that produced that deficit?
(3) What remedy should be applied to prevent a recurrence of railway deficits?

Then, if the Government further desired to go about the matter in a thoroughly practical way, they would invest the committee with the powers prescribed in the amendment moved by the leader of the Opposition. But the Government has done nothing of the kind. Instead of submitting practical questions of that kind to be determined by this committee, the Government proposes to submit a set of questions that will entail prolonged discusssion, endless hair-splitting, and, in the end, no practical results. One has only to read the questions to see that standing out in all its nakedness before him. Let me read them:

(1) What information as to operation of Canadian National Railways and Shipping as conducted by the Board of Directors and Management should, in the public interest, be brought down in Parliament on Question, Motion for Production of Papers, or otherwise.
(2) When, by that method, and under what conditions, if any, should such information be given, regard being had for the necessity of securing to Parliament and the public all facts requisite for the determination of policy (including finance), and to the Board of Directors the best possible conditions for efficiency of management.
(3) What system of auditing should be adopted, and what extent of detail should be given in the Annual Report.
(4) Whether and for what purposes the said committee should be continued, and that for the above purposes and for such other purposes as the committee deem in the public interest there be referred to said committee the Annual Report of the Board of Directors and that the said committee have power to examine witnesses under oath, to send for papers, persons, and records, and to report from time to time.

That is not the kind of information that the Canadian people are looking for at the present time and expect this Parliament to obtain. The people expect, yea, the people demand the fullest possible information on the railway situation. On that score, there is complete agreement between those who advocate public ownership and those who advocate private ownership and operation of railways. In support of that, let me read a few extracts from a couple of editorials published immediately after the preceding debate in this House upon this subject. On March 24, last, the Toronto Globe said:

In his speech on the condition of the Government railways Dr. Reid made an appeal for advice as to how the situation could be improved. Obviously the House could not respond to the appeal unless it were put in possession of the facts, and from this point of view there was force in Mr. King's amendment asserting the right of Parliament to full information as to the working of the railways. The taxpayers, who will have to make good a deficit of nearly $70,000,000 this year, have also a right to be informed. The objection that information of this kind might give an unfair advantage to the Canadian Pacific railway, a formidable rival of the Government railways, has not a great

deal of weight. The success of the C.P.R. has much more solid foundation than the obtaining of an occasional glimpse into the business of its rivals. Nor is it fair to assume that the amendment moved by the Opposition was actuated by hostility to Government ownership. Public ownership must be accompanied by publicity and responsibility.

Further in the same article the Globe says:

What the House and the country require is not fragmentary information as to details, but a clear understanding of the working of the system, its weaknesses and their causes, with a view to finding a remedy if possible. This is not to be found either in the annual statements of the Minister of Railways or in any accounts or other information submitted to Parliament. Government ownership on so vast a scale is a new departure, and new means of communicating information must be devised.

Still later the same editorial goes on:

The general principle that the House should control the expenditure of public money applies as much to railways as to any other branch of the public business. Public ownership does not mean, or should not mean, the denial of one of the first principles of responsible government.

And again:

The vastness of the system and the huge expenditures it involves are reasons, not for less, but for more information.

Then on the same date the Montreal Gazette, an exponent of the principle of private ownership and operation of railways had this to say in an editorial:

Perhaps as good an illustration as can be found to prove that the National railway has been taken out of politics is the proposed appointment of a Parliamentary Committee to bring it into politics. The absurd pretence that the property of the people can be turned over to an irresponsible Board of Directors compelled the Prime Minister to take up a wrong attitude towards the amendment of Hon. Mr. King on Tuesday evening. The constitutional principle which the leader of the Oppositon invited the House to approve is absolutely unassailable, that principle being "that it is the undoubted right of Parliament to demand and receive copies of all reports, accounts, correspondence and papers in relation to the management of every department of the public service, including the affairs of the Canadian National railways, whether operating directly under the control of a department or under corporate form."

The Government treated Hon. Mr. King's amendment as tantamount to a vote of want of confidence, and as a consequence it was rejected; yet the principle that the people who pay the taxes have a right to know how the proceeds of the taxes are applied survives.

The pretension that to submit the National railway management to the inquisition of Parliament might lead to divulging of important business secrets to the Canadian Pacific Company is not to be taken seriously. We imagine the executive officers of the Canadian Pacific will not sit at the feet of the National Railway Board to learn wisdom. The point, however, is this: who owns the National railways; out of whose pockets come the money to make up the operating and interest charges of that system? The people of Canada own the roads; they and they alone are the proprietors and if the management has been entrusted to half a dozen or more reputable gentlemen, does that deprive the owners of the right to demand an accounting? The truth is that the Government made a false step when it set up the pretence that the National railway was taken out of politics by intrusting its affairs to a government-appointed Board. The National railway has not been taken out of politics; it cannot be taken out of politics; and it should not be taken out of politics. As well contend that the Canadian Pacific Directorate, or that any other corporate institution should not be amenable to its shareholders. It is the last thing to be tolerated that a dozen gentlemen, however estimable, should be given a free hand to do as they will with the property of the people. The Government is accountable to Parliament for its administration of public affairs; why should that accountibility be removed from the men who manage the largest and most important branch of the public service?

The editorial concludes with this statement:

The question is of supreme importance, and the sooner the Government drops the flimsy pretence that the responsibility for the management of the people's railways has been committed to an irresponsible directorate, and is therefore immune from criticism, the sooner will the country arrive at a solution of its most difficult and disturbing problem.

So that the position taken by the hon. leader of the Opposition, as expressed in the amendment that is now before the House, is endorsed as I have said by those who advocate public ownership, as well as by those who advocate private ownership of these great public utilities.

Now, Sir, up to the time the right hon. gentleman the member for King's (Sir Robert Borden) spoke this afternoon, the discussion had proceeded on the assumption that this Government committee which the Government proposes would investigate something, but the right hon. the member for King's made it quite plain that this committee would not investigate anything. In so doing he destroyed practically all the arguments that had been advanced in support of the Government's position up to that time, and he also took the force out of the argument which the leader of the Government addressed to the House just a few moments ago. What did the hon. member for King's say? In rather vigorous language he criticized the position taken by my hon. friend from Marquette (Mr. Crerar) in supporting the amendment, and in doing that he made the definite statement, a very proper statement, I submit, that the purpose of this proposed committee is not to conduct an investigation, but to

define a principle. That, Sir, I submit, is precisely the fact, but that, Sir, I again submit, is not what the people of this country expect of any such committee at this present time, and, Sir, in view of that fact, I commend not only the wisdom of my hon. friend from Marquette, and his friends who sit about him, in supporting this amendment, but the greater wisdom of my hon. friend the leader of the Opposition in embodying these sound principles in the resolution which he has placed in your hands.

Then the right hon. gentleman from King's said that after defining a principle, and he took good care not to say how many weeks or how many months it would take the committee to define this principle, the committee could come to this House and ask for powers to carry out this principle. Now may I inquire how long the Government intends that this farce should go on? How long is this performance to be kept up about defining a principle and then coming back to this House to find out how you are going to apply that principle, when, and to whom? If the Government are allowed a free hand in the matter, I venture the prophesy, that the leader of the Government will not be able to get away to the Imperial Conference in June next, because long after that time this House will be deliberating some feature of this principle which is to be defined by this committee. Now is it not apparent to everybody who has given a moment's thought to the subject that while the Canadian people are hungering for the facts about the railways, this proposed committee, limited to these four questions, will spend its time debating theories and in discussing academic issues? This committee will not only spend its time in doing that, but in bringing in interim reports to this House, and further time will be taken up in discussing these reports here and in issuing further instructions to this committee. Then in the end what will happen? My hon. friend from North Oxford (Mr. Nesbitt) expressed grave regret this afternoon that somebody on this side of the House should have even mentioned the prospect of a majority and a minority report. Well, it is not so many years ago that my hon. friend and I served on the Soldiers' Boots Committee of this House, and I recall with a good deal of pleasure that he was then very glad to join in a minority report when the majority in the committee undertook to stifle the facts and prevent them from being known to the House. So majority and minority reports are not as strange to my hon. friend from North Oxford as he would lead the House to believe.

There will be time spent in doing all these things. Then a debate will take place in this House, after the majority and minority reports are brought in here, and finally the majority report will be endorsed by the majority supporting the Government in this House. Well, Mr. Speaker, what period of the year do you think we shall have reached then? We will have gone long past the time when the right hon. gentleman should have sailed for the Imperial Conference, and the country which at this moment expects us to be busy eliciting the facts as to the total amount of the railway deficit and the causes contributing to that deficit, and studying means for providing a remedy to prevent a recurrence of that deficit—the country that expects us to do that will by that time have become so disgusted with this Parliament that the force of public opinion will, I believe, drive these gentlemen to the polls no matter how disinclined they may be to face the electorate.

The situation has been referred to as a serious one. Of course it is. Nothing could be more serious than the railway situation that confronts us to-day. But how is it possible that there should fall from the lips of hon. gentlemen who pictured the gravity of the situation, the proposition that the time of this House and of a committee embodying a large number of members from every section of the House should be occupied in debating theories, in defining a principle, instead of going into matters in a businesslike way and ascertaining the facts. I am glad to see my hon. friend from Oxford (Mr. Nesbitt) coming to his seat; he also expressed the hope that this committee would be composed of business men. In that remark I find an echo of some observations heard in this House a few days ago regarding the desirability of having business men and not lawyers on this committee or similar committees. Well, I may point out to my hon. friend from Oxford that a lawyer is the head of the most successful transportation system in this country, if not in the world. The president of the Canadian Pacific Railway is a lawyer; and I might also point out to my hon. friend and those who entertain this idea, that a business man has been the head of the institution that has made the mess we are called upon to deal with at the present time in connection with the Canadian National

Railway system. A lawyer is also the head of the great United States Steel Corporation, one of the best managed and most successful institutions in the world; while a business man made the terrible mess of the railway situation in the United States. I could go further in this connection, but it is unnecessary to extend the argument.

Mr. MEIGHEN: My hon. friend might proceed along that line, keeping in mind the speeches of his leader out in Western Canada.

Mr. MURPHY: True, I could proceed along that line, but the further I went the worse would become the case for the Government; I have already made it bad enough. Now, Mr. Speaker, at this hour I do not intend to detain the House any longer. The Government, in effect, are resorting to a manœuvre to rid themselves of a responsibility which is essentially theirs, and theirs alone. They propose to have a committee prescribe a line of procedure which they themselves, by their attitude in this House, have already made it plain to Parliament and to the country is their policy in regard to railway matters, and they are doing this so as to throw upon Parliament a responsibility, which, as I have already said, is the Government's alone and from which the electors of this country will not allow them to recede.

12 m.

Mr. BUTTS: Will the hon. gentleman allow me a question?

Mr. MURPHY: Yes.

Mr. BUTTS: Was it not the late Laurier government that made, to use your own words, the greatest mess of the railway situation?

Mr. MURPHY: No.

Some hon. MEMBERS: Question.

Mr. SPEAKER: Before putting the question, I must direct the attention of the House to the fact that a misprint appears in the last line of the second paragraph of the main motion, the word "and" having been inserted instead of the word "for" before the word "efficiency." I think this will be obvious on perusal.

The House divided on the proposed amendment of Mr. Mackenzie King, which was negatived on the following division:

YEAS

Messrs.

Archambault,	Boivin,
Béland,	Bourassa,
Brouillard,	Lanctôt,
Cahill,	Lapointe,
Chisholm,	Léger,
Copp,	Lemieux,
Crerar,	MacNutt,
d'Anjou,	McDermand,
Davis,	McMaster,
Déchêne,	Maharg,
Délisle,	Marcile (Bagot),
Demers,	Michaud,
Desaulniers,	Molloy,
Deslauriers,	Murphy,
Duff,	Pacaud,
Ethier,	Papineau,
Euler,	Pelletier,
Fafard,	Savard,
Fontaine,	Séguin,
Fortier,	Sinclair (Antigonish and Guysborough),
Fournier,	Sinclair (Queens, P.E.I.),
Gervais,	Thomson (Qu'Appelle),
Gould,	Tobin,
Halbert,	Trahan,
Jacobs,	Turgeon,
Johnston,	Vien,
King,	Wright—56.
Knox,	
Lafortune,	

NAYS

Messrs.

Andrews,	Long,
Argue,	MacKelvie,
Arthurs,	McGibbon (Muskoka),
Ballantyne,	McGregor,
Ball,	McIsaac,
Blair,	McLean (Royal),
Blake,	McQuarrie,
Boyce,	Martin,
Butts,	Meighen,
Calder,	Merner,
Casselman,	Morphy,
Charters,	Myers,
Clark (Bruce),	Nesbitt,
Clarke (Wellington),	Nicholson (Algoma),
Clements,	Paul,
Cooper,	Peck,
Cowan,	Redman,
Crowe,	Reid (Grenville),
Davidson,	Sexsmith,
Douglas (Cape Breton S. and Richmond),	Shaw,
Drayton (Sir Henry),	Sheard,
Edwards,	Smith,
Finley,	Spinney,
Foster (Sir George),	Stacey,
Fraser,	Steele,
Fulton,	Stevens,
Glass,	Sutherland,
Green,	Thompson (Weyburn),
Halladay,	Thompson (Hastings),
Harrison,	Thompson (Yukon),
Hartt,	Tolmie,
Hay,	Tremain,
Henders,	Tweedie,
Hocken,	Whidden,
Keefer,	Wigmore,
Lalor,	Wilson (Saskatoon)—73.
Lang,	

PAIRS

Messrs.

(The list of Pairs is furnished by the Chief Whips).

Kemp,	Kay,
Charlton,	McCoig,
Stewart (Hamilton),	Truax,
Allan,	Lesage,

Armstrong (Lambton),	Leduc,
Douglas (Strathcona),	Ross.
Mackie (Edmonton),	Hunt,
Guthrie,	Pardee,
Manion,	Parent,
Scott,	Proulx,
Best,	Gordon,
Chabot,	Devlin,
Bowman,	Macdonald,
Fripp,	Cannon,
Crothers,	Reid (Mackenzie),
Doherty,	Marcil (Bonaventure),
Borden,	Clark (Red Deer)
Tudhope,	Maclean (Halifax),
Cockshutt,	McCrea,
Anderson,	Campbell,
Maclean (York),	Bureau,
Porter,	Casgrain,
Currie,	Stein,
Bonnell,	White (Alta),
Mackie (Renfrew),	Pedlow,
Brien,	McKenzie,
Bristol,	Gauvreau,
Middlebro,	Robb,
McCurdy,	DuTremblay,
Harold,	Buchanan,
Griesbach,	Kennedy (Essex),
Wilson (Wentworth),	Rinfret
Nicholson (Queen's)	Verville.
Cruise	McGibbon (Argenteuil)

Mr. ROBB: I was paired with the hon. member for North Grey. Had I voted I would have voted for the amendment.

Mr. FIELDING: I was paired with the hon. member for Victoria (Ont.) Had I voted I would probably have voted for the amendment.

Mr. PROULX: I was paired with the hon. member for South Waterloo. Had I voted I would have voted for the amendment.

Mr. CAMPBELL: I was paired with the hon. member for Halton. Had I voted I would have voted for the amendment.

Mr. McDONALD: I was paired with the hon. member for North Huron. Had I voted I would have voted for the amendment.

Mr. REID (Mackenzie): I was paired with the hon. member for West Elgin. Had I voted I would have voted for the amendment.

Mr. CLARK (Red Deer): I was paired with the right hon. member for Kings, N.S. Had I voted I would have voted for the amendment.

Mr. BUCHANAN: I was paired with the hon. member for Brant. Had I voted I would have voted for the amendment.

Mr. McCURDY: I was paired with the hon. member for Laurier-Outremont. Had I voted I would have voted against the amendment.

Right Hon. Mr. DOHERTY: I was paired with the hon. member for Bonaventure. Had I voted I would have voted against the amendment.

Mr. BONNELL: I was paired with the hon. member for Victoria (Alta.). Had I voted I would have voted against the amendment.

Hon. T. A. CRERAR (Marquette): Before the main motion is put I should like to suggest to my right hon. friend the leader of the Government that the motion might well be enlarged in one particular, and I propose to offer an amendment to that effect. I will take only a minute or two in suggesting one or two reasons for it. One of the essential needs to final success in the operation of our national railways and merchant marine, is the complete establishment of confidence on the part of the public in the management and control of the enterprise, and I am bound to say that that confidence will, in large measure, depend upon the freedom from political influence of any kind with the proper administration of the system. Only in such a way also can complete efficiency in management be secured. Now under the present method of handling this matter, the appointment of the Board of Directors, and consequently the control of the management, lies in the hands of the Government. I am not here offering any criticism of the Government for the manner in which that responsibility has been discharged by them in the past, but nevertheless I wish to point out the fact that so long as that condition obtains, whether it is under the present Government or any Government that succeeds it, the possibility of that power being used by the Government of the day for political ends will be present in the minds of a great many people in this country, and it is very desirable, Sir, that it be removed if possible from them.

Now, I quite recognize the difficulty that confronts one in the consideration of this question. It has been said to-night that the people of Canada are the shareholders in this railway system, and that is absolutely and entirely true. At the same time they cannot discharge the functions that are ordinarily discharged by shareholders in a private corporation. On the other hand if the matter is left entirely in the control of the Government, the abuses that I have already referred to will arise as far as the election of directors are concerned and the appointment of the management. It seems to me therefore, Sir, that it would

be well if my right hon. friend who leads the Government would consent to an enlargement of the powers of this committee in one particular, and to that end—without any desire to keep the House sitting any longer because I trust I have made my position clear in the short statement I have made—I beg to move, seconded by the hon. member for Red Deer (Mr. Clark):

That the motion be amended by adding thereto as clause 5, the following words:

What aproximation, if any, consistent with the responsibility of Parliament in the matter, can be found to the appointment and the control of directors and management ordinarily exercised by shareholders in a private corporation.

I think this is a matter that might well engage the attention of the committee. If we are to reach any sound settlement of this very important question it must, I think, be found, if possible, along the lines I have indicated. I could extend my remarks and amplify the argument in favour of this amendment; but I do not wish to do so at this late hour; it would be a hardship on the House after we have spent so many hours to-day in debate. Therefore, I submit this amendment to my right hon. friend in the best of faith and with an honest desire to help, and I trust he may see his way clear to accept it.

Mr. FIELDING: Will you accept the amendment?

Mr. MEIGHEN: I find myself in general agreement with the hon. member for Marquette (Mr. Crerar), Mr. Speaker, as regards the object that he has in view, and I am glad to say that I am able to give him another evidence that my argument was correct on the motion in chief, by assuring him that I am prepared to accept the amendment in wider terms than he puts it. Among the subjects to be deputed to the committee for inquiry he suggests:

What approximation, if any, consistent with the responsibility of Parliament in the matter can be found to the appointment and to the control of directors and management ordinarily exercised by shareholders in a private corporation.

What the hon. member has in mind, if I read his amendment correctly, is as to whether or not there might not be appointed in some way some body which would take the place usually occupied by shareholders in relation to a private concern. That is the suggestion the hon. member makes as to a possible improvement in the plan that Parliament has adopted for the management of the system. I would suggest to him that it would be better to make it wider, so as to include not only any recommendation the committee might see fit to make along the line of his amendment, but along any line at all that the committee might feel would be a suggestion looking to the improvement of the general scheme of management. I intimated when the matter was first before the House, that that might be well submitted as a suitable subject for inquiry by the committee, and I know the hon. member will admit in a moment that if it is to be a subject for inquiry, while it should of course be definite, still keeping it definite it should be as wide as it can be made. If, for example, the committee should feel that the Board of Directors might be differently appointed, without establishing any body to take the place of shareholders, or if they might have any other recommendation that they saw fit after inquiry to make, that would enable Parliament to improve the general scheme of management of the system, it should be recommended. The plan now is to appoint, by the Government, a Board of Directors of business men, a president and general manager. If there is any better plan, whether it is along the line the hon. member suggests by his amendment or not, then if this committee can recommend it, it will be of advantage to this House.

I have re-drafted the amendment myself in these words, which I think cover the ground:

What, if any, improvement could be made in the general scheme of management.

That undoubtedly would enable the committe, if they saw fit, to report in favour of just such a plan as the hon. member intimates is in his mind by the amendment that he moves, and it would enable the committee, if they thought there was anything better or anything additional to that, to recommend that as well. I am prepared to accept the amendment in that form. I do not think it would be put in the best shape just in the way it is submitted by the hon. member, first, because it is too confined, and, second because I do not know that the expression means in the ultimate just exactly what the hon member intended it to mean.

Mr. SPEAKER: The hon. member for Marquette (Mr. Crerar) has, of course, exhausted his right to speak, but I am sure that under the circumstances the House will

accord him the indulgence of stating whether or not he will accept the substitution suggested by the Prime Minister.

Mr. CRERAR: Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the courtesy of the House in extending to me this privilege. I must confess at once that I have not the definiteness and ability in drafting amendments that my right hon. friend the leader of the Government has. Nevertheless, with the statement he has made and the suggestion he has also made for the change in the wording of my amendment, I am quite willing to agree. The main purpose I had in bringing it forward was, if possible, to get some consideration by this committee of this important matter. The change my right hon. friend has made, accompanied by his statement that it would be even broader in its application than the amendment I submitted, is entirely satisfactory to me and I am quite willing that his suggested amendment shall be substituted for mine.

Mr. MEIGHEN: The words should appear, Mr. Speaker, after the word "continued" in the first line of clause 4. That is where the clause really ends; the rest of the motion applies to all the foregoing clauses.

Mr. McMASTER: Might I suggest, Mr. Speaker, that "5" had better take the place of "4" and then that "4" be changed to "5"?

Mr. MEIGHEN: That is quite satisfactory.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: Mr. Speaker, the resolution of my right hon. friend related primarily to discovering the methods whereby information could be given to Parliament in respect to the management, control and operation of these National railways. The amendment which is now proposed has to do not so much with the question of information, which is the one that we have been discussing throughout the day, as it has with considering a different method of control and management. As such, it seems to me that it introduces an entirely new subject for the consideration of the committee.

I have already pointed out that I thought the object of the Government in instituting the committee was to get away entirely from the question of disclosing information as fully as this House wishes to have it, and to substitute a series of other questions for the committee to consider. This amendment adds just one more to the list. Much more time of the committee will now be taken up in considering questions of management and control, and we shall probably be put off further than ever from getting the information which we wish to receive. On the other hand, if there is going to be a committee I suppose there is no harm in referring to it any number of questions. The subject dealt with in the amendment now proposed is an important one, which might well be debated in Parliament at any time. But if the reference of one additional question to the committee will have the effect of assisting the Government to discover a policy for itself, I for one have no objection to its addition. At the same time, I should say that the committee as a whole is not acceptable to us on this side of the House, because it is not a committee with power to get full information and to get it at once, but is rather, as I have already stated, a committee for the purpose of engaging in studies of an academic character. While I do not think the proposed committee will meet the purposes which we have in view, there is not enough objection to the reference to it of the additional question to warrant our asking the House to divide on the amendment.

Mr. CAHILL: Before this amendment is adopted I should like to say a word. It would seem from the discussion to-night that this resolution as drafted is not sufficient to meet the requirements of the situation. Would it not be possible for the leader of the Government to have the House moved into Committee of Supply on a given date in order that we may discuss this question and determine just what should be submitted to the proposed committee? I make this simply as a suggestion. I am satisfied that the Government will find themselves in great difficulties even after this proposed committee is appointed, but not nearly in as great difficulties as those with which the country will find itself confronted. We are all looking for a solution of this question. Hon. members opposite accuse the Opposition of playing politics, but certainly hon. gentlemen on this side have had no hand in the playing of politics in regard to these railways. It is the earnest desire of every member of the Opposition, I am sure, to find a solution. It is quite apparent that if this resolution is amended at the eleventh hour—which is after twelve o'clock—it will still be not capable of meeting the conditions. I think the Prime Minister should consider some method of arriving at a com-

mittee that would have complete power to handle this whole question.

Mr. SPEAKER: Mr. Crerar moves in amendment, seconded by Mr. Clark (Red Deer), that the following be inserted as clause 4:

4. What if any improvement could be made in the general scheme of management.

And that the present clause 4 of the resolution be made clause 5. Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt the amendment?

Amendment (Mr. Crerar) agreed to.

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

Some hon. MEMBERS: Carried on division.

Some hon. MEMBERS: No.

Mr. SPEAKER: Mr. Meighen moves, seconded by Sir Henry Drayton:

That a Select Standing Committee on National Railways and Shipping be appointed for the present session, and be instructed to inquire into the following questions:—

(1) What information as to operations of Canadian National Railways and Shipping as conducted by the Board of Directors and Management should, in the public interest, be brought down in Parliament on Question, Motion for Production of Papers, or otherwise.

(2) When, by what method, and under what conditions, if any, should such information be given, regard being had for the necessity of securing to Parliament and the public all facts requisite for the determination of policy (including finance), and to the Board of Directors the best possible conditions for efficiency of management.

(3) What system of auditing should be adopted, and what extent of detail should be given in the Annual Report

4. What if any improvement could be made in the general scheme of management.

5. Whether and for what purposes the said committee should be continued, and that for the above purposes and for such other purposes as the committee deem in the public interest there be referred to said committee the Annual Report of the Board of Directors and that the said committee have power to examine witnesses under oath, to send for papers, persons, and records, and to report from time to time.

The House divided on the motion of Mr. Meighen; as amended, which was agreed to on the following division:

YEAS

Messrs.

Andrews,	Butts,
Argue,	Calder,
Arthurs,	Casselman,
Ballantyne,	Charters,
Ball,	Clark (Bruce),
Blair,	Clarke (Wellington),
Blake,	Clements,
Boyce,	Cooper,
Cowan,	McQuarrie,
Crerar,	Maharg,
Crowe,	Martin,
Davidson,	Meighen,
Douglas (Cape Breton S. and Richmond),	Merner,
	Morphy,
Drayton (Sir Henry),	Myers,
Edwards,	Nesbitt,
Finley,	Nicholson (Algoma),
Foster (Sir George),	Paul,
Fraser,	Peck,
Fulton,	Redman,
Glass,	Reid (Grenville),
Gould,	Sexsmith,
Green,	Shaw,
Halladay,	Sheard,
Harrison,	Smith,
Hartt,	Spinney,
Hay,	Stacey,
Henders,	Steele,
Hocken,	Stevens,
Keefer,	Sutherland,
Knox,	Thompson (Weyburn),
Lalor,	Thompson (Hastings),
Lang,	Thompson (Yukon),
Long,	Thomson (Qu'Appelle),
MacKelvie,	Tolmie,
MacNutt,	Tremain,
McDermand,	Tweedie,
McGibbon (Muskoka),	Whidden,
McGregor,	Wigmore,
McIsaac,	Wilson
McLean (Royal),	(Saskatoon)—80.

NAYS

Messrs.

Archambault,	Lafortune,
Béland,	Lanctôt,
Bourassa,	Lapointe,
Brouillard,	Léger,
Cahill,	Lemieux,
Chisholm,	McMaster,
Copp,	Michaud,
d'Anjou,	Molloy,
Déchêne,	Murphy,
Délisle,	Pacaud,
Demers,	Papineau,
Desaulniers,	Pelletier,
Deslauriers,	Savard,
Duff,	Séguin,
Ethier,	Sinclair (Antigonish and Guysborough),
Fafard,	
Fontaine,	Sinclair
Fortier,	(Queens, P.E.I.),
Fournier,	Tobin,
Gervais,	Trahan,
Jacobs,	Turgeon,
King,	Vien—42.

PAIRS

Messrs.

(The list of Pairs is furnished by the Chief Whips).

Kemp,	Kay,
Charlton,	McCoig,
Stewart (Hamilton),	Truax,
Allan,	Lesage,
Armstrong (Lambton),	Leduc,
Douglas (Strathcona),	Ross,
Mackie (Edmonton),	Hunt,
Guthrie,	Pardee,
Manion,	Parent,
Scott,	Proulx,
Best,	Gordon,
Chabot,	Devlin,
Fripp,	Cannon,

Doherty,
Tudhope,
Cockshutt,
Maclean (York),
Porter,
Currie,
Bonnell,
Mackie (Renfrew),
Brien,
Bristol,
Middlebro,
McCurdy,
Griesbach,
Wilson (Wentworth),
Stewart (Lanark),
Nicholson (Queen's)
Cruise
Marcil (Bonaventure),
Maclean (Halifax),
McCrea,
Bureau,
Casgrain,
Stein,
White (Ata),
Pedlow,
McKenzie,
Gauvreau,
Robb,
DuTremblay,
Kennedy (Essex),
Rinfret,
Boivin.
Verville
McGibbon (Argenteuil)

PRIVATE BILLS

CONSIDERED IN COMMITTEE—THIRD READINGS

Bill No. 31, an Act respecting the Canadian Pacific Railway Company.—Mr. Mewburn.

Bill No. 32, an Act to incorporate The Canadian Transit Company.—Mr. Kennedy (Essex).

Bill No. 8, an Act respecting The James MacLaren Company.—Mr. Fontaine.

Bill No. 45, from the Senate, for the relief of William Henry Coulson.—Mr. Hocken.

Bill No. 46, from the Senate, for the relief of Elizabeth Alexander.—Mr. Douglas, (Strathcona).

Bill No. 47, from the Senate, for the relief of William Gleaves Doyle.—Mr. Best.

Bill No. 49, from the Senate, for the relief of Dorothy Mearuel Score.—Mr. Fripp.

Bill No. 50, from the Senate, for the relief of Henry William Maynard.—Mr. Hocken.

Bill No. 51, from the Senate, for the relief of George Elmor Glossop.—Mr. Copp.

SECOND READINGS

Bill No. 58, from the Senate, for the relief of Hazel Galbraith.—Mr. Douglas (Strathcona).

Bill No. 48, from the Senate, for the relief of William John Bell.—Mr. Tudhope.

On motion of Right Hon. Mr. Meighen, the House adjourned at 1 a.m. Saturday.

APPENDIX

The statement referred to at page 1755 as ordered to be published in the Debates is given herewith. The statement is accompanied by the following letter:

TORONTO, April 7, 1921.

Dear Dr. REID:—Referring to my letter of yesterday's date, enclosing answers to questions asked in the House by Hon. Mr. Murphy, relative to wages paid on the Canadian National railways.

You will note answer to Question No. 4, showing the monthly earnings paid to certain classes of employees, is based on the regular working hours, but in order to show the effect of the overtime conditions, I am enclosing herewith a memorandum, in duplicate, giving total earnings of twelve agent-operators at different points on the eastern lines of Canadian Northern railway for the years 1916-20, which you may wish to add to our answer to Question No. 4.

Yours very truly,

A. J. MITCHELL,
Vice-President.

The Honourable J. D. REID,
Minister of Railways & Canals,
Ottawa, Ont.

Question 4 of the series asked by Hon. Charles Murphy (Russell) on 7th instant. is as follows:

4. What are the monthly earnings as compared with 1916 for the following classes of employees working full regular working hours:—Shop Mechanics, Carmen, Agents and Operators, Freight Shed Men, Trackmen, Bridge and Building Men?

The statements given in answer to the series of questions, including the No. 4 above, will be found appended to the Debates of 7th instant. The supplementary statement ordered to be published in the present issue follows:

QUESTION 4— MEMORANDUM

The earnings per month shown for the various classes of employees are exclusive of overtime for emergency service. We are, however, showing below a statement prepared for the years 1916 and 1920 showing the total earnings of 12 agents, which will show that the total earnings are greatly affected by overtime conditions. We would, however, point out the stations referred to were some of the stations where the highest amount of overtime had been paid, and does not mean that every station would be affected the same way, as far as the individual earnings are concerned, as at points where it is found more economical to add an extra operator it is done, rather than pay overtime. However, the expense to the Railway is practically the same whether it is paid in overtime or for additional staff, due to the eight hour day. The earnings shown below would be further increased through the application of Decision No. 2 of the United States Railway Labour Board dated July 20th, 1920.

Position	Location	Amount Earned		Average Monthly Rate		Schedule Rate 1916		Schedule Rate 1920	
		1916	1920	1916	1920	January to April	May to Dec.	January to April	May to Dec.
Day Operator	Capreol	891·82	2,656·91	74·32	221·41	62·50	70·00	140·00	170·00
Agent	Parry Sound	1,160·00	2,348·21	96·67	195·68	90·00	100·00	165·00	192·00
Agent-Operator	Washago	936·56	1,767·43	78·05	147·29	63·00	67·00	113·00	125·00
Agent-Operator	Deer Lake	916·00	2,238·76	76·33	186·56	64·00	70·00	125·00	149·00
Agent-Operator	Key Jct	1,397·51	2,094·14	116·46	174·51	64·00	68·00	125·00	149·00
Agent-Operator	Torrance	1,022·11	2·502·56	85·18	208·55	63·00	68·00	113·00	139·00
Agent-Operator	Udney	1,010·73	2,406·31	84·23	200·53	63·00	67·00	113·00	138·00
Agent-Operator	Beaverton	1,234·79	2,964·53	102·90	247·04	70·00	77·00	130·00	160·00
Agent-Operator	Pefferlaw	990·16	1,999·33	82·51	166·61	63·00	68·00	111·00	136·00
Agent-Operator	Orono	842·70	2,182·84	70·23	181·90	68·00	73·00	125·00	158·00
Agent-Operator	Brighton	1,035·83	2,880·46	86·32	240·04	68·00	73·00	125·00	149·00
Agent-Operator	Yarker	1,053·35	2,262·73	87·78	188·56	65·00	75·00	150·00	180·00

Tuesday, April 11, 1921.

The House met at Three o'clock.

CIVIL SERVICE—LIST OF RETIREMENTS

Hon. J. A. CALDER (Minister of Immigration and Colonization): Mr. Speaker, I beg to lay on the table of the House the First Annual Report of the Civil Service Commission on its Operations under the Act respecting the Retirement of Certain Members of the Public Service, as required by section 7, chapter 67, 10-11 George V. In other words, it is a report of the retirements made during the calendar year 1920 under the Retirement Act passed at the last session.

CANADIAN NATIONAL RAILWAYS

REFERENCE TO SPECIAL COMMITTEE OF THE HOUSE

On the Order being called, "Motions:"

Right Hon. ARTHUR MEIGHEN (Prime Minister): Mr. Speaker, I am ready to move the motion for the appointment of the special railway committee of the House, authority for which was given in the form of a resolution passed on Friday, but owing to the absence of the leader of the Opposition I defer it for the present. Later in the afternoon I shall move that we revert to this Order.

PRIVATE BILLS

FIRST READINGS

Bill No. 62 (from the Senate), for the relief of Frederick Harold Walton.—Mr. Fripp.

Bill No. 63 (from the Senate), for the relief of Mary Elizabeth Leonard.—Mr. Ball.

Bill No. 64 (from the Senate), for the relief for Alexander LaRue.—Mr. Douglas (Strathcona).

Bill No. 65 (from the Senate), for the relief of Maria Martin Morel.—Mr. Fripp.

QUESTIONS

(Questions answered orally are indicated by an asterisk).

PECUNIARY CLAIMS CONVENTION

Mr. DEMERS:

1. Does the Board of Arbitration, established pursuant to a convention called "Pecuniary Claims Convention" to give award upon the claims of money existing between the British Empire and the United States, among which are included the claims of Canadian hay dealers for overpaid rates of duty, still exist?

2. If so, does the Government know when the reopening of the sittings of said Board, which have been suspended since 1914, will take place?

3. Does the Government intend to take steps toward the resumption of the hearings of said Board in a near future?

Right Hon. ARTHUR MEIGHEN: I am informed that this question was answered on **March 10 and that it** appears on page 774 of Hansard. Perhaps it had better stay on the Order Paper, however, as the hon. member who put the question is not in his seat.

Question stands.

DAYLIGHT SAVING

Mr. ETHIER:

1. Is the Government aware that in certain sections of the country daylight saving has been prescribed as from May 1 to October 1 next?

2. Is the Government aware that the change from solar time thus separately fixed, in various parts of the country, is such as to bring about great confusion and actual inconvenience, patricularly to the rural communities?

3. Is it the intention of the Government to pass legislation in this connection, through the enactment of a uniform statute providing for the regulation of the time throughout the Dominion?

Sir GEORGE FOSTER:

1. The Government is aware, through reports in newspapers and otherwise, that daylight saving has been prescribed, as from May 1 to October 1 and other dates, in certain sections of the country.

2. The Government is not prepared to go into any explanations nor to give any information with reference to that complex question.

3. It is not the intention of the Government to pass legislation, through the enactment of a uniform statute, providing for the regulation of the time throughout the Dominion.

BLOOD INDIAN RESERVE

*Mr. MOLLOY:

1. Did the Government of Canada in the year 1883 make and conclude a treaty with the Blood Indians in which it was provided that there should be reserved for the use of the said Blood Indians forever that tract of land in Southern Alberta known as the Blood Reserve?

2. How many cattle belonging to the Blood Indians and to the Indian Department were on the Blood Reserve during the fiscal year 1917-18, according to the reports of the Indian Agent?

3. How many Blood Indian horses were on the reserve at that time, according to the same authority?

4. Were there in the said year approximately 10,000 head of white ranchers' cattle grazing

on the Blood Reserve with the consent of the Indians and under a formal grazing concession (or a renewal thereof) granted by the Indians themselves some fifteen years before, with the approval of the department and continuously utilized during that period?

Right Hon. ARTHUR MEIGHEN:

1. The treaty, being a public document, speaks for itself.
2. 3,300.
3. 3,462.
4. No.

*Mr. WHITE:

1. What is the total number of cattle and horses that were already on the Blood Reserve when the Government started its greater production campaign on Indian Reserves in the Spring of 1918?
2. What income from the grazing on their reserve of cattle and horses belonging to white people did the Blood Indians receive for 1917?
3. Was the Blood Reserve one of the Indian Reserves classified by the Minister of the Interior as largely vacant and unutilized when he was answering objections to the passage of the amendment to the Indian Act on April 23, 1918, as reported in Hansard, pages 1048 to 1055?

Right Hon. ARTHUR MEIGHEN:

1. Cattle 3,300, horses 3,677.
2. $10,250.
3. Yes.

*Mr. WHITE:

1. How many grazing leases of portions of the Blood Reserve were issued in 1918 by officers of the Department of Indian Affairs?
2. Was the leasing done by public tender?
3. Who authorized the granting of leases on the Blood Reserve without asking or obtaining the consent of the Indian owners?
4. Under what law were the grazing leases of 1918 on this Reserve issued?
5. Does the Government believe that war urgency is a valid excuse for breaking treaties?

Right Hon. ARTHUR MEIGHEN:

1. 38.
2. No.
3. Answered by No. 4.
4. Under authority of Order in Council of February 16, 1918, and section 4, Cap 26, 8-9 George V.
5. Answered by No. 4.

*Mr. MOLLOY:

1. Did a delegation of prospective lessees come to Ottawa in the early months of 1918 to secure leases on the Blood Reserve from the Government? If so, on what date?
2. Who were the delegates, and who was the member or representative of the Government with whom they discussed the matter in Ottawa?
3. Did the Indian Department, or any of its executive officers, without obtaining the consent of the Indians, grant a number of grazing leases on the Blood Reserve in the spring of 1918?
4. If so, for how long a term were said leases granted?

[Mr. Molloy.]

Right Hon. ARTHUR MEIGHEN:

1. No.
2. Answered by No. 1.
3. Yes, under authority of Order in Council of February 16, 1918, and section 4, Cap. 26, 8-9 George V.
4. One year term renewable yearly up to five years, and subject to termination upon giving six weeks' notice in writing.

*Mr. WHITE:

1. Is the Government aware that certain Blood Indians were by the Greater Production leases of 1918 deprived of their means of living on the reserve and have since been obliged to roam about the surrounding country hunting odd jobs by which to support their families?
2. Is it the intention of the Government to continue the said grazing leases on the Blood Reserve for 1921?
3. How many Blood Indians are at present homeless as the result of the said Greater Production leases of 1918 and the continuation thereof in 1919 and 1920?
4. Is it the intention of the Government to repeal the amendment of the Indian Act under which these dispossessions took place?
5. Has the Indian Department offered compensation to any of the dispossessed Indians? If so, when, to whom, and what was the compensation offered?
6. If not, why?

Right Hon. ARTHUR MEIGHEN:

1. No.
2. Yes, if it is in the interest of the Indians to do so.
3. Answered by No. 1.
4. It is not the intention of the Government to introduce any amendments to the Indian Act during the present session. (See answer No. 1).

5 and 6. Answered by No. 1.

*Mr. SHAW:

1. What revenue has been received for the Indians owning the various reserves in Saskatchewan and Alberta from grazing leases since the spring of 1918?
2. What rentals were previously received for the benefit of the Indians from these lands?
3. What amount of the total revenue was received on account of the Blood Reserve and credited to the Blood Indians?

Right Hon. ARTHUR MEIGHEN:

1. $321,976.
2. $10,000.
3. $97,190.

*Mr. SHAW:

1. Who was the agent of the Blood Reserve from June, 1908, to June, 1911?
2. Did the financial inspector of the department report on the cattle conditions of this reserve in July, 1911?
3. What was the nature of his reports?
4. Did the agent refuse to sign the statement of the cattle owners?
5. How many cattle were there on the Blood Reserve according to the statements of the agent in 1909?

6. How many were found on the reserve in 1911 when the cattle were dipped for mange?

Right Hon. ARTHUR MEIGHEN:

1. R. N. Wilson.
2. Yes.
3. The inspector reported as follows:

The cattle business which should be the greatest industry here has for some years been declining at a tremendous rate. The agent's annual report shows that in 1909 they had 7,348 head, which in 1910 had fallen to 5,285 head, or a loss of 2,063 head, which, if estimated at $30 each, would represent $61,890, and the calf crop had fallen from 1,667 to 980 in one year. At the count this year which was made during the dipping for mange, and which can be relied upon as nearly correct as can be made under the circumstances, the count was 2,934, and 459 calves branded in addition. This makes a loss to the herd of 2,351 head, which at an average of $30 per head represents $70,530, or a loss in two seasons of over $132,000 in value, besides a reduction in the calf crop from 1,667 in 1909 to 459 in 1911, although it is altogether likely there will be more calves dropped this year. It will be noted that there are only 912 cows left and 98 two-year-old heifers. These are the classes that a hard winter affects the most here, because nothing was done to provide against the cold weather, no hay was put up, the calves were not weaned, and the yearling heifers were not kept away from the bulls. Consequently when the severe weather came the calves sapped the strength of the cows, and the heifers raising two years, heavy with calf and maturing their bodies, were not able to stand it. I cannot understand how everything was allowed to go on so recklessly after the previous year's loss. I asked the stockman how it happened that no preparations were made, and his reply was characteristic, that "the agent would rather provide a diamond ring for the engineer than a toothpick for the stockman."

4. Yes.
5. 7,348.
6. 3,393.

*Mr. WHITE:

1. How many leases were granted for grazing purposes on the northern end of the Blood reserve in 1918 under the Greater Production scheme?
2. Approximately, what was the total acreage covered by said north end leases?
3. How many of said leases fixed a limit as to the number of live stock to be grazed and in such cases how many head of stock were allowed to each section of 640 acres?
4. Were any of the above lessees compelled to fence their leases?
5. How many of the above class of leases, on the Blood reserve in 1918, were free of both fencing conditions and restrictions as to the number of stock brought on to the reserve under them?
6. Did these leases give the holders thereof practically unlimited grazing privileges over the unleased portion of the Blood Reserve?

Right Hon. ARTHUR MEIGHEN:

1. 21.
2. 43,299.78 acres.
3. None.
4. No.
5. All.
6. No.

*Mr. MOLLOY:

1. Was that southwestern portion of the Blood reserve containing approximately 40,000 acres and habitually used by the Blood Indians for hay-making and as a winter grazing range for their cattle leased by an official of the Indian Department to white men in 1918?
2. Was access to the said land by the Blood Indian cattle herds shut off by the construction in 1918 of a 12 or 13 mile fence dividing the said area from the rest of the reserve?
3. Has the attention of the Government been called to the fact that in 1918 a large portion of the hay land, upon which the Blood Indians were dependent for the feeding of their cattle and the support of their families, was leased by the Indian Department to white men?
4. What quantity of hay was removed from the Blood Reserve by the Greater Production lessees during the fiscal year 1918-19?
5. What quantity of hay and straw was removed from the Blood reserve by the "Production" lessees during the fiscal year 1919-20?

Right Hon. ARTHUR MEIGHEN:

1. Grazing leases were granted on the southwest portion of the Blood Reserve in 1918 in order to produce revenue for the Blood Indians, ample areas remaining for the support of the Indians' cattle.
2. No.
3. Answered by Nos. 1 and 2.
4 and 5. The Department of Indian Affairs has no information that any quantity of hay and straw was removed from the Blood reserve by the greater production lessees during the fiscal years 1918-19 and 1919-20.

*Mr. SHAW:

1. In what year did the Blood Indians first engage in the business of raising cattle?
2. How many cattle were supplied by the Department of Indian Affairs in that year?
3. Who took charge of the Blood reserve in 1903, and when did he leave the service of the department?
4. How many cattle were on the reserve when he took charge?
5. How many cattle did he report to be on the reserve in 1905, 1906, and 1907 respectively?
6. How many cattle were found to be on the reserve when he left the service of the department?

Right Hon. Mr. MEIGHEN:

1. 1894.
2. 50.
3. R. N. Wilson was appointed by Order in Council of December 21, 1903, to take charge from February 1, 1904. His resignation was accepted June 15, 1911.

4. 3,519.
5. 1905, 6,000; 1906, 7,500; 1907, 7,621.
6. 3,393.

CAMP BORDEN—AEROPLANES

Mr. SINCLAIR (Guysborough):

1. How many aeroplanes are now in commission at Camp Borden?
2. What was their total initial cost?
3. How much was expended on repairs during the year 1920?
4. What was the total expenditure for the staff and the wages of all operators and employees for the year 1920?
5. How many planes were wrecked at this camp since the armistice?
6. What has been the total expenditure for all purposes in connection with the maintenance of this camp since the armistice?

Hon. Mr. GUTHRIE:

1. 59.
2. Nil.
3. $29,814.66.
4. $130,925.15, including pay and allowances of all officers and airmen.
5. 6.
6. $33,959.50.

CANADIAN CITIZENS' WAR CLAIMS

Mr. DUFF:

1. What are the number of claims received by the Government from Canadian citizens, for damages sustained and loss of property by the depredations of German submarines during the period of the war?
2. What are the amounts of the said claims, for loss of goods and for loss of shipping?
3. What is the total amount of saleable assets at present in the hands of the Government which formerly belonged to the German government or German citizens?
4. Will the Canadian Government, following the example of United States and Great Britain, settle the claims of Canadian citizens and pay to them the reparation due them? If so, when?

Hon. Sir HENRY DRAYTON:

1. 459.
2. (a) Loss of life and damage to persons, number of claims, 105, $1,452,-194.06; (b) Loss of merchandise and personal effects, number claims, 320, $900,-785.64; (c) Loss of shipping, number for claims, 28, $17,105,904.94; total, $19,458,-884.64.
3. This amount can only be estimated, $23,000,000.
4. There is no legal claim for payment of reparation. Such claims cannot, therefore, be said to be due. The Government is not aware of any policy respecting payment of claims for reparation announced by the Government of the United States. The policy of the United Kingdom was announced by the then Chancellor of the Exchequer on May 4, 1920, as follows:

[Mr. Meighen.]

But His Majesty's Government recognize that in particular cases, while there can be no legal claim, a private individual may have a strong moral claim for compensation for sufferings or damage for which it will be the desire of Parliament to make provision. They propose, therefore, to set aside a sum of £5,000,000 out of the first receipts on account of reparation which are allocated to the Exchequer of the United Kingdom as distinct from the British Empire (which cannot be till after payment has been made for the cost of the Armies of Occupation) to be used as fund out of which payments can be made to individuals as an act of grace on the part of His Majesty's Government.

MONTREAL INLAND REVENUE OFFICES

Mr. RINFRET:

1. Is it true that the offices of Inland Revenue Department, at Montreal, have been transferred into the Customs building?
2. If so, for what reason?
3. Is it the intention of the Government to change the number of employees of the Inland Revenue Department, at Montreal?

Hon. Mr. WIGMORE:

1. The Inland Revenue offices at Montreal have been transferred to the Customs building.
2. Consolidation of Customs and Inland Revenue services.
3. The question of reducing the Customs and Inland Revenue staff is under consideration.

HIGHWAY GRANTS—SASKATCHEWAN

Mr. WRIGHT:

1. For how many highways in the province of Saskatchewan has a project statement been approved by the Minister of Railways for Federal grants under The Canada Highways Act, chapter 54 of the Statutes of Canada, 1919?
2. What are the highways in respect to which agreements for Federal aid have been reached between the province of Saskatchewan and the Minister of Railways?
3. Have any sums been paid to the province of Saskatchewan under the Canada Highways Act?
4. If so, what is the total amount up to March 31, 1921?
5. To what road or roads do these payments apply?

Hon. Mr. REID (Grenville):

1. 3.
2. Cadillac-Battleford highway, Section "G," extending from Battleford to North Battleford, a distance of 2½ miles.

Assiniboia-Prince Albert highway, Section "B," extending from Crestwynd to Moose Jaw, a distance of 25 miles; Section "D," extending from N.E. 36-19-27-2 to N.E. 32-20-26-2, a distance of 9 miles; Section "G," extending from N.E. 33-34-27-2 to Dana, a distance of 25 miles.

Big River-Prairie River highway, Section "A," extending from Big River to S.E. 6-43-7-2, a distance of 16-1/4 miles; Section "F," extending from Prince Albert to Shellbrook a distance of 26½ miles.

3. No.
4. Answered by No. 3.
5. None.

HIGHWAY GRANTS—ALBERTA

Mr. REDMAN:

1. For how many highways in the province of Alberta has a project statement been approved by the Minister of Railways for Federal grants under "The Canada Highways Act," chap. 54 of the Statutes of Canada, 1919?
2. What are the highways in respect to which agreements for Federal aid have been reached between the province of Alberta and the Minister of Railways?
3. Have any sums been paid to the province of Alberta under the Canada Highways Act?
4. If so, what is the total amount up to March 31, 1921?
5. To what road or roads do these payments apply?

Hon. Mr. REID:

1. None. The general plan of roads to be improved under the Canada Highways Act has been approved by the minister, but no separate projects have yet been submitted by the province.
2. None.
3. No.
4. None.
5. None.

GRIFFENHAGEN AND ASSOCIATES

Mr. ETHIER:

1. Are Messrs. Griffenhagen and Associates still in the employ of the Government?
2. If so, what is the nature of their present work?
3. Does the Government intend to dispense with their services? If so, when?

Sir GEORGE FOSTER:

1. No.
2. Answered by No. 1.
3. Answered by No. 1.

Some members of the Griffenhagen and Associates are still employed under supervision of the sub-committee of Council and in conjunction with the Civil Service Commission in carrying out the reorganization already begun in the Post Office Department, and the Department of Customs and Inland Revenue.

QUESTIONS PASSED AS ORDERS FOR RETURNS

Mr. ETHIER:

1. How many civil servants were appointed to permanent positions on April 1, 1921, and what are the names of such employees?
2. What is the classification of each of the said employees and the department in which they are employed?
3. What is the date of their first appointment to a temporary position?
4. Upon whose recommendation have said employees been made permanent?
5. Have other temporary employees been recommended for permanency? If so, when will they be so appointed?

Mr. CURRIE:

1. How many promotions have been made in each grade in each separate department of the Inside Service in Ottawa for the year ending April 4.
2. How many of these promotions were made on account of qualifications obtained through Civil Service examinations?
3. How many promotions were made without qualifying certificates being held by the candidates as a result of having taken the Civil Service examinations?
4. How many promotions were made in each department without reference to Civil Service examination and without classification?

Mr. MYERS:

1. How many officials are now employed by the Canadian National Railway system in the traffic and operating departments?
2. How many officials were employed by the Canadian Northern Railway in the traffic and operating departments prior to the Government taking over the system?
3. How many officials were employed by the Grand Trunk Pacific Railway in the traffic and operating departments prior to the Government taking over the system?
4. How many officials were employed by the Canadian Government railways, namely, the Intercolonial and Transcontinental, in the traffic and operating departments prior to the amalgamation of the companies into the Canadian national system?
5. What was the total cost in connection with wrecks on the Canadian national railway on the line between Saskatoon and Calgary for the year 1920?
6. Was the cost of wrecks charged up to operating expenses or to capital account?
7. What was the total detention expenses on the Canadian railway between Saskatoon and Calgary for the year 1920?
8. Why is it that certain equipment of the Canadian national railway is charged to operation expenses instead of capital account?
9. What is the total amount charged to capital account for the year 1920 in connection with Canadian national railways?

UNOPPOSED MOTIONS FOR PAPERS

Mr. SMITH:

For a copy of all correspondence, telegrams, petitions and other documents exchanged between the Dominion Government and the Ontario Provincial Government or any ministers of either administration, relative to the removal of the British embargo on Canadian cattle.

Mr. SINCLAIR (Guysborough):

For a copy of all telegrams, correspondence, petitions or other documents exchanged between the Government of Prince Edward Island and the Federal Government relative to the taking over and operating of the Dalton Sani-

torium by the Federal Government and the handing back of the same to the Government of Prince Edward Island.

SULLY, QUEBEC, PROPOSED STATION

On the notice of Motion:

Mr. GAUVREAU:

For a copy of all letters, correspondence, petitions, financial statements and all other documents, exchanged between the settlers of Sully and along the National Transcontinental in the county of Temiscouata, and the Superintendent of the Government railways in connection with the erection of a station at Sully, Quebec.

Right Hon. ARTHUR MEIGHEN: It occurs to me that as the mover of this motion is here, he would probably consent to the motion being transferred to the committee which was ordered by the House on Friday.

Mr. GAUVREAU: Yes.

Motion dropped.

MURRAY BAY-TADOUSSAC—PROPOSED STEAMSHIP SERVICE

Mr. P. F. CASGRAIN (Charlevoix-Montmorency) moved:

That, in the opinion of this House, an up-to-date steamship service should be established between Murray Bay situated in Charlevoix County and Tadoussac in Saguenay County.

He said: Mr. Speaker, at the beginning of my remarks I think it is well that I make plain to the House that the steamship service which I ask the Government to establish between Murray Bay and Tadoussac is especially for the fall, winter and spring months. It may be that the House is not familiar with conditions that prevail in that part of the province of Quebec, and I would like hon. members to bear with me for a few minutes in order that I might make my position clear. In the month of October when the Canada Steamships line ceases its summer service in that part of the district, the people of Tadoussac and other parts below, as far as Belle-Isle, and further down the river, rely, for communication with the district of Quebec, upon the service of a small ferry boat between Tadoussac and Baie Ste. Catherine. A few years ago there was in operation in the province of Quebec, in connection with the Department of Railways and Canals, a ferry boat service running between Rivière Ouelle and Murray Bay, conducted by the C. G. S. Champlain. This service was discontinued at the time when the Quebec and Saguenay railway was put into operation in 1919. At that time I succeeded in obtaining from the Minister of Marine and Fisheries (Mr. Ballantyne), with the asistance of the Department of Trade and Commerce, that this steamer which was making the service between the north and south shores, would be transferred for the fall, winter and spring months to the service between Murray Bay and Tadoussac, calling at intermediate points, Cap à L'Aigle, Ste. Fidele, St. Simeon, Baie Ste. Catherine, and crossing over to Tadoussac. This steamer, I am told, made twenty-eight or thirty trips in 1919, until last spring when finally the service had to be discontinued because the boat was sold to the Gulf of St. Lawrence Navigation Company, Quebec. Since that time, I have been endeavouring on numerous occasions, through communications, petitions and letters addressed to the Minister of Marine and Fisheries, and also through communications addressed to the Department of Trade and Commerce, to have established a new means of communication between that part of my county, Murray Bay, Cap à L'Aigle, St. Fidele, St. Simeon, Baie Ste. Catherine and Tadoussac, but I have always met with a refusal on the part of the Government. The Government contends that the service which at present exists between Baie Ste. Catherine and Tadoussac is sufficient. There is, I admit, a certain little boat which is supposed always to transport the mail from Tadoussac to Baie Ste. Catherine and vice versa. I have received numerous letters about this boat, and I am informed that it is quite inadequate for the needs of the people. I understand that it is only about 12 feet in length, and that very often during the heavy storms in the spring and fall and winter it is unable to cross from one side of the river to the other. I hold in my hand a letter from a gentleman who is well known in the district of Quebec, Mr. D. H. Pennington, a prominent lumber and timber merchant, who writes under date of March 16, as follows:

Mr. CASGRAIN, M.P.,
Ottawa, Ont.

Dear Sir,—I am owner of Mille Vache Seigniory in the county of Saguenay, and I had occasion to drive down there last week, and I was surprised when I arrived at Baie St. Catherine to cross over to Tadoussac, to find nothing but a small canoe about 12 feet long, to cross the Saguenay river; that is all they have there to cross passengers and mails now, and when there is a wind blowing you cannot cross and when it is fine it certainly is not very agreeable.

With all the lumber operations that are now going on below the Saguenay, it is a downright shame for the public, and the very important mails to be subject to such treatment, and they

tell me that only a few days before I crossed, that half the mail bags went adrift and were picked up out of the water. No doubt it is too late to do much for this winter, but other winters are coming.

This Mr. Pennington is the owner of a large pulp mill, the Saguenay Lumber Company, at Mille Vaches. There are also other pulp mills of great importance in that district, and nearer Murray Bay, at St. Siméon there are pulp mills conducted by the MacLaren people and by the Provincial Industries Limited. Then there is another mill in which my hon. friend from Drummond and Arthabaska (Mr. Brouillard) is heavily interested. Very often in the winter when the people down there have requisitioned supplies, the supplies have been sent as far as Murray Bay, and from there they have had to be taken by sleigh for thirty-five or forty miles to Baie Ste. Catherine, and from there the supplies have to take their chance in crossing the river in this little canoe of which I have spoken. When in company with Mr. Philippe Dufour, the local member for the county, who lives at Murray Bay, I took this matter up with the Department of Trade and Commerce, I was informed that it did not come within the jurisdiction of the Federal authorities, and that the Department of Trade and Commerce could do nothing in the matter because it was a river wholly within a province, and the ferry should be supplied by the Provincial Government. I took issue with the department on that point at that time, and I was very much surprised to find out to-day that not only the Department of Trade and Commerce entertained that opinion but the Department of Finance also. Some time ago I put a question on the Order Paper asking what was to be done with regard to the petitions for a better service that had been sent in by the people in that part of the country and I received the following reply on March 8:

Mr. Casgrain:

1. Has the Government through the Department of Marine and Fisheries and Post Office, received any petitions or demands for a steamer service between Baie Ste. Catherine and Tadoussac, in the County of Saguenay, under the control of the Government.

2. Has the Government considered the necessity and advisability of such a service being granted?

3. Is it the intention of the Government to grant the request contained in the said petitions?

Sir Henry Drayton:

1. Yes.

2. Yes.

3. Upon consideration of the Department of Marine and Fisheries it was decided that as this was a ferry service it should be supported by the Provincial Government.

I join issue with the Government on that very point. It is clear by the British North America Act that navigable rivers come under the control of the federal authorities. In fact, a few years ago there was some trouble in the county I have the honour to represent, at Baie St. Paul, where a certain lumber company had erected dams along the river. The Government by Order in Council last year compelled them to demolish those dams. There is proof that the Government or their experts considered this a navigable river and, as such, coming within the control of the federal authorities. Furthermore, I am informed that recently when a bridge was built on the St. Charles river, the Provincial Government had to obtain the consent of the federal authorities before construction could be commenced. Surely, a navigable river of the width and length of the Saguenay, which is two-and-a-half miles across at the place I am speaking of, comes within the jurisdiction of the federal authorities.

I do not want to detain the House much longer, but I should like to draw the attention of the Government to the contract which now exists between the Post Office Department and the person who is taking the mails across at that point. It is in French, and reads as follows:

L'entrepreneur devra effectuer la traverse de la rivière Saguenay aussitôt que possible après son arrivée à la Baie Sainte-Catherine, ou après son départ de Tadoussac, quand bien même il serait obligé de se servir d'un yacht à cet effet.

I am told that this clause in the contract was never put into effect. If it had been put into effect, the contractor would have been forced to secure a yacht or some vessel of sufficient capacity to enable him to take care of the passenger traffic at that point as well as the mails. As the Government apparently does not want this man to live up to the letter of his contract, I have presented this resolution, in order to obtain from the Government the grant of a subsidy or assistance from the Department of Marine and Fisheries in the way of a Government boat between Murray Bay and Tadoussac, stopping at the places I have mentioned.

Last year, when this matter come up on the Estimates of the Canadian Government Merchant Marine, I drew the attention of the House to the fact that in that matter the Government was entering upon an adventurous policy, the advantages of which had not been shown, and the results of

which were very doubtful. I said that the Government surely ought to be able to spare a few hundred thousand dollars to provide a boat service for the people in that part of the country. I blamed the Government at that time for not taking proper steps to provide a service, and I again, this year, make the same complaint, and would urge upon the Government that a subsidy be granted as was done a few years ago, or that a regular boat service be provided by the Government for the people in that part of the country which I represent. I think the merchant marine in this way would be performing better service than by doing what it is now, sailing the seven seas. A boat of 100 tons could perform this service and call at the different ports, and I am sure that if the merchant marine performed service of this kind instead of what it is now doing the deficit on the merchant marine would not be so big as it was last year.

Mr. SAVARD (Chicoutimi-Saguenay): (Translation.) The subject of my hon. friend's resolution (Mr. Casgrain) would perhaps concern my constituency more than his own. I therefore heartily endorse this resolution. The facts of the case have been so ably put forward by the hon. member that I have very little to add to what he has already said. However, with your permission, Mr. Speaker, I will make a few remarks on the subject. The population of the whole county of Saguenay and of the Northern Coast, which includes a great number of parishes and some very important industries, has been since two or three years, absolutely isolated from the rest of this country, on account of the niggardliness of this Government.

Some years ago the firm of Price, one of the largest business concerns in the province of Quebec, had an important mill at St. Catherine's. As it was necessary to communicate with the North Shore, the firm maintained a ferry service between St. Catherine and Tadoussac, thus benefiting the North Shore's population from Tadoussac to Labrador by giving it the means of communication. This company maintained its ferry service during many years, but having finally shut down its plant at St. Catherine, had no further interest in continuing the ferry. It was then that the Saguenay people asked the Government, at that time under the leadership of Sir Wilfrid Laurier, for the necessary assistance to maintain the ferry between St. Catherine and Tadoussac. The Government having understood the importance of the request and the necessity for the people of the Northern Shore to communicate with the rest of the country, immediately granted about three thousand dollars. With the aid of this subsidy those interested hired a fine boat and organized a daily service between St. Catherine and Tadoussac, which continued without interruption during the winter. I did not expect to speak upon this question so I have not the exact dates at hand, but it was some years ago before I had the honour to sit in this House, that the right hon. Minister of Commerce, as my hon. friend the member from Charlevoix has just stated, cut off this subsidy, claiming that as a ferry-boat this service should be subsidized by the Provincial Government of Quebec. In consequence that part of the country is isolated. I do not know whether the member then representing these people made any effort to prevent this crying injustice, perhaps one of the greatest committed by the Government. I do not mention these facts simply because it is a part of the population of my county that suffers from this state of affairs; I cannot believe that the right hon. Minister of Commerce has understood the importance of keeping the population of the North Shore in touch with the rest of the country, and the injustice these people are suffering through his department. I refuse to believe that, to save a few hundreds or thousands of dollars, this service has been cut off, depriving of communication an intelligent population that has given soldiers to the country, many of whom sleep their last sleep in Flanders. Even while admitting that the Government was not absolutely obliged to maintain this steamboat service, due consideration should have been taken of the great inconvenience caused by its suppression, especially at a time when millions of dollars are being thrown to the four winds and when twenties and even hundreds of millions are being talked about for ships that we claim are absolutely useless. To deprive this population of a service which is absolutely necessary in order to save a few thousand dollars, as a serious mistake, and I to not believe that the right hon. Minister of Commerce has realized the injustice committed by his department, for if he had, he would not have cut off this subsidy. I do not know whether the member who represented this county before me endeavoured to prevent this injustice being committed, but I am inclined to think not; for I imagine that the

then member had influence enough with the Government to prevent it. I will further say that there was laid upon the table on September 19th, or October 19th, 1918, a letter from Mr. Girard, former member for Chicoutimi, addressed to the Hon. Postmaster General, in which he said, referring to the assistance asked for by the Priest of Tadoussac and also myself, to permit a gasoline launch service to carry the mail between St. Catherine and Tadoussac, that it was useless. I can, then, only conclude, since he had the courage, not to call it the cowardice, to affirm that this little ferry service was useless, that he did not do his duty towards his electors when the right hon. Minister of Commerce cut off this subsidy in 1916.

I have had occasion to talk with the right hon. Minister of Commerce on this subject, and he told me, as I have just said, that it was a ferry service, and should be looked after by the province of Quebec. He added, "the province of Quebec is so flourishing, its coffers are so full of money, that it would be easy for it to give some thousands of dollars to this population to permit it to communicate with the rest of the country." I did not contest his statement concerning the finances of the province of Quebec, because if ever there was a true statement, it is that one.

I had the occasion, at the time, to meet Sir Lomer Gouin, the Prime Minister of the province of Quebec, whom I apprized of the opinion of the right hon Minister of Trade and Commerce. The latter had told me: "consult Sir Lomer Gouin on this matter and let me know what he thinks about it." This I did, in the course of a pretty long conservation I had with him; Sir Lomer Gouin stated that the right hon. Minister of Trade and Commerce was certainly mistaken, and that he would endeavour to show him so when he next came to Ottawa.

Sir Lomer Gouin came up to Ottawa a few days later, but he did not meet the right hon. Minister of Trade and Commerce, as the latter had left the Capital to go to Europe. The hon. member for Halifax (Mr. Maclean), the then acting minister, would not intervene, although he was fully convinced of the justice of the case, nor would he alter the decision which the right hon. Minister of Trade and Commerce had taken. The Question remained as it stood. These people were deprived of all means of communication during the long winter months. Deprived of every means of communication, I stated, but let there be no mistake: They had a mail service every eighth day, but at times they would be without it for a fortnight.

A population as that which inhabits that immense territory extending from Tadoussac to Labrador, a territory composed of from fifteen to twenty parishes, numbering from twelve to fifteen thousand inhabitants and in which important industries are established, is deprived of a postal service during whole weeks. To my mind, any intelligent people would but need a knowledge of such conditions to be unanimous in calling it an indignity, an infamy perpetrated on that population. I must say that I did all I could to obtain from the Government some relief for these citizens, and that we have succeeded to some extent, not through the Rt. Hon. Minister of Trade and Commerce, but through the Postmaster General. The hon. member for Charlevoix is now proposing a resolution which I fully approve, and I would be very glad if it were readily accepted by the Government.

Hon. RODOLPHE LEMIEUX (Maisonneuve—Gaspé): As a summer resident of the district under consideration, I desire to support the motion made by the hon. member for Charlevoix (Mr. Casgrain). There is a very large population at the mouth of the river Saguenay in the county of Charlevoix, and as my hon. friend the member for Chicoutimi-Saguenay (Mr. Savard) has said, there is also a large population on the other side of the river from Tadoussac to Belle Isle. There are at least twenty or twenty-five large fishing posts besides the Hudson's Bay posts in that district, and trade has been improving of late years, especially in view of the establishment of a large pulp industry. I might mention the Clarke establishment at Seven Islands, for instance, and several others. The district is certainly going to prosper, and the mouth of the river Saguenay ought not to be considered as a minor outlet. Considering its expanse, I should be inclined to compare it to an arm of the sea; and I might mention to the right hon. gentleman (Sir George Foster), that it is navigable in all seasons. For many years the department over which I presided, the Post Office Department and the Department of Trade and Commerce, I think, subsidized the steamer service between Fraserville and Baie Ste. Catherine; and, much to the surprise of the navigators in the Quebec district, a tug-boat could even in winter perform the service between Fraserville, on the south shore, and Baie Ste. Catherine on the north shore. That

little service gave excellent satisfaction for many years. I do not know whether it is still maintained; but I claim, at all events, that between the extremity of the county of Charlevoix and the beginning of the north shore settlements, there should be maintained a ferry service subsidized by the Government. The right hon. gentleman says that it ought to be subsidized by the province of Quebec. Technically he may be right; but I will remind him that in those far-away districts, where the habitations are scanty, and the posts are widely scattered, the Federal Government is usually somewhat generous towards the population. As we know, the Federal Government is not obliged to subsidize roads and highways. It is true that some years ago we passed a statute granting to the various provinces some subsidies which have to be spent according to certain fixed rules. Since Confederation, however, in the county of Gaspé, which I have the honour to represent, the Marine Department has maintained, on the northern portion of the peninsula, what is, known as the Maritime Road. That road in the county of Gaspé covers a considerable distance from Ste. Anne des Monts to Fame Point. Until very recently that highway has been maintained by the Federal Government because it was necessary to have it in good order for the repairs of the various lighthouses. I do not know whether the Marine Department has ceased subsidizing that road. At all events I know that since Confederation it has been maintained by the Dominion Government because around all these light houses and in all these little coves there are fishing posts. I claim, Mr. Speaker, that the case is analogous to that which has been presented to the House this afternoon by my hon. friend from Charlevoix. The county of Charlevoix is a large county, and the county of Chicoutimi still larger. Indeed it runs from Tadoussac, the oldest settlement in Canada, up to Belle Isle and away beyond up to Labrador; it is without railway communication and, as I said a moment ago the lumber industry —not to speak of the fur industry, or the fishing industry—is at the present moment undergoing such a development that the Government would be justified in maintaining that service on that arm of the sea, the Baie Ste. Catherine, the outlet of the Saguenay River. It is unfair that those far-away settlements should be deprived of their mail service during so many days of the months. It seems to me that when we pay such a large subsidy for the maintenance of a mail service in the Yukon District, which is comparitively new, we should not begrudge a small amount which would maintain this particular service in the oldest section of Canada all the year round.

Right Hon. Sir GEORGE FOSTER (Minister of Trade and Commerce): I have to thank my hon. friend from Charlevoix-Montmorency (Mr. Casgrain) for his courtesy in deferring the discussion of this question from last Monday until to-day to suit my personal convenience. I have listened to his remarks, which have been ably supported by the hon. gentleman (Mr. Savard) who sits behind him, and as is usual in all cases which concern Quebec, by my hon. friend from Maisonneuve (Mr. Lemieux); but I am afraid that the premises upon which they found their arguments are scarcely correct and maintainable in comparison with services which we carry on in other parts of the Dominion. No amount of good-will or sympathy can convert the mouth of the Saguenay River into an arm of the sea if you take into consideration where the Saguenay River enters the St. Lawrence, and the long expanse of the latter river, before it goes out to the sea. So that the good-will of my hon. friend from Maisonneuve rather played havoc with logic and with geographical definitions when he tried to argue that the Saguenay was equivalent at least to an arm of the sea.

Mr. LEMIEUX: Our people down below Quebec, past Fraserville, when they speak of the River St. Lawrence, always say, "C'est la mer."

4 p.m.

Sir GEORGE FOSTER: But the facts of the case are that the service from the county of Charlevoix to the county on the other side —that is between Ste. Catherine and Tadoussac—is really a service across the river Saguenay, and that river is an internal river within the province of Quebec. There is not an instance that I know of in all the Dominion where public money is voted from the federal treasury for the maintenance of any service between two banks of a river that flows within that province. My colleague (Mr. Calder) who was listening to the discussion that was taking place, brought to my attention this fact—that the province of Saskatchewan itself pays out over $150,000 a year for maintaining ferry services from one bank of a river to another bank, both banks being within its

own territory; and in all the provinces such ferries are kept up and maintained by the province itself. It is difficult to establish any difference, in point of administration, between the river Saguenay itself and any other river in a province where the convenience of the people makes it necessary to have a ferry service between the two banks of a river, or between towns and villages situated on either bank of that river. That is the view which has commended itself to the Department of Trade and Commerce and to the Government as well, and one can see no good reason for spending the money of the Dominion on a ferry service on that river, and declining to do it on other rivers in other provinces of Canada. It is a service which belongs, practically and primarily, to the province itself, and I am happy to know—as I believe my hon. friends opposite also are,—that the province of Quebec is in such a good financial condition at the present time as to enable it to take care of all these ferry services without being in the least incommoded thereby. I am glad also to know that I have the approbation of my hon. friend from Brome (Mr. McMaster) when I make that statement.

Mr. McMASTER: Silent approbation.

Sir GEORGE FOSTER: Silent at times but still my hon. friend's countenance speaks on such occasions. With reference to the postal service, that comes within entirely a different category. The postal service must be carried on by the Federal Government no matter whether it crosses provincial rivers or over provincial highways —that is the duty of the federal Government alone. I noticed what my hon. friend from Charlevoix-Montmorency said with reference to the contract made in this case by the Post Office Department with the man who carries the mail. I will call the attention of the Postmaster General to my hon. friend's statements, and if the contract is not lived up to I think the Postmaster General will give his personal attention to the matter. When the old ferry service was done away with by the federal Government, it then fell to the duty of the Postmaster General to get his mail carried across at the point in question, and he had to enter into another contract with whomsoever he could to have that service performed, and in part that particular ferry service has been aided to that extent. When the Dominion Government subsidized the service the mails were carried by virtue of that subsidy and no extra drain was made upon the Post Office Department, but when the subsidy was withdrawn, of course it became the duty of the Postmaster General to make other arrangements.

My hon. friend from Charlevoix-Montmorency advanced the argument that as navigable rivers fall under the jurisdiction of the Dominion Government, therefore it followed that the Dominion Government should subsidize services upon such rivers. I do not think he will find that in the constitution, and if he revises his argument I think he will come to a different conclusion, because I know that once he gets his premises right he is pretty sound and logical in building up his argument. Because the Dominion Government has jurisdiction over navigable rivers as to obstructions to navigation and other cognate matters that therefore it is bound to undertake all the provincial services which may be required on those rivers is, in my opinion, an argument that cannot be maintained.

With reference to the north shore generally, the Dominion Government has carefully and uniformly done the best it could towards serving the segregated settlements along that shore clear down to the straits of Belle Isle, and this year we are putting on at large expense what I hope will be the best service that we have yet attempted to furnish there. That will provide for the necessities of all the population from Quebec down to the furthest settlements, along that coast. We consider it the duty of the Dominion Government to do that, not because the trade warrants the expense, for up to the present time the trade has been small and the expense has been steadily growing, but because they are widely separated settlements and it is the part of the Dominion Government to be generous in providing services along such a coast line. I do not think that my hon. friend's constituents living along that coast will have any cause for complaint when the service which we are providing for the present year is inaugurated. It is in responsible hands and the vessels will be of a good class, and I hope there will be a decided improvement in that service.

I am afraid, therefore, that I cannot speak very hopefully to my hon. friend as to putting on a second service for a certain portion of that coast, or a ferry service on that portion of the river Saguenay on the opposite sides of which the two towns referred to are situated. It must be the duty of the local government to look after

a proper ferry service under conditions such as obtain there.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Before the hon. member (Mr. Casgrain) rises, it is my duty to advise the House that he will exercise his right to close the debate, and therefore if any other hon. member desires to speak he should do so now.

Mr. CASGRAIN: Mr. Speaker, I have listened with considerable interest to the remarks of the right hon. Minister of Trade and Commerce (Sir George Foster), but without being convinced. I am personally familiar with one case, as the hon. member for Gaspé (Mr. Lemieux) has pointed out. These are the facts. The people of these two counties bordering on the river Saguenay are not at all in the position of people living on each side of a river, for this is not a river service, it is a sea service. The boats crossing from Murray Bay to Tadoussac or in returning have to go right out to sea. The circumstances here are of a special character and necessitate special treatment. This is not simply a service across a river as instanced by the hon. minister. As to the granting of the service I am asking for establishing a bad precedent, I would direct the attention of my right hon. friend to the fact that on the very same river St. Lawrence, right in the open sea, the Government has for fifteen years subsidized the steamer Champlain to make connection between the Intercolonial at Rivière Ouelle over to Murray Bay. We are only asking for the continuance of this service down below from Murray Bay as far as Tadoussac in order to afford a link with the other portions of the county as far as Belle Isle and to be a feeder to the Quebec and Saguenay railway which is now being operated by the Government. As the hon. member for Gaspè has pointed out, these people are in a very peculiar situation. The settlements along the north shore were established in the early days of Canada, and the people living there have had to bear the burden of taxation that went towards improved railway and other facilities for the rest of the Dominion, and now that they ask this House to vote a few thousand dollars to help them keep their scattered communities in communication with one another the answer is that to grant such a request would be creating a bad precedent. As a matter of fact, we have already created similar precedents by contributing to improvements in other provinces, and I think this part of the country which I represent ought to be better treated than the hon. minister is prepared to treat it now.

Motion negatived.

SITTINGS OF THE HOUSE

WEDNESDAY SITTING. REGULAR ADJOURNMENT AT ELEVEN O'CLOCK

Hon. W. S. FIELDING (Shelburne and Queen's) moved:

That, in the opinion of this House, it is desirable that the rules of the House be so amended as to provide (a) that the hour of meeting on Wednesday be 3 o'clock instead of 2 o'clock, as at present, and (b) that the House adjourn at eleven p.m. unless exceptional circumstances recognized by the House generally, require a later sitting.

He said:

Mr. Speaker, the object I have in view in putting this resolution on the Order Paper, I need hardly say, is, not to divide the House, but to afford an opportunity, which I think is desirable, for the members on both sides to express their views on one or two points which it seems to me have an important bearing both on the comfort of members and on the efficiency of our work.

The resolution touches two things: First, the rule respecting Wednesday sittings, and, second, the hour of adjournment at night. In regard to the Wednesday recess, I think I may be accused of being the father of that particular baby, because I believe it was at my own suggestion that the Wednesday recess was at first adopted. I am not responsible, however, for the attachment thereto which requires the House to meet at two o'clock. I think the idea of an evening when the members shall be free to avail themselves of any opportunities that may offer for social engagements, is a very desirable thing. It makes for the efficiency of the House. There are members, of course, who take their duties somewhat lightly, and those may not attach much importance to an evening recess because they will take that recess whenever they want it irrespective of rules. But there are other members who give close and earnest attention to public business, and many of them, although they do not take a very active part in the debates, nevertheless feel it their duty to be present and listen with close attention in order that they may be fully informed of the public business of the country. To men of that class it is a burden to be here night after night without any recess at all. Men have a natural desire to be entertained, or to entertain, and they need opportunities for social engagements in one form or an-

other. I believe it is not unreasonable that there should be one such evening during the week, and if we so provide by rule, I do not think that the efficiency of the House will be diminished. On the contrary, hon. members would adapt themselves to the rule and say: Well, since we can make engagements for Wednesday evening we shall feel it our duty to be present on other evenings. I think, therefore, that the Wednesday evening recess is a very desirable thing; I regret that the Government, in the pressure of business, as they think, have already cancelled it for the present session; I would hope that even yet they might see the wisdom of changing that. However, we are dealing now with the general principle.

With regard to the meeting at two o'clock on Wednesday, I never approved of that; I think it is a mistake. With the engagements that members have in various ways during the forenoon—attending committees or possibly fulfilling private engagements —it is not easy for them to get to the House at two o'clock. I am sure that every hon. gentleman who has endeavoured to comply with that rule has found difficulty in doing so. I remember that not long ago one of the Cabinet ministers came in at three o'clock on Wednesday and expressed surprise that the House had been sitting for an hour. More than once I have known that to occur in the case of private members. I think it is well that we should have a regular and established hour of meeting for each day in the week, so that hon. members will not find it necessary to charge their memories as to what is the hour of meeting. Therefore, while I support the idea of the Wednesday evening recess, I strongly advise the meeting at three instead of at two.

As to the question of the hour of adjournment in the evening, it is found that little or no business of importance is ever done after eleven o'clock at night. Of course, under exceptional circumstances the House might sit until a later hour, and for that I am providing in my resolution. But as a rule, after the House has been sitting from three o'clock in the afternoon, and having regard to various engagements of hon. members and their committee meetings in the mornings, I think that until eleven o'clock is quite late enough to sit. If we adopt automatically the eleven o'clock rule, subject to exceptions in urgent cases, when the House generally would agree, members will adapt themselves to that rule and will arrange their business accordingly. I do not believe that we should lose any time as a result. As it is, the House quite frequently sits until a very late hour; one or two cases have occurred recently when adjournment did not take place until well on into the morning. On one occasion during this session we sat until about five o'clock in the morning. I think that is a foolish thing to do. In my long parliamentary experience I have had to do with a good many late night sittings. I have participated in some, possibly I have been responsible for some; but I have never looked back on one of those occasions without thinking how foolish it was that we did not close up our business at eleven o'clock and go home. Little or nothing is done when you have members sitting here after eleven o'clock at night; those who give close and careful attention to the business of the House are tired and weary and not in good condition to do business when the House meets the next day. I do not want to dwell on the question; I think these reasons are strong and will commend themselves to hon. gentlemen on both sides. My chief purpose in introducing the resolution is to afford an opportunity for a free and open expression of opinion on the part of hon. members, and I shall be glad if those who feel interested will tell the House frankly how they view the matter.

Mr. H. H. STEVENS (Vancouver Centre): Mr. Speaker, I am very glad that the hon. member for Shelburne and Queen's (Mr. Fielding) has brought up this subject —not that I agree with him, but in order that I may have this opportunity of expressing the view of one who comes from a great distance and is forced to remain in Ottawa practically during the whole session. It is all very well for hon. gentlemen who live within a few hours' journey from the Capital and who can give fair attention to their private affairs while the session is in progress to be anxious to restrict the hours of sitting of the House. But it is exceedingly unfair to those of us who come from a distance, who have to remain here during the whole session and who have no opportunity of attending to private business, that there should be two days of the week during which very little business is done, namely, Monday and Friday—the result of an ancient tacit arrangement between both sides of the House. It is generally understood that no contentious business will be carried on during those two days. When the House meets on Friday we note

that there has taken place a general exodus of hon. gentlemen who live eastward in Quebec and in eastern Ontario, and who leave Ottawa on the 3.30 or 4 o'clock train on Friday afternoon and remain away until Monday or Tuesday. On Friday night about nine o'clock nearly all the Ontario members, or a very large number of them, living west of Ottawa, in the vicinity of Toronto and in western Ontario, leave the city, and return, as a rule, on Tuesday morning. I submit that this is exceedingly unfair to those of us who are not privileged to communicate with our business associates at home or with our families. Now, I have no apology to make for speaking as I do, because during the thirteen sessions—I think it is—that I have been in the House I have only on one occasion missed more than seven days in a session; in many sessions it has been three or four days. I speak, therefore, with some conviction and with a considerable degree of feeling. I do not wish to make personal references, but I know how it is with myself. Business has suffered very seriously, and this condition could be remedied somewhat if hon. gentlemen attended the sittings of the House on Mondays and Fridays and evidenced on those days the same degree of interest in the business that they do on the other days of the week. If, moreover, we were to cut the speeches on ordinary occasions—excepting, perhaps, those of the mover and the seconder of a motion—down to about twenty minutes or half-an-hour, I think that would be a move in the right direction. But I submit to my hon. friend who moves this motion that nearly all the late sittings are occasioned by the participation in debate by hon. gentlemen who take very little interest in the business and who come in at the last moment when an important vote is about to be taken. I have seen it scores of times, and my hon. friend has seen it oftener than I have. An important subject is under consideration—we will say, the Budget, the speech from the Throne, or some other important matter—and it is generally understood, after a debate of perhaps two or three weeks, that a vote will be taken, say, on Tuesday. Well, under ordinary circumstances it is expected that the vote will be taken during the evening, but, one after another hon. gentleman whom, perhaps, we seldom see in the House and whom we seldom hear, get up and the debate drags on until two, three or four o'clock in the morning. That is invariably the case, so the condition which prevails is not the fault of those who regularly attend the sittings of the House; it is not the fault of those of us, I contend, who come from the remoter sections of the country. It is largely the fault of such hon. gentlemen as I have described.

Now, I would not favour restricting the hours as suggested by the hon. gentleman, because it would simply mean the prolonging of the session and the imposing of greater hardships upon those who attend regularly the sittings of the House. In my estimation, the adoption of this proposed rule would do no good. But I would like to see the rules amended, as I moved in the House about two sessions ago, so as to restrict the length of speeches in debate. That, I think, would tend greatly to facilitate the business of the House. I further would like to see this unwritten law of no serious business being taken up on Monday and Friday entirely done away with, so that during the five days of the week that the House is sitting we may accomplish as much business as possible.

Mr. MICHAEL CLARK (Red Deer): Mr. Speaker, I find myself in complete agreement with fifty per cent of the resolution of my hon. friend (Mr. Fielding). Speaking from personal experience, I have found the two o'clock to six o'clock sitting long and irksome and such as to make it difficult to follow closely all the business that goes on during those four hours. With regard to the recess in the evening on Wednesdays, I think we are doing very well. We have a recess in the evening for the first portion of the session when the darkness comes early and it is the pleasure of members to meet in social gatherings on that particular evening of the week.

I am not in agreement with my hon. friend as to his further proposition. There is something in what has fallen from the lips of the hon. member for Vancouver Centre (Mr. Stevens)—that we ought not to have these days in the week when we do not do any serious business. All the working days of the week ought to be treated very much alike. I cannot, however, quite agree with the hon. member for Shelburne and Queen's (Mr. Fielding) that no serious business is done in this House after eleven o'clock at night. Why, Sir, if I may say so, he himself is the very embodiment of the contradiction of what he has laid down in that respect. I have the pleasantest recollection of a speech which he delivered in the old Museum while we assembled there. I am sure it was after eleven o'clock at night when he renewed his reciprocity

discussion with the former Minister of Finance, and to the delight of everybody, in perfect temper and in round and éloquent periods, long after eleven o'clock at night, he assailed his opponent with horse, foot and artillery. Indeed, I think my hon. friend's brain considering the years it has functioned, is a perfect miracle of activity after eleven o'clock in the evening. I say that with all sincerity and, therefore, I contend that he himself is a contradiction of what he has stated. He has made so many good speeches in his time that he has forgotten the time of night at which he has delivered them, but I am sure I have not. I have heard many of his speeches delivered after eleven o'clock at night, all of them while he was an older man than I am at the present moment.

The resolution has some misgivings about itself, so to speak. It says that we might still find exceptional circumstances in which we should sit after eleven o'clock at night. It is only in exceptional circumstances that we do so now, and, indeed, at the beginning of this session, the disposition is all the other way. On the very first night of the debate on the Address, the House was adjourned at ten minutes to ten by a leading front-bench man on this side of the House. That is a reprehensible practice. We should as in so many things in life, begin as we mean to carry on with the sittings of Parliament; we should be a businesslike body from the beginning of the session to the end. I am in thorough agreement with the hon. member for Vancouver Centre in that respect. And his argument might be carried further in regard to the meetings at the beginning of the session. We ought to do business then just as we do it later; and I think there are special circumstances when the Government of the day would be justified, from the very beginning of the session, in refusing adjournment at 9.50 o'clock in the evening, because at 9.50 o'clock we have not sat two hours in the evening. Improvement could be made along the lines mentioned by my hon. friend and along this line. The resolution, as I have said, would allow us to sit still later in exceptional circumstances; and I think that debates that have been carried on in a traditional way so long as almost to become constitutional might very well still be carried on in that way, and that the common-sense of the House of Commons could use its time on the whole wisely with the rules as they are in regard to our general meeting. I am getting old enough to have to restrain some of those revolutionary tendencies that show themselves unaccountably in men older than myself, and I would feel if we made the alteration on Wednesdays and and the Government would consider before another session came up, of giving fifty per cent of this resolution their earnest attention, we might leave the conduct of our general debate on the other days of the week to the commonsense of this assembly, which has never erred very far and which, I feel, will be a growing quantity in this great young country as the years go by.

Mr. J. A. CURRIE (Simcoe North): Mr. Speaker, I am one member of the House who find I cannot quite agree with the hon. gentleman who introduced the resolution. Some years ago the rules of the House were under review, and a number of corrections were made in them. At that time it was supposed that we had reached finality in the matter of change. Two questions are brought under review by this resolution. The first is the matter of the elimination of Wednesday evening sittings. Mondays and Wednesdays are private members' days. Many members do not realize that, in the Old Country, owing to the large amount of work they have, they are compelled to shorten up the time, so that private members who wish to bring resolutions or private Bills to the attention of the House, have to go into the lobby and ballot, and possibly not more than 15 per cent of the members who wish to bring private matters before the House, have an opportunity of doing so. Fortunately, that is not so in this House; the utmost latitude is given to members to bring in matters of a private nature and to discuss them, and generally during the first two months of the session we spend Mondays and Wednesdays in discussing matters brought forward by private members.

It would be a great mistake, to my mind, to eliminate the night session, especially until some rule is adopted with reference to Supply. Those of us who have been in this House for a long time know very well that the greatest enemy, the wolf of time, in this House, is the discussion over Estimates. A small item, amounting possibly to not more than a couple of hundred dollars in the aggregate, will be discussed in committee of Supply for a whole day and a whole night and the same thing argued over and over again. Nothing very edifying is achieved by that operation and no particular information gained. When our rules were changed some years ago, we inserted a clause giving cloture with notice,

and cloture with notice meant simply, in the matter of the Estimates, that a minister, coming into this House in the afternoon or at night with his Estimates, was at liberty to stand up and call a series of items, ten, fifteen or twenty as the case might be, for the next day, and the next day the items would go through automatically, the time limit for speeches being twenty minutes. We have never taken advantage of that rule. Had we done so, the time occupied by the House in putting Estimates through would be cut down by seventy-five per cent, and that is where the great loss of time occurs.

As regards work on Mondays and Fridays and the understood rule that no matters of a controversial nature should be brought up on those days, apparently the blame for everything is cast upon those members who are so fortunate, as regards Parliament, as to be able to go home at the end of the week. I am not so selfish as to turn around and say that most of the time of the House is occupied by members from the remote provinces; but if you compare the amount of talking done by members from Ontario and that done by members from remote provinces, you will find that fully seventy-five per cent of the talk is done by members from remote provinces. If you adopt this resolution, you are going to prevent every man, who has a business of his own and knows anything at all about the business of the country, from coming into this House. This country at the present moment is faced with a grave crisis in its business affairs, and surely hon. members do not wish to have this House full of professional politicians. If you adopt any such rule as is proposed you are going to have that. If you want to shorten the sessions, apply closure to the Estimates, and you will cut the length of the session by fully one-half, but if you are going to prevent business men in the eastern part of this country from going home and looking after their affairs over the week-end, you are simply going to eliminate all the business men from Ontario and Quebec from this House. I do not think it is in the interests of this country that anything of that kind should take place. If you are going to deprive private members of their privileges on Mondays and Wednesday, why, of course, you can do so, but I warn you that in doing so you are doing grave injury to the country. I claim that with the rules as at present laid down, if they were as religiously enforced as they should be, the length of the session could be cut fully one-half.

What good purpose is served by lengthy debates on Estimates? I have sat in this House for many years, and again and again I have seen an item come up and discussed, and then when the discussion was over and the minister had given his explanation, some member would wander into the House from the lobby and the whole discussion would be gone over again. When that member had got all the information he desired another member would come in and want the whole thing argued over again. There is nothing to be gained by that mode of procedure. We must get down to business, and some method must be adopted of expediting the work, either by a committee outside of the House going over the Estimates, or by limiting the discussion in this House on the various items of Supply, as our rules provide. But the trouble is that no ministry has been strong enough or fearless enough to carry out the rules of the House as they are laid down. If that were done, there would not be one-half the trouble. We had endless debates in this House, running over three and four days, until the closure rule was adopted. I remember the first time closure was applied. Notice of the business to be taken up on the following day was given, and when the business came up for discussion speeches were limited to twenty minutes. Half of my hon. friends opposite could not occupy their twenty minutes and the vote went through long before it was anticipated it would. Had closure not been applied on that occasion, the debate would have gone on for two or three weeks. If you desire to do justice to men who are not professional politicians,—and I think the country at large needs a few of these men,—you must be as reasonable as possible to the business men in the House and give them an opportunity once in a while to give a little attention to their own affairs. I know it is a great hardship on the western member who lives at such a distance from Ottawa that he cannot go home over the week-end, but I think the eastern members and those nearby Ottawa can help matters out very much, and they have been trying to do so, by inviting the members from a distance to go out socially and see some of the country in the East. There is a great deal to be seen in the East as well as in the West. The East is an important part of this country, just as much as the West. We should not have

any class ideas whatsoever. It is very much in the interests of the whole country that Parliament should be of a cosmopolitan character, that all interests should be represented here, not as classes but as a whole. We should have a certain percentage of the professional classes, a certain percentage of the trading class, of the manufacturing class, and of the agricultural class. Every class should be represented here, every race, religion, and colour, and then Parliament would get a proper view of the mind of the people of this country as a whole.

I have had occasion to sit at the head of committees of this House, and I have found that the business men in the committees were very active, and very willing to carry on the work of the committee just as they would their own private affairs. There is a Joint Committee on Printing, of which I have had the honour to be Chairman for many years. The membership includes a number of Senators, and amongst them some of the ablest men in the whole of Canada. By organizing, and through earnest efforts to achieve some saving in that branch of the Government business, we have succeeded, in three years, in making a saving of close to a million dollars in very small expenditures. I am satisfied that if the gentlemen composing other committees were of that character and made up their minds what they were going to do, the business would be done much more expeditiously. For instance, if we had a committee on Supply composed of members of the House with good executive ability, I am satisfied that the discussion on Estimates in this House would be very much shortened. What is the situation now? From now on, three-fourths of the session will be given over to Supply, and when the end of the session approaches about twenty per cent of the Supply may have passed, and then the rest all goes through with a rush in one day, or two. Hundreds of millions of dollars will then be voted without any one having a word to say.

If a number of items were called by a minister for discussion on the following day, and we had to get those items off the slate, and the discussion were limited, I am sure we could discuss properly every item in the Estimates and shorten the session very considerably. Sometimes a minister has items he does not want discussed. I know, when I was in Opposition we had to watch for those; we knew the minister would delay bringing them up until the very last day, when they had to go through, and not a single word could be said about them at all. Our rules as a whole are far better than the rules of the British House of Commons. In the British House they have a form of closure which is called the Kangaroo or the Scissors, with no notice. The minister can call any item, and jam it through, and there is no discussion whatever. Our form is closure, with notice. No item can be put through unless notice has first been given and opportunity for proper discussion afforded; speeches are limited to twenty minutes, and the items must automatically be voted or struck out. I have sat in the House for a great many years, and wasted a great many hours in Supply listening to talk, and I have never yet seen more than three or four items in the Estimates struck out or reduced, and when that did happen it was generally at the instance of a minister. The waste of time is largely due to the discussion of small matters in Supply, and I think hon. gentlemen on both sides of the House should seriously consider whether we cannot reach a unanimous decision to shorten the session by using the method of closure provided in the rules of this House. Let the items be closured through with notice. The items would be called that were to be taken up the next day, then after a discussion the items would automatically go through. I am satisfied that this method would achieve the object sought by the hon. member who has introduced this resolution. I would be the last man in the House to limit the rights of private members on matters that affect them, but I do not think it is necessary to go to bed every night at eleven o'clock. I think the business of the House should be carried through until finished. We are not on the eight-hour day here, but even if we were and we got paid for overtime, there would still be no limit to the debates. If we got double time after eleven o'clock, I suppose we would keep the discussion going until six in the morning. Therefore, I think we had better leave the rules as they are, and I would strongly urge the Government to enforce closure with notice on the Estimates. No harm can come from doing that, it would shorten the session by a month or two, and I think every hon. member would have ample time to discuss any item he wished in the time provided.

Hon. RODOLPHE LEMIEUX (Maisonneuve): As an old member of the House I wish to give my support to the motion moved by my hon. friend from Shelburne and Queen's. It is true that we are not under

the eight-hour system, as my hon. friend from North Simcoe (Mr. Currie), has just said. But we are here to perform our duties as diligently and intelligently as possible, and I submit that under the present system it is impossible for us so to do. I appeal to my friends on both sides of the House, whether we should not be sorry indeed if, on occasion, towards the close of the session, our electors were in the gallery witnessing the spectacle presented in this House, a few seats being occupied by ministers and a few others by members of the Opposition, and, for the rest, practically an empty chamber. Why is that? It is because, from ten o'clock in the morning until late in the evening, members have been going from committee room to committee room, and, from the opening of the session at three o'clock in the afternoon, have been discussing in the House different questions varying in their scope and in their importance. I say that it is not in the interests of the country that absurd rules of that kind should govern this Chamber.

Sir, as regards the Wednesday half holiday I consider it a Godsend to the members, and a mistake was made when the hour of meeting on that day during the first part of the session was fixed at two o'clock. As my hon. friend says, every one forgets that the House meets at two o'clock. And besides, it is not conducive to health that so early in the afternoon members should be called upon to legislate in the House of Commons. Furthermore, we do not do so much work during that additional hour that we could not very well meet at the usual hour of three o'clock. I therefore agree absolutely with my hon. friend from Shelburne and Queen's in asking the House favourably to consider amending the rule so that on Wednesday the House might meet at three o'clock and adjourn at six, giving us the rest of the day.

Now, as regards the late sittings, I will be more emphatic on this question than some of my hon. friends. I say that it is unbusinesslike that we should sit from practically the first day of the session until the last, after twelve o'clock at night. Under such circumstances, how can you expect a member of Parliament, who is anxious to perform his duties with diligence and care, to study any question either in the library here or at his own residence? How can you expect him to give any subject the consideration it deserves, if he is obliged to be in his seat from three o'clock in the afternoon until one o'clock or sometimes two o'clock in the morning? And in the morning, Mr. Speaker, the member is not idle; he has to attend various committees—the Railway Committee, the Public Accounts Committee, the Insurance Committee, the Banking Committee, and others. How can a member of Parliament attend to the business of the country with reasonable diligence and care if his day is filled as I have described? It is not fair to the member; it is not fair to his electors; it is not fair to the country.

My hon. friend from North Simcoe says that we have the very best rules possible. Well, take the British Parliament. Except on certain occasions agreed upon between the Government and the Opposition, the House of Commons at Westminster never sits after eleven o'clock in the evening; unless it be by reason of some very grave question under consideration. It is true, however, that the British House of Commons sits nearly the whole year round, with just a few intervals of adjournment; but at all events, except on very special occasions, as I have said, when there is an agreement between both leaders, the House never sits after eleven o'clock. In France it is the same; except on questions of grave importance, the Chamber never sits after nine o'clock in the evening. Take the United States Congress; it is very seldom that congressmen sit after ten or eleven o'clock at night. So that we might very well amend our rules and make it a question of agreement between the Government and the Opposition as to when the House shall sit after eleven o'clock. Of course, at the end of the session, when there is much business to be overtaken, there might be a few sittings beyond that hour; but for the rest of the session, I contend that there is no reason for those late sittings. My hon. friend asks: How can we shorten the session? Well, they have found a remedy in England. The hon. gentleman, a moment ago, spoke of the closure, and the wisdom of enforcing this measure. I must say that while the closure exists under our rules, it is not one of those weapons that any parliamentarian would care to use. In the United States, there comes a moment in any debate when, by mutual agreement, between the Whips, the speeches delivered thereafter shall not take more than ten minutes, or perhaps even five minutes. It is agreed that some of the principal speeches on both sides will cover a certain length of time, the others being limited to ten minutes, or twenty minutes at the outside. But in England there is a better rule still than

the closure. There is a time-saving system which is about to be adopted. They have, during the war, established over there a select Committee on National Expenditures, composed of members of both sides of the House. That committee scrutinized the various items of the Estimates; called for expert witnesses from the several departments; submitted to the Government proposals for reductions; and thereby exercised that very function for which Parliament exists, namely, the control of expenditures. My hon. friend suggested a moment ago that a minister might come before the House and say: To-day I give notice that so many items from the Estimates will be taken up, and after a delay of twenty-four hours they will be automatically voted.

This is not the way I understand British freedom. If these items had been scrutinized and reported upon, not by a committee of the whole House, but by a Select Committee, there would be very little discussion, except on a few selected items. That is the way they proceed in the Parliament in London. There they will have the Irish night, they will have the Scotch night, they will have the Welsh night, and they will have the English night. They take the items affecting these sections of the United Kingdom, and the time of the House is not lost there as it is here on items of the Estimates. It seems to me that this would be a proper reform, and when accomplished I am quite sure would have the effect of reducing the session by at least one or two months.

Mr. CURRIE: I think the hon. gentleman is mistaken about the Committee on National Expenditures. That committee investigates expenditures that have been made, but there is no change in the rules with regard to the Committee of Supply of the House.

Mr. LEMIEUX: I advise my hon. friend to read the book which has lately been published by Mr. Davenport.

Mr. CURRIE: I have got the rules of the House.

Mr. LEMIEUX: This committee was established during the war and saved millions to the Government in Great Britain by pointing out useless expenditures. The chairman of that committee was the ex-Postmaster General, Sir Herbert Samuel, who is now Governor in Palestine, and there is a recommendation by them that the National Expenditures Committee be made permanent. I understand that the question is now before the British Parliament, and that the committee has ninety-nine chances out of one hundred of becoming permanent. At all events I desire to say—

Mr. CURRIE: If the hon. gentleman will pardon me, the impression which I, and other members, gathered from my hon. friend's remarks was, that in England there was a permanent committee of Parliament on national expenditures dealing with this question, and that consequently there was no necessity for discussion there in Committee of Supply. But the House goes into Committee of Supply over there just the same as it ever did. The committee to which my hon. friend refers was purely a special committee, and is not a permanent one under the rules of the House.

Mr. LEMIEUX: It may not be a permanent committee at the present moment, but it was established and maintained during the war and has rendered most valuable service to the Government and to Parliament, and as an institution it will remain. I say that when you have that committee you need not have closure, because the items will have been scrutinized in advance by members of the House and the debate on these matters will be much more intelligible than it is at the present time. I think it would be wise if, on certain occasions, there was an agreement between the Whips to limit the duration of debate. They have that system in the United States and they are a most practical people. The moment closure is imposed by the Government it has not the same flavour; but if there is a mutual agreement, a gentleman's agreement, between the Whips that the speeches will be limited we will have here what they have in the United States—a common-sense debate on the big issues of the day. On the whole I support the motion of my hon. friend for Shelburne and Queen's.

Mr. H. B. MORPHY (North Perth): I think it is a good thing in the interest of the House and of the country that this resolution has been introduced. On listening to the arguments which have been advanced, not only during the present but during other recent sessions, I have been very much struck with the idea that if the principle of the closure were applied all the time it would raise the standard of debate in this House. That idea is based upon a recollection of what happened after

the one occasion, I think, upon which closure was applied in this House, under the rules; but I think if any hon. gentleman will take the trouble to consult the record of the first and second sessions after closure was introduced on the occasion in question he will be convinced, overwhelmingly convinced, that the standard of 5 p.m. debate in this House was never in its history as high as it was immediately after closure had been tried. The speeches were shorter, they gave evidence of more thought, and to my mind abundantly showed more preparatory work on the part of the individual member in connection with the subject matter which he rose to discuss. I have always been convinced of that; and I put forth the suggestion that if, by co-operation among the members generally, we could obtain the same result as followed from the application of the closure this Parliament would shine forth to the outside world, and in particular to all our constituents, as a more business-like assembly of men sent here by the people to conduct the country's affairs. The other night the House was regaled with a speech by one hon. member which lasted for five hours—five hours of what I would call destructive criticism; in fact it was hardly worthy of the name of criticism, its every tendency was factious and destructive. There was hardly an item in that five-hours speech that was of a nature tending to assist the Government in the solving of the great problems that are now on hand. Now, a speech of five hours in the British Parliament, or in any other parliament in the world, would bring down the wrath of the nation. That wrath would be aroused by anyone having the temerity to waste that much time in a deliberative assembly. Yet we are treated occasionally to five-hour speeches, although sometimes they are shorter—sometimes they occupy three hours, and sometimes two hours. I venture the assertion that any man who wishes to speak two, three, four or five hours can enhance his reputation a thousand fold by occupying far less time and limiting his speech to three-quarters of an hour. I did notice, in the celebrated example to which I have referred, that the speech consisted of verbiage—it was wanting in logic, in reason and in objective, except that there was apparently the idea of stultifying the opposite party. I do not believe the people of Canada to-day are very much concerned with the "Ins" and the "Outs" in this House, with what party shall take the Government side and what party shall go into Opposition—not nearly so much concerned with that idea as they are concerned with the great problems the country has to solve, and the solving of them by members generally bending their energies towards assisting the Government in reaching a sane solution. This should be a business man's Parliament, because our problems are greater than they ever were before in the history of Canada. It is a business man's opportunity, and, if I may be permitted, I would say to the members of all parties that the closer they get to the idea that there are great problems to be solved, and that the country is looking to hon. members to solve those problems, instead of talking captiously and destructively for two, three or five hours, the more correctly they will interpret the feelings of their constituents. In that sense I would like to suggest, that parties should unite as far as possible upon the great problems confronting the country and bend their energies to a sane Canadian solution of them, and that credit for honesty of purpose should be given to any constructive suggestion no matter whence it comes. In a word, that hon. members should get down to close business-like efforts, irrespective of party, to solve these problems as quickly as possible in order to expedite our national affairs, save the time of the House and let the members get back to their homes. It seems to me that we are forgetting that time is valuable outside the House as well as inside.

The hon. member for Maisonneuve (Mr. Lemieux) spoke of the Wednesday evening holiday being a God-send. I quite agree with him that it is, but that is because we waste so many other nights and get home so late in the mornings that it becomes absolutely necessary to have such a respite from our arduous labours. I believe that nearly all hon. members will agree with my statement that there is a factious opposition, a speaking of words, and words, and words, until sometimes, I must confess, I think that the brains of some hon. gentlemen have ceased to function, for they speak without thinking, purely for obstructive purposes, saying this, that or the other thing by way of organized opposition to some hon. minister who is not very well liked. What has that got to do with the policy of the country? It is prostituting parliamentary life to gratify personal animosity. We have notorious examples of that sort in the House. Such tactics do not make for high parliamentary standing,

and we may be certain that the country does not approve of the actions of such hon. gentlemen.

I have a suggestion to offer which I think will appeal to us all, Mr. Speaker,—including myself probably, although I have tried not to dilate at undue length on any subject which I have debated in this House. There is a rule, I think, in the United States Congress that members who wish to speak to their constituents—and that seems to be the great desire here—so that their speeches may be published in the local newspapers, may hand those speeches in to the Speaker already typewritten, and the Congressmen are then free to attend to other business with the full assurance that their speeches will duly appear in the Congressional Record. It seems to me that that might be a very good rule to introduce here. I am sure that the hon. member for Maisonneuve in the quiet of the library or in the shelter of his own home, would find it a welcome relief to write out his speeches, of course not at too great length, and hand them in to the Speaker to be printed in the next day's Hansard; and thus having seen to the enlightenment of his constituents, he would be free to attend to some other business.

I believe that the Wednesday holiday is a good thing, if we are bound to sit up until such late hours. But this debate, even if it should serve no other purpose, from my point of view, has enabled me to express my opinion that we waste too much time in factious and destructive criticism, and that we do not spend quite enough time over business which ought to engage our closest attention,—that while we oppose the Estimates of one minister's department we let the Estimates of another minister's department go through practicaly scot free, and the factious opposition is just for the purpose of creating an effect which even though it is reflected in the press, is but evanescent, and for which the country does not care a snap of the finger.

Mr. A. B. COPP (Westmoreland): Mr. Speaker, I did not notice anything in this very innocent resolution introduced by my hon. friend from Shelburne and Queen's (Mr. Fielding) that would give my hon. friend opposite the opportunity of reading a lecture to the Ooposition for having, as he put it, organized factious and destructive criticism against some cabinet minister to block his Estimates. During the time I have been a supporter of the Opposition I do not know that such a condition of affairs has ever obtained on this side of the House, and I am sure that my hon. friend has entirely misinterpreted our attitude.

My hon. friend from Vancouver Centre (Mr. Stevens) expressed himself personally along the same line that I would have folowed with regard to the attendance of hon. members. Coming from some distance, I realize that it is very important for all the members to get through with the business of the House as quickly as possible having due regard to the importance of that business. I have been a rather regular attendant both in this House and also on committees to which I have been appointed, and I have found that in sitting on committees until one o'clock—and that always means a few minutes after—it is impossible to get out to lunch and be back in time for the two o'clock sittings on Wednesday afternoons. I do not believe that the earlier hour of our meeting on Wednesday afternoons expedites public business very much; but if I felt that meeting at 3 o'clock would lengthen the session by one day, I would feel as my hon. friend from Vancouver said, that the House should meet at two o'clock. I do not believe it has had that effect, and for that reason I think the House should meet at three o'clock every day.

With regard to the Wednesday evening off, my hon. friend from Shelburne and Queen's said that hon. members desired this evening for social engagements. I am not very much given to such engagements, but still I feel that Wednesday evening is very important to a large number of hon. members. If we cannot engage in social affairs, at least we need recreation along different lines, and I believe that this freedom on Wednesday evenings is a very real benefit to hon. members. I have always thought that that evening is taken away by the Government too early in the session. I do not mind losing it towards the end of the session when it is necessary to get business through as rapidly as possible, but I think, with the hon. member for Shelburne and Queen's, that if we have not that evening free from the work of the House a great many of us will naturally take any evening that suits our convenience. Therefore there is a very real advantage to the conduct of the business of the House by reason of hon. members making their social engagements for Wednesday evenings.

As to adjourning the House at eleven o'clock each night, I quite agree with my hon. friends resolution because he has added a proviso—unless circumstances may require a later sitting—which, of course, must be left to the Government to determine. My hon. friend from Red Deer (Mr. Clark) expressed himself against that part of the resolution, and he instanced the fact that my hon. friend from Shelburne and Queen's on one occasion made a very eloquent speech after eleven o'clock at night.

Mr. CLARK (Red Deer): Many.

Mr. COPP: I have no doubt he has made many such speeches. My hon. friend knows that the eloquence of the mover of this resolution is such that he can always be depended upon to make a very interesting speech at any time of the day or night when he feels called upon in the public interest to address the House. But I would say to my hon. friend from Red Deer and to other hon. members that there should be no necessity for any hon. member to be called upon to deliver an important speech after eleven or twelve o'clock at night. The House should adjourn not later than midnight and give hon. gentlemen an opportunity of making such a speech at a time when there will be a full attendance of members to listen to their arguments. Personally, I feel that the work of this House should not be a test of physical strength. It should be a matter of getting the public business before this House in a reasonable, earnest, straightforward manner. The duties of Parliament are important, and they can be properly attended to only during reasonable hours,—such hours as those during which a man may ordinarily be expected to give attention to his public or private business.

The hon. member for North Simcoe (Mr. Currie) says that if the rules are changed so as to enable members of Parliament who are business men residing in Ontario to go home on Fridays and attend to their business, this whole Parliament will become a farce. With that assertion I am not in agreement. It is quite obvious that we want business men in this Parliament, and it is true that we have a number of them here. Business men from Toronto, Montreal and other places which are near the seat of Government can, I submit, attend to their business and at the same time carry on their legislative duties.

I do not know that there is much to be said in regard to what has been referred to as an unwritten arrangement concerning Mondays and Fridays. I do not know that any such arrangement has been followed in Parliament during the time that I have been here. Of course, an item of business has been occasionally held over because an hon. member specially interested in it desired to take part in the discussion, but, generally speaking, the work of the House proceeds on Mondays and Fridays just as it does on the other days of the week. I know that last Friday night the work of the House went on as usual; we sat here until half-past twelve.

In reply to my hon. friend's remarks concerning the proposal that the House should adjourn at eleven o'clock each night, I submit that we do not make very much progress by sitting considerably later. As I say, to sit a few moments after eleven will not matter, but in the case of Estimates or any other subject coming up after eleven o'clock members of the House are tired and weary and more or less fretful and annoyed, and we do not get on with the business as we would if we had a regular hour for adjournment. Once the feeling prevails that someone is trying to force something through, the attitude is naturally taken by some that it shall not go through, and if it does not go through at eleven it will not go through at twelve or at one, so that sitting later is productive of no advantage. For these reasons, Mr. Speaker, I support the motion of the hon. member for Shelburne and Queen's.

Mr. H. C. HOCKEN (West Toronto): Mr. Speaker, I have a great deal of sympathy with the motion presented by the hon. member for Shelburne and Queen's (Mr. Fielding). I think that when we start work at ten o'clock in the morning and keep at it until eleven at night, we ought to "call it a day." If we continue to extend our sittings until two or three o'clock in the morning it will be necessary for some one to organize a National Union of Canadian Orators and strike for an eight-hour day or something of that kind. If the members of this House would exercise their privileges —I was going to say with more intelligence; perhaps I ought to say, with greater care—it would not be necessary to organize such a union and it would not be necessary to sit after eleven o'clock. When a man speaks for four or five hours on one subject, as happened the other night, he not only wearies Parliament but I think he commits an oratorical crime. We listened to the hon. member for Quebec East (Mr. La-

pointe) the other day for nearly an hour and a half reading from a newspaper. Practically every member of the House had read the article in question. If the hon. member wanted that to go on the record, I submit that it should have been taken as read, and, as the member for North Perth (Mr. Morphy) suggests, handed in for insertion in Hansard.

Since coming to this House I have been very much surprised at the length of the speeches, at the verbosity of some hon. members. My training has been entirely different from that of the lawyer, who seems ordinarily to earn his fee by the length of his speech.

Mr. CASGRAIN: Not at all. We do not do that.

Mr. HOCKEN: Well, I am judging simply by what I have heard since coming here. If some of these lawyers had taken courses in journalism they would condense their speeches. The reason why the gentlemen of the press do not occupy the gallery on occasions is this extraordinary verbosity to which I have referred. They get only a grain of argument out of a bushel of remarks, so they spend their time elsewhere than in the gallery. I would like to submit to members who offend in this respect that they not only waste the time of this House, but they offend against their own reputations. Some of the most important speeches made in the Imperial House of Commons occupy but twenty minutes or half an hour; and in these speeches statements are made not merely of national but of international and world-wide importance and significance. But to make a speech like that requires some work. I am reminded of the young rector who was complaining to his bishop that it made him sweat to prepare his sermons. The bishop patted him on the shoulder and said: "Well, my boy, somebody has to sweat; it is either you or the congregation." And that is about the way it is in this House; if the members will not sweat in the preparation of their speeches, then the rest of the members have to suffer. The Lord knows we do suffer, Mr. Speaker, from some of the addresses that are given, for a man will take an hour or two, sometimes more than that, to say something that he should condense into about twenty-five minutes. Now, I do not want to transgress in this respect, but I just want to make one reference to my hon. friend from Graspy—

An hon. MEMBER: Where is that constituency?

Mr. HOCKEN: —the hon. member for Graspy, who, I think, is one of the greatest offenders in this respect. He speaks at tremendous length and on every question. Nothing is quite settled until the member for Graspy has—

Mr. CASGRAIN: He has more experience than you have. He knows more than you do.

Mr. HOCKEN: I have no doubt; I am but a very humble and inexperienced member of the House. But I have lived in the world about as long as my hon. friend from Graspy. I have had some experiences elsewhere, and, perhaps, being of the same age as the hon. gentleman, I might be able to give him a bit of advice—advice, Sir, such as was tendered to me when I was a young man. I began my career as a reporter on a newspaper; and you know, Sir, a young reporter always imagines that the particular article he writes is the most important thing that is going into the paper. Now, we had a very efficient city editor on that journal, and I remember that on more than one occasion when I brought in a comparatively insignificant story, spread out at length, as the hon. member for Graspy spreads out his remarks, the city editor would look it over and would say to me: "Young man, you are too damn diffuse; cut this down to a stick."

An hon. MEMBER: Order.

Mr. HOCKEN: I am simply quoting the story verbatim. Now, I would tender that advice to my hon. friend from Graspy—

Mr. CASGRAIN: Where is that place?

Mr. HOCKEN: —and to some of those four or five-hour runners who get the track and keep it till the end of the session. There are half a dozen men in the House who could save us a good deal of time if they would. But, Sir, when I recall the distinguished appearance of my hon. friend from Graspy as he utters one of those orations—taken largely from the speeches of Lord Palmerston—I am afraid that he will not accept my advice. What I would propose would be this—a change in the rules that would limit speeches to half an hour, unless the unanimous consent of the House were given for an extension of time for the speech of any hon. member. I have sat in other legislative bodies where we had a rule of that kind; and if a man

had really anything to say that required more than that time, he was always given permission; but the rule gave us an excellent opportunity to see that the debate was not carried on simply for the purpose of some man hearing himself speak or preparing material for the next general election. If the House would make a rule that half an hour should be the limit for a speech, we would not need to sit after eleven o'clock at night and we would not need to form a Canadian National Union of Orators.

Mr. J. W. EDWARDS (Frontenac): Mr. Speaker, when this matter has been brought up as it has been on other occasions in this House, I have always subordinated my view as to the time spent in this chamber to the opinions of members representing constituencies in the far East or the far West. It is possible for myself and many other members from Ontario and Quebec constituencies, to go home on Fridays and to get in touch with their businesses. That is a privilege and a very great advantage to those hon. gentlemen; but members from the far West and those from the Maritime Provinces cannot very well do that without losing time in the House. Therefore, I have felt that, whatever my views might be in regard to the time that is spent in this chamber, I should be willing to give way to the opinions of those members who represent constituencies at a distance from Ottawa.

I do not think there is any more time wasted in this House in proportion to the number of its members, the vast extent of this Dominion and the multiplicity of questions that come up, than is wasted in other deliberative assemblies throughout this country. It has become a common practice to refer to long speeches and the length of time wasted in this House, and frequently we see our newspapers writing editorials on the question. This has always struck me as somewhat inconsistent on the part of newspapers when one has only to turn over a page or two in order to see the quantity of space absolutely wasted with "Peter Pal," "Mutt and Jeff" and other stuff of a like nature which is not of any benefit to any person in the Dominion of Canada. Another waste of time that I have seen on the part of newspapers and newspaper editors is a repetition of one day's editorial in the next day's issue. I do not think there is any more time wasted in this chamber than is wasted in county councils or other municipal bodies in proportion to the number of members in those bodies and the subjects with which they have to deal. We are all fallible; we are all liable to make mistakes and I presume, as long as there is a Parliament for Canada, there will always be a certain amount of time wasted in this as in any other assembly, I do not care what it is.

It has always struck me that some time might be saved in the early part of the session. It is usually two or three weeks before committees get down to work, and I see no reason, and I have never been able to see any, why Parliament should not meet in the mornings in the first few weeks of the session, at least until committees organize and get to work, when, of course, morning sittings would be impossible as members could not be in the chamber and on committees at the same time.

As regards Wednesday evening sittings, it has always seemed to me that the Wednesday evening holiday, which is given to members in the first few weeks or month or so of the session, has been for the benefit of two classes of persons who attend Parliament, those persons who have formed the habit of attending prayer meeting once a week, usually on Wednesday night and who, having formed that habit, of course, want to continue it when they come to Ottawa—and there is very great reason why they should continue it—and those other persons who have got caught in the social whirl in Ottawa and want Wednesday evening to attend to that. I have never been greatly troubled in either direction and, therefore, I have always been willing to attend sessions of Parliament on Wednesday evenings. I can see no earthly reason why Parliament should sit from two to six o'clock on Wednesday and not sit on Wednesday evening, but sit from three to six o'clock on Thursday and from eight to eleven or twelve o'clock the same night. I am absolutely opposed to the Wednesday evening holiday, whether it is for the benefit of those who want to attend prayer meeting that night or for the benefit of those who are caught in the social whirl and want to attend to that. In other words, I think that they might confine all their dances to Saturday evenings and their prayer meetings to Sunday afternoons and evenings.

As regards limiting the evening sitting to eleven o'clock, I do not think it would be advisable to make any hard-and-fast rule in that respect. We have an hour fixed for the meeting of Parliament, but to fix eleven o'clock or any other hour as

the hour at which the House should and must close at night, would be inadvisable. Very often you might be in the midst of something of importance, perhaps a matter of getting through some Estimates; the subject might have been pretty well exhausted in debate and just about ready to go through, some progress to be made about eleven o'clock; but some person realizes that there is a rule or an understanding that the House is to adjourn at eleven o'clock, and, availing himself of that, keeps the thing going for a few minutes more until the House automatically rises. The closing hour should be left to the common sense and intelligence of members composing this House, and when, in their wisdom, they think it advisable for the House to sit until half past eleven or eleven o'clock or a quarter to eleven, well and good. We are not schoolboys; we are men of mature age, and common sense will regulate the matter pretty well. There may be some nights when we will exceed the limit and go to one or two o'clock in the morning, without doubt to the regret of every person in the chamber. That sort of thing is not likely to be repeated night after night, and why? Because the common sense of members is opposed to anything of the kind. Therefore, it would be far better to leave the hour of closing to the good judgment of the members composing the House.

Right hon. ARTHUR MEIGHEN (Prime Minister): The first section of the motion of the hon. member for Shelburne and Queen's (Mr. Fielding), to the effect that the Wednesday afternoon sitting should open at three o'clock commencing with the first of the session, deals with a matter that I think should be regulated pretty much to meet the will of the majority of members, and consequently could best be done after inquiry and report by a committee. The rules of the House are almost invariably amended on report of a committee. It is now some years since such a committee sat, but I would not think it would be wise at the present session to appoint another. We have so many important and special committees now, and so many hon. members are engaged thereon, that, particularly at this period of the session, with the work becoming heavier for each and all of us, we should consider carefully before embarking upon another.

As to the second and more important portion of the resolution I have views that I desire to oppose to those of the hon. member who moves it, and I do so with deference, knowing that his experience is much longer than mine, and that he doubtless has studied the subject more carefully. I, of course, naturally look upon this matter from the standpoint of the Government. He, just as naturally, looks upon it from the standpoint of the Opposition.

Mr. FIELDING: No.

Mr. MEIGHEN: The hon. member for Maisonneuve has reinforced the argument of the mover of the resolution by a reference to the practice of the British House. I think I can use that reference to show wherein we necessarily differ from that House. The British House does have some general rule whereby it closes at about eleven o'clock, but there is this very great difference: In the British House closure became a fact and a rule away back in the eighties, I think. It became a matter of constant practice through many years and even decades, and growing out of the constant application of closure there evolved what is looked upon as a sort of voluntary closure, agreed upon by the whips of both sides—a practice that never could have become established, and never, indeed, would likely have existed, had it not been for the fact of the closure being constantly applied by the Government, and necessarily applied, to get the public business done. In this House we have voluntary closure at times, but it is very, very rare, and I do not think that with the practice we have now, even though we have a rare resort to closure, we could ever make much progress by agreement between the whips for the shortening of speeches or the shortening of debates. We try that, but we do not succeed; that has been the practice under both Governments. The reason, chiefly, is the one I have just given, that closure in Canada is of much later growth. In England they have had closure all through these years, and consequently there has been time for this practice to grow, a practice that naturally takes root in the closure rule, because the whips on both sides know that unless they succeed voluntarily, then by force majeure the debate comes to an end anyway, because closure is applied. Consequently, they are able to get business done from day to day under the influence of the rule on the one hand, and this practice that has grown out of it on the other.

But there is this further. In Great Britain the closure rule is immediate and almost automatic, that is to say, they can bring discussions to a close almost at any

time, and without notice. In Canada we have a much more considerate closure rule. We can only apply it one day to take effect the next, and then only at one o'clock on the following morning. I think it is well that in these matters we move slowly. While the closure rule remains as it is in this House, it is a matter of actual experience that we can make no sufficient progress if we are going to have an automatic rising of the House at eleven o'clock at night. Of that I have not the least doubt whatever. Why, what progress have we made up to now, Mr. Speaker? Any real business that has been done since the House opened on February 14, this year,—and we have not had any eleven o'clock automatic rising,—has been done mainly after eleven o'clock at night, and much of it well on towards morning. On the whole of this question I am very much in agreement, under present circumstances, with the hon. member for Red Deer (Mr. Clark). I do not think it is possible to make progress if we have anything like an automatic rising of the House at eleven or any special hour.

While I am on my feet, I call attention to the hours at which the House has risen. Sometimes, but very rarely, have we risen much past eleven o'clock. I have before me the hours from the beginning of the session until now, and eleven would represent about the average. I know the dates on which we rose later, and those are the very dates when we got the work of Parliament done. I would like, indeed, if faster progress could be made. I am not saying this to complain especially. Possibly if I were on the Opposition side I would have another viewpoint, but I am going to try, if I ever get there, to be more reasonable in this regard than I have found the present Opposition. We are met practically every time we attempt to go into Supply with a motion on one subject or another; I will not say of no importance, but I do say that if this House sat 365 days in the year I could guarantee to place in the hands of the Opposition an amendment every day that would be of equal importance to any that they have advanced so far. You can always get a matter, I will not say of no importance, but one that will serve the purpose of creating a discussion and creating press material, and that is what really goes on. So if we intend to make progress from now onwards, it would be fatal, indeed, if we should now come to any decision to rise automatically at eleven o'clock. I would think we would soon be where the British House is to-day in one regard: we would be sitting the whole year round, for that has become the British practice. Indeed, so great is the effort there to get on with public affairs, that automatic closure is applied constantly, and even then they frequently do not rise for dinner. The House will run right on from six to eight o'clock, certain members going out at certain times. That is how they are able to rise at eleven. If they had our practice in other respects, had our closure, and the rare application of it, the business of the Old Land could not begin to be done if they rose at eleven o'clock or at any set time, though it were hours later than that. Consequently, while I do not feel there is any possibility of the acceptance by the Government of the latter part of his resolution, there is considerable to be said for the first part, and it would appear to me it would be better for that matter to be taken up by a special committee at the beginning of a session.

Mr. J. A. MAHARG (Maple Creek): I find myself in agreement to a certain extent with what the hon. member for Centre Vancouver (Mr. Stevens) has said. The method of conducting the business of this House, and the length of the sittings is of considerable importance to those members whose homes are a long distance from Ottawa. It appears to those of us who are so situated that several changes might be made with considerable advantage to us, at least, and without any great disadvantage, I believe, to members residing nearer to the seat of Government. Take private members' day. I can see no good reason why private members, instead of having Monday and Wednesday, should not have Monday and Friday. I believe it is usually understood between the party whips just what matters are to come up on private members' day, and members who were sufficiently interested in any matter that would come up for discussion might very well remain over the week-end. I do not think that would seriously interfere with the rights of any one.

For once at least, I agree with the hon. member for Frontenac (Mr. Edwards). We do not usually see eye to eye, but I do concur in his views, to a considerable extent, in the matter of Wednesday sittings. He is of the opinion that we might very well sit on Wednesday mornings during the early part of the session. I would go much further and suggest that during the early part of the session we might also sit on

Wednesday night, at least while the debate on the Address was being discussed. After all, no particular question is ever under discussion in that debate; it is usually a rambling repetition from beginning to end; it is practically a re-hash of what has been previously dealt with. In the debate on the Address the same matters come up that have been talked over scores of times before and I think we might very well devote Wednesday nights to a continuation of that debate until its conclusion. I would not press my point in regard to the Budget debate. But I do think, Mr. Speaker, that we might very well sit on Wednesday nights during the early part of the session, at least until we disposed of the debate on the Address.

I was much interested in the remarks of the hon. member for West Toronto (Mr. Hocken), regarding the length of speeches It struck me forcibly at the time he was speaking that there is very little difference between an hon. member making one long speech on a specific subject, and another hon. gentleman making several possibly shorter speeches on another subject. I have listened, on several occasions, to the hon. member making somewhat lengthy speeches in regard to the Civil Service Commission, and if we took the various periods taken up by him and added them together the result would probably compare favourably with the length of time occupied the other night by an hon. member who spent, I believe, something like five hours of the time of the House discussing a certain subject. Even if the House adjourned at 11 o'clock I am doubtful if it would have shortened the speech of the hon. gentleman very much, for I am convinced that, from his point of view, the subject was far from being exhausted, and had the House adjourned at 11 o'clock, supposing he had the floor then, it might have been possible for him to have started again the next day and to have continued for several hours more. So that in that respect we might not have been further ahead on that occasion by an early closing.

Members from a distance would suggest an earlier calling of the session. Why not go back to the old practice of calling the session in November and giving a fairly lengthy recess during the Christmas holidays, so that those engaged in the retail business might have sufficient time to wind up their affairs for the year, and also better cope with the Christmas rush? If that were not quite convenient, then I would suggest that we meet as early in the New Year as possible. Then again, in the matter of Easter holidays, we think it is rather unfair for members who reside in proximity to Ottawa to object to a longer recess at Easter. I understand the objection comes principally from those who are so situated and who can attend to their business over the week-end. Now, we do not very seriously object to their paying particular attention to their business at that time, but we do submit that to those of us who live at a distance from the Capital, a five-day recess is of no use; we should have the privilege of a two weeks' vacation to enable us to attend to our affairs at home. If we calculate strictly the number of days which members have off, we find that in addition to the fifteen days to which members of Parliament are entitled, a great many members can avail themselves of the week-end holiday. If I might make the remark, I observe in the lobbies on Fridays quite a number of coats, canes, etc., hanging around, which disappear shortly after the House opens; and a similar condition prevails on Mondays, when members on their return even have their grips in their hands in order to get into the House before adjournment. Those who can avail themselves of the week-end, in addition to the fifteen days allowed, are to all intents and purposes taking forty-seven days to themselves out of a total of eighty days, if we reckon on a basis of sixteen weeks as the length of the session. Those of us who cannot take advantage of more than the fifteen days think this is scarcely fair.

A point raised by the member for North Simcoe (Mr. Currie) was that if you did away with this Friday and Monday holiday, if I might term it a holiday, you would practically prevent business men from becoming members of Parliament. I wonder whether we are to conclude from that remark that there are no business men in the House other than those who are enabled to attend to their business over the week-end. Leaving myself and those employed in the same occupation out of the question, I could mention several business men in this House whose business is just as difficult to manage from a distance as that of the average commercial and industrial business man, if not more so. We have such men representing western constituencies. We have a number of professional men who cannot delegate their business to others without very serious loss, and I do not see why it should be any more difficult for an eastern business man to be a member of

Parliament than it is for a western business man, from my hon. friend's point of view.

Now, as to the closure, I do not think I can be accused of taking up more than a fair share of the time of the House, but to me word "closure" sounds somewhat harsh. I think that other methods just as effective and less objectionable might be devised. For instance, suppose you cease the publication of Hansard. I wonder what effect that would have. I am of opinion that if you cut out the printing of Hansard, it would have considerable effect on the length of debates; and, to use the ordinary expression, it would then be up to the member himself if he wished to have his speech distributed among his constituents. I would still furnish the facilities for him if he wished to have that done; but as to his speech being printed, it would be a matter entirely for him to decide and it would be for him to defray the expense. Again, referring to the question of closing at 11 o'clock, I fully agree with the Prime Minister when he says that so far this session the real business of the House has been conducted after 11 o'clock. I believe I am within the mark when I say that the Opposition have been largely responsible for this fact.

On almost every occasion when a motion has been made to go into Committee of Supply an amendemnt has been moved which, in most instances, has occupied very nearly the whole of the sitting up to eleven o'clock. I am not criticizing this proceeding—it may be absolutely necessary and the submission of such amendments may be quite proper—but nevertheless if we are going to limit the time within which we shall sit to eleven o'clock, then I think we must be prepared for a similar condition to that in the Old Country where Parliament sits practically all the year round.

In the discussion considerable importance has been attached to the matter of physical endurance, and as to the possibility of the limit of that endurance being reached when members are asked to sit so late. If hon. members occupied their seats all the time there might be some foundation for that argument. I quite agree that if hon. members had to keep their seats during the entire sitting of the House, there might be force in such an argument, but, the actual facts do not support the contention. A casual observation will show that, on the average, not more than one-fifth of the seats of the House can be claimed as occupied continuously; the attendance of members varies and has even fallen to the point where the Speaker has had on one occasion to adjourn the House for want of a quorum. Very often the attendance will only number some fifty or sixty members—indeed unless the occasion is a special one it is very seldom that more than fifty or sixty members are in their seats. Unfortunately for me I am not a smoker, and I have not as good an excuse to advance for leaving the chamber as some hon. gentlemen employ when they wish to take a little leisure out in the lobby or elsewhere. I do not think, therefore, that any hon. member is suffering very much by reason of the continued occupancy of his chair, and we do not need to worry very much about such a point as that when we are not compelled to remain in the chamber continuously. For these reasons I do not know that I can support the resolution except as to opening the proceedings at three o'clock on Wednesday. I am unable, however, to support the proposition that the latest hour for sittings, unless there be good reason to the contrary, shall be eleven o'clock.

Mr. FIELDING: If the House will bear with me for a few minutes I think I shall be able to say before the House rises for dinner, all that I wish to say in reply. I regret that the motion has come up at a time when so many hon. members are absent, because, from the conversations I have had with many hon. gentlemen on both sides, I am satisfied that the purpose of this motion has a larger degree of sympathy than has been made evident in the discussion to-day. I have already intimated that I have no intention of asking the House to divide upon this motion. If I felt that such a motion would have the effect of prolonging the session, as suggested by the hon. member for Centre Vancouver (Mr.Stevens) I would be among the first to oppose it. However, I do not think it would have that result; I think the effect would be quite the opposite.

I sympathize with the views expressed by hon. members who have been described —I think it was by my hon. friend from Maple Creek (Mr. Maharg)—as the "long distance members." They are in a different position from those hon. gentlemen who come from Montreal and Toronto, and I quite sympathize with them in their attitude. On the other hand I must make this observation—which I hope will not be found to be inaccurate—that in looking around at the empty seats at a late hour

I find that just as many "long distance members" are absent as those who might be described as "short distance members." I do not find that in that respect distance makes very much difference. There is a disposition on the part of members not to submit to the long and continued sittings; and if you are not going to have 6 p.m. an occasional recess—if you are going to sit on Wednesday nights, and on other nights as well, until eleven o'clock, you may do so nominally but later than that you will not do so in reality because members will not remain; and anybody who wants evidence of that fact can come into this chamber almost any night right after eleven o'clock and he will find that in most cases there is little more than a bare quorum on the Government benches—that is an actual fact.

Now the discussion broadened into one upon the advisability of a general revision of the rules of the House. Much has been said on questions of interest, but I do not think such questions bear directly on the matter at issue here. The Prime Minister, for example, talked about motions to go into Supply and amendments thereto. That is a very interesting subject and I should like to deliver an essay some day on what is the real basis of amendments to Supply in this chamber, but I do not care to do so now. My hon. friend from Maple Creek proposed that Parliament should meet earlier. I agree with that. My hon. friend from North Simcoe (Mr. Currie) proposed to enlarge the closure. Well, that is a large question. Possibly there may be wisdom in that suggestion, but I confined my motion to one or two particular points which seemed to me to be easily within the grasp of the House, and I do not think any sound reason has been advanced against those suggestions. It has been said by the hon. member for Centre Vancouver that there is an unwritten law that on Mondays and Fridays no business of importance shall be transacted. My hon. friend has certainly no warrant for that statement; there is no such unwritten law to my knowledge. There is a convenience at times in not bringing on matters on Monday or Friday afternoon; but there is no written law or no unwritten law on the subject. As the best evidence of that I call attention to the fact that the Prime Minister on Friday last brought forward a motion of great importance, one that he knew was likely to be a matter of contest. Still he brought it forward on Friday; he felt free to do so and I make no complaint of his taking that course. However, I think there is no such Monday and Friday rule as my hon. friend from Centre Vancouver describes. Now, as I pointed out, if hon. members are not to be allowed an evening off they will probably take it for themselves and the only result will be that we will take up business when the House is largely empty.

There is another thought that I would like to express. Much has been said about the waste of the time of the House. There are 235 members in this chamber—I think I am correct in the statement—men with heads on their shoulders and brains in their heads. They have not been sent here to be indifferent to what is going on, and if we are going to have democratic government, if we are going to have real representation of the people, those men must give expression to their views from time to time. That is not a waste of money and it is not a waste of time—it is simply a feature of the democratic government under which we live. Very much has been said about the waste of time in Parliament which is entirely unwarrantable.

There is only one other thought which I desire to express at the moment, and it relates to a matter as to which I have no personal grievance, and from which I suffer no personal discomfort. Some of the members of the House are not as young as I am. Some that may be as young in years are not as blest with health and strength as I have the happiness to be. There are members of the House on both sides—perhaps to be accurate more on the Government side,—whose condition of health does not permit them to sit here and yet we find them brought to the House at two, three, four or five o'clock in the morning. These men have been dragged out of their sick beds to come here and take part in the discussion or to vote. That, I think, is a thing exceedingly to be regretted, and in my opinion it would be very much in the interest of good government, very much for the comfort and convenience of members as well as in the interest of efficiency, if we had rules which would enable more regard to be paid to the condition of health of these gentlemen. Mr. Speaker, I desire to withdraw the resolution.

Resolution withdrawn.

CANADIAN NATIONAL RAILWAYS

SELECT STANDING COMMITTEE APPOINTED ON THE MOTION OF THE PRIME MINISTER

Right Hon. Mr. MEIGHEN: With the consent of the House, and the leader of the

Opposition being present, I would like to move that the House return to motions in order that I may move for the appointment of a Select Standing Committee on Railways and Shipping.

Motion agreed to.

Mr. MEIGHEN: I move, seconded by Hon. Mr. Reid:

That the Select Standing Committee appointed on the 8th instant, respecting the production of information, the system of auditing, the publication of detail in the Annual Report and the improvement that could be made in the general scheme of management of Canadian National Railways and Shipping as at present conducted, and the continuance of the said Committee and the reference thereto of the said Report, consist of the following members:

Messrs. Allan, Ballantyne, Bureau, Cahill, Casgrain, Chaplin, Copp, Crerar, Davidson, Duff, Hocken, Long, Maclean (Halifax), Maclean (York); Manion, McLean (Royal), Mewburn; Murphy, Nicholson (Algoma); Papineau, Reid (Grenville), Reid (McKenzie), Stevens, Stewart (Lanark), Tweedie, White (Victoria).

Mr. FIELDING: Is the right hon. gentleman correct in the form of his motion? It reads, "That the Select Standing Committee appointed on the 8th instant." There was an order of the House that there should be a committee, but I do not think he is correct in saying the committee was appointed.

Mr. MEIGHEN: I noticed that. I asked the Clerk of the House to prepare the motion, and this is his drafting.

Mr. FIELDING: I do not object if the right hon. member is satisfied.

Mr. MEIGHEN: The question is, did the resolution of the 8th instant really appoint a committee?

Mr. SPEAKER: No.

Mr. MEIGHEN: Then this resolution should read:

That the Select Standing Committee pursuant to the resolution of the 8th instant, respecting the production of information,—

And so on.

Mr. FIELDING: That is right.

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

Motion as amended agreed to.

Mr. MEIGHEN: I move, Mr. Speaker, that the House do return to the Order Notices of Motion.

Motion agreed to.

At Six o'clock the House took recess.

After Recess

The House resumed at Eight o'clock.

INTERCOLONIAL RAILWAY—EXPROPRIATION OF LAND AT LEVIS

Hon. W. S. FIELDING (Shelburne and Queen's) moved:

For a copy of all correspondence since January 1, 1912, between the Minister of Railways and Canals or any officer of the Department of Railways and Canals at Ottawa, and any officer of the Intercolonial Railway, and between any of such officials and Messrs. G. T. Davie and Son, or any solicitor or agent of the firm, respecting the expropriation of land at Lévis, Quebec, for the purposes of the Intercolonial Railway.

He said: Mr. Speaker, the transaction referred to in this motion for papers began, as the dates will show, several years ago, but has attracted public notice only recently through an action that has been tried in the courts—one which, indeed, is still before the courts. In August, 1912, the Government of Canada, for the purposes of the Intercolonial Railway, acquired by expropriation a property in the town of Lévis in the province of Quebec owned by the firm of George T. Davie and Son and other members of their family. In the course of the transaction they employed the services of a gentleman in the real estate business in Montreal, Mr. D. W. Ogilvie, doing business under the name of D. W. Ogilvie and Company. A little later they brought into their service another gentleman in Montreal, a member of the legal profession, Mr. C. A. Barnard, K.C. These gentlemen were employed to carry on the negotiations with respect to the property. When the transaction as respects the Government was closed and the compensation determined, some difficulty arose between Messrs. Davie, the owners of the property, and Mr. Ogilvie and Mr. Barnard, who had been employed in the negotiations. A dispute having arisen as to the compensation which Messrs. Ogilvie and Barnard should receive for their services, Messrs. Davie effected a settlement with Mr. Barnard to his apparent satisfaction, but in the case of Mr. Ogilvie they were not so fortunate. Mr. Ogilvie objected to the compensation allowed him, whereupon he brought an action in the courts of the province of Quebec against Messrs. Davie. At the first stage of the action Ogilvie failed; Davie was successful. The case was then appealed to the Appeal Court in the province of Quebec and there again Mr. Ogilvie was unsuccessful. The case was

then brought to the Supreme Court of Canada and was dealt with quite recently, judgment being given in favour of Mr. Ogilvie, the judgment of the lower courts set aside and a new trial ordered. That is the way the case now stands in the courts. It is but right to say that in these proceedings the Government was not a party and neither the plaintiff nor the defendant appears to have had any interest in probing the Government's side of the question, if there was a Government side; so that any information we get in the matter concerning the Government's action comes from what we might call the side lights; we get a glimpse of it occasionally as we look over the proceedings in the courts. Information of that character is necessarily incomplete, and it would not be wise to form a conclusion based upon it. But I think when I state in outline the facts as they appear on the records of the courts the House will agree that it is a case in respect of which we ought to have further information.

It was on August 12, 1912, that the Government acquired the property. On that day the engineer of the Intercolonial railway deposited in the Registry Office of the county of Lévis a plan and description of the property in question. I think I am right in stating that in accordance with the law, upon the plan and description being so deposited, the title to the property became vested in the Crown, subject, of course, to the right of the late owner to receive fair compensation. Now, there are two methods, either of which may in the ordinary way of business be employed to determine the compensation. The Government may themselves, by such method as suits them, fix a valuation on the property and may offer accordingly the price which they are willing to pay. If the late owner —whom I shall speak of now as the owner —is content with that; if he accepts the price so offered, the transaction is ended. But if he is not satisfied with what is offered, or if no offer is made, then the owner has the right to take his case into the Exchequer Court and that court will determine the compensation to be paid. It seems to me rather strange that neither of these ordinary business methods was adopted in this case. The Government do not appear to have made any offer to Messrs. Davie, and Messrs. Davie certainly entered no action in the Exchequer Court. The matter appears to have been allowed to drift along in the expectation that negotiations would in some way bring about a satisfactory solution. Messrs. Davie seem to have had the notion that they could not go about this thing in a straight, simple, businesslike way—send in their claim and establish it; they seemed to have had the notion that influence—I use the word that is found in the record—was required, and they obtained the services of Mr. Ogilvie because they thought his influence would be useful. Later they thought they needed more influence, so they obtained the services of Mr. Barnard. Let me say at once that Mr. Barnard himself says he was not employed in a professional capacity; he, therefore, was not to be considered as merely making a claim for ordinary legal services—he was employed as negotiator, as he says himself, to get all that he could for the parties. Mr. Barnard, as I have said, was brought into the transaction some time after Mr. Ogilvie became concerned in it; Mr. Ogilvie seemed to have conducted the negotiations at first, and later Mr. Barnard came in. At the beginning there appeared to have been negotiations with Mr. Gutelius and others, officers of the Intercolonial Railway, but after a short time the conclusion seemed to have been reached that the matter could not be settled in that way; that recourse must be had to higher authorities. So it came about that Mr. Gutelius and others dropped out of the matter and the scene was transferred to Ottawa.

Shortly after Messrs. Ogilvie were employed they wrote a letter to Messrs. Davie with regard to the compensation that was expected. On May 7, 1913, Messrs. J. W. Ogilvie and Company wrote this letter to Messrs. George T. Davie and Sons, of Lévis, Quebec:

> Dear Sirs,—The Intercolonial railway of Canada have sent us a blue-print of your property situated in Lauzon Ward, Lévis, showing the land they purpose to expropriate lying between the present Intercolonial railway and the King's Highway; the strip of land having a superficial area, according to the plan as prepared by C. A. Bourget, of 36,900 sq. ft. E.M.
>
> In order to take up this matter with the Intercolonial railway, will you kindly write us giving us the best cash price you will accept for the 36,900 sq. ft. of land. On receipt of your letter we will communicate with the proper officials and endeavour to make a sale of the property direct to the Intercolonial railway without expropriation proceedings.
>
> Trusting you will give this matter your early attention, as it is advisable to settle with the railway before expropriation proceedings are started.
>
> Yours very truly,
> (Sgd.) D. W. OGILVIE & Co. Inc.
> Per D. W. Ogilvie.

Here you see that the agent was asking from his principals a definite price for

which they were prepared to dispose of the property. This is the reply of George T. Davie and Son, dated at Lévis, May 14, 1913:

Levis, May 14, 1913.

Messrs. D. W. OGILVIE & Co.,
11 St. Sacrament Street,
Montreal, Que.

Dear Sirs,—In answer to your letter of May 7, we beg to say that we are asking one dollar and twenty-five cents ($1.25) per foot of our property which has been expropriated by the Intercolonial railway.

Yours very truly,
(Sgd.) GEO. T. DAVIE & SON,
Per J. O. A. V.

That communication offering the land at $1.25 per foot appears to have been conveyed, although I do not know how, to the Intercolonial Railway authorities, because at some later stage when Mr. Barnard endeavoured to get $3 per foot for the property, he was told that was ridiculous, as the Government already had the offer of Messrs. Davie and Son to sell at $1.25 per foot. That seems to have been for the moment rather a knock-out blow to the negotiators. They recovered, however, and they represented that when they offered the property for $1.25 per foot, they really meant $1.75, and that the error was merely a clerical one. The negotiations appear to have proceeded for some time on that basis and, in fact, the matter was ultimately settled without reference to the original offer. At one stage Mr. Gutelius was offered the property at $1.75 per foot, and he said that that was too much and he refused to pay it. After the principals and their representatives made further representations to the Government, they ultimately, as I shall show, effected a settlement in which they got a very much larger price than Davie was willing to sell for. It is important, in view of what occurred subsequently to notice this letter signed by George T. Davie and Son per one of their officials offering the property at $1.25 per foot, when at a later stage the demand was made for a much higher price, and as I stated the representation was made that this letter contained a clerical error. It appears that when the matter came to trial, the gentleman who wrote this letter, under the authority, presumably, of George T. Davie and Son, was no longer in their service. He was, however, available, but he was not called as a witness. I suppose it did not interest either party to the suit to probe that question of the $1.25 per foot. After the matter was all settled, when there was no longer any question with the Government, but when there was some question between Ogilvie and Barnard regarding their compensation, we obtained through the record, for I have no other source of information, a statement of what Mr. Barnard thought about this mistake. Mr. Barnard, writing to Mr. Ogilvie in connection with the arrangement about their compensation said :

We have succeeded in getting them—

The Davie's.

—$1.75 per foot, notwithstanding the fact that they had at one time offered to take $1.25, and I do not possibly see how they can raise any objection to turning over everything over $1.75 per foot.

That is Mr. Barnard's letter to Mr. Ogilvie after the transaction was settled with the Government. Mr. Barnard also wrote to Mr. G. C. Stuart, K.C., of Quebec, one of the counsel in the case, as follows:

As regards the Davie's themselves, they should remember that Ogilvie's services, outside of these $15,586.15—

That has reference to a previous portion of the matter which is of no importance here.

—has resulted in their getting in any case 50 cents per foot for their property more than they had at one time been willing to take, which 50 cents amounted on 36,900 to $18,450, so that even if they pay Ogilvie the amount I consider he is entitled to, they are still $18,450 better off than they would have been had they not dealt at all with Ogilvie.

That is Mr. Barnard's statement. Then Mr. Barnard was a witness at the trial and this occurred in his testimony:

I thought therefore, that I ought to point out to Mr. Stuart that as a matter of fact our joint services—

Ogilvie's and Barnard's.

—in any case had resulted in getting $1.75 for the property that Davie's had been willing to take $1.25 for.

Q. That was the fact? A. That was the fact, yes.

The Government, you see, had then been settled with; but while the transaction appears to be carried on on the basis that this $1.25 per foot offer was a mistake, we find Mr. Barnard, in correspondence and in his evidence at the trial, stating and swearing that $1.25 per foot was what the Davie's were really willing to take at that time. The story is too long to burden the House with it all, because I only want to show sufficient ground to make a basis for getting further information. There was

some question of difficulty at an early stage about the area in question. At the beginning there seemed to have been one or two surveys and some misunderstanding arose in that way. At one stage a larger quantity of land was mentioned, and Mr. Campbell, Deputy Minister of Railways, in a letter stated that he thought they had included some land already owned by the Intercolonial. Messrs. Davie and Son, however, had that matter all amicably settled by declaring that the quantity of land was 36,900 feet, and in all their negotiations later on they mentioned that quantity and at the trial they swore that that was the quantity. When the deed was ultimately passed, a larger quantity of land was mentioned; instead of 36,900 feet the deed contained a mention of 63,000 and some odd feet. Mr. Barnard, commenting on that, said that it appeared to him that it was a manœuvre—I am using his word—

Hon. Mr. REID: The hon. member said 69,000; it should be 39,000.

Mr. FIELDING: Yes. The quantity mentioned in the deed is 38,000 and some odd feet. The "sixty-nine" comes in a more substantial matter of dollars and cents. Mr. Barnard said that he could not quite understand why that change was made. At all events, he said, Davie was not getting any more for 38,000 odd feet than he was going to get for 36,900 feet. He said that this was a manœuvre to cover up a sum of $5,000 which he was to get in the transaction, and that so far as he was concerned he did not want to be covered up at all. That matter, however, in the end, perhaps did not affect the general question. The main question seemed to be that Davie offered this property to the Government for $1.25 per foot, and in the end the Government paid not only $1.75 per foot, but $5,000 more. Davie allowed Barnard $10,000 for his services. Some may say: "If it suited Mr. Davie to pay to Mr. Barnard a sum of $10,000 for his services, what business is it of ours; we need not care." We need not care if it were absolutely the fact that Davie paid the $10,000; but a more careful examination of the facts shows that what Mr. Davie did was to pay only $5,000, and the other $5,000 to Mr. Barnard was paid by the convenient device of adding that sum to the charge to the Government and making the Government pay it. Mr. Barnard got $10,000, but only $5,000 of it came out of Mr. Davie. The record seems to show very clearly that for a property which the Government were offered for $1.25 per foot, they paid in the end $1.75. Not only that, but they also paid an additional sum of $5,000 under the circumstances I have described.

These are the facts set forth in the proceedings in the court. If it be true that an offer was made in good faith, and Mr. Barnard treats it as a bona fide offer, to sell this property for $1.25 per foot, and if the negotiations were carried on for a long time and finally carried to Ottawa, and negotiators were employed to do that which ought not to have needed negotiators, it seems to be as simple a fact as we can present that the Government paid $18,000 odd more for that property than the owner was willing to take, and that an additional $5,000 went, not to the Davies, but to Mr. Barnard. These facts are only sidelights which come out in the course of the inquiry in the court. Again I say, one only gets a partial view of the situation. I do not want to draw any conclusions from incomplete information of that character. I quite admit that we should reserve our judgment, and I present these facts accordingly. All I ask is that in view of these facts set forth in the court—I have no other source of information—the House should adopt the resolution, whereby we would get all the papers relating to the subject.

Hon. J. D. REID (Minister of Railways and Canals): When this motion was placed on the Order Paper I asked one of my officials to get all the facts in connection with the case in order that I might be able to reply to my hon. friend when he moved his resolution in the House. I am sorry to say that up till six o'clock I had not received the information, but since that time I have endeavoured to get what little information I could in order to give it to the House this evening.

Let me say at the outset that there is no reason why all the papers and correspondence in connection with this transaction should not be brought down, and they will be brought down at the earliest possible date. This whole transaction from start to finish took place prior to my being Minister of Railways and Canals and therefore I was not personally siezed of the facts in connection with the case, but in the short time I have had since six o'clock to look into the matter I understand that these are the facts:

On December 15, 1911, the town of Levis advised the railway officials that they proposed to abandon the city stock pens which the Intercolonial had been using

until that time. The officials of the railway, after studying various locations for a new stock pen, decided that that site was the best, and that they should try and purchase the property. Accordingly Mr. Brady, the general manager of the railway, on July 2, 1912, recommended to the then Minister of Railways, the late Mr. Cochrane, that the property be purchased, and on August 12, about a month later, the property was expropriated by an Order in Council upon the recommendation of Mr. Cochrane. The matter then stood for about two years. Negotiations in the meantime were carried on between Mr. Gutelius and D. W. Ogilvie and Company, representing G. T. Davie and Sons, Lévis. I understand that Mr. Gutelius offered $1.75 per foot, but that was refused. Accordingly, Mr. Gutelius appointed, as was the custom, three valuators, Jos. Gosselin, contractor, Lévis, Télesphore Charland, Mayor of Lauzon, and Jos. Edouard Parent, Beaufort, to value the property.

Mr. FIELDING: What was the date of their appointment?

Hon. Mr. REID: They were appointed on December 30, 1913, on the recommendation of the Postmaster General, dated December 16, 1913, to ascertain whether $1.75 per square foot was a fair and reasonable price. The result was that these arbitrators reported on February 2, 1914, giving a valuation of $3.00 per square foot. On January 30, 1914, D. W. Ogilvie and Company withdrew the option for the lower price,—I presume that means $1.75,—and on April 4, named the price of $2.75 per square foot. Negotiations were continued with D. W. Ogilvie and Company through their solicitor, Mr. Barnard, and finally on March 15, 1915, Mr. Barnard after an interview offered to accept $69,575 in settlement, the terms being a cash payment of $9,575 with interest thereon, leaving a balance of $60,000, with interest thereon at 4 per cent from date of taking possession, payable when convenient to the Government to do so. Mr. Gutelius in the memorandum signed by him says:

> Personally it was my intention to recommend the acceptance of the $1.75, and hoped that the valuators would confirm this as being fair and reasonable. When they raised the price, however, to $3.00 per foot and the owners were apparently aware of this figure, it made it more difficult, so that the settlement which was finally affected was to my mind a good business proposition and less than the Exchequer Court would have awarded us, having in mind that our own valuators would endeavour to protect their valuation of $3.00 per foot before the court.

[Mr. Reid.]

I mention these facts merely to show that Mr. Gutelius as general manager was trying to protect the interests of the railway and the Government by endeavouring to get the property at as low a price as possible, and also to show that Mr. Cochrane acted under the advice of his officials, and, I believe, in good faith. I am quite satisfied that if there was anything wrong in any shape or form my predecessor knew nothing whatever about it; nor, I believe, did Mr. Gutelius. On the recommendation of Mr. Cochrane the order was dated October 26, 1915, advising the acceptance of $69,575 for 38,723 feet of land. That was the official Order in Council, and from the information I have received since six o'clock I think it was the understanding that the $60,000 was not to be paid for two years, during which time 4 per cent interest was paid on that amount. The final payment was made, I think, in 1918. Of course, that payment was made after I became minister, but the matter had already been settled, so that I never heard of it until the hon. member placed the motion on the Order Paper. As I have said, however, so far as the Government is concerned, I believe that the transaction was carried out by the officials and by the minister in good faith, and if there have been commissions or anything of that kind they know nothing whatever about them. We are only too pleased to bring the papers down and have the matter thoroughly investigated from start to finish.

Mr. FIELDING: There is little I care to add to what has already been said. I am quite aware that the matter must have taken place largely before the minister entered the department, and I have no desire to cast reflections upon any one. But the facts as I have stated them, on the authority of the proceedings in the courts, show the necessity for further investigation. I want to state one or two points in reply to my hon. friend. He says that an Order in Council was passed to pay this sum for 39,000 odd feet.

Hon. Mr. REID: The quantity is 38,723 feet.

Mr. FIELDING: Yes, nearly 39,000 feet. Now, Messrs. Davie, all through the latter part of the negotiations, held, and in the trial distinctly swore, that there were only 36,900 feet. There is no information yet to account for the larger quantity of nearly 39,000 feet mentioned in the deed.

There is a suggestion from Mr. Barnard that there was a manœuvre to cover up something which he did not want covered up. My hon. friend says that an Order in Council was passed to pay $69,575; but 36,900 feet at $1.75 does not amount to that sum; it gives only $64,575. The facts seem to be that Messrs. Davie and Company offered the property at $1.25 per foot, and though there was some talk of that being a mistake, we have the sworn testimony of Mr. Barnard that it was correct, that Messrs. Davie were getting 50 cents per foot more than they themselves asked for. They were paid, not the sum of $46,125 which they were willing to take, not the $64,000 odd that would be the amount at $1.75 per foot, but the higher price of $69,575. On the surface it does appear that there was something peculiar about the management of this affair. I do not wish to press the matter further, because I admit that the information is incomplete and I would prefer that we reserve judgment until we are in possession of all the papers.

Motion agreed to.

CORRESPONDENCE RE JUDGES ACT, 1920

Hon. RODOLPHE LEMIEUX (Maisonneuve—Gaspé) moved:

For a copy of all correspondence between the Chief Justice of Ontario and any Member of the Government as to the Judges' Act of the Session of 1920.

He said: I have nothing to say about this motion except that I think it is in the public interest that this correspondence be laid on the table of the House. I understand that there has been between the Government, especially the Minister of Justice (Mr. Doherty), and the Prime Minister (Mr. Meighen), and the Chief Justice of the province of Ontario, some correspondence regarding the Judges' Act as amended by the legislation of last year. When that correspondence is laid on the Table we shall be in a position to deal further with the matter.

Right Hon. C. J. DOHERTY (Minister of Justice): I had not observed this motion on the Order Paper. I shall ascertain whether there is any correspondence of an official character that should be produced. If there is I shall be glad to table it.

Motion agreed to.

BUSINESS OF THE HOUSE

Mr. SPEAKER: Orders of the Day.

Mr. LEMIEUX: With your leave, Mr. Speaker, I understood that we would revert to some other motions.

Hon. Mr. REID: I understood otherwise.

Mr. SPEAKER: The hon. member (Mr. Lemieux) says there was an understanding that the House would revert to certain motions that had been passed. It might be well for the Government to intimate their desire in the matter.

Hon. Mr. REID: I understood that we would proceed with the Orders of the Day.

Mr. LEMIEUX: I do not wish to press the point if my hon. friend prefers to take the Orders of the Day. It was my impression, however, that we would take up motion No. 15, dealing with the question of the Chicago Drainage Canal, in which, I think, the Minister of Marine is interested.

Hon. Mr. BALLANTYNE: I should like my hon. friend to let that motion stand; I have not had an opportunity of looking into it.

Mr. LEMIEUX: Until Monday next?

Mr. BALLANTYNE: Yes.

CANADIAN NATIONAL RAILWAYS—REDUCTION IN NUMBER OF EMPLOYEES

On the Orders of the Day:

Mr. A. B. COPP (Westmoreland): I desire to refer to a matter which has been dealt with in the public press for the last two or three days, and I should be glad to have an expression of opinion regarding it from the Minister of Railways. I refer to the reduction in the number of working men in the Canadian National shops in the city of Moncton. There is a rumour to the effect that from 600 to 800 men are to be turned out from the C.N.R. shops in that city. Is that report correct, and, if so, is the order only a matter of temporary expediency or is it to be permanent? This is of great importance to the people in that city as well as to the public generally. Will the minister be good enough to make a statement to the House?

Hon. J. D. REID (Minister of Railways and Canals): The hon. member was kind enough to inform me at six o'clock of his intention to bring this matter up on the Orders of the Day. I called up President Hanna at Toronto, and asked him what

the real situation was. Mr. Hanna informs me that owing to a decline in the business of the railways, they could not find work for all the employees in the shops. They therefore offered to keep on all hands and reduce work to half-time. All employees in shops west of Port Arthur accepted. Those on the Government railways as a body refused, and the management could therefore do nothing but lay off temporarily all surplus employees. Just as soon as there is work the men will again be taken on.

CANADIAN NATIONAL RAILWAYS—PRICE OFFERED FOR RAILS

On the Orders of the Day:

Mr. JOHN C. DOUGLAS (South Cape Breton and Richmond): I desire to draw the attention of the Minister of Railways to a despatch which appears in the Canadian press of yesterday, as well as the newspapers published to-day, which reads as follows:

> Roll Rails at Cost for C.N.R. is offer
> Sydney, N.S., April 9.—In a statement to the Canadian Press today, R. M. Wolvin, president of the Dominion Steel Company, stated that the company had offered to roll rails for the Canadian National Railways at actual cost, but he gave positive denial to a statement appearing in an Ottawa despatch, which reported the offering of a large rail order to the company by the Department of Railways.

In view of the importance of this matter, and the large amount of unemployment that prevails at Sydney and Glace Bay in consequence of the small amount of business being done in connection with coal and steel operations. I desire to ask the minister if he has any statement to make on the subject.

Hon. Mr. REID: I noticed the article in question and I wish to make the following statement with respect to it:

> The Canadian National Railways have rails for renewals and repairs for 1921. Notwithstanding this fact they have offered to take a large quantity of rails for new work. They have offered the Algoma Steel Company the same price as paid them for rails during 1920, namely, $55 per ton, and have offered the Dominion Iron and Steel Company the same price. This price both companies have refused and are asking higher prices. As the mills have reduced the wages of employees, and rails in the United States are offered at $47 per ton, it it not considered reasonable that the Government should be called upon to pay an increased price for rails for 1921.

REPORT OF DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH

On the Orders of the Day:

Mr. PETER McGIBBON (Muskoka): I wish to ask the Minister of Health if there is any report from that department, and if so when it will be laid 2before Parliament.

Hon. Mr. CALDER: If I am not mistaken the report has already been laid upon the table. If it has not I will make enquiries and see that it is laid on the table as soon as possible.

HUDSON BAY RAILWAY

On the Order for resuming the adjourned debate on the proposed motion of Mr. Campbell, as amended:

> That, in the opinion of this House, work on the Hudson Bay railway should be resumed as soon as financial conditions permit, and that the project be completed with the least possible delay.

Mr. SPEAKER: I understand the hon. gentleman who moved the resolution desires to reply.

Mr. J. A. CAMPBELL (Nelson): I was not aware that this matter was coming up to-night. However, as it has been taken up, and as the opportunity is afforded me of replying to some of the statements made during the debate which took place some days ago, I shall take advantage of the occasion to say a few words. May I say, by way of preliminary, that I was somewhat amazed—in fact I was dumbfounded—by the somewhat cold-blooded manner in which the Minister of Railways (Mr. Reid) when this matter was last brought up, showed his indifference to the pledges and promises of the Government, and of his party generally, in connection with this scheme. Surely the country has come to a sorry state when a responsible Government, such as we presumably have at the present time, can lightly wave aside the solemn pledges which they have made in connection with a matter of national importance such as the construction of the Hudson Bay railway. The only excuse, or at least the chief excuse, which was given by the minister for the absolute disregard by the Government, and by the party which supports them, of the pledges and promises made in connection with this railway, was the fact—or the alleged fact—that the financial condition of the country would not warrant a further vote of money in connection with this road at the present time. Actually, Mr. Speaker, this statement was made despite the fact that money is being spent like water in connection with all other kinds of public undertaking such as shipbuilding, the construction of dry docks, improve-

ments in harbours, the carrying out of the St. Lawrence improvement scheme and various other undertakings. We look at the Estimates this year and we find that sums ranging from two to ten millions, are being spent in various parts of Canada on public works of this nature. Nevertheless we are told that even so small a sum comparatively as $1,700,000 is not available to complete the Hudson Bay project on which $21,000,000 has been already expended.

Two members of the Liberal Opposition, the hon. member for North Waterloo (Mr. Euler) and the hon. member for Lotbinière (Mr. Vien) criticised the project and quoted some evidence given in the past against the scheme. Now, as I have already pointed out, the evidence which they cited is not new; it has been produced in the House from time to time on previous occasions and it has been answered. As the result of various commissions and investigations held from time to time, the Government of Sir Wilfrid Laurier started the building of this road and intended to carry it to completion but were not allowed to do so. As a result of the elections of 1911 another Government stepped in and went on with the work after further investigation was made. I intimated to the House when this question was last before it that I did not wish to take up the time of the House in giving details as to the evidence in connection with this matter. That evidence is very extensive, in fact, it consists of volumes, and I do not propose to-night to go into it. I would simply refer the two gentlemen in question to the statements of Sir Wilfrid Laurier and his Government and I ask them if they repudiate the action of Sir Wilfrid and his Government in 1910 when they began the construction of this railway after having thoroughly investigated the project. I have the same question to ask of hon. gentlemen supporting the Government. Do they repudiate the statements made by Sir Charles Tupper, by the former Prime Minister (Sir Robert Borden); by the present Prime Minister, the Minister of Trade and Commerce, and others—statements which I quoted in the few remarks I made the other day and which were emphatically in favour of the scheme? I ask hon. gentlemen opposite if they repudiate the statements made by these gentlemen and by the governments which they represented.

The hon. member for North Oxford (Mr. Nesbitt) during the previous debate told a very gruesome story of the horrible things he had done at various times in the past, and declared that he was not now playing politics. I would like to ask my hon. friend who is playing politics at the present time? Are those who are asking to have the Government's promises carried out playing politics, or is it those who propose to set aside one scheme which has been promised, undertaken and nearly completed in order to carry out another scheme which was only put forward in order to win a by-election? I ask him who is playing politics when the Hudson Bay Railway project is set aside, after so much money has been spent on it, in order to construct a dry dock at Esquimalt to fulfil a pledge that was made in order to win a by-election at Victoria not so very long ago? It looks to me as though hon. gentlemen opposite are carrying on the same programme as that which my hon. friend from Oxford declared he had been supporting in the past, although he is now repentant. I would like to ask my hon. friend if he thinks the Estimates in connection with the construction of dry docks, canal improvements, and other matters that are on the Government's programme at the present time, indicate a sincere desire for economy? I propose, Mr. Speaker, when the time comes to bring these questions definitely before the House to ascertain whether the House correctly appreciates the situation—whether we are simply going to have economy in one particular and not in all? If we are going to have economy—something which I very much desire to see brought about as a matter of public policy, then it should be applied everywhere and not simply applied in one particular part of the country.

The hon. member for North Oxford also indulged in certain remarks about something that somebody had told him as to the great amount of dredging that had to be done at Port Nelson. As a matter of fact if the hon. member had cared to obtain reliable information about that particular subject, he could have gone to the Department of Railways and the chief engineer would have told him definitely what the situation was as far as dredging is concerned. He repeated a story that some one had told him, but I may tell him that it will be emphatically denied if he goes to the proper quarter for information. But this hon. gentleman as well as other hon. members have brought down here a lot of hearsay evidence and retailed it as arguments against a scheme which has been thoroughly investigated and pronounced sound and feasible, and the feasibility and practica-

bility of which is not an issue at the present time.

It would seem from the statements made by certain gentlemen that in the case of the Hudson Bay project they contend that this should be a ready-made route. There never was such a situation existing in the Dominion before. The St. Lawrence was not a ready-made route. I have a vivid recollection of taking passage in the steamship Victorian, I think it was fifteen years or so ago and when we were only a few hours' out from Montreal about nine o'clock one morning we ran aground this side of Quebec, and the passengers had to be taken off in small boats and landed at Quebec. In my own case I lost so much time that I had to abandon the voyage. I was told that the Victorian remained aground for some months. If anything like that had happened on the Hudson Bay route the hon. gentleman would have used the incident to condemn the project; yet millions of dollars have been spent on the St. Lawrence route, and although it is not perhaps quite as satisfactory as it should be, we are not condemning the route. But if half as much money were spent on the Hudson Bay route I have no doubt that it would be a certain success. Regarding my hon. friend from Battleford—

Mr. LONG: North Battleford.

Mr. CAMPBELL: Regarding my hon. friend from North Battleford, notwithstanding the rather critical tone of his remarks, I think that, generally speaking, I am considerably in accord with the statements made by him. I might interpolate here that in any remarks which I made I was not in any way casting aspersions on my hon. friend. I believe he has honestly investigated this proposition—something that certain other hon. members have not done—but cannot see his way clear to advocate continuance of the project at the present time. He read an article from the Grain Growers' Guide—I have not got it here as I did not know this matter was coming up to-night—written by some one who had been to the Bay, criticizing severely the character of the work that had been done.

9 p.m. I am fully in accord with that criticism, because the scheme appears to have been muddled from start to finish, and to have been so handled, as some think, in order to show that the project will not work out successfully. Although I agree with him that certain of the work already done has been unsatisfactory, owing perhaps to insufficient investigation in some respects, still I disagree with him in his opinion that the work can well be stopped altogether at the present time until the matter is thoroughly investigated. I say that certain work should go on, and that as to other work for instance, such as that in connection with the terminals, further investigation might be made.

I made a proposition to the right hon. Prime Minister a short time ago which I think covers the ground. The dump or grade is completed to the bay. I suggested that the rails be laid from the present end of steel for a distance of about forty miles, which would bring the line to the head of navigation on the river. The Government own and operate a stern wheel river steamer at Port Nelson, and if my suggestion were adopted the railway would connect with the steamer and thus complete connection with the bay. The cost would not be excessive, and by this means men and material could be brought into the bay for any investigation or work that may be necessary there. I am told that as soon as connection is made with the bay, commercial fishing will be indulged in. I was also told by a prominent official of the Marine and Fisheries Department that it was the intention of the department—the hon. minister can correct me if I am mistaken—as soon as the railway is completed to the bay to put on one or more steam trawlers for the purpose of investigating the fisheries. I was informed that the department had this in view before the war broke out, but the war forced them to abandon this proposal and it was then decided to allow it to remain in abeyance until connection is made with the bay by means of the railway or otherwise. I received a letter a few days ago from a gentleman interested in iron properties on the east shore of Hudson bay—he is only one of a number who are so interested. He had told me some years ago that he and his colleagues were waiting until the railway was completed in order that they might start work on their properties. Now he wants to know what the prospects are for getting in this year. If this connection could be effected now a great deal of work of an exploratory nature would be undertaken, which will add to the regular traffic resulting from the building of the road.

Now a few words in conclusion with reference to statements made by the hon. Minister of Railways and Canals. He stated that the road did not pay. Of course it does not pay. Does anybody in this House

know of any public undertaking with which the hon. minister is concerned that does pay? The day after the debate on this matter recently he read a statement regarding the Canadian National railways, and if ever there was a proposition that did not pay we had a glaring example there. I could name a number of other undertakings with which he is connected that do not pay; for instance, the Welland canal and the Trent canal in which he takes a great deal of personal interest. As far as the Hudson Bay railway is concerned, it was never intended to pay as a local proposition. The idea was to connect the wheatfields of the prairies with the Bay, and local traffic was not in the minds of those who undertook the enterprise. But we find a situation has developed in the meantime which shows that the country through which this railway passes is not the wilderness we thought it was, and that there are resources there which, if properly handled, will produce a great deal of local traffic, and it is within the bounds of probability that when the road is completed the local traffic itself will form a substantial part of the operating surplus. The line was to be constructed to Port Nelson and the work was proceeded with at great speed during the war, but when peace came that work was stopped. The road is about two-thirds built, and when operations ceased the road was left practically in a field. It is being operated—not for the 332 miles on which steel is laid, but only for about 214 miles. It does not go any place in particular, indeed, as I have said, it practically stops nowhere. How could any road under such circumstances be expected to pay? Yet my hon. friend says that because it does not pay we are going to stop work, and go ahead and spend millions and millions of dollars on other public works that we do not expect to get any revenue from whatever.

This matter was brought before certain members of the Cabinet on one occasion by a delegation of members of this House and the statement was then made by one of the ministers that we had to economize, and so far as he was concerned no public works were going to be built that year, although a number of places wished to have public works proceeded with just as the West wished to have the Hudson bay railway completed. I asked him if he had any public works under way, such as post offices or similar buildings which had been left partly constructed without any roof on, and which he proposed to leave in that way until financial conditions should improve. He said there was no instance of that kind. That would have been an instance analagous to the conditions existing in respect to the Hudson bay railway at the present time.

I might say here, Mr. Speaker—and I have said it before—that if this were a one word of its immediate construction. I would not prefer one request to have the work commenced. Further, if the Hudson Bay railway had been completed for a distance of only one hundred miles or thereabouts, you would not hear one word from me by way of request for an extension of the line at this time. But neither of these conditions applies to the Hudson Bay railway project. The roadbed is practically completed to the bay; the rails are laid three-quarters of the way, about one-half the line is operated, and only a comparatively small expenditure and an inconsiderable amount of work is required in order to put the road in such condition that connection can be made between The Pas and the Bay. In view of these facts, and in order to protect the money that we have invested in the enterprise and to make something out of it; in order to make it a business proposition in a real sense, it is urged that certain work in the way of construction be gone on with.

The Minister of Railways intimated that all expenditure made on railway account was needed for the building of branch lines in the West, and he said that I had appeared before him on several occasions in connection with the building of those branch lines. He speaks very truly; I am as much interested in the building of branch lines in connection with the Canadian National Railway system, as I am in the Hudson Bay railway. But the fact is that the money is not being used for the building of these branch lines in the West. The 1919 programme so far as the building of branch lines is concerned has not yet been carried out. When the minister puts as an alternative to the building of the Hudson Bay railway the completion of these branch lines, he merely attempts to pull wool over our eyes, because, as I say, the branch lines programme is not being carried out. At different times delegations from the West have asked for the construction not only of the Hudson Bay railway but of certain branch lines. The minister has said: We cannot build both; will you take the branch lines or will you take the Hud-

son Bay railway? That is a very unfair proposal? I remember that this question was put specifically to a large delegation from the Melfort district in Saskatchewan, and the reply was: Go ahead with the construction of the Hudson Bay railway if you cannot give us both. It was stated in the resolution on this subject signed by western members that the construction of necessary branch lines should be carried on in addition to the construction of the Hudson Bay railway; that the one should be done and the other not left undone. The question of terminals has been raised. The proposal which I have made is such as would allow for the making of further investigation so far as terminals are concerned. There is a feeling throughout the country, right or wrongly, that the proper terminal has not been chosen. I have been careful to avoid the issue with respect to terminals; I am not prepared to state conclusively whether the proper terminal has been chosen or not. I am not an engineer, though I have my own opinion in the matter, as I have been to both Churchill and Nelson. It is possible that the engineers can make a satisfactory terminal at Nelson; I am not here to say. But apparently there is a feeling that sufficient investigation was not made before the decision with respect to the terminal was arrived at; that a sufficiently careful inquiry was not carried out by experts. My suggestion therefore, as previously outlined, is that the road be completed to the head of navigation on the Nelson, and if there is any doubt in the mind of the Government—and they have not expressed any —with regard to the question whether a proper terminal has been chosen, let the matter be thoroughly investigated by competent harbour experts. If it is then deemed advisable that a change should be made, it can be made without the necessity for any extra work, because the turn would have to be made at a point beyond the end of the construction which I now suggest. I wish in conclusion, Mr. Speaker, to emphasize the fact that the West is paying for this road, not the East, and not Canada as a whole. Preemptions and purchased homesteads have been set aside in the West for the purpose of realizing money in order to build this railway. As I have said, approximately $28,000,000 worth of these lands have already been sold—at least, had been sold up to a year ago; the amount is probably greater by this time. What is the Government doing with this money? It is ear-marked, I am told—and this came out in debates in this House—for the construction of the Hudson Bay railway, but instead of going on with the work for which this money was provided the Government have decided to let it stand for the time being, and they do not say how long it will be before the work is resumed.

I contend, therefore, that the case against the completion of the work to the point suggested has not been made out. The question of economy does not enter into the matter. If the Government were carrying out a programme of economy throughout the whole country, not a word would be said by the West so far as the construction of this road is concerned. But when money is being spent lavishly upon other enterprises that do not involve the production of revenue, surely the West is being differentiated against, it is being sacrificed, for interests which appear, for reasons which we can surmise to have a more powerful pressure. Now, I do not know whether it is in order at this stage to withdraw the resolution, owing to the amendment which has been made. But the resolution as amended, is of no benefit, and there would not seem to be any advantage in asking for a vote on it. If I am in order, therefore, I would ask leave to withdraw the resolution.

Motion withdrawn.

EXCESSIVE OR INADEQUAE PUNISHMENTS

On the Order for the second reading of Bill No. 18 to amend the Criminal Code so as to provide for the revision of excessive or inadequate punishments.—Mr. Tweedie.

Hon. C. J. DOHERTY (Minister of Justice): There is much to be said in support of this Bill, but it touches directly the Department of Justice, and it does seem proper that we should make inquiries of judges who will be called upon to operate under the proposed provision and of the attorneys general of the different provinces who are responsible for the administration of the criminal law, as to their view concerning the effect of this legislation on the proper administration of justice from the point of view of criminal law. We have instituted this inquiry. We have not yet received replies from all the sources to which we addressed ourselves, and as it is desirable that we should have an answer to this question before coming to a final conclusion with regard to the adoption

of the measure, I suggest to the hon. gentleman who is responsible for the Bill that if he will let it stand for the present I shall endeavour to expedite the obtaining of this information.

Mr. TWEEDIE: That will be satisfactory to me. I simply wish to point out that this Bill has been passed by the Senate in three successive years; unfortunately in other years we have not been able to get it before the House. On the assurance of the Minister of Justice that the matter will be brought before the House during this session I shall be very glad to let the Bill stand until he obtains the information to which he refers.

Mr. BUTTS: May I ask the minister if he would consider the matter of doing away with that part of the Criminal Code which gives power to judges to suspend sentences?

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: I fear that the question asked by the hon. member (Mr. Butts) is not in order at this time. The hon. member in charge of the Bill has consented that the order stand; therefore no discussion is permissible at this stage. I am sure that the Minister of Justice will, when his Estimates are under consideration, or on some other convenient occasion, answer the question put by the hon. member.

Order stands.

THE HOUSING PROBLEM

PROPOSED ESTABLISHMENT OF A FEDERAL HOUSING BOARD

On the Order for resuming the adjourned debate on the proposed resolution of Mr. Hocken, as amended.

That, in the opinion of this House, the general interest of the people of Canada will be served by making it possible for every industrious, frugal and thrifty citizen to become the owner in fee simple of a house and lot; that the Government of Canada should grant assistance to make that possible; and to that end, an annual appropriation should be made to buy land and build houses for men of good character who can make a small initial payment and undertake to liquidate the indebtedness incurred by monthly instalments as may be agreed upon; that a Federal Housing Board be appointed to carry out the plan which, for the first year—or such longer period as in the opinion of the Governor General in Council may be desirable—shall be confined to men who have served overseas.

Mr. H. C. HOCKEN (West Toronto): I would like to withdraw this resolution.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Is it the pleasure of the House that the hon. gentleman have leave to withdraw the resolution?

Some hon. MEMBERS: Carried.

Resolution withdrawn.

FUEL SUPPLY PROBLEM

On the Order for resuming the adjourned debate on the proposed resolution of Mr. Steele.

That, in the opinion of this House, the future fuel supply of Canada should be considered by Parliament, and that a Special Committee of the House of Commons should be forthwith appointed to inquire into all matters pertaining thereto, with power to send for persons, papers and records, to examine witnesses under oath and to report from time to time.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: The committee called for by this resolution having been appointed, I would ask if it is the pleasure of the House that the hon. gentleman have leave to withdraw the resolution.

Some hon. MEMBERS: Carried.

Resolution withdrawn.

CRIMINAL CODE AMENDMENT

On motion of Mr. D. A. Lafortune (Jacques Cartier), Bill no. 52, to amend the Criminal Code, was read the second time, and the House went into committee thereon, Mr. Boivin in the Chair:

On section 1—penalty.

Mr. DOHERTY: I would like to make a suggestion to the hon. member. I am fully in accord with the purpose of the Bill that he has introduced, so fully in accord that, in a Bill that is in course of preparation, making a number of amendments to the Criminal Code, there is included this particular provision. Under those circumstances it would probably be more desirable that this amendment should appear in the Bill amending the Criminal Code, rather than that we should have a separate Bill for this purpose. I have no objection to the hon. member's Bill passing, should he prefer having it pass in that way; but I make the suggestion that, having advanced the Bill this stage, he might let it remain in committee, and I will have it disposed of in another manner.

Mr. LEMIEUX: In the meantime, the hon. member might explain the nature of the amendment.

Mr. LAFORTUNE: I am quite satisfied with what the minister says, and I

have no objection to joining my Bill with the one proposed by the Government. The object of the Bill is to protect the citizens from a species of fraud committed particularly in our large cities. As everyone knows, we have in Montreal men who defraud the public by playing the game called "Three Card monte." We had a case before the Assizes. We had a man arrested; but the Court of Appeal, in which I was acting as Crown Prosecutor, decided that that mode of playing cards was not in itself a fraud sufficiently established to maintain the accusation made against the person. In the case of the King vs. Rosen and Lavoie, the Court of Appeal rendered this decision:

It is by the Court of our Sovereign Lord the King now here considered, that the question stated by the Judge of the Sessions should be answered in the negative, and it is accordingly adjudicated, and finally determined, that this appeal be granted, and the conviction be quashed and set aside, and the said conviction is quashed and annulled.

We were then bound to bring in a Bill to amend the criminal law so as to prevent fraud being committed by the game of "Three Card monte," by enacting that it in itself would be a crime. I had the honour of discussing the matter with the learned judges of the Criminal Court of King's Bench, and they were all in favour of the Bill. As the minister said, there is no objection to the Bill, and it is very necessary to have this legislation enacted so as to protect our citizens. As we were unable, as the law stood, to proceed against people who defrauded the public by means of "Three Card monte," we thought it proper to have the law amended by the addition of this clause:

Every one is guilty of an indictable offence and liable to two years' imprisonment or a penalty not exceeding one hundred dollars, or both, who,

(a) In any premises under his control, to which the public have access, engages in or permits other persons to engage in the game known as "Three Card monte" or similar game played with other instruments than cards.

If we made it a crime for people to play with three cards, they might play with four cards or they might play with other instruments than cards, and that is why we thought it proper to enlarge the clause so as to endeavour to cover other cases. I am glad the Minister of Justice approves the Bill, and I am satisfied to join him and have the Bill passed as he suggests so as to protect every one. I am also pleased that both sides of the House are unanimous in approving the Bill.

[Mr. Lafortune.]

Mr. DOHERTY: Under those circumstances, I would move that the committee rise, report progress and ask leave to sit again.

Progress reported.

IMMIGRATION ACT AMENDMENT

On the order for the second reading of Bill No. 56 to amend the Immigration Act (Deportation of undesirable persons):

Mr. LAPOINTE: The hon. minister of Immigration and Colonization (Mr. Calder) has told me that he proposes to incorporate the provisions of this Bill in another Bill which the Government intend to introduce at this session. Under the circumstances I shall not therefore press the second reading of this Bill. I would ask that it be allowed to stand.

Hon. Mr. CALDER: I intimated to the hon. member for Quebec East (Mr. Lapointe) the other day that it was the intention of the Government to introduce in the House of Commons the Bill that was defeated in the Senate last year. As a matter of fact, a Bill is now in course of preparation amending the immigration law in a number of respects. It is almost completed, and I expect to give notice of it on the Order Paper in a day or two. I thought it would be well to have all the amendments embodied in one Bill.

Order stands.

SUPPLY

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

Public Works—chargeable to capital—Marine Department—Government shipbuilding programme—Amount required for the contruction of vessels in accordance with Government programme, $8,330,000.

The CHAIRMAN: This item was before the committee for discussion on Thursday last during the entire afternoon and evening. Shall the item cary?

Mr. SINCLAIR (Antigonish and Guysborough): Dealing with this subject when it was before the House last week, I pointed out that the minister's statement this year was decidedly different in tone from his statement last year. Then my hon. friend was bold and aggressive. He put all the big strawberries on the top of the basket, but this year he is apologetic and gives a number of reasons why he embarked on this policy. He has evidently begun to realize that in the present financial condition of the country

an expenditure of $70,000,000 which is considered by the ordinary man on the street to have been wasteful and unnecessary, is a very heavy responsibility, and I am very glad to know that he is showing signs of repentance. The minister gave some reasons why we on this side of the House according to his view, have no right to criticize his programme. He said, among other things, that we made no effort to stop him when he was asking for these large votes for this purpose in former years. I think that is true with respect to the vote that he obtained at the inception of the shipbuilding programme in 1918. At that time, in the session of 1917-1918, the war was on, and as everybody knows, ships were being sunk by the submarines. Furthermore, hon. gentlemen on this side of the House were not then acquainted with the facts in regard to the operations of the Imperial Munitions Board. I endeavoured all through the war to keep track of what was going on in the shipping business, but I did not know that in so many of the shipyards in this country ships were being constructed at that time for the Imperial Munitions Board. You are aware, Sir, that the censor was busy at that time and that any news relating to the construction and launching of ships was suppressed. I might say that if I had known in 1918, when my hon. friend came forward and asked for a vote to build these tramp vessels, as a Government venture, that the yards of Canada were all busy building ships for the Munitions Board, on the account of the admiralty, I should have had a great deal of hesitation in allowing him to go forward with his programme without a protest. I took care to enter my protest as soon as the facts were disclosed. The ships built by the Munitions Board were just as good, for the purposes of the war, as the ships built by the Government of Canada. When those ships were finished they were turned over to the British Admiralty, just the same as the ships built by the Canadian Government would also be turned over to the British Government for use in the war. So one ship was just as much use as the other so far as the war was concerned. It was at that stage that my hon. friend stepped in, I think unnecessarily, and asked for the expenditure of what has now grown to be a very large sum of money in connection with this venture.

I also pointed out that it would have been very easy for my hon. friend to retire from this shipbuilding programme at the close of the war. When the war ended, on November 11, 1918, there were actually only four keels laid. I have a table here published by the Canada Railway and Marine World which, I believe is a reliable publication, showing the dates. I have no doubt that its information is official, but if there is anything wrong my hon. friend can put me right. The names of the vessels for which keels had been laid were the Voyageur, June 11, 1918, the Pioneer, July 17, 1918, the Warrior, July 17, 1918, the Volunteer, October 1, 1918. None of these ships were launched prior to November 11, 1918, so all that my hon. friend had to do if he wished to discontinue his programme, was to settle with the parties with whom he had made contracts and had not commenced to build, and he could have gone on and finished the four vessels whose keels had been laid. That would have involved a very small outlay comparatively speaking, but my hon. friend did not choose to do that. He went on with his programme, and has attempted to justify it on different occasions since on various grounds. In my former remarks, I challenged the statement of my hon. friend that these ships are necessary in connection with our railway systems. They are only freight vessels. Their speed is about 11 knots, or under. If my hon. friend was projecting a line of fast steamers, and if the country could afford to put the money into them, to connect with our railway system and take passengers across the Atlantic or across the Pacific, that is an enterprise that has often been mentioned in this House and has been favoured by both sides. Of course, it would cost a great deal of money; but that is not what my hon. friend is doing. He is building tramp vessels to compete with private owners. I pointed out to him that the sea is covered with such vessels at the present time. It is estimated that there is now afloat something like 50,000,000 tons of shipping. At the time the war broke out there was only about 40,000,000 tons, so that there is now some 10,000,000 tons more than there was at that time, while trade has decreased enormously since the close of the war. It is therefore easy to see how difficult it will be to make money with freight vessels for some years to come, the shipbuilding programme throughout the world having been overdone. It was unnecessary for my hon. friend to go on with his programme in view of the fact that the war was over, and that he was only building freight vessels that had to compete with ships

built prior to the war for about a quarter of the sum he paid.

I pointed out to my hon. friend that on the Clyde and in other British and European ports, prior to 1914, ships of the same kind as he is building were being built at about $50 per ton deadweight. He admits that the average cost of the vessels he is building is about $192 per ton deadweight, almost four times as much. In these hard times with low freight rates the minister has to compete with vessels that were built at about one-quarter the cost of those he is operating. I have already pointed out that the venture cannot be called a war measure; nor was it necessary, so far as our railway systems are concerned. If there is any freight at all delivered at the coast by our railways, it is easy to find a ship to carry it forward to destination. All that need be done by the owner of the freight or produce is to employ a broker in the big markets of London and New York, and he will find that he can send produce across the ocean at a lower rate than the minister can run his ships and carry it himself. So that government operation of ships is not economic, at the present time at all events, in connection with our railways. The other question was regarding our export trade. I pointed out to my hon. friend that he had not been able to show that he had done anything in the way of expanding our export trade through these vessels. At any rate, our export trade has been going the wrong way ever since these vessels have been operating. I showed that while in 1919 we had a balance of trade in our favour of $150,000,000, in 1920 we had an adverse balance of $150,000,000; so that the balance of trade went the wrong way during the past year to the extent of at least $300,000,000.

But the main difficulty is that these ships must be losing money; they did not pay their way last year. While my hon. friend shows a small earning; he made no proper allowance for depreciation and for the interest on the money that he put into these ships. If he cannot pay at least 5 per cent for depreciation and 5½ per cent for interest on the money—for that is what he is paying for it to the public—if he cannot pay 10½ per cent on capital, then he is losing money and will end in bankruptcy. Now, he has not done that within four or five million dollars. I have shown you, making the calculation on the capital which my hon. friend says he has put into this venture, that he has come out the wrong way to the tune of $4,343,619 for the last year. That is not a very good showing. Let me point out, not for the purpose of making the story worse than it is, but in order that we may arrive at the facts, that freights are not nearly as profitable this year as they were last year; in some trades there is not more than 50 per cent this year of last year's output. So that we can easily see that if my hon. friend lost over four million dollars last year he stands to lose a very much larger sum this year. In the face of that we are still going on with the building of ships, knowing that when we get through with them, they will not be worth anything like the money we are paying for them. If I am correct in the statement that in the market they are not worth to-day more than 25 per cent of the amount they cost, the ships we are building now, and for which we propose to vote this money to-night, will be worth, when they are finished, only one-quarter of what is spent on them; the other three-quarters will virtually have been thrown over the bridge.

According to the statement given to the House a few days ago by the minister, which will be found at page 1331 of Hansard, there are no fewer than sixteen ships now in course of construction. The minister puts the deadweight tonnage of these ships at 114,470 tons, and the average price at $192 per ton. To complete these sixteen vessels will cost the country, according to that statement, $21,978.240. If it be true that these sixteen vessels now being constructed will be worth only 25 per cent of cost when they are finished, we shall, by finishing them, sustain a loss of $16,483,-180. That is a very serious matter. We have not the information as to how far this work has been proceeded with. It may be that it is not possible for my hon. friend to stop at the present time. I do not know whether any of these are new contracts or not; that information has not been given to the House. It would be interesting to know what state these contracts are in. I am assuming now that all the money which the minister is asking for is to complete contracts that have already been entered into. I pointed out the other night that, looking over the list of routes on which the minister proposes to put his ships this year, I find that no fewer than three of them are subsidized routes, routes on which the Government are subsidizing ships to compete with those which they purpose operating. That is unbusinesslike. For

example, under the minister's programme, we are going to run a line of ships from Vancouver, through the Pacific ocean, to New Zealand and Australia. We have a line of ships running now from Vancouver to New Zealand and Australia, and we are subsidizing those ships to the tune of $130,000 for the present year, in fact the money was voted a few days ago. But if it be correct—and I think it is—that they call at the same ports—undoubtedly they do in some instances;—then we are giving our competitor an advantage to the extent of $130,000 and that competitor already has the trade. The company that is running the present line has been conducting that service for a number of years. It has worked up business connections and knows all the details. It has fast vessels—better vessels than ours; vessels, according to the blue book which I have on my desk, that run at the rate of sixteen and seventeen knots an hour, while ours only make about eleven knots. These vessels are competing with us for the small trade between Vancouver and those far off ports in Australia and New Zealand. Looking over the returns of the Department of Trade and Commerce I find that the whole trade of last year was very small, that the whole business done between these points would not furnish one cargo for the five large vessels that my hon. friend is proposing to put on the route. I would like to know where he expects to get business for these vessels during the year 1921, remembering all the time that our competitors are on the route and that they have the business at the present time? My hon. friend may have some plan that I do not understand, but it looks to me as if he would be burning expensive coal in sending these vessels on a 6,000 mile trip across the Pacific ocean with very little in them.

In the discussion the other evening my hon. friend from Vancouver Centre (Mr. Stevens) dealt with the question of the dry dock at Halifax. This is a question, I think, that is not properly discussable in connection with this shipping venture, but I want to point out, seeing that my hon. friend from Vancouver Centre dealt with it, that he has not studied the question sufficiently. He said that the company that formerly owned the Halifax graving dock had not appealed from the decision of the Exchequer Court and consequently had no right to complain about the amount that was awarded. I understand that is not the question about wihch they are making complaint. What happened was this: The company were carrying on business in Halifax as a graving dock company for a number of years. Most of the money invested in the enterprise was British capital. It had been invested in this dock a good many years ago, and subsidies were also paid the company. A new company, called the Halifax Shipbuilding Company was started, and what the Government did was to expropriate the property belonging to the old company and hand it over to the new company who have it now,—at least the Halifax Shipyards, Limited have a lease of the dock. The dock was taken from the original company. The Government stepped in and expropriated the property, took it from the old company and gave it to the new concern, without a justification for doing so. That is the camplaint, as I understand it and it is for the Government to explain why they pursued such an arbitrary course.

That, according to my information, is the complaint that has been made by the Halifax Graving Dock Company.

Now considerable has been said in this discussion about the refusal of the Government to give information, not only about the operation of its vessels, but also in regard to the operation of the national railways. The Opposition have repeatedly demanded information, which information has been refused. It should not be necessary for me to undertake to prove the statement, for every member of the House must know it to be the case. I was surprised to hear, however, the Minister of Finance, and also the Minister of Railways, state in the discussion that took place the other day that ample information had been given to the members on this side, and that the questions the Government refused to answer were trifling questions relating to the salary of a station master or something of that kind. I submit that the questions asked by gentlemen on this side were not trifling questions, but that at the last two sessions of Parliament both the Minister of Marine and the Minister of Railways have constantly refused to answer the most vital and important questions that were submitted to them. Let me give one or two examples. Last session a supporter of the Government, the senior member for South Cape Breton (Mr. Douglas) desired to get some information in regard to the purchase of coal for the use of the Government ships and he asked these questions:

What quantity of coal was consumed by the Canadians Government Merchant Marine in the year 1919? How much of same was Canadian and how much American?

He also asked:

Was this coal purchased by tender and what was the price paid?

Now these were very simple and yet important questions, but the answer the Government gave its own supporter was this:

The Government has no information. These transactions were carried on by the Canadian Government Merchant Marine as an incorporated Company.

Now, Mr. Chairman, I question the truth of the statement that the Government had no information as to the prices they were paying for coal, and that they had no information as to whether the coal had been purchased by tender or not—I simply do not believe it. We expect to get correct information from ministers of the Crown when plain questions of that kind are asked in this House. I submit that there can be no good reason why such questions should not be answered. The transaction was completed, it was not for the year that was to come, it was not even for the current year—it had reference to the year 1919. I can understand that when negotiations are going on, and tenders are being invited, it would not be proper to disclose such matters; but after the transaction is over, after the coal has been purchased and has been burned, and during the following year a member of Parliament asked "What did you pay for your coal?" there should be no secret about it. Our competitor could not get any information from the answers to the questions, unless it was that the Canadian Government were buying coal at better prices than they were themselves, or at a higher rate. In any case these questions should have been answered.

It could not do any possible harm to disclose that kind of information, although the Government has persistently refused to furnish it. About the time this question was asked it was reported in the Halifax papers that the Government had one of their ships there for which they had not provided a cargo and therefore found it necessary to purchase a cargo of coal for the river Plate in order to give the ship something to do, and it was said they purchased about 8,000 tons at a dollar a ton above the market price. Whether that statement be true or not, you can understand, Mr. Chairman, how it makes the public suspicious when the department refuses to answer such simple and proper questions.

On Thursday of last week I endeavoured to get some information myself with regard to a certain ship called the "Beaver" that had cleared from Halifax for Barbadoes. I asked this question:

How many passengers did this vessel carry on the said trip?

The answer was:

The department has no information.

I also asked:

What is her deadweight tonnage and how many tons of freight did she carry from Halifax on said trip?

The answer was:

The deadweight tonnage of the vessel is 3,972½ tons. The department has no information as to the quantity of freight carried on the voyage referred to.

The department went to the trouble of telling me what the tonnage of the ship was, but they had no information as to the quantity of freight that ship was carrying. That was the very thing I wanted to find out, because I was told the ship sailed from Halifax with so little freight that it was not possible for her to pay her way.

Another example. Last year we were informed that a ship by the name of the "Recruit" was stranded in the St. Lawrence river, and we were assured that the Government would not lose any money because the ship was well insured. I was glad to hear that at the time, and I took occasion during the present session to find out whether the Government really did come out of that transaction without a loss. I put this question on the Order Paper:

Was the steamship Recruit of the Canadian Government Merchant Marine that went aground at Vache Point, St. Lawrence river, rescued and refitted for sea?

That was answered in the affirmative. I also asked:

If so, how much was expended in repairs? and how much was collected from insurance companies?

This is the answer:

The information asked for is information as to operating details under the Canadian National Railway Board, and is not in possession of the Government.

I submit, Mr. Chairman, that the question as to whether we collected that insurance was a question which there was no reasonable ground for refusing to answer.

In another case I find this question asked by the hon. member for Lunenburg (Mr. Duff):

What are the names of the steamers of the Canadian Government Merchant Marine which entered at the port of Montreal since May, 1918?

That question is answered and the names are given of a large number of steamers. The next question reads:

What are the names of the steamers of the Canadian Government Merchant Marine on which work was performed by the Hall Engineering Company, of Montreal?

This is the answer:

Information in so far as work performed on Government steamers, no reports are filed at Ottawa as these are matters in connection with operation and under the Board of Management of the Canadian Government Merchant Marine who are responsible for all matters in connection with operation.

My hon. friend has led us to believe on various occasions that he would give us information about construction, but not about operation. These two questions I have quoted are both questions relating to operation. And I would like my hon. friend to explain why he was able to give us the facts in connection with the first question, but was not able to give us the names of the ships that were repaired by the Hall Engineering Company. I could multiply instances of such refusals, but I will not detain the committee because every hon. member knows that the pages of Hansard are covered with such questions regarding railways and ships where the information desired was persistently refused.

10 p.m.

I would like to give a sample of the management of these vessels as disclosed in the answer to a question by my hon. friend from Westmoreland a few days ago. It appears that one of the government steamers by the name of the Laurentian was repaired in the port of St. John. The question is this:

Is the steamship Laurentian owned by the Government?

The answer is: yes.

If so, when was she purchased, from whom and what price was paid?—A. The Laurentian was purchased in April, 1917, from the Canada Steamship Lines, Limited, for $50,000.

Q. Was said steamer out of repair and tied up at St. John for five months or for any time? If so, for what length of time?—A. Yes, four months.

Q. During the time said steamer was so tied up in St. John, how many of the crew remained aboard?—A. Twenty-two.

This answer goes on to say that the wages of these 22 sailors were paid by the Government during the four or five months that the ship was under repair. That is an extraordinary thing for the department to do. A private owner would never think of doing it. As soon as the ship of a private owner comes into port he discharges his crew and pays them off. He hires another crew when ready to send his ship out again. He does not keep his men on board feeding them and paying them wages for four or five months, but that seems to be the way in which at least one of these government vessels was handled by the department. To my mind that is a very unbusinesslike proceeding and requires some explanation. In the minister's statement of the other day, I find the following:

There is a further consideration from which as the minister primarily responsible for the programme I derive some comfort, and that is that every contract made, every voucher paid, every letter and telegram exchanged between the department and contractors is open for the fullest inspection of any member of the House who desires any further information.

My hon. friend has not produced these papers; he has not given us the pleasure of seeing them. I am glad to hear that they are open for inspection. I am also glad to hear that he derives comfort from anything in connection with his programme. I did not think there was very much comfort for anybody else in conection with it; I am quite satisfied there is no comfort in it for the people of this country. It may be quite true that the minister has the vouchers somewhere. But the question is; where is the money? Are we ever going to see it again? I submit it is rather cold comfort to realize that we are spending $70,000,000 on this venture and that there is no prospect of our ever seeing our money again.

Attempts have been made not only by the minister but by other hon. gentlemen on that side to throw responsibility upon the shoulders of hon. gentlemen on this side for the enormous present and prospective losses in conection with the railways as well as with shipping. A few days ago in the course of the railway discussion the hon. member for Brantford (Mr. Cockshutt) used this language:

Why are we in this country staggering like weary Titans under this burden? It is because my hon. friend and the hon. gentlemen who led him at that time were in a government that launched railway schemes upon the country fifty years in advance of their time.

My hon. friend from Brantford seems to have forgotten some very recent history in

which he himself figured. I would like to ask him who it was that forced the Canadian Northern railway upon the people of this country by closure? Did we not resist that transaction to the utmost? Did he and his party not enforce the closure rule to put that measure through? Did he not speak and vote in favour of it? The hon. member for Brantford has a very heavy responsibility to answer for in this matter. He has the reputation of being a business man, and I have no doubt that his word goes for much in the councils of his party. He assured the House at the time this matter was up that within from three to five years this project would be a paying venture. I do not think he would give us that assurance to-day, but he was willing at that time to place an additional burden of from four to five hundred millions on the shoulders of the people in order to take over the Canadian Northern system. Then again, what about the Grand Trunk deal? Who is responsible for the additional four or five hundred millions of dollars of liabilities involved in the purchase of that system? Are members on this side responsible for that? We voted against it; my hon. friend from Brantford and the hon. gentlemen who sit with him voted for it. We were assured that that was going to get us out of our difficulties; that the acquisition of the Grand Trunk would help us in regard to the other lame ducks that the Government had taken over. But it has not turned out that way. If you look at the Estimates you will find that the railway system that requires the largest sum for the current year is the Grand Trunk—something like $89,000,000. In that estimate, I believe, is included the fixed charges on the Grand Trunk Pacific, which, according to the Public Accounts, appear to be a little over $8,000,000. So that if you choose to make us responsible for the Grand Trunk Pacific and take off that $8,000,000, there is still $80,000,000 required for the current year to operate the Grand Trunk system. So the men who insisted on taking over the Grand Trunk have very heavy responsibilities to answer for before the people of this country. We do not know how much of the eight millions is deficit; the estimate does not disclose the fact. It bunches the whole thing together —improvements, betterments, and deficit are lumped in one sum and we are asked to vote the enormous amount of $89,000,000 en bloc to keep the Grand Trunk running for the current year. I submit that my hon. friend should not have blamed us for all these difficulties of which he himself is guilty. It would be better for that weary Titan from Brantford to manifest a spirit of repentance and to show some contrition for his own mistakes instead of throwing railing accusations at the heads of hon. gentlemen on this side of the House. But everybody knows that the Government is responsible for our financial condition both in railways and in connection with merchant ships. They cannot escape the responsibility. Parliament has little responsibility regarding our shipping debt because Parliament had nothing to say with reference to these ship contracts; Parliament was not given an opportunity to discuss them. Hon. gentlemen will remember that at the time of the armistice, November 11, 1918, there were only four keels laid in the ship-building programme, and not a single ship had been launched; but before Parliament met the following February the minister by Order in Council entered into eighteen contracts without competition and without tender. Now can anybody say that members on either side are responsible for these transactions. They were carried out by Order in Council behind closed doors, without Parliament being informed and without our knowing anything whatever about them. Questions were asked when the minister's Estimates came on, and then we discovered that in the interim my hon. friend had entered into these new contracts involving an expenditure of many millions. The trouble is that the war spirit seems to be rampant on the part of the Government. Although the war has been over for two and a half years the Government are carrying on as if the war were still in progress. You know, Mr. Chairman, that description in the New Testament of the Roman centurion who had men under him, and who said: "I say to this man, Go, and he goeth; and to another, Come, and he cometh; and to my servant, Do this, and he doeth it." That is the spirit that seems to pervade the Cabinet. It is the military spirit, the war spirit, and I submit is the reason why members of Parliament were not consulted about these shipping contracts and large expenditures and are not even now consulted. We are told that sixteen ships are in course of construction; but we do not know what stage they are in, nor whether it will be possible to save any of this money or not. We know that if we build a ship to-day for $2,000,000 and launch it to-morrow, she is worth when launched only $500,000; we know that we have thrown away $1,500,000 in the operation. Any shipping man who knows anything about

the shipping business knows that to be the fact. Is it not important that we should know in what stage the shipping programme is? The minister, however, has not told us anything about the matter, and I hope he will not hold us responsible for anything he is doing in connection with it.

Now we come to the question as to what we should do with those ships, my hon. friends on my left always want a constructive policy, and I have no hesitation in giving my views, that if the ships are losing money by our operating them at the present time, we should not continue to operate them, because we have no money to throw away. I am also firmly convinced that it will be better for all concerned if we get rid of them, and put them into the hands of private owners. I read at the time in the London Times, that, within two weeks after the armistice, the British Government announced their policy that the freight vessels that they had purchased and built should be placed on the market and turned over to private owners.

Mr. CLARK (Red Deer): Not bad for a slow little country.

Mr. SINCLAIR (Guysborough): That was the policy of the British Government and it was the right policy. Private ownership of ships has been successful in Great Britain, which is the greatest shipping country in the world. It has not been necessary for the British Government, in order to maintain their supremacy on the sea, to put the money of the British people into the building of ships. All they have to do is to leave the people alone and the people will do the business themselves better than the Government. My hon. friend should have left the people of Canada alone. The minister would have less to answer for and the country would have been better off if the people had been left alone. He has put the shipping of this country back for a decade by his so-called policy; he has driven shipping enterprise out of the field. Have you heard of any man putting his money into ships in this country since this programme commenced? No man would take the risk. The minister put the prices up so high; he engaged all the shipyards; he inflated prices so that new shipyards were started, and the people who put their money in them are likely to lose it. This policy will be bound to end in putting the shipping business back for a number of years to come in place of assisting it. Some hon. members will say, "Oh, but we must have ships." Of course we must have ships; we must also have wheat and potatoes and steel; but that is no reason why the Government should begin to plant potatoes or to sow wheat. Or build steel plants. Let the Government stay out of this business; it is far too hazardous a business for the Government to be in. It is not advisable for the Government to be competing with private ownership on the seas without any prospect of reducing freight rates or of being of any advantage to the country. I have pointed out that my hon. friend does not need those vessels for the railways, and that in regard to our export trade, if we have a cargo to send to any part of the world, there are thousands of vessels ready to carry that cargo as cheaply as the Government can carry it. It is, therefore, altogether unnecessary that we should have those ships at all, and the minister will be doing the part of wisdom if he will get rid of them as quickly as possible and put them into private hands. It may be that he will not be able to sell them, at the present time; I do not know whether any one would buy them from him or not. To begin with, he would have to make a heavy loss, and he would require to make terms. He might have to give a number of years to pay for The ships. He would, of course, require to impose conditions that they would engage in Canadian trade, and remain upon the Canadian registry. If the minister had the courage to announce that his policy is to get rid of these vessels and turn them over to private ownership on the best terms he can, I am quite sure that the step would be satisfactory to the business men of this country. And that ultimately we would save a great deal of money. The Government, by engaging in this shipping programme is not doing any good to our trade; it is involving the country in a very large expediture which is likely to become much larger. It is not possible, in my judgment, for the minister to show anything like a profit for several years to come on these vessels. If he is not able to show a profit, to earn his depreciation and interest, he is going into bankruptcy, and we will lose our $70,000,000 in the end. It is far better to make our loss now and to put the ships into the hands of people who will operate them in the interest of Canadian trade. I think I have said enough at the present time, and I hope I have given the minister a few things to think about and to answer.

Mr. CLARK (Red Deer): Perhaps it would be more convenient if I said a few things before the minister replies, and he could deal with them at the same time as with the remarks of the hon. member for Antigonish and Guysborough (Mr. Sinclair).

Mr. BALLANTYNE: If my hon. friend would allow me, I would prefer to answer the hon. member for Antigonish and Guysborough now. I did not think it would be necessary for me to say very much more as regards the Government shipbuilding programme and the operation of the ships, inasmuch as the statement which I presented to the House went into the matter very fully. The hon. member for Antigonish and Guysborough is a man who is held in very high esteem in this House and also by everyone who has the pleasure of knowing him. Therefore, I feel it is necessary, on behalf of the Government, to answer some of the salient points that he brought out in his speech. Apparently, the results for 1920 have been rather disappointing to my hon. friend. He has had considerable experience in the shipping business, and from what he knew of the high cost of operation of ships and also the very marked decrease in freights that had taken place, especially during the remaining months of 1920, he no doubt was looking for a very much worse statement than I had the pleasure of presenting to the Houes on behalf of the Government. I think the figures speak for themselves. The result of the operation of the Government shipping by the operating company is, to the mind of the most men, a very creditable showing, and inasmuch as my hon. friend has dealt considerably with the figures of the statement, it is only fair to hon. members and also to the public that I should go more in detail into the figures that I presented to the House a few days ago than I did on that occasion. First of all, I think I made it abundantly clear then—and if not, I will do so now—that the ships made an operating profit. I do not want my hon. friend or ony other hon. friend to get the total profits mixed up with the operating profits of the ships. If our railways had made an operating profit instead of having made a loss of $70,000,000, every hon. member of this House would feel in a much better frame of mind that he does now. But the Government ships have made an operating profit on closed voyages, for which profit I take no credit whatever, because the management of the Government ships is left in the hands of the Canadian Government Merchant Marine. The management are composed of old, experienced shipping men who have been for many years with the old Allan Line, and I here wish to pay my compliments to the management for the very splendid showing they made under very difficult circumstances during the calendar year 1920. The operating profit on closed voyages, as vouched for by the well-known firm of auditors, Messrs. Marwick, Mitchell and Company, was $1,293,525.55. Hon. gentlemen on the other side of the House have distorted, I will not say deliberately, but at all events they have not admitted that the Government ships during the past year made an operating profit. Now all hon. members know that in that operating profit is included the general expenses of operation of the ships, besides $1,000,000 for insurance premiums. If the ships had done nothing more than make the operating profit I have just mentioned, I consider that would be a very good showing, but the operating company have done more than that. On the open voyages a conservative estimate is that the profit applicable to 1920 would amount to $183,000. Therefore, the net operating profit on the Government ships amounted to $1,476,525.55. Will any hon. gentleman that has any knowledge of shipping say that that is not a remarkably good showing that the Government ships made during the year 1920? I know that the public are satisfied, and I know I shall read in the newspapers a little later on that the people of this country are very much gratified at the splendid showing that the Government ships made during the year 1920.

Mr. SINCLAIR (Guysborough): Does my hon. friend say that the people of this country are satisfied with a showing that did not earn interest on the money that was put into the ships?

Mr. BALLANTYNE: If my hon. friend will wait a moment I am coming to that. First of all, I want to make it clear that the operating profit on the Government ships amounted to $1,476,525.55.

Mr. DUFF: What year was that?

Mr. BALLANTYNE: 1920.

Mr. DUFF: Is that a new statement?

Mr. BALLANTYNE: No, it is the same one.

Mr. DUFF: It is not the same that you gave to the House the other day. On what

page of Hansard will we find that statement?

Mr. BALLANTYNE: I can tell my hon. friend that in a minute. My hon. friend occupied the time of this committee for four-and-a-half hours the other day, and I hope he will not begrudge me the time necessary to make my statement. I shall guarantee I shall not take longer than forty-five or fifty minutes.

Mr. DUFF: If the minister will allow me, the hon. member for Lunenburg is in an entirely different position from the minister. The minister is here endeavouring to get the House to pass a vote of $8,000,000, and as a representative of the people of Lunenburg I say that I am fully justified in asking any questions that are relevant to the item under discussion. I am not going to allow the minister to tell me that I cannot ask questions. The minister cannot evade my questions by referring to a speech I made the other night, I want to tell the minister he must answer.

The CHAIRMAN: Before the minister proceeds, it might be well to make the rules quite clear. The hon. member for Lunenburg is entitled to ask any question he sees fit concerning this item, and the minister can of course give any answer which he sees fit, but I must point out that when the minister has the floor, no hon. member can take the floor away from him, even for the purpose of asking a question, until the minister has concluded his remarks.

Mr. COPP: Unless the minister consents.

The CHAIRMAN: Unless the minister consents, of course.

Mr. BALLANTYNE: I am sorry the hon. member for Lunenburg did not understand the very plain statement which I made and which appears on the pages of Hansard, but for his information I will gladly repeat the figures. I say that the net operating profit on closed voyages for the calendar year ending 1920 was $1,293,525.55. And to that the net earnings on voyages closed since January applicable to 1920, namely $183,000, and you have a net operating profit for the year of $1,476,525.55, which I think the public of Canada will agree is a very good showing.

Mr. DUFF: The minister is not giving the statement he gave to the House on March 29, as it appears on page 1334 of Hansard. Do the net earnings shown on page 1334 of Hansard, amounting to $781,460.09, include that $183,000 on closed voyages?

Mr. BALLANTYNE: Certainly. My hon. friend from Lunenburg is taking the net results of the entire statement. I am giving the operating profits first.

Mr. DUFF: You said net profits.

Mr. BALLANTYNE: Net operating profits. Now we come to the question of depreciation. A great deal has been said about the cost of the Government ships, and a great deal has also been said, and rightly, about the depreciation of values. Everybody knows that there has been a very sharp decline in the cost of ships, but my hon. friends opposite, in order to show the public that there has been an enormous loss, take off the full depreciation, and take it off about twice over, from the profits for the current year, and say, here is a loss of $20,000,000, sometimes they say $50,000,000. Now these are very unusual times, and after such a long period of war every manufacturer in this country, every wholesaler, and every retailer, has large stocks of raw material and finished goods on hand that have very markedly depreciated in value. Any man who has been in business will know that if a large manufacturer carries a stock of war material estimated at $5,000,000, let us say, and there has been a depreciation in value of say $3,000,000, the manufacturer does not write off that $3,000,000 depreciation for the one year 1920. If business houses did that, they would be insolvent. What do business men do? They recognize the great depreciation in values that has taken place due to the war, and they set aside a reasonable amount for depreciation and spread it over a term of years, and that is precisely what the operating company have done. They have taken off 2 per cent, and just here let me explain a misunderstanding on the part of some hon. gentlemen. That 2 per cent depreciation was not on the full cost of the ships, but on the full cost of the ships as they were turned over to the operating company. Therefore, the depreciation is not 1,135, as some hon. gentlemen made it out to be, but 2 per cent on the full cost of the ships as they were turned over in 1920 to the operating company. The depreciation for last year amounts to $667,665.45. The operating company will reinvest that amount of depreciation, they tell me, probably in Victory Bonds bearing 5½ per cent interest, and 5½ per cent interest during a period of twenty-five years

will write off the entire cost of the Government fleet. Now, I think that hon. members will agree that that is a sound and conservative way of taking care of depreciation in values of the steel ships built by the Government under contracts, most of which were let during the war and the rest in the year 1919 when prices were very much higher than they are now. It is most unfair to the Government and to the operating company to take the full amount of millions of depreciation during the year 1920 and say that there is a loss to the Dominion of Canada on Government ships. Let me point out to hon. gentlemen that when the National Transcontinental railway was built, from Moncton to Winnipeg, at a cost to this country of $200,000,000, there was not one cent of interest paid, and there never will be for a good many years to come. I am not finding any fault with that myself; but what seems peculiar to me is that my hon. friend who has just taken his seat (Mr. Sinclair), and who has been in the House so long, should earnestly lament the fact that we are not getting full interest on the Government ships. It does not seem to trouble him that no interest was paid in connection with that $200,000,000 spent on that portion of our railroads.

Mr. CAHILL: Where does the minister get the $200,000,000 from?

Mr. BALLANTYNE: From the Minister of Railways.

Mr. CAHILL: Well, the blue book of the Minister of Railways gives it at $168,000,000.

Mr. BALLANTYNE: I am quite willing to take the corrected figure as given by the hon. member for Pontiac.

Mr. FIELDING: What difference does $30,000,000 make?

Mr. BALLANTYNE: The principle remains, nevertheless.

Mr. FIELDING: The principle is there, but the interest is not.

Mr. BALLANTYNE: So far as depreciation goes, I have had the operating company's figures checked up, and if the earnings keep on as they did in 1919 and 1920, the entire cost of the fleet will be written off in twenty-five years. Let me repeat again, that no business concern in this country would write off depreciation on raw material or finished goods all in one year. Now, when we come to the interest, if the operating company had been able to make earnings enough to pay 5½ per cent interest on the cost of the ships as they were turned over to them during the past year, the amount of that interest would have been $1,828,329.07. I am quite prepared to view the statement in the way my hon. friend would like to have me look at it. What is the loss on interest when we have concluded with the entire statement? It is $1,000,000. That is a fair statement; it is a true and accurate statement, vouched by the company's auditors, the well known firm of Marwick, Mitchell and Company; and it is the only way a statement would be dealt with by any of the banks and business men throughout the country. If it gives any comfort to hon. gentlemen opposite to take off the entire depreciation on the ships at once and say that that is a loss, I have nothing further to say. Let me say, however, that during the last year the operating cost of ships was the highest that the shipping world had ever known. When you take into account the rapidly declining rates of freight and the fact that no shipping company in the world has ever had the same number of ships turned over to them in such a short space of time as this managing company, for them to make an operating profit of $1,476,525.55, to write off for depreciation, outstanding liabilities and incorporation expenses the sum of $695,065.46, and to show 2.35 interest on war cost of ships, is to make what I consider a very good statement, and so do the Government and the people of Canada.

Mr. CAHILL: Oh, no, not the people.

Mr. BALLANTYNE: Well, I will come to that in a moment. When the hon. member for Lunenburg (Mr. Duff) was speaking, he said that I made the statement last year in the House that half a million dollars for interest had been paid into the Consolidated Revenue Fund of Canada, and in his usual declamatory style, he brushed that aside and said he did not believe that a cent had been paid into that fund.

Mr. DUFF: I did not say that.

Mr. BALLANTYNE: Well, I will withdraw that statement, but that is the way I understood the hon. member.

Mr. DUFF: You must not understand; read my speech and see what I said.

Mr. BALLANTYNE: When I get my summer holidays I shall be glad to read the hon. gentleman's speech. I made inquiry

of the Finance Department to-day and this is the information I received: There was a cheque for $500,000 for the year 1919. The cheque was received by the Finance Department from the National Railways, and was divided thus: $415,358.36 will be found at page 102 of the Public Accounts for 1919-20 and the balance $84,641.64 went into last year 1920-21. There, I think, is clear enough proof; I have indicated where in the Public Accounts the particulars may be found.

Mr. DUFF: Is it not a fact that the minister told us last year, when he made his statement, that he had paid the Finance Department 5½ per cent on the total cost of the 1919 ships or the ones in commission at that time?—not $500,000, but 5½ per cent on the total cost, which would amount to over $1,000,000.

Mr. BALLANTYNE: I can only inform my hon. friend that the information which I presented to the House last year and which I am giving this year, is information I got from the operating company and which I have no reason to doubt at all. The information I gave last year I repeat again; it covers the full amount of interest on the ships that were in operation in 1919, at the rate of 5½ per cent. I come to another very important matter. My hon. friend from Antigonish and Guysborough (Mr. Sinclair), said I had given three reasons for the Government entering into a policy of shipbuilding, namely, war, railways, and expansion of export trade. That is quite correct. He then went on to say that he could see no reason for entering upon a shipbuilding policy as a war measure because the first ship not launched until November 1918. That, of course, is quite correct; but I became a member of the Union Government in 1917, and during the very dark months of 1918 the war was at its very height. There was more tonnage sunk then that at any other time during the war, and no minister of the the Crown within the confines of the British Empire could sit down and say he would not enter into shipbuilding, nor would he do this, that or the other thing, because possibly the war might cease at any moment. There was only one policy for the Canadian Government to follow, and the same policy was being followed by the British Empire and all the Allies—that was to strain every nerve and to go ahead with the building of ships as fast as we could as if the war was going to last forever. Therefore this Government very wisely, and with the unanimous consent of the House, entered upon a policy of shipbuilding, for war purposes only, in April, 1918. Happily the armistice was signed on November 11, but that was no reason for the Government not going ahead, in the early part of 1918, with their plans and their contracts with the various ship builders throughout this country to construct ships under Canadian registry, in view of the very heavy loss of tonnage that was taking place daily.

Mr. SINCLAIR (Guysborough): My hon. friend has omitted to mention the main reason I gave. It was not that the keels were not laid until a certain date; it was that the Munitions Board were building ships and that the Canadian yards were busy with contracts for that board at the time my hon. friend intervened.

Mr. BALLANTYNE: My hon. friend will also remember that when I announced the Government's policy on April 4, 1918 —I have Hansard here to prove it—I very clearly explained to the House that the Imperial Munitions Board were keeping all the fourteen yards that were building steel ships in Canada busy building ships for the Mother Country under British registry, but that Canada was providing the money to build those ships—

Mr. CAHILL: Just as a loan.

Mr. BALLANTYNE: —and I said at the time the Government thought it the wiser policy—instead of putting up money to build ships under British registry for the Mother Country—which ships would leave this country and be free from Canadian control—to construct ships ourselves inasmuch as we were putting up the money for Great Britain anyway. Then we would be able to build up a mercantile marine of our own under Canadian registry which would remain under our control for all time to come.

Mr. SINCLAIR (Guysborough): We were simply lending the money.

Mr. BALLANTYNE: Of course we were lending the money. I also said at that time that Canada needed a mercantile marine to co-operate with her large system of railways. Now my hon. friend is a much older man than I am but I cannot follow his reasoning when he says that there is no need of ships in connection with a large system of railways. Well, if my

hon. friend can prevail upon the Canadian Pacific Company to sell their fleet of ships, which is just as large as ours, and if he can impress that company with the fact that they can carry on their transportation in Canada and throughout the world with a railway system only and without ships, —if he can get the Canadian Pacific Company to do that I am willing to recommend it to the Dominion Government.

Mr. SINCLAIR (Guysborough): If my hon. friend can make a profitable business with this venture like the Canadian Pacific Railway Company is doing I would be glad to see him go on, but I do not think he can.

Mr. BALLANTYNE: That was not my hon. friend's statement. My hon. friend stated "In my opinion there is no need for ships for railways."

Mr. SINCLAIR: (Guysborough): Certainly not.

Mr. BALLANTYNE: He further said "No railways should have ships; we can get all the ships that we want."

Mr. SINCLAIR (Guysborough): Quite true.

Mr. BALLANTYNE: I have only been Minister of Marine since 1917, and I found ships as scarce as hens teeth. During 1917, 1918 and 1919 we could not get ships at all. My hon. friend also says we have not done anything to expand the export trade of Canada. Very well, I will take the British West Indies about which my hon. friend knows a great deal. When we were building ships an official of the Royal Mail Packet Company that has four ships running to Bermuda, Demerara, and Port of Spain, said "Surely you are not going to run ships down to the West Indies." It was the usual story from private owners. He said "We are taking care of all the trade. What a foolish policy it would be for the Dominion Government to send ships down to the West Indies." I told that gentleman that while we were building ships and owning ships—that is the Government of Canada—we were not operating the vessels, and the routes upon which they would run would be left by the Government to the management. Now what has been the result? Twelve of the Government ships are operating down there and they are hardly able to take care of the trade. Take the South American route. Would the Dominion of Canada have a single ship running to South America if this Government had not built and operated its own ships. Any man that is familiar with the transportation to the West Indies knows that the trade of those islands was in the hands of our American friends. The South American trade has also been in their hands. Let me tell my hon. friend what has happened as the result of the ships of the Canadian Government going down there, and in order to save time I will only give the bulk figures. The exports of Canada to the British West Indian Islands—Bermuda, British Guiana and British Honduras—in 1913 amounted to $4,967,312 but in 1920 they had increased to $15,257,014. That is what the Government ships have done in expanding trade between Canada and the British West Indies. Now let us see what the growth in imports has been. In 1913 our imports amounted to $9,864,017 and in 1920 they had grown to $19,863,722. Yet my hon. friend says further that these ships have done nothing to expand the export trade of Canada; and I have only cited to him the figures with respect to the West Indies alone. The hon. gentleman took the trade returns for 1919 and compared them with the returns in 1920, and he discovered from those returns that the exports were some three hundred millions less in 1920 than they were in 1919 but that is not at all surprising. The hon. member knows just as well as I do that the reason for the exports being so much larger in 1919 than they were in 1920 was on account of the need for replenishing the depleted stocks of the world after the war, but now that world-wide depression is being experienced it is not at all to be wondered at that our export trade has decreased. But I can tell my hon. friend that the decrease would be very much more if it had not been for the ships of the Government Merchant Marine.

I want to tell my hon. friend another thing. The Government held a conference with representatives of West Indies in June, 1920. What was the whole problem that had to be solved in order that Canada and the West Indies might draw closer together in the matter of trade arrangements? If the Government had not owned and been able to operate its Merchant Marine I doubt very much whether we would have been able to have successfully completed, as we have done, the details of the agreement entered into and which will be submitted to this House shortly by the Minister of Trade and Commerce. I say that we would not have been able to have concluded that preferential trade agreement with the West Indies if it had not

been for the fact that this country owned its own mechantile fleet. Jamaica, which has never yet granted Canada a preference, is now willing to give us a preference in the best market of all the Islands down there of twenty-five per cent and I repeat again if it had not been for the fact that we were able to give the West Indies the transportation facilities that we are giving them, if we had not been able to provide the passenger accommodation that we have provided—with ships sailing from Halifax in winter and from Montreal in the summer time to the Bahamas, Jamaica and British Honduras—I doubt very much whether we would have been able to have completed, in the successful way in which we did, the preferential agreement entered into between Canada and those Islands.

Now, to hear hon. members opposite one would think that Canada was the only country that had to face the problem of depreciated values of ships. But the Government of Canada has received no credit for not building wooden ships. When the Government launched its shipbuilding programme I was besieged with requests from the Maritime Provinces and from the provinces of Quebec and British Columbia to have included in our programme the construction of wooden ships. As the minister responsible, I advised the Government not to embark on wooden shipbuilding at that time, because when peace came those ships would be of little value to us and would ultimately be an enormous loss. What were other countries doing in the meantime? Old England was having wooden ships built here, so was Norway and so was France, and while our highest average cost for steel ships was $191.50 per ton, I have seen the contracts placed for wooden ships here and I know the cost ran as high as $200 a ton. Then no one finds fault with the Emergency Fleet programme which our neighbour to the south carried on, but she has millions of tons of wooden ships on her hands and she does not know what to do with something like 536 steel ships. Then turning to the Mother Country, think of the enormous shrinkage in value both on steel and wooden ships that she has had to face. Besides that, England during the war built large national shipbuilding yards, as they were called over there, or, in other words, government yards, and they were building steel ships on a large scale. During the war Australia built just as large a mercantile fleet of steel ships as we did. I have read, as no doubt other hon. members have, what is called the Parliamentary Journal of the Empire, which gives a short synopsis of the debates that take place in the Mother of Parliament and in all the other parliaments of the British Empire. But I have not read a word of criticism in any of those parliaments in respect to the great shrinkage in the value of their ships. I find no fault with hon. gentlemen opposite for criticising the shipbuilding policy of the Government, because one of the duties of the loyal Opposition is to criticise, but inasmuch as this is a national policy I hope that hon. gentlemen opposite will take a national view of the matter and think of what these ships are doing for Canada—of how they are helping our railways and how they are helping to expand our export trade and to advertise the Dominion all over the world. Although the profits are not yet very great, I do not look through the same blue spectacles as does my hon. friend from Antigonish and Guysborough. We will pass through this depression and as long as this Government remains in power our mercantile fleet will continue to be owned by the country and operated by the Canadian Government Mercantile Marine. We are not going to sell these ships to any private interests, for just so long as we own our Canadian National railways we shall need to operate our mercantile fleet in conjunction with those railways.

11 p.m.

Hon. members have even gone so far as to estimate what the loss is going to be on the operation of our merchant marine for 1921. True, they do not know how much cargo is going to be carried, they have not the slightest idea of what the revenue or what the expenses are going to be, but still they sit down and say: Here is our loss for 1920, and here is the loss that we are going to have in 1921. Last year my hon. friends stated that 1920 was going to be a poor year. They said. Wait until you see the end of 1920, and then the people of Canada will realize where they are going to be with your shipbuilding policy. Well, we have finished 1920, and it has been a good year. Everybody thinks so, except the minority of hon. gentlemen opposite. I do not know what 1921 is going to turn out, but in this young country we have got to keep our courage up. Many of us have been through depression in our own business and we have emerged successfully, and I think the country is going to come through this depression all right. It may be that hon. gentlemen will be surprised

next year when they find a profit on the operation of this much-abused merchant marine.

I am not as familiar with the history of the past as my hon. friend from Red Deer (Mr. Clark), but the other day I happened to come across what is known as Cromwell's Navigation Act of 1651. I think hon. members will agree that that is far enough back.

Mr. COPP: That will be far enough back. Now come along from year to year.

Mr. BALLANTYNE: What was the object of Cromwell's Navigation Act of 1651? No country knows better how to expand her trade than the tight little island of Great Britain, and Cromwell's Navigation Act laid down the principle that imports into the United Kingdom should be in British bottoms only, and that three-fourths of the crew should be British subjects. That is the way England started to secure the supremacy of the seas that she has maintained so well since that time not only with her mercantile fleet but also with her navy. What did Germany do in 1870? She subsidized steel shipbuilding and gave preferential rates over her railroads for cargoes to be carried in German bottoms. Therefore if Canada should lose a few million dollars a year I would conceive it to be good policy for us to have built these ships and to continue to operate them. We hear a lot about Canada being a nation. Show me a nation in the world to-day that is not a maritime nation. It is high time that Canada owned her own mercantile fleet and assumed her place among the maritime nations of the world.

I want to refer to one or two points made by my hon. friend for Guysborough before I sit down. He says that on November 11, 1918, we had only four contracts placed, and that we should have ceased shipbuilding at that time. I do not think he was in the House when I gave the figures the other day, and I will give them again now.

Mr. SINCLAIR (Guysborough): My hon. friend is a little astray in what I said. I said there were only four keels according to the dates from a return which I got in that journal to which I referred. I am aware that there were a number of contracts, in fact I stated there were eighteen contracts between the date of the armistice and the meeting of Parliament.

Mr. BALLANTYNE: I am quite willing to accept my hon. friend's correction. When he said that only four keels were laid down I inferred he was under the impression that that was all the Government had done on November 11, 1918.

Mr. SINCLAIR (Guysborough): Oh, no.

Mr. BALLANTYNE: As a matter of fact the value of contracts signed on or before November 11, 1918, amounted to $29,299,991.40; the value of contracts approved by Order in Council on or before November 11, 1918, but not signed, amounted to $16,359,708—or a total amount of commitments on November 11, 1918, of $45,759,694.40. The value of contracts approved by Order in Council after November 11, 1918, was $27,283,572.50. Now, hon. members are well aware of the reasons why the Government placed contracts in 1919. I stated them fully when the vote was before the committee but it will take me only a moment to do so agin. This country, like all other counutries, was in a state of chaos as the result of peace following four prolonged years of war. Nearly 50,000 men were employed in our shipyards, including the allied trades, and it would have been a rash procedure for the Government suddenly to have closed the shipyards at that time and sent those 50,000 men adrift, particularly in view of the fact that as many of our returned soldiers were among the men so employed. The Government recognized the gravity of the situation—and no Government has ever gone through more serious times than this Government has. The Government therefore said: We will continue our ship-building programme, first, to keep the wheels of industry going; to keep these 50,000 men employed in order to tide them over a very serious period, and also because of the fact that a fleet of sixty-three ships is none too large for Canada. We realized at the time that we were going to lose money on these ships, but it was imperatively necessary that the Government let further contracts is it did in 1919. Further, we went on with public works; we went on with the Welland canal, and we let as many contracts as we could in order to tide the country over that very difficult time. The Government have no apologies to make; they have no regrets whatever for entering upon this ship-building policy and for carrying it on as they did in the critical period of 1919 to which I have just referred. Now, my hon. friend likes to go back to pre-war times. He says that a ship in pre-war times would cost about £8

or £9 a ton. That is prefectly true, but I think my hon. friend will agree that it is not fair to compare the pre-war cost of an ordinary tramp freight ship with the high costs prevailing when the Government let their contracts in 1918 and 1919.

Mr. SINCLAIR (Guysborough): If the minister will permit me, I did not make the comparison for the purpose of showing that there was anything wrong in that respect with the minister's operations. I did so to show that it was impossible for the minister to make a profit when the ships that he built cost four times as much as the ships built during the war, of which there are millions of tons now afloat. I admit that a ship cannot be built now for the price at which it could have been built before the war.

Mr. BALLANTYNE: Quite so, and in that respect Canada is in no different position from that of England, United States, Norway, France or any other country. They all have a large amount of tonnage built during the war. Norway had a ship launched at the Vickers shipyard, Montreal, on Saturday last. I know the cost of that ship, but I do not think it is fair to a foreign country that I should here state the price.

Mr. CASGRAIN: Why?

Mr. BALLANTYNE: Well, I do not think that I should. I cite the case merely to show that all countries of the world placed large orders for tonnage at just as high prices as Canada paid. Our friends to the south paid an average price of $215 a ton as compared with our price of $191.50. Canada can compete with the other nations of the world, because other nations have not fleets wholly built in pre-war times. A large proportion of the ships operating on the seven seas to-day were built during the war at high cost, just the same as Canada's were.

Now, there is another thing. The hon. member for Lunenburg (Mr. Duff) when he was speaking gave figures to show at how much lower prices ships could be built to-day than the prices paid for the Government ships. When I made my statement to the House I said that the same type of ship as our 8,400 ton deadweight would cost to-day in the United Kingdom $130 a ton. My authority for that is this: our naval architect has just returned from England. There he visited all the yards, and I had told him to find out for me exactly what the yards of the United Kingdom would charge to-day for ships of the type that we are building here. The information that he brings back is that these ships, figuring on the difference in exchange would cost $130 a ton. It is not fair to say that an ordinary tramp ship can be built to-day at a certain price as compared with the cost of the Government ships when it is a fact that the machinery, auxiliary equipment and type of the tramp ship generally are totally different from those of the Government ships. Then, my hon. friend advanced a peculiar argument; I am not an experienced shipping man but I have never heard it. Shipping men tell me that the speed of a freight ship should not be over 10½ or 11 knots an hour. If you have a freight ship with a greater speed than that you burn too much coal and the ship cannot be economically operated. But my hon. friend thinks that Canada's ships are too slow; that freight ships should have a speed of something like thirteen or fourteen knots an hour.

Mr. SINCLAIR (Guysborough): My hon. friend has entirely mistaken my idea. I pointed out that the Australian company operating in competition with my hon. friend was running fast boats and that that would be another circumstance which would make it difficult for him to get the freight. I quite agree that a freight vessel must necessarily have a lower speed than a passenger vessel. I would not favour making the speed of a freight vessel anything like that of a passenger vessel. My hon. friend misunderstood me.

Mr. BALLANTYNE: I do not think I did, but of course I will accept the explanation of my hon. friend. But I want to point out to him that more than once in his speech to-night and during his previous speeches he referred to the Government ships as tramp ships—I took note of it at the time—and referred to the slowness of the speed, 10½ and 11 knots. That is a proper speed for the ordinary freight ship. So far as the Australian route is concerned, while I have not the details I was told by the management not very long ago that our ships are carrying full cargoes to Australia and New Zeoland and that that is the most profitable route which the Government ships at present operate. My hon. friend also made the point that we subsidize these competing ships. True, we are subsidizing ships running to Australia, to Newfoundland and to the West Indies. But the ships under subsidy by the Department of Trade and Commerce are

freight and passenger ships, whereas the Government ships carry freight only.

Now, I wish to submit the following details of difference in construction and equipment between the Government ships and ordinary British tramp ships:

1. Increase in accommodation area, and quality also accommodation for 4 passengers with deck saloon and lavatory adjacent.
2. Additional heavy derricks.
3. Additional electrical plant.
4. Total equipment and outfitting, not included in British vessels.
5. Sidelights brass in Canadian vessels: cast iron in British.
6. Steam heating in excess to suit Canadian winter ports.
7. Steering gear: very much in excess of British vessels, being directly connected to rudder head with telemotor control.
8. Telegraph: largely in excess of British vessels.
9. Winches: one extro on Canadian vessels.
10. Navigating position largely in excess of British vessels.
11. Fittings and equipment throughout in excess of British vessels.
12. Canadian vessels have cold store and refrigerating engine for ships' provisions. British vessels have only ice box.
13. Grain trimming and escape hatches in Canadian vessels extra.
14. Mechanical operating gear for engine room skylights and handling lifeboats.
15. Sundry items throughout vessels, such as teak rails, extra rails and stanchions, canvas work, extra stores, galley and pantry equipment, hospital, galvanizing iron work, upholstery, etc., all additional to equipment in British vessels.
16. Bronze propeller blades, and bronze spares. Cast iron in British vessels.
17. Additional covering to boilers.
18. Ash ejector fitted in addition to ash hoist.
19. One sanitary pump extra.
20. Independent in place of attached feed pumps.
21. Extra metallic packing.
22. Extra spare gear and outfit.
23. No trials were held on British vessels owing to war conditions? All Canadian vessels perform 6 hours full power trial, with steering and anchor trials.

"I may say also that a number of our vessels are equipped with oil fuel installation in addition to coal fuel." There is, therefore, a long list of differences between a Government ship and an ordinary freighter.

There is another thing that has just occurred to my mind. The hon. member for Antigonish and Guysborough Mr. Sinclair) and the hon. member for Lunenburg (Mr. Duff) said that a large number of the Government ships were idle; that they were swinging at their anchors in Halifax harbour. This country has been fortunate; all the Government ships were busy in 1920, and up to this moment they are, so far as my information reaches me, all engaged. The reason that ships are lying at anchor in Halifax harbour at the present time is because they are in there for their annual overhaul, and when that is done, they are going to enter into the coal trade of Canada. My hon. friend (Mr. Sinclair) says that our small ships are of no use; that they are only yachts. Let us see what size "yachts" they are. Nearly all of those ships are 3,750 tons deadweight, and we have only four that are as small as 2,800 tons. My hon. friend knows that to do trade in Newfoundland and the West Indies where the waters are shallow, you must have vessels of light draft, and we could not send larger vessels than the ones that are plying now either to the West Indies or to Newfoundland. In addition to that, our vast system of railways requires a large number of that exact type of ships to be put into the coal trade.

Mr. SINCLAIR (Guysborough): Does my hon. friend intend to put the small ships into the coal trade?

Mr. BALLANTYNE: The operating company do.

Mr. SINCLAIR (Guysborough): They will be making a mistake.

Mr. BALLANTYNE: Possibly. I have never interfered, nor has the Government, with the management. I do not know anything about the operation or the price of their coal. I do not ask them any more questions than I would ask the Canadian Pacific.

Mr. CASGRAIN: Do you not think you should?

Mr. BALLANTYNE: All that I am interested in, as Minister of Marine and Fisheries in this Government, is the net results of the operation of ships at the end of the year. I am not going to cover the debate that took place in this House the other day; but no man could manage ships if the Minister of Marine or any of the other ministers of the Dominion Government were going to ask him where he bought his lubricating oil or coal, or where he bought his butter or cheese. I do not ask a single question at all; they have an absolutely free hand as long as I am Minister of Marine, and as minister and speaking for the Government, I want to say that we are well pleased with the splendid showing made in 1920 and we are very hopeful for the year 1921.

Mr. CLARK (Red Deer): It is considerably past the hour when the House should be closed up if we had carried the pro-

position that was before us to-day, and I do not want to detain the committee unduly at this hour. I am lost in admiration at the courage and optimism of the minister and I say that unreservedly. He is a splendid type of a Canadian; but even Canadians can be too optimistic, and I really think the minister, just at the moment, is the leader in the class of super-optimistic Canadians. My hon. friend is too optimistic when he assures himself and keeps assuring this committee that the country is behind this shipbuilding policy. I want the minister to listen to what I am going to say on this subject. If there was anything in that statement or as much in it as my hon. friend thinks, I know of no man who would be so loyal to him as the Prime Minister (Mr. Meighen), but even the Prime Minister the other day used words of very great caution and reserve in regard to this scheme. He said: "It is true the picture is not as rosy as we could wish it might be." I thought I used rather strong language when I spoke of the business as a white elephant, but if there is a fair amount of truth in the representations that have been made by the hon. members for Lunenburg (Mr. Duff) and Antigonish and Guysborough (Mr. Sinclair), I do not think I used too strong language at all.

There is this further fact which I should like to bring to the minister's mind so as to moderate his optimism as to the people of the country, and it is a point he might be able to clear up. The severest critics in the press of my hon. friend's statement the other day were to be found in newspapers which are about the very strongest supporters of this Government. The Halifax Herald, a newspaper which has always been prepared to burn its boats for anything coming from a Conservative ministry or a ministry that might be suspected of any tendency towards Conservatism, offered most uncompromising and severe criticism of the minister's whole scheme, and Halifax is a shipping port where newspapers should know something about this question. I am trying, you see, to get the minister into a reasonable frame of mind on this subject, because if he goes away with the Prime Minister to Great Britain as he is threatening to do, and he keeps in this optimistic frame of mind about shipping, he will be coming back with a string of dreadnoughts in his train. That would be a very serious catastrophe to come over this country at the present time. You come from Halifax to Ottawa, and you have in Ottawa a paper known as the Journal which has vied with the Halifax Herald in severe animadversions upon my hon. friend's statement. Then you take a trip from Ottawa to Montreal, go back a little in your tracks, and you come to the greatest shipping port in this country, the place where surely my hon. friend's scheme should have enthusiastic support if it gets it anywhere. But here again his journalistic friend, the Gazette, meets him and joins with the Ottawa Journal, with the Halifax Herald, and to some extent with the Prime Minister himself, in taking a gloomy view about the subject upon which my hon. friend is a positive Micawber, who is always sure that something is going to turn up to get him out of his troubles.

I want to give my hon. friend some more reasons why I think his optimism is not entirely well founded. I am going to show him, I think without any fear of contradiction or refutation, that his scheme has already broken down in some of its main features. I want to make very definitely this statement, that the scheme as undertaken by the Canadian Government was not in its inception a war measure at all. If I need any evidence of that, I find it in the statement which my hon. friend made a few minutes ago. He said that when he embarked upon the scheme, the Imperial Munitions Board was building, I think he said, at fourteen points in Canada, was doing all with Canadian material, Canadian men, and at Canadian shipping points that could be done for the winning of the war. I do not see my hon. friend take any objection to that. Then, I repeat, the first point in his argumentative platform goes out clean from beneath him. It never was a war measure at all, and that has a serious bearing on things we have heard in this debate, not only from my hon. friend the minister, but from this side of the House that this shipbuilding was all right as a war measure, but should have been stopped at the asmistice. It never was a necessary war measure as undertaken by the Canadian Government. The work never should have been taken out of the hands of the Imperial Munitions Board. We had our hands very full during the war, and the Government had my whole-hearted support at that time for anything in reason, but as my hon. friend admitted the other day, I never gave any countenance whatsoever to his taking up this business of shipbuilding.

Well now, if it was not a war measure, what was it? What was at the back of my hon. friend's head when he undertook this? It was nothing that was in any way dis-

creditable to him, neither was it discreditable to my hon. friend from Maisonneuve and my hon. friend from North Cape Breton that they agreed with him. What is discreditable to them, I think, is the way they leave the minister in the lurch to-day. It is especially wrong on the part of a Highland Scotchman, who should always be prepared to die in the last ditch for any cause to which he has given his adherence. But I leave them out of consideration. What was in my hon. friend's head was that if there was to be shipbuilding in Canada, it was a useful industry for the Government to support. That was really what was in his head, and he was an extremely skilful man in setting about it. I do not want to use the words offensively, but when he arranged to burglarize the public purse, he took the precautionary measure of enlisting some of those who ought to be detectives and making them receivers. That is what happened at various points in this country. He got them into the scheme with him,—it is no use going behind the bush in this business—and so he had this put before us as a great scheme for building up the shipbuilding industry in Canada. That was what was in my hon. friend's mind. He had all the anxiety about the war that any member of the Cabinet had, and their anxieties were great, but his anxiety was not that ships were not being built fast enough in Canada for the war, because he knew the Munitions Board were building them fast enough, faster and better than he could build them, and he ought to have known—and this is where I must blame him, kind as he has been to me in his language, and I appreciate his courtesy and kindness—he ought to have known, I say, that he would have got out of his difficulties much sooner if he had left the business in the hands of those who were experienced in this kind of work.

I have not heard any pointed reference to the steel end of this shipbuilding project. What is the position of the steel end of it? The minister says now that we ought to have projected a war that was going to last forever. Well, that is a long way to look forward to, a very long way. Indeed, it is more than the mind can grasp, and it must be clear, I think, to the minister that if we were to look forward to a war lasting forever, we need not have troubled about these matters any further because we should have all gone down in the sweep. There would not have been a government to take the place of the one that is disappearing on the other side, and all our troubles would have been settled in oblivion.

Mr. BALLANTYNE: If my hon. friend will allow me, I did not say the war was going to go on forever, but I said the Government ought to go ahead with its plans for helping win the war as if the war was going to go on, which is a different thing.

Mr. CLARK (Red Deer): That only shows that the minister was careful as a prophet, but very careless as to policy, because if the war was not going to go on forever, it has become fatal for him to go on with his policy forever. While the war has gone, the policy is with us. I do not think the minister is helping himself by his correction.

This was what was in the minds of those implementing this project. What otherwise was the meaning of a contract for five years, and that is a considerable portion of forever, with the Dominion Iron and Steel Company? I think I am right in saying that a contract was entered into with that company for 250,000 tons of steel plate. I do not know precisely what is the condition of that contract now, but it is confidently stated in many quarters that only 40,000 of the 250,000 tons have been delivered, and that that part of the project is closed down at the present moment. I do not think it is going at all—if I am wrong, the minister will correct me—and the Government is being pursued, naturally, by the company for some compensation for their losses under this very formidable contract which has broken down. I do not want to press this point very much further. I am only concerned that the main features of this scheme should be before this committee before we vote $8,330,000. It is somewhat alarming, Mr. Chairman, to reflect that this vote, which now looks so small to us, is one-fifth of the total expenditure of Canada in 1896, when the late Liberal Government came into power—one-fifth of the total money that was running the whole Dominion for federal purposes. We cannot lightly pass this vote until we are sure the committee knows what it is doing, and that the country also knows what are the main features of this scheme. I take it that at the present moment—and I am very anxious to have the minister's attention, because I want to know, and the committee will want to know, exactly what the state of his mind is before he gets his money—the position of the Government is that construction on this programme will cease this year, that

this is the last money that the minister expects to ask for, for the construction of ships under the Dominion programme. Well, I am sorry to say that brings us to this position, that the second plank of my hon. friend's augmentative platform goes out from beneath him, because for the moment this great industry of shipbuilding, this building up of industry along the line of shipbuilding, has disappeared from the Government's programme. The programme, my hon. friend said in his first statement to the House, will terminate so far as the Marine Department is concerned this year, so that the second plank in his platform, I repeat, goes out from beneath him. I wish I could be as sure of the Government as I am of the Marine Department. I will tell my hon. friend why I have doubts on that subject. Just before the statement which I have quoted from memory occurs this other statement:

> Regarding the question of a subsidy as an aid to stimulate steel shipbuilding in Canada, the Government has this matter still under consideration, and it may be that an announcement in that connection will be made by the hon. the Minister of Finance when he brings down his budget.

Now I must say that that statement fills me with very considerable alarm. I had hoped that we should get away from our duties here by the end of May or early in June, but if, after we have got the shipping vote all on one side, we are to have a system of shipping subsidies for an industry which is as manifestly difficult to carry on as the shipping industry at the present moment, then I apprehend that the discussion of the Budget will be neither brief nor smooth. I will not say any more about it at the present time than just that, because, if we are to be asked, on top of the minister's statement about the surplus ships that are in the hands of the government of every nation in the world, to invest Canadian money in more shipbuilding, then we are certainly to be asked to take a course which is unbusinesslike and which would lead to certain loss and certain national disaster in the immediate future. I issue that word of warning in the hope that it may reach the ears and eyes of the Minister of Finance and that he will not fulfil the veiled prophecy which is contained in that portion of my hon. friend's speech.

Now, in connection with the building of industries, my hon. friend has repeated an argument to-night for the continuance of this scheme which he used in the year 1919, and which he used last year; that is, as to the employment of workmen. At first sight, and if we did not go below the surface of the matter, it would naturally appeal to any one of us in these difficult times. But I want to point out to the Government that the employment of public money to give work to any portion of our inhabitants in an unprofitable enterprise only aggravates the difficulty which it sets out to relieve, because you can get money only in two ways. If you raise it by taxes, then you take the money from the pockets of the taxpayer to put it into an unprofitable enterprise; if it remained in the pockets of the taxpayers, it would either go into the development of their own business or to swell the money in the hands of our banks, and would be loaned out to promote profitable business. If, on the other hand, instead of raising it by taxes, you raise it, as is not too seldom the case, by borrowing, then, in addition to the economic evils which I have just pointed out, you have the further economic loss of having to pay interest on the money you borrow; and when, as is frequently the case, we borrow from a foreign country, there is the added evil that for the sake of relief to a few workmen at a few points in the country, we pay interest to foreign people. Capital comes into the country in the shape of goods made abroad, and we make business for the foreign country from which we borrow and employ workmen in that country only to score a loss and put our own workmen out of work in our own country. So that no policy is more reprehensible, no policy in the long run is more economically unsound, than the policy of embarking on unprofitable or unremunerative work for the simple object of giving temporary and local relief to a handful of our own people.

Now it was not a war policy; the minister has proved that. It was not a necessary war policy; it was simply a continuation of a war policy which was being as well, or better done, and with vastly less risk to the people, by the Imperial Munitions Board. It clearly was not a good way of building up Canadian industry, because my hon. friend assumes the committee that we are giving it up this year as a Government enterprise. I have pointed out its futility and folly as a cure for unemployment, and their remains the consideration that it is the necessary complement to the Government system of railways. Well, I should like to know exactly where my hon. friend stands under this head. We are left now with the ships on our hands. I do not wish to use language of recrim-

ination. My object is not a party object; it is to serve the country in this matter and help the people and the Government, if they will be helped, out of their difficulties. But I should like to know if I am right in interviewing my hon. friend's mind when I infer from what he has said that he still thinks it is a good thing for the Government to go on operating these ships. A diametrically opposite policy has been suggested by my hon. friend from Guysborough (Mr. Sinclair), who says he would sell the ships. Well, I do not know whether I would recommend that policy at the moment, for the minister is in the unfortunate position of having missed his mark. He said himself that he could have sold them last year; but las year was 1920, and this is 1921, and I doubt very much whether there is anything in the suggestion of the hon. member for Guysborough, for the simple reason that it is highly problematical as to whether he could sell the ships except at a loss that must be regarded as absolutely ruinous.

With regard to the alternative of going on operating these ships, though of a sanguine temperament, I still fail for the moment, I am sorry to say, to share the minister's optimism. It seems to me to be a very doubtful course of national policy to add to railroads, which show a deficit of $70,000,000 this year, a fleet of ships which, at their end of this transportation system, I very much fear may show a deficit in the years that lie immediately in front of us. I hope not. As a good Canadian, I hope I am wrong; but that is how it looks to me. I believe that my hon. friend, even if we allow his figures to be all right to-night, will have a different showing to make next year; and if there were any way of disposing of these ships at a reasonable loss, I would seriously ask him to consider the recommendation of my hon. friend from Guysborough.

For the rest, I should not like to sit down without a constructive word, and I must repeat what I have said to my hon. friend from the beginning of this business. He has referred to-night in complimentary terms to Britain's history in regard to shipping. He spoke of what was done at the time of Cromwell. Well, the spirit that runs British ships was manifest then; but to bring British shipping to where it is to-day, in addition to that spirit, there has been a policy, and that is the policy not want to press this point; I am almost tired of hearing my own voice pressing it in this House, I have had so much to say upon it. I do want to say, however, that this Government will have to decide whether they want a high tariff policy or a shipping policy, because they will not get both. I repeat that prophecy with the utmost confidence, and I do so for the purpose of urging my hon. friend to bring this consideration before the Cabinet. What is the sense of building railroads to carry the surplus of our crops to the edge of the ocean, and building ships for the avowed purpose of carrying those crops, and then putting up a high tariff wall as an obstacle in the way of goods either going out or coming in? You may have the one policy or the other to pursue both is an act of economic folly. If we are to have a tariff wall as high as Haman's gallows then do not let us fool ourselves about having a successful merchant marine, because we shall not have it.

I have tried to review the minister's policy in as few words as I could compress it into. I have charged that his policy was not a war policy undertaken for the war. It was taken out of the hands of those who were doing it as well as he has done it, and better. It has failed as a shipbuilding industry in the hands of the Government; it is a doubtful scheme as regards operation; and I do not think it will be made a success until the country alters its fiscal policy.

I just have one word more to say, and that is that if the minister goes to Britain we shall have to know a good deal about naval policy before that time. I would recommend to him that when he goes to that country to study shipping at first hand, he should meet the shipping men of the Old Land and they will tell him how shipping has been made a success there. He will only find one opinion amongst people who have anything to do with ships in Britain as to what has been the cause of the success of British shipping. He will only find one opinion, as indeed there only can be one opinion; and to continue with this shipping policy at the same time that we follow the fiscal policy that has been followed in this country, from Confederation up to the present moment, is an act of economic folly which can only end in national loss and disaster.

Mr. COCKSHUTT: I do not profess to be a sailing man, and I do not profess to know a great deal about the mercantile marine, but I do think there has been considerable criticism from some of our friends across the way, especially those that come from the maritime districts. My

good friend from Red Deer (Mr. Clark) lives at a good distance from the sea now, and I am afraid that he has forgotten some of the opinions that he brought over with him from the Old Land when he first came across.

Mr. CLARK (Red Deer): My memory is my strong point.

Mr. COCKSHUTT: My hon. friend was then more of a maritime man that he appears to be at present. The hon. member for Antigonish and Guysborough (Mr. Sinclair) has delivered a long address tonight as did the hon. member for Lunenburg (Mr. Duff), the other day, conveying the idea that the shipbuilding policy with which the minister has allied himself is one that is going to lead to great disaster in this country. The minister is well able to look after himself as has been proved on many previous occasions. However, I shall say a few words with regard to some of the points raised and I shall, in reply to what has been stated by one or two gentlemen opposite, place on record a few of the press criticisms which have been said to be of a very unkind nature; I think it was the hon. member for Red Deer who made that observation. Some of the newspapers, however, have not criticised the minister in any such way, and if the comments come from papers that are usually unfriendly to the minister and the Government I think perhaps they will have quite as much effect as if they were from papers that have supported the Government, even if those comments are not, in some instances, as favourable as they might be. I shall read first the opinion of the Sydney Post:

> Canada's experience with its state-owned merchant marine has been more encouraging than with its Government-controlled railway system. In cost of construction and operation, in freights earned, and in successful business management Mr. Ballantyne was able to demonstrate by a comparative statement that Canada's merchant marine has made a record which suffers nothing by comparison of that of any other country.

That is fairly strong and it comes from a maritime quarter, the Sydney Post of March 31. I hope the hon. member for Lunenburg will take notice of that fact.

Mr. DUFF: Thank you, I have.

Mr. COCKSHUTT: I now come to the Winnipeg Tribune. It is published in a city a fairly long distance from the sea, but not so very far from the Great Lakes where shipping is considerable of a factor. The Winnipeg Tribune of March 31 contains the following:

> "The showing made by the Canadian merchant marine is not by any means bad when the circumstances of trade during the past year are taken into account, and when its position is compared with merchant marine of other countries."
>
> "The merchant marine as it exists, however, forms a great and powerful weapon in the hands of the Government of Canada for the development of overseas trade. It is capable of being used, and should be used both to stimulate trade where it may be profitable to the country as a whole, and to correct some of the unfortunate tendencies of our trade as it at present exists."

I think that is favourable comment coming from the Winnipeg Tribune. Now, let me quote from the Vancouver Province of March 30:

> "Happily the Minister of Marine does not share all the experience of the Minister of Railways. He does not report a deficit."
>
> The Government purchase of ships was not intended as a direct financial investment. It was one way of providing employment for returned soldiers for the period or readjustment after the war. In this province, and doubtless elsewhere preference was given to returned men in these works. The industry gave regular and well paid employment at a time when it was gretly needed."
>
> "Nevertheless the Canadian merchant fleet seems to have been kept busy, and it is now possible to establish several Canadian steamship services which might otherwise have to wait.

Next, I will give a quotation from the Hamilton Spectator of April 2:

> It is true that the shipbuilding programme was not completed in time to be of practical service in the campaign; but the Government can hardly be blamed for not foreseeing the exact date of the termination of hostilities.

Now the Toronto Mail and Empire of March 31:

> The statement presented by the Minister of Marine and Fisheries respecting the operation of the national merchant fleet for 1920 is very gratifying. It is the more pleasing because in the latter part of the year shipping conditions on the ocean were much depressed. The United States shipping Board had to lay up hundreds of vessels, and suffered heavy operating losses. British owners had to lay up ships. Rates fell from one-third to two-thirds of what they were in January, 1920. Competition for cargoes was keen by the tramp freighters, and new routes were projected by many of the important old lines. It might have been expected that the Canadian Government fleet, being a new comer on the ocean, would have been at a large disadvantage in breaking into transatlantic cargo carrying, but though the number of ships in operation increased during the year to 47, with a tonnage of 250,000, cargoes were found for nearly all voyages. Hon. Mr. Ballantyne was able to report an operating surplus of $1,293,000. After depreciation, incorporation charges, and liabilities, the net surplus was $781,460

which was 2.35 per cent on the capital cost of the ships. Last year was really the first fair test of the merchant marine, because in 1919 only a few round voyages had been completed by about a dozen ships. When rates had sunk so low that even thousands of British vessels were laid up, the making of an operating profit was a triumph of management. There are sixteen vessels still to be delivered, nearly all of them large vessels. Hon. Mr. Ballantyne complains that the Canadian manufacturers have only given half-hearted support to the government vessels. They have not gone after export business, as they should, and have been too content to do their importing of overseas materials through United States channels. The rapid extension of routes on which the government freighters ply offers to Canadian business men exceptional sea transportation, and as costs of production come down, and a surplus productive capacity is built up, more energy in developing overseas business should be expected. The government ships are giving the service, at any rate, and if they can continue to pay their way, making some return on their capital cost, the country will have reason to congratulate itself on the experiment. Few countries have attempted national operation of merchant vessels with any success.

I have only read a few of the large number of extracts that I have here.

Mr. COPP: Were they marked to be read?

Mr. COCKSHUTT: No. I have read several, and if my hon. friend wants more they can certainly be handed to him.

Mr. COPP: You had better read them.

Mr. COCKSHUTT: I am not going to kill time, as my hon. friend might expect.

Mr. COPP: You have done more of it than I have this session.

Mr. COCKSHUTT: I did not say my hon. friend had killed time. Do not run away with that idea before it is imputed to you. I said I did not want to quote them for that purpose, and although I have these extracts I do not propose to read them at the behest of my hon. friend.

I want to devote one or two moments to the arguments put forward by my hon. friend from Red Deer (Mr. Clark). He has several grievous faults to find with the shipbuilding policy of Canada as a policy. It is open to criticism probably, and I would expect my hon. friend, who studies all matters of economics, to have some criticism on so large a subject as the shipbuilding policy of Canada. Now as the Vancouver Province article which I have just read pointed out, shipbuilding was undertaken for several reasons, one of which was to carry freight in co-operation with our railways. And I take issue with my hon. friend from Red Deer and other gentlemen opposite who criticize that as not being the part of good policy. The Canadian Pacific railway has made excellent progress along that line. It finds that it is necessary to have freighters on both oceans, and has operated them successfully for a long time in conjunction with its railway system. I admit that it requires very strong backing to do that, but if the Canadian National railways are to be a success they must be able to compete in all matters with the Canadian Pacific railway, and they cannot do that too soon. I can quite understand that shipping men do not like that any better than the Canadian Pacific Railway does, but the Government having, partly perhaps from choice, but largely from compulsion, taken over about 20,000 miles of railway, we are now obliged to run those railways to the best possible advantage, and I submit that it is economically a sound policy to have boats on the oceans east and west and also on the lakes, if necessary, to co-operate with our railways and to make our carrying charges as low as possible so as to compete with any other transportation company in that respect.

I think transportation is a national policy. I thought to have ships upon the waters, would appeal to my hon. friend from Red Deer, because though I know he is pessimistic with regard to many things that are made in Canada, if I recall correctly he did not think that Canada was only able to build ships of a small character and for the carrying trade, but in that celebrated debate on the Naval issue my hon. friend even went so far as to strain his free trade opinions in favour of building dreadnoughts in Canada. I do not want to misconstrue him. I was in the House when that speech was made, and I was shocked that a gentleman who as a rule was so consistent on free trade could have broken through even to the extent of proposing that we should build battleships, but I believe the hon. gentleman did advocate that policy on that occasion. If I have misinterpreted him I shall be glad to be corrected.

12 m.

Mr. CLARK (Red Deer): If my hon. friend will permit me, I do not want to interrupt him, but he is always so fair to me that I know he wants to be told exactly where I am in that matter. Of course, I supported Canada building her own ships for defence. If she was to have a navy at all, I preferred to have it made in Canada. If I may say so, I think my hon. friend has come to my view in that respect. It was

a question of defence, and even so old an authority on economics as Adam Smith states that defence is the first duty of a country. But when it comes to a question of building ships for profit, my hon. friend is dealing with another question altogether. I believe in having good stout locks upon my house for my own security, but it does not follow that I want to embark in the business of a locksmith and lose money in making and selling locks.

Mr. COCKSHUTT: Mr. Chairman, I did not think the hon. gentleman was going to explain his shipbuilding policy and give his reasons for going back on free trade to the extent of supporting a shipbuilding policy for Canada. I thought he would have had uttered only two or three words to tell me whether I was minsinterpreting him or not. I do not like to have a free trade speech thrust in the middle of a protectionist speech because it rather spoils the thread of my argument. The hon. gentleman says that I have come to his line of policy. Not at all. I am backing the building of ships that we can build in Canada to advantage,—these merchant marine ships,—but I am not asking that we should build dreadnoughts, for they are the last word in shipbuilding, and even yet Canada is not prepared in any shape or form to build those big battleships. I do not think my hon. friend accuses me of being unduly peaceful, but I say that at the present time I do not think Canada is called upon to embark on a battleship enterprise. Therefore, I am not in line with his policy on that occasion.

Now, if the manufacturers of Canada, as is stated by the minister—and I am afraid there is some truth in it—have not taken full advantage of his policy, it must be remembered that at the present time export trade presents very serious difficulties, as everybody knows who is in the business. If you sell your goods to-day to foreign countries it is questionable if you can get paid for them, and if you do get paid it is in a depreciated currency or in goods that you are not in need of. Therefore I say it was a most unfortunate time for the minister to embark on this policy. But that is not his fault, and the blame should not be on him. The policy is all right, but it was embarked upon about four years too late. The minister was not in office at that time or I believe that the policy would not have been undertaken too late—I mean too late to get the best financial results, not too late to be of general advantage to the Dominion in point of trade. I myself waited on the then Minister of Marine four or five years ago and begged him to embark on the building of some ships. That was away back in the second year of the war, when it became evident that we were going to lose a large amount of British shipping through the activities of the German submarines. I tried to convince him that it was the psychological moment to undertake a shipbiulding programme. At that time ships could have been built at half the price that they cost later, and, further, during the war they would have paid for themselves if they made two or three successful voyages, so high was the cost of transportation at that time. Therefore I say to my hon. friend from Red Deer that this is a sound commercial policy providing we are getting good value for the money spent.

The question arises whether or not the best of bargains has been made. I do not think any hon. gentleman has said that the minister did not make the best bargain possible at the time the contracts were let, and while it is easy to figure out now that you have lost money on those contracts, where is there a private firm to-day is not more or less in the same position? I know of small businesses in our town that have had to wipe out nearly half their capital this last year because they were caught when the war ended with a vast amount of material on hand which went down to twenty-five per cent of its original value. I am connected with several enterprises that have had to make very serious reductions in the value of the goods on hand —and it would strike the Government the same as it would strike private individuals. Before the war ended the farmers were getting very high prices for their produce, but if they carried their stock recently they had to write off a large proportion of the value and if they sold they had to sell at a straight loss. Therefore, the minister having in good faith placed contracts for the building of these vessels, is carrying out his part of the contract as an honest man should. Every business man must stand by his business engagements whether they are going to be a loss to him or not. So I say to the hon. member for Red Deer that the policy is all right; the only question is whether the thing is being done at the right time and to the best advantage. If the hon. member knew that proper consideration had not been given to the matter and that fair advantage had not been taken of the oppor-

tunities offered, why that would be a point which he could reasonably put forward as an argument. But he questions the right of the Government, or of practically anybody to spend money on what we might call relief work.

Mr. CLARK (Red Deer): I did not question the "right" of the Government. The Government is almighty in the country while it is governing. I questioned the wisdom of the Government's action. I join with my hon. friend in defending the rights of the Government, but I should be sorry to join with him in every thing he thinks wise.

Mr. COCKSHUTT: All wisdom, I admit, does not dwell under my cranium, nor does it under that of my hon. friend. Perhaps a little error creeps into both now and again, but there is more error in my hon. friend's cranium, I think, than there is in mine on this question of relief work. He says he questions the wisdom of the Government. Well, both in the Old Land and in this land works of practically no utility have been undertaken for the sake of furnishing employment to workmen. This policy has been followed in order that these men might feel that they were not dependent on the contributions of their fellowmen; in order that they might maintain their dignity and be in a position to say with truth: We are earning our living. So when my hon. friend says that that is not good policy I answer him by saying that the Government was justified in its expenditure which resulted in furnishing employment to returned soldiers and others who would otherwise have been out of a job—justified even if the ships could have been built at twenty-five or fifty per cent less. I believe that my good friend here, the member for Skeena (Mr. Peck) who has every sympathy for the soldiers, will express the view that it is a sound policy to help returned men, even if at a disadvantage otherwise.

Mr. CLARK (Red Deer): If it is good policy, why does not the Government continue it? Why is the Government finishing its contracts and why has it cancelled its contract for plates?

Mr. COCKSHUTT: The minister had a certain programme, and that programme is finished at a certain time. All programmes, no matter how long they are, and all speeches on great questions, must some time come to an end—because they are finished.

Mr. CLARK (Red Deer): The unemployment is still there.

[Mr. Cockshutt.]

Mr. COCKSHUTT: Perhaps so, but it may be relieved in another direction. Why should we keep on building ships if we have enough? Let us build something else that we need more. What about highways? That is a good thing on which to spend money and the proper time to undertake work of that kind is when the workingmen of the country need it. I stand by that as sound policy. It is a sympathetic policy. I will not say it is a charitable policy, because when you furnish work to a man who is willing to work, I do not think you are giving him charity; you are simply making it possible for him to obtain his daily bread in an honest and satisfactory way and to hold his head up and say: I am a man among men. I am surprised that the hon. member for Red Deer should object when the Government say they undertook this policy partly to furnish work for the unemployed. As is pointed out by the Vancouver paper, this policy was a great benefit to a large number of returned men in that city.

Now, as to the value of the ships we have, I do not profess to know as much about that phase of the subject as the member for Guysborough (Mr. Sinclair) does. But I am afraid he is disposed to write off somewhat more on these ships than he would if he was the owner of them. I do not know the hon. gentleman's pedigree, but I rather think there must be some Scotch in him. As a matter of ordinary business the whole amount should not be written off in one year; it should be spread over a term of years. No business man would say: Well, this is a pessimistic morning; I will take an inventory of my stock and down comes everything to seventy-five per cent below what it cost. Where would the assets of this country be if we applied that principle all round? What can you sell to-day at one hundred cents on the dollar? I challenge my hon. friend to pick out of the daily market reports in the newspapers ten companies whose stock is to-day selling even at par or anything near par. Canadian Pacific stock, which was selling two or three years ago as high as 285, has come down to as low as 115. If that is possible in the case of a great and powerful enterprise managed to the last degree of efficiency, is it likely that the Government, embarking on a new policy in difficult times, could foresee that shipping was going to come down with such a sudden bump? I say, therefore, that business men throughout the country will not be disposed to criticise the minister because he keeps the book value of his ships above

the market price. I say that in spite of the contention of the hon. member for Guysborough, who, I believe, paid some attention to me a few moments ago when I was not in the House. I repeat that the proper way to make these reductions is by a certain amount each year, according as the business will stand it. It is unreasonable for the hon. member for Lunenburg or the hon. member for Guysborough to suggest that the whole thing be cut down in one fell swoop; if they were shareholders in a company, they would not advise such a course as that. Why ask the Government to get pessimistic all of a sudden? I admire the optimism of the hon. Minister of Marine. It is quite true, as the member for Red Deer has said, that it is an optimism that is not, perhaps, given to everybody. Some men are always pessimistic and some are always optimistic; I try to be a little of each. I know that we all want a little bracing in these times. It appears to me that it comes like a tonic from the Minister of Marine and Fisheries to hear him, in answer to wails that come from the other side, wails all down the line about the tremendous loss in ships and to Canadian trade, say: "Well, I see brightness ahead; I see a future for our ships; I see that this is going to be a commercial success some day, and in connection with our railways, is going to be a paying policy for the Dominion of Canada." I really think when the hon. member for Red Deer (Mr. Clark) sleeps over this situation, he will conclude that he went a little too far in his depression tonight as regards a policy that is really commendable. I do not like to see him get into a pessimistic mood. I know it is very hard for him to refrain from that when he sees protection romping around, but I hope he will not give way to it too much. As I do not want him to become too pessimistic, I will give him as a bracer, a definition of pessimism that I heard the other day. A man is a pessimist who considers it is necessary to wear both a belt and braces. I suggest to my hon. friend that he does not get too pessimistic as to require bracing up to that extent.

I rose to make these few remarks only because I think the minister has been perhaps unduly pressed on this subject, and he is too good natured, he does not want to use too many hard words, so I do not believe he will object to my putting in a few thrusts to my hon. friends opposite to show them that I, as a business man, believe the minister has done his utmost to make the affairs of this country successful and prosperous. He began the work at the very top notch, and while that was unfortunate, it was not his fault. He was urged to do it on every hand, and many to-day would have him continue it. I believe even the hon. member for Maisonneuve (Mr. Lemieux) who made that severe attack on the minister the other day, would be willing to let the item pass, if the minister would say: "I will spend a few million dollars in the constituency of Gaspé in building ships." Do not be too pessimistic about the success of the shipping policy of the minister in connection with the railways. While I admit that deficits of the kind that we have had on the railways cause a shudder to run down our spine, so to speak, we believe that, with our railways and our ships being operated in conjunction with each other, this country will be pulled out of the mire by a board that may be finally brought to give its best attention to the development of these great enterprises. If we boost up our shipping and boost up our railways as we should, if we show the loyalty that is in us towards these enterprises and do not criticise and knock and pound and try to drive into the earth our property, there will be a vast difference in the atmosphere in a very short time. That is the spirit which I commend to the attention to some of my hon. friends opposite; I suggest that they lend a friendly hand and try to get a traffic for our property both on water and on land, and I think in due course they will see the sun smiling just as the Minister of Marine says.

Mr. DuTREMBLAY: Last session this Parliament passed an Act empowering the Government to lend money to the extent of $20,000,000 to shipyards. Has any shipyard taken advantage of this, and is the Government giving any encouragement, by subsidies or in any other way, to shipyards?

Mr. BALLANTYNE: No shipbuilder has taken advantage of the Act passed last session. One shipyard applied for it, but the Government did not see fit to grant them the financial aid because they were working on contracts which they had secured before the Act was passed. The Government took the ground that when the Act was passed last year, it was only to encourage the bringing into Canada of new orders. As regards subsidies, that is a matter that will be mentioned when the

Budget is brought down by the Minister of Finance.

Mr. CLARK (Red Deer): Will the minister tell us exactly what is the position of the Government at the moment in regard to the contract for steel plates?

Mr. BALLANTYNE: The hon. member for Red Deer seems to be quite familiar with the matter. The Government took 40,000 tons on account of the contract for 250,000 tons. The demand was very brisk last year from all parts of the world and was greater than we were able to supply. Then suddenly the demand ceased throughout the world, and although the Government sent a man over to England in November and December to see if he could get orders, he was unable to obtain any. Therefore, the Government cancelled the contract, and any claim that the company may have will have to be settled by the Exchequer Court. In any event, the claim can be only for the remaining tonnage.

Mr. McDONALD: What is the estimated cost per ton to complete the boats now under construction at Toronto?

Mr. BALLANTYNE: The contract was let at $180 a ton. The company unfortunately failed, and while my department called for tenders to have the work finished at a fixed price, we were unable to get anybody to tender on that basis. Several firms tendered on a percentage basis, and the contract to finish the ships was awarded to the Collingwood Shipbuilding Company. I cannot make a positive statement, but I do not think the ships will cost any more than the original contract price of $180 a ton, although I am not, of course, certain of that.

Mr. McDONALD: How and when were those contracts advertised and who submitted tenders for the same?

Mr. BALLANTYNE: If my memory serves me aright, the Port Arthur Shipbuilding Company, the Collingwood Shipbuilding Company, the Canadian Vickers, the Three Rivers concern and the Halifax concern were asked, but we got firm bids only from the Port Arthur Shipbuilding Company and the Collingwood Shipbuilding Company.

Mr. McDONALD: Has the Government any report on the cost of work due to the inefficiency of the class of help now employed in Toronto?

[Mr. Ballantyne.]

Mr. BALLANTYNE: No. We have one of our own men there, and the reports coming into the department from day to day go to show that the work is being done efficiently.

Mr. McDONALD: How much is being paid on these contracts, first, to the Dominion Shipbuilding Company or the liquidators, and secondly, to the Collingwood Shipbuilding Company?

Mr. BALLANTYNE: Perhaps the hon. member would go on with any other questions he may have to ask, while the deputy is looking that up.

Mr. McDONALD: What arrangement have the Government made with the liquidators relative to the material on hand with the Dominion Shipbuilding Company?

Mr. BALLANTYNE: When the Government first commenced to let contracts they took the precaution of getting a surety bond from each shipbuilder for 10 per cent of the value of the contract. In addition, we took a lien on all the material that might be in the yard. In case of the failure of a firm, such as the Toronto firm, for instance, we can collect the value of the surety bond, and in addition all the material on the works belongs to the Dominion Government.

In reply to my hon. friend's previous question, the total contract price amounted to $630,000 for each ship, and the amount paid to the company before they went into liquidation amounted to $409,500. The Collingwood Shipbuilding Company are now completing ships on the basis of cost, plus 15 per cent. They are being paid as the work progresses, on the voucher of our man on the work.

Mr. McDONALD: Is the Government in possession of information relative to steel prices? Is the Government paying the liquidator the 1921 or the 1919 prices for the steel on hand?

Mr. BALLANTYNE: There was a large quantity of steel plate in the yards; I saw it when I was there last fall. The contract for that steel was made before the company went into liquidation, and the Government are standing by it.

Mr. McDONALD: That will be the 1919 price?

Mr. BALLANTYNE: I am not sure.

Mr. CAHILL: Would the minister mind repeating what he said with reference to depreciation and a sinking fund?

Mr. BALLANTYNE: The operating company have allowed 2 per cent depreciation on the cost of the ships. That amount of depreciation will be re-invested each year, yielding 5½ per cent interest. Therefore, with the 2 per cent depreciation and the interest in the course of 25 years, providing the company's earnings are kept up, there will be enough to write off the entire cost of the fleet.

Mr. CAHILL: If we got this $8,000,000 working in that same direction it might work off some of the liabilities of the country. The minister is really borrowing money to put into a sinking fund. I do not see how he can borrow money, pay interest on it, and at the same time use it as a sinking fund to reduce his obligations. If he had a surplus invested, and had not borrowed the money in the first place, there would be some reason in his argument, but to borrow money and place it in a sinking fund and say that you are going to wipe off the liability with that is not a very sound argument I am afraid.

Mr. BALLANTYNE: That is the usual way in a business concern, so far as my judgment goes. The operating company are in a very strong liquid position. I referred to that in my first statement, and therefore did not want to refer to it again this evening.

Mr. CAHILL: They owe one hundred cents on the dollar.

Mr. BALLANTYNE: Their current assets show a very nice surplus over current liabilities. They do not owe a bank anything, so they are in a very good liquid position. The only way to write off the excessive cost of the ships is to spread it over a period of years, and I do not think 25 years is too long. I have had their figures checked, and they will be able to do that provided their earnings can be kept up. I wish to say to my hon. friend, who understands these things so very well, that there are very few operating companies, if any, that are called upon to make their operating expenses provide for depreciation, as in the present case, and then be expected to earn 5½ per cent on the war cost of the vessels. We are taking it up with the operating company now, and it seems to me we ought to modify that rate of interest, but we have not done so.

Mr. CAHILL: Modifying the interest charge would only be a bookkeeping transaction in any event. The people of Canada are called upon to furnish the money; they have to pay the interest on the debt of Canada. So unless the minister pays the interest on the full amount that he borrowed from the treasury for this company, over which he claims to have no control, it does not matter whether he makes a bookkeeping entry at 3½ per cent or at 7 per cent, which is the rate, I believe, the Government are paying now. The country is losing the difference. For the minister to say that he can borrow money to create a sinking fund is surely not good business. If the minister had his fleet paid for, if he had sold stock and paid for his fleet in that way, and the fleet was earning profits so that the minister was able to lay aside a surplus, there might be some force in his argument; but to say that with borrowed money he can create a sinking fund to write off depreciation, I am afraid, is not sound business.

Mr. BALLANTYNE: We are not borrowing money to create a sinking fund. If my hon. friend and I had been going to build that fleet, we would have had to borrow the money from some bank or issue securities. Having done so, we would then provide a depreciation fund just the same as this company is doing. It appears quite the usual thing to me.

Mr. CAHILL: Is there not a charge against the Marine Department or against this shipping company? Do they not agree to pay interest annually amounting to so much?

Mr. BALLANTYNE: 5½ per cent.

Mr. CAHILL: Have they paid it?

Mr. BALLANTYNE: They paid 5½ per cent last year.

Mr. CAHILL: But not for 1920?

Mr. BALLANTYNE: No, they have not earned 5½ per cent on the capital cost of the ships, only 2.35 per cent.

Mr. CAHILL: Therefore, you have no money to put into a sinking fund?

Mr. BALLANTYNE: Oh yes, we have.

Mr. CAHILL: If you pay your interest you have no money to put into a sinking fund. You are probably $1,000,000 short, and therefore, you have nothing to put into a sinking fund, so it is useless to talk about a singing fund that is going to relieve the situation. You are not paying your interest.

Mr. ELKIN: It is only a matter of bookkeeping.

Mr. CAHILL: Yes, but the difficulty is it is very expensive bookkeeping for the Canadian people. If the minister was doing the bookkeeping for himself, he might go on and spend his money and I would not criticise him at all, but in this case it is the money of the Canadian people. I do not like his statement that he has a sinking fund that is going to take care of something when, as a matter of fact, it is not because he has not paid his interest. He has made a loss on operation for the last year and therefore has nothing to place to sinking fund and cannot possibly pay for the ships in twenty-five years or twenty-five hundred years.

Mr. BALLANTYNE: There is a surplus of current assets over current liabilities which will enable the company to set aside the amount of depreciation their statement shows.

Mr. CAHILL: Is there a sufficient amount of current assets to pay interest?

Mr. BALLANTYNE: Yes, and more.

Mr. DUFF: The minister says he has set aside $667,000 for depreciation. I understood him to say that 2 per cent this year, and a corresponding amount during the next twenty-five years, would wipe out the $70,000,000.

Mr. BALLANTYNE: The company have taken 2 per cent of the value of the ships turned over during the past year, and that 2 per cent amounts to $667,665.46. They will re-invest that at 5½ per cent, and the annual interest on the 2 per cent year after year for twenty-five years will accumulate sufficient to write off the cost of the fleet.

Mr. DUFF: The minister says that with this $667,000 odd he is going to pay off the $70,000,000 in twenty years.

Mr. BALLANTYNE: No, but depreciation every year.

Mr. DUFF: How much will you pay off in twenty-five years?

Mr. BALLANTYNE: The actuaries have figured it out. I have had one ship taken at a valuation of a million dollars to make sure that their figures would be right, because I am careful not to put anything but correct information before the House. They have taken a ship valued at a million dollars. Two per cent of that will be $20,000; re-invest that $20,000 at 5½ per cent, and write off 2 per cent every year; then keep on investing with compound interest on top of compound interest, and in twenty-five years it will equal $1,000,000.

Mr. DUFF: The minister says that he has put this $667,000 in the sinking fund, and after doing that he has no money left. Consequently he owes the Finance Department interest on the money invested in these ships in 1920, which is $50,000,000. How can any business man put money to rest when he has not paid interest?

Mr. CASGRAIN: It cannot be done.

Mr. DUFF: It is absolutely impossible. The minister owes interest, not only for 1920, but also for 1919. If I understood him correctly about an hour ago, when he was making his third speech this evening, he told us that the amount of $500,000 which he paid to the Finance Department in 1919, was all the money he owed that department for interest on money advanced by the Government up to December 31, 1919. Am I correct? Very good. Then if the minister will be good enough to turn to page 1331 of Hansard, he will find that he made the statement that at December 31, 1919, he had twenty-four vessels of a tonnage of 129,000 tons. If the minister will take his pencil and make a calculation he will see that at $192 per ton these twenty-four ships cost $24,768,000.

Mr. BALLANTYNE: Yes, but bear this in mind—

Mr. DUFF: I catch your point; let me go on and, if I am wrong, you can correct me. Interest at 5½ per cent on $24,768,000 is $1,362,000. If I apprehend what the minister was about to say, it is that all this money was not advanced during the year 1919. Is that what he was going to say? Yes; exactly, the minister nods his head. The minister will not forget that part of that money was advanced in 1918, so that one off-set the other. For instance, he was paying out for the work during the progress of construction, from May or June, 1918, to December 31, 1919, so that he not only owes interest in 1919, but also has not paid interest for 1918. Taking what was advanced in 1918 and what was advanced in 1919, the two years' interest would amount to one year's interest on the total cost of the ships.

Mr. BALLANTYNE: I admit quite frankly that during the progress of the construction of the ships, while moneys were being advanced, the country lost interest; but it is not fair to charge interest

to the operating company until the ships are turned over.

Mr. DUFF: It is as broad as it is long. Some one is losing that interest, whether it is chargeable to capital account or not. The country, in addition to paying $192 per ton from the time the contract is let or the keel is laid, loses that interest, and it makes no difference, so far as the people are concerned, whether the interest comes out of operating account or not. It must be paid, and consequently the minister owes, in addition to the $2,740,000 interest for 1920 which he admits—

Mr. BALLANTYNE: Of course, I cannot tell, without looking it up, what the advances have been. I could not give any idea what the interest would amount to, because I would need to find out how the advances were made and the length of time, and then figure the interest. I do not know what it would be.

Mr. DUFF: I agree that it is impossible to tell exactly what the interest is; but it is a fair assumption that he owes the 1920 interest, whether it is $2,700,000 or not, I do not know; it a question of degree.

Mr. BALLANTYNE: It is $1,828,000.

Mr. DUFF: Does that include also the interest that would be due on progress payments on the ships?

Mr. BALLANTYNE: No.

Mr. DUFF: That would be another $400,000.

Mr. BALLANTYNE: I do not know.

Mr. DUFF: Neither do I; but it would be somewhere around there. Taking the minister's own figures, the interest due for 1920 would be in the neighbourhood of $2,000,000. Although the Canadian Government Merchant Marine paid into the trasury $500,000 for 1919, there is still owing some interest for 1919 and 1918, either by the merchant marine or by the Marine Department.

Mr. BALLANTYNE: That is drawing a very fine line.

Mr. DUFF: When the minister says that he is putting aside some $667,000, and is making a good showing, I think it is quite fair to say that he has not done so well, because he owes about $2,500,000 or $3,000,000 interest.

Mr. BALLANTYNE: That would not be fair. I am quite willing to leave it to my experienced friend, the hon. member for Shelburne and Queen's (Mr. Fielding). This company is operating the ships and we have to put them on a strictly business basis. We could not charge them interest during the progress of construction of the ships, because that would not be fair. I say that the Government of Canada would have to take care of that interest, but it must not come into this statement at all; it has no relevancy to this statement.

Mr. DUFF: I agree with the minister in the statement that until the ships are handed over to the Government Marine, that company should not pay interest; but that does not effect the position of the people of Canada. Somebody certainly lost that interest. If it is not added to the capital cost of the ships, and I presume from what the minister said it is not, then instead of having expended $50,000,000 on capital account, as the statement shows, we will expend more, or else he owes the Finance Department a certain amount of money for interest which has been added to the capital account.

Mr. BALLANTYNE: It was not the policy of the Government—my hon. friend will allow me to make this explanation—when I was a harbour commissioner for the port of Montreal to pay the interest on the capital expenditure of many millions of dollars while the development was going on, or until the work was finished and it was put in a position to pay its own way. The hon. member for Shelburne and Queen's will quite readily remember that, and without taking up the time of the committee I could name a port in Canada where millions of dollars have been spent and no interest was received during the construction and none has been received since.

Mr. DUFF: But, these works were in a different position.

Mr. BALLANTYNE: They are national works.

Mr. DUFF: They are to this extent,—that the minister is coming here and telling us that he has made a profit on this business. It may be a good policy in the case of the harbour works in Montreal, where all they get is a certain amount of revenue and which works are not expected to pay just like ships pay.

Mr. BALLANTYNE: They pay their interest.

Mr. DUFF: If they pay their interest so much the better, but this is a different policy altogether. Harbour works are an

entirely different thing from the Government launching into a shipbuilding programme. However, I do not want to get diverted from my speech. I will answer the remarks of the hon. member for Brantford (Mr. Cockshutt) by saying that if it is good business for the Government to go into the ship operating business, it would be equally good policy for the Government to build trawlers in these yards and send them out to Prince Rupert, Lunenburg, Halifax and Canso and operate those same trawlers. The Government has just as much right to engage in the fishing industry as they have to engage in the shipping business. The Government may just as well engage in the refining of sugar or engage in the buying of Canadian wheat. Seeing that practicaly half a crop remains in Western Canada unsold, why not go into the wheat buying business in order to help the farmers. Why not buy all the wheat in the western grain elevators and everywhere else, for that would be carrying out the same principle? Why not buy agricultural implements, and I say this with the greatest possible respect for my hon. friend (Mr. Cockshutt).

Mr. ELKIN: The hon. member for Lunenburg is a shipping man. He has a knowledge of the Atlantic ring and the position that Canada and Canadian shippers found themselves in with regard to the trans-Atlantic trade. Will he say it is not good business for the Canadian Government to place themselves in the position of building and owning ships so that they can open up trade routes for the benefit of Canada and Canadian shipping?

Mr. DUFF: In answer to my hon. friend I would say that the Canadian Government ships have not been opening up trade routes. To every port where the Canadian Government Merchant Marine ships have gone since they were launched, other Canadian vessels have been going for years past. These routes have been served by other lines of Canadian steamships for 150 years past. It is all nonsense to say that these ships of the Canadian Government have increased Canadian business; they are running all around looking for freight. In the Halifax Herald of to-day my hon. friend will find it stated that one of the Government ships is leaving Halifax to go to Portland. Another one is bringing a cargo from Buenos Aires to Philadelphia. That is the way in which these steamers of the Canadian Government Merchant Marine are helping Canadian trade. The minister tells us what great things they are doing in the way of developing Canadian trade. I would like my hon. friend to turn to the report of the Department of Trade and Comemrce and see what evidence he can find there of that. The minister has a line of ships running to Brazil, and to hear him talk a minute ago one would imagine that nobody ever took any business to Brazil from Canada before. Why Canadian sailing ships have been going from St. John, Halifax, and other Canadian ports to Brazil for the last one hundred and fifty years. My hon. friend from St. John knows that. It is not the Government owned ships only that have been doing this business.

Mr. ELKIN: Not on regularly established trade routes.

Mr. DUFF: My hon. friend must know that if there is no freight to be carried no ships are required. The ships to which I have alluded have always carried freight if there was any freight to be carried. Now as to the trade with Brazil, I find these figures on page 6 of the report of the Department of Trade and Commerce: Brazil —1914, $267,858; 1918, $974,368. That was before there were any ships belonging to the Canadian Government Merchant Marine. In 1919, and this would be for the year ending March 31—and of course before the minister had very many ships—the trade had increased to $4,000,000; but in 1920 when the minister had opened this particular route, as the hon. member for St. John calls it, the exports to Brazil had dropped to $2,703,000. So you see the minister's steamers are not doing very much to open up trade routes to Brazil and, as I said a moment ago, sailing ships from St. John and Halifax have been carrying the products of Canada to Brazil for the last one hundred and fifty years and there was never any complaint. Now the minister's ships are doing the business which these sailing ships were formerly doing. Vessels representing an investment of millions have been tied up because the Government has embarked on this scheme—that is where the whole trouble lies. I could read the shipments from Canada to other countries. I could make a comparison between shipments in 1914 and shipments in 1918 and 1920. There has been an increase on account of the increased cost of the goods. My hon. friend knows the cost of merchandise is perhaps two hundred per cent greater than it was in 1914 and yet the minister says

we are doing more business because these ships are on the ocean. Why there is nothing in the statement when you analyze it and learn exactly what it means. I repeat that these ships are not opening up trade routes, they are going around looking for freight. They are carrying products to New York, they are loading cargoes in Portland, Baltimore, or somewhere else to carry across the ocean, and so on.

Now to get back to the question of the interest account, because I want this thing straightened out, I say that the minister cannot very well claim that because he had $667,000 at rest for the first year and has not paid his interest for 1918, or 1919, or 1920, he has any surplus, or any money, at rest. The very first thing he must do is to pay interest on the charges before he talks of putting money to rest account. In estimating this interest I take the cost of those steamers which were put in operation up to December 31, 1919, at $192 a ton. I think I am safe in saying that that figure applies to the whole sixty-three ships, and that the cost is on the average $192 a ton. In figuring at $192 a ton for the 1919 ships and the 1920 ships the minister is far too conservative. I think he will find that instead of costing $192 they averaged $202 a ton because they represented the heaviest contracts.

Mr. BALLANTYNE: I might inform the hon. member that the lowest price was $167.50, other contracts were let at $180, and the highest price paid was $215 a ton. It has been very carefully figured out that on the entire programme the average will be $191.50.

Mr. DUFF: That is exactly what I am saying, but I am trying to show that the first ships constructed by the minister cost $215 a ton.

Mr. BALLANTYNE: No, $180.

Mr. DUFF: He paid $215 for some.

Mr. BALLANTYNE: For one or two.

Mr. DUFF: And the ships that are being built now are being constructed for a lesser price than any of the others.

Mr. BALLANTYNE: Some are, some are not.

Mr. DUFF: I mean you did not contract for any ships for $167.50 in 1918 or 1919.

Mr. BALLANTYNE: The lowest price we paid in 1919 was $180 a ton for the ships built by the Coughlan Shipbuilding Company of Vancouver, and one by Wallace at $167.50.

Mr. DUFF: Consequently that figure of $167.50 brought down the average.

Mr. BALLANTYNE: That might be, but when the 63 ships are finished the cost to the country will be $191.50.

Mr. DUFF: But in figuring my interest on $191.50 a ton on the 1919 ships I was figuring low. It would be more correct if I figured the average at about $202 because the minister will admit that those ships cost more than the ships that are not yet completed. I would like to have some information in regard to another matter. Late last session hon. gentlemen opposite voted some $703,000, to be found in the Further Supplementary Estimates for the year ending March 31, 1921, on page 14, No. 549, by way of advances to Victoria, British Columbia, Shipbuilders, Limited for the construction of four vessels at an estimated cost of $250,000 for each vessel—

Mr. BALLANTYNE: That does not come under the Department of Marine and Fisheries at all. If my hon. friend will direct that question to the Minister of Finance he will be able to give him the information required. It is money the Government of Canada loaned to that shipbuilding company through the Finance Department.

Mr. DUFF: Do I understand the minister to say that the Finance Department made the contract with these people?

Mr. BALLANTYNE: Yes.

Mr. DUFF: Now, the Toronto shipyards. I understand the minister to say that the contract he made with these people is on a cost plus basis. What money had the Government already advanced to the shipyard before the new arrangement was made? And what difficulty, if any, arose with the workmen in the yard?

Mr. BALLANTYNE: $409,000 was the amount paid. We have not had any difficulty with the men in the yards at Toronto. More skilled and unskilled workmen have been offering their services than are really needed. When the war was on that yard paid the highest wages of any shipbuilding yard in Canada, 90 cents an hour. When we came to let this contract on a cost plus basis, naturally I knew that the Collingwood Shipbuilding Company were not interested in

1 a.m.

what wages would be paid, because the higher the wages the greater would be the amount of cost plus they would get from the Government; therefore, the maximum scale of wages was fixed at 75 cents which was the current wage in Toronto at the time.

Mr. DUFF: I understood there was a strike and that the men would not accept the wages the Government offered.

Mr. BALLANTYNE: A few men of the Trades and Labour Council may have struck, but the yard had more men than they really needed.

Mr. DUFF: I understand that the number of men who were previously employed in the yard had some disagreement with the Government about wages, and therefore struck for better treatment. Will the minister explain what happened?

Mr. BALLANTYNE: A few of the old men who were employed by the Toronto Shipbuilding Company at ninety cents an hour for an eight-hour day were not satisfied to take a drop to seventy-five cents an hour, and they left.

Mr. DUFF: Is the minister aware of the fact that the men now employed by the company in the place of those skilled men are not capable shipwrights?

Mr. BALLANTYNE: I know that assertion has been made, but the Collingwood Shipbuilding Company have demonstrated fully to the Government that they have one of the best equipped yards in the Dominion and that their workmen are thoroughly skilled. Besides that, the Marine Department have got their own man there, and I can assure the hon. member that the work is being done just as efficiently as in any yard in Canada.

Mr. DUFF: How much money was paid to the Vancouver shipbuilding companies, and how much are the vessels under construction likely to cost?

Mr. BALLANTYNE: We were able to make a much more advantageous arrangement at Prince Rupert than we were at Toronto, and the Wallace Shipbuilding Company are completing those ships for eight per cent over labour and any material they have to buy. I do not know exactly what the ships are going to cost, but I should say it will be a little bit less than the original contract, because that was one of the highest contracts for that type of ship that the Government let; it was during the war and the price was $198 a ton.

Mr. DUFF: Has the minister any information in regard to the work done on the Canadian Inventor?

Mr. BALLANTYNE: None.

Mr. DUFF: Has he received any complaint about the shaft being short after the ship was launched and taken over by the Government? And had the Government to spend a large amount of money to put in a new shaft?

Mr. BALLANTYNE: I have not any knowledge.

Mr. DUFF: Of course, I can understand that it is impossible for the minister to give the information which the committee should have before they pass this item. It seems to me there should be somebody here—

Mr. BALLANTYNE: Is my hon. friend referring to something he heard when out at Vancouver?

Mr. DUFF: Oh, no.

Mr. BALLANTYNE: I do not know whether this ship that my hon. friend has in mind was built by the Coughlan Shipbuilding Company or not. My deputy tells me that the Canadian Inventor was built by the Coughlan Shipbuilding Company. There was something wrong with the tail shaft and the Government inspector made them take it out and put it back without any extra cost to the Government.

Mr. DUFF: I have another complaint with regard to the Canadian Inventor. Perhaps there is nothing in it.

Mr. McGIBBON (Muskoka): There is nothing in any of them.

Mr. DUFF: The hon. gentleman does not know anything about the subject.

Mr. McGIBBON (Muskoka): It is just like your speech.

Mr. DUFF: I should like the hon. member for Muskoka to be courteous.

Mr. McGIBBON (Muskoka): It is just like your speech; there is nothing in it.

The CHAIRMAN: (Mr. A. Thompson): Order.

Mr. DUFF: I was going to ask a question; now I will read the whole article. It has to do with the treatment accorded to the crew of the Canadian Inventor. It says:

Complaining that the treatment accorded them after their ship had put to sea was far from that represented in the ship's articles and appealing to the public for an investigation to "give them a square deal," ten members of the crew of the C.G.M.M. freighter Canadian Inventor, which reached Calcutta on Monday, have addressed a communication to the World. This reads as follows:

"S.S. Canadian Inventor,
at sea.

"We read with pride of the work proposed—

Mr. BALLANTYNE: I do not wish to interrupt the hon. member, but I may say that I have seen that article.

Mr. DUFF: But the hon. member for Muskoka has not heard it.

Mr. McGIBBON (Muskoka): I am quite willing to give to it the value that usually attaches to my hon. friend's remarks.

Mr. DUFF: Did the hon. member put a question? If he did I would like him to repeat it. The item continues:

"S.S. Canadian Inventor,
At Sea.

"We read with pride of the work proposed and already accomplished by the Canadian Government Merchant Marine Service in opening up various trades between the United Kingdom, Australia, India and the Orient. Prouder still were we when we read that the ships of the service were built in Canada and manned by Canadians; in fact, our pride soared so high that we overlooked many of the essentials which go to perfect the whole system.

Mr. ELKIN: What is the hon. gentleman reading from,—Robinson Crusoe?

An hon. MEMBER: Read it over again.

Mr. DUFF: I will do so for the benefit of the senior member for St. John (Mr. Elkin) who evidently did not hear my reading of the article so far. It is from the Vancouver World and is dated March 8, It reads as follows:

Seamen on Canadian Ship in Complaint

Crew of C.G.M.M. Inventor Say Treatment Shameful—Were Rationed

Vancouver, March 8.—The Vancouver World says:

Complaning that the treatment accorded them after their ship had put to sea was far from that represented in the ship's articles and appealing to the public for an investigation to "give them a square deal," ten members of the crew of the C.G.M.M. freighters Canadian Inventor, which reached Calcutta on Monday, have addressed a communication to the World. This reads as follows:

"S.S. Canadian Inventor
At Sea.

"We read with pride of the work proposed and already accomplished by the Canadian Government Merchant Marine Service in opening up various trades between the United Kingdom, Australia, India and the Orient. Prouder still were we when we read that the ships of the service were built in Canada and manned by Canadians; in fact, our pride soared so high that we overlooked many of the essentials which go to perfect the whole system.

"One, if not the most essential, is the crews of these ships which have started out to do so much. This is the fact we wish to draw to the public notice, the inhuman treatment handed out to us, the indispensable pieces of machinery which go to make up the perfect machine. We say indispensable, and so we are, although the government does not classify us as such.

"All returned men and experienced seamen welcomed the service as a means of employment and ready to take advantage of the opening offered rather than throw themselves on the already overburdened list of unemployed.

Some hon. MEMBERS: Louder, louder.

Mr. DUFF: Mr. Chairman, I wish you would try to keep order.

Mr. McGIBBON (Muskoka): I rise to a point of order. The hon. member is reading his speech.

The CHAIRMAN (Mr. A. Thompson): The hon. member is reading a quotation from a newspaper, the name of which he has given. He is, therefore, perfectly in order.

"At the time of signing deep sea articles, which were read out to us before we gave our signatures, the conditions seemed up to the standard of other services, and while alongside the government wharf, during the time we were loading, conditions seemed as represented. But as soon as we got to sea conditions changed and from then on have gone from bad to worse, until things have come to such a state that one would hardly imagine that we were human beings at all.

"On mustering before the commanding officer of the ship to request sufficient food to feed healthy men, the chief stewart was called and we were informed by him that we were on rations, nothing of which was ever read out of the articles. Even these meager rations ran out two weeks before we reached our first port of call, and we have had emergency rations ever since. We all put up with 'bully beef' and hard tack, some of us for over three years whilst overseas, realizing the necessity of it, but there is no reason for such conditions to exist today.

"The three meals put together each day would not make one square meal for a healthy man. Then, added to the lack of food, was the condition of the weather—not one real fine day ever since we left port. For days snow, ice, rain, sleet and heavy seas washing fore and aft, breaking up the deck cargo, which had to be re-lashed every time, drenching us to the skin day after day; not so much as a hot drink when we came below.

"Another thing, in watches, we are on duty day and night, and in all weathers there is a period of fifteen hours without a meal. Take, for instance, the 4 to 8 watch, considered the best, going on watch at 4 p.m., relieved for supper for half an hour at 5 p.m.; then relieved again by the next watch at 8 p.m.; turn into a nice bed consisting of a straw pillow and mattresses and one pair of blankets; called at 3.30 a.m. to

get ready for watch at 4 a.m.; not relieved until 8 a.m., with not as much as a cup of warm cocoa going on or coming off, with the thermometer down to 10 deg. of frost inside the wheelhouse as it has been day after day.

"Bear in mind it is not the cold or the weather we complain of—we are not fair weather sailors. It is the state of the inner man to cope with these conditions that we object to. We give these details of duty because there are a great number of people not acquainted with the duties aboard ship.

The CHAIRMAN (Mr. A. Thompson): I would remind the hon. member who is speaking of rule 18, section 2, which reads:

Mr. Speaker or the Chairman, after having called the attention of the House or of the committee to the conduct of a member who persists in irrelevance or a tedious repetition either of his own arguments or of the arguments used by other members in debate, may direct him to discontinue his speech.

I do not wish to make that ruling, but I would draw it to the attention of the hon. member who, I am sure, will use his own good judgment in the matter.

Mr. DUFF: Mr. Chairman, speaking to the point of order, I wish to say that I have not been guilty of tedious repetitions; I repeated the reading of the article at the express wish of hon. members sitting on the Government side. I think you are wrong, therefore, in calling me to order.

The CHAIRMAN (Mr. A. Thompson): I did not call the hon. gentleman to order; I simply directed his attention to the rule.

Mr. DUFF (reading):

We are not a bunch of illiterates, we have to serve our time and not all in a position to do so as cadets. The sea is the same as every other profession. It has changed, and the men of the fo'c'sle to-day are going to be the officers on the bridge to-morrow.

We hear some accuse us of being agitators, radicals, Bolsheviks. Nothing of the sort, we are human beings appealing for human treatment.

The CHAIRMAN: Order.

Mr. DUFF: Do you want me to go on?

The CHAIRMAN: I was merely trying to make order so that the hon. member could proceed.

Mr. DUFF (reading):

We realize there is no support given to anybody using radical and direct-actions, so encourage us to be patient and give your co-operation in our endeavours to get better conditions.

We are making this public appeal in the hopes that there are some in authority who will read it and make it their business to at least investigate the matter and give us a square deal.

(Signed) Robert C. Gray, J. P. Bruce, A. Ferris, S. Bullock, G. Davie, C. Headley, G. W. Burney, A. Muir, R. H. Traeksley, A. Malcolm.

I would like to inquire from the minister, who says that this matter has been called to his attention, if the management of the Canadian Government Merchant Marine has communicated with the captain and officers of the Canadian Inventor and found out whether this story is true or not.

[The Chairman.]

Mr. BALLANTYNE: As the hon. member is well aware, the operation and management of the ships are entirely in the hands of the operating company. The article was merely brought to my attention by my private secretary, but not to deal with, and I would not have dealt with it, had it been brought to my attention for that purpose, because the matter is one that belongs solely to the management to deal with.

Mr. DUFF: I understand the position the minister is in; that the minister is not the one who deals with the matter. I understand that the merchant marine is under the managing company the same as the railways. But as the minister has given us a statement of the operating expenses of the company for last year, and as this has to do with operation, I think I am quite justified, although I do not want to press the question, in bringing the matter to the minister's attention, and I should like to ask him if he would not make a note of this and get somebody to write to the management of the ships and ask them to take up the matter with the captain and see whether this story is true or not.

I thought I saw the hon. member for Brantford (Mr. Cockshutt) come in a few moments ago. In the excellent address which he gave us, he spoke about the reasons why this shipbuilding programme or policy was a good one. He quoted from a number of newspapers to show that he was justified in making that assertion. In the few remarks which I made to-night, I also made a few quotations to show that other newspapers did not have the same faith in this shipbuilding programme and especially in the profits which the management of the ships told us that they made last year. To prove to the hon. member for Brantford that some of the newspapers are not very well satisfied with this policy or the way in which the ships are being managed, I would like to read an article which appeared in the Montreal Gazette after I had made my speech.

Mr. BALLANTYNE: The hon. member must know and if he does not know, I can tell him something about my own city. This is a free country, as Sir Wilfrid Laurier used to say, and every man has a right

to express his opinion. In the city of Montreal the majority of business men are absolutely opposed to public ownership for reasons which I do not need to tell the hon. member; the French press hold different views, so what the Montreal Gazette publishes is not surprising at all. In view of the late hour, unless the hon. gentleman is very anxious to read the article which merely reiterates what the Montreal Gazette has already stated; that is its opposition to Government-ownership.

Mr. DUFF: I am sure I am not anxious to keep the minister here; in fact, I think we might adjourn. I have a question or two to ask as to contracts.

Mr. BALLANTYNE: Go ahead.

Mr. DUFF: I will read this article first. The hon. member for Brantford, as I said a moment ago, quoted from a number of newspapers, and I read from some newspapers to show that they did not have the same faith in this shipbuilding programme as regards profits. I am glad to hear the minister say that this is a free country. We thought it was not, and we are glad that the ban is lifted and that no more Orders in Council will be passed. This is an editorial from the Montreal Gazette of Saturday, April 9, headed "The Merchant Marine:"

The debatable point in connection with Canada's merchant marine is that of policy. When the construction of ships was undertaken by the Government in the spring of 1918 there was no dissent in Parliament, the action being generally approved as a war measure. At that time the sea tonnage of the world was being decimated by German submarines, resulting in a serious shortage of ships, and it was as necessary to the successful prosecution of the war to provide means of transportation overseas as to raise reinforcements for the army. Cost of construction was a secondary consideration. The cry was for ships and more ships; and to avert the disaster threatened by the enemy submarines the United States engaged in an extensive shipbuilding programme and Canada in as large a one as her resources permitted. There can, therefore, be no profitable discussion as to the wisdom of the policy in the circumstances of its inception, and controversy should be confined to the sole question of the prudence of retaining the ships and operating them through a Government agency at the charge of the Canadian people.

Upon this point there is a division of opinion. Many persons, unconnected with the shipping business, are convinced that a Government service cannot profitably compete with private companies on the sea more than on the land; while there are others who from national priide, or a less worthy motive, are captivated by the idea of Canadian ships flying the Canadian flag, ploughing the seven seas, and carrying Canadian commerce to the four corners of the earth. There is a patriotic sentiment aroused by the picture which the Minister of Marine has not neglected to evoke. But business is business; and it is very dubious whether the taxpayers will long applaud an appeal to patriotic pride that involves dipping their hands deep into their pockets for no practical purpose. The Canadian mercantile marine could probably have been sold, both the completed and uncompleted vessels, a year and a half or two years ago at cost price; to-day they would scarcely realize 40 per cent of cost, and it is very far from certain that a reaction upward to price will occur before the ships have run their course and been scrapped. The Government, however, resolved to engage in the shipping trade for reasons which had no relation whatever to the purpose of the original policy, and were wholly an afterthought. Those reasons, as stated by Mon. Mr. Ballantyne, were the desirability of linking a steamship service with the national railway, and the means supplied by the ships of opening up new trade routes and expanding Canada's foreign commerce. The Canadian Pacific had an ocean fleet as an adjunct to its land, and why not the Government? And so, superimposed upon the National railway deficit, we have the deficit of the Canadian Mercantile Marine to be met out of the taxes upon the people.

It is pertinent to point out the fundamental difference between rail and water transportation. In the case of the former the road bed is restricted, while in the case of the latter it is as wide as the ocean. There can be no monopoly of business in respect of ships. Vessels of any and all countries can ply their trade in the ports of the world; there is no such thing as right of way, but free and open competition, and ever the ship comes to seek the cargo. If the National Railway requires ships to carry its over-seas traffic, the ships can be had for the asking without the expenditure of a single dollar on capital account. If the ocean-borne traffic is unprofitable the ship owners bear the loss, and the Canadian taxpayer escapes. The fact that Governments cannot successfully compete on even terms with private enterprise remains as a cardinal objection to the maintenance of the Canadian mercantile marine, and if it is contended that the National Railway requires to be supplemented with a steamship service, the rejoinder is that this service can be secured without price to the people and with equal advantage to the railway by arrangement with privately owned steamship companies.

The Canadian marine venture has already involved the loss of many millions of capital in consequence of the drop in the value of ships, and involved the loss of at least $2,000,000 on operating account in 1920, under the most favourable statement of accounts. It is most desirable that Canada's foreign trade should be enlarged, that new markets should be sought, that ships carrying Canadian products should reach countries not hitherto tapped, but $2,000,000 in the way of subsidies to steamship lines, over and above earnings, will go a long way towards this end, while at the same time removing the risks of heavy loss to the taxpayers now incurred. The Minister of Marine is firmly convinced of the prudence and advantage of the mercantile marine, and he is an experienced business man. But the Minister of Railways is also convinced that the National Railway is a fine proposition. It may be so; but unfortunately for the Canadian people these

convictions have loaded upon them an enormous debt and an enormous deficit; have strained the credit of Canada; have necessitated very heavy taxation; and hold out no hope of amelioration for many years while the fatuous policy of Government ownership is persisted in.

That is what the Montreal Gazette says, and I am sure that paper is as much to be depended upon as the paper from which my hon. friend read. I would like a little more information before I sit down. I notice by Volume II of the Auditor General's report for 1920, page 0-101, the following:

Canadian Otter 4,350 tons, deadweight, at $215 per ton; instalments paid, 10, $794,962.50; 'tween decks $29,850; re-adjustment of exchange, etc., $1,899.33, total, $826,711.83, less paid in 1918-19, $140,287.50.

So that in addition to paying $215 per ton deadweight there has been paid for 'tween decks $29,850, and an item of $1,899.33 for re-adjustment of exchange. Consequently the ship cost that much more.

Mr. BALLANTYNE: Would the hon. member expect any shipbuilder to put in 'tween decks for love?

Mr. DUFF: No, I would not, but we have been given to understand by the minister that these ships averaged $192 per ton. What I want to find out is whether these extras were included in figuring the average cost?

Mr. BALLANTYNE: Certainly not. I might tell my hon. friend that there have been a great many extras. The refrigerating plant for instance, that goes into these ships is extra, so are the oil burners and many other things.

Mr. DUFF: Well then, these ships must have cost more than $192 per ton, which was the figure the minister gave to the House. I do not hold the minister responsible, because he probably just made the statement which was passed to him, but certainly when these extras are added in, the cost must be more than $192. The minister has admitted that is correct.

Mr. BALLANTYNE: Certainly.

Mr. DUFF: Consequently, the price of $192 should be corrected, and the correction go out to the public. I also notice that the Canadian Squatter is down here at $215 per ton. She also had to pay $29,854 for 'tween decks. This ship therefore cost $223 instead of $215 per ton. Now if every ship has cost $7 per ton more than the amount the minister stated, it means that the average price is $199 per ton instead of $192. Then I notice in connection with the Canadian Voyageur, 4,300 tons dead weight, at $207 per ton, "excess dead weight 275 tons at $207." Would that be extra?

Mr. BALLANTYNE: It is the tota ascertained dead-weight.

Mr. DUFF: The contract was for a 4,300-ton boat. When the ship was ready for delivery, the surveyor from the department, I suppose, went on board and measured the ship and found that instead of being 4,300 tons deadweight capacity she was 4,575.

Mr. BALLANTYNE: That is right.

Mr. DUFF: In his statement did the minister figure this at 4,300 tons or 4,375?

Mr. BALLANTYNE: The total ascertained deadweight.

Mr. DUFF: Then in the case of the Canadian Pioneer I see here extras: wood bulkhead, $2,268.27; canvas $110; additional awnings $1,901,72; lamp chimneys $5.25; altering gunner's room $680; refrigerator plant $1,850: That seems a pretty large item for awnings, and I do not think the Government should have had to pay extra for wood bulkheads, which are certainly a part of the vessel.

Mr. BALLANTYNE: The Canadian Pioneer was going to India and everybody knows what a hot climate India has. The operating company asked to be allowed to put awnings on the boat. The bulkheads do not amount to much.

Mr. DUFF: That is satisfactory. Then I notice an extra for the Canadian Miller, steel cargo derrick at $5,500. Would that be part of the vessel's equipment?

Mr. BALLANTYNE: The operating company asked for a heavy derrick to handle the heavy cargoes that the ships would carry.

Mr. DUFF: Would not the ordinary derricks available be sufficient to put cargoes on board?

Mr. BALLANTYNE: Not very heavy lifts.

Mr. DUFF: I see here an item for adjustment of exchange. Why should the Government pay exchange when the contract was made in Canada? And then I see something about a tail-end shaft. It seems to me that this is something which a ship must have if she is to go to sea.

Mr. BALLANTYNE: The operating company asked for a spare tail-end shaft in case anything happened the original one and we allowed them to procure it.

Mr. DUFF: Will the minister say why the Government should have to pay exchange when the contract was made in Canada?

Mr. BALLANTYNE: When steel was sold at a fixed price and they could not get delivery in Canada owing to heavy demand and bought in the United States, it was only reasonable that we should allow the difference in exchange.

Some hon. MEMBERS: Carried.

Mr. DUFF: Hon. gentlemen opposite do not seem anxious to obtain the particulars of these items for the information of the country and I will not go further; but in round numbers, the extras which I notice would amount to perhaps $50,000. As I understand it, these ships cost $50,000 in addition to the contract price.

Some hon. MEMBERS: Carried.

Mr. PIERRE CASGRAIN (Charlevoix-Montmorency: (Translation.) Mr. Chairman, I had no intention of taking part in this discussion, specially at this late hour, but after the definite and sweeping assertions made last night in the House by the Minister of Marine, at the outset of his statement concerning the Canadian Government Merchant Marine, I deem it advisable to define my attitude in this connection. The minister declared that the whole country is satisfied and that this year, to use his own words, the said company could come before the House and the public with a "creditable showing." As for me, Mr. Chairman, I am not satisfied with the declarations of the Minister of Marine, and I maintain that the situation of his new Merchant Marine Company is not satisfactory, for all the money which we put in this undertaking, I think we had a right to expect a better result. One has no need to go very far to realize that this result is not what was expected. We find at page 31, of the Report of the Department of Railways which was brought down a little while ago, that among the subsidiary companies, are The Canadian National Telegraph Company, the Great North-Western Telegraph Company of Canada, and, at the bottom of the page this other white elephant, the Canadian Government Merchant Marine, Limited—

Mr. Chairman, the Minister of Marine, has boasted that many newspapers had approved his policy, and had expressed the opinion that the financial statement presented this year to the House, was very satisfactory. A moment ago, I saw the hon. minister hand over certain papers to the hon. member for Brantford, so that the latter might keep the floor for a little while. The minister will allow me, I hope to read to him a few extracts from the report of the Bank of Montreal, dated the 6th of December last. It is to be found in the "Standard" of Saturday, December 11th, 1920. I want to be reasonable, and I shall not read the whole report. I shall be content with quoting a few of its most important statements, and shall afterwards ask my hon. friend, the Minister of Marine, what he intends doing should he agree with the comments made by the President of the Bank of Montreal, when submitting his last financial statement.

Here is what the report says under the caption "Government Owned Railways and ships":

> Canada to-day has a very large National Railway System which is being operated at a heavy loss, thereby increasing the load on an already heavily tax-burdened country. Sooner or later some means must be found to relieve this situation. Some confidently believe that by proper public administration of the lines, deficits can be cut down.

It is the President of the Bank of Montreal who speaks thus. He adds—

> My own view is that the proper solution will be found if the Government, at the earliest feasible time, divests itself of ownership and operation of the roads and places them under corporate control upon terms fair to the country and upon conditions that will ensure the service for which the construction of the lines was undertaken.

And further on the President of the bank speaks as follows:

> In the same connection, and speaking for myself alone, it would appear desirable that no more national expenditure should be made for the building of ships."

Of course, he speaks only as president of the bank, but I wish to draw the attention of the chairman and the members of this committee upon the eminent qualifications, the high personal standing of the president of the Bank of Montreal. Though I may not be an intimate friend of his, I may not eat at his table, I may not visit at his house, I may not meet him at the club, I say that no one can deny his influence in the financial circles of Canada; he is an intimate friend of the Minister of Marine,

who is often met in company with his friends of the Bank of Montreal, of the Royal Trust of Montreal, of the Sherwin-Williams, and of many other powerful companies, of which the Minister of Marine is either one of the chesty and ponderous directors or shareholders.

Mr. Chairman, allow me further to quote certain other statements of the president of the Bank of Montreal—

Mr. CHAIRMAN: I understand the hon. member for Skeena (Mr. Peck) is rising to a point of order.

Mr. PECK: No, I wish to ask the hon. gentleman a question. I wish to inquire if Lord Shaughnessy is not on the Directorate of the Bank of Montreal?

Mr. CASGRAIN: The books speak for themselves, I did not look at them. You can inquire for yourself. The blue book and the other books will tell you better than I can.

The CHAIRMAN: Order.

Mr. BALLANTYNE: The hon. member does not know if that is so?

Mr. CASGRAIN: I do not. You know more than I do. That is why I am here and you are there.

The CHAIRMAN: I must remind hon. gentlemen on both sides that even at this late hour it would be well for hon. members to address the Chair.

Mr. CASGRAIN: (Translation). Mr. Chairman, I willingly abide by your decision. Since I have the honour of representing the county of Charlevoix in this House, I realized that when, intent on having our views accepted, we put in our way of expressing them more vim perhaps than the occasion justified, we often regretted that some of your decisions did not favour us as much as we would have wished; but no one ever complained.

While a programme of ship-building during the war was commendable, subsequent developments dictate a modified policy. In June, 1914, the world tonnage totalled 49,000,000 tons; in June, 1920, it has risen to 57,300,000 tons, and, in addition, at the end of September this year there were 7,565,000 tons under construction. Tonnage at present exceeds requirements, and in expectation of rate reduction and shrinkage in earnings, construction abroad has already been arrested, and empty tonnage is now laid up in many ports. There is no ground for the belief that this condition will quickly pass. The United States recently failed to secure bids for standard ships; Japan has cancelled orders for 100,000,000 tons in his own shipyards, and Norway is cancelling orders in Great Britain. These factors constitute, in my opinion, a danger signal that Canada might well heed and stop all further new construction.

Mr. Chairman, such was in the month of December last, the opinion of the president of the Bank of Montreal who, as I said a moment ago, reflects the sentiments of the financiers of the metropolis, and of Quebec and the whole country as well.

We have read—I have for my part—the reports of several other banks issued since then and in no other report from a bank or a financial institution supposed to be reputable or of any importance have I found a single word of commendation or approval concerning the new policy of the Government Merchant Marine. On the contrary, the president and the directors of the Bank of Montreal, who are the friends of the Minister of Marine, are giving him in the words to which I have just called the attention of this House the most solemn warning that could be given to a public man and to a good friend, by saying: "Sir, stop; you have done enough; that might have been all very well during the war; we could have needed it in the beginning, but there is a time when we must stop; otherwise, whatever good we might have expected from that policy will be set to naught by the deficits which will pile up in the future." Such is the substance of opinion uttered by the president of the Bank of Montreal and the directors of that financial institution.

What is happening to-day in this House? In contradiction to that warning, we see the hon. minister asking for eight million and a few odd hundred thousand dollars to go on with the programme initiated two or three years ago, when some necessity may have then existed. Now that necessity has vanished; nevertheless, the minister comes and tells us: "Vote that sum of money; I need it and I need it at once."

The hon. minister told us a moment ago: "We shall pass this item and we will be at it the night through."

Mr. Chairman, for my part, if we were to remain here the whole night, I am willing to do so, but I don't intend to let the item pass before I have the opportunity of entering my protest on behalf of the constituents I am representing in this House, and of the party to which I have the honour to belong.

Mr. Chairman, there must be a reason for the presistency in that policy. Has the minister given any? Quite the contrary, he told us and I have taken it down: "Pros-

pects are not very good now." Well, Mr. Chairman, if the future forebade nothing better than we had in the past, instead of continuing this policy, would it not be better to put up with a loss and to suspend work on some ships which can no longer be of any use, rather than wait for what may turn up, relying on a better market in years to come, and in the expectation of getting at most a paltry amount which would not cover the interest upon the money's voted and expended this year?

I am amazed when I see the hon. minister and his friends offering reasons which do not hold, and are quite conflicting. A moment ago, we had it from the hon. member from Brantford that it was good policy because it had given work to returned soldiers and to unemployed men, and because at this time the shipbuilding industry is flourishing. I ask you, Mr. Chairman, in all that the hon. Minister of Marine has stated to-day, with a view to show the soundness of the Government that this policy, is there any mention of how many returned soldiers have been put to work in the shipyards? He has not mentioned one. Nor did he tell us how many of these unemployed, who, not long ago, were in the streets of Montreal, clamouring for bread and storming the restaurants, had been given work in the shipyards?

Surely, had those people been employed in the ship yards the Government has assisted through this policy of a merchant marine, we would not have the spectacle which is to be seen in Montreal, Toronto and elsewhere, and there would not be people depending to-day upon public charity for a living. Nor would we have the hon. member for Brantford asking us, as if Parliament was a charitable institution, to continue this policy in order to prevent the unemployed and the famished to die of hunger.

When it is a question of voting an item, as the one we are debating this evening, we should take all the means possible so as to ascertain whether the policy proposed is one which is sound and co-ordinated, and if in passing this item, benefit will be derived not only for the eastern section of the country, the Halifax, the Vancouver and the province of Quebec dockyards or any other place but if the whole country will benefit in any way. I question whether the hon. minister has shown us, the other day and the other night, when he brought down his report of our merchant marine, that he had made good use of the money we voted in past years?

I ask myself if, considering these circumstances, we are justified to-day in voting the amount of $8,000,000 as the minister desires?

Mr. Chairman, one thing strikes me: It is that when the Government wishes to promote a rather difficult policy, in many cases, their ablest men are not called upon to do it. When it comes down to a railway undertaking, the hon. member for Grenville (Mr. Reid), who directs that department, is called upon to initiate all kinds of schemes more or less acceptable, and as I mentioned it when I had the occasion of criticising his estimates last year, no better advocate can be found. Whoever listens to him, feels convinced that even with a poor case something good will turn up, providing that his pleadings are sufficiently stretched out and loud—to bury the contentious voices, thus leading all to believe that he is right. Now that we are dealing with the Marine Department, the Government, to defend its policy, chooses one of its friends, the hon. member for St. Lawrence, the present Minister of Marine. I must say to the Government, that they were not so happy in their choice, for since the Minister of Marine is at the head of that department, he has shown, I shall not say inability, but has not given proof of the same foresight, sagacity and experience, that he has shown for his own interest and that of companies, such as the Sherwin-Williams and others of which he was a director, or a shareholder. I might even say, if I wished to be a little harsh, that the hon. minister is a flaw, the stumbling-block in the Government, and the sooner he will disappear, the better it will be, not only for the Government, but for the whole country.

When we weigh what he has accomplished, and consider his policy and the results which have followed, he can be termed a perfect cipher.

The hon. minister is of much importance, perhaps too much. This is the reason why he is unable to bring to the administration of this department, all the vigour and energy that one should expect from the head of so important a department. For this reason I refuse to vote the item of $8,000,000—which he asks this evening. This, I do in the interest of my county and my constituents, also in the interest of my province and in order to be faithful to the mandate which has been entrusted to me.

Mr. RINFRET: The hour is late, but I think with such a large amount of money involved and in the face of a policy which is so little in accord with good sense and public spirit, we had better accept the challenge of hon. members on the other side and possibly sit here over night rather than let this item pass. First of all, I desire to challenge the opinion expressed by the Minister of Marine that this policy is endorsed not only by Parliament but also by the people of Canada.

Some hon. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

Mr. RINFRET: We are not in a hurry. It is very remarkable, Mr. Chairman, that we have a Government so boastful of public support when speaking in this House and yet so little anxious to go to the polls.

Mr. BALLANTYNE: We will give the hon. member a chance in Yamaska county very soon.

Mr. CASGRAIN: The sooner the better.

Mr. RINFRET: We want that chance not only in Yamaska county but in the whole country.

Mr. LALOR: We will give you a chance and show you fellows a trick or two before we get through.

Mr. CASGRAIN: You will not come back.

Mr. RINFRET: We have given the Government many opportunities during the session to consult the people. We first of all asked the Government to accept an amendment to go to the country but it was refused by hon. members opposite.

Mr. BLAKE: Mr. Chairman, I rise to a point of order.

Mr. RINFRET: Then we offered an amendment on another occasion—

The CHAIRMAN: Order.

Mr. BLAKE: I rise to a point of order. The hour is late and I think the hon. member should speak to the question before the committee.

Mr. DUFF: I wish to speak for a few minutes on that point of order, Mr. Chairman If I understand the point raised by the hon. member for North
2 a.m. Winnipeg correctly, it is that the hon. member for St. James Division of Montreal was not speaking to the question before the committee. It seems to me that the point of order is not well taken, for although the hon. member did not keep perhaps as close to the subject under discussion as he should have, it was because of the fact that the hon. Minister of Marine in his usual manner interjected a remark with regard to Yamaska.

Mr. PECK: (from the seat of the leader of the Opposition): Mr. Chairman, speaking to the point of order—

Mr. CASGRAIN: The official leader of the Opposition!

Mr. PECK: No. Speaking to the point of order raised by my hon. friend from North Winnipeg, although the House is in very good humour I think we would get along with these items much better if parties on both sides of the House would cease interruptions. I am one of those who cannot agree with my very good friend from Shelburne and Queen's—for whom I have the very highest regard—as to shortening the hours; I think we should lengthen them. I am going to see this debate finished and the item passed. Good humour is all right, but speaking unofficially for the leader of the Opposition, I think we should get along very well if we did not interrupt.

The CHAIRMAN: Before giving any ruling upon the point of order, I must direct attention to the fact that the remarks of the hon. member for Lunenburg (Mr. Duff) and of the hon. member for Skeena (Mr. Peck) were not relevant to the point of order raised by the hon. member for North Winnipeg (Mr. Blake). Coming to the point of order itself, the Chair regrets that it was not paying sufficient attention to the remarks of the hon. member for St. James (Mr. Rinfret) to declare whether the rule should be applied in the present instance. But in theory the point raised by the hon. member for North Winnipeg is certainly well taken, and I am sure that the hon. member for St. James will adhere strictly to the question under consideration.

Mr. RINFRET: Mr. Chairman—

Mr. SINCLAIR (Guysborough): Mr. Chairman, I would like to know by what authority the hon. member for Skeena (Mr. Peck) is professing to act as leader of the Opposition?

The CHAIRMAN: Mr. Rinfret.

Mr. RINFRET: I have so much to say about the question under consideration that I am perfectly willing to bow to your ruling. I would express the wish that the Chair would pay a little attention to what

I say; I think that would be very proper even at this late hour.

Now, the Minister of Marine has said that this policy has been endorsed by the people. I was endeavouring to show that the Government had given the people no chance whatever to endorse this policy, when I was called to order. I do not regret the incident, because this discussion has brought to this side of the House a member who usually sits on the other side, the hon. member for Skeena (Mr. Peck) —and he seems to enjoy it. While it is two o'clock in Ottawa it is only around ten o'clock in Prince Rupert and probably that is why the hon. gentleman is so cheerful.

Coming back to this item, I share the view of the hon. member for Red Deer (Mr. Clark) that this was not altogether a war measure. The minister made that very plain to-night when he said that while he laid down his policy as to building steel ships as if the war was going to last forever, he was more cautious when it came to wooden ships. In another part of his speech he said that at the conclusion of the war we would not have known what to do with the wooden ships and he boasted that he had been clever enough to prevent this country from spending any money on this class of ships. I would say that if he had been a little more cautious, possibly he would also have refrained from engaging this country in such an extensive steel shipbuilding programme. It will be seen that although my hon. friend was at that time under the impression that the war might last quite long and that it was imperative that shipbuilding must go on, he was exercising some discretion as to the quality and character of the ships. I repeat that had he been as cautious with regard to steel as he was with regard to wood, we would be better off to-day.

I may add that I do not share the minister's optimism as to the outcome of this venture. Possibly it is because we on this side have been unsuccessful in obtaining information, although we have made a great effort to obtain it. The minister himself has said to-night that he does not know much about this venture, and that he does not care to know anything about it. He said he was not going to inquire from the management where they bought their coal, butter, milk and so on. I do not feel that way at all, Mr. Chairman. I think we should know from the management not only where they get their coal, but where they get the deficit which we have to face to-day.

My hon. friend admits that other countries have a surplus of ships, and he says that is an excuse for our being in the same position. But the trouble is that other countries have been engaged in shipbuilding for some time while this country seems to have chosen as the time to build the very time when it was imperative not to do so. That is an altogether different situation. As to the surplus which my hon. friend claims, I think he should give his secret to the hon. Minister of Railways. But if we get back to good book-keeping I do not think the hon. minsiter can claim any surplus. It has been shown that the best claim he can make is a return of some two per cent on the capital investment. We know that the Government borrowed money from the Canadian people at the rate of five and one-half per cent and that the securities for these loans are exempt from taxation to the extent of one billion three hundred and some millions. The Government, therefore, in investing a portion of that money in their shipbuilding programme and obtaining a return of some two per cent—which is much disputed, but that is their own figure—are not only using money on which they are paying five and one-half per cent interest, but are using the amount of the income tax return as well. So that the claiming of a surplus under these circumstances indicates a very great degree of optimism. I am inclined to repeat something I heard my good friend from Waterloo say the other day in Montreal: that if the minister can claim a surplus in the face of all the facts relating to his shipbuilding programme, he is entitled to open a sunshine factory with cucumbers as his raw material.

The member for Brantford (Mr. Cockshutt) has endeavoured to give us some opinions of the press which, he says, show that the people are very appreciative indeed of this policy of the Government. When he started out he gave us the impression that he was going to quote Liberal newspapers which were emphatically in support of this policy, but he confined himself to a few Tory newspapers which were trying very hard indeed to find the least bit of common-sense in it. He started out with the Sydney Post, which could not say anything better in support of my hon. friend's policy than that it was less disastrous than the railway policy. It did not say the policy was a good one, but expressed the view that it was not as bad as another policy which was worse. Then he quoted the Winnipeg Tribune, which simply said that the policy was not

too bad when compared with that of other countries. Again the policy itself was not endorsed; the view was expressed that the condition here was no worse than somewhere else. He then went to the Vancouver Province, another Tory paper, which said not that the policy was right, but that it had a redeeming feature; it gave employment to returned soldiers. So with the Hamilton Spectator, which never dreamed of being a Liberal journal, and so with the Mail and Empire, which has just absorbed another Toronto paper and is also a good, strong Tory journal. So that the Liberal press opinions put forward by the hon. member for Brantford amount to the views of a few Tory papers, not endorsing the policy, but stating in one case that it is not as bad as something else, and in another that it is less disastrous than the railway policy.

Mr. BALLANTYNE: The hon. member knows that La Presse is the largest newspaper in Canada, having a circulation like 140,000 copies a day. Would he mind quoting what La Presse has to say editorially on this subject?

Mr. RINFRET: I have read recently the editorial columns of La Presse, and its expressions of opinion with regard to the railway and shipping problems indicate to me that it is perplexed as to what attitude to take.

Now, I wish to quote the words of the president of the Royal bank, Sir Herbert Holt, with regard to this matter. He says:

> Government control has practically disappeared during the year just past—wheat, paper and sugar being the commodities to be freed from regulation. Government ownership of transportation systems has developed. Without any advantage to the public in efficiency or rates, the operation of our national railways during the last twelve months has resulted in a loss which will probably more than absorb the amounts collected on Excess Profits and Income Taxes for the year 1919. Unless Government methods of operation are more efficient in this country than they have been in others tax payers in Canada may find the maintenance of their railroads and fleet more expensive than pension charges and other legacies of the war combined.

An hon. MEMBER: Order.

Mr. RINFRET: If the hon. gentleman wishes to rise to a point of order. I will listen to him with great pleasure. I see there is nothing of the kind.

Mention has been made of the Montreal Gazette during this debate; but for some reason or another, perhaps because the House was not in a listening mood, no quotation from the Montreal Gazette has been placed on Hansard, so far as I know. I have in my hand an editorial which is not very long and which is interesting, and I will crave the indulgence of the House and that of the minister in particular while I read it.

Mr. BALLANTYNE: I am in no hurry, and I may say that we on this side of the House are in no hurry at all, so that the hon. member can take just as long as he likes.

Mr. RINFRET: I am very glad to hear that. I think we cannot be accused of delaying the debate. What we would like to do would be to delay the shipbuilding, but it is unfortunately too late to do that. This article is headed: "The Canadian Marine," and it is from the Montreal Gazette of December 9, 1920:

> The building and operating of ships is precarious business for governments to engage in, more so than the construction and management of railways, because in the case of the latter there can at least be some permanence of rates. The war gave immense impetus to the shipbuilding industry, both from the urgent demand for ships to transport men and supplies and by reason of the large losses caused by submarines. Cost of construction doubled and trebled, and more than one government felt it necessary to supplement private yards with public plants. Now, the inevitable has happened.

As we predicted.

> There is a glut of ships. The tonnage of the world at nearly 60,000,000 tons is much the largest of record, and this at a time when the foreign commerce of many countries has been checked by depreciation of currency and the contraction of credit. Freight rates are falling. So expeditiously and easily can ships be sent over every sea to every port that water transportation costs conform quickly to the law of supply and demand, and there seems bound to be considerable loss in the future in the inventory value and operating results of vessels built at the peak of prices.
>
> Canada had developed a considerable shipbuilding industry, the principal customer of which has been the Government The Government will in a few months possess a mercantile navy of 63 vessels, quite a formidable fleet, constructed in Canada, and having an aggregate tonnage of 386,140 tons.

I would commend this to the attention of the minister, but I am sorry that he is not in his place.

Mr. BALLANTYNE: He is here.

Mr. RINFRET: I apologize to my good friend; I never like to speak when he is out of my sight; but I will read a little louder so that the sound of my voice will reach where he sits now:

The policy of procuring ships was a war policy, and it is very doubtful whether in other circumstances it would have been entered upon; so that while there was ready and adequate justification for the creation of a fleet, it is by no means certain that it should be continued as a Government activity, much less enlarged in number. Last year the nineteen Canadian Government vessels then afloat made an operating profit of $1,056,767 from completed voyages, and a further profit of $350,000 was estimated from open voyages, making a total profit of $1,406,000 on operating account.

Some hon. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

Mr. RINFRET: Here again I may interject that these are the figures given by the Government, and for many reasons and particularly for the reason that we are not given any information, I personally take no responsibility whatever for what I am reading. I continue quoting from the Gazette, and I hope my hon. friends have not missed a word, because I am quite ready to start over again if anything has failed to reach their understanding. The Gazette says:

Interest on capital and depreciation must, however, be provided for, and the failure so to do is a notable omission in the annual report of the Canadian Government Merchant Marine, Limited.

I am waiting for the applause of hon. gentlemen opposite.

Mr. LALOR: There is nothing of much note yet.

Mr. RINFRET (reading):

The money invested in the ships costs Canada 5½ per cent, and depreciation in the case of ships is a serious item, so that when all the charges are taken into account the fleet will be found to have entailed loss.

Just what we are claiming to-night.

The retention of the fleet in Government control is a purely business problem The ships are linked up closely with the National Railway System, and the report of the directors contains the statement that the fleet of the Merchant marine forms a most important ally to the National System of railways, and enables the railway to obtain large through shipments of freight to Atlantic and Pacific ports which would be lost to the National System if it were not for the steamship connections of the Canadian Government Merchant Marine Limited.

The last paragraph is a quotation from the Government report made by the Gazette. The Gazette goes on:

We are somewhat sceptical of this statement for the reason ships may be chartered without the expense of capital investment, and that chartered ships can be operated quite as economically as Government-owned vessels. The directors, cognizant of the change in conditions, warn the public that the Government marine is not to be regarded as a money-making proposition, in these words:—

"Having regard to the fact that all of your company's vessels have been built since the war began, the cost of construction has been much higher than prevailed before hostilities, so that the interest, depreciation and insurance expenses on your vessels are much higher than obtains on those of your competitors whose fleets, even after taking into consideration their new tonnage would not nearly equal per ton dead weight the cost of the fleet of the Canadian Government Merchant Marine Limited. Your vessels will also be competing on some trades against vessels carrying foreign crews. It will be seen, therefore, that while a satisfactory business is being done—

The Government is speaking, of course.

—and much new trade developed, large profits should not be looked for."

Then the Gazette continues:

The considerations counselling a cessation of new building are that the ships are unprofitable, and that they serve no purpose not equally to be secured by charter of by alliance with private steamship companies. The United States Government, very prudently we think, has terminated its war policy of public ownership and operation, and is disposing of its fleet, and in matters of business the Americans are shrewd. There is, indeed, something inspiring in the existence of a fleet of Government ships sailing the seven seas, and extending the commerce of Canada to the four corners of the earth, always provided the sentiment does not involve heavy cost and heavy taxation, for it should be remembered that the loss on the fleet falls on the pockets of the Canadian people.

I could quote from other papers, but I think this puts the case very clearly. I regret that the Government has adopted with regard to the national railways and the merchant marine the policy of not giving information to the House. The reason given by the Government for this policy is that it would not be good business to disclose to the competitors of the Government system its administrative methods, but is it not extraordinary to hear that given as a reason, Mr. Chairman, when we remember that the competitor to the state-owned railways and the Government merchant marine is the Canadian Pacific Railway Company, whose brilliant and effective methods of administration have brought that company to such a brilliant success? However, as the Government persists in not giving information to the House, either on the railways or the merchant marine, I think that we on this side of the House are perfectly justified in trying to get the information and discussing the items before the committee to the extreme limit. As far as I am concerned, I wish to place myself on record as being absolutely opposed to the Government's policy. I think the Government should be censured for ever having embarked upon this shipbuilding pro-

gramme, and not only should it be stopped immediately as regards the building of new ships, but the Government should dispose of its present fleet at the earliest opportunity.

Mr. CAHILL: How much does the minister expect to have to spend to complete the contracts in Toronto that are let on this cost plus 15 per cent basis?

Mr. BALLANTYNE: I do not expect it will cost more than $180 per ton, because labour costs are down, but I do not want to make any positive statement.

Mr. CAHILL: What will be the total still to be expended?

Mr. BALLANTYNE: The original contract price was $630,000 per ship, and there has been paid $409,500. I could only give an estimate of the balance. It would cost, I should suppose, about $230,000 to $250,000 to finish each ship.

Mr. CAHILL: When the ships are completed, does the minister think he could get as much for them in the market as he will have to spend to complete them?

Mr. BALLANTYNE: It is not the Government's policy to dispose of its ships.

Mr. CAHILL: The people of this country are more interested in where this money is going than in the Government's policy. Would it not be good business for the minister to cancel these orders? What is the purpose of expending this money on a cost plus 15 per cent basis when the minister apparently has no control over the company in the matter of expenditure?

Mr. BALLANTYNE: One of the principle reasons why the Government went on with the building of these ships—there are many reasons but I shall not detain the committee to give them—was that there was a large number of men out of work in the city of Toronto, and although the Government knew they could not get the same efficiency out of men in the depth of winter, with these boats all exposed, we went on with the work to give bread and butter to our returned men, who were clamouring for employment.

Mr. CAHILL: Were the men who were getting the 15 per cent plus, which would amount to something over $60,000 particularly hungry?

Mr. BALLANTYNE: I am not speaking of him, because like my hon. friend from Pontiac, he possesses plenty. I was speaking of the hundreds of men who were clamouring for employment. I happened to be in Toronto at the time and I know there was a very serious unemployment situation there.

(The continuation of the debate will appear in a later issue.)

Tuesday, April 12, 1921.

Mr. CAHILL: Under those circumstances would it not have been better to distribute the money to these unemployed rather than give it to the contractors on a cost plus basis? Who is this firm that is getting this $60,000 for overseeing the work?

Mr. BALLANTYNE: The Collingwood Shipbuilding Company.

Mr. CAHILL: Does the minister propose to spend any more of this $8,000,000 in that way, giving 15 per cent, plus, for the finishing of ships?

Mr. BALLANTYNE: As I said in the earlier part of the night, we have only two ship companies in Canada that failed, one at Prince Rupert, and the other at Toronto. The company at Prince Rupert received 8 per cent and the other company 15 per cent.

Mr. DUFF: Why do you pay one contractor 15 per cent and another 8 per cent? It seems to me that 8 per cent is high enough.

Mr. BALLANTYNE: I differ from my hon. friend there. I may say that the Wallace Shipbuilding Company, after they agreed to finish the ships at 8 per cent, sent a man here for the purpose of getting out of the arrangement, because they thought there was an immense amount of material yet to be purchased, and they were figuring a large sum to be spent on material as well as labour. Had they known that such a small amount of material was to be purchased they would not have quoted 8 per cent. Fifteen per cent was the best price we could get in eastern Canada.

Mr. DUFF: If I understand the situation, the contractor gets 8 per cent on everything he buys, on every cent of wages he pays out, and on every bit of material he provides. All he does is to oversee the work. Now, on one contract in Toronto where the minister says there is $221,000 yet to be spent, the contractor would get $30,000 for overseeing the building of that

ship. It seems to me that my hon. friend is mistaken when he says that that is not a goodly sum to pay out. If the answers he gave me with regard to the Prince Rupert contract are correct, the amounts due on these two contracts total something like a million or a million and a quarter, and 8 per cent on that, it seems to me, is quite a respectable sum. The minister thinks that 8 per cent is rather small. When one looks over the Auditor General's report for the last four or five years and sees the exorbitant prices which the Government has paid to certain shipyards in the country to build destroyers and other boats, it will be obvious why the minister says that this is not a large percentage; but in my opinion, and in the opinion of people who know something about these contracts, 8 per cent over and above the cost of everything that goes into the building of ships, as well as labour, is a fairly good commission for shipbuilders to get.

Mr. McGIBBON (Muskoka): I have listened all night and into the morning with great patience to the discussion of these Estimates. I have listened on many occasions to the member for Pontiac (Mr. Cahill) and the member for Lunenburg (Mr. Duff) discussing, from a theoretical point of view, the issues that are before the House to-night.

An hon. MEMBER: This morning.

Mr. McGIBBON: This morning, rather; and even at 2.45 a.m. I am persuaded that it is still possible for me to tell those hon. members a few things.

An hon. MEMBER: What are they?

Mr. McGIBBON: Be patient and you will hear them. It is quite apparent to everyone on both sides of the House that hon. members opposite have been greatly disappointed by the showing that has been made by the minister. Throughout the length and breadth of the country, newspapers favourable to the Opposition have led the people to believe that they were to expect another financial spectacle such as we had in connection with the Government railways, and ever since the Minister of Marine submitted his report to the House, we have seen the bitter disappointment on the faces of members of the Opposition. They have come here expecting something that they could turn to advantage, and being disappointed, they are trying to bolster up a weak case. The hon. member for Lunenburg and the member for Pontiac—I want them to mark this—refuse to accept the minister's word when he says that after the armistice this work was carried on, to a great extent, to give employment to returned soldiers. I quite understand that the member for Lunenburg and the member for Pontiac had no sympathy with that undertaking.

Some hon. MEMBER: Order.

Mr. DUFF: Order. Mr. Chairman, the hon. member for Muskoka (Mr. McGibbon), has made the statement that the member for Lunenburg and the member for Pontiac had no sympathy with the returned soldiers. I ask that the statement be withdrawn.

Mr. McGIBBON: That is what I said.

Some hon. MEMBERS: Order.

Some hon. MEMBERS: Take it back.

The CHAIRMAN (Mr. Peck): I do not think that the expression is out of order. The hon. member for Muskoka does not, I suppose, intend to cast any reflection on any hon. members.

Some hon. MEMBERS: Order.

Mr. CAHILL: I do not wish to dispute your ruling, Mr. Chairman, but the statement was quite plain, and perhaps you did not catch it. What was said was undoubtedly a reflection on the members to whom it had reference.

The CHAIRMAN (Mr. Peck): I would ask the hon. member for Muskoka to withdraw any remark that casts a reflection on hon. members.

Mr. McGIBBON (Muskoka): With the greatest humility, Mr. Chairman, I bow to your decision, but I may take the privilege of placing before the House the record of the hon. member for Lunenburg.

Mr. DUFF: Go to it; come on.

Mr. COPP: We challenge you to do it.

Mr. McGIBBON: On another occasion.

Mr. DUFF: Do it now; come on.

Mr. COPP: You dare not do it.

Mr. McGIBBON: It takes better stuff than the hon. member for Lunenburg to tell me that I dare not do it.

The CHAIRMAN (Mr. Peck): I must ask the hon. member for Muskoka and other hon. members to keep their temper. I trust no reflections will be cast on any hon. member; I do not do it myself.

Mr. McGIBBON: I have not the least intention of reflecting on anyone, but if the hon. member's record in the House constitutes a reflection on himself it is no fault of mine.

Mr. SEGUIN: (Translation.) Mr. Chairman, I would raise a point of order. I question whether the hon. member is justified, at this stage of the debate, in attacking other members and not to discuss the question which is before the House. I should like to have your decision on this point.

Mr. RINFRET: (Translation.) Mr. Chairman, before you give your decision, I should like to discuss the point of order. I do not think that the Chairman can claim that the hon members. . . . . .

Some hon. MEMBERS: Order, order.

Mr. McGIBBON (Muskoka): Mr. Chairman, I must object to this interruption. If hon. members have any questions to ask me, let them do so.

Mr. RINFRET: I am speaking to the point of order. In doing so, I am speaking in French, as is my right. If the hon. gentleman cannot understand me, while it is no reflection on him, it is his fault, and he cannot deprive me of the privilege of addressing the House in the language I am using.

Mr. RINFRET: (Translation.) My argument, Mr. Chairman, is as follows: An hon. member claims that other members of the House have no sympathy for the soldiers, the president of the committee cannot rule that this is not derogatory to their honour. I believe, on the contrary, that the president, must take the view that when a member accuses another of not having had any sympathy for our soldiers, he has made a serious charge, which he should retract.

The CHAIRMAN (Mr. Peck): After the decision of the Chair has been given it cannot be criticized. Therefore I would ask the hon. member for Muskoka to proceed with his speech, but he must be good enough to refrain from indulging in any personal reflections and thus render less difficult the duty of the Chair.

Mr. McGIBBON: It is a great pleasure Mr. Chairman, for me to submit to your ruling. I have been a member of this House four years and I have never intentionally transgressed any of its rules. I have always, to the best of my ability, extended courtesy to every hon. member but, Mr. Chairman, there are limits beyond which courtesy cannot be extended. There are times when patience ceases to be a virtue; and at three o'clock in the morning we have had rehashing of old articles and a recourse to old tactics which amounts to nothing more or less than obstruction. The time has come when we should have a show-down, and if any hon. members want their record to be placed on Hansard I am quite prepared to take up the challenge and see that that is done no matter who may be hurt.

Mr. DUFF: All right go ahead and put it on record.

Mr. McGIBBON: Having said that, I want to congratulate the Minister of Marine on the broad-minded policy that he conceived and laid before the people of this country. I want to congratulate him on the success which has characterized that policy up to the present hour, and I have not the least doubt that for that policy the future holds prospects equally as bright. Some hon. gentlemen opposite have a very short memory. I ask the hon. member for Pontiac (Mr. Cahill) what would have happened had the war gone on for another eight or ten months? We know that the enemy would have won the war, because the destruction of merchant vessels was so far outrunning the building of tonnage that we would not have kept pace with it. Does any hon. member here to-night deny that? If he does he had better go and consult the records. I tell hon. gentlemen that had the destruction continued for another eight months at the rate it was progressing, the British Empire, and its Allies, would have lost the war on that very ground alone. Are we to condemn the Government of Canada for taking the necessary precautions to try and supply the deficiency in ships caused by the destruction of tonnage that was going on and in order to help us to win the war? Without ships we could not have moved a man and could not have moved a pound of freight. If hon. members opposite do not know that, they had better delve a little into the history of the last five years and ascertain the facts for themselves. If we had lost the war what would have happened? Would hon. members have been here to-night quibbling over the expenditure of a few millions of money spent in pursuing a policy that was imperatively necessary. It is a travesty on parliamentary procedure that we should be kept here until three o'clock in the morning debat-

ing about the expenditure of a few millions of dollars upon the construction of a merchant marine that was intended to play an important part in helping to win the war. It is a travesty on our intelligence and our patriotism. Let hon. gentlemen search history a little if they will and what will they find? How has England kept up her balance of trade for the last thirty, forty or fifty years? By pushing her merchant marine and her commerce into unknown lands. Let my hon. friends take up the exports of Great Britain to the United States, to Germany or to any of the other countries that are under protection and what will they find? That during the years I have mentioned those exports were diminishing and her balance of trade was only kept up by opening up fresh avenues of trade with South America and other unprotected countries. What would she have done if she had not had a merchant marine available for that purpose? Are we so short-sighted that we cannot see beyond the present hour? Is it to be thought that our merchant marine has no more prospective value to Canada, and that it ought to be scrapped? Do people think that the trade to be derived in future by pushing into foreign markets is of no value to Canada? I advise hon. gentlemen opposite who indulge in such criticism to study the trade statistics, and ascertain what has already been done in that line and what the prospects are for the future. Let them enlarge their vision and let them conceive of Canada as a nation. Let them conceive of the Canadian people as a nation equal to any on the face of God's earth. How are we going to achieve that trade expension which we all hope to see if we have not the means of carrying our products to the seven seas of the world? Mr. Chairman, I have listened for days—not only during the present session but in former years—to the utterances of the member for Lunenburg (Mr. Duff) and the member for Pontiac (Mr. Cahill) and I have gone out of the House wondering whether we are children or whether we are men. I say to hon. members—and I do not very often take up the time of the House—for God's sake broaden your vision, get a true conception of the nation and its status, lift your eyes above the horizon of Canada—yes, above the horizon of the British Empire—and look at these questions from a broad national standpoint and see if Canadians cannot take their place as one of the great nations in the world. When you do that, and when you push your commerce into the seven seas of the world you will not spend time until three o'clock in the morning worrying about whether we have a return of two and a half or three per cent interest on your money. For Heaven's sake, is there nothing bigger or brighter in a nation's outlook, or in a nation's ideal, to discuss than to be quibbling over a few dollars? Was it dollars that made the British Empire? Was it dollars that saved the world in the great struggle from which we emerged in 1918, or was it patriotism? Was it the ideals that men cherished or was it mere quibbling over petty issues? What are you going to pin your faith to if you lack ideals, or lack belief in the nation's future? To me it is inconceivable that we should be kept here until this late hour of the morning squabbling over the petty issue as to whether we have got two and a half per cent or five per cent return on our money, when the great issue is before us of what we are going to do to build up our country. What are we standing here for to-night—for a nation within the British Empire, or for that small parochial colonialism that we hear so much about from the hon. member for Lunenburg that is bound up, I was going to say within the four walls of a ship.

Mr. DUFF: Do you stand for the Canadian Government Merchant Marine?

Mr. McGIBBON: Sure I do. I stand for anything that is going to make Canada a nation. You cannot make Canada a nation without a merchant marine. You may lose a few million dollars, but is it not worth something to carry the commerce of Canada to the four corners of the earth? Are you going to measure that in dollars and cents? I say, Mr. Chairman, for God's sake—

Some hon. MEMBERS: Order.

Mr. McGIBBON: —let us forget this parochialism, let us get down to business, let us conceive of Canada as a nation, and let us deal with our national affairs accordingly.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: Shall the item carry?

Mr. COPP: No, Mr. Chairman. I am going to address myself to the Chair, if I may have the privilege. My hon. friend from Muskoka (Mr. McGibbon) has devoted some time to the subject of what we should do to make Canada a nation. I do not propose to pursue that line, as it seems to me that it is entirely out of

order, but if we ever wanted any evidence to prove the necessity of the motion made by my hon. friend from Shelburne and Queen's this afternoon for an adjournment of the House at a reasonable hour, we have it before us to-night. However, that is not for me to discuss at the moment. We are to-night discussing a very large and very important item in the Estimates. Such business is usually treated by hon. gentlemen in a serious and considerate manner, but although this is one of the largest individual items very little, if any, consideration is being given to it by my hon. friends opposite. The Minister of Marine has asked us to vote $8,330,000 for the completion, as he says, of the Canadian Government Merchant Marine. It is useless at this time to argue what should have been done at the outset, but it is not too late to consider what should be done now. In the statement which he made to the House last week I find that forty-seven vessels are in commission and, as he would say, sailing the seven seas. Apparently he takes a great deal of credit to the company to whom he has handed these vessels over for operation because they have made a profit, as he claims of 2.35 per cent over operating expenses.

Mr. BALLANTYNE: No. The operating profit which I gave a few moments ago was $1,400,000 odd.

Mr. COPP: But what percentage?

Mr. BALLANTYNE: I understood the hon. gentleman to give the profit as an operating profit. The operating profit is $1,400,000 odd.

Mr. COPP: That is the way you put it in your statement:

> I wish to point out that these net earnings are before providing for interest, and the above amount of net earnings, $781,460.09 is equal to 2.35 per cent interest on notes given to the Government for the full cost of the ships.

Mr. BALLANTYNE: But that is not the operating profit.

Mr. COPP: That is the profit amounting to 2.35 per cent on the cost of the vessels, as I understand that statement.

Mr. BALLANTYNE: After providing for all operating and overhead expenses, depreciation, etc.

Mr. COPP: My hon. friend may find the argument of some success as far as he and his friends are concerned, but I cannot see how he can figure that we have made a profit on the operation of these vessels until he is able to show that interest and all fixed charges have been paid. My hon. friend gives reasons why he embarked on this shipbuilding industry, the main reason being to provide work for returned soldiers. That was a most worthy motive. But if that was so, I would like to know what the minister thinks of the recent dismissal of seven or eight hundred men from the Canadian National Railway shops at Moncton, the majority of whom are returned soldiers. Surely the same broad sympathy should be extended to those men and others elsewhere, although there has been a deficit in the operation of the Canadian Government railways. In referring to the shipbuilding industry, a moment ago my hon. friend said that we on this side of the House hoped that we will have another "financial spectacle" as we had in respect to the government railways. It is a "financial spectacle," Mr. Chairman, and it behooves all hon. gentlemen, I care not on which side of your Chair they sit, to try and work out the best arrangement possible to meet present conditions. That cannot be done while we are indulging in threats and challenges such as have been thrown across the floor of the House to-night. I can readily understand that my hon. friend can argue that it would be unreasonable to sell these vessels at the present time and go out of the shipping business, but so far as I am concerned—and I do not profess to be an expert in these matters—I can foresee that we are going to have in this shipbuilding industry, if we can dignify it by that name, another failure next year, and that that failure will be repeated year after year, piling deficit upon deficit, just the same as is happening now in the operation of our Canadian National railways.

3 a.m.

We had that before us when my hon. friend embarked on this—I was going to say tragedy; when he embarked on this undertaking. We had the example of the Canadian Government Railways with a deficit year after year, yet my hon. friend saw fit to hand out this dole of fifteen per cent over and above cost to the ship-building concerns in Montreal and elsewhere—and he comes back here and tells us he did it because he hoped to give employment to returned soldiers. If that is so, did he assume any responsibility as to the wages these men should receive? I would like to see the country relieved from the terrible burden which has been imposed upon

it, and I suggest that if my hon. friend consulted and accepted the advice of reliable business men, he would be doing the country a service. He knows such men, many of them, in the city of Montreal; he knows their business capacity and qualifications, and their counsel might be of value. We launched out into this undertaking without proper thought, without proper study, without proper consideration. We have lost money, but to many people to-day a few millions is as nothing; we have come to think in large amounts. I say that we should get back to normal. We should cease thinking in terms of hundreds of millions and get back to a little horse-sense, if I may use the term. Let us not go on drifting until it is too late. I say to my hon. friends opposite that I am serious in this matter; I do not desire to talk politics.

Some hon. MEMBERS: Oh, oh.

Mr. COPP: Hon. gentlemen do not seem to understand the conscientious expression of opinion without reference to politics. That attitude on their part is easily explained, because with the exception of the minister himself not one gentleman opposite has paid the slightest attention to the item that has been before the committee for consideration since yesterday afternoon. My hon. friends opposite should realize that they have as much responsibility as any other hon. member of this House in the matter of seeing that the Minister of Marine is granted only sufficient money properly to carry on the business of the country with due regard to the country's interests and not with a view to continuing the extravagance which has been going on during the past two years.

Mr. CASGRAIN: I find at page 31, on the last line of the annual report of the Department of Railways and Canals of Canada, for the fiscal year dating April 1 to March 31, 1920, the following words:

"CONTROLLED COMPANIES"

"Canadian Government Merchant Marine, Limited".

(Translation): I would like the hon. Minister of Marine to tell me who are the shareholders in this company and when it was incorporated.

Mr. BALLANTYNE: This was a subsidiary company created by the Government in order that the House and the people generally might know what profit or what loss was the result of the operations of the ships. In doing that we followed the example of the Canadian Pacific Railway Company in connection with their ocean service.

Mr. CASGRAIN: (Translation.) I would now like to know who are the shareholders of the company and who is its president?

Mr. BALLANTYNE: The Government, I think.

Mr. CASGRAIN: (Translation.) Who is the president of the company?

Mr. BALLANTYNE: The King.

Mr. CASGRAIN: (Translation.) Where is the head office of the company?

Mr. BALLANTYNE: At Toronto.

Mr. CASGRAIN: (Translation.) I wish to thank the Minister of Marine for his kind information, because I had no knowledge of the facts concerning the incorporation of this company; I knew that a limited company had been incorporated, but I did not have the information which the hon. minister has just given me. I am happy to learn that His Majesty the King is president of the company and that the public are the shareholders. I see that not only do we own the shares, but that we have all the responsibility and deficits as well.

I would now like to know from the hon. minister—I also read on page 31, the following:

Constituent and subsidiary companies comprised in the Canadian Railway system —sub-title: Constituent companies.

The Canadian Northern Railway Company.

The Canadian Northern Ontario Railway Company

The Canadian Northern Quebec Railway Company

Mount Royal Tunnel and Terminal Company, Limited.

Canadian Northern Pacific Railway Company

Canadian Northern Alberta Railway Company

Canadian Northern Western Railway Company

The Canadian Northern Saskatchewan Railway Company

Central Ontario.

The Canadian Northern Manitoba Railway Company

Duluth, Winnipeg and Pacific Railway Company

Duluth, Winnipeg and Pacific Railroad Company

Duluth, Rainy Lake and Winnipeg Railway Company

Mr. BALLANTYNE: I rise to a point of order. We are not on the Railway Estimates and I cannot see how my hon. friend is in order on the Ship-building vote in reading the names of all these subsidiary railway companies.

Mr. CASGRAIN: (Translation.) This is to show what relation the three paragraphs have to one another. I read at the head of page 31: "Constituent and subsidiary companies comprised in the Canadian Northern Railway system." I wished to enumerate the constituent companies. Further on, I read: Subsidiary companies, which is another class of companies, and still further on, under the caption "Controlled companies," we have "The Canadian Government Merchant Marine, Limited." I thought I was entitled to enumerate the various companies making up the entity or class termed "Constituent companies," as well as others which make up the other class known as "Subsidiary companies," and also that which is designated under the name "Controlled Company." I should like to know in virtue of what this company has been classed under that designation. I think the question I have put to the minister is quite in order.

The CHAIRMAN: (Translation.) I understood the point of order was decided by the very fact that the hon. gentleman had put his question, but I take it now that he has not yet got an answer from the minister.

Mr. CASGRAIN: (Translation.) What I wish to know is just this: I spoke of "Constituent Companies," and under the caption "Subsidiary Companies," I mentioned "The Canadian National Telegraph Co.", "The Great North-Western Telegraph Co. of Canada." and several other companies, and under the last caption "Controlled companies," I mentioned "The Canadian Government Merchant Marine, Limited." I should like to know under the authority of what Order in Council, of what Act, or other enactment, that company "The Canadian Government Merchant Marine, Limited," was placed under the control of the "Canadian Northern Railway System."

Mr. CAHILL: Has the minister a copy of the contract with the Collingwood Shipbuilding Company of the cost plus basis?

[Mr. Casgrain.]

Mr. CASGRAIN: There is a point of Order.

The CHAIRMAN: I understand the hon. member has a perfect right to ask under what Order in Council or what law or what Statute this Company was placed under the direction of the Canadian National Railways Company; but the Chair is helpless; the Chair cannot oblige the minister to give an answer unless he so desires.

Mr. CASGRAIN: With your permission, I will translate.

Mr. BALLANTYNE: It is not necessary.

Mr. CASGRAIN: I see at the end of page 31, controlling company, Canadian Government Merchant Marine, Limited. I would like to know by what Order in Council or law, or if there is no Order in Council or law, by what Act or deed the Canadian Government Merchant Marine, Limited, came under the control of the Canadian National Railways system?

Mr. BALLANTYNE: The Government own all of the stock, as my hon. friend well knows. I am quite prepared to stand for loss of time. I can quite understand what the hon. gentleman is at. What he wants to do is to kill time; it is not information he wants.

Mr. CASGRAIN. We are serious.

Mr. BALLANTYNE: So am I, but the night is young. I am afraid I cannot agree with the hon. gentleman about his seriousness, but I will try to be a little more serious than he is and tell him that the Government own this company and the company was created by Order in Council, as he well knows.

Mr. CASGRAIN: (Translation.) That makes it clear to me that the company has been constituted under the Order in Council which has just been quoted to me, but that does not tell me by what authority that company has been placed under the control of the Canadian Railway system.

Mr. RINFRET: Possibly I may be permitted, at this stage of the debate, to protest against the minister's assertion that we are not serious. This was supposed to be private members' day, and his item came on only at the last moment or around midnight and naturally found a House not so well filled as it might have been. There is only a handful of members on both sides of the House; but we are endeavouring, not only myself, but my friends, the hon.

member for Lunenburg (Mr. Duff), the hon. member for Pontiac (Mr. Cahill) and the hon. member for Charlevoix-Montmorency (Mr. Casgrain), to get information. It is very hard to get it; but we intend to stay here until we do so, and we are very serious and, in fact, more serious than the minister thinks.

Mr. CASGRAIN: (Translation.) If you allow me, Mr. Chairman, I will put my question to the Minister of Marine in a different way: Has the Canadian Government Merchant Marine, Limited, been put under the control of the Canadian Northern system under the last law passed in 1919 concerning the administration of the Canadian National Railway system?

The CHAIRMAN: Shall the item carry?

Mr. CASGRAIN: (Translation.) Since I cannot obtain an answer from the Minister of Marine, I will ask the House to take note of my remarks. I have a right to an answer to the question, which I have put at least three or four times.

The hon. Minister of Marine, said something a moment ago which might seem true, but it was not quite the truth. I must say that I am as serious as the Minister of Marine can be. I am asking for information, and he refuses to give it. If there be an Order in Council as he claims, he must know it and should tell us; if it be under the law passed in 1919 that the Canadian Northern System, Limited, and all the subsidiary companies were put under the control of the Canadian Northern Railway system, he must know it and should tell us. I represent a constituency of 20,000 voters, who sent me here not only to represent them, but to represent Canada as a whole. When we are asked to vote a sum of eight million and some odd hundred thousand dollars, it is not a matter to be disposed of in an instant. The hon. member for Muskoka (Mr. McGibbon), put the question a moment ago, What is the use of haggling so long over a matter of a few millions? Mr. Chairman, the people's representatives have the right to know how this money is spent. We have here before us a company organized as a company with limited responsibility; it is not known when it was organized; we are told the King is its president and the Government controls the shares. I ask the Minister of Marine, who is in possession of all the information, to tell us what its exact situation is, and he refuses to answer me. I ask the Chair to request the minister to give me an answer and I am told that the Chair cannot force him to answer. Again I put the question and again I receive no answer, but I am sure that when I go back to my constituency next summer, and tell the electors what has been the conduct of the minister this evening, he can rest assured that the verdict rendered will not uphold him.

A moment ago, in the course of my remarks, I put the following question to the minister: How many returned soldiers have been employed in the various yards in Canada? I had no better success; the minister did not deign to answer.

Mr. Chairman, I asked a moment ago how many returned soldiers had been employed in the various yards of the Canadian Marine. I received no answer. This is the fourth time that we put pertinent questions to the minister, and he says, You are not serious. Mr. Chairman, if we were not serious we would not sit here tonight, the hon. members for St. James (Mr. Rinfret), for Montcalm (Mr. Séguin), for Pontiac (Mr. Cahill), for Lunenburg (Mr. Duff), and myself; and our venerated leader this evening, the hon. member for Shelburne and Queens (Mr. Fielding) would not be in his seat, being content, notwithstanding his advanced age and all the years of labour which he spent in the service of his country, to remain among us at this hour of the night to lend his help to His Majesty's loyal Opposition.

Our opposition is loyal, we simply ask the Government, whose claim is that the object of this policy is to help the returned soldiers and to prevent the unemployed from starving with hunger, to tell us, at least, how many of those people have been employed in the ship building yards. I do not think the assertion made by the minister is correct. I would not say it is false, as this would be inconsistent with parliamentary etiquette; but we all know what happened, of recent date, in the province of Quebec.

Aided by the hon. Minister of Finance (Sir Henry Drayton), the hon. Minister of Marine introduced, in the dying hours of last year's session, a bill enabling the Government to dispose, by Order in Council, of Estimates amounting to about $20,000,000. Now, it was hardly a fortnight after that law had been adopted, when two companies supposed to share in that sum were bankrupt; I mean the Three Rivers Shipyard and the National Shipbuilding. such are the industries favoured by the Government and by the Minister.

Glancing at the ministerial benches, I find that the hon. minister himself has gone out; perhaps he is disgusted with his work. It is about time he should be, having swallowed the millions granted in the preceding years. I am told that I am making obstruction, that I will not understand, that I have no reason to take such steps as I am taking to-night. Mr. Chairman, when we are asked to vote this amount right away, I cannot do otherwise than take the position I have taken, and I am surprised that the minister should lack courtesy and loyalty to the extent of not listening to us and of leaving the chamber, because he is afraid that were I to speak at any greater length, I might perhaps make more punctures in his management of the merchant marine for which millions are voted by this House. Mr. Chairman, there is another point to which I would call the attention of the committee and of the country. I asked the minister, a moment ago, some information as to a certain Order in Council and also as to the several resolutions, actions or other nefarious decrees of the Government concerning the management of the marine. I have got no answer, as I said a moment ago I caught, on their flight, some expressions and phrases uttered by the minister while delivering the great speeches of which he has somewhat the monopoly and explaining the management of his great company as he would have done to a small board of directors or to a small and very poor municipal counil. He said: That information, I have it, not because the merchant marine is managed neither by the Marine Department or by myself, but by a company, and all I have to do is to depend upon them and to ask them the results and the remittance of the money.

Money was voted to the minister in that way and he would now have us vote an item of $8,000,000. I, for one, shall refuse to vote it, because that sum will be managed and spent not by the minister himself, but by the company called the Canadian Merchant Marine, under the control of the Canadian Northern Railway Company, the doings of which it will be impossible to supervise and the extravagant expenses of which it will be impossible to control. Should those in charge of that company take a fancy to send ships to any part of the world, where there is no traffic, we could not prevent it, and the hon. minister would tell us next year: "With the eight millions I have completed the building of a few ships, but I have rereceived a report showing that I have less revenue than last year."

Were we sure that this was the last amount we would be called upon to vote for the merchant marine, and would the Minister give us the information which we now ask, perhaps we might reconsider the decision we are taking to-night to oppose that item; but under the present circumstances we cannot change our attitude with respect to that matter. I may be charged with having said too much, but when such a heavy expense is being dealt with, no one could even say enough. The position we have taken is perfectly justified by the very fact that the Government will not give the information we would like to get. Therefore, I hope that my hon. friends will help me in this contest. I have probably held the attention of this House during too long a time, but I think I owed it to myself and to my electors to say what I have said. I shall now take my seat, reserving the right to begin again later, on the occasion of some other items which will be submitted to us, and I hope my hon. friends will continue the debate which I have opened.

Mr. CAHILL: Has the contract with the Collingwood Company any fair-wage clause in it?

Mr. CLARK (Red Deer): Has the Minister of Marine gone to the Senate?

Mr. CALDER: The Minister of Marine has been in the House a very long time. He has gone out for a very short while, and will be back in a few minutes. I understand that in the contract itself a scale of wages was fixed.

Mr. CAHILL: Has the minister a copy of the contract? Trouble was reported there.

Mr. CALDER: There is not a copy of the contract here.

Mr. CAHILL: Is there one in the department?

Mr. CALDER: Certainly.

Mr. RINFRET: The Minister of Marine was charging us a minute ago with not being serious, but I think he has been carried away by his own seriousness. I hope he will be back in the House to reply to our questions.

Mr. CALDER: He will be here shortly.

Mr. CAHILL: A good deal has been said about the contract for the employment of labour in Toronto. The minister now tells us he has not such a contract; but after considerable effort on the part of the members of the Opposition, we were able to find out that there was some kind of contract on the basis of 15 per cent plus on some $460,000 odd. It would appear that the Government are not very serious in their professions of interest in the labour men, at least not so serious as they are in their attempt to provide fat sums to certain gentlemen who, I presume, are friends of theirs in the contracting business. With regard to this money which the ministry proposes to vote to-night, the statement that has been given to us is, to say the least, the most preposterous thing ever presented to Parliament. The Government come down and propose a vote of $8,300,000 to finish their shipbuilding programme, and the minister mis-states his position; he attempts to bring in a statement showing that he has made an earning when, as a matter of fact, he has incurred a loss. He tried to show the committee that he was placing a sum of money in a rest fund that was to be used for depreciation on his ships. I will not say he was trying to mislead the committee.

Mr. McGIBBON (Muskoka): You might just as well.

Mr. CAHILL: But he gave a statement that was misleading. He stated that he had earned a surplus and had some money to provide for a sinking fund, whereas, as a matter of fact, he had not earned interest on his investment, and therefore had no money to loan. His scheme was all right, but the only thing was that he had no money. So that it is not only bad bookkeeping but it is misleading to say that he has provided a sinking fund to take care of depreciation. Now, the shipping people claim that they should have at least 5 per cent for ordinary depreciation, and my hon. friend has not even provided that amount. He has not earned a total of 5 per cent on the whole operation. He has not actually earned interest, and therefore no amount for the 2 per cent he allows for depreciation, which, according to the shipping people, should be 5 per cent. The people of this country have reached the point where they are very much concerned over the extravagance of the Government. The Government apparently have lost touch entirely with the country; they do not seem to appreciate what is in the minds of the people. The people are being taxed to just about their limit of endurance. The Government have devised every possible scheme to tax them, and they are unable to bear any further burdens. Yet the Government are asking for $589,000,000 this year, and unless you are going to borrow, which means bankruptcy, you will have to tax the people for that. The minister said it would probably cost $460,000 to complete these two ships, and he would not say that they would bring that money on the market when completed. The people have no money to squander on these official extravagances. It is all right for the hon. member for Muskoka (Mr. McGibbon), to talk of a few millions here or there; but if I mistake not, his desk mate to-night, the member for North Perth (Mr. Morphy) advocated the other night that the Government should go full steam ahead as they did in the United States. Well, so far as this Government's expenditures have been concerned, they have been going full steam ahead for the last five years. They opened the throttle wide and threw away the steering gear, and have gone the limit in every possible kind of expenditure. They have no regard for the people's money; they are simply hanging on as long as possible. I do not know what their hope is; I do not believe they have any, but they will hang on as long as they can, and continue to squander money. Yet the ministers do not think it necessary for them to give information to the committee. The member for Muskoka said we were obstructing. I have not been on my feet as long to-night as he was, in all the time I have spoken. I have been trying to get information, and every time I got up to speak, some one else wanted to follow up the line of argument he had in his mind, and until now I have not been able to state my views on the shipping question. I think the Government will acknowledge that their shipping programme was a mistaken one, and that it was wrong for them to continue it last year. Had they taken the advice of the Opposition, and disposed of the ships, they would have been in a much happier mood than they are to-day. It is not the business of the Government to own ships and chase around the world looking for cargo. That is for private enterprise, and the Government will find that out. The minister was unfair to the committee in pointing out the advantage of his ships to the export and import trade of Canada. He said that in 1914 we had imported from the West Indies $9,000,000 worth of goods, and

in 1920 $19,000,000 worth. In 1914, I might point out, we imported from France about $3,600,000 worth of various commodities, and in 1920, something like $61,000,000, almost twenty times as much, and I do not think that the Canadian Marchant Marine carried a dollar's worth of these goods. There is also an item in regard to Greece; this has increased sixteen thousand per cent, but it is not due to the Canadian Merchant Marine. And there is an item for Italy, which is equally as large. There is an item for Italy and it is equally as large. Of course these are exports from Canada, and it will be argued by hon. gentlemen opposite that the Government do not need to provide ships in which to send these goods over to those countries because the Government paid for the goods themselves—they loaned money to the Canadian manufacturers to furnish these goods to Italy, Greece and Roumania. Having provided the goods they do not need to provide the ships. But our trade has increased with a number of countries that our ships do not visit. The percentage under the heading of "other foreign countries" has increased by seven hundred per cent. That is a greater percentage than the minister was able to mention when he spoke of the merchant marine doing such great work for our export and import service.

The minister disclaims all responsibility for the Canadian Government Merchant Marine. He does not interfere with the management in any way, and he does not scrutinize the expenditure, but if there are any deficiencies the people must provide the taxes. We know that he furnishes the money but that is all we do know. But that is not good enough for the Canadian tax-payer. He is being forced to the wall by reason of having to pay heavy taxes, which have become an enormous burden on the country. My hon. friend tells us that he has been building ships in order to provide employment; and in the next breath he tells us that he is paying some person fifteen per cent on the wages of those men. There is something wrong about that; no man has the right to collect fifteen per cent from the labouring men of this country. That is not good business and there must be something wrong when such a system can obtain. The Government should wake up and take notice in regard to all these matters because if they do not the time is coming when Canada will be in serious difficulties. In fact the Government have got the country into difficulties as it is, and the situation is growing worse all the time.

[Mr. Cahill.]

The Government have embarked on a policy of public ownership but for what reason I do not know. Just think of their coming to the House and asking for $8,000,000 in the present case, and then telling us that they have absolutely no control over the expenditure of this money. It is a most absurd position to take, and the people of the country are wondering where it is going to end. They are thinking seriously upon this whole problem. When the minister states we are talking lightly about these matters he is misstating the facts. When hon. members opposite accuse me of wanting to obstruct I have no hesitation whatever in saying that I would be too delighted to obstruct this item until it was withdrawn. If my physical endurance would permit it I would stay here for a week opposing it and hon. members opposite might call it obstruction as much as they liked. I would do that willingly if it would save $8,000,000 for the Canadian people, money which they can ill-afford at this juncture to squander. It is an insane policy to spend money without any objective or without any policy in view, and it is, to say the least, a lamentable condition of affairs for the Canadian people. The Government have no hope of doing any better. They have not the courage to face the situation and take their loss. They admit no responsibility to the country, but they go on taxing the people, and the Minister of Finance is turning grey in his attempts to find money to pay for these extravagances. We have been here now almost two months, and the Minister of Finance is not yet able to say when he expects to be able to present his Budget. The Minister of Marine told us to-night that the Canadian Government Merchant Marine is managed by the Canadian National Railways. Yesterday evening the Prime Minister proposed solemnly and as if he meant it the appointment of a committee to look into the affairs of the Canadian National Railways, of which this merchant marine is a branch, and yet the Minister of Marine to-night asks for a vote of $8,300,000. Apparently he has no regard for the committee which the Prime Minister appointed only a few hours ago. It does not look as if the Government were serious or took the Prime Minister seriously. The minister tells us the same old story, that he has no knowledge of the affairs of this undertaking which seems to be an outlet to squander the savings of the people, for apparently the irresponsible directorate in charge may decide what to spend without

4 a.m.

any restriction whatever. That condition of affairs would not be permitted if hon. members opposite had the courage to consult the electorate. We are being asked to spend money to help the working man—of which some gentlemen will take 15 per cent—in order that we may provide an export business, for which we must pay the manufacturer in advance, and then in turn we put a tariff wall around the country to exclude imports. But under our system we do not need to exchange goods! We are furnishing the goods, the money and the ships, and, not satisfied with that, we are subsidizing other ships to compete with our own merchant marine. We are going on the assumption that as long as we turn out paper dollars we can bring about prosperity. That is a policy for school children, for this Government, but it is not a policy that will be tolerated by the Canadian people when they have an opportunity to express their views at the polls. I hope the minister will seriously consider the withholding of this item until he can bring it before the committee which his leader named this evening.

Mr. MAHARG: I was going to suggest that we rise and report progress on account of the absence of the minister, but as he has just returned I am satisfied to go ahead with the business. I have a few questions to ask him. What time in 1918 were the first ships put into commission on the trade route to the West Indies?

Mr. BALLANTYNE: The Canadian Voyageur was launched in November, 1918, and the Canadian Pioneer in December, 1918, They were sent to Quebec to be finished off owing to the St. Lawrence freezing up between Montreal and Quebec. They went from there to Halifax, and the Canadian Voyageur was the first one to sail some time in February.

Mr. MAHARG: I want to get the date in 1918 when your ships started trading with the West Indies.

Mr. BALLANTYNE: I think the Canadian Voyageur went to the West Indies on her first trip but I am not certain.

Mr. MAHARG: Could the minister state the value of the trade with the West Indies at that time?

Mr. BALLANTYNE: The exports or imports?

Mr. MAHARG: Both.

Mr. BALLANTYNE: To all the West Indian Islands, in 1918, $9,653,761; in 1920, $15,257,014.

Mr. MAHARG: Will the Minister give us the tonnage for those periods?

Mr. BALLANTYNE: No. The Trade and Commerce Department, from whom I got these figures, could not tell me what the tonnage was.

Mr. MAHARG: It is difficult for us to know just whether our trade is increasing or decreasing if we cannot have the tonnage. This afternoon the figures given were for 1913 and 1920, I think. I would like very much to have the figures for the tonnage, as dollar comparisons may be very misleading on account of violent fluctuations. How many of the Government ships are on the Great Lakes at present?

Mr. BALLANTYNE: None.

Mr. MAHARG: How many could be transferred to the Great Lakes?

Mr. BALLANTYNE: Well, that would be a matter for the company to decide, but we have a few 2,800 ton and a few 3,750 ton ships that could operate on the Lakes. We have twenty-five ships of canal draft size.

Mr. MAHARG: Twenty-five ships that could be transferred to the Great Lakes?

Mr. BALLANTYNE: Yes.

Mr. MAHARG: No subsidies are paid on the Great Lakes, I believe?

Mr. BALLANTYNE: No.

Mr. MAHARG: It seems to me that it would be very good business for the Government to transfer a number of these ships to the Great Lakes. I made this suggestion a year ago, and I believe that the minister promised sympathetic consideration, or something to that effect. In the face of the scarcity of shipping on the ocean and the tremendous fall in ocean freights, I would like to ask why a number of these boats have not been transferred to the Great Lakes.

Mr. BALLANTYNE: The ships were occupied elsewhere running to Newfoundland and the British West Indies, and some across to European ports. I think I promised my hon. friend last year that I would bring the matter to the attention of the management; I shall be very glad to do so again. I do not know whether the opera-

tion of these ships on the Lakes would be profitable or not, neither can I say now whether or not there is sufficient freight offering there. My hon. friend will understand that I do not follow the details of the operation of the ships.

Mr. MAHARG: I am at a loss to understand the position taken by the Government. Is the Dominion to provide seventy or eighty millions of dollars and take care of a continuous loss possibly for years and yet have nothing to say as to the expenditure of those moneys? Are we quite helpless and absolutely in the hands of this shipping company?

Mr. BALLANTYNE: No. When we first turned the ships over to the operating company I told them to use their judgment in putting the ships on the routes that they thought would pay best, but that one thing we did not want them to lose sight of was the national interest. There may be some very good reason, with which I am not familiar, why they did not put some of these ships on the lakes. Not later than to-morrow, or when I can get away from the House, I will telephone down and let my hon. friend have the answer speedily.

Mr. MAHARG: Then my hon. friend cannot say why they have not been put on the lakes?

Mr. BALLANTYNE: No.

Mr. MAHARG: Has the Government made inquiry into the possible profitable employment of those boats on the Great Lakes?

Mr. BALLANTYNE: It is only reasonable to suppose that the operating company would see that the ships were put on the routes where there was the best chance of making money. They have even gone further than that and put them on routes where they were taking a chance. The absence of our vessels from the lakes would signify, I should think, that the trade there would be unremunerative. But I do not want to make a positive statement; I will have the manager communicated with to-morrow and let my hon. friend have his answer. The answer of the minister suggest another question.

Mr. MAHARG: Have any of the directors of this company any interest in outside shipping companies?

Mr. BALLANTYNE: There again I do not want to make a positive statement. I have known for many years the gentlemen who are directors of the Canadian Government Merchant Marine and if they had any connection with the Canada Steamship Lines, I think I would know it. So far as I know, they have not.

Mr. MAHARG: While the Canada Steamships are the big noise on the lakes, they are not the whole thing, there are many other smaller companies, some of more or less importance. It does seem to me that the Government have been a little lax in their duty in connection with an expenditure of this size, especially when it has been made with the idea, as has been stated, of assisting the Government railroads. Now, I think there is a field on the Great Lakes where our railroads can be helped tremendously.

Mr. BALLANTYNE: They may be.

Mr. MAHARG: I do not think there is any doubt about it. I think the Government should have made inquiries with a view to finding out just in what fields these ships could best serve the railroads; for assistance to the railroads was the one strong argument used by the Government to-day in favour of their construction. Is the minister aware that there are companies on the Geat Lakes that are making handsome profits, paying good dividends on capital, but whose capital is, according to the best information that can be obtained, at least four-fifths water?

Mr. BALLANTYNE: The hon. member will understand that I have no knowledge of private companies operating on the Great lakes.

Mr. MAHARG: This is public knowledge, as the Canada Steamships, Limited, a few days ago issued a report which appeared in the press showing that they made handsome profits this last year on the Great lakes. It would seem as though it would be wisdom on the part of the Government to keep well informed in that respect. The point has been raised in this House of the control of transportation rates on our lakes and it has met with considerable opposition. Some members of the Government have suggested, probably not publicly, but privately, that there might be some way of controlling the cost of transportation on the Great lakes, and I was wondering if this was one of the means which they had in mind, because it would be a very effective way of controlling it to some extent. But we have on the Great lakes today, even if the minister would take for

granted a hypothetical case and assume, according to the figures of the hon. member for Lunenburg (Mr. Duff) that his ships have cost him five times more than they are worth now, a field of employment whereby he could make full interest on the total cost of his ships.

Mr. BALLANTYNE: My hon. friend does not want to make an exaggerated statement. He is not a gentleman of that type, and I do not want him to think ships could be bought at one-fifth the price paid by the Government.

Mr. MAHARG: I am not saying that; I am saying "even if you take the figures as a hypothetical case." I am not saying what ships could be built for now, whether it is twice or five times less. I have shown to the minister that if we take the actual figures that are being paid for freight on the Great lakes now, he could go into competition on the Great lakes and earn full interest and something to spare on the total investment of his ship. That should surely be good business and worth trying.

Before I go further, I want to show to the minister the actual figures being charged on wheat, which is one of the chief products shipped across the Great lakes and one of the most profitable kinds of business carried on, on the Great lakes. These are actual figures of one company which does a great deal of the shipping on the lakes. I should like the committee to bear in mind that the shipment of grain across the lakes in the month of September is very small, because it is about that time the grain commences to move from the prairies. Even in the month of September, 1919, the rate from Fort William to bay ports was three cents; in 1920 in the same month, it was 4½ cents, or an increase of 50 per cent. In October, the grain starts to move freely and in October, 1919, the rate was 3 cents, and in October, 1920, from 5 to 5½ cents, or an increase of almost 100 per cent. The same figures apply to November of 1919, and 1920, from Fort William to bay ports. From Fort William to Montreal in September, 1919, the rate was 11 cents; in September, 1920, from 13¾ to 14 cents; in October 1919, 11 cents and in October, 1920, 15½ cents; in November, 1919, 11 cents and in November, 1920, 15½ cents. All these rates show a tremendous increase, all the way from 33 per cent to almost 100 per cent over the rates in 1919. This shows that there is a field of most profitable employment for almost the entire merchant marine. As the minister admits that he was not aware of the profitable field, I thought I would quote these rates so that he need not be in doubt as to possibilities of doing a profitable business on the Great lakes. How many ships were fitted with a view to lake trade?

Mr. BALLANTYNE: Twenty.

Mr. MAHARG: Yet none of these ships have been employed in that business, and this is most remarkable because a large number of those ships were built right on the lake ports from Port Arthur to Toronto.

Mr. CLARK (Red Deer): Ten of them tied up in Halifax.

Mr. MAHARG: Instead of ships plying on the lakes where they were built and where there is plenty of profitable work for them to do, they have been taken off to ocean routes and, as the statement has been made, chasing around the world looking for business. Have any of these ships been used in the coal trade?

Mr. BALLANTYNE: Not yet, but quite a few of them are at the port of Halifax now being overhauled, and it is the intention of the company to put them into the coal trade as soon as navigation opens.

Mr. MAHARG: Are they being rebuilt so as to be suitable for the coal trade?

Mr. BALLANTYNE: No.

Mr. MAHARG: They do not require rebuilding for the coal or grain trade?

Mr. BALLANTYNE: Not so far as I know.

Mr. MAHARG: I am glad to know that, because there is a way out for the minister to serve a very useful purpose to this country, by immediately getting those ships into commission on the Great lakes.

Mr. BALLANTYNE: We will look into that matter with pleasure.

Mr. MAHARG: There are now some 40,000,000 bushels of grain in store at the head of the lakes. Some of this is being loaded now; in fact, by this time some of it is probably on its way, and I do not think the Government need worry very much about looking into the matter. The business is there and will always be there, because production in western Canada is going to increase. The boats could serve a useful purpose, not only in carrying grain, but in breaking down some huge combines on the lakes which affect not only the West, but very materially the East. Some are

under the impression that lake rates are not of much interest to the people of eastern Canada; but, to use a popular expression, it gets them both ways, just the same as it does those who live west of the Great lakes. Thus, these boats can serve a useful purpose there and at the same time find very profitable employment.

When you consider the profits that companies can make there with their capitalization such as it is, I am sure you will agree that there is room for improvement. I should just like to mention one or two combines they could break up right away. There is the insurance combine in particular. A few years ago, before the Grain Commission in Winnipeg, a miller stated that they could secure lake insurance at 50 per cent of the price they then had to pay if they could get shipping to carry their goods without having to take insurance from those who had control of the boat space on the lakes. Apart from the saving in dollars and cents, you could put a crimp as it were, in this combine business. Hundreds of thousands of dollars worth of produce goes to waste in these lake ports simply because the shipping companies do not have to take it unless they like; there is no control over them one way or the other. They have held up shipments of grain for days, even when the Grain Board had control of the trade, and they would not supply boats unless their price was met. The breaking up of this combine would be of tremendous value to the country, not only in a direct material way, but in its moral effect in bringing concerns of this kind to their senses. The only conditions at present under which you can do business with them are beyond human endurance.

I do not wish to detain the minister any longer this morning. I thank him for his courtesy, I hope he will take into consideration some of the suggestions I have made, and should we come back here again next year, I hope his answer will be a little different. I hope he will give us more than a promise to take the question into consideration, for really these promises do not get us very far.

Mr. P. A. SEGUIN (L'Assomption and Montcalm): (Translation.) Mr. Chairman, it was not my intention to take part in this debate, and I remained at my seat in the hope that the minister realizing the extravagance of this item, as well as the seriousness and large number of the objections urged against its adoption, would drop it, thus dispensing me with saying a word; but as the Government have made up their minds to force this very large amount through the House, I think it is incumbent upon me to protest strongly in the name of my constituents against the granting of this item.

Mr. Chairman, only a short time ago, the hon. Minister of Agriculture applied for a vote of four million and some odd thousand dollars toward promoting the main industry of this country. The Government thought fit to content themselves with a paltry four million dollars to meet the requirements of Canadian agriculture, and the Minister of Finance turned a deaf ear to the entreaties of the hon. Minister of Agriculture and withheld even the amount which would have provided for maintaining the experimental farms. How is it then that the hon. Minister of Marine can now come before the House and ask for a vote of $8,000,000 toward the building of ships which we have no need for, and that, without giving us any of the grounds on which such a large grant might be justified. When we ask for explanations from the Minister of Marine, his answer is: I am not positive, I am not particularly acquainted with the details, I leave such matters to be dealt with by the company without looking very closely into them myself." Or else he says: "The outlook is not very bright." Indeed, as regards the building of our merchant marine, the outlook is not particularly encouraging. However, we are told that it has been deemed necessary to pursue that policy in order to procure work for returned soldiers. But on inquiring from the minister as to the names of the soldiers who benefit through the amounts spent by the Government, the minister is not even in a position to state the number of returned soldiers who are paid out of these millions. We are told that we are triflers, that we are not serious in objecting to such a large expenditure so uselessly incurred. I am of opinion that if one side of the House is open to the charge of flippancy, it is the party which at such a critical period of our national life, at a time when our finances are in such a deplorable state, urges us to grant lightheartedly and without discussion millions and millions of dollars. That is enough to cause the people of this country to rise and to induce its representatives in this House to do their utmost toward inducing the Government to examine themselves and realize the hatefulness of their ways. Hon. gentlemen who preceded me on this side of the House have shown that the whole press of this country, with the exception of a few newspapers

quoted by the hon. minister, have disapproved of the building of the ships. Extracts have been quoted from the Gazette, a paper which never lets an opportunity to help this Government slip by, and which characterizes this shipbuilding policy as extravagant and not to be pursued any longer. And please note, Mr. Chairman, at the time the Gazette published this editorial, on the day following, congratulations were extended to it by a prominent taxpayer of Toronto, in a letter which reads as follows:

Canadian Merchant Marine.

To the Editor of The Gazette:

Sir,—I read with considerable interest the article in your issue of January with reference to the Canadian Government Merchant Marine, and to me there appears to be more truth than poetry in the view taken by you in connection with this fleet.

The Government was justified in building these ships when they did—no one should question this—but when it comes to a Government running a fleet of steamers in opposition to private owners, that is quite another question.

I submit for the consideration of the Canadian tax payers whether it is reasonable or even common sense that a Government can, from a financial standpoint, successfully run steamers in competition with private companies, especially when those managing are novices compared with the managers of old seasoned companies, such as the Cunard Company, the Donaldson Line, Furness Line, as well as the hundreds of old and established companies of Great Britain and Norway which are operating freight steamers the world over.

But the public are told that these steamers are opening up new trade routes, but where, may I ask, are these new trade routes? Certainly not between Canada and Great Britain and the Continent, ports such as Glasgow, Liverpool, London, Hamburg and so on. South African ports are not new ones, neither are Australian and New Zealand ports. The South American service is, I beleive, new, but the management is only playing with this and it should not require sixty-five steamers to open up this route.

Only a few days ago the press informed the Canadian public that the Government steamers were being operated at less cost than any other steamers in the world; those ignorant of ships and shipping might accept such a statement as correct, but to anyone at all familiar with shipping business, the statement is so absurd that it is not worthy of consideration.

Is it reasonable that the Norwegian and British owners, with their long years of experience, cannot manage their shipping business as economically as Canadians especially, remembering that the Canadian fleet is under the control and direction of gentlemen with little or no experience.

It is a fact beyond question that the Government managed Intercolonial Railway has been a charge upon the tax payers of Canada ever since its opening. What is to be expected from the Government owned steamers? Nothing but deficits, and heavy ones at that, and the now over burdened tax payers will be called upon to pay up millions annually as the result of Government operating annually as the result of Government operated tonnage.

Owners of steamers outside of Canada are losing less money by tying up their boats to the piers in harbors than by operating them and in face of this it is claimed that the Canadian steamers are making money.

How is this possible? It is not possible, and the tax payer is being misled.

It shows clearly, Mr. Chairman, that an extravagant shipbuilding policy is generally considered as being absolutely against the interests of the country. If we compare the Estimates of the Department of Agriculture with those of the Department of Marine and of the Department of Militia, we are inclined to believe that those in authority have actually lost their heads, and that they really want to rouse the people's wrath and to stir up the farmers in the most arbitrary manner by showing them that they do not care to give the agricultural industry a proper assistance. We should congratulate the hon. Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Tolmie), for his efforts to promote that branch of the administration, but what can he do when he is told by the Minister of Finance "You must confine yourself to such an amount."

I cannot see why they should be so very sparing as regards the assistance to be given to the farming industry, when they are spending so lavishly on some unnecessary items. I wonder whether the interests at the bottom of such undertakings have anything in common with the interests of the country, and if under this shipbuilding scheme, we would not be able to discover some huge scandal such as it has been the prerogative of the Tory administration every time they succeeded in getting into power and remaining there some time.

I do not wish to detain the House any longer. I may have occasion to further discuss the matter, but before taking my seat, I must protest once more, on behalf of my constituents and on behalf of the county of L'Assomption, as strongly and as vigorously as I possibly can, against this policy of wasting millions without any advantage to the country.

Mr. CLARK (Red Deer): We have sat for quite a long time and do not seem to be getting much further forward. I do not know that any good purpose is being served by continuing the sitting. The cause of its continuance has not been on this side of the House; the policy is that of the Government. There has been a suggestion —I am not quite sure that it has not

come from the minister—that there has been a want of seriousness on this side. I cannot admit that for a moment. I have listened to the whole debate, I myself having occupied eighteen minutes of the committee's time just before midnight. I have heard all that has been said, and if there has been a want of seriousness, which I would not dispute, it has not been on this side. We do not consider eight and a quarter millions of the people's money a matter for jest, and it was not from this side of the House that a mock presentation of a bouquet was made to the Chairman of Committees. I have not heard a speech from this side of the House that was not seriously directed to some item in the Minister's programme with a view to getting information. There have been three contributions to the debate from the other side since the minister retired from the debate, which he has done for some hours, with the single exception of his replying to the member for Maple Creek (Mr. Maharg), in his usual courteous manner. So far as speeches are concerned, the contributions from the other side have been three; although there have been numerous other contribution in the way of the opening and closing of desks; and the entertainment has also been added to in a way I have not seen in my experience in this House, in the shape of a midnight lunch. That happened on the other side, however. The seriousness is here; the frivolity is with the people who treat lightly the country's money. The three speeches to which I have referred have not helped the minister's position. My hon. friend from Brantford (Mr. Cockshutt), made a speech in which the one attempt at serious argument was the contention that this money spent for the benefit of returned men was a good thing. I had given economic reasons why I did not think it was a good way to cure unemployment by creating more. As a matter of fact, the contention of my hon. friend falls to the ground in this particular, that unemployment is rifer in this country at the present time than since I came to Canada twenty years ago. So that the very object of the minister has fallen down, as well as other planks in my hon. friend's argument. But it cannot be the opinion of hon. gentlemen opposite that it was done entirely to afford employment to the unemployed, because my hon. friend from Muskoka had a vision of these ships sailing the seven seas. If it were not so late, I should like to know from the minister what disposition has been made of all the ships he has finished at the present time. So far as we are concerned, every minute of this debate has been useful. In the very last words which the minister uttered to the committee, he told us that a number of these ships are in Halifax harbour being overhauled. That is not what the Halifax Herald says about them.

It says they are tied up in that port because they have nothing to do. In previous remarks upon this question I pointed out, that from the columns of the Montreal Star I had learned that some of these ships were coasting up and down Norway, or Scandinavia, and even going to Germany to try and get cargoes. I would like to know exactly where the ships are at the present moment? However, what I want to point out to the committee is that we have two contradictory statements made as to what the ships have actually done, and what they are doing at the present moment. On the one hand we have it asserted that they are doing good business because they are going to promote Canada's trade in all the seven seas, and on the other, that at any rate they have done some good in providing work for the unemployed. As I said when the hon. member for Brantford was speaking, if that was their object it is a pity to have stopped such a programme when my hon. friend considers it so attractive. If the object was to employ the unemployed, then there never was so much need for shipbuilding and road building. If this Government believes in spending public money for this purpose why not raise another Victory Loan and go ahead and spend money?

We of the Opposition, we who are opposing the Government of whatever creed, have no monopoly of the view that this business has fallen down. The ships were built at a loss, they were built in an unprofitable way, and they were built at too high a price. I asked my hon. friend the other day, would he say now, as he said a year ago, that he could sell these ships at a profit. Could he sell them at all?

Mr. CASGRAIN: Not one.

Mr. CLARK (Red Deer): My hon. friend is asleep apparently and I repeat the question—could he sell the ships at all? Then if he could not I reiterate that they are a white elephant on his hands. Now that is the condition of the ships. With regard to their helping out the railroad policy, what my hon. friends opposite, from the minister down to the back bencher, have to

prove is that two deficits make a surplus. We have a defiicit of seventy millions on the National Railways and we, who are not serious forsooth, are to be told that if you only add losing ships to losing railroads the thing will be all right. Well, those of us who live another year will see. Those ships that are in Halifax harbour being overhauled are not earning much money for this year. The ships that are coasting up and down Norway are not earning much money. I am very much afraid they are not earning money because everybody who knows anything at all about ships knows that it is a very difficult thing for shipping to earn money anywhere at the present moment. I admit that quite frankly and seemingly my hon. friend from Skeena (Mr. Peck) agrees with me.

Mr. PECK: No, I ask why do you blame the Government then?

Mr. CLARK (Red Deer): Why I should blame the Government for going into an unprofitable business against my own warning? When my hon. friend and his friends knew or were told, that this was an unprofitable business and went into it and come forward with a story such as we have heard about these ships, is my hon. friend so lacking in his grasp of public authority as to seriously press the question why the Government should be blamed, if one of the Government enterprises is undertaken against the knowledge of those who know something about shipping, and against warnings in the press of this country? In many quarters from the very beginning, especially in the capital city of the country, in the "Citizen" newspaper which every hon. gentleman could have read. From the beginning of the enterprise, every move in this shipping policy has been pointed out when it was wrong and condemned. That is why I blame the Government, and I ask my hon. friend if he does not think there is good ground for it?

Mr. LALOR: Are the Government supporters alone to blame in that respect? What about hon. gentlemen opposite who supported that programme?

Mr. CLARK (Red Deer): My hon. friend has an excellent opportunity of settling accounts with other members of the House for himself.

Mr. LALOR: I am asking you the question.

Mr. CLARK (Red Deer): A child can baffle a philosopher, and really I am not prepared to tell my hon. friend at just this moment to apportion the blame. These of course are to blame that defended the policy. But that does not rest at my door, and after all is said and done the Government of the day is responsible for the policy of the day; and I have not known it as a common policy for a Government, when it is being met by solid facts and solid arguments, to ask a person using those arguments and producing those facts to apportion the blame between the minister and other members of the House. That is the business of my hon. friend from Haldimand, (Mr. Lalor) not mine. I do not want to delay these proceedings. I have occupied ten minutes in addition to eighteen —that is twenty-eight minutes of the time of the House, I have taken up. I do not feel that I have wasted a moment. I have spoken in what I conceive to be the best interest of this country, just as every word that I have ever uttered was uttered from that point of view and that point of view alone. I would call the attention of my hon. friend from Skeena to the fact that when I qrst uttered these words I was sitting behind the Government as he himself is sitting still. I was sitting behind the Government, and I was one of the few men—if he wants a confession—who were disappointed that by proceedings like these the Union Party was smashed to slivers. When I next blamed this policy, and pointed out the evils of it, I had moved to the crossbenches because I would not make myself responsible for this shipbuilding business. My hon. friend, therefore, has no ground when he asks me why I blame the Government in this matter. The summary of the matter is this: It is an unprofitable enterprise, and despite all I have heard about it being a popular policy from end to end of the country it will not requre many such detailed debates as we have had in the last two days on these Estimates to change any popularity that is left into very great unpopularity. I do not believe quite that my hon. friend is so sure of the popularity of this scheme. I do not see how he can be so sure of it because if it is not popular in the Government press in Halifax and Montreal then I can assure him it is not popular with the farmers of the prairies. Neither is it popular with the working men of Toronto who have had deputations up here revealing the very inwardness of the business. That popularity has not been a thing that has been absolutely evident in the by-elections that have taken place all

over the country. Neither does the confidence of the ministry in their own popularity become evident when they keep by-elections back as far as they can by straining the law to the last point. I warn my hon. friend that he is living in a fool's paradise in regard to the popularity of the scheme. This night's debate, so far as this side of the House is concerned, has been fully justified because, up to the last moment, whenever the minister intervene he gave us information which has thrown more light on the scheme and that is what the country wants. It is an unprofitable scheme, it is next door to a bankrupt scheme, and I am afraid that the minister will find that it is a poor backing for an administraton which is rapdly approachng the same position politically as this scheme has arrived at economically.

Now so far as I am concerned I should like, if I have any influence with my hon. friends on this side, to suggest that we have made our protest, we have ventilated this thing pretty well considering the number present, and so far as I am concerned I really doubt whether there is any wisdom in going any further. The minister is looking worried, he has already retired for an hour and we do not want to overwork him. I think therefore the vote had better be passed. Eight million three hundred thousand dollars.

Mr. CASGRAIN: It is a large amount to swallow.

Mr. CLARK (Red Deer): It is needed, is it not, for the finishing of certain contracts? The finishing of contracts is something that, after all, we are just as sensitive about as any one on the other side of the House. But that fact furnishes the final condemnation of the scheme at the present moment. For, here is a scheme of shipbuilding on the part of the Government for certain purposes, nearly every one of which has been knocked on the head. You have a number of ships already built which are idle, and here is an order for $8,300,000 to build some more. To do what? To get cargoes where those already built cannot get them. If my hon. friend could
5 a.m. sell the ships I would stand the big loss on them, because it will be some years before they do anything for this country, especially if the policy of the Government is not changed on other matters.

Mr. MAHARG: The hon. member for Brantford (Mr. Cockshutt) referred to-night to the fact that the hon. member for Red Deer (Mr. Clark) questioned the wisdom of the project, but the hon. member for Brantford must surely have himself questioned the wisdom of it when he referred to it as he did. He said the policy itself was all right, but he was not certain that the time of putting it into operation was all right.

Mr. CLARK (Red Deer): It was too late.

Mr. MAHARG: What is the good of advocating a policy if you do not put it into effect at the proper time? It is good policy to sow wheat in my part of the country, but not unless you know when to sow it. I might just as well say that it is good policy for me to sow wheat in January as that it is good policy to go into shipping without knowing the proper time for doing so. I think his argument is just as illogical as he would like the House to believe our argument is.

Then he said that the farmers themselves know all about the fall in prices. I would like to tell the hon. member for Brantford that the farmers do know all about the fall in prices, but they also know something about the advance in prices, particularly of agricultural implements, in connection with which the hon. member's name is very prominent. I had occasion to purchase some implements before leaving home to attend the session here, and the manager of the company through which I did the business told me that there was only one agricultural implement and they handled practically all lines—that had not gone up in price. These advances run from 10 to 20 per cent. The hon. member for Brantford may be glad to have this information, especially as the Cochshutt Manufacturing Company make more than one line of agricultural implements.

Mr. SINCLAIR (Guysborough): It is an extraordinary situation that the twenty-one hon. members sitting on the other side of the House seem to have no arguments to put up against the able speeches that are made from this side of the House. Apparently no one is able to answer the arraignment of the Government just delivered by my hon. friend from Red Deer. It strikes me that my hon. friend from St. John, a distinguished member of the Government, ought to be able to defend it, if it is capable of defence.

Mr. CASGRAIN: He is a dumb philosopher.

Mr. SINCLAIR (Guysborough): And my hon. friend from Colchester (Mr. McCurdy)—can he say nothing in defence of the Government? If this policy is right why is it that no supporter of the Government can demonstrate it? We are open to argument, but we are determined to do everything in our power to prevent the passing of this $8,000,000, because we are fully convinced that it is an extravagant and useless expenditure at the present time. We have shown that these ships are only worth 25 per cent of the money put into them. Twenty-five per cent of $8,000,000 is $2,000,000, so that we are throwing away $6,000,000. We are told that this is to help the unemployed. It strikes me that there is no more extravagant way of employing idle men than in building ships, for you pay a very small amount for labour and a very large amount for material. Labour is not a great part in the construction of a ship. Besides, if you employ labour in one part of the country you are equally bound to employ it in other parts. In the town where I live there is a shipyard, but the Government have not recently let any contracts there, although there are a great many idle men in the locality. Why do we not get the use of some of this money in New Glasgow instead of its being all spent in Toronto, Port Arthur and other places west of Ottawa?

Mr. BALLANTYNE: Does not my hon. friend know that we placed a million dollars' worth of contracts at New Glasgow and $8,000,000 at Halifax.

Mr. CHISHOLM: Not millions.

Mr. SINCLAIR (Guysborough): I did not know that $8,000,000 was to be expended in Halifax.

Mr. BALLANTYNE: Quite a large part of it.

Mr. SINCLAIR: How many ships are being built in Halifax under this programme?

Mr. BALLANTYNE: There are two yet.

Mr. SINCLAIR (Guysborough): Does my hon. friend pretend to say that he is going to spend $4,000,000 on one ship?

Mr. BALLANTYNE: No.

Mr. SINCLAIR: (Guysborough): If he is, the condition is much worse that we thought it was. My hon. friend must be mistaken when he says that this money is to be expended in Halifax.

Mr. BALLANTYNE: A portion of it.

Mr. SINCLAIR (Guysborough): Well, if my hon. friend is to find work for the returned soldiers, how is it that he is placing contracts in a few places like Toronto and Halifax, and making no provision for the returned soldiers in other places in Canada? My hon. friend stated the other day that he had sixteen ships under construction and only two of them are being built in Halifax, so that there must be fourteen somewhere else. He has not told us where the fourteen are being built. He also told us that the total tonnage of the sixteen vessels amounted to 114,470 and that the average cost of building is $192 per deadweight ton. That means that my hon. friend is asking for $8,000,000 to complete a shipbuilding contract involving $21,978,000 worth of work. My hon. friend has not given the explanation of this; it looks to me as if he would be coming back later for a large sum in order to complete his programme. He has not told us, either, how much work has been done on the ships that are now in course of construction. He stated this morning that the ships that were in Halifax harbour were there for repairs. Well, that is an illuminating statement. The newspaper that supports the Government in Halifax and has done so from its inception until very recently has been criticizing the Government severely on its shipbuilding programme. From his window the editor can see in the harbour ten or twelve ships lying at anchor.

Mr. DUFF: Fifteen on Saturday.

Mr. SINCLAIR (Guysborough): Fifteen on Saturday, my hon. friend says; that is the spectacle witnessed by the editor of the "Halifax Herald." Consequently he came out and informed the country of the condition of things. Well, if as the Minister says these ships are under repair there must have been something wrong with their construction in the first place, because they are comparatively new ships. If there are fifteen in the harbour at once and all for repair, it will take a long time to have the repairs made, because only one ship can go on the slip at a time. This is the manner in which we are getting light on this question.

On page 9 of the 53rd annual report of the Minister's Department I find the following:

The following is an approximate comparison of the cost of wages and board per month between a British, an American, a Canadian, and a Japanese steam merchant ship of similar tonnage and dimensions; cost of the British

ship for wages and board per month $3,645.09, of the American $6,711.10, of the Canadian $2,303.50 and of the Japanese $1,124.50.

The pay of the master of the Canadian ship was $250 per month, that of the master of the Japanese ship $100 per month; able seamen on the Canadian ship received $16.20 per month, on the Japanese ship $9 per month.

My hon. friend, then, who is spending millions of money for the purpose of giving employment to men in certain parts of Canada, pays his sailors $16.20 a month, about fifty cents a day. The classification of the Civil Service, page 5, gives the compensation of an ablebodied seaman on the Great lakes and on the coastal waters as $55, $60, $65, and $25 for subsistence in addition. But on the deep sea waters of the Atlantic, and, I suppose, of the Pacific, my hon. friend expects his sailors to work for $16.20 a month, while the master gets $250—as much as fifteen sailors. His ships ought to make money if he is paying his sailors at that low rate.

My hon. friend informs us that there is a sinking fund to provide for the capital expenditure and also for the depreciation, and that at the rate at which he is accumulating amounts in this sinking fund he expects to discharge the debt in twenty-five years. But my hon. friend appears to have made no provision for keeping the ships afloat during that twenty-five years, and to provide for necessary repairs. He tells us that ten or fifteen ships that are at Halifax are there for repairs. It takes a great deal of money to make repairs in these times; the machinery of the ships will depreciate year after year and will have to be renewed; the boilers will have to be renewed every ten years anyway even if the best care is taken of them. The minister cannot repair his ships and renew his machinery and boilers twice during the twenty-five year period without some money, and so far as I can learn, he has not made any provision for repairing his ships or renewing boilers and machinery. How does the minister propose to deal with the question? How does he propose to get the money to put in new boilers? Will he take the money out of the sinking fund? If he does, his sinking fund will be very largely reduced. If he could get along without any repairs for twenty-five years; if his boilers would last for twenty-five years, his theory might work out. But twenty years is regarded as the life of an ordinary tramp vessel; if it lives for twenty-five years, all the better, but it is apparently necessary that the minister's ships should last for twenty-five years to work out the sinking calculation the minister has made. How does the minister expect to keep his ships afloat during those twenty-five years? I do not see that he has made any provision for that important eventuality.

I pointed out, when I was speaking before, that freight rates have become very much less during the last few months. During the first six or seven months of 1920 rates were high and ship-owners made a good deal of money. The slump came the last of August or the first of September. As everybody knows who knows anything about ships, it is usual to have contracts two or three months ahead, so that most of 1920 must have been carried on under pretty good contracts at fairly high rates. Then the slump came and rates dropped to about one-half. I am familiar with some of the trades; but if any hon. gentleman will go into the library or reading room and take the "Journal of Commerce" of New York or the "New York Herald" and look over the fixtures of vessels last September or August and look over the same fixtures for the same routes at the present time, he will find a very large difference in the rates that are paid. If my hon. friend, on my calculation, lost $4,000,000 last year, how much is he going to lose this year? We are in dead earnest about this matter, because we feel that we represent the people of Canada; that there is at stake, not only this $8,000,000, but probably $10,000,000 or $12,000,000 more to be wasted in connection with these ships during the current year. We cannot afford to spend this money; the people of Canada have enormous burdens to shoulder; indeed, the hon. member for Brantford (Mr. Cockshutt) represented the Canadian people as a weary Titan carrying an enormous load. It would be a great mistake for us to permit the Government to do anything we could prevent, in order to increase that load by some $12,000,000 for the coming year. That is the reason why we are fighting this question inch by inch; and if ever we were in earnest in our lives, we are in earnest now, if possible to get some concession from the minister, to draw from him some promise that he will look into the matter and that if it costs more to finish those ships than to leave them alone, he will not spend the money for the present year. If any of these ships are just about commenced—and I do not know whether they are or not, because the minister has not told us—if the keel

is laid and a few thousand dollars spent, we should not think of throwing away another million to complete the ship when we know that when it is completed, it will not be worth in the market more than 25 per cent of the money put into it. That is the way the matter strikes us, and it ought to strike hon. gentlemen opposite in the same way. I see a number of business gentlemen opposite me. Do they want to waste $8,000,000 or, perhaps $12,000,000, during the current year? I am sure they do not. If not, let them take charge of their minister, and endeavour to do something with him. They alone can do it. We cannot do it on this side; it is like throwing pearls in the wrong direction for us to make speeches on this side attempting to influence the minister; but hon. gentlemen opposite can influence him if they try, if this venture strikes them as it strikes us on this side, as a losing game, a blunder, that should not be committed by the Government of this country.

Mr. PECK: Just in case anybody thinks nobody on the Government side is going to talk, I should like to say a few words. My good friend from Red Deer (Mr. Clark) seemed to resent a question that I asked him in all good humour. The hon. gentleman is such a master of eloquence, and we all respect him so much and listen to him with so much interest that I am sorry he resented the question I asked.

Mr. CLARK (Red Deer): I did not resent the question at all.

Mr. PECK: The hon. gentleman cannot have any more good humour than I have. As I understood the hon. gentleman to be bewailing the decline of freight rates throughout the world, I simply asked why the Government should be blamed for this decline in freights and why that should not be considered in the loss of profits. It is a very god thing that we have continued this debate, because I am quite sure hon. members opposite are entirely sincere; I do not believe they mean to obstruct. When you look across the House at those earnest and sincere countenances, you can see that they do not mean to obstruct. Therefore, is it not very much better that thirty or forty of us should sacrifice our time until this hour of the morning, or if you like during all the forenoon in order to get this item through? This shows that not only we on the Government side, but hon. gentlemen opposite are sincere in this matter, and we want to get the item through. What is the use of carrying on this debate for days? Let us get the item through, and I am sure we can if we go on.

I am not going to carry on the discussion in defence of the policy of the Minister, because we do not need to do that. It is very easy to tear things down, but it is very hard to build them up. I am quite sure that the minister's policy is going to win out, and I am prepared to stand hehind it. I do not care what gibes are thrown at me about my not crossing the floor of the House. I am as good a free trader as the hon. member for Red Deer, absolutely, and if I had a little square constituency down in Alberta, I might talk a whole lot of free trade and nothing else, but I am a practical politician. I am going to fight for free trade where we can get it, but I challenge my hon. friend from Red Deer to say if he can get it from the official Opposition in this House. Take the leader of the Opposition (Mr. Mackenzie King), or the hon. member for Shelburne and Queen's, (Mr. Fielding), or the hon. member for Quebec East, (Mr. Lapointe) or the hon. member for Beauce, (Mr. Béland)—all these hon. gentlemen have made high protectionist speeches in this House. I look in vain for free traders on the other side of the House.

Mr. CASGRAIN: Here we are.

Mr. PECK: I know you are there, but there is no free trader there.

Mr. SINCLAIR (Guysborough): Here is one.

Mr. PECK: If any hon. gentlemen can show me where we can get genuine free trade or a policy that will work towards free trade I will be with him, but in the meantime you have to show me. I always listen to my hon. friend from Red Deer with the utmost respect, and I challenge him to say whether he has any more sympathy than I have with the speeches from the official Opposition.

Mr. CLARK (Red Deer): We are all together on this item.

Mr. PECK: In the meantime let us get on with this item. We are all good humoured and want to get it through. I know hon. gentlemen opposite want to get it through and adjourn the House.

Mr. CLARK (Red Deer): I just want to say that if I have earned any portion of the respect of my hon. friend from

Skeena by anything I have done in this country, then indeed it is one of the highest rewards that has come to me, and a far better reward than could come to me in any other form. So far from holding any resentment, I replied to him with the utmost earnestness. He might have mistaken that for temper, but it was not so. I was very anxious to get my point of view into the mind of my hon. friend. It was simply earnestness, not ill-temper. How could I be ill-tempered with so genial a gentleman as the hon. member for Skeena? Let us leave that.

My hon. friend has joined me at one point. I did say a few minutes ago that I did not see much use in continuing this discussion, but I have rather changed my mind since because of the very practical and sensible speech of my hon. friend from Antigonish and Guysborough (Mr. Sinclair). The more we go into this thing the worse it seems to get. Every time the minister speaks or tells us anything it appears to make his case worse. I do hope we shall have a ministerial reply to the last speech of my hon. friend from Antigonish and Guysborough. He has made a calculation—he knows something about shipping—and he fears that $8,000,000 is not going to finish the contracts of the minister. He has made a calculation by which he has demonstrated to this committee that there are good grounds for fearing $21,000,000 will be needed yet. That is a practical point which the minister is bound to take up, even at this late hour of this sitting. If this $8,000,000 is only a portion, and we shall have to find $21,000,000, I think that is good ground for not getting the item through in a hurry.

My hon. friend from Skeena has issued a challenge to me. I am very proud of him as a confessed adherent of the doctrine of free exchange. He is consistent in believing in a shipbuilding programme, and no doubt if he pegs away at the minister he may get him on a fiscal policy that will make their ships pay. I want, however, to appeal to my hon. friend's imagination—I do not think it is the strongest thing about him. He is the sort of man I would like to have with me if I was going to fight tigers—but I would like him to project himself in imagination to the harbour of Halifax, and to suppose that by some modern invention an inhabitant from the planet Mars had also come to Halifax harbour to see what was going on there. He would naturally ask my hon. friend from Skeena some questions. He would know he had come from close to the Minister of Marine and would naturally suppose he was well up on the shipbuilding programme. "Well," the man from Mars would say to my hon. friend, "what are those fifteen ships doing over there?" "Oh," says my hon. friend from Skeena, "they are being overhauled." "Is there nothing for them to do on the sea?" "Not for the moment; cargoes are very hard to get." Then they would look around the harbour and see two new ships that were being built. This intelligent inhabitant of Mars would naturally say: "Well, I cannot understand why you should be building two more ships when the finances of the country are strained to the utmost, and you have no cargoes for the fifteen ships that are here." What would my hon. friend from Skeena say if he had it put to him in that way? Does he not see that it is an immensely practical proposition that my hon. friend from Guysborough puts up when he says: We had better cut that loss if there is any suspicion of our being drawn into an expenditure of $21,000,000. But there is another side to this question of hurrying the item through. What would the inhabitant of Mars say to the hon. member from Skeena when he explained that we were building more ships, at the cost of millions of money, when we had dozens of them that we had the greatest difficulty in finding cargoes for now? He would say: "I would like to take the next aeroplane back to Mars." So far as I am concerned, I am content from that point of view. My hon. friend has not convinced my reason about the wisdom of getting the item through, but when reason fails to appeal to the majority, then we must succumb to majority rule. So that I join with my hon. friend in wishing that the item may go through as soon as possible. It is getting on to breakfast time now.

Mr. D'ANJOU: (Translation.) I should be recreant to my duty if I did not join those eloquent gentlemen who preceded me, in objecting most strongly to this item of more than $8,000,000 that is asked by the Minister of Marine. Besides the minister, two other hon. gentlemen from the other side contributed to this debate. The first stated that the discussion was nothing but ridiculous, as it was only a question of a few million dollars. Hon. gentlemen have heard so much about millions during the war and are now so familiar with large figures that they are ready to vote any

amount that may be asked by the Government. However, when they were in the Opposition they proved to be very sharp obstructionists; they used to discuss items of $500 for hours; but now that His Majesty's loyal Opposition objects with good reason to this item, they take occasion of that to ridicule the stand we are taking to defend the rights of the people. Hon. gentlemen are doomed to be disappointed, and when they come before the people they shall have to give a strict account of the moneys they have spent in useless and disastrous undertakings.

It may be argued that this discussion is of no avail since the Government, having a majority in this House, can have the money voted whenever they like. But we on this side of the House are satisfied that we have fulfilled our duty in representing properly not only our own constituents, but the whole people of Canada, who shall have to pay exorbitant taxes to meet the enormous expenditure involved in the construction of ships in this country.

According to the experts, at any rate, it is established that this policy was disastrous and it is time for the Government to stop such foolish expenditures of no benefit to the country. Unrest is rampant in the country and not only the people's representatives but the people themselves beg the present Government to economize. Take for instance the Department of Agriculture, whose credits should be very large; the estimates for Agriculture amount to only $4,502,000 and still the Government come and ask for 8 millions to spend on the mercantile marine. However, it seems to me that the interests of the country would be better served should the Government drop their disastrous shipbuilding policy and transfer those 8 millions to the Department of Agriculture so as to encourage our farming community. For my part, and during the last two sessions, I have had occasion to ask the minister to establish an experimental farm in Rimouski county and, on every occasion, the minister told me that my request was a most reasonable one but that it could not be granted until the country's finances were in better shape. The minister said a moment ago that he was ready to spend the night here in order to put through the vote for 8 millions for his shipbuilding industry, but nevertheless, he refuses to extend the necessary explanations or give all the information that the people's representatives in this House may expect from him.

The hon. members who spoke before me have given the opinion of various newspapers regarding the shipbuilding industry in this country. Extracts were read from liberal newspapers, papers in sympathy with the Government, unionist newspapers. With your permission, Mr. Chairman, I shall read an extract from a newspaper which is rather giving its support to the agrarian members in this House: the Ottawa Citizen:

Too Many Ships.

While our government is taking much credit to itself for its extensive and costly shipbuilding program, which goes on apace, there is developing a world situation in tonnage which is becoming of serious import to all maritime nations. This relates to the glut of tonnage from which the European and American continent is suffering. Writing *in the New York Evening Post, Mr. Allan Nevins calls attention to the fact that the United States shipping board has tied up seven steel vessels since the end of September and now announces that eight more, all large ships, have been withdrawn. A noted American authority on maritime affairs is quoted to the effect that hardly half the world's available ocean tonnage is being employed at this time and that a general fall in shipping securities in the United States and Britain marks the general situation.* Companies here and abroad have resorted to special devices to keep their tonnage moving. Five lines plying from Liverpool to Oriental ports—the Cunard, Ellerman, Moss and others—have offered rebates to shippers who will promise to restrict themselves to their vessels. Steamships agents in New York and other American ports are making vigorous efforts to obtain parcel freight in default of full cargo shipments. A fortnight ago the American shipping board announced that American lines carrying freight to the four chief ports of Germany, Holland, Belgium and France would be allowed to fix their own rates. This means a price-cutting war in competition with European lines.

The chief causes for the present situation are given as too much tonnage and a heavy decline in freight shipping. According to Lloyd's Register the world had, in June, 1914, a gross tonnage of about 45 1-2 million tons of shipping. In June of this year it had almost 54 million tons. In addition to this there is building some seven or eight million more tons. In the United States the shipping board has attempted in vain to sell some of the 1,000 steel ships under its control to private parties but the knowledge that the world is in for a protracted spell of sharp competition and of freight rates that spell disaster to lines lacking in efficiency and very heavy capital has proved too strong for the board to do business.

Mr. Chairman, after the evidence offered by the most important newspapers representing public opinion in this country, after the opinion given by experts in shipbuilding, it seems to me that the honourable the Minister of Marine should open his eyes and that, not only should not we report

progress, but this item should be struck out of the estimates for the mercantile marine and granted to the Department of Agriculture. The Government should strive to economize where economies may be accomplished. When the development of Agriculture is at stake, or when those industries which may contribute to develop or increase the richness of our country are at stake, I have no objection to the Government spending all the money they think proper to spend. For my part, I feel sure that the members of the Opposition are now doing their duty towards their constituents and towards the country at large when they oppose with the greatest energy this item of 8 millions which the Minister of Marine asks the House to vote.

Mr. RINFRET: I do not want to detain the House, but I must congratulate the member for Maple Creek (Mr. Maharg), and the member for Red Deer (Mr. Clark), for supporting the Opposition in their attitude to this item. We object to the Merchant Marine, and falling in line with the member for Red Deer, have endeavoured to show that even during the war the minister discriminated in his treatment between steel ships and wooden ships. But even if, as the minister claims, this were a war policy, I contend that it is all the more reason why it should now be discontinued. The Government was supposed to be elected for war purposes, but they do not realize that the war is over. We object to this policy on the further ground that it is another form of Government ownership. This Government has been experimenting with railway ownership, and their experiment has proved disastrous. It is well known that Government ownership in the United States has also proved a great failure, and instead of experimenting further and trying their great administrative powers in this matter, the Government should abandon the policy of public ownership in both railways and ships. The funniest part of the whole debate is the claim of the Minister of Marine that he has a surplus in the operations of his ships, and his figures show an elasticity of bookkeeping which is perfectly astounding. The investment in this great venture is about $50,000,000. The Minister says he has obtained, or rather the management has obtained—because he confesses that he knows nothing about the subject himself—a surplus of over $780,000, something like 2.35 per cent on the initial investment of $50,000,000. The Government is carrying loans on which it is paying 5½ per cent, besides exempting these loans from the income tax. So that it will be seen that the minister cannot show any better statement than a return at 2 per cent on capital. We know that the capital cost of the ships has been shrinking a good deal since they were built. These ships cost $192 per ton deadweight, and it is now claimed that they could be well replaced by ships costing $130 per ton. It is clear, therefore, that we have lost the enormous sum of $62 per ton on the value of the ships, and this represents, both on ships now in commission and on those to be finished, a total deficit of something like $20,000,000. Of course, the minister and his supporters say that we do not need to worry about millions; the war has been won and we must provide employment for returned soldiers, and it does not matter at all if it costs one million or twenty million dollars; we can well afford it. I agree with what has been said by the hon. member for Guysborough (Mr. Sinclair), that the worst way to deal with the problem of the returned soldier is to have such expensive contracts as ship-building for the sole purpose of providing a little temporary work. There are dozens of ways in which we could help the soldiers to equal advantage and with more profit to the country, and this ship-building policy is a poor excuse for providing employment. We have quoted in this House extracts from the press, Tory, Liberal and Independent, and we have also quoted reports of the Bank of Montreal, the Royal Bank, and, in fact, nearly every bank except possibly the Bank of Commerce, all adverse to this scheme of ship-building as well as the policy of the Government ownership of railways. The people have to provide the deficits, and while it is all right for the ministers to say that it is only a matter of a few millions, the people want to know where this money is to come from. We know that in a few weeks' time the Minister of Finance (Sir Henry Drayton) will have to come before the House and advise that some means of taxation be adopted to make up these deficits; and it is a serious responsibility for hon. members to make light of the matter and pass it off with any trivial remark that it is only a few million dollars, or words to that effect. The people have been labouring heavily under the taxation of the Minister of Finance of last year, and that hon. gentleman is now at work to find some other means of taxation. When the people have to dig down into their flat purses to find a few dollars and give them to the Government it

is outrageous to hear the minister say: Oh, that is all right; give us all your earnings so that we may experiment in Government ownership.

I wish to read the following short paragraphs from a clipping from the "Journal of Commerce," a New York paper, dated October 26, 1920:—

> The present cost of operation of modern vessels is from three to five times greater than during the ten-year period prior to 1914, while freight rates are only from two to three times higher at the present time. Building programmes are being curtailed and it is reasonable to believe that freight rates cannot be kept below the actual cost of operation, and unless some international rate war should spring up as a result of the paternal legislation enacted by the last Congress and which the president, with apparent wisdom, has so far declined to enforce, it would seem reasonable to believe that freight rates are not likely to go lower, and with stabilization of the general situation may work higher.
>
> In this connection, it is well for shippers to bear in mind that at this time two years ago the rate on one commodity, for instance, cotton, from New Orleans to Genoa was about $8 per 100 pounds, while to-day the rate is from $1.25 to $1.50 per 100 pounds, or just one-fifth of the rate two years ago, and only about double what the rate was in 1913, although the cost of wages, coal, port charges, etc., have trebled and quadrupled during the same period.

I could go on reading, Mr. Chairman, but I would not utter one sentence which I felt was not useful and necessary for the carrying on of the business of the country. The United States, with their tremendous export trade, had an over-supply of ships. In Canada, though, we continue to build ships, even in the face of the present situation. It would be better for Canada to buy ships from the United States at the present time than to continue to build them in this country. But we should do neither, because we do not need the ships. Not only should we censure the Government for entering upon this policy; we should stop building ships and try to dispose of the ones we have at the earliest possible moment.

6 a.m.

Mr. CAHILL: Will the minister inform the committee at what yards the sixteen ships to be completed are under construction?

Mr. WIGMORE: Victoria, 1; Halifax, 2; Prince Rupert, 2; Toronto, 2; Montreal, 2; Midland, 1; Vancouver, 1; Collingwood, 1; Levis, 1; Port Arthur, 1; Coughlan Yards, Vancouver, 2.

Mr. CAHILL: What is the tonnage of each?

Mr. WIGMORE: Victoria, (one), 8,300; Halifax, (two), 10,500; Prince Rupert, (two), 8,350; Toronto, (two), 3,500; Montreal, (two), 8,300; Midland, (one), 3,500; Vancouver, (one), 8,300; Collingwood, (one), 3,500; Levis, (one), 8,300; Port Arthur, (one), 3,500; Vancouver, Coughlan Yards, (two), 8,300.

Mr. CAHILL: What amount is still to be paid on each?

Mr. BALLANTYNE: I cannot tell the amount for each ship, but the vote will certainly complete the work and no further vote will be asked for. I heard the hon. member for Guysborough say that it would take $21,000,000 to finish the ships. I hope hon. members will take the word of the Government.

Mr. CAHILL: What are the names of the builders of the ships not yet finished?

Mr. BALLANTYNE: Halifax Shipyards, Toronto Ship-building Company, Harbour Marine Company of Victoria, Coughlan Ship-building Company, Vancouver, Wallace Ship-building Company of Prince Rupert. There is also one ship to be completed at Levis and one at Midland.

Mr. SINCLAIR (Guysborough): I do not wish to put my word against that of the minister, but I stated that, according to the minister, there were sixteen ships under construction and that on the basis of a total tonnage of 114,470, at a rate per ton as given by the minister, the cost would reach $21,978,240. If the minister would tell us now how much money he has expended on the ships we would be able to check these figures.

Mr. BALLANTYNE: I gave them to the House when I made my first statement. Of the amount of $8,000,000 required to complete the programme $4,665,496.10 is a re-vote from last year.

Mr. CAHILL: Is there no way in which the minister can cancel these orders and dispose of the unfinished ships?

Mr. BALLANTYNE: The ships will be entirely finished by July next and it would be quite impossible to cancel the orders now.

Mr. CAHILL: According to the twenty-eighth report of the Department of Trade and Commerce for the fiscal year ending March 31, 1920, the total value of goods of Canadian origin exported in the field covered by the Canadian Government Merchant Marine was $30,000,000. We have apparently spent $1.50 for every dollar's worth of goods we exported; yet the in-

creasing of our export trade was one of the principal reasons why the Government went into the ship-building business. To a country that had any knowledge of the economics of export and import, of production and manufacture, my hon. friend's appeal would not be a very sound one. To attempt to build ships to promote export trade is surely building your house on the sand. Hon. gentlemen opposite criticise us on this side for not offering constructive criticism. Well, it is not exactly the business of an Opposition to provide the Government with policies; when the Government find they have no policy, it is time for them to resign.

Taunts have come from the Government side against members of the Opposition for their war records. I have no apology to make for my war record nor for that of my constituents. From the little village of Portage du Fort, in the county of Pontiac, with a population of 360 souls, we had 37 volunteers before conscription came into effect, and after conscription came into effect there was only one man conscripted, and he was neither French nor Irish, but of my hon. friend's nationality, and that is not saying anything against his nationality.

Mr. MAHARG: Who has control of these ships before they are launched?

Mr. BALLANTYNE: The Government, under the Department of Marine.

Mr. MAHARG: I understand that five of these ships are being constructed at inland ports, and that they will be finished in July. I would suggest that if the minister has control over these boats construction be rushed as rapidly as possible, and that these ships be retained on the lakes where they would be absolutely sure to find employment. If he has not control, I would urge that he suggest to the company that the ships be retained on the lakes.

Mr. CAHILL: I wish to read an item from the Halifax Herald, one of the papers supporting the Government:

> The announcement in parliament that the deficit on the government owned and operated railways amounts to something like seventy millions of dollars, is not only startling, but really alarming. In placing the figures at seventy millions it is stated the Minister of Railways was "breaking the news gently," and by that it would occasion no surprise if the actual deficit ran up to over a hundred millions.
>
> But while public attention is focussed on this enormous and really staggering deficit of the railway system, a note of alarm is being sounded from other quarters. There are rumors

to the effect that the railway system is not the only utility that is losing money.

For instance, there is the Canadian Merchant Marine. This gigantic enterprise must have cost the people of Canada a huge sum of money. To-day it is costing a huge sum of money. How many millions of dollars went into this enterprise, we do not know. How many millions of dollars are being spent annually by this same enterprise we do not know.

We think it would be well for the Parliament of Canada to take this matter in hand.

Are the millions of money being spent wisely? That is the question the people would like to have answered.

Are all those ships earning their keep? That is another question the people would like to have answered.

There are about ten of those fine ships in Halifax harbour at the present time, anchored in the stream. Some of them have been there for quite a length of time, and there does not appear to be any hope of their leaving their anchorage at an early date.

The maintenance of a steamer of any size costs money. The maintenance of the ten steamers of the Canadian Government Merchant Marine service cannot cost under one thousand dollars a day for each ship, or, at the inside calculation, ten thousand dollars a day. These ships are fully manned. The officers and members of the crew are sustained at the Government's expense and they are paid out of Government money.

Why are those ships lying idle in Halifax harbour?

If there are ten of those ships lying idle in Halifax harbour how many are there lying idle in other harbours?

Would it be a fair estimate to place the loss occasioned by the maintenance of those idle ships of the Canadian Government Merchant Marine service at $50,000 a day?

Why maintain all those ships if there is nothing for them to do?

Why use them to crowd out privately owned ships on routes of trade which private capital and enterprise have taken years to build up?

Why should the Government enter into competition with its own people?

There are many millions of dollars invested in those steamers. But the first cost is only a bagatelle in comparison to the cost of maintenance and if Canada is not careful, if Parliament does not put on the brakes, does not find out the reasons why, there is a possibility of the country getting another shock of equal if not greater proportions than that served up by the Minister of Railways last week.

The taxpayer of Canada should keep both eyes on the Canadian Merchant Marine.

If Parliament does not put on the brakes, it says. Well, we are putting them on now.

Mr. BALLANTYNE: The Westinghouse brakes.

Mr. CAHILL: No, the Opposition brakes. I would advise the taxpayers to keep their eyes on the Minister of Marine.

The minister persists in going ahead with this foolish and insane scheme in the face of advice from practically all the papers supporting the Government, with the excep-

tion of a few clippings which my hon. friend gathered and handed back to the member for Brantford (Mr. Cockshutt). I do not believe fifty per cent of the members of the Government are honestly in favour of this enterprise, but they must support the proposition because their majority is getting narrow and they cannot afford to go against the Government.

An hon. MEMBER: We had a majority of thirty-eight the last time.

Mr. CAHILL: The time is coming fast when you will be glad to have a majority of three, and if I can help to bring that time any nearer, I am prepared to stay here.

Mr. BALLANTYNE: Next week?

Mr. CAHILL: Well, the sooner the better. Now I am sure that if the minister consulted any schoolboy he would be advised not to squander this $8,000,000 of the people's money on this insane project. I think we had better call a halt and save the people from disaster.

Mr. PIERRE CASGRAIN (Charlevoix-Montmorency): (Translation.) Mr. Chairman, since I have addressed this House, only a few moments ago, I have noticed with some astonishment, mingled with anxiety and even fear, I might say, that the Minister of Marine is left alone to pull himself out the best he can, in the discussion of an item in his budget, and which places him at the mercy not only of the Opposition, but also of that of his own Government friends. I am sorry to see that those who supported him in the past years, in the launching of his new policy of a Canadian merchant marine, abandon him entirely to-day. We have now been sitting all evening, even part of the night,—dawn is now breaking—and the only person, the only member on the right, the only minister who has spoken in the defence or helped in the triumph of the Meighen Government policy, was the hon. Minister of Marine. Three ministers sat in the House this evening: the Minister of Customs, the Minister of Public Works, and the Minister of the Interior. Yet not one came to his rescue. Why? I perceive the reason, Mr. Chairman, in the remark which was made by the Prime Minister himself, when he expressed doubts and fears on the future results of the colossal enterprise of the Minister of Marine. The item of eight million and some odd hundred thousand dollars,—which we have been debating for many hours, is not one which should be voted without giving it much thought; I have already given my reasons why we should strongly oppose it. All my hon. friends who spoke before and after me are of the same opinion. When we consider the item which the Government wishes to have adopted, to-day, by this House and its eagerness to spend not in the interest of the Department of Marine but in the interest of a company called "The Government Merchant Marine, Limited", there is food for thought and we wonder what the Government is doing in other spheres. The Government must devote itself to the public welfare and supervise every thing where its activities find an opening, for instance: wharves and public works in the different provinces, and where they already exist, they must be kept in good condition of repair by the Government; it is its duty to look to these things. Some of these come under the Department of Marine, others are controlled by the Public Works Department.

In my own county there are some wharves which up to the present time were lighted at the expense of the Marine Department. The cost was about $1,000 per year. There was one at Cap à l'Aigle, one at Murray Bay and another at St. Irenée. What is happening to-day? Some time ago, I received a letter informing me that it was the intention of the Department of Marine, of the hon. minister himself and of his deputy minister, to cancel the subsidy which had been granted up to then for the lighting of these wharfs. What will happen when the steamboats of the "Canada Steamship Company" come down at night to this part of the county, to Murray Bay, Cap à l'Aigle and St. Irenée, when they will travel up and down the river; there will be no more lights on the wharves to accommodate travellers, the steamboats and even in some cases not only the boats of the "Canada Steamship Company" but also the Government's own boats. Last night, we were asked to allow the vote on this item of eight million and some odd hundred thousand dollars to go through, and this morning they still insist in having it shoved through; yet we are refused a grant of a few thousand dollars for these wharves. I called upon the deputy minister, Mr. Johnston, and pointed out to him that this was a disastrous policy which would occasion serious inconvenience, many disadvantages and even loss of life. The deputy minister, who that day was a busy man, did not pay much attention to me "Come in some other time, I am too busy at present".

If last night and this morning, we have strongly protested, as we are now doing, it is because the Government, through its representation: the minister, the deputy minister and those who have the care of the commonwealth, are not doing their duty. It is our right to demand from the Government that they look after the commonwealth as they should do. When the Government through its employees and its ministers refuse to do so, it is but just that the members of Parliament should assert the right of those they represent and refuse to pass the items which the Government to-day are pressing them to do. They do not bother about items of two, three, four or five thousand dollars, but they attach much importance to those running into millions, they are easier to shove through, the trick being done, the Government's supporter, those who sell paint for instance, obtain contracts and get rich.

Yesterday afternoon I brought before the House a resolution which came within the province of the Minister of Marine. I was asking for the establishment of a steamship service between Murray Bay, in the county of Charlevoix, and Tadoussac, in the county of Saguenay. You will allow me to say a few words in French on this matter, because this pertains as much to the Marine Department as to the Post Office Department or the Trade and Commerce Department. Nearly two years ago the Minister of Marine himself gave me permission to use the steamer Champlain which, up to that time, had been running between the north and south shores, between Murray Bay and Tadoussac, with calls at Cap à l'Aigle, Saint Fidèle, Saint Siméon and Baie Ste. Catherine.

During the winter season 1919-1920 the service given by this steamer was a most satisfactory one. Now, what happened last spring? Friends of the Government offered to buy this steamer—the St. Lawrence Gulf Shipping Company, if I am not mistaken, represented by a man called Charles Barnard of whom our venerable friend, the member for Shelburne and Queen's, has had occasion to speak last night. I do not want to blame the right hon. Minister of Justice, but this Mr. Barnard happens to be his brother-in-law. I leave the conclusions to those wishing to draw them.

Since that time there has been no steamer service between those places. What happened? As I said yesterday afternoon there is nothing but a small boat going across from Baie Ste. Catherine to Tadoussac with the result that, during the spring, fall and winter months the traffic is four, five or six days late and that the mail can be carried only every second or third day and even only once a week.

Last year, when I criticised the Estimates of the Marine Department, I told the minister that, instead of spending considerable sums—he was then asking for twenty millions—he should not spend all of the amount voted, but save a small part for the constituents I have the honour to represent, a sum of two or three hundred thousand dollars, or grant them a subsidy of three, four or five thousand dollars to permit the establishment of a service between Murray Bay and Tadoussac. Nothing resulted from my request because the Marine Department have much more to do than look after the people of Charlevoix and Saguenay counties. They are busy doing big business. They deal extensively with the Dominion Steel, they carry law suits with this company before the Court of Exchequer; and also with the Nova Scotia Steel Company and the British Empire Steel Co. of which the Deputy Minister of Marine and Fisheries was one of the directors until recently when he resigned to resume his duties as Deputy Minister, so as to give more time to the Canadian Mercantile Marine which was brought forth by the minister and himself. I have but one more thing to add; I have said it several times in the course of this debate, but I would rather say it over again, because the hon. members sitting to your right, Mr. Chairman, are rather boneheaded. Although we tell them that they simply usurp power, that they hold no mandate to keep up this railway policy and to make the people swallow this policy of a mercantile marine which they are boosting to-day, they refuse to listen. The day will come, which is not far off, when after telling them: "Keep your hands off the public treasury," the electors of the Dominion will tell them in their turn what we, the members on the left side, are telling them to-day: "Leave the merchant marine alone, because this is not a good policy for the people of this country."—"Govern—mind your own business."

Mr. MARHARG: How many Government ships have been built and launched in the Port Arthur shipyards?

Mr. BALLANTYNE: Six.

Mr. MAHARG: In what years were they launched?

Mr. BALLANTYNE: In 1919 and 1920.

Mr. MAHARG: What time of year were they launched?

Mr. BALLANTYNE: I do not know the month, nor the day, nor the hour.

Mr. MAHARG: I am not quibbling on such minute information. I want to know approximately, within a month, the time of year these ships were launched.

Mr. BALLANTYNE: I will look up the information.

Mr. CLARK (Red Deer): While the deputy is looking up that information, does not the minister think that as leading the House at this moment, as well as being minister in charge of estimates, he might report progress?

Mr. MACKIE (Renfrew): No chance; carry on.

Mr. CLARK: My hon. friend from Renfrew is not leading the House, and I was not appealing to him. It might be well for the minister to consider that if one sitting of the House runs into the other it might become necessary to carry this vote by closure.

Mr. BALLANTYNE: Does my hon. friend think that is fair after the very plain obstructionist policy that has prevailed on the part of members on the other side since somewhere about midnight? There has been a most deliberate attempt to delay the business of this country; yet the request is now made, at two minutes past seven in the morning, that the committee rise and report progress. All I can say is, certainly not.

7 a.m.

Mr. CLARK (Red Deer): I am not saying anything unfair, I am appealing to my hon. friend to think of his responsibility as leader of the House. Nor can I quite admit, having had considerable experience in Parliament, that the policy of the Opposition has been such as to deserve the characterization the minister has applied to it. The last time I was on my feet I pointed out that the minister never intervened without giving fresh facts upon which further appeals to him could be made as to what his policy really meant: I held out the olive branch to my hon. friend in more ways than one during the night and I thought it was no harm to ask the minister whether he had considered that.

Mr. BALLANTYNE: I appreciate the courtesy which the hon. member always evidences in this House. I have no reference to the hon. member or to those associated with him. But the official Opposition planned this obstruction and put it into effect. Is it fair, therefore, to call upon the Government to ask the committee to rise?

Mr. COPP: By what authority does the minister say that the Opposition planned obstruction tactics and carried them through.

Mr. BALLANTYNE: According to the evidence to-night.

Mr. COPP: The evidence as given by the hon. member for Red Deer is that no obstruction was offered. In fact, my hon. friends sitting to our left have taken a more emphatic stand if possible in regard to this item than the members of the official Opposition. No obstruction tactics were arranged or organized. The suggestion made by the hon. member for Red Deer is a proper one, and I again appeal to the minister to consider the course which he is taking. I have no apology to offer for my attitude. I have remained here this morning and I would remain much longer if I thought that the effect would be to prevent the wasteful expenditure of the people's money. The minister may have a very acute and definite knowledge concerning the transactions of his department but hon. gentlemen on this side have not that information, and the only way we can get it is by interrogating the minister when his Estimates are before the House. The minister, guardian of the treasury so far as his department is concerned, asks the people for $70,000,000 which he has virtually handed over without consulting the people to a company they know nothing about. I repeat, Sir, that the conclusions of the hon. member for Red Deer, who is an hon. member of considerable experience, are absolutely right, and I would feel that I was not doing my duty to my constituents, to Parliament or to the people if I did not utter the strongest protest of which I am capable against the procedure which has been adopted by the Government.

Mr. MAHARG: Is the minister in a position to answer my question?

Mr. BALLANTYNE: Ships were lounched ready to go to sea, on July 17, 1919, August 6, 1919, October 4, 1920, October 29, 1919, October 15, 1920, and November 17, 1919.

Mr. MAHARG: May I ask if these boats left the head of the lakes with cargoes or part cargoes?

Mr. BALLANTYNE: I do not know if that comes under the operation of ships.

Mr. SINCLAIR (Guysborough): Has the Merchant Marine made any report to the Minister this year?

Mr. BALLANTYNE: None other than that which I presented to the House in my statement. Their annual report will be issued shortly.

Mr. SINCLAIR (Guysborough): I think we should have the advantage of that report before us before we are asked to vote this money. I am surprised my hon. friend undertook to charge the Opposition with obstruction. He has brought this upon himself by stating the other day that we had not opposed the passing of items for the construction of ships, and that consequently we had committed ourselves to the Government programme. We are now endeavouring to make our objections as plain as we can. It is not from this side of the House alone that opposition is coming. There is no newspaper in this country that has been so loyal to the present party as the Halifax Herald, and we have had extracts from that paper read to-night showing that the Herald is arousing the whole people of Nova Scotia on this question. The Ottawa Journal and the Montreal Gazette take the same view as the Halifax Herald of the Government's policy. You could not name three more loyal papers to the Liberal and Conservative party than these three, yet they are all protesting against the expending of this money.

Mr. BALLANTYNE: When the report of the Merchant Marine does come down, it will be an exact duplicate of the figures I have presented to this House already. I can say further that the annual report of the Board of Directors will not contain nearly such extensive information as I have given to the House.

Mr. DUFF: The minister has told us that the amount placed to rest for depreciation is $667,665.46. On the same page you will find that between that amount and the depreciation reserve shown on the consolidated balance sheet there is a difference of $148,175.86.

Mr. BALLANTYNE: That is the amount of depreciation carried over from last year and added to this.

[Mr. Ballantyne.]

Mr. DUFF: There is no such amount in the 1919 statement as $148,000. I have looked for it.

Mr. BALLANTYNE: I said that this amount of $150,000 was carried over from last year and added to this year's depreciation.

Mr. DUFF: Then it should have appeared in last year's statement but it does not. It does not speak of $148,000, but of $1,056,767.38.

I admit that the minister is in an awkward position, and if he has not the information it is only fair that he should report progress. He said the other day that he was willing to give all information, and there is absolutely no reason why this item should be forced through. We are not trying to block the estimates, but we want to get information in view of the promise given by the minister on March 29, that he would inform the House on these matters.

Mr. BALLANTYNE: If the hon. member will read Hansard he will see that I offered to give every bit of information possible regarding contracts placed for steel ships between the Department of Marine and the shipbuilders. I am prepared to do that.

Mr. DUFF: The minister should be prepared to give information with regard to all of the operations of the Marine. There is an item of $148,000 in regard to which we want to know something.

Mr. BALLANTYNE: What is before the committee is the 1921 statement. The only item here that is taken from the 1919 figures is the item I have just given of $150,994.46. I have given frankly and freely all the information I have.

Mr. DUFF: I can quite understand that the minister feels we are pressing him too hard.

Mr. BALLANTYNE: Not at all.

Mr. DUFF: The minister need not deny it. At the same time, we are not blocking his estimates.

Mr. BALLANTYNE: You are.

Mr. DUFF: That is not quite fair. In the operating account you have an item for depreciation of $667,000, and in the same column you have an item for something like $880,000 for depreciation. The public will think there is something wrong, and someone has to prove where the differences come in.

Mr. BALLANTYNE: Are you not satisfied to take the certificate of such a well known concern as Marwick, Mitchell and Company? If you are not going to accept the operating company's figures, audited by their own auditor, and this reputable firm, the Government cannot possibly do more.

Mr. DUFF: The minister is a business man; he has done business on a larger scale probably than any other man in this House, and he knows how far auditors can go and what information they can obtain. If he will read their statement, he will see that they add a qualifying clause that the information they get is according to the books of the company. They cannot possibly tell what the true facts are.

Mr. BALLANTYNE: I have seen hundreds of statements of various companies during my time. If an auditor comes to audit your business he has to get the information from you, and he must therefore say that his statement is based on information that is given to him. That is as far as any auditor can go.

Mr. DUFF: That is what I say; it is impossible for Marwick to be absolutely sure that these accounts are correct. Marwick does not know whether the outstanding liabilities are $22,000 or $222,000, and it a well known fact that that item is not correct.

Mr. BALLANTYNE: How do you know it is not correct? My hon. friend must not suppose that the auditors can go to the Government Marine and make a cursory examination of the books. A firm like Marwick goes closely into these questions. The whole statement falls to the ground if we are to take the position my hon. friend is taking.

Mr. DUFF: The minister does not know whether this is really a profit or not, and I think I am right in saying that no shipping man in the world would make up a statement and say that the Government made money since the first of January on their ships. I do not believe there is a steamer in the world that has made any profits since the first of January, or at all events since September 1, last. And yet, in order to make a good showing, the company puts words into the mouth of the minister and makes him say that he made a profit of $183,000. There is no question that that cannot be correct, and this is another reason why the minister should furnish the Committee with information. The company estimated some $513,000 as profits they expected on unclosed voyages in 1919 and 1920, and the minister expects us to pass this item without any information. If there is one business in the world in connection with which the management cannot predict any sure profits it is the shipping business, and the minister of Customs (Mr. Wigmore) who is present must know that this business is the most precarious in the world. When a ship leaves port, although the owner may know what his expenses are going to be and what the cargo is, nevertheless he can never figure on what his profit will be. He can only tell when his crew are paid off. It is a shame that the Minister should be placed in such a position—to be made to father a statement of that kind, because any man who reads it must know that there is something wrong. There is no justification for figuring a profit of $350,000 on voyages which were not closed.

The minister told us on two occasions that these ships were built so as to increase Canada's export trade, but early this morning, finding that his previous statements would not hold water, he explained the presence of fifteen ships in Halifax harbour by saying that they are going to be used in the coal trade. Well, they may as well be used in the carrying of coal as lie at anchor in Halifax harbour or take goods to foreign countries at a loss. But the ministers's argument that his ships were built to increase export trade falls to the ground when he now says that he is going to use practically thirty-three per cent of his ships in the coal trade. Then, there is the curious fact that these ships were built on the Great lakes and subsequently taken elsewhere, although the minister in reply to the hon. member for Maple Creek (Mr. Maharg) practically expressed his willingness this morning to place some of them on the Lakes. Surely that shows bad management somewhere.

8 a.m.

Another statement made by the minister in regard to the operation of these ships is rather interesting—and this is a point on which I have not touched before. On page 1331 of Hansard, in his statement of March 29th, the minister said:

> With regard to the costs of operation, it will be found that a comparison of Canadian Government wage costs with like costs of operating similar ships by Great Britain, the United States, Japan, Norway and France, is as follows:
>
> The monthly wage cost of a Canadian Government merchant marine ship of 8,100 tons

deadweight which carries a crew of 41, including 2 boys, is $3,705. Published figures from an authentic source—(bulletin issued by Dow, Jones & Co., of New York), show the monthly wage cost of foreign ships of similar tonnage as being, for British ships $3,924; American, $5,315; Norwegian, $3,378; and Japanese, $2,869.

But I find that quite a different statement in this regard appears in the report of the minister's department. It says:

The following is an approximate comparison of the cost of wages and board per month between a British, an American, a Canadian, and a Japanese steam merchant ship of similar tonnage and dimensions; cost of the British ship for wages and board per month $3,645.09, of the American $6,711.10, of the Canadian $2,303.50, and of the Japanese $1,124.50.

Now, Sir, I would like the minister to explain the discrepancy which exists between the figures given in these two statements.

Mr. BALLANTYNE: The explanation is that the figures given in the departmental report are a year old, whereas the statement I presented to the House, gave the figures up to date.

Mr. DUFF: I notice also that in the departmental report it is stated that the pay of the master of the Canadian ship was $250 per month, and that of the master on a Japanese ship $100 per month, and that able seamen on the Canadian ship receive $16.20 per month, and on the Japanese ship $9 per month. Am I to understand that on the Government ships able seamen received last year only $16.20 per month?

Mr. BALLANTYNE: I am informed that my hon. friend is quoting from the parliamentary report, and that that is a ship of Canadian register operated by a Japanese crew.

Mr. DUFF: It does not read that way. It says that an able seaman on a Canadian ship received $16.20 per month.

Mr. BALLANTYNE: Those figures do not apply to the Canadian Government Merchant Marine at all but to a Japanese crew on a ship of Canadian register.

Mr. DUFF: I should like to know who are the managers and directors of this merchant marine?

Mr. BALLANTYNE: The maneger is Mr. R. B. Teakle, for many years with the Allan Line. The directors are Mr. Hanna, Mr. Mitchell, Colonel Cantley, Mr. E. R. Wood, Mr. Barnhill, and Mr. Reilly, of Winnipeg.

Mr. DUFF: Mr. Teakle of Montreal may know something about shipping but none of the others do. I think the directors should be competent shipping men, and one should be located at Halifax and another at Vancouver.

Mr. CLARK (Red Deer): I would again point out to the minister where we have arrived in this matter, and make another appeal to him, such as I made an hour and a half ago. We have arrived at the position where reason does not prevail, where two sets of grown legislators have resorted to a policy, for some hours at least, of pure force or endurance. The vote before us is upon a policy which is very unpopular in the country. There is no difference on the Opposition side of the House in regard to the subject, and I venture to say that if we had an honest expression of opinion we should find very grave doubts among hon. gentlemen opposite as to the wisdom of this policy. As has been pointed out, three of the leading ministerial papers are opposed to this policy, the Halifax Herald, the Montreal Gazette and the Ottawa Journal. I am pointing these things out in order to induce, if possible, a reflective frame of mind in my hon. friend. My hon. friends to my right cannot be moved; I have appealed to them. They at any rate are sure of defeat, and for this reason, that the Government has the machinery in its own hands by which this impasse can be brought to an end along proper and reasonable lines provided in the legislation of the country. If the Minister cannot get his vote without it, he can get it by the closure, as long as he has a majority behind him. Under these circumstances, what is the use of persisting?

Mr. BALLANTYNE: I cannot understand the reasoning of my hon. friend. Surely he can remember that the serious business of the House ceased at midnight when the member for Lunenburg (Mr. Duff) read a voluminous article in regard to certain ill-treatment which had been meted out to some seamen on one of the ships. I asked him if he would be good enough not to read the article, as we had all seen it. Not only did he read it, but he deliberately started in again and read it over.

Mr. CLARK (Red Deer): In response to an invitation.

Mr. BALLANTYNE: Since midnight we have listened to nothing but newspaper re-

ports from the Montreal Gazette, the Halifax Herald, and other papers. I could read reports from newspapers all over the country commending the Government Merchant Marine, but I have too much compassion on the committee to do that. My hon. friend from Red Deer attaches too much importance to what any newspaper says about the Government shipbuilding policy. If he thinks that the press of the country is opposed to that policy, the first time he is in the library let him read the newspapers and he will see that the majority of them are very much in favour of our shipbuilding programme.

Mr. CLARK: Name some newspapers.

Mr. BALLANTYNE: I will not take up the time of the House doing so. Now, questions have been discussed all night and this morning which have been dealt with before, and as leader of the Government at the moment I will say frankly and freely that, in view of the systematic blocking of our estimates since midnight, I certainly will not, at a quarter to nine, agree to report progress.

Mr. MAHARG: I desire to correct the minister. He said that since twelve o'clock we have done nothing but quote newspaper reports.

Mr. BALLANTYNE: I leave out the hon. member.

Some hon. MEMBERS: Order.

Mr. MAHARG: Previously to twelve o'clock I did not say one word. The minister, I will admit, always answered me courteously, and I think he will admit that I never gave him any reason for making a statement of that kind in reference to myself.

Mr. BALLANTYNE: My remarks had no reference to the Agrarian party, which is so well represented in this House today.

Mr. CLARK: It would be ungracious of me not to acknowledge the generosity of my hon. friend's afterthought. But that is only an illustration of the effect which the strenuousness of this sitting has had upon his intellect. The minister is not fit to go on with the game he is playing.

Mr. BALLANTYNE: Do not be alarmed; I am all right.

Mr. CLARK: I think my hon. friend is exhausted, and I would have to take with more than a grain of salt any figures which he might give, unless they were well audited by someone else.

Mr. BALLANTYNE: I am perfectly sober.

Mr. COPP: I do not want to take issue with my hon. friend the minister, or to entreat him to report progress, but I will not permit his statement to go unchallenged, that there had been systematic blocking of the Estimates since twelve o'clock. The minister has occupied more time than any other member of the committee. The hon. member for Lunenburg (Mr. Duff) in reading a second time the newspaper article referred to, was only courteously complying with a request from the other side. Now, the minister said he did not quote articles which he could have given by the dozen in commendation of his programme. Well, he had newspaper clippings before him and he deliberately gave them to another hon. gentleman to make use of, and in order that they might be read he had to request a member who had the floor to sit down. I challenge him to deny that statement. It is no use his raising his hands in holy horror and shedding crocodile tears on the misuse of time in this Chamber. I have taken up a few minutes, and I can inform the hon. gentleman that I am prepared to stay here till three o'clock this afternoon or twelve o'clock to-night and see that the people's interests are safeguarded before this item passes.

Some hon. MEMBERS: Louder.

Mr. COPP: I will speak just as loud or as quietly as I want to. Now, we on this side will not permit the statement to go unchallenged that we have in any way blocked the Estimates. We have only exercised our right in asking for information which the minister should give us.

Mr. CAHILL: I did not say a word before twelve o'clock last night, and when I did criticise the Government, I did so mildly. When I read from a newspaper, the extract was very short and it was from a newspaper which, although condemning the Government in this case, usually supports it. I am glad the Minister of Railways (Mr. Reid), who is the senior officer in this undertaking, is now in charge of the Estimates. We were told that the Canadian Pacific Railway had ships, and we were asked whether any person would say that they could be sold. The Canadian Pacific Railway ships, I am informed, are not of the kind that we are spending money on.

They are passenger liners running on established routes, while our ships are tramp vessels running all over the country looking for cargo. We were told also that the Canadian National Railway Company could not get along without ships. Well, the Canadian Pacific Railway got along very well without ships. I know that the Great Northern, one of the best railways in the United States, ventured on the shipping business, and went out of it because it was not profitable. But the Canadian Pacific Railway are organized and equipped to take care of international trade to a larger extent than any other organization in the world. I am quite sure the Minister of Railways will not claim that the Canadian Merchant Marine has been an acquisition to the earning power of the Canadian National Railways. It is a mistaken idea that you can assist the National Railways by carrying cargo from South Africa to South America or from Texas to Liverpool. Now, the Government must not try to evade responsibility in this matter by placing it in the hands of an irresponsible body. They have taken a course that will naturally create a great deal of opposition. The Prime Minister, about twenty-four hours ago, appointed a committee to look into the whole question of railways and shipping, and a very few hours after that the Minister of Marine came down with his Estimates and wanted to put this very large sum of money through for his shipbuilding programme. He insisted that he had a programme; that he was going on with it; that nothing would induce him to part with these ships. Well, if any one was unreasonable, it was the Minister of Marine. I hope, therefore, that when the Minister of Railways comes to pass his estimates he will be more generous in the matter of giving information; and that now that he is in the Chamber, he will by furnishing all the information possible, refrain from obstructing the estimates of the Minister of Marine. I do not hesitate to say that I should be glad to obstruct this item if by so doing I could prevent its being passed. I am quite willing to take the responsibility of obstructing in this case; I only wish I could obstruct more successfully than it seems to be in the power of the Opposition to do.

Hon. Mr. REID: I think it is hardly fair for the hon. member to say that the Government ships are not bringing traffic to the railways. Last summer I discussed the matter with Mr. Phillips, our agent in London, and he mentioned the fact that our ships collected a cargo in South Africa, I think it was, for Canada.

Mr. SINCLAIR (Guysborough): What products come from South Africa to Canada?

Hon. Mr. REID: It was a port in Africa or some other foreign country that Mr. Phillips mentioned. In any case, he said that there was a full cargo from that country to Canada. When our vessels go to England or to ports in foreign countries in that part of the world, they do bring return cargoes, and consequently our railways get the benefit.

Mr. MAHARG: Are these cargoes supposed to be shipped to ports where our own railroads will get the traffic?

Hon. Mr. REID: If it is a cargo that we can collect for Canada, our railway gets the benefit of it when it is landed.

Mr. MAHARG: But in the case of Canadian Pacific freights, would they go to our roads, or to the Canadian Pacific Railway?

Hon. Mr. REID: They work together in order to get a cargo for the vessel. If the Canadian Pacific would ship their freight by our vessel, we would get that advantage; otherwise they might have to send it on one of their own ships or on a tramp vessel at a later date.

Mr. MAHARG: If they gave you their freight to take care of, you would hand it over to them at a port where they would secure the railway haulage?

Hon. Mr. REID: If our agent could get a full cargo at some point, say in South Africa, our vessel would take it. If the Canadian Pacific agent had a part cargo, we might take it and let them receive it at this end. Now, a number of these smaller ships could be used between Sydney and Montreal in the carrying of coal.

Mr. SINCLAIR (Guysborough): I have pointed out that it is the experience of the manager of the Dominion Coal Company that small ships did not pay in the coal trade and that they found it wiser to use larger ships with big hatches for operation between Nova Scotia and Montreal. If my hon. friend has any large ships, I would advise him to use them in that coal trade, unless he wants to lose money on the business. There may be use for the small ships somewhere, but evidently that is not the place to put them.

Mr. RINFRET: As one of the members who earlier in the night made a few quota-

tions, I wish to say that I have no apology to make for doing so. The Minister of Marine, of course, would not enjoy my reading of the editorial from the Montreal Gazette. I quoted also from the report of the Royal Bank. Any objection on the part of the Minister of Marine to these quotations would be not because of their length, but because they expressed distinct disapproval of his policy. The Minister said some time ago that the Opposition had planned this obstruction. Now, I have noticed that the Minister of Marine always brings up his estimates when they are least expected. Last year, when he was quite aware that a number of members from Quebec were objecting to estimates for the Canadian Navy, he made a point of bringing those estimates down on Saturday evening, when many hon. members from Quebec would be away. But it happened that we were not away; the discussion proceeded forced until midnight, and the Minister was obliged to bring his estimates up on another day. On the present occasion, the minister comes down with his estimates on Monday, private members' day, and at a time when quite a number of members were attending in Montreal the funeral of a former member of the late Laurier administration. It was wholly improper that the minister, about half-past eleven at night, and on such an occasion should ask the committee to consider an important item respecting the merchant marine. Yet the minister wonders why his estimates are not well received and why we raise objection. If he would give notice in the ordinary way that the estimates of the merchant marine would be taken up tomorrow or on a day named, possibly he would not be subjected to this particular treatment. This is a very important item, calling for the expenditure of $8,000,000. I think the point made by the hon. member for Guysborough (Mr. Sinclair) is a very strong one—that next year the minister will come down and ask for more millions in connection with his ship-building policy.

This item is a large one compared with some of the other items of the different departments. For the Justice Department, which is a very important department, we find the Government is well satisfied with an item of $2,181,000, as will be seen by reference to pages 11, 12 and 13 of the Estimates. For the Agricultural Department, page 24 of the Estimates, all that is asked is $4,500,000, plus another $1,000,000 authorized by statute. For the carrying on of this important service, which we cannot do without, the Government is satisfied with $5,500,000. But they ask us to vote $8,000,000 for the Merchant Marine, which service results in annual deficits, and we do not know when it will end. I think this comparison is very edifying, and we might refer to the Immigration Department, page 25 of the Estimates. That department is satisfied with $1,500,000, and possibly a few hundred thousand more, to carry on the work of the department. It is absolutely out of place that the Government should ask us to vote $8,000,000 for this fantastic Merchant Marine with which we are loaded. The Department of Health is a most important department, dealing with medicine, hospitals, quarantine stations and so on; but the Government is well satisfied with $700,000 for that department. On page 50 of the Estimates we find that the Government is only asking $2,465,000 for the Lighthouse and Coast Service. This service is not intended for ships which are empty, which the Government did not know where to send or what to put into, but this is a very important service for the general steamship trade of the country. I will not say the amount is not large enough, but, when compared with other items, it seems very reasonable. But by comparison the amount asked for the Merchant Marine is much too large. The amounts asked for by the Fisheries Department, the Labour Department, the Dominion Lands Department, or any other department are smaller than the amount asked for by the Merchant Marine. I think it is unfair that the Minister of Marine should refuse the Committee to rise.

I join with the hon. members on the other side of the House in greeting the Right Hon. Minister of Trade and Commerce, who has just taken his seat. He is a sensible gentleman, and I feel quite sure that when we put our case before him he will advise his colleagues to rise and report progress. I think he will agree that it is utterly improper to ask us to vote this amount this morning. This is Private Members' day, the item is important, and the attendance in the House is very slim. I appeal to the good sense and the prolonged experience of the Right Hon. Minister of Trade and Commerce (Sir George Foster) as to whether we are not right in asking the Committee to rise. We are entitled to more information, and it is not at all unreasonable to ask that this item should stand over for further discussion. When we try to speak from our own knowledge and experience in such matters

we are jeered at and referred to as members who did not know much about the question. When we cite quotations from papers supporting the Government, or from reports of presidents of great financial institutions, we are charged with obstruction and an endeavour to kill time. I think the hon. minister has failed to appreciate the earnest desire of members on this side of the House to obtain information, and perform their duties as representatives of the people. The hon. Minister of Marine argued that the Merchant Marine was a war measure and that when he started shipbuilding he had done it as if he thought the war was going to last forever; he said this was a very proper thing and we could take no chances. He said that while other nations were building wooden ships he would not follow their example, because the ships would be of no use after the war, and we would be loaded with them. My hon. friend had a double mind, a war mind as regards steamships and a peace mind as regards wooden ships.

The experiment of the Government in public ownership was disastrous, and was an utter national catastrophe in regard to railways, and we should not make the same mistake with shipbuilding. The Minister of Marine says that if we have the ships and the railways working together we will have different results and possibly a surplus. The deficits that are creeping up in the Merchant Marine are liable to become as great as the deficits in the administration of the railways. Some day in the future the Minister of Marine will say that it is all right, we have deficits in the railways and in the Merchant Marine, but that is because there is a missing link, and we should build aeroplanes to run in connection with the ships and the railways. When Sir Vincent Meredith, Sir Herbert Ames, and the newspapers supporting the Government condemned these policies, it was about time to stop. I would urge that the Rt. Hon. Minister of Trade and Commerce should advise his colleagues that further discussion should be postponed.

Sir GEORGE FOSTER: I have not had the pleasure of sitting the seance through to-night, but I recall old times when I have seen daylight streaming through the window. My hon. friend from St. James (Mr. Rinfret), has appealed to me to ask members on this side of the House to agree to rise and report progress. In order to report progress, we will have to show that some item has been passed which would indicate that we have made some progress. The item before the House is one for the fulfillment of contracts already let. I am informed that not a single contract for which this money is being asked has been let since the last session of Parliament. These contracts were in conformity to a policy which had been supported and received an affirmative vote in the House, and the contracts were let in the line of a policy which had been determined upon in the House. The contracts having been let and the work having gone on, they must be proceeded with and the contractors must be paid, and the money necessary to complete the vessels must be voted, so as to bring them upon the water, where they can produce returns. Is it reasonable under the circumstances to refuse the vote for the completion of this work? We have our differences as to policy in this House, but Parliament can never proceed with its work unless the majority rules. The previous vote received the approbation of the House and the money was voted. Is it supposable now that the Government is going to back up, and that no money should be voted to complete the work? That is impossible. If that were done the Government could not retain its self-respect, and could not function. The Government must give such information as can properly be given. I venture to say that no new matter has been introduced during the debate and the subject is worn thread-bare. If the Government is to function they must have the money to carry on the established policy.

Mr. CLARK (Red Deer): My right hon. friend the Minister of Trade and Commerce has made a brief speech on this subject, but he suffers very great difficulty in not having heard the discussion during the night. If he had heard that discussion he would not have ventured on one of the arguments that he used, and certainly would not have ventured on the guess that he has made as to what has been going on. He says that if progress had been made he would willingly accede to the request to report progress. That is an endeavour on his part to get round what is ordinary parliamentary formula. He has frequently taken part in the reporting of progress when no item had been voted. I will try to show him that progress has been made during the time he has been enjoying a much-needed rest. His argument is based exclusively on the fact that this $8,000,000, equal to one-fifth of the total expenditure, roughly speaking, of this whole Dominion at the time my right hon. friend ended his

period as financial adviser of the previous Conservative administration, is to complete a contract. In this shipbuilding scheme the Government has not shown any very great respect for contracts. They had a contract in connection with this very scheme with the Dominion Iron and Steel Company of Nova Scotia, a contract in good faith I presume, to take 250,000 tons of steel from the Dominion Iron and Steel Company for this shipbuilding project. Only 40,000 tons have been delivered, and this Government who, my hon. friend says, must observe the sacredness of contract in connection with building ships has cancelled the steel contract and arbitration proceedings are going on now to settle their account with the Dominion Iron and Steel Company.

My right hon. friend also ventured upon the guess that no new matter came out during the night. I may say that a great deal of new matter came out during the night, and I will deal with the new matter in referring to the short speech which the Minister of Railways made just now, of which I did not hear the whole, but which I venture to refer to in regard to the part which I did hear.

He was saying, when I had to leave the House a few minutes ago, that this government building of ships was primarily a war measure. Now, I venture to take direct issue with my hon. friend, if he means that it was a war measure undertaken, of necessity, by the Government. We elicited very important information in regard to that during the night—very important, as far as I was concerned, during the period since twelve o'clock which my hon. friend, the Minister of Marine said a few minutes ago had practically been wasted. That hon. minister himself told us that when this shipbuilding scheme of this Government was taken up, the Imperial Munitions Board had been for some time engaged at fourteen different points in Canada, marshalling all the forces that Canada could spare of men and material for shipbuilding; had been doing all that Canada could do in addition to her almost superhuman efforts in the field. I take the ground that the hon. Minister of Railways could not have known all about this scheme or he would not have claimed that this was undertaken in the first instance as a war measure. It was transferred from the Imperial Munitions Board, who were doing the work splendidly, and who would have had this very great advantage in the doing of the work, that they would have been able to stop it at the end of the war,—transferred not the better to attend to the war, but transferred to the Dominion Government with this idea in the back of the hon. Minister's head—and I take it with this idea also in the Government's head—that the busines might be undertaken as a Canadian work, and the benefits presumably passed into the pockets of Canadians; so, I say, the defence that this was a war measure falls to the ground. The Minister of Railways has used the argument in this House—and we have heard it during the night, we heard it last evening—that the shipping scheme of the Government is a necessary complement of the National Railways. Well, now, the thing that we cannot get over in that connection is this: This Dominion is very short of money at the present time, all railroad extensions within Canada have had to cease, and I commend the Government for their firmness in that connection. We have had a report in connection with the Canadian railways which, to say the least, of it, ought to make every member of this House, whether on the Government or on the Opposition side, anxious about the financial condition of these roads and the financial condition of the whole country. The duty of the Opposition comes in at this point to find out exactly what is going to be done with the vote of $8,000,000 and what the Government hope for. Now, if we are to regard the shipping scheme as the complement of the railway scheme, and if we could have the assurance that the shipping scheme was going to be such a success in the next few years, that it will help the railways out of the hole, we on this side of the House should be satisfied. Will the Minister of Trade and Commerce say he has any hope that this shipping scheme will help the railroad scheme?

An Hon. MEMBER: Certainly.

Mr. CLARK: My hon. friend says "Certainly," then he must prove to us how two deficits will make a surplus. That is the financial difficulty that is bothering the humble individuals on this side of the House. I do not know who it was who interrupted me with that confident adverb, "Certainly." Whoever used it is omniscient in railroad and shipping matters. If he believes that this shipbuilding scheme, this building of ships at a time when ships are a drug, not only in the Canadian market, but in the markets of the world, is

justified economically and will help in the railway situation, to meet the deficits on the railways of forty millions last year and seventy millions, this year,—well, we cannot see how two deficits are going to make a surplus, and how a small deficit is going to help to meet a bigger one. I want to get to very close quarters with this scheme, and I want to tell the right hon. the Prime Minister and the Government exactly what is troubling him, and to give my right hon. friend, the Minister of Trade and Commerce, some information that we have received during the night. I wonder if my right hon. friend has any idea how many of these ships are in Halifax harbour at the present time. I do not think he knows. Well, we have been here all night, and we have the information. There are fifteen of them. I do not think they are two years old. And what are they doing in Halifax harbour? The Halifax Herald, a journal which generally supports this Government with might and main says they are tied up to the wharves and doing nothing. We heard during the night from the minister that they were being overhauled. Well, the overhauling of fifteen ships within two years of being turned out by this Government is a pretty serious operation for the people of this country. And what else is going on at Halifax? Will he (Sir George Foster) believe that, with these fifteen ships tied up in the Halifax harbour and their counterparts sailing over the seven seas seeking cargoes in Scandinavian and other ports, and not finding them; with their capital value cut in the middle—there are now two new ships being built in Halifax harbour? Does he not think this is a work of supererogation and that there is danger of financial disaster if this policy is continued? Does my right hon. friend wonder that we, on this side of the House, are anxious and that we do not want this work to go further without the country being fully apprised of the facts and understanding the situation of the shipping scheme at the present moment? Why, I ventured to indulge in a flight of imagination during the night. I wondered if a man from Mars, if he were intelligent, who came to Halifax harbour for the first time and looked over it with one of the Government supporters and saw the condition of affairs—I wondered what he would think of the inhabitants of this planet and especially of this country and the members of the Dominion Government. He would naturally say, "Well, what are these fifteen ships doing here idle? They look to be pretty new. The paint is hardly off them." He would have to be informed, "They are getting overhauled. They have been for two years pulling us out of our railroad deficit, and they have now come into this harbour to be overhauled." Now, if he were of an inquisitive turn of mind he would take the Government supporter to where the two new ships were being built and ask: "What are these ships for?" "Oh, these are new ships to join the company of the idle ships that are getting overhauled." Then what would he say? If, as I have presumed to imagine Mars is inhabited by intelligent people he would say "Get me an aeroplane, and let me go back to the planet Mars where there are intelligent people, for I cannot find any intelligence in the Dominion Government." He would be compelled to say that if he were intelligent, which I have presumed to imagine.

I had sworn to myself I would not say any more about the merits of this scheme. My hon. friend the Minister of Marine will tell the House I have occupied very little time during the night. Indeed for the last four or five hours the men who have been debating the merits of this scheme have been growing so strong that I could not get a word in edgeways except to promote walking in the paths of peace. I have been endeavouring in the last four or five hours to get the Minister of Marine to listen to reason, and as I am on my feet I will tell my right hon. friend (Sir George Foster) the advice I have been giving him. I have pointed out to him that this scheme is doubtfully popular, that the Government's hold in this House is a slender one, that their tenure of the country is still more doubtful, and that it would have been the part of wisdom to use the legal regular machinery for terminating this debate. I fully concede—my right hon. friend knows I concede it before I say so, and as I have said before on critical occasions this session—a government is constitutionally a government as long as it has a majority of the House behind it. But my right hon. friend knows his Shakespeare: "It is excellent to have a giant's strength, but it is tyrannous to use it like a giant," and what I tried to impress upon the immature and inexperienced parliamentary mind of my hon. friend the Minister of Marine and Fisheries was that it would be a wise thing to let the few of us who feel very keenly on this sub-

ject go home some hours ago and then he could meet the House later and put his estimate through by the legalized procedure of the closure. What are we going to gain by sitting here hour after hour? I do not know what the proper machinery will be for bringing this seance, as my right hon. friend has called it, to a close. I am not very well up on how the guillotine is operated in this country, but I understand that notice is needed. In any case I refer this matter to my right hon. friend in a conciliatory spirit, which the Minister of Marine will admit I have displayed again and again at this sitting—I said hours ago that as far as I was concerned I did not believe in the policies of force. I have only a distant connection with my hon. friends to the right; I was only supported by one member of the Progressive group for hours; so that I could not do more than suggest a certain line of conduct. We have arrived at an impassé in which physical force is being used. Now the closure is physical force, but it is physical force reinforced by reason, and carried out in a reasonable way. And I say to my right hon. friend, (Sir George Foster) who is now leading the House, that he should consider that aspect of the case. We cannot refuse the estimate; the Government is in power, and we cannot refuse it. But we can surely take two nights to discuss it, and if the night runs into the morning, then it is an obstinate minister that is to blame and not an inquisitive Opposition. May I show my right hon. friend the reasonableness of what I am saying by reminding him that ten years ago he himself took a leading part in holding up estimates, in holding up the House of Commons against the beneficent measure of reciprocity, most of which he himself has since helped to carry, and he did that not for two nights only, but for days and days, and weeks and weeks, and almost months, until he forced the Liberal Government to go to the country. Now there is no power in an Opposition to do that now, because my right hon. friend has the closure as every civilized country in the world has been compelled to have it, so it is only a question of following properly arranged and legalized machinery, instead of methods which are perfectly natural to a strong-minded and decided character who has spent his life in business, like my hon. friend the Minister of Marine and Fisheries, but are utterly foreign alike to the nature and experience of my right hon. friend who leads the House. I pray the Minister of Marine to postpone his eagerness to get his estimate through, and to consider the new matter we have brought out during the night in as favourable a light as he can, and to meet me half way, and seize the olive branch which I offer on behalf of the recalcitrant group to my right.

Mr. FONTAINE (Hull): (Translation.) Mr. Chairman, I rise to endorse the appeal made to the Government by the hon. member for Red Deer (Mr. Clark) that they may consent to adjourn and report progress. I heard a moment ago the hon. Minister of Commerce (Sir George Foster) who had just re-entered the House and upon whom we counted to induce his colleagues to show themselves amenable to common sense, say that it was difficult to report progress as no progress had been made. It seems to me on the contrary that we have accomplished much. The members of this Parliament who opposed this item of eight million dollars have spent the night here defending the interests of the country and trying to obtain information which, unfortunately, were denied them by the Minister of Marine. The only information we obtained—I heard the hon. member for Red Deer mention it a moment ago—is that at the present moment there are fifteen vessels lying idle in the port of Halifax. It is most astonishing that the Minister of Marine should come before this House and ask for a vote of eight million dollars for boats when we already have more boats than what we know what to do with.

The hon. Minister of Commerce pretended that it is a matter of abiding by a contract. I am much astonished at hearing members of the Government speak of abiding by a contract. I remember many contracts which the Government repudiated; many times when their word had been given they broke their word. I find them now strangely ticklish on the point of honour and of abiding by their word. They have not accustomed us to this.

Eight millions is an enormous sum while we only vote four millions for the Department of Agriculture. Do you not think it would be more to the point to vote eight millions for model farms, for the improvement of means of communication in the rural districts? It seems to me that eight millions given for the development of agriculture would be the very best investment at present.

We are opposed to the merchant fleet because we believe we don't need it. I heard

members of the Government tell us, "But you, of the Liberal party, have you not favoured a marine, have you not advocated a marine?" Quite so, Mr. Chairman, but to-day circumstances are altogether different. We are no longer in pre-war times, when the German danger was abroad. It seems to me that now every dollar should be used for reconstruction and for the promotion of agriculture, and not for building boats, which is throwing money away. I now ask of the Government not to force us to sit day and night until they have their gag ready. I humbly invite them to be willing to abide by common-sense, in order to allow the members of this House to go and rest. It seems to me that it should not be necessary to talk to them for days and nights in order to make them understand that an expenditure of eight millions for boats at the present time is an extravagance which we, on this side of the House, cannot allow to pass. If the Government want absolutely this item to be adopted, there is no use in our sitting here any longer, let them have the courage to rise, let the right hon. Minister of Commerce, who is now leading the House (Sir George Foster) rise boldly and put on the gag, the machine which they invented and patented in order to silence us. We shall leave the matter to the electors of the country for them to pronounce between the two parties. We shall submit to the gag here, confident as we are that they will understand that we have acted as we have through love of duty and care for their interests.

You know it, Mr. Chairman, the Government no longer possesses the confidence of the country. The Government have no mandate and the electors would be much surprised if we did not oppose this expenditure. I say that this expenditure is not necessary, first because the Minister of Finance (Sir Henry Drayton) is at a loss for taxes to meet the interest on our war debt. From January to December he racks his brain to find means for meeting our liabilities. Then, why this expenditure which, in my judgment, is quite useless? I heard a few days ago the right hon. Prime Minister say that owing to the financial situation, he had decided to reduce by 25 per cent the bonus for the civil servants. The Government have no money to pay the civil service, and they ask us to vote eight millions to build ships which we don't need, probably with the object of benefiting political friends.

Mr. Chairman, why does the Minister of Marine seem to take offence? I heard him say, about six o'clock this morning: "The hon. members of the Opposition have spent the whole night reading newspaper extracts and repeating the same thing over and over again." Why, are we not justified in taking every possible means to prevent the adoption of this item? And since the hon. ministers will not yield to common sense and to the arguments submitted by us, is it not our right and our duty to resort to the constitutional means at our disposal, in order to check this expenditure? As I said a moment ago, since the Government is unwilling to supply any information or to pay any heed to our arguments, let them have no hesitation in resorting to force. As a general rule, they are not afraid to do so. Why should they spend all this time uselessly? Why not apply the gag right away?

I do not think Parliament would be justified in voting this item. I say, again, that when we are bound to burden ourselves with such sacrifice, when the ratepayers of this country have to disburse such enormous amounts in the shape of taxes, when the Minister of Finance keeps imposing tax over tax, it is unreasonable on the part of the Government to have us vote items amounting to eight millions, without even supplying the information that all the members of this House have a right to get.

The Minister of Marine seems to become extravagant, or rather has he always been so. I understand that a man, used as he is to handle millions, may be unable to fancy that we would reduce the amount of the vote he is asking; but he must remember that all the rate-payers and citizens of this country have not had, like himself, the good fortune to belong to all kinds of companies paying big dividends and having paid still larger dividends, during the war, on account of the war. We, citizens of this country, who are sitting on this side of the House, belong to the people, and we ask, in the name of the people, that the members of the Government should return to the right path and yield to our legitimate demand. Should the Government wish to go on with the debate in this style, let them be assured of our strength, of our resolution, of our earnest desire to do our duty to the extent of sitting here as long as they may like us to. We are ready, however, to adjourn; but let not the Government or the Minister of Marine fancy that they are going to wear us out. Perhaps we are not the majority, but we have the

courage and we know that we are performing our duty. We are not so numerous as is the other side of the House, but I may well say, Mr. Chairman, that we have the satisfaction to know that we are doing our duty by sticking to the position we did take, and, thank God, the members of the Opposition will keep doing their duty to the last minute. Useless is it for the Government to think or to fancy that they will wear us out. We are going to follow them up and I do not think they should resist any longer. Let them use the gag, the weapon which they are so fond of, the public is in expectation of that, after all. Here is what my electors have kept telling me for a long time: "Doctor, you hold a seat in the House, you allow to pass all manner of expenditure to the amount of millions, we are driven to wretchedness, the city is filled with unemployed people, the shops are closed, we shall soon have to depend on public assistance to save our citizens from starving." Meanwhile, the magnates of the Government, the millionaires, the presidents of the big companies will force us to sit during the whole night because they wish to get more millions and to keep on piling up money for themselves and their political friends. How is that?

I think I voice the wish of my electors in rising to speak at this hour of the day, and I am sure they will give me credit for it. It is my candid opinion that the Government is wrong and should not persist in its pertinacity, it being admitted that pertinacity is an ill-adviser. I am surprised to see that the hon. Minister of Commerce, who has so much experience, who has grown old in politics, does not make his colleague, the Minister of Marine, listen to reason. I understand that the Minister of Marine may be liable to stubbornness as he is younger, more fiery, more enthusiastic, and as he has been a minister for just a couple of years, but the Minister of Commerce, an old man who has spent fifty years of his life in politics, should not listen to this ill-adviser called stubbornness, he should rather bring the members of the Government back to reason and say to them: "Since the Opposition is eager to obtain further information, since they will not let this item pass before they have been supplied with sufficient information, all right, we will adjourn and give them the information they want."

Moreover, the members of the Government and more particularly the hon. Minister of Trade and Commerce, know this by experience. It was not my privilege to occupy a seat in this House at the time of the reciprocity measure, but I have been told that the hon. Minister of Trade and Commerce had led obstructionist tactics against that measure for months. That shows once more that a stubborn man never wants woe. A few years ago, the members of the Government, who were then in Opposition, fought against that policy which was to bring happiness to every farmer of this country; to-day you may see them ready to run to Washington asking for favours and willing to accept anything. Why should we not make the most of past experience and why, glancing backwards, seeing that ten years ago he committed serious blunders to the detriment of the country, does not the hon. Minister of Trade and Commerce listen to reason and acknowledge for once at least that we are right and should have every needed information? For, after all, when it is a matter of spending the people's money, Mr. Chairman, if you only knew how conscientious, how timorous I am. Had the hon. Minister of Marine himself to pay the eight millions, I can assure you he would not be so much in a hurry and would willingly grant the wish of those who surround him and who want some explanations. Unfortunately the money belongs to the people and they do not care when spending other people's money.

Mr. Chairman, I beg the hon. Minister of Marine to think the matter over. It seems to me that his political training would have caused him to act otherwise, but I realize that his connection with the hon. members on the other side of the House has quite altered his nature. Formerly, when he was president of the Montreal Harbour Commissioners, the hon. Minister of Marine would not have had that Tory tendency towards compelling people to vote millions of dollars without even supplying them with the necessary information. It hurts me to see that he has agreed to sit on the other side of the House where, coming in touch with such sinners, he has become a greater sinner than them. Once more, I believe it is useless for the Government to hold on. Were they to compel us to sit until three o'clock in the afternoon, their situation would not be any fairer nor any better.

Besides, the whole press of this country, save those papers that are paid to stand by the Government, the fairly independent press that ponders is against that expenditure for the marine; the press that often

sides with the Government is opposed to all this expenditure. What is the reason of that stubborn determination to build a fleet, in spite of the members of this House, were they free to act according to their convictions; for, could we read what is in the heart of every member on the other side, we would see that, like us, they are against that expenditure. However, the rod brings them into submission and besides they fear the elections. These gentlemen know very well that were they by a mishap to compel the Government to go before the people, they would never come back here. I am afraid interest is the prime mover in their actions, I apprehend we will not have a free and independent jury in this House so as to do justice to the people, because they are too selfish.

It seems to me that persons having as much experience as the members of the Government have should halt a moment, think the matter over and realize they are going astray. They may by such an expedient, thanks to their majority, hold on to power until next year, until the elections, but they must know that by such a behaviour, by ignoring the voice of the people, by gagging the House, they are doing unpopular acts which the electorate will be well able to judge at the proper time. I am not here to offer any advice to the Government—God forbid such a pretension on my part—but it seems to me they ought to reflect. Sometimes a fair word does no harm, no matter where it comes from, be it from the most humble being, from the most unassuming workingman. Before resuming my seat, I say once more to the members of the Government to think it over, to see in what situation they are placing themselves before the country and the electorate. From my own viewpoint, they might above all let the committee report progress because, after all, the farther they go along that path, the more they harm themselves in the eyes of the electorate, so for us on this side who are raising objections, we deem that in doing so we are doing our duty, that in acting in that way we are keeping our trust as the representatives of the people. At this time, when we have no money, when industries have had to close, when the people are in distress, it seems to me that it is a most unpardonable extravagance to ask us to vote a million dollars, especially when this money is to be voted without serious thought being given to it, without the necessary information. I think the members of Parliament have certain

rights. I understand that we are not entitled to such privileges as are enjoyed by members of the Government, I admit that we are very modest, very humble, that we do not, as does the hon. Minister of Marine, belong to powerful companies, yet, I think that we are entitled to fair play, and that the Government are wrong in refusing to give the information that we have been asking for. Besides, has not every member the right to obtain full information? What would our electors say should we vote millions of dollars without requiring that the Government render us a detailed and conscientious account of such expenses as have been made?

Mr. Chairman, it is most important that the members of the Opposition fulfil their duty, and let me say so, we shall read with pride and satisfaction, in the papers, that we have fought bravely all night through, so as to bring the Government to its senses.

I would like to say one word more before I resume my seat. I notice that the hon. Minister of Marine is not in his seat, but I hope that the hon. Minister of Railways and Canals (Mr. Reid) or the hon. Minister of Trade and Commerce will stand up and declare that they are ready to give in to our fair request, and as they are not well informed and they are not sufficiently acquainted with all the items, since it is because of ignorance on their part that we cannot obtain any information, let us grant them the benefit of the doubt: I hope they will soon adjourn so as to allow them to secure this information, which they can afterwards impart to us.

In behalf of the country, in behalf of those whom I have the honour to represent, I beseech the Government to do justice to our claim, to do right by our country, and I ask all the members of the Opposition to stand firm in their rights so that the Government shall surrender.

Mr. MICHAUD: (Translation.) I wish to ask my hon. friend a question concerning the ships which are in the harbours of St. John and Halifax. It appears that there are at the present moment fifteen ships at Halifax: Does my hon. friend know how many of those ships which are now in St. John's harbour belong to the Department of Marine?

Mr. FONTAINE: I believe that the Government ships which are at present in the St. John's Harbour are absolutely idle.

Mr. McCREA: Mr. Chairman, members on the other side of the House have been accusing those on this side of obstructing,

stating that we had formed plans and schemes to obstruct the Government; but as one of the members who have been sitting here all night I wish to assure the hon. minister that that has not been my purpose. It is not a matter of pleasure or a matter of satisfaction to sit here all night; I am here to get information on both sides, as far as possible. I wish to hear the arguments for and against. I have heard a good deal of sound argument showing why this marine should not have been undertaken. Our friends on this side of the House have been asking for information, and I am very sorry to say they got but little. The least the minister of this department, or the minister of any other department, in bringing estimates before the House and asking to have them voted, could do would be to come forward with all the necessary information possible. Suppose this marine were undertaken by private corporation, and the general manager of the corporation at a general meeting came before the directors, and they asked him a lot of questions, and he said "Oh no, I do not feel like giving you this information," do you think they would tolerate that kind of thing from their manager or president or any other officer? It appears, we have constructed some 47 vessels and put them afloat. I believe we should have the date that every vessel was launched and a statement of the cargoes they carried, and what money they made or lost, separately. Then when we had this information as to the prospects or outlook for those vessels as a paying investment, we would probably have more courage to go on and vote more money to complete the project, but I have sat here all night trying to obtain information. I have not voted either on this question or any other question without information, and I do not propose to vote on this question until I get all the information possible, so that I may form a sound and as well-reasoned judgment as I can as to whether this project was a wise or foolish one.

After listening to the argument and the information given, from what little knowledge I have of the shipping business I concluded that it was the height of foolishness for this Government to undertake to build vessels at all. During the war no doubt everybody was doing everything possible in the way of building ships and making munitions; and all this kind of thing, for the purpose of winning the war. Every manufacturer in this country was busily engaged in making munitions of war. But when the war was over we stopped, immediately shut up the shops and ceased making munitions. Why did they not do the same thing with shipbuilding? But they say, "These contracts were let." Was it wisdom on the part of the Government to let contracts which would not be completed for three years? Why did they not let the contract for the building of one or two or three vessels, but not more than could be finished within six months, and when that one was completed, if the war was still continuing, and we needed more vessels, let the contract to build another? But the letting of contracts by the Government for the building of some 63 or 64 vessels at a cost of some $60,000,000 to $70,000,000, and coming to the House and saying they were built for war purposes, is worse than nonsense—it was foolishness.

Ever since I came to the House, I have questioned the wisdom—or the foolishness—of constructing so many railways. Indeed, the consensus of opinion on both sides is that too many railways have been built. But the Government have said: "Oh, yes, but it was your party which commenced these railways, and we had to finish them." In 1911, when the then Opposition appealed to the electors for support, their cry in the Eastern Townships was that the then Government, of which the late Sir Wilfrid Laurier was the leader, were not business men, and hon. gentlemen then stated to the people that if they were returned to power they would adopt and apply business principles. Well, if they had carried out their undertaking, the very very first thing they would have done upon taking office would be to carry out an investigation of the railway projects and of any projects involving the considerable expenditure of public money with a view to seeing whether the expenditure was wise or unwise. Then, as business men, they should have caused any projects found to be unwise and uncalled for to be discontinued right then and there. But my hon. friends did not do that; yet they come to us now and say: We were simply completing what you people commenced. The least we would expect from intelligent men—and I think there are some intelligent men on that side of the House—is that they would profit by the mistakes made in connection with the building of railways. If experience is worth anything, was not the building of transcontinental lines, for which there is no traffic, not a simple reason for caution before any programme of building vessels was undertaken? There is some justification for the

building of railways, even if traffic is not offering for them at the moment; there is the possibility of developing our natural resources and of encouraging settlement. But the building of ships is quite a different matter; a ship built at Halifax can sail any sea and call at any port. Before the war shipping was not a paying proposition; for years men who had put their money in ships were not making money. Now, I have done a little shipping and in the particular line of goods with which I have to do, the pre-war rate from the ports of Canada—Montreal, Quebec, Halifax, St. John—to the ports of England or Scotland was anywhere from thirteen to sixteen cents a hundred. The rate during the war from and to the same ports was anywhere from $1.60 to $1.80. In other words, the rate went up more than twelve times. And the Government launch out on a ship-building programme. When this question came up last session, the minister made the argument that the operation of the Government ships was a paying proposition. Well, I would like to know why it would not be a paying proposition, in view of the tremendous increase in rates. But when you have regard to all the information—such information as we have got—it is very doubtful whether the operations were really on a paying basis. It is said that a net profit of some 2.35 per cent was realized. Is that a good profit, having regard to the fact that rates were about twelve times what they were in pre-war days? To-day the rate on the same class of goods is about 55 cents a hundred, or more than three times the rates under normal conditions. But with fifteen of these vessels already tied up, unable to get cargoes, nothing to do, and the rates dropping every day, what do you think of the chances of vessels constructed at a cost of $192 a ton? The ordinary cost of constructing vessels in normal times was about $50 a ton, or one-quarter of what it cost the Government to build its ships. The Government ships then, built at a cost of about $200 a ton, are going out to compete with vessels built at $50 a ton? Do you think they have any chance of success? Absolutely none. I venture to say that even if these fifteen vessels that are tied up could get cargoes, they would make a smaller loss by remaining at anchor, because I doubt very much if they would get rates that would pay the cost of operation, to say nothing about profit.

Mr. Chairman, I surely will not be accused of obstructing because this is the first time that I have been on my feet to address the House or the committee since the session opened. I should not rise to take up the time of the committee now had I not wished to express my opinion that this is one of the rankest, most foolish, most unjustifiable expenditures that the Government has ever made on railways or on anything else. There is some justification, as I have said, for building new railroads into new territories to develop new sections of the country, but no argument of this kind can possibly apply to the carrying out of an extensive shipbuilding programme. If we had large surpluses at our disposal, there might then be some justification for experimentation in shipbuilding and the carrying out of a large shipbuilding programme. But we have $70,000,000 of a deficit in railway operations alone; in fact, if the Minister of Railways brought down a correct statement, making a fair allowance for depreciation of rolling stock, road-bed, and everything else, the deficit would be nearly twice $70,000,000.

Hon. Mr. REID: Oh, no.

Mr. McCREA: The minister shakes his head, but I want to tell him that the depreciation on rolling stock, ties, rails, and on everything else pertaining to a railway would run into a tremendously large sum. I do not find that he has made any allowance for this depreciation, nor has he, so far as I can see, made any allowance for capital invested.

Hon. Mr. REID: The hon. member has not read the statement or he would not say that.

Mr. McCREA: What allowance has the Minister made for the capital invested in these roads? What allowance for depreciation of rolling stock, road-bed, and everything else? No, I am not fond of talking; in fact, I would rather avoid it. But I did not sit up all night on this occasion simply for the love of sitting up; I have passed that stage. But I think I owe something to the constituency I represent, and besides, I try to represent the people of Canada, so far as my ability goes. I consider that I would be far from doing my duty if I sat quiet and allowed this vote to go through without making a strong protest. So far as I am concerned, I propose to remain here until this item is withdrawn, or until it is put through by closure.

Mr. FORTIER: (Translation.) Mr. Chairman, I wish to join with the brave phalanx of the Opposition and prevent the

Government from committing such an act as they would be blamed for by the people. Together with the electors I have the honour to represent I object to this vote or $8,000,000 for the Canadian merchant marine. I do not think that the reasons given by the Minister of Marine, at the beginning of the debate, can in anyway whatever justify the Government in voting such large sums as this for the continuation of a useless undertaking.

I was in my seat when the hon. Minister of Marine rose to speak in favour of the building of a merchant marine. He told us that his reasons were these: Firstly, because it had been a war undertaking and therefore must be continued; secondly, because the country owned the railways, and our transportation facilities must be co-ordinated; we must add to our railways a fleet of merchant ships; thirdly, he said Canada must carry out her treaties with foreign countries, and this is required to complete our transportation system. Let us take his reasons one by one. After having considered each of these reasons, I feel justified in objecting to vote this sum. In fact, if the merchant marine has been altogether a war undertaking, we should, now that the war is finished since several years, discontinue all works undertaken because of the war. That which is most important to-day, for the country, is to forget the war: when Canadian finances were involved to such an extent as will bear not only on the present generation but also on several generations to come. After the armistice had been signed, Cabinet ministers and especially the Minister of Finance told us that we had entered upon a new era that we must give up expending such large sums as we had been obliged to do during the years of great sacrifices; what we must now do was to practise economy and encourage production.

The period of reconstruction is beginning; let us turn our efforts towards a new era of economy and production. On this condition only Canada may be able to meet its obligations and to look into the future with confidence.

Now, the second reason invoked by the hon. Minister of Marine is that we must build this merchant marine in order to complete our transportation system. For several sessions we have been told of the nefarious work of the Government in nationalizing the railways. We have the proof now that the country is involved in enormous expenditure, in yearly deficits which reach over fifty millions and will still increase; we have the proof, I say, that there was no necessity for the Government to acquire those railways. We have indulged in an undertaking the consequence of which is to pile on taxes which will burden the country for ever. Now, why should the present Government want to add to this enormous liability incurred by the acquisition of the railways, almost as large an indebtedness for the construction of a merchant marine. If the railways, as has been several times stated, are too huge for the present population of the country, if a vast immigration policy is needed to give these railways the employment they now lack, why tack to this railway system a merchant fleet which will have no employment either? This second reason advanced by the Minister of Marine does not hold good. It only shows more plainly the utter uselessness of this policy.

Thirdly, he said, we must seek commercial treaties with foreign countries, and to that end it is necessary to have mercantile ships. I understood that it is in the country's interest to seek commercial treaties with the neighbouring republic. I understood that, from generation to generation, the policy of the government—whether Liberal or Conservative—has always been to secure commercial treaties with our neighbours; I understood that even in spite of the absence of treaties, Canada has no better ally than the United States and that it would continue to deal with the Americans. Whatever have been the barriers raised between the two countries, whatever have been the customs duties imposed on the exchange of our commercial products, they have not prevented Canada from dealing with the United States far more than with any other country in the world. Therefore what is the use of building ships to go and beg for commercial treaties with the West Indies or some unknown country of South America, when we have by our side the American republic which is interested in dealing with us, and when it is our constant interest to deal with it? Besides is not the present Government rather inclined to secure commercial treaties with the United States? It is surely the policy of the Opposition; it is certainly the policy which was adopted at the great convention held here in 1919. I for one would see with the utmost satisfaction new treaties on the basis of reciprocity which we fought for in 1911, and which allowed the producers of this country to carry on a profitable commerce with the neighbouring republic.

The two principal reasons which induced me to rise and oppose this enormous vote of eight millions are the following: First, the debts and the liabilities of the country do not allow us to embark upon such considerable expenditure. Mr. Chairman, I would not at this moment put before the committee the lamentable picture of the enormous debt with which the country is encumbered, and which reached two billions; of the yearly liabilities which Canada has to meet; of the interest upon the debt; of the expenditure involved in our participation in the war; of the war pensions which amount to an annual disbursement of over fifty millions; and moreover, of the lamentable liabilities incurred for the acquisition of the railways and for the building of the merchant marine. Ministers have told us that the country has annually to face deficits on account of their railway policy, deficits which amount to more than fifty millions, and which will next year probably reach one hundred millions. We also know that on account of this merchant marine building policy, the country will again face annual deficits. These are only incipient and will, of course, grow annually, all these obligations which to-day burden our Canadian Budget will not allow us to think of such a stupendous undertaking as this one.

In order to meet these yearly deficits of our Canadian finances, the Government has been forced to have recourse to this abominable system of taxes. No doubt, it is necessary, to meet the war expenditures, that taxes be levied whatever may be the cause of their assessment, however, it is not less true that in their results they are odious, when they are levied on the income and specially when their consequence is to bring misery in the Canadian homes, and to-day the taxes levied on the ratepapers are more odious than any of those that may have been imposed in the past. They are levied upon the income of the humblest, upon the head of families that have to support their children and are forced to borrow to meet this tax.

But this is not the only consequence of this disastrous policy of unlimited expenditure brought on by the Government. Another which glares at us in this Capital, has been the extraordinary treatment meted out to the Civil Service. For instance, but a few days ago we saw in the press and even heard, I believe, through the official channel of the Government's representatives, that the civil employees of the Dominion Government will have to put up with a curtailment in their bonus. Are you aware, Mr. Chairman, of what a curtailment in the bonus means at the present time? Are you aware what a curtailment of bonus means to this large number of civil employees who support a family, many of whom have sacrified their career to give their country the best part of their life, do you realize what this means in the year 1921? They had come to look upon, for the last few years, this bonus as an integral part of their salary, and the Government were obliged to admit that it was absolutely necessary to permit them to exist. In reality, if there is a bonus which can be considered as an integral part of the salary which a civil employee receives, it is certainly that bonus which was given to them since these years of war, since the high cost of living. I would like to see the name of bonus disappear and the employees, who after all would not be drawing such a high salary owing to the maintenance of the high cost of living, receive to-day as a permanent salary, his present one plus the bonus received for the last few years. Instead of fully considering this question as it should be, that is judiciously, we find the Government depriving the civil employees of part of their income at a time when the high cost of living has not decreased. Rents, for instance, far from going down, are on the upward trend, and the cost of living maintains itself at a high level and if anything threatens to rise. Therefore no justification exists for the Government to lower the salary and particularly the bonus which the civil employee receives. They will put forward as a reason that the expenditures are heavy, that Canada's obligations are numerous and that they must economize and clip the salaries of the civil employees in order to continue to administer the country's business. But what contradictions do we not find in the Government's attitude, on the one hand cutting down the civil employee's bonus and on the other trying to force a vote to-day for $8,000,000 for its merchant marine building policy, when this undertaking is not justified, the war being over, when we should enter on a period of reconstruction, when we should economize the most and when, lastly, instead of spending uselessly as the Government wishes to do, we should busy ourselves with reconstruction work.

It was justly pointed out during this debate, that the Government want this enormous sum to be voted so as to continue the construction of ships, when they have but small amounts placed to the credit of agri-

culture and other important departments of the Administration. There is but $4,000,000 placed to the credit of agriculture and yet they wish to pass a vote, for this year, of over $8,000,000 for the building of ships. It would be wiser to increase, if the country's finances will permit it, the subsidies to agriculture than to continue to vote money for these merchant ships. There are many openings in our dear Canada where the Government could well spend money to help the agricultural interest. They have told us that in the future they would encourage the establishing of experimental farms. There are many places, and I could indicate some in our province and in my county, where the Government might well encourage agriculture by establishing some of these experimental farms.

As it was remarked a few days ago, there is a movement towards agriculture and all eyes are turned to the host of farmers who are the important producers of this country. We see the reason why the Government, in order to beget a little popularity, has promised to expand that policy of establishing experimental farms; however we are still waiting. I do not see any in my section, and certainly it is a place where one should exist, in that colonizing territory. No doubt, it is important that these farms should be established in the more settled parts of the country, in the St. Lawrence valley and in the different parts of the other provinces, but if there are places where these agricultural subsidies would have the best results, it would certainly be in those colonizing parts, such as Labelle where in the midst of the Laurentian hills a new region of cultivable land is being opened under beautiful blue skies and amongst evergreen hills where is to be found a very energetic population, forming to-day one of the important centres of the province. It is in those places where experimental farms should be established, and instead of spending money for the building up of a navy, it is in encouraging agriculture, if there is money to spend, that this money would be better placed. The second reason I invoke to oppose the vote of this amount, is that to-day this merchant marine is absolutely useless. Indeed, it is in this debate that the fact came out. Certainly, the number of ships built or acquired by the Government up to date, is too large. Of what use are these ships? Are they employed on trips from which we derive some returns such as to transport our products to countries with which we have commercial treaties for the exchange of products or are they not awaiting in some port or another the cargo that luck will bring their way? It was shown in this very sitting of the House, that there are in the port of Halifax fifteen of these ships which are at anchor for the last few days. No one knows when they will obtain a cargo. This brings out the uselessness of our merchant ships and the futility of the Government's policy on that question.

Instead of spending money to acquire new ships would it not be wiser, now that the Government is in possession of almost all our railways with the exception of the Canadian Pacific, to see that not only in one particular province but that in all of them necessary branches be built to complete their system?

Would it not be wiser for the Government, who wish to complete our transportation system, instead of acquiring new merchant ships when the number we own is already too great and when it is shown that these ships are absolutely useless, would it not be better to complete our railway system? Does not the country now know that the construction of the Transcontinental, for instance, was certainly justified by the fact that in going through these unknown regions of the northern provinces of Ontario and Quebec, it opened up to colonization a vast territory? The glory certainly is to the credit of our Canadian statesman, it is to the honour of Sir Wilfrid Laurier who foresaw the development of this beautiful region of Abitibi, where to the north of the Laurentides, is thrown open a domain almost as extensive as that of the St. Lawrence valley and where the sons of that old province have ventured in great numbers to open up important and prosperous centres. It would be advisable to complete this system of railways inasmuch as our finances will permit. Before spending millions in the shipbuilding enterprise it would be more appropriate for instance to connect Montreal with the Transcontinental by means of that projected road of a few years ago, by the "North Railway Company," and thus by this extension connect the Metropolis of Canada, the large city of Montreal with the Transcontinental by skirting the counties of Argenteuil and Labelle and through this vast region situated to the north of these counties. This is an enterprise which by its own merit commends itself to the Government. Since we have millions to spend for useless enterprises, I take it upon myself to draw the attention, for the are the most urgent. mB.Oydcvmome m

completion of these railways, to the absolutely important undertakings which recommend themselves to our attention and which are the most urgent. Besides this one, I could also point out that of the entension of the State-owned railways in the older sections of the province, particularly in the county of Labelle. I have had the occasion, some years ago, to call the attention of the Government to the advisability of extending the Northern Canadian line which runs from Montreal to Huberdeau, and whose chart provided for its construction to about the centre of the county of Labelle; this section of the country was opened many years ago, it is rich in natural resources, but there are no railway communications, and for several years, the people have been waiting for an extension of the line. I had the honour to accompany a delegation who waited upon the Minister of Railways and Canals, and to state as clearly as possible the importance of the completion of this railroad, from a viewpoint of revenue to be obtained from it by the company, or by the Government who own this system, and also for the inhabitants of this important district. We undoubtedly received a kind welcome, I could not say otherwise; the minister received us very well; he understood that it was most important for the Government to provide for the extension of this line, but though we have been pressing him for the last two or three years, pointing out the need of this enterprise, nothing so far has been done. I know that, in answer to my repeated request in behalf of my county, the Government shall tell us: "We cannot at the present moment make any large expenditure." Yet, this would not be a useless expenditure since it would result in great benefit for the Government, and because the development of our district, owing to the extension of the lines, has been such that we can assure the Government that they could not find a better means to obtain a revenue for these railways, then by building these branch lines. It has indeed been admitted that there is not a more remunerative line for the Canadian Pacific, in the province of Quebec, than these branches which run north, towards Mount Laurier, or leave Ottawa for the Gatineau to Maniwaki. These are the roads which have given the best results to the Canadian Pacific. If the Government would consider the progress made by this company, if they would but give better attention to our request, if they would do as this company has done, and build branch lines to the important centres where we have a growing population, where the land is being cultivated, where we have rich natural resources, water powers, mines, and a forest wealth which awaits but actual development, if, as I say, the Government, would pay any attention to our request, they would not adopt this disastrous policy of construction of a merchant marine, but they would provide for the completion of its railway system before wrongly attempting to complete the transportation system by uselessly constructing ships, when so many are idle, at the present time, in the ports of Halifax and St. John. Instead of investing their money in a merchant marine, they would provide for our railway system and the completion of its branch lines, they would complete the work which private concerns have not be able to do. Such is the duty of the Government, and, if ever there is a thing which would justify the Government for its nationization of the railways, in the eyes of those who were the most strongly opposed to this system, it would be the completion of the railway system and the provision of these newly settled districts, or even the older ones with the railway communications that they require. So far, the railway companies have been interested only in linking the large centres, those from which they could expect immediate benefit, but the Government, now that they own the greater part of our Canadian railways, have for duty to complete the work which has been left unfinished by private concerns, and help towards the settlement of this district, this beautiful district of Labelle, for example, by building those branch lines which are necessary for their upkeep and progress. By doing this, the Government would establish remunerative systems which would help in reducing the enormous deficits which are accumulating from year to year.

I have spoken at length on this all-important question. I have deemed it my duty to rise and protest, and I have done so with great pleasure. I know that in the accomplishment of this duty I will please those whom I have the honour to represent. Should I have to remain here several days and several nights yet, to oppose this worthless, disastrous policy of a merchant marine, this useless vote for millions which are constantly accumulating and encumbering our Budget, I would do so with the greatest satisfaction, for I could then go proudly to my electors carrying my head high, and say: "I have stood up for your interests"

and I am here ready at all times to stand up for the interests of the people.

Mr. TURGEON: I see the Minister of Trade and Commerce (Sir George Foster) looking at me. I am sure he thinks it strange that the persuasive appeal which he made a few moments ago to members on this side of the House, to allow the minister (Mr. Ballantyne) to report progress, after voting the amount under discussion, has had no effect. If his appeal could affect the mind and heart of one member on this side of the House, he knows it is the mind and heart of the member for Gloucester (Mr. Turgeon).

However, I deem it my duty on this occasion to express, as briefly as I possibly can, my views on the great question of the Merchant Marine of Canada, a question, the discussion of which I had left to my hon. friends from Nova Scotia and other provinces who are more competent to discuss it with the authority derived from practical experience in the pursuit of their own business. The Minister of Trade and Commerce no doubt remembers that every session during the war I rose in this House and implored him and the Government of which he is a member to begin at once the construction of merchant vessels to help the Allies in carrying not only munitions but provisions to Great Britain in her stress, when it was taking every ton that a vessel could carry to maintain the millions of soldiers who were fighting for democracy and for the salvation of Canada.

The time came when the United States felt that she had to join the Allies in the war, and she found herself pretty much in the position of Canada—without a navy able to transport the millions of soldiers which she was determined to send to help the Allies. During that period, I for one, and others on this side of the House, appealed to the Right Hon. the Minister of Trade and Commerce, and to the other members of the Government, to give help to Great Britain in the matter of transporting the American soldiers who were so badly needed to put an end to the struggle in which the Allies were engaged.

There was no attempt on the part of the Government to build a ship. I will not refer to the time of the naval debate in 1911, when we on this side of the House placed on the statutes of the country an Act for the construction of a naval service, which would have been so useful during the war, and so remunerative to Canada after the war, because we would have had those vessels ready for the transportation of our commerce from this time forward. But my hon. friends on the other side remained silent at that time and did nothing at all. The press of the country could never persuade any member of the Government to undertake the construction of a vessel, either for the navy or the merchant marine. At last in 1917, when my hon. friend the Minister of Trade and Commerce came into the Government, he announced to this House that he had a naval programme ready to submit to us. War was still going on. I remember, when speaking on the Budget, that I congratulated him upon the project he had enunciated. But he had remained silent for three years, and they were only commencing to construct the navy at that time. But still, as I thought, it was time then to begin. But war ceased almost as soon as the Government commenced the construction of marine vessels. We asked them to halt, because we knew that Great Britain had all those vessels which she had used for the transportation of munitions and soldiers, not only from Canada but from the United States, and there were more ships on the ocean than could possibly be used for business. They had commenced too late, but, late as it was, they were determined to go on. There was certainly no constructive or wise policy adopted in this matter—no policy that would be carried out by any business concern in Canada, or in any place the world over. They knew that freight had risen high—twelve hundred per cent from the pre-war rate up till that time. They knew that with the cessation of the war, and the cessation of the transport of munitions and soldiers, with an immense fleet at the disposal of the countries interested, those freight rates would necessarily come down as rapidly as they had risen during the war, and that, therefore. the new vessels they were building were bound to be a loss to the country. But no appeal could be effective upon the mind of my right hon. friend and his colleagues in the Council.

When I came into this Chamber about nine o'clock this morning, the hon. gentleman from St. James (Mr. Rinfret) was addressing the House,. He stated that they had been accused by the hon. members on the other side of the House of having had an understanding that they should continue this debate during the night, and stop the vote from being effective. In contradiction of this statement, I will tell my hon. friend that I left this House last night, contrary to my habit. a few minutes before twelve,

thinking that, on a private members' day, the Government had simply taken the vote merely to finish the day, and that in a few minutes my hon. colleagues would be following my example and going home. When I came here this morning and heard that statement made, I desired to register a denial of the statement that there was any such understanding. My hon. friend will give me credit for this—that had I known there was to be any such protracted sitting I would have been here all night, the same as the rest of my colleagues. When we appeal to the Government to stop the waste of money upon the building of ships which cannot be used, they tell us that they have a contract, and, having a contract, they had to carry on. I always thought, from my experience in business of the departments of government of the country for the last twenty-five years, that every contract the Government made with a firm or private individual contained a clause that the contract would be terminated on the Government giving notice within a certain time specified in the contract. No contract has ever been made by any Government of Canada without such a provision. They gave a contract to the Dominion Iron and Steel Company in Nova Scotia for 250,000 tons of plate, and, after they had received about 25 or 30 per cent, they stopped the contract and advised them they could use no more. They could have exercised the same privilege with the shipbuilders in the different shipyards of the country. But they were not always so timid when they wanted to cancel a contract or stop shipbuilding in this country. Great Britain has been building ships for a year or two in our shipyards in Canada through the Munitions Board. They had work going on all the time. They had been building ships which they thought they might need in the future. They were not so sensitive at that time about contracts. They practically told the Munitions Board to vacate the shipyards of Canada, and that they themselves would build these ships, instead of the Munitions Board which represented the Government of Great Britain. This I consider most criminal. If this had been done by the poor member from Gloucester, or Sir Wilfrid Laurier when he was at the head of the Government, and if he had said to the Government of Great Britain: "I will discontinue your work here and I will take your place," such action would have been condemned very strongly. It was certainly not only audacious, but it was against the friendly intercourse between the Government of Great Britain and one of her Dominion under the British flag. Why not allow Great Britain to go on with the project if they desired to do so? When the war was over, Great Britain having so many ships that she did not need them all, could have sold to Canada any number of vessels which we might have required for that ocean traffic. But they have built those ships now, and we are told by the Government that fifteen of them are to do in the port of Halifax a certain traffic. I do not wish to mingle the question of railroads with this question of marine to-day, as I do not intend to occupy the attention of the committee very long. I do not say that we have too many railways. I always took the ground that if our railways are not paying what they should pay to-day, and do not give the service they should give, it is not because we have too many railways, but because we do not give to the Canadian railways the traffic which is there for them, but which is diverted from Port Arthur—seventy per cent of it—every year to Buffalo and New York. And I say again in regard to the relations between the railways and the merchant marine, that all the import trade that is coming back from New York, Philadelphia and Boston comes also through those ports, and, therefore, our own marine is deprived of the ocean trade going and coming. My hon. friends on the other side have said that the Transcontinental was a useless expenditure, but I say that it was the most patriotic and beneficial expenditure in railroads that Canada ever made. I am sure that that view will be expressed by future historians, to the great shame of those who have opposed the building of this road.

I do most earnestly appeal to the Government to take this matter into further consideration and see whether they can determine upon a policy more in line with the interests of the people. Why do my hon. friends, in view of the enormous financial burdens of the country, insist upon proceeding with this ship-building programme? The minister has endeavoured to show a surplus on operating account in connection with his Government ships, but I am afraid that this does not disclose the real condition, and that next year he will come to the House with an even more unsatisfactory result. Sir, wherever the Canadian may set foot upon his native land there he finds rich natural resources. Why, then, not take such steps as are necessary to make full use of this great Transcontinental

railway,—built to compete with railroads leading to the ports of New York; built to suit Canada's condition; built to carry the produce of the western farmer through Canadian ports to its destination across the sea; built to carry a tonnage which no other railroad in America could possibly handle. Sir, all these considerations were had in mind by these who projected this great system. The road is so constructed that trains of from sixty to ninety cars can be hauled with a single engine, over a road-bed as smooth as the floor of this House. Only by developing to the full by every means at our disposal the traffic handled by these lines can we hope to get rid of the deficits which the railways of Canada have experienced during the last two or three years. I am not opposed to the management of railroads by the Government. When some people in despair cry out: Give back the Government-owned railroads to their former owners, or hand them over to a private concern, I say, let us do the best we can; let us develop these roads which have been constructed to make short our great distances and to make more direct and convenient the transport of our produce from the field to the point of export.

Mr. Speaker, my right hon. friend who leads the House may question my judgment, but he will not doubt my sincerity. I appeal to him in all earnestness, not as the member for Gloucester, but as one who is trying to reflect the opinion of the people of Canada generally, to take such steps as will prevent this wasteful expenditure. Let the Government do this in their own interests, if for no other reason, because if they reconsider their action the people will say: They have taken the right course; we will support them. If we proceed as we are doing we shall only have to struggle with new deficits year after year. We have to look forward to a deficit again next year and as long as that is the case why should we not stop the construction of useless vessels? I am appealing to the Government in the exercise of their duty—their duty, not to the Opposition but to the people of Canada—to stop this expenditure, and I still trust that my right hon. friend who now leads the House will consider what I say and will consent to report progress and in the meantime to consider the matter, and when we come back again tomorrow or next week he can present a programme upon which we on this side of the House, will perhaps be responsive to his appeal.

Mr. EDWARDS: Mr. Chairman, I would be the last person in this House to doubt the sincerity of my hon. friend for whom I have now, as I always have had, a very high esteem. But after listening to his remarks in reference to the Transcontinental project, I trust he will not think I am using harsh or disrespectful language if I say I have certain doubts as to his judgment. I agree with the hon. gentleman that we have too many railroads in this country; that is a fact which has been pretty well impressed upon us from one end of Canada to the other, about which, I think, there is perhaps no real difference of opinion. But it just strikes me that it will be well if hon. gentlemen who sit on the other side of the House would look over the pages of the history, going back a few years, and measure the extent of their responsibility for the fact that Canada has too many railroads to-day. It might be well if they, in all fairness, in considering the question, should estimate what portion or parts of the Government railways of Canada are most responsible for the $70,000,000 deficit which we have to-day and, if they will seriously and honestly give consideratioon to that question they will admit the responsibility for such a huge deficit is very largely, I might say, almost entirely theirs.

But, sir, I have not risen for the purpose of discussing the railway situation, I want to say a very few words in regard to this particular matter which is covered by the vote before us. Might I be permitted to call attention, very briefly, to one or two facts: The original shipbuilding programme, of which this is a continuation and a part, was launched on April 4, 1918, at which time $20,000,000, I believe, was asked for and voted. I think I am right in saying that the shipbuilding policy was pretty generally accepted by both sides of the House at that time, and that there was no objection to voting the $20,000,000. If I am right in that statement, then those who consented to the shipbuilding policy inaugurated in 1918, who gave their consent and raised no objection to the vote must, in all fairness, assume their fair share of responsibility for the inauguration of the policy and for the voting, at least, of that $20,000,000. We proceed next to the following year. Then, I think, some $30,000,000 was asked for in May, 1919. On that occasion, I believe the hon. member for Gaspé (Mr. Lemieux), or as he was referred to the other night, seeing that he sits for the constituency of Maisonneuve also, the hon.

member for Graspy—commended the Government very strongly for its shipbuilding policy, for keeping the wheels of industry going in this country. Now that was in May, 1919, and I think I am right in stating that the distinguished member for Marquette, the leader of the progressive party, was in May, 1919, a member of the Government and therefore—

Mr. McCREA: That is perhaps the reason he left, he did not agree with them.

Mr. EDWARDS: That is perhaps so, no doubt the hon. gentleman can state the reasons why he left, but I am stating the fact; and I do not think my hon. friend will question the reasonableness of my statement, when I say that the hon. gentleman (Mr. Crerar) cannot reasonably get away from his responsibility in voting that money and in the endorsation of that policy. In regard to those hon. gentlemen sitting around him now, and who occupied seats on this side of the House at that time, and who at that time voted the same way that hon. member voted, they are in the same position, and cannot escape their full share of responsibility for the second vote of $30,000,000 and for their endorsation of the shipbuilding policy. Now, that places the responsibility for a total of $50,000,000. I come now to last session when I believe $20,000,000 was asked for and was voted, and with regard to that vote I believe that some hon. gentleman who gave their support to the shipbuilding programme when it was inaugurated in 1918 and again gave their support to that programme when the $30,000,000 was voted in 1919, did not give their support. In all fairness I want to state that fact. But the item was voted. This Parliament, rightly or wrongly, did vote $20,000,000 last year. Now let us see how much it is proposed to add to that amount. True, a vote of $8,000,000 is asked for by this item. But I ask hon. gentlemen in all fairness to consider this fact, that of the $20,000,000 that, rightly or wrongly, was voted last session, only $15,334,000 was actually expended, so that of the $8,000,000 which is asked for now, $4,664,000 is a revote of money which was voted by Parliament last year, and in reality the further money which this Parliament is asked to vote now is $3,334,000. That completes the shipbuilding programme.

Let me go back to the question of responsibility for the building of the ships. I say that there are hon. gentlemen sitting across from me who gave their support not only to the shipbuilding programme in 1918—that was unanimously approved—but who gave their support to the shipbuilding policy in 1919 and to the vote of the $30,000,000, and many of them took a less hostile attitude, at all events, last session in regard to the $20,000,000 than they are taking at the present time. I want to call attention to this further fact The $30,000,000 voed in 1919 was voted at a time when the hon. member for Marquette was a member of the Government, and when most of the hon. gentlemen sitting across the floor to my immediate right were sitting on this side of the House and giving their support to the Government, and therefore supporting that $30,000,000 vote. I claim that, whatever that vote enabled the Government to do in the way of building ships or carrying out their programme, any man in this House who voted for that $30,000,000 must share responsibility for the work that the Government did and that they were enabled to do because that money was voted. That vote of May, 1919, carried the programme through not only to the end of 1919, but to the end of the fiscal year, that is to March 31, 1920. I claim, therefore, that hon. gentlemen like my hon. friend for Marquette, who was in the House and a member of the Government when this money was voted, must share responsibility for whatever work was carried on up to the end of that fiscal year in so far as shipbuilding was concerned. There were not any new contracts let for vessels after December, 1919. Therefore, if I am wrong in backing the Government up in this programme, it appears to me that certain hon. gentlemen opposite who have expressed their opposition to this programme are just as far wrong as I was wrong. They gave their adherence to the policy of the building of ships just as much and as far as I did. And, after December, 1919, no further contracts were entered into, and the contracts entered into in December, 1919, would not have been entered into if this House had not consented to the vote of $30,000,000, to which vote hon. gentlemen opposite gave their approval just as much as I did.

Mr. CRERAR: My understanding is that contracts were entered into as late as May, 1920.

Mr. BALLANTYNE: There have been no contracts entered into since 1919.

Mr. EDWARDS: That was my understanding when I made the statement. I will concede at once that if the hon. member for Marquette or any other hon. gentle-

man who sat on this side of the House at that time and gave his approval to the vote of $30,000,000 can show that contracts were entered into after the expiration of that fiscal year, that is, after the 1st of April, 1920, he is absolved from all responsibility in that regard; but in so far as anything was done by this Government on their shipbuilding programme in the year 1919, it was only done, and could only be done, because this Parliament voted $30,000,000 for that purpose. In voting that $30,000,000 for that purpose we told the Government to go ahead with their shipbuilding programme and enter into contracts.

What other conclusion could you come to? No contracts were entered into after December, 1919. Therefore, if I was wrong in regard to the vote that enabled and encouraged the Government to proceed with their shipbuilding programme, some hon. gentlemen who are trying to get out from under now were just as far wrong as I was. It is all right for some of these hon. gentlemen to bring this matter up now in the way they have done, for the purpose of achieving what is patent to everybody here. Since this matter has come up, it has afforded an opportunity to some hon. gentlemen to make speeches and deliver orations, in order to try and impress their constituents with the fact that they are great for economy; that is the whole purpose. Of course, the opportunity afforded by this vote has been followed up by the hon. member for Red Deer (Mr. Clark) to present, as usual, some more of his free trade fallacies, of which he has always a stock on hand. It has given him that opportunity, of which he avails himself no matter what item comes up for discussion. It has given some other hon. gentlemen the opportunity to say "Oh yes, we agreed to your shipbuilding programme in 1918, but the war was on then, and we did so as a war measure." Mr. Chairman, I will freely accept that as a reason from an hon. member like my hon. friend from Gloucester (Mr. Turgeon), but should I accept it as a reason from the hon. member from Lunenburg (Mr. Duff), for instance? I cannot accept such a reason from any hon. member who assumed the attitude which that hon. member did at a time when our soldiers were asking for reinforcements. He did what he could to prevent them from getting there. That hon. gentleman had a use for his ships at that time, and it was not in the interests of the Allies, but to take men away out to sea so that they could not report for service. So, when my hon. friend states as a reason why he supported the policy of 1918 that it was a war measure, I say that he has got to bring up another story to convince me. I do not think the hon. gentleman's record is such as to substantiate any such assertion on his part. Now, the House sat all night debating this question, and I think we may look at it for a moment.

Mr. CAMPBELL: Are you in a position to say whether any of those contracts for ships could have been cancelled?

Mr. EDWARDS: Most frankly, I am not in a position to say; the Minister of Marine must answer that question.

Mr. CAMPBELL: Certain railway contracts have been cancelled, and I do not see any reason why the same procedure could not have been taken in regard to the ships.

Mr. EDWARDS: I am not in a position to give my hon. friend an answer. Speaking from my own personal knowledge, I know that in the city of Kingston, where there is a small shipbuilding plant, the Collingwood Company, there was an anxious request the winter before last for a contract for a new vessel. I know also that in December, 1919, out in Vancouver they pleaded with the Government very strenuously for one or two orders to relieve the unemployment situation, because the soldiers were coming back in great numbers and there was considerable unrest. Unemployment was staring the people in the face in various parts of the country, and something had to be done. To what extent the Government was influenced, in giving orders for ships, by conditions that then arose and the urgent appeals that were made, I can frankly say I am not in a position to state. But so far as I am concerned, I am willing to take my share of responsibility for voting this additional $3,300,000, which is really all that we are asked to vote, to complete a shipbuilding programme which was in the first place unanimously agreed to. The first vote of $20,000,000 passed without objection; the second vote of $30,000,000 passed, if not without objection, at least with compliments from certain prominent gentlemen opposite; and as regards this final amount, I for one am willing to assume my share of responsibility. What does it amount to after all?

Mr. CAMPBELL: Is there any more reason why this programme should be com-

pleted than there is why other programmes in regard to other national projects should be carried out?

Mr. EDWARDS: Yes, I think there is. I do not blame my hon. friend for keeping constantly in mind the building of the Hudson Bay Railway.

Mr. CAMPBELL: I did not mention it.

Mr. EDWARDS: Well, I do not profess to be a mind reader, but I will bet a horse to a hen that I am not very far wrong. If I represented the constituency represented by my hon. friend, I think that probably I should have done what he did the other day. I would have made a speech in the House which I could send to my constituents to show them that I was putting up a vigorous fight on their behalf for the building of this railway. Now, that is playing the game, and I have no objection at all to that course. But I do think, without going into the details, that some reasons might be advanced for carrying out contracts entered into in the shipping programme of the Government, while reasons equally cogent could be given for not completing the Hudson Bay Railway at this juncture. I may say, however, speaking for myself, I hope the day is not very far distant when the line in which my hon. friend is deeply interested will be completed. I sincerely hope that.

Mr. CAMPBELL: But you will not vote for it.

Mr. EDWARDS: Not this year; if it comes up this year I will not vote for it.

Mr. CAMPBELL: And I will not vote for this item this year.

Mr. EDWARDS: I do not think you will, and that brings me exactly to the point I was coming to. My hon. friend will give reasons, as others did last night and yesterday afternoon, why he will not support this proposal. That is within the rights of hon. members. But having done that, what is the use of taking up further time? The Government must assume responsibility for this vote, and eventually we will put it through. The hon. gentleman opposite, having placed their views before the country and stated their opposition to this vote, having maintained that opposition throughout the whole night, must be satisfied that the country will be fully aware of their attitude towards this subject. That being the case, what is the sense of spending further time discussing the question? If there are any hon. gentlemen opposite who have not put themselves on record as being opposed to it, for Heaven's sake let them get up and express themselves. But having done that, what more is there for them to do? For my part, I am prepared, for reasons I have given, to support the Government in this matter; and hon. gentlemen opposite are equally prepared, for reasons they have advanced —I will not enter on the question of their sincerity—to vote against the item. Very well, having put themselves on record, they should see the futlity of further opposition. That is all I desire to say now. I do object to certain hon. gentlemen trying to lay the blame, if blame there is, on the Government for its shipbuilding policy that received their support in its initial stages, when they voted the great bulk of the money that has so far been expended on this programme.

Mr. PEDLOW: The members of this House generally, and more particularly the members of the Opposition, are extremely grateful to my hon. friend (Mr. Edwards) for having accorded them the privilege of expressing their views on this subject. I trust, however, he will be good enough to concede that the members of all sections of the Opposition are aware of this privilege, and are prepared to exercise their rights on this question. The fact that they have stood here in the front line trenches, many of them all night, in defence of their views on the policy of the Government, shows that they not only know their privileges, but are ready to assert them. The member for Frontenac has taken to task very seriously the member for Lunenburg (Mr. Duff), who precipitated this discussion. He has referred to the war record of that hon. member, and while I cannot see that that has anything whatever to do with the discussion now in progress, I think that the war record of the member for Lunenburg will compare favourably indeed with that of the hon. gentleman.

Mr. McCREA: A good deal better.

Mr. PEDLOW: My hon. friend has said that the Opposition did not object to this vote last year. If the hon. member will read "Hansard" covering the Estimates when that vote was under consideration last year, he will find that many of the members, including the member for Lunenburg, raised strenuous objection to that vote.

Mr. EDWARDS: I would remind my hon. friend that I did not say anything of the kind.

Mr. PEDLOW: If I have not understood the hon. member for Frontenac, I am sorry; but I am still of the opinion that that was the impression left on the House. We are not here to-day to wave the flag. I think that the members on this side of the House can claim equal honour with the members on the Government side in regard to war work and war activities, and there is no need for any references of that kind. That sort of thing is ancient history, and has nothing to do with the subject we are dealing with to-day.

Some hon. members on this side of the House did in 1918, 1919, and even in 1920, support this shipbuilding proposition; but it is quite evident that they have a seen the error of their way in that regard, in which respect they differ from the members on the Government side of the House.

The hon. member for Frontenac (Mr. Edwards) claims that in view of the fact that this project was favoured at one time, and in spite of the admitted fact that it is a losing game, we should continue spending $192 per ton in building ships that are worth only $35 to $42 per ton to-day. Is that good business? I ask you Mr. Chairman, I ask the Minister of Railways whether this is good business, and I would like the Minister of Marine and Fisheries to get up and say now, if he will, that it is good business. It is suggested that as the Government have entered into the contract, it is sacred matter; but it is a well known fact that contracts which were entered into during the war by the Government, by manufacturers, by importers, and by business men the world over, are not now regarded in that sacred light. In many cases those contracts were cancelled, and a readjustment was made on a fair basis. I know of many instances in which manufacturers and importers were allowed that privilege and where an adjustment was made satisfactory to both parties to the transaction. The Government, during the period that has ensued since the Armistice was signed, have exercised that right, and have cancelled munition contracts, adjusting the matter satisfactorily with the parties concerned. Why not exercise the same right in regard to building vessels that are not needed, vessels that would simply lie idle alongside the 16 other vessels that are now lying idle in the harbour of Halifax? The Government have exercised their right to cancel war contracts for textile materials, and I know that in these instances they have paid bonuses amounting to three-quarters of a million dollars, for the cancellation of those contracts. I think it was good business on the part of the Government to make an adjustment of that kind.

I was delighted to see the Minister of Trade and Commerce come in so bright and fresh this morning after his night's rest when others had been labouring all night and had, as he says, produced nothing. He immediately took hold of the situation and suggested that we pass the item without further discussion. It was quite evident to him that the Committee had reached a stage where it was impossible to make progress without the application of the rules of the House. He could gather from the temper of the Opposition and from the tenor of their remarks that we were determined that this item, $8,330,000, shall not pass unless the Government take the only course open to them and apply the closure. I am very much of the same opinion as the hon. member for Red Deer (Mr. Clark) in regard to that matter. I detest the word "closure," but as he points out it is a method that has been adopted by all the governments of the civilized world. If it is clear—and I am sure it must be clear to the Government—that this Opposition is determined that this item shall not pass unless we are forced to pass it by the only means in the hands of the Government, they should in all reason and in all decency listen to the appeal made by the hon. member for St. James (Mr. Rinfret) and repeated by the hon. member for Frontenac (Mr. Edwards), the hon. member for Red Deer (Mr. Clark), the hon. member for Gloucester (Mr. Turgeon), the hon. member for Sherbrooke (Mr. McCrea), and others. This item is only one installment of the amount required by the hon. Minister of Marine and Fisheries.

I have been figuring while this discussion has been going on, that there is a balance of 114,470 tonnage still to be constructed, and at $192 per ton this will cost the sum of $22,978,240. If this item of $8,000,000 is passed for the purpose of doing this work, it is only an instalment on the amount required to complete the work—about one-third of the amount actually needed. So that we are committing ourselves to a proposition that is really like a will-o-the-wisp. We are getting nowhere. It would have been better if the Minister of Marine had

exercised the privilege granted in all contracts entered into during the war, and have cancelled the contracts for the ships, the construction of which had not been commenced. That would have been the sensible course. The attitude of the minister is worse than nonsense. It is unbusiness-like to go on spending $192 for $35 worth of service. The hon. member for Sherbrooke says it is worse than nonsense—it is foolishness. I go further and say it is worse than lunacy. No sane business man would adopt such a course in his own affairs. The Government can only force this item through by closure, and I would ask them to consider the possibility, the advisability and the desirability of cancelling the contracts, in order to see if a reasonable adjustment cannot be made with the firms who have these contracts in hand. Comparing the result of the railway operations in the past year, with the operations of the Government Merchant Marine, it seems to me that the Minister of Railways and Canals and the Minister of Marine and Fisheries have been running a race with each other to see which would pile up the biggest deficit. The Minister of Railways presents the result of the operation of the railways during the past year and shows a deficit of some $70,000,000, and he says "There it is, boys, go to it; what will you do with it?" The Minister of Marine and Fisheries does not come up quite to that point, but, according to the estimate made by a man experienced in shipping, the hon. member for Lunenburg, the Minister of Marine and Fisheries piles up a loss on the year's operation of not less than $59,000,000. That statement has been made on the floor of the House and I have not heard it successfully contradicted. The figures submitted by the hon. member for Lunenburg are very convincing, and no one could seriously dispute them. The Minister of Trade and Commerce made the assertion, or possibly the guess, that no new idea had been advanced during the whole night's discussion and nothing had been achieved, and intimated that the Opposition were simply marking time. As a member of the Opposition, I am willing to continue marking time until we obtain satisfactory information from the Minister of Marine and Fisheries, and we have been asking for information all night. There is one item here which I think cannot be explained by the Minister of Finance. I refer to the discrepancy $148,175.86—I am now quoting the figures from the minister's own statement, page 1334 of Unrevised "Hansard." I find under operating account, 1920, an item deducted for depreciation of $667,665.46. In a subsequent statement also presented to the House by the Minister of Marine and Fisheries I find an item for depreciation the total of which is given $815,842.32. That is an item transferred in the balance sheet by the minister submitting the annual net result for the year. That shows a discrepancy of $148,175.86, between the two different accounts. We should have an explanation of this discrepancy. It is a large amount to the ordinary citizen, but may seem only trifling here. I think it is large enough to warrant the Opposition in holding up the item until we receive a satisfactory explanation of it. We have been asking all night about the earnings of the different ships, and we have been told by the hon. member for Lunenburg that a great many of these vessels have been parading up and down the coast of North America with mud ballast. It would have been better if these vessels had been left in Halifax harbour or some other harbour. We were told that these were built for the purpose of assisting the export trade of Canada, but these vessels have been engaged in coast trade in the Mediterranean sea, taking cargoes from one point in the Mediterranean to some point in Europe. In view of the fact that the Government have to go out to all ports of the world to look for trade to keep these vessels going, it seems to me it is not reasonable that they should continue building vessels presumably to help the trade of Canada, and send them out to foreign ports to be used in this way. All this is being accomplished at the expense of the taxpayers of this country. The Minister of Railways some time ago volunteered the information, when asked the question, that one of these vessels was being used in the trade between Canada and South Africa, he was asked what class of merchandise was brought by that vessel from South Africa to Canada, and he was entirely ignorant as to the commodity handled by vessels on that route. We would like to know what proportion of the $8,000,000 is going to be used in overhauling the vessels laid up in Halifax harbour. I understand that most of these vessels have not been in use for more than two years. It is preposterous that a vessel from which the first coat of paint is hardly worn should have to be laid up for repairs.

I have urged the reasonableness of my request that these contracts be cancelled. The Government saw fit to cancel various

contracts for munitions, textiles, and steel plates; the railway companies, I understand, have cancelled large contracts let during the war and the period of reconstruction. The Government having exercised its right to cancel many other contracts since the termination of the war, I appeal to them to consider seriously the advisability of cancelling the contracts for the remainder of the ships under construction, and thus save an enormous amount to the taxpayers of Canada. I wish to voice my opposition to the continuance of these contracts. These contracts are being carried on without any probability of effecting good objects so far as the public are concerned. A few individual contractors and labourers might be benefited by their continuance, but the people generally would be penalized. It would be in the interests of the country in the long run if some compromise between the contractors and the Government was arrived at with a view to the cancellation of these contracts. Possibly the vessels actually under construction might be completed and disposed of, but we should be recreant in our duty if we permitted the Government, without protesting on our part, their right to go ahead with the building of vessels for use in Canadian trade. I have much pleasure in associating my protest with that of other hon. members on this side—and I am glad that all hon. members sitting on this side of the House, including those to my extreme left, are included in this opposition. The Government may rest assured that this vote will not be carried without the adoption of the strongest measures that it is in their power to employ.

Mr. ROCH LANCTOT (Laprairie and Napierville). (Translation.) Mr. Chairman, I think the Minister of Marine will not complain that I am making any obstruction regarding this amount of eight millions, as this is the first time that I rise to discuss this mercantile marine scheme launched by the Government some three years ago. I want to know why we should persist in this insane policy, why we should spend more and more millions when past experience proves that all this Government's undertakings have caused some awful losses to the people of this country? I agree with you, Mr. Chairman, that we have to deal with a most unlucky Government. They have taken over most of the railways in this country and thus bringing about heavy deficits. They have undertaken shipbuilding, then the cost of construction fell about 80 per 100 and the Government is still paying the same price, that is $192 a ton, though the price should not be more than $40 or $45. I want to know why the minister did give such long term contracts when he could have followed the exemple of other countries and cancelled those contracts whenever there occurred a change in prices, or else, grant contracts from year to year, so as not to pay in 1920 and 1921 prices which are three times what they were when the contracts were given.

Now, we are charged with having countenanced this mercantile marine policy. So far as I am concerned, Mr. Chairman, I may say that I never did countenance any undertaking of this Government. If some of my hon. friends from this side of the House saw fit to aid the Minister of Marine in this shipbuilding policy, that is their business and I have nothing to do with it. However, I was of opinion at that time that they were mistaken in helping out this Government and you will admit with me, Mr. Chairman, that I never supported the Government in anything they did since 1914 and, particularly since 1917 till this day, and that I do not propose to do so in future.

This shipbuilding policy, if I understand what has been said in this House within the last few days and especially by the hon. member for Lunenburg (Mr. Duff), will probably cost the country as much as our national railways. Not only will the Government pay the construction of these ships four times what it is worth, but they will also be called upon to pay a handsome amount to the Dominion Steel people for their cancelled contract. Is it not a fact, Mr. Chairman, that in the United States such cases had been provided for and that the Government had a right to cancel a contract at any time? But, in this country, our Government, always generous towards the big corporations, and loath to displease them, have put no such clause in our contracts and we are now at the mercy of the Dominion Steel, who, after the elections or even before, will send an account which Jean Baptiste will have to settle. I wonder if we merchants, we farmers, could not strike such bargains as those made by the Minister of Marine? I wonder if a Western farmer could have, three years ago, sold his wheat for three years to come at $3 a bushel, and kept up this price for three years?

I also wonder if I could have sold my hay, three years ago, for $30 a ton and

insist on this price being paid for three years to come? Under such conditions I do not think that any serious-minded man would want to do business with me or with the Western farmer, but our Government, though posing as a serious Government, make contracts with shipbuilders for two or three years, always at the same price and even when those prices fall to $40 or $45 they must still pay $192.

I often hear the railway question discussed in this House. True it constitutes a white elephant on the hands of our people, but I am always surprised to hear the hon. members on the Government side. They look as if they wanted the people to believe that the Liberal party is responsible for this state of affairs. If I remember correctly, the Conservatives are in power since 1911, and before 1911 the Government of the day had given the Canadian Northern 35 millions to build their road from Prince Arthur to Montreal, but this building was not carried through till after the hon. gentlemen opposite came into power. Thus, they had a perfect right, once the elections were over, to stop this undertaking and take over the road from Mackenzie & Mann as they have done some years latter, but too late. If they had been business men they should have dispossessed Mackenzie & Mann after the 1911 elections, they should have taken over all the western branch lines so as to provide feeders for the National Transcontinental.

Moreover they had completed the Transcontinental as projected under the administration of Sir Wilfrid Laurier and as stipulated under the contract with the Grand Trunk, we would have had the finest railway of the country and we would now have had two transcontinentals to maintain instead of three. The Government now say that they made no greater mistake than we have. They carried on the construction of the Canadian Northern railway as far as Vancouver on the Pacific coast, after the year 1911. Why? To help the McBride policy which had it been allowed to prevail would have dragged the province of British Columbia into bankruptcy. I ask you, is it their work or ours? I say it is the doings of this Government, since 1911. I have a certain knowledge of this railway policy. It is always the same thing. Mackenzie and Mann having obtained, in 1911, $35,000,000 from the Liberal government, must have contributed to the Conservative party's funds, three or four million dollars to carry the elections of 1911. They now put the plea that we did not protest against the merchant marine. Did the Conservatives protest, in 1911, against the grant of $35,000,000 to Mackenzie and Mann? They did not cast their vote against this railway policy because they had the certainty of getting a good share of those $35,000,000 in order to defeat Laurier. "Anything to beat Laurier." Let them not throw the stone, because they are the most open to criticism.

This disastrous policy must change. On this subject I wish to remark that I entirely approve of the principle adopted by my hon. friends of the Agrarian party, that each side will have to look to the re-election of its own candidates. Mr. Chairman, if to-day we have to put up with such enormous debts, the fault can be found in our election, it is due to election organization, to the buying up wholesale of newspapers to favour a party's politics, because for these things money is needed and who are those who put it up. They are the magnates, the railway companies, the banks and the large manufacturers. Have you any doubt that these gentlemen in return expect to retrieve their losses, as the saying goes? This is what ruins a country. We should act with Parliament as is done with a municipal council of a parish when it makes a mistake with regard to public works within its limits. Those interested would not allow the cost of such work to be 400 per cent higher than if it was done by a contractor at the cost price of the market. If however such a thing should happen, and if a council paid exorbitant prices, those interested could have recourse to a court of justice and would certainly be upheld in their contentions, for the municipal councils can be called upon to give an account of their act before the courts and be convicted as the case may be; but this House is the highest court of justice in this country, there is no higher tribunal and that allows it to adopt the most senseless and the most expensive enterprises which the people have to pay.

When one speaks in this House, no matter on what subject, it always ends on war topics. My hon. friend from Frontenac cannot to-day say one word on the merchant marine without bringing in the war, without mentioning what such and such a member has done and what he has not done. Well, Mr. Chairman, for my part, I have done what I should have done, and I fear no reproach, but I would like to see things cease and that the House betakes itself to business. Mr. Chairman, you have often heard that Sir Wilfrid Laurier's

Transcontinental as it is called, was to cost but $13,000,000, and often have I noticed when these figures of $13,000,000 were mentioned, they were greeted with prolonged applause on the Government side. The right hon. member from King's (Sir Robert Borden) has many times mentioned to us those figures, $13,000,000 to construct 1,800 miles of railway! I never took it for granted that the ex-Prime Minister was serious when he used to throw this bomb of $13,000,000 for an 1,800 mile railway. I never paid much attention to it and I also noticed, up to now, my hon. friends on this side of the House never passed any remarks about it. I think the proper time has come for me to take up this assertion. If I am not mistaken, the Laurier government who conceived this transcontinental project, declared that the railway after completion, would be handed over to the Grand Trunk who would undertake the operation of it for seven years without paying any interest to the Government which would mean to the country an expenditure of $15,000,000 of unpaid interest. At the expiration of the seven years, the Government was to rent the railway to the Grand Trunk for forty-nine years, the latter paying an annual interest of three per cent on the total cost of the road. That is what I understood. If the ex-Premier wishes to visit my county and there declare before my constituents that the transcontinental built by Sir Wilfrid Laurier was to only cost $13,000,000, I am certain that my electors would not take him seriously. It is simply a political bluff. I consider myself a practical man, I know the value of a dollar, I have laboured and handled the plough, I am not always an easy mark for the politician's bluff. I would like to see a change in this state of things; that business be taken up seriously in this House. Is it possible for a Government like the present one to administer railways and a merchant marine? Mr. Chairman, I say it is not, because I know but too well the members of the Government. No returns can be expected from what they do. First, I give them no credit for ability unless it is that of furthering their aims through politics. These gentlemen are directors or are shareholders in large companies and they have more at heart the companies' interests than those of the public. So far I have not seen this Government do anything for the welfare of the country. What is however, evident to me, is that they have not followed our example, for the Liberal party after having held power for fifteen years, had to retire as poor as it was in 1896; in contrast to the Liberal party, which was always opposed to the nationalization of public utilities, the present Government thus reasoned: we shall take possession of the whole public service; not only shall we have control of the civil employees, but we shall have all the employees of the state-owned railways and of our merchant marine. In this way we shall control the country, cost what it may, we shall succeed nevertheless. I foresee that it will place a great number of electors at their beckoning, but on the other hand, I believe, that the latter will not all vote for them and besides there is the people who pay for these ruinous enterprises, who have an inkling of what transpires behind the curtains and who will dismiss them at the next general elections. I do not wish to ramble away from the question. Why this great hurry to vote $8,000,000 for the merchant marine? We cannot afford it this year; then why not place that amount on next year's estimates? The hon. member for Nelson (Mr. Campbell) complained only yesterday of the Hudson Bay Railway for which $21,000,000 have been spent. I believe it is more important to complete that railway, the cost of which has been more than reimbursed by the sale of lands which skirt this road, than to continue the building of ships when we have not sufficient freight for the ships we already own, not mentioning the enormous deficit we are accumulating. If it is wise, in order to economise, to delay the construction of the Hudson Bay Railway for one, two or three years, how much wiser would it not be for the Minister of Marine to postpone his own project to next year or later if need be. He would simply have to complete the ships already in building, not to start any others and leave things as they are. For as the hon. member for Sherbrooke (Mr. McCrea) remarked the ocean freight rates will fall in the proportion of 90 per cent. I have some experience of what took place before the war. I was an exporter of hay to Europe and pre-war times we could export hay through the port of Montreal to Liverpool from the opening of navigation up to July at a price of 12 shillings and at times for 15 to 17½ shillings to Glasgow. You are well aware that for the last few years we could not export a ton of hay to England for less than $20 and $30 a ton.

Now, if the Minister of Marine has been somewhat encouraged by the fact that the number of ships built in 1919, were re-

munerative, he cannot pin his faith to the belief that the rates will be maintained at those high levels, because all the countries of the world have now larger merchant fleets than previous to the war and taking into consideration that the European countries are ruined, and buy very little, there exists very little water transportation. He stated last year that he could have sold his ships at a profit. I am afraid that he has lost the occasion of reimbursing the people of this country, the money invested in that enterprise. Still, it was the advice that was given to him by many members of this side of the House, people of great experience, such as my hon. friend of Guysborough (Mr. Sinclair) and Lunenburg (Mr. Duff), who knew better than the Minister of Marine and better than myself what ought to be done and the things that relate to the merchant marine. It is not perhaps too late: it is still better, when the market conditions are unsteady to sell at once and not to put off. When a man has netted 75 or 80 per cent, he sleeps in peace, whereas when he keeps his stock, he gets sick. I am surprised that the hon. minister is not ill on account of the appalling cost of his merchant marine. As a matter of fact, it is not he who pays, but the country, and so he may sleep quietly. Many hon. members on this side of the House know more about that matter than myself, and I trust they will continue the discussion, but I may refer to it again this afternoon should it be necessary.

Mr. POWER: In reading over the Hansard of March 29, 1921, page 1329, I find there the most interesting statement of the Minister of Marine and Fisheries:

> When we are in Committee of Supply I will, to the very best of my ability, and with the greatest pleasure, give the fullest information to hon. members regarding the operations of the Canadian Government Merchant Marine.

Taking the Minister of Marine and Fisheries to be a man of his word I should like to ask him a number of questions. I am sorry he is not in the House, but if the hon. gentleman who is now leading the House can tell me whether he will be in a position to answer them, I will put them to him. Will the hon. gentleman who leads the House tell me whether he is in a position to answer?

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: I am afraid I am not a mind reader. I have not heard what the hon. member wishes to be answered.

[Mr. Roch Lanctot.]

Mr. POWER: On page 1331 of unrevised Hansard, the Minister of Marine and Fisheries gives a list of the vessels which compose the Canadian Government Merchant Marine, and which when built will complete the programme of the Government. I am glad to see the excellent deputy minister of Marine and Fisheries enter the House. I assure him that it is with great pleasure that a large number of the members of this House and the people generally heard that he had returned to the department which he had graced with his presence for a long time. We, and I imagine the business people of this country, are somewhat at a loss to know how the Department of Marine and Fisheries could be carried on in his absence. With the hon. member for Lunenburg (Mr. Duff) we all agree that he has had large experience in matters connected with the department.

I am glad to see the Minister of Marine and Fisheries (Mr. Ballantyne) also in his seat again. I was just pointing out that in his statement it is set forth that 114,470 tons have yet to be completed. At $190 per ton this would amount to twenty odd million dollars. We are now being called upon to vote $8,000,000. Would the minister be kind enough to tell me whether this is the only instalment, or whether we may expect to vote other items later?

Mr. BALLANTYNE: I am sorry that the hon. member for Quebec South was not present last evening as he would have heard this question answered. But I have no objection to answering it again. The vote we are asking for now, $4,000,000, is a re-vote for last year, and is to complete the Government's shipbuilding programme. All the ships are so far advanced that by the end of the month of June, and not later than the month of July, all the ships will be finished. Possibly, it may be some little time before I have the honour to ask hon. members to vote money again, but you never can tell.

Mr. POWER: Really then, we have only $3,000,000 of a new vote.

Mr. BALLANTYNE: Yes.

Mr. POWER: Over how many ships is this $3,000,000 to be spread?

Mr. BALLANTYNE: Sixteen.

Mr. POWER: Would the hon. minister be kind enough to give me the names of the ships? I hope they will be christened with proper names. If as my hon. friend the member for Lunenburg (Mr. Duff)

has pointed out, the Government are entering into the spirit trade, I hope the ships will be properly named. I would suggest to the minister that he enter into a conference with his friends from Ontario, who are disturbing the electorate of Ontario with the presence of "Pussyfoot" Johnson and others, to have proper names attached to those ships, so that this country and other countries will know the kind of business that this Government has entered upon. I would like to know the names of those ships and the places where they are being built. It is important to know that. It has already been pointed out that when large public undertakings are being carried on in any constituency, it is extremely difficult for a member to ask for a public accounting. Such being the case, it would be well to know in what constituencies these ships are being constructed. I imagine that one is being constructed in a constituency close to my own, but I am prepared to oppose the vote in spite of that.

Mr. BALLANTYNE: We have not got one called the "Canadian Power," but if I had thought of it sooner, there would have been.

Mr. POWER: It would be a mighty good ship.

Mr. BALLANTYNE: The steamers are the Traveller, the Cruiser, the Constructor, the Reefer, the Thresher, the Pathfinder, the Leader, the Logger, the Skirmisher, the Coaster, the Challenger, the Harvester, and the Transporter. The Traveller is being built at the Harbour Marine Works, Victoria, and the Cruiser and Constructor at Halifax. On the Cruiser and the Constructor a little over a million dollars each has been spent, and on the Traveller about a million and a half.

Mr. POWER: How much more remains to be spent on the Traveller?

Mr. BALLANTYNE: I do not know.

Mr. POWER: Surely you are in a position to tell us what you expect to pay for these boats.

Mr. BALLANTYNE: The contract price on the Traveller was $1,673,000. We expect to have the Cruiser and the Constructor finished in July.

Mr. POWER: It might not interest members of this House, but it would interest business men engaged in shipping to know how the Government's programme is being carried out. It would be well for us to take our loss generally on the whole marine and let it sell for what it can. If we stopped building now, what would be our loss approximately, as compared with the loss we should sustain if we completed the boats and sold them below cost? I do not ask these questions in order to annoy the minister; nothing is further from my thoughts. How much more remains to be expended?

Mr. BALLANTYNE: We will find out and let you know during the next hour.

Mr. POWER: What about the next boat?

Mr. BALLANTYNE: If you want full information regarding the minor details of every boat I shall have to send to the office and get it. You want to know exactly how far advanced these boats are, how many more plates are to go on, what decks, and everything like that?

Mr. POWER: It might be interesting.

Mr. BALLANTYNE: And all about the piping, and so forth. We will try to get it for you.

Mr. POWER: And particularly the amount which is still to be expended on each. The minister can give that now.

Mr. BALLANTYNE: I have not got it.

Mr. POWER: Give me the contract price for each ship, and approximately how much has been expended on each.

Mr. BALLANTYE: I cannot tell you that, but I will get all the information I can, down to the smallest screw, if you will give me time.

Mr. POWER: I am only too glad to give you time. The members on this side want complete information in order to form a reasonable judgment on the whole question. I am sure that if we had full information some of us who are prejudiced against the scheme might become staunch supporters of it. I at present have a prejudice against the minister's policy but if I got all the information I require that prejudice might be removed. I do not believe in government control of ships or railways, or, for that matter, of anything else—not that I have no confidence in hon. gentlemen opposite, but I have no confidence in the operation of public utilities and even if we were sitting opposite I should hold the same view. I do not know that the minister attaches very much value to the conversion of a new recruit, but if he does I would be only too glad to be converted to his view, and cal.

his attention to the old saying of the joy in Heaven over the conversion of one sinner. It is Heaven to be in the minister's place just at the present moment, but there might be joy in that portion of the Chamber if he could obtain one or more converts. I would like to ask the minister whether he has taken seriously into consideration the suggestion which was made in the House by the Minister of Railways last week, that we should take these boats and place them on the inland coasting trade and use them for carrying coal from the Sydneys to Montreal. Have representations been made to him with respect to this, and by whom?

Mr. BALLANTYNE: Not only have representations been made, but the company have decided to put those vessels on the coal trade. A large number of them are in Halifax just now, having a certain amount of overhaul, and then they are going to be put on the route.

Mr. POWER: Is that what the sixteen vessels are doing?

Mr. BALLANTYNE: The number has varied. I would not want to make a guess, but I will wire and find out.

Mr. POWER: How many boats does the minister intend to place on the route?

Mr. BALLANTYNE: It is not arranged by the minister: it is done by the Canadian Government Merchant Marine.

Mr. POWER: How does the minister know there was such an intention?

Mr. BALLANTYNE: Because I was told so by the management.

Mr. POWER: Is the minister given all the information?

Hon. Mr. BALLANTYNE: Oh, certainly.

Mr. POWER: Has he anything to do with influencing the decision?

Mr. BALLANTYNE: Not at all.

Mr. POWER: Is the management convinced this will be a paying route?

Mr. BALLANTYNE: I do not know what the management's views are.

Mr. POWER: If not, why does he think the management is going to run the boats from Halifax?

Mr. BALLANTYNE: That is the arrangement we have with them.

Mr. POWER: That is the arrangement the minister has with the management?

Mr. BALLANTYNE: It is very old news to my hon. friend, that the management of the merchant marine is entirely free from Government interference, and that Mr. Hanna, and his experienced steamship men, manage the boats and put them on whatever route they see fit.

Mr. POWER: Is Mr. Hanna a steamship man?

Mr. BALLANTYNE: Mr. Teakle, of the Allan line, is the experienced man.

Mr. POWER: And all matters of policy such as these are entirely in the hands of the Canadian Merchant Marine?

Mr. BALLANTYNE: As far as the management of the ships is concerned.

Mr. POWER: Questions of policy as to where those boats are to sail would, I presume, be in the hands of this company. So that when the hon. minister takes credit for extending the trade of Canada to such and such ports, the minister was really not responsible for that?

Mr. BALLANTYNE: I gave the management full credit for the great showing of the Merchant Marine as to the carrying of Canadian products and the profits. I do not take any credit.

Mr. POWER: The hon. minister is not responsible for the opening of new trade routes, in any part of the country?

Mr. BALLANTYNE: No.

Mr. POWER: If any credit is to be given, it is to be given to the management company?

Mr. BALLANTYNE: Yes.

Mr. POWER: If the minister became convinced that certain sailings were not paying, that certain services—such as the service to Newfoundland for instance—were not paying, could the minister, under his arrangement with the Merchant Marine, make representations to the Merchant Marine?

Mr. BALLANTYNE: Surely.

Mr. POWER: If the House becomes convinced of this, would the decision of the House have any weight with the Merchant Marine?

Mr. BALLANTYNE: The decision of the majority of the House always has influence with the minister.

Mr. POWER: It always has?

Mr. BALLANTYNE: Yes.

Mr. POWER: I am glad to hear that. Therefore, should it be shown that the policy of establishing a service to certain countries, at the same time subsidizing the concern to run the steamship service, were in its nature apparently an absurb policy, a bad system to be followed, could the minister, after listening to representations on the part of shipping men, such as the hon. member from Lunenburg and others, make such a representation to the Company as would induce them to change?

Mr. BALLANTYNE: I am quite sure that if the member for Lunenburg makes representations to my colleague the hon. Minister of Trade and Commerce that he is entitled to a subsidy on his fishing smacks, it will receive careful consideration of the Government.

Mr. POWER: I do not know that he has asked for any subsidy on fishing smacks, but I think it rather unfair for the minister to say——

Mr. BALLANTYNE: I thought I heard him mention the hon. gentleman's (Mr. Duff's) name.

Mr. POWER: I said he had made certain representations that it was a bad business to subsidize boats to go to a certain country or to certain parts, and at the same time to send our own mercantile marine there, often at a loss, and I asked the minister. If he were convinced that these representations of the member for Lunenburg were just and reasonable, could he have any influence on the Merchant Marine Company and ask them to change this policy?

Mr. BALLANTYNE: Again, I am sorry my hon. friend was not with us last night. The Government ships are freight ships—the hon. gentleman from Antigonish and Guysborough (Mr. Sinclair) describes them as tramp ships; I do not call them that. None of them are passenger ships, and, therefore, none of them are subsidized. The ships that are subsidized to Newfoundland, to the West Indies and Australia, are passenger ships subsidized by the Minister of Trade and Commerce.

Mr. SINCLAIR: It is not a reflection to call vessels "tramp ships."

Mr. BALLANTYNE: I understand that.

Mr. POWER: Is there any possibility of the minister influencing the decision of the Merchant Marine Company?

I would like the minister to lay down the principle because I wish to make some representations on behalf of my constituents. Is it worth while making representations to the minister with regard to any question of policy as effecting the Merchant Marine?

Mr. KEEFER: Is my hon. friend in favour of the Government operating these ships?

Mr. POWER: I am not.

Mr. KEEFER: If not in favour of operating them, is he in favour of having them operated by a private company?

Mr. POWER: I am in favour of getting rid of the whole thing, lock, stock and barrel.

Mr. KEEFER: Is the hon. member aware of the amount of trade from the west coast of Africa that is now coming to Canada?

Mr. POWER: No.

Mr. KEEFER: Is the hon. member aware how much trade from the coast of Africa is going to the United States?

Mr. POWER: No.

Mr. KEEFER: Would the hon. gentleman think it advisable to have a transport service between here and the west coast of Africa?

Mr. POWER: Now, I will put that question to the minister. Will he please give me an answer?

Mr. BALLANTYNE: I am not the Minister of Trade and Commerce;—he will be here in a few moments.

Mr. POWER: Then I give that answer to my hon. friend from Port Arthur (Mr. Keefer). Then, may I again ask for an answer to my question whether the minister can influence the management of the Merchant Marine to change or to amend its policy if the proper representations are made?

Mr. BALLANTYNE: I am a modest man and would not like to claim too much. If, however, my hon. friend will tell me what he wants I will try to get the influence that he thinks I ought to have.

Mr. POWER: I have recently been asked by a number of people in Quebec and Montreal to place before the minister the suggestion that he ask the Merchant Marine to arrange their services so as to facilitate

the shipment of horses to the Old Country. I understand that that would be a very profitable trade, and that if we could get the boats, American horsemen would be only too glad to come to Canada and carry on their shipments from Montreal or Quebec. I have also been told that the Merchant Marine boats have been discriminating against the port of Quebec. They obtain cargoes, say, in the East Indies and carry them through to Montreal, refusing, unless the cargoes are very large, to discharge at Quebec, with the result that shipment has to be made by rail back to Quebec. This involves considerable expense and inconvenience on the part of Quebec merchants and consumers, and it would seem to be only fair that these cargoes should be discharged at Quebec. I would like the minister to take these matters into consideration. If we have him with us this afternoon I hope to read to him some letters with reference to the trade in horses with the United Kingdom.

Mr. HERMAS DESLAURIERS (Montreal, St. Mary's): (Translation.) Mr. Chairman, it is much to be regretted that the Government saw fit to force the Opposition to spend so much time in trying to make them agree to what common sense should have caused them to accept from the start. The difference between the Opposition and the members of the other side of the House is now to be seen clearly, because when some members of the other side suggests some practical measure, dictated by common sense, we of this side are always anxious to accept it. For many years the Government has proven that, on account of our bad financial conditions, it is necessary to practice economy. Now it is in the name of that very economy that the Opposition feel it is their duty to oppose these extravagant Estimates. Mr. Chairman, we cannot possibly agree to the votes asked for, under the present circumstances, for many reasons. First of all, it has not yet been shown to us that the carrying of this naval policy of the hon. Minister of Marine was obligatory, necessary and beneficial. We refuse to vote such enormous sums of money when we know that they will serve to convey once more that same man Crosby from Halifax to Hudson bay where he goes with food for some Eskimos who do not exist there. We refuse to vote any amount in order to allow that man or others to carry to Chesterfield some wire with which to fence 10,000 square miles of land, so that cariboos that never pass there may breed. We refuse to vote those Estimates because we know that, on the shores of the Richelieu river the minister puts to dry many a vessel that could be used somewhere else. We then refuse these Estimates because we know that at Port Nelson a number of boats do not serve any purpose. There is amongst others a steamer called the Neophyte which is idle on the shore. There are four other barges there. There is that precious dredge which for the last fifteen days has not been used. For all those reasons, Mr. Chairman, we object to the shipping Estimates at the present time.

We know that the selection of Port Nelson as a seaport is altogether ridiculous, that the natural port of that district was Port Churchill. But the Minister of Marine saw fit to remove the natural port of the Hudson bay from Port Churchill to Port Nelson, which is at the further end of the Hudson bay and where the boats of Crosby cannot reach but at a distance of 25 miles when year after year they carry on shipments of supplies for people who do not exist. And that is the reason why they have transferred there that notorious dredge, in order that they might dig a channel through which ships could more easily reach the port when all the time it was demonstrated that the Nelson carries alluvia which destroys year after year the work accomplished during previous years.

We are asked to grant those sums of money for the building of ships. It was shown lately in this House the present boats of the Government had wandered about the seven seas in quest of cargoes. We have sufficient proof of that.

Now that the war is over and this question of patriotism seems to have been settled for the time being while exports have been reduced to normal, it is understood that we do not need more ships. Moreover, if we wish to help the expansion of shipping, we may, in imitation of the Montreal Vickers', go to work and build ships for Norway and other countries. Why build ships if we have no cargoes to carry? Such a departure might prove most dangerous to our young nation. True it is that we hold this famous title of nation, having bound ourselves to respect the conditions of the League of Nations. Now, as far as Canada is concerned, what does that League of Nations mean? The right hon. Minister of Justice (Mr. Doherty) and the former president of the Privy Council (Hon. Mr. Rowell) told us wonderful things in this

connection, things of such a nature as to exalt the patriotism of a young nation to the utmost. On the other hand, their utterances in Europe were dreadful, so much so that, at a certain moment, Europe felt itself shaken and, surely, the nicident would have been most ingracious had not the former president of the Privy Council thought fit to deny his own words.

By clause 10 of the covenant of the league, we bind ourselves to carry, in war time, our human cargo overseas; and by that same clause, we also bind ourselves to carry the victuals necessary to feed about fifty nations. Surely, this famous League of Nations does not rank very high in my estimation, it rather constitutes a snare, a screen behind which Europe may pull its wires at the expense of the smaller nations.

I beg leave to quote an instance of this before I proceed further. When the last war between Russia and Poland took place, Poland and thirty-three other nations had signed the Peace Treaty according to which, in the case of war, those nations were to help Poland to have the integrity of her territory respected, and were to come to her rescue. Well what happened? Poland, in that war with Russia, was abandoned and found herself alone. The nations which had assumed the obligation to defend the integrity of her territory and to use their influence in her favour in the council of the League of Nations, did nothing of the kind. What, then, does that League of Nations amount to? It is apparently a mere means of calling the smaller nations to the rescue of the bigger. Supposing a war was declared in India, in Egypt or elsewhere and we had a navy which was available, our ships would be at the disposal of those nations which had signed the Peace Treaty.

I shall oppose, with all my might, the votes intended to develop the naval scheme of the hon. minister, because a scandalous misuse was made of our ships in the past. No later than three years ago, when the people of this country were put on short allowance in the restaurants and in the hotels, the Government's ships were carrying bacon over to the Esquimaux, who eat nothing but raw meat, and that merchandise, which would have been so useful to our white people, the officials at Port Nelson were obliged to deliver it to the Esquimaux, who made candles with it.

We have met with the railway disaster; we have run into a debt of $650,000,000 in connection with the Canadian Northern; we have to conclude the purchase of the Grand Trunk by which we shall incur a debt of $900,000,000. The railway deficit is a real disaster, and yet, we find, on the Government side, no less a man than the hon. member for Lambton East (Mr. Armstrong) who would like to see the present Government marine operated under similar conditions.

It is claimed in certain quarters that, at a time of enforced idleness, when so many people are out of work, it would be most important for the Government to let contracts and to operate and develop the marine. I think that reason is groundless. When the last Norwegian ship was launched at Montreal a statement was made during the banquet which followed, to the effect that it was the intention to close the Vickers shipyards within a month or more from that date. I have said, just a few days ago, that we had, in this country, an industrial policy which was surely not unfamiliar to the Government, and that this policy was no more nor less than a policy of protection beyond measure. It is desired that the question of salaries should be settled, and there you have the reason why the president of the company stated at that banquet, that work would cease at the Vickers' shipyards, at Montreal, although there was no lack of contracts.

We also oppose the present votes for economy's sake, because the burden of taxes on the ratepayers' shoulders is already heavy enough. Our marine is bringing us a deficit, our railways have brought us one likewise. It is probable that the Budget will reveal still higher taxes. I find it altogether unreasonable to favour a programme which in the past has brought about deficits and which, on account of its present uselessness, will entail deficits still larger. With a debt of over two billions, we can say that the Government cannot afford to spend such sums for an undertaking which at best can only be a matter of chance.

I heard a short time ago, "The two parties cannot throw stones at each other in the matter of the national railways; the Liberal party have a great share of responsibility, and so have the Government party." There is, however, a slight difference to be considered. Under the Laurier regime it could be allowable for a government to spend something to foster the progress of the country; but at a time when Canada's debt reaches two billions, I think the blame we can level against the present Government is much more serious. We are often told that the resources of the country

must be developed. True, if you have the wherewithal to do so. Our credit is wretched; we have a formidable debt which demands at all cost the strictest economy, and our resources are but hypothetical at the present time. We cannot believe in the reason invoked by the Government that they want to give work to people in shipyards, no more than we could believe them when they talked of a programme of workmen's lodgings. They were to give employment to all the trades, they were to keep from the working class the danger of unemployment. They had an underlying design. They meant to impose such impossible conditions that no one would accept the offers, and they were refused everywhere.

I admit that under the present circumstances, we should follow the advice of the Government who urge us to practise economy; but we do not want to be the only ones to do so; they must do likewise; they must put an end to the development of its merchant marine programme; they must stop their expenditure on the Welland canal to make a seaport of Toronto; when we know that the Welland canal can only be of use to the coast trade. Under present circumstances, they ought to undertake to strike out the fifty millions intended for the Welland canal, and the hundred millions voted to continue the development of the port of Toronto which will never be anything but a port for tourists.

I therefore beseech the Government to practise that which they preach, to content themselves with the strictest economy in the matter of shipbuilding. And I hope they will recognize the good faith of the Opposition and the duty which is now imposed upon us to oppose most energetically votes for which there is certainly no excuse, and which can only result in heavier taxes being imposed upon our fellow-citizens.

Mr. GORDON: The minister has gone far afield for justification of his merchant marine policy citing legislation existing in Cromwell's time. He may be Cromwellian to that extent, but he is mistaken if he thinks the Canadian people are behind this proposition. Leading Canadian journals on both sides of politics have been quoted indicating clearly that the people generally and the business interests are altogether opposed to it, but the Minister apparently intends to carry it through with the assistance of his supporters. Let me quote from the Toronto Saturday Night, the leading financial journal in Ontario, which has supported the Government in practically all its legislation. The last issue of that journal says:

When the war was at its height and when the deadly submarine was getting in its best work, the thought was very general that it would be years before there was again sufficient shipping to meet the public demand. But see what has really happened? There are to-day tied up at the docks or swinging at anchor more idle vessels than ever before known. An authoritative statement is to the effect that there are five million dead weight tons of shipping laid up in Britain, America and Scandinavia, a total of 1,278 ships. It is not a case of there being too many vessels, provided world conditions were normal is place of being utterly demoralized as they now are. It is safe to state that there are not less than two hundred million people over in Europe who would only be too glad to see these ships now motionless sailing into their ports carrying from this continent the necessities of life. But, alas, they have nothing with which to pay, so they must go without.

Much of this idle shipping can now be purchased at far less than original cost, the owners being only too glad to get out from under. A prominent Canadian ship broker informed the writer the other day that first-class vessels could now be purchased at well under $100 per ton, whereas these same vessels cost $200 or upward per ton to construct.

This is one of the foremost journals in Ontario and has been a sympathetic supporter of the Government and particularly of the Minister, and what I have just read indicate one of the storm signals in that province.

On Thursday last, April 7, the Evening Telegram of Toronto, which has been a Government supporter ever since it was founded, opposed this scheme in a very vigorous editorial headed "Concealment Can't Help." The editorial reads:

The financial showing of the Canadian Government Merchant Marine is quite as good as was to be expected. But the Minister of Marine might well have been a little more frank with the public. The merchant fleet was started under the stress of war. The building was continued under popular demand that no Government would have dared to deny. The operation has been, so far, as can be seen, business-like and economical.

But what was to be gained by attempting to conceal the fact that a great deal of the war-time cost will have to be written off? What profiteth it the Government to give a false impression that the fleet showed a surplus when the capital charges must necessarily be taken into account? The fact still remains that the Canadian Government Merchant Marine has a deficit of $1,500,000, a statement such as any business man would give serious consideration when the actual depreciation in shipping values is increased by many millions.

Hon. Mr. Ballantyne may be playing politics, but playing politics won't pay deficits. These are serious financial times in the country's history, and nothing is to be gained by misleading statements that will have to be amended at an early date.

The hon. Minister of Marine and Fisheries in presenting his statement to the House gave certain figures which I will repeat briefly.

Operating Account for 1920

Gross revenues closed voyages		$10,027,442 77
Operating expenses		8,733,917 22
Operating profit closed voyages		$ 1,293,525 55
Deduct—		
Depreciation	$667,665 46	
Outstanding liabilities	22,000 00	
Incorporation expenses	5,400 00	695,065 46
Net earnings closed voyages		598,460 09
Net earnings on voyages closed since January applicable to 1920		183,000 00
Total net earnings		$ 781,460 09

The significant point is this, the minister says:

I wish to point out that these net earnings are before providing for interest, and the above amount of net earnings, $781,460.09 is equal to 2.35 per cent interest on notes given to the Government for the full cost of the ships.

Now, the depreciation in any asset is the difference between its actual cost and its replacement value. The replacement value of ships to-day is shown by the many authorities which have been cited to the House to have been cut in two, and yet the hon. minister assumes to cut off by way of depreciation only the 5 per cent which is the annual depreciation outside of any which comes by reason of the condition of the world's markets and the absence of business for shipping. If a loss of 50 per cent had been caused to the merchant marine by tempest, or in any other way, that would be the present depreciation. Loss has been caused, not by tempest, but by reason of certain conditions existing. So that the proper course for the minister to take would have been to carry on his books the shipping at its actual cost, to write off the depreciation, and to take his loss as any business house would do. I submit that the hon. minister has confused the principles of depreciation, because 5 per cent is depreciation which continues outside of any other consideration, no matter what happens. That is the basis which is generally accepted in the matter of depreciation. But in addition to that, there is the depreciation which results from other causes, such as tempest, fire, or anything else that involves the laying up or destruction of the ships. For such depreciation the minister should have made allowance in his figures, and had he done so, as the " Telegram " points out, the loss would amount to something like $1,500,000. The minister should revise his figures in order that the exact situation may be understood, and should adopt the principle that depreciation is the difference between the actual cost and the present replacement value. That is the principle which has been adopted in all the courts. The position is more serious in view of the fact that every dollar taken from business in taxes reduces by $1 the possibilities of business expansion. If it was necessary to keep returned men employed, it would have been well for the Government to cancel its orders when it found that shipping was no longer needed, and adopt some scheme along the line of housing, or establish some fund in co-ordination with the funds of the provinces to keep the returned men engaged. By doing so, they would have kept the men busy establishing homes instead of building a vast fleet of ships which is resulting in loss day by day, and the outcome of which we are unable to ascertain.

Every village and every town is opposed to the scheme, and every paper that is printed has something to say in criticism of it. The confidence of the public is shaken, and there is a widespread feeling that the Government should immediately get rid of a scheme which is not paying and which is adding to the burden of this country day by day.

There may be, and there is, a reason why we cannot get rid of our difficulties in connection with railway construction, because railways are necessary to maintain communication between the various parts of the country. Cities, towns and villages would be cut off, and great loss would be entailed in trade and business if we did not carry on the railways even at a loss. But that is an entirely different situation from the shipping; it is entirely different from carrying on trade between negro ports in Africa and Canada, or carrying whiskey to Cuba and Jamaica, and so on, as is being done, at a loss.

I submit, therefore, that we should not pass the estimates which the minister has submitted to the House, as it is simply throwing money away on a scheme which has not been well considered, and which will entail greater loss as time goes on.

Mr. E. SAVARD (Chicoutimi-Saguenay): (Translation.) Mr. Chairman, I have often heard people of all conditions say that we should expect anything from the present Government, and I don't doubt but my colleagues on this side of the House have also heard the same opinion expressed;

but there are limits to all things, and that is why we could not foresee that, last night, between eleven o'clock and midnight, after a day especially allotted to the private members, the Government would bring forth this item of eight millions for the consideration of the House, especially under the unfortunate circumstances known to all, circumstances which necessitated the absence of a number of members either already in Montreal or on their way there. I say that the Government must necessarily have known of those regrettable circumstances, and that it took a good deal of audacity on their part to ask the House, under such circumstances, to deal with a matter of such importance. Evidently, had we been able to foresee that the Government would bring forth this matter last night, there is no doubt, as was stated with as much sincerity as valiance by the hon. member for Dorchester (Mr. Cannon), that most of the members would have spent the night here to take part in the debate.

There is no doubt but that the Government counted upon the absence of many of us; but if they had hoped thus to pass this item without difficulty, they must have found themselves much out in their calculations. The Opposition is still hale and hearty, and ready to fight day and night, the whole week if need be, until the Government bring into operation the means at their disposal to close our mouths, and apply foreclosure.

Mr. Chairman, like all those who have spoken before me I am opposed to this Government marine policy, and I also, am decided to adopt all possible means to oppose it. The Opposition have been blamed for having passed the time, during the night, in reading paper extracts. Has not the Opposition a right to do so? Have they not the full right to do so? The duty of the Opposition here is to express the opinion of the public, the opinion of the electorate throughout the country. And what is the best way to do that? Is it not by quoting such comments as are made by the Canadian press? Although it may displease the Government, or perhaps the hon. Minister of Marine, I beg forgiveness for giving myself the pleasure of reading an extract —and especially of reading it in English— of an article published by the Citizen of Ottawa, in December, 1920. I do not know whether this article has ever been read; in any case, it may be well to read it again.

Too Many Ships.

While our Government is taking much credit to itself for its extensive and costly shipbuilding programme, which goes on apace, there is developing a world situation in tonnage which is becoming of serious import to all maritime nations. This relates to the glut of tonnage from which the European and American continent is suffering. Writing in the New York Evening Post, Mr. Allan Nevins calls attention to the fact that the United States shipping board has tied up seven steel vessels since the end of September and now announces that eight more, all large ships, have been withdrawn. A noted American authority on maritime affairs is quoted to the effect that hardly half the world's available ocean tonnage is being employed at this time and that a general fall in shipping securities in the United States and Britain marks the general situation. Companies here and abroad have resorted to special devices to keep their tonnage moving. Five lines plying from Liverpool to Oriental ports—the Cunard, Ellerman, Moss and others —have offered rebates to shippers who will promise to restrict themselves to their vessels. Steamship agents in New York and other American ports are making vigorous efforts to obtain parcel freight in default of full cargo shipments. A fortnight ago the American shipping board announced that American lines carrying freight to the four chief ports of Germany, Holland, Belgium and France, would be allowed to fix their own rates. This means a price-cutting war in competition with European lines.

The chief causes for the present situation are given as too much tonnage and a heavy decline in freight shipping. According to Lloyd's Register the world had, in June, 1914, a gross tonnage of about 45½ million tons of shipping. In June of this year it had almost 54 million tons. In addition to this there is building some seven or eight million more tons. In the United States the shipping board has attempted in vain to sell some of the 1,000 steel ships under its control to private parties, but the knowledge that the world is in for a protracted spell of sharp competition and of freight rates that spell disaster to lines lacking in efficiency and very heavy capital has proved too strong for the board to do business.

For this reason and for several others, we are strongly opposed to this naval policy, but the chief reason is that the country cannot afford this expense, as many an hon. member has repeatedly said before me, but in such a struggle as we have been going through, since last night, I think repetitions are necessary, and there cannot be too many of them.

Some time ago, I heard the hon. Minister of Railways and Canals state before this committee that for several years no railway would be built by the Government. The same thing has been said for the Public Works Department. There is a pressing need of certain works which we have asked for, for many a year, such as an extension of the wharf at Chicoutimi, for this wharf is too small, and the development of our district is consequently delayed. We are invariably told: "We cannot do anything for you, the Government has no

money." It has been the same for everything we have asked. I have always received the same answer to all that I have asked for, for several years: "We have no money, and the proof is that we do not undertake any work." That is why thirty-one engineering offices have been closed in the country; the Government have closed sixteen of these offices in the Department of Public Works. We are told that the Government have decided not to undertake any public works because of the need for economy. These offices have been closed; yet, I hear that the employees have been kept on, that they have been transferred to other departments. As I have already said on many another occasion, the county of Chicoutimi is certainly a beautiful one. I believe that on the other side of the House, there is not one member who has any idea of the extent of the district of Chicoutimi-Saguenay, and even on this side of the House, I am sure that some would be surprised were I to tell them that in order to go from one end of my county to the other, one has to travel eight hundred miles. It is perhaps larger than the rest of the province of Quebec. The Dominion Government owns large properties in the lake St. John district and also in the Chicoutimi district, and all along the northern coast to Labrador. I do not think I am exaggerating when I say that the Government has built in my district, in the lake St. John district, and along the Saguenay, about sixty wharves which will certainly fall to pieces, now that the engineer's office is to be closed.

I do not know whether this engineer has left his office; at any rate, the closing of the office is a foregone conclusion; the engineer will leave Chicoutimi and come and live in Quebec; and the Government property—some sixty wharves—will continue to deteriorate. Besides, the Government has had dredges made; they spent several thousand dollars in the dredging of the Saguenay river; but there are absolutely urgent works to be attended to, for the district is going to develop at an unexpected rate within the next few years. However the Government seem to put obstacles in the way and impede progress. Why refuse in all the counties of the country the carrying out of absolutely necessary works, and spend some ten millions for an altogether useless marine? When we confer about such matters with well informed people, people of second judgment and free from political entanglement, they cannot imagine that a government should take the responsibility of so nefarious a policy: of spending ten millions for an absolutely useless marine while refusing to carry out positively urgent works in all parts of the country.

Well, as I had occasion to say yesterday, the Government under a pretense of economy, has suppressed a small grant which the Laurier government had allowed for 12 or 15 years, as soon as the Price firm ceased to carry on its industry at St. Catherine's bay. For several years Sir Wilfrid Laurier's government granted a supply of $3,500 to a very interesting population, that of the north shore. It is not a mere fishing community; they have large industries, they own fine farms, numerous, flourishing parishes. Now, under the pretence of economizing a few cents, this population is deprived of an absolutely necessary service. The Minister of Commerce gives as a reason for it that this service is a "ferry service". I had always understood that a ferry service was carried on between the two shores of a river. This subsidy granted by the right hon. Sir Wilfrid Laurier was to allow a boat to go from Tadoussac, on the north shore of the St. Lawrence, to St. Catherine's bay, which is not on the Saguenay river but on the St. Lawrence. Therefore it seems to me that this cannot be a "ferry service". When a boat leaves Tadoussac she has to go to the St. Lawrence and come back to St. Catherine's bay. For 12 years this subsidy was granted; everybody found it absolutely necessary, and now, in order to save a few dollars a whole population of about fifteen thousand souls are deprived of all communication during the long winter months.

I say that, for all those reasons, no confidence can be placed in ministers, who thus carry on the business of the country, and I oppose the vote of eight millions which the Minister of Marine is asking for.

Mr. LAVIGUEUR: Before making the few remarks that I desire to address to the committee upon this subject, I would like to ask the hon. minister or the right hon. gentleman who leads the House a few questions. I would like to ask if many demands have been made by the people of Quebec, or from the district of Quebec, for contracts for ship-building?

Sir GEORGE FOSTER: I understand that quite a large number of demands came in from different parts of the province of Quebec.

Mr. LAVIGUEUR: Would the right hon. gentleman give the names of those who made requests from Quebec?

Sir GEORGE FOSTER: No, my hon. friend had better put that question to the hon. Minister of Marine and Fisheries.

Mr. DUFF: It seems to me that the Minister of Marine should be here when his estimates were going through.

Sir GEORGE FOSTER: The Minister of Marine has been here for the greater portion of the time.

Mr. LAVIGUEUR: This is a very important question, and I am greatly surprised that my right hon. friend does not give the information, because it is to my knowledge that quite a few demands have been made by very reliable and important firms in Quebec who were recommended by the most prominent citizens in Quebec for contracts. The city of Quebec pays a large share of the taxes of this country, and the people there were entitled to their share of the patronage as much as the people of any other part of the country. That is why I would like, and why I would insist upon, a reply from the right hon. minister who leads the House, or from the Minister of Marine. I quite understand that the hon. Minister of Marine has given quite a lot of time and has been in the House most of the time since yesterday. But, on the other hand, if the Government are not in a position to answer my question, I would like to have an adjournment until the Government is prepared to give an answer.

Sir GEORGE FOSTER: My hon. friend might have taken an earlier opportunity, when the hon. Minister of Marine and Fisheries was in the House, to put his question, but I will make a note of those questions and hand them to the Minister of Marine when he comes in, and my hon. friend will get an answer to his questions.

Mr. LAVIGUEUR: What the right hon. gentleman who now leads the House says is quite right. But this is the first time I have had occasion to speak on the question.

Sir GEORGE FOSTER: Let my hon. friend put his question, and I will make a note of it for the Minister of Marine when he comes in.

Mr. LAVIGUEUR: It is my turn to speak now, and it is my right to get an answer to my question.

Sir GEORGE FOSTER: Allez, go to it.

Mr. LAVIGUEUR: Mr. Chairman, I have the pleasure now of seeing the Minister of Marine and Fisheries coming to his seat, and with your kind permission, I will repeat my question. I would like to ask if it is to the knowledge of the hon. minister that some demands were made upon the Government for contracts for building ships in the city of Quebec, and in the district of Quebec.

Mr. BALLANTYNE: I think the hon. member is aware that the Government when they were placing contracts placed a contract with the Davis Shipbuilding Company for two—three—ships.

Mr. LAVIGUEUR: That is not exactly an answer to my question. Does the hon. minister say that a contract for two ships—

Mr. BALLANTYNE: Three.

Mr. LAVIGUEUR—was placed with the Davis Shipbuilding Yards at Levis? Is it to the knowledge of the hon. the minister that quite a demand was made by Quebec firms outside the Davis firm for contracts for building ships?

Mr. BALLANTYNE: I am not aware that there is any shipbuilding yard in the city of Quebec building steel ships except the Davis firm; I know they build wooden ships at Quebec, but the Government is not building wooden ships, only steel.

Mr. LAVIGUEUR: Another point: Is it not to the knowledge of the hon. the minister that the Quinlan & Robinson firm of Quebec have applied several times for contracts for shipbuilding in the city of Quebec?

Mr. BALLANTYNE: Not that I am aware of. I can only repeat what I stated a moment ago that they are not steel shipbuilders, and we are not ordering wooden vessels.

Mr. LAVIGUEUR: Can the hon. minister tell me why they do not order wooden vessels?

Mr. BALLANTYNE: My hon. friends opposite have found much fault with the Government during the last twenty-four hours for ordering steel vessels, and it may be that their criticism would have been still worse if we had ordered wooden ships.

Mr. LAVIGUEUR: Was not fault found when the contract was entered into for steel ships?

Mr. BALLANTYNE: Oh, no; when the Government launched their shipbuilding programme it was with the consent and approval of hon. gentlemen on both sides of

the House, including the hon. gentleman (Mr. Lavigueur). The demand was for steel only, not for wooden ships.

Mr. LAVIGUEUR: Is the hon. minister aware that for a great number of years Quebec has been a great centre of shipbuilding?

Mr. BALLANTYNE: Of wooden ships, yes.

Mr. LAVIGUEUR: The firm of Quinland & Robinson, of Quebec, of which mention has been made, have built some wooden ships and I understand that they have been quite satisfactory, and have carried out their contract.

Mr. BALLANTYNE: I have not any knowledge whatever with regard to wooden ships. We did not order any, and I have no personal knowledge of wooden ships; I advised the Government not to order any, and I advised them to confine their shipbuilding programme to steel ships. I think my advice on that occasion was wise.

Mr. LAVIGUEUR: I would like the hon. minister to tell us why he should be opposed to wooden ships.

Mr. BALLANTYNE: I think the hon. member is aware of the fact that wooden ships are out of date in competition with steel ships, and while all other countries ordered wooden ships during the war—I am sorry my hon. friend was not here through the very pleasant evening which we spent last night when I made the statement that the United States has a million tons of wooden vessels they do not know what to do with, and England and France with Norway—large tonnage of wooden vessels which cost them $200 per ton. Luckily for Canada we have not any wooden ships.

Mr. LAVIGUEUR: (Translation.) Last night a bomb exploded in the House of Commons. A credit of $8,330,000 was asked for the Merchant Marine. The House was taken by surprise. No one expected that such a demand would be made last night. The debate started vigorously. The siting lasted all night; it will last probably all day and perhaps the whole week. The members on your left, Mr. Chairman, are convinced they have an imperious duty to fulfil, and want to protect with all their might against this policy, which is condemned by the electors from one end of the country to the other.

We were given, last week, a statement on the operation of the Government railways, acknowledging a deficit of seventy million dollars, and I believe that if the auditing of the accounts of the administration of the National Railways was conscienciously and properly made, it would not be seventy millions we would have to deplore, but more likely one hundred millions and perhaps more, as stated by many newspapers, including those favourable to the Government. It is therefore found, Mr. Chairman, that the Government operation of the National Railways is disastrous, to the utmost, altogether ruinous, and calculated to bankrupt the country, unless the Government be driven from office by the wrath and indignation of the people, and unless competent people having the interest of Canada at heart, should take the direction of national affairs. After having had a deficit of 120 millions in two years with the railways, the hon. Minister of Marine asks us to continue the building of a Merchant Marine as a means of giving employment to returned soldiers. This aim would be most praiseworthy, and if it had been faithfully carried out there would have been nothing but congratulation to offered to the Government. But, as in all the programmes introduced by the Government, this one has been brought down as a mean of maintaining themselves in power, ontwithstanding the will of the people. Favouritism has been shown to friends of the Government in the giving of contracts, and a bid made for popularity.

I asked the hon. Minister of Marine a short time ago if he had received requests from different parts of the province and from the district of Quebec for shipbuilding contracts. The hon. minister does not recollect having received numerous requests from this district. I know that he speaks in good faith when he says his memory fails him, but to my personal knowledge the most urgent requests have been made to the Government by firms of the highest standing for some of these contracts for Quebec, the cradle of shipbuilding in Canada, in order that work might be given there, as elsewhere to the brave soldiers who distinguised themselves at the front, and who asked the Government an opportunity to earn the bread for their families. If the Department of Marine wishes to make the necessary search it will be found that the Quebec firm of Quinlan and Robertson, offered to construct steel vessels at that place, but there have been no contracts for shipbuilding given to Québec. There is neither work nor patronnage of any kind for that city, because it is hostile to this Government. I

have myself pleaded with the Government; I have forwarded petitions. Formerly I had the honour to be mayor of the city of Quebec ant it was in that capacity that I took these steps. The Quebec Chamber of Commerce also applied to the Government with the same objection in view, but we received merely acknowlegements of our petitions, and the contracts were given elsewhere, some times without tenders, to the friends of the Government. Enormous contracts were given, and Quebec was rerefused even the slightest consideration for the returned soldier who wanted bread for his family. Apart from the firm of Quinlan and Robertson, the Davie Shipbuilding Co. of Lévis, one of the best organized firms in the country also applied for contracts. The hon. minister answered one of my questions just now by saying that the firm of Davie, of Lévis, had built two vessels, and had given full and entire satisfaction. A lay number people from the city of Quebec worked in the Davie Shipyards, and Lévis as well as Quebec tried to obtain contracts, but the citizens of Lévis were no luckier than those of Quebec, and after the building of the two boats, no other contract was given. The great majority of the labourers who worked at Lévis were deturned soldiers, as I know from having Government places for most of them, and they are now thrown out of work.

I listened with much interest to the judicious remarks of the hon. member for Lunenburg (Mr. Duff) an the subject of shipbuilding, and I congratulate the hon. member upon the valuable and interesting information he has given to the country. The same applies also to the hon. member for Antigonish and Guysborough (Mr. Sinclair).

Because of the disastrous Gouvernment Merchant Marine policy, and the administration of the National railways, the people of the country are to be bled white to replenish the public treasury to which they willingly contribute since they know that the Government during the war contracted very heavy debts which, whether wise or not, have to be paid. The public is obliged to make the greatest sacrifices, even the humble labourer who earns barely enough to keep his family, must contribute a certain percentage of the wages he earns by hard work, to pay the debts contracted by this Government. And where does this money go? Can the tax-payers at least have the satisfaction of being able to say that their money serves to decrease the National debt? No, Mr. Chairman, I am well informed? I believe that the Income tax brought about 28 millions to the public Treasury last year. Has any part of these 28 millions been used to reduce the national debt? On the contrary, these amounts contribute only in a small degree to pay off the disastrous administration of the national railways and merchant marine, which are running the country to ruin and will prove more costly to the people than the war.

I was proud and rather satisfied to notice lately that the city of Quebec for the year 1919, had contributed to the public treasury through the income tax, the amount of $2,-800,000. It has therefore the right to claim her share in the distribution of government grants. Each time, however, Quebec has asked for some favour; what has been the Government's reply? Only of late, I petitioned the hon. Minister of Public Works, asking for the rebuilding of a breast wall, the property of the Government, which had been destroyed during the flood of 1918 and which supported the Saint Grégoire de Montmorency road, in the beautiful county that I have the honour to represent in this House. It was refused, they even declined to do anything whatsoever, even to repair this property which was their own. My predecessor asked the Government who had even promised to relieve the situation by the construction of a bridge on the island of Orleans connecting the mainland with seven of the most flourishing parishes of the Quebec district, comprising deserving farmers, who are isolated on that island during a certain period of the year, when they cannot sell their products to the city and neither ship them, not even can they dispose of their fish which become a loss, Mr. Chairman, at a time when we are pre-occupied in lowering the cost of living. Subsidies were once granted them but they have since been cancelled. For many years we have insisted that the Government put to execution this important project, and which will be done, you may rest assured, when the Government of this country will be under the administration of persons having a sense of justice and wish to be equitable to the population of this country without distinction of race or religion.

When we shall have at the head of the Government men of the stamp that I have just mentioned, the bridge of the island of Orleans will be built and it will be an act of justice and an important improvement.

We have requested, Mr. Chairman, that the Government instead of throwing away their money in enterprises like the merchant marine, in order to favour their friends, I might also add the city of Quebec has also made the request, that this Government, its Premier its ministers, the entire Cabinet, fulfil the contract and keep their pledges. While the right hon. member for King's (Sir Robert Borden) is in his seat, I shall recall his words pronounced in 1913 at the Chateau Frontenac on the occasion of a large banquet given to him by the citizens of Quebec. He then declared to the citizens of Quebec that he wished to do them justice and that he had come to Quebec to see that these large enterprises were to be continued without any interruption and completed. Where are those pledges, those contracts signed by the Government for which the city of Quebec has made enormous sacrifices to obtain the development of railways, to obtain the transportation of the western wheat which had been promised to them and which was to the advantage of the whole country? The promises, the contracts, the solemn pledges and the declarations made by ex-Premier of Canada before many hundreds of persons at the Chateau Frontenac, in Quebec, where are they? All these pledges have become a dead letter. They always answered us: "Gentlemen, your demands are reasonable, but we cannot for a moment think, during war time, to execute any work, we cannot think of spending any money." Nevertheless, we voted millions after millions and the Government spent that money in the building of ships and they refused to the citizens of the Quebec district, improvements which would have benefited the whole country. They continued to ship the western grain through the American ports, at a cost of 34 to 35 cents per bushel, when by shipping it by the St. Lawrence river and Quebec, route, having given us the wharves and the elevators promised, we could have shipped the Winnipeg wheat at a cost of about 16 or 17 cents per bushel, this is to say 50 per cent cheaper and at the same time utilize our national railways and shorten the route by 214 miles, from Quebec to Winnipeg. This is the way that the Quebec province has been treated by the Government since 1911. And to-day when they wish to bring on closer relations with Quebec, when they want to shake hands on the eve of federal elections, is it not time, Sir, for the citizens of the province of Quebec to consider how shamefully they have been treated by the Government. You may be sure, Mr. Chairman, that the people of the city of Quebec and of the whole province do remember and will not forget; such is their motto. Can this Government, which has only three members from Quebec in its ranks, after having denied all its pledges and if I may be allowed to use the expression—boycott the province of Quebec, can this Government expect in the next general election any other result than that which it obtained in 1917? The representatives who will be sent to this House by the province of Quebec will be just as united as they are to-day.

There has been another injustice towards the city of Quebec to which I would like also to refer. Quebec has a very well organized exhibition. whose board always relied on the $50,000 allowed by the Dominion Government. When our turn came to apply for the grant, we were told that the Government could not give it because they had to economize during the war. It is always the same answer as regards the province of Quebec. After the war, we sent our request to which they replied: "We are not giving any more grants; we have done it two or three times for other provinces; Quebec never got it, but, now we have stopped these grants."

I wanted to draw the attention to that injustice on the part of the Government towards the city of Quebec, because if you want to have god farm products and to encourage young people to remain on the land in order to cultivate it and to provide cargoes for the Government ships, it seems to me that it would be an excellent policy to give a little encouragement to the good farmers of the Quebec district, as it has been done elsewhere, and to give to Quebec the grant which it did not get, although entitled to it. The Board of Harbour Commissioners did not meet with greater success, when they asked for the construction of a cold storage plant, which would allow to ship through Quebec the butter and cheese which we are forced to ship through Montreal, because we have no cold storage plant in Quebec. I do not know that any of the members of the Government who are present in this House can say that the province and especially the city of Quebec actually received a share of the grants.

Allow me, Mr. Chairman, to say a few words about the government-owned railways and the service which we have in Quebec. I believe it is the duty of the

people to patronize the national roads as much as possible and when I am not in too great a hurry to reach Quebec or Ottawa, I travel on the Canadian Northern. Do you know what kind of service we get between Quebec and Montreal, for instance? The Canadian Pacific runs three good trains daily which cover the distance in five hours; the Canadian Northern has pretty good coaches, it is a fairly good train but it takes seven hours to go from Quebec to Montreal. When taking the Ocean Limited from Montreal to Quebec, you would think that they would make use of the Quebec bridge and take the passengers right through to the city, however they do nothing of the kind. The Ocean Limited, when not late, reaches Lévis at five minutes past twelve at night, and there is a boat to take the passengers over to Quebec city; but unfortunately it happens sometimes that the train is late—it is a habit with the government-owned railways —and as it reaches Lévis at 2 or 3 o'clock in the morning, passengers have to wait on the wharf for ferry boat. Travellers coming from Quebec to take the Ocean Limited, who number sometimes 50 or 60 and perhaps a 100, cross over with the ferry boat which leaves at 11.30 p.m. and if the train is late, they have to wait in the open air until 2 or 3 o'clock in the morning. That is how the national railways are being operated. It would be much better to have a train leaving from the Pacific station, which would go over the Quebec bridge and connect with the Ocean Limited, for the convenience of the passengers bound for Montreal, and those bound for Quebec could be taken right through to the city. When a request to that effect was made by the council and the Chamber of Commerce of Quebec, the Government replied that it would involve too great an expense. The administration of our national railways is the same throughout the country.

The operation of the road is about the same elsewhere—I have had occasion to travel a little between Quebec and Winnipeg, for instance. When I passed by way of Toronto, I found magnificent coaches, very large, very well appointed; but if I pass via Cochrane, it is another story between that place and Quebec. It is as if one would say, It will always be good enough for Quebec—I would like the Minister of Railways to see for himself; I am sure he is ignorant of the state of things, and I would be most happy if he could realize what kind of service is given from Cochrane to Quebec. It is one that could not be compared with that to be had between Toronto to Winnipeg.

These are some of the grievances of the citizens of Quebec. For my part, I am absolutely opposed to the policy of the Government Merchant Marine, which is nothing less than a duplicate of the disastrous National Railways policy, and had I an advice to give the Government, I would tell them to give up the whole scheme at all cost, immediatetly if possible, to get rid of this load which is breaking the country's back, and which together with the national railways, spells the ruin of the nation.

I said a moment ago that we had solicited contracts for the firm Quinlan & Robertson. It comes to my memory now that we also asked for contracts for a company of shipbuilders of Saint Laurent, on the Isle of Orleans, which employ a large number of workmen there and elsewhere. This request was no more heeded by the Government than the others. So that when I say that the distribution of contracts was marked by favouritism, I believe that it will be admitted that I am absolutely justified.

Therefore, Mr. Chairman I shall vote against the item of $8,338,000, and I will ask the Government before indulging in useless expenditure, before sinking millions as they do, to give a little more consideration to the citizens of Quebec, who pay their taxes like everybody else. I will ask them again to continue the work on the St. Charles river, at Quebec, and I will not weary asking this. The Government have already sunk $1,600,000 in these works; moreover they have cancelled the contract which they had with the contractors and acquired the whole plant, and if I am well informed this plant was valued at about five of six hundred thousand dollars. Without any reason, the Government, some day, decided to discontinue the work in spite of engagements taken and in spite of their contracts. Notwithstanding many solicitations from the citizens of Quebec, the Government have refused to resume the work, and the matter will no doubt go no further, like the rest. It seems to me this would have secured a fine port for the Government marine.

I will vote against this item of $8,000,000.

Mr. MEIGHEN: Mr. Chairman, the committee has been sitting for about eighteen hours continuously. The item under discussion was before the committee on a previous day from about 4.30 until six

o'clock, and again from eight o'clock in the evening until 12.30 the next morning. Certain hon. gentlemen opposite have formed the opinion that they should block this item, for what purpose I am unable to conceive, and for what purpose I modestly suggest they do not quite understand themselves.

The history of the item under review is very briefly this: During the progress of the war, indeed at a period which turned out to be fairly near the end, having in mind the total amount of construction, the Government did undertake a shipbuilding programme of certain dimensions. Toward the undertaking of that programme they had been repeatedly urged by the hon. members of this House, and from the entire Dominion pressing requests came that this country should commence the task of establishing a mercantile marine, requests that were all the more pressing because of the all too-imminent necessity of the hour.

That policy was embarked upon, if I am correctly informed, with the unanimous approval of this House in the first place. That was in the spring of the year 1918. In the spring of the year 1919, after the armistice had been signed, but before, I believe, peace was formally established, the policy was continued with certain limitations. A vote of this House was taken for its continuance, amounting to $30,000,000, and my recollection is that that vote was unanimous, some objection being taken (but no vote being called for) on the part, not of the official Opposition, but of one or two hon. gentlemen who now are among the Farmer group. However, the policy that the Government had ventured upon received the unanimous, or almost the unanimous endorsation of this Parliament some six months or more after the armistice had been signed, with the limitations set up in the vote of that day. That constituted endorsation of the programme which the vote embodied, and to which the vote should be applied. Following out the mandate of Parliament, the Government let certain contracts, and the decision to let the last contract was come to in the month of December, 1919, now almost a year and a half ago.

Towards the end of the year 1919, the unemployment situation in Canada was becoming more and more acute; not that we suffered as other countries did, but undoubtedly in December, 1919, and during the early months of 1920 there was very considerable distress due to unemployment in various parts of the country. The Government was importuned, as only a Government can be importuned, to relieve that distress. The importunity was particularly strong because so great a degree of the distress was suffered by men who had returned from the war, and the chief pressure came from those men, and from those who represented them and pressed for consideration on their behalf. That was a factor of considerable magnitude in relation to the letting of the last two or three vessels or more, all of which had been authorized by this Parliament.

Now, I say again, the last decision was arrived at in that month. Efforts were made to keep the price down to the lowest possible point, thus delaying the final Order in Council approving of the contract until the month of March, 1920. Since that date no new engagement of any kind has been entered upon, none whatever; all that the Government has done, all that was left to do, has been to carry out the obligations into which this country had entered by the authority of this Parliament, by virtually the unanimous authority of this Parliament and which had been pressed upon us from all sides.

To complete that work, to carry out the contracts into which we had solemnly entered by the authority of Parliament, a vote was taken last year. It was stated in that vote last year that more would be required, that probably it would be impossible to complete the ships within the then present year, and that something more would be later requested. The vote that is now before the House, a vote of $8,000,000, is to cover $4,665,000 that was included in last year's $20,000,000 vote, and the balance for that completion which it was plainly stated last year would be required as the work would necessarily continue into this year. The Government then is merely engaged in asking for a revote of about three-fifths of this amount and of the other two-fifths for the completion of work which this Government was authorized to perform by this House.

The position of the Opposition, if I am able to put it into words, seems to be this: They are entirely with us in authorizing expenditure at a time when it is popular, where the work is being done, but after the work is nearly done and it is time to pay, then they are altogether against us. They quite agree that the country should enter into solemn engage-

ments, but they are entirely opposed to the country carrying them out.

Just a few days ago, one hon. gentleman stated that because certain moneys were not paid in London, England, he hung his head in shame at the spectacle of Canada repudiating her obligations. Canada has repudiated no obligation to which Canada was bound, but the party of which he is a member now believes that this House should be held between heaven and earth, stagnant, sterile, doing nothing, for days for fear that Canada may comply with her obligations to people of this country. There are contracts to pay for that have been entered into, and there are also contracts to complete. Are hon. gentlemen taking the position that we are perfectly right in laying down the hull of a vessel, but wholly wrong in completing the vessel?—that it is perfectly proper to build a ship, but wholly wrong to put the engines in that ship? Do they say that it is wholly wrong to complete that which it was wholly right to commence? Because they believe that just at this time when the operation of shipping the world over is suffering by reason of reversal, in which suffering we bear our part, do they say this is the time for the Opposition to stand here and say, "When the sun shines everything is all right and we approve of it, but when the clouds come we go back on everything we have said and we want to sit back and do nothing?" I was surprised that the hon. gentlemen of the agrarian party should have allowed themselves to be lured by plausible phrasing on the part of the official Opposition into the position they have got themselves in. Are they aware that the leader of the agrarian Opposition (Mr. Crerar) was a member of the Government when the whole work was undertaken and when the last ship was ordered?

Mr. CRERAR: I am quite sure my right hon. friend the Prime Minister does not willingly misrepresent me. I left the Government early in June, 1919, and I have here Hansard, containing a question asked by my hon. friend, the member for Lunenburg (Mr. Duff)—

Mr. MEIGHEN: I beg the hon. gentleman's pardon; he is right, I know the point he is making.

Mr. CRERAR: Mr. Chairman, my right hon. friend made the statement definitely and very explicitly that I was in the Government when the last contract was made.

I left the Government early in June, 1919, and I want to tell my right hon. friend, and my hon. friend the Minister of Marine and Fisheries, that according to the information brought down in reply to the question by my hon. friend from Lunenburg in this House, and answered on March 4th, of this year, the last contract for these ships, two in number, was let on the 7th April, 1920, ten months after I left the Government. Now, I do not wish to take up the time of my right hon. friend the leader of the Government, but this simply illustrates all that he knows, and all that my hon. friend the Minister of Marine and Fisheries knows, about his own business. When my right. hon. friend the leader of the Government makes such sweeping statements in order to score a point, he wants to be very certain that his facts are correct before he repeats them.

Mr. MEIGHEN: I was quite ready the moment the hon. gentleman called attention to the date. I knew then I was wrong in that statement, and I accepted the hon. gentleman's statement—the hon. gentleman's resignation was in the June previous—and for that error I am quite prepared to make amends to the hon. gentleman. I have no desire to misstate the position of anyone. But the fact that the hon. gentleman was not a member of the Government at the time the contract for these two ships was let, does not alter the fact that he was a member of the Government when the estimate was prepared and brought into this House and that he supported the entire shipbuilding policy when it was thus undertaken.

Mr. CRERAR: Might I ask my right hon. friend another question? If his statement just now is correct, does he mean to say that that commits me indefinitely to the building of ships by the Government?

Mr. MEIGHEN: It commits the hon. gentleman to the support of the programme which was then undertaken. That is the point. We are not taking a policy, we are not continuing a policy but only completing an authorized programme which he supported. We undertook a certain task which we are carrying out. It is true, the contract for two ships were let after the hon. gentleman resigned, but that is not a reversal of policy, it is an execution of policy.

Mr. CRERAR: Almost one-third of the contracts for building ships were let after I left the Government.

Mr. MEIGHEN: Let me say that if I understand the situation aright, the position of the hon. member for Red Deer (Mr. Clark) at least has the greatest resemblance to consistency of that of any hon. gentleman opposite. He takes the position that we should not have undertaken the building of ships at all, the building of ships being peculiarly the commercial prerogative of the United Kingdom, they being able to build them much more cheaply than we, and that consequently we should leave to them the work of supplying the carrying needs of this country. While it might be such a difficult task for us that it may not be wise for us ordinarily to enter into competition of that nature, at the time this was done there were very special circumstances which made it our duty to build them, even at great cost; special circumstances which made it our duty to build ships in this country because they were required, and had to be built wherever the ships could be constructed. These are the circumstances under which this programme was undertaken. The hon. gentleman went through a performance similar to that in which he has been engaged during the last twenty-four hours some years ago. In 1913 I remember he delivered then a long series of speeches, taking the ground that instead of ordering any ships for war purposes in England, we ought to build two fleet units in this country, no matter what they cost, that we ought to build ships on the Atlantic and on the Pacific, at a time when the cost of building in this country would have been easily double the cost in England and at a time when emergency called for them being built with the least possible delay. The hon. gentleman held this Parliament up, or was instrumental in doing so for weeks in an effort to compel the building of ships in Canada for purposes of war, on the Atlantic and on the Pacific, at a cost of probably fifty million dollars to this country. At a time when the ships had to be built we undertook the building of seventy million dollars' worth of ships to this country.

But hon. gentlemen opposite are evidently tired of the task they have undertaken on this occasion. One after the other they have pleaded that this debate be brought to a close, that they do not want to continue the performance that has been going on for some thirty hours. Well, I do not think we could wish clearer evidence of the purpose of that performance. The hon. member for Red Deer, the hon. member for St. James, Montreal, the hon. member for Lunenburg, Nova Scotia, and the hon. member for Westmoreland all have pleaded for the Government to intervene and have the closure applied in this committee. Well, if that be so, it is pretty good evidence of the purpose of their talk. It is the best evidence that the debate was conducted only in order that it would have to be stopped. Under the circumstances, I feel that it is the duty of hon. gentlemen on this side of the House to accede to their request. The Estimates were brought down in this House on the 8th of last month. I believe the debate on the Address was finished only on the 3rd. I do not know of any previous occasion when the Estimates were brought down so early after the conclusion of the debate on the Address. Commencing, I think, on the 15th, or earlier, on each and every day when the House reached Government Orders, we have moved the House into Committee of Supply. As yet merely fractional items have gone through. The progress this House has made has been infinitesimal compared with the work the House has to do, and if this is to go on, then Parliament will cease to be the High Court of the nation. It will arrive at a status in the public eye that I, for one, would not like to contemplate. I, therefore, feel it my duty to take the first step to bring to an end this performance, and I move that the further consideration of this item be postponed.

Mr. MURPHY: Under the rules this motion is not debatable.

The CHAIRMAN (Mr. Boivin): No.

Motion agreed to.

Ocean and river service—maintenance and repairs to Dominion steamers and icebreakers, $1,750,000.

Mr. PARENT: May I ask what amount of money has been spent for the icebreaker Montcalm?

Mr. BALLANTYNE: The amount was $138,094.

Mr. PARENT: Perhaps the hon. gentleman would save time if he would give us the names of the various steamers and the amount of money spent for repairs on each one.

Mr. BALLANTYNE: The names of the vessels and the amounts spent on each are as follows:

The Aberdeen	$ 5,784
The Arranmore	nothing
The Argentine	160
The Bellechasse	1,890
The Brant (hull repairs)	1,393
The Concretia (hull repairs)	214

The Dollard	1,773
The Druid	46,810
The Estevan (hull repairs)	5,900
The Frontenac	2,200
The Grenville	4,500
The Lady Grey	71,000
The Lady Laurier	1,060
The Lambton	2,753
The Laurentian	28,000
The Montcalm	20,000
The Newington	3,400
The Reserve	900
The Rouville	9,000
The Scout	893
The Shamrock	16,600
The Stanley	10,000
The Thomas Mason	191
The Vercheres	900
The H. W. Lee	2,890

Mr. PARENT: Is there any special reason why repairs amounting to $46,810 were made to the Druid?

Mr. BALLANTYNE: The steamer Druid was in a very bad state of repair, and naturally the cost of putting her in proper seaworthy shape was greater than if she had not been in such a bad state of repair.

Mr. PARENT: What is her tonnage?

Mr. BALLANTYNE: None of these ships is bought or operated according to tonnage. They are just small river craft.

Mr. PARENT: Has the minister an idea how much it would cost to buy a ship similar to the Druid at the present time or at last year's prices? No doubt, with his experience in shipbuilding, he will be able to give the committee that information.

Mr. BALLANTYNE: I do not claim any particular experience in shipping. The hon. member probably has in mind the hon. member for Lunenburg (Mr. Duff). I could not give the hon. member the information for which he asks.

Mr. CASGRAIN: I am told that the steamer Champlain, which up to last year belonged to the Canadian Government, was sold to the Gulf of St. Lawrence Navigation Company, and for some reason or another, some delay occurred in obtaining a settlement of the accounts. Can the minister give me some enlightenment as to this matter?

Mr. BALLANTYNE: The matter is now in the hands of the Justice Department, but the Government are fully protected by note and mortgage on the ship.

Mr. CASGRAIN: Who is attending to the Government's side of the case in the matter. Who is the attorney of record?

[Mr. Ballantyne.]

Mr. BALLANTYNE: As my hon. friend knows, there are a large number of attorneys and other legal gentlemen in the Justice Department. I cannot give my hon. friend the particular name.

Mr. CASGRAIN: The minister does not quite catch the point I want to make. Generally, there are in the Department of Justice different lawyers looking after special cases; but when it comes to a matter of pleading cases before the Exchequer Court or Supreme Court or a local court, the department generally retains the services of lawyers in the different localities where the cases are to be pleaded. In one instance in Quebec where an expropriation was going on, the Government retained the services of Mr. Bernier, who is now a judge. In the present case, who is the attorney, if any, who has been selected to look after the interests of the Government?

Mr. BALLANTYNE: I am sorry I cannot give the hon. member the name of the legal gentleman in the Justice Department, but my colleague, the Minister of Justice (Mr. Doherty), has promised to get it for me.

Mr. CASGRAIN: It may be that the Minister of Marine and Fisheries is not in a position to give the committee that enlightenment, but I see next to him the Minister of Justice, and surely the Minister of Justice knows who is retained for this case. I wish he could whisper to the Minister of Marine and Fisheries the name of this attorney, because I would like very much to know it.

Mr. DOHERTY: I can only give my hon. friend my present impression, which is that the case has not reached the stage where outside counsel would be necessary. I cannot say that positively. The hon. gentleman, I think, appreciates the fact that it is not possible for me to walk around with, present to my mind, who the lawyer is in every particular case in which we may be concerned. I shall be very glad to ascertain the fact. I am now told by the Deputy Minister of Marine that I would be justified in saying positively that no lawyer outside of the department has been retained in connection with the case. I make the statement upon his authority.

Mr. CASGRAIN: What amount has been paid up to date on account of the purchase price of the steamer Champlain, and what is the balance still remaining due on that price.

Mr. BALLANTYNE: The price at which this ship was sold was $61,050—$13,000 has been paid in cash, and four notes have been given of which one of $12,000 has been met. There are still unpaid one note for $11,997 and two for $12,000.

Mr. CASGRAIN: When did the sale take place?

Mr. BALLANTYNE: I have not the exact month; it was either July or August, 1920.

Mr. CASGRAIN: Who are the signatories of these notes, and are they responsible persons? Are they persons with whom the contract was made, or other parties?

Mr. BALLANTYNE: The Gulf of St. Lawrence Navigation Company, Thomas Harling and one of the Messrs. Clark, I am not sure of his initials.

Mr. CASGRAIN: Was there not a gentleman called Mr. Barnard, of Montreal, who had something to do with the contract that was passed in the guaranteeing of the payment of these notes?

Mr. BALLANTYNE: Not that I am aware of.

Mr. CASGRAIN: What interest do these notes bear and has the interest been paid regularly?

Mr. BALLANTYNE: If the hon. gentleman will ask me some other question, so as to enable the business to proceed in the meantime, I will be very glad to let him know about the matter of interest later on.

Mr. CASGRAIN: I will be delighted to do so. Does the minister know that the Gulf of St. Lawrence Navigation Company is now in liquidation?

Mr. BALLANTYNE: Quite so.

Mr. CASGRAIN: Is the note signed by the company alone?

Mr. BALLANTYNE: I said a moment ago that it was not only signed by the company but also by Thomas Harling, and one of the Messrs. Clark, I do not know what his initials are.

Mr. CASGRAIN: I think I know this Mr. Harling. I think he was in Montreal some time ago and that he engaged in the shipping business. I am told also that he did not find his venture in our city a profitable one, and that in the city of Quebec, where he tried to do a little better, his success was not any greater. I do not consider that the Government has any very great guarantee in the signature of Mr. Harling. This company is in liquidation to-day, and I think I can assure the committee that such a person as Mr. Harling is hardly one to respond to the payment of these notes when they become due.

Mr. BALLANTYNE: Would my hon. friend consider the Gulf Pulp and Paper Company's endorsation good enough to appear on the notes?

Mr. CASGRAIN: This is the first time I have heard of that name. I thought by the answers which were given in the House last year that this steamer was sold to the Gulf of St. Lawrence Navigation Company that is now in liquidation. The notes are signed by this company which is in liquidation, and the endorser, if I understand well, is Mr. Thomas Harling.

Mr. BALLANTYNE: And also the Gulf Pulp & Paper Company. My hon. friend knows very well that this company which is established at Clark Harbour, is tremendously strong financially, so that there is absolutely no risk at all as long as their endorsement is on the note.

Mr. CASGRAIN: May I ask the minister who are the parties in the Pulp & Paper Navigation Company that endorsed these notes?

Mr. BALLANTYNE: Clark Brothers.

Mr. CASGRAIN: Is the note endorsed by Messrs. Clark Brothers themselves?

Mr. BALLANTYNE: It is endorsed by the Gulf Pulp Paper Company which is an eminently good concern, as my hon. friend knows.

Mr. CASGRAIN: Continuing further, I would like to ask the minister when the contract was made between the Government and this company for the purchase of that steamer?

Mr. BALLANTYNE: It was made during the month of May last.

Mr. CASGRAIN: In May last? But when was the endorsation placed on the back of the note by the Gulf Pulp & Paper Company?

Mr. BALLANTYNE: You want the date?

Mr. CASGRAIN: Yes.

Mr. PARENT: Just lately, was it not?

Mr. BALLANTYNE: On the 5th day of May.

Mr. CASGRAIN: In what year?

Mr. BALLANTYNE: In the year 1920.

Mr. CASGRAIN: So, if I understand well, it was about the same time that the contract with the Government was approved?

Mr. BALLANTYNE: About the same time.

Mr. CASGRAIN: I would now like to ask how it is, if this note is signed by two good endorsers—at any rate endorsers that the Government pretend are good—that the matter is in the hands of the Department of Justice for adjustment?

Mr. BALLANTYNE: It may ease the anxiety of my hon. friend about the safety of the Government financially when I say that Clark Brothers have now sold out the Gulf Pulp & Paper Company to Lord Northcliffe. I think my hon. friend will feel satisfied that he is wealthy enough to take care of the obligations.

Mr. CASGRAIN: What are the legal costs in connection with this matter?

Mr. BALLANTYNE: None.

Mr. CASGRAIN: None at present?

Mr. BALLANTYNE: Not yet.

Mr. SINCLAIR (Queen's): I want to call the attention of the minister to a promise which he made when he was putting his Estimates through the House last year. On that occasion I urged that there should be an improvement in the wages paid to the engineers on the steamer Brant. The minister then made a statement which was quite satisfactory, but apparently the matter has been allowed to drop without having been attended to. At all events I have heard nothing upon the subject lately, and I would like to know from the minister if the matter has been adjusted, and if so, in what way?

Mr. BALLANTYNE: I received information with regard to the steamer Brant a day or two ago, and the department is now very carefully considering what shall be done in the way of advancing wages. I do not say that we will advance the wages, but we have the matter under our consideration.

Mr. SINCLAIR (Queen's): Is the minister willing to adhere to the statement which he made in the House last session on this matter?

Mr. BALLANTYNE: I do not recall the circumstances.

Mr. SINCLAIR (Queen's): His statement was that the prevailing rate of wages would be paid.

Mr. BALLANTYNE: I think my hon. friend will recollect that a year ago I qualified that statement by announcing that the Government were willing to pay the prevailing rate of wage for a similar sized ship.

Mr. SINCLAIR (Queen's): I might also remind the minister that he qualified his statement still further. He also said that the prevailing rate of wage to be paid would not, in any case, be less than the wage of last year, plus the bonus. With reference to the information which the minister spoke of receiving, would he be good enough to say when he received that information and from whom?

Mr. BALLANTYNE: The information came from Mr. Winchester of the Brant and Mr. Cummings of the National Association of Marine Engineers. I can assure my hon. friend that we will not overlook the matter. I cannot at this moment say just what we will do, but the question is under our consideration and will be dealt with very shortly. As soon as a decision has been reached I will be delighted to let my hon. friend know.

Mr. SINCLAIR (Queen's): I am very glad to hear the minister speak in such a tone. I regret to have to bring this matter before the committee, but I have been endeavouring to get it settled through the department almost ever since May 5 last. I am glad to know also that the minister is willing to act on the information which he has received from the secretary of the National Association of Marine Engineers in Charlottetown, and the engineers who are interested, namely, the engineers on the Brant. In regard to the prevailing rate of pay I think the officers of the department might have acted with greater promptitude in ascertaining the facts. I would like to know further from the minister if the adjustment made according to the information he has given to the House will date from April 1, 1920, as it should do?

Mr. BALLANTYNE: Well, I am not prepared to say that. I think my hon. friend will just have to leave the matter to our generosity. I can assure him we will do the best we can.

Mr. SINCLAIR (Queen's): I am not asking for this readjustment of wages as a

matter of generosity, I ask it as a matter of right. It is something which should have been settled long ago.

Mr. CASGRAIN: The Government do not bother with small matters, they only bother with millions.

Mr. SINCLAIR (Queen's): However, I am willing to accept the statement of the minister and leave the matter to his own judgment.

Mr. CASGRAIN: Coming back to the matter to which I invited the attention of the committee a few moments ago and referring to this transaction between the Government and the Gulf of St. Lawrence Navigation Company re the sale and disposal of the steamer Champlain. The minister told us that a contract was signed on a certain date, but he did not tell us who signed that contract. Of course, the Government was one party, but who were the parties of the other part?

Mr. BALLANTYNE: The Gulf of St. Lawrence Shipping and Trading Company, Mr. H. de S. Bossé signed on behalf of that company.

Mr. CASGRAIN: Did any other person connected with the company sign?

Mr. BALLANTYNE: As far as our knowledge goes it was Mr. Bossé alone.

Mr. CASGRAIN: Would it be possible for the minister to obtain the contract from his two valuable assistants who are helping the committee in disposing of these items? I would like to have a more positive answer in regard to the parties who signed on behalf of the company. I am informed on good authority that the person who was supposed to have a controlling interest in the company, who, as we say in French was the bailleur de fonds, was a prominent lawyer in the city of Montreal, Mr. Barnard. I would not say that he went so far as to give a bond or guarantee for the transaction, but I think there is something in the information tendered to me. Would the minister refer to the contract and let us see it?

Mr. BALLANTYNE: My hon. friend does not expect me to send it across the floor of the House at this moment?

Mr. CASGRAIN: No.

Mr. BALLANTYNE: I have not got the contract, but I will be very pleased to forward it to the hon. gentleman.

Mr. CASGRAIN: If the contract was made and signed by Mr. Bossé on behalf of this company, and if notes for the balance were also signed by him on behalf of the company and endorsed by one Thomas Harling, how is it that afterwards this new company, the Gulp Pulp and Paper Company, which was not a party to the contract, endorsed the notes? At whose suggestion did the new company endorse or guarantee the notes, and why?

Mr. BALLANTYNE: These gentlemen were interested in establishing this service with Clarke's harbour.

Mr. CASGRAIN: Do I understand that the steamer Champlain is to run between Quebec and Clarke's harbour, and that it has been transferred to these people?

Mr. BALLANTYNE: I could not answer that.

Mr. CASGRAIN: I understand the Government had in its possession the contract signed by the party who is buying the steamer, and that notes were also given by the company, one for $12,000 and another for $11,000 odd; later a new company came in and endorsed the notes. I would like to know why the Government thought it necessary to require that further endorsation if the company and Mr. Harling were considered sufficiently responsible in the first place?

Mr. BALLANTYNE: I know my hon. friend will find no fault with the vigilant officers of the department getting all the endorsements they possibly could in the public interest. That is just what they did. They would have obtained more endorsements had that been possible.

Mr. CASGRAIN: Were these two notes that the minister has been speaking of the first notes, or renewals?

Mr. BALLANTYNE: The first notes.

Mr. CASGRAIN: Are they overdue now?

Mr. BALLANTYNE: One of them has been paid, as I told my hon. friend a few moments ago. The others have not been met, and that is the reason we are referring the matter to the Department of Justice.

Mr. CASGRAIN: What is the amount of the two notes that have not been met?

Mr. BALLANTYNE: Twelve thousand dollars each.

Mr. CASGRAIN: Has the Gulf of St. Lawrence Navigation Company, through the liquidator, refused payment of those notes?

Mr. BALLANTYNE: Yes.

Mr. CASGRAIN: On what ground?

Mr. BALLANTYNE: The usual ground —that they did not have the money.

Mr. CASGRAIN: Did the Government have recourse to the endorser, Mr. Harling, for payment?

Mr. BALLANTYNE: The department protested the notes and we are holding Mr. Harling liable along with the Gulf Pulp and Paper Company.

Mr. CASGRAIN: When were the initial protest proceedings taken?

Mr. BALLANTYNE: In the language that legal gentlemen generally use, the notes were duly protested. I cannot give the exact date.

Mr. CASGRAIN: Did the minister ask the Gulf Pulp and Paper Company Limited for payment of those notes?

Mr. BALLANTYNE: The notes were put in the bank and they were not met. Thereupon they were protested in the usual way.

Mr. CASGRAIN: A few moments ago the minister told us that it was good policy to obtain as many endorsements as possible in connection with these notes; that not only had we the signature of the gulf of St. Lawrence Navigation Company, but also the endorsement of Mr. Harling; then, to obtain further security the department got the Guly Pulp and Paper Company to endorse the notes. Now the minister has taken proceedings against this company. I would like to have some enlightenment from the minister as to the financial backing and capacity to pay of this Gulf Pulp and Paper Company Limited.

Mr. BALLANTYNE: From what information I have been able to give my hon. friend and the fact that we have a mortgage on the ship, I do not think we need worry about the Government getting the full price. My hon. friend knows very well that the Gulf Pulp and Paper Company is owned by Lord Northcliffe and is thoroughly sound; he also knows that Thomas Harling is fairly good; and with a mortgage on the ship besides that, why should any one worry?

Mr. CASGRAIN: It is all very well to have the names of such big companies as the Gulf Pulp and Paper Company, controlled by Lord Northcliffe, and Clark Brothers, but I have known many big corporations that were reputed to be very strong financially, but which sooner or later we discovered were far from being what they were supposed to be. The minister tells us that we have a mortgage on the ship, but this ship is in the hands of other persons to-day, and therefore the Government has no control over it, and should the ship meet with disaster no one knows what position the Government would be in in regard to their security. If the Gulf Pulp and Paper Company is so good and is controlled by Lord Northcliffe, I would sooner that the minister would apply immediately to that company and to the Clark Company for payment of these notes.

Mr. PARENT: I want to refer again to the "Druid, Mr. Chairman. Have any tenders been asked for the expenditure of $46,000 in repairs on that particular ship

Mr. BALLANTYNE: Such work as was not done by our own workmen was carried out by tender.

Mr. PARENT: Where was the work performed and how long did it take the department to spend $46,000 on that ship?

Mr. BALLANTYNE: The work was done by the Davies, but I cannot tell my hon. friend the number of days or hours that they took.

Mr. PARENT: Does the hon. minister know how much was done by tender and how much without tender?

Mr. BALLANTYNE: I cannot inform the hon. gentleman just how much was done by the department and how much by tender. I shall have to get the information for him.

Mr. CASGRAIN: I have received some information from the hon. minister in regard to the nefarious transaction with the Gulf of St. Lawrence Navigation Company regarding the steamer Champlain. I do not wish to detain the committee much longer on that matter, but in closing let me say that the information given by the hon. minister in answer to my question does not satisfy me, and I do not think it will satisfy the committee. If the minister would follow the suggestion I have made and go immediately to the people of the last mentioned company who endorsed the note and to Lord Northcliffe for the balance that is due, it would be better for the interests of the Government.

Coming to another subject, while on the item for repairs and maintenance of steamers and ice-breakers, I would like to draw the attention of the minister to a certain incident that happened in the county which I have the honour to represent. I am in receipt of a letter dated March 1, 1921. It is signed by the Rev. Monsieur Abraham Gaudreau, the parish priest of Bergeronnes, and is addressed to me. It reads as follows:

(Translation.)

BERGERONNES, March 1, 1921.

To Mr. M. P. CASGRAIN, M.P.,
Parliament, Ottawa.

Sir,—I wish to bring to your knowledge a proof of ill will on the part of the Department of Marine which might be a subject for a question in the House if you should deem it advisable; I shall therefore give you the facts.

About December 22 last, the schooner Marie Lydia (owned by Mr. Joseph Dumont of Lévis) which was wintering at Bergeronnes drifted away, carried by the ice. This schooner is worth $25,000. We asked for help to send the Montcalm; the river was perfectly free of ice, the weather was fine; it would have been easy for a ship like the Montcalm to go to the rescue of the Marie Lydia, which was exposed to the weather for five days in front of Trois Pistoles, and bring it to safety at Tadoussac. Notwithstanding most pressing entreaties, we were never able to obtain a favourable answer. The schooner is now safe at Cap de la Madeleine. Of what use are our ice breakers, if they cannot be utilized to go to the rescue of so valuable ships.

You can obtain all the correspondence which took place on this subject by applying to the Department of Marine who will give you all the facts in this case. Eight days ago the schooner was still at Godbout, the Montcalm could have rescued it at any time.

With my anticipated thanks,

I am, yours faithfully.

AM. GAUDREAU, Priest Curé.

Rev. Mr. ABRAHAM GAUDREAU,
Bergeronnes, P.Q.

OTTAWA, March 12, 1921.

Reverend Sir,

I wish to acknowledge your letter dated the 1st inst. with reference to the accident that happened to the schooner Marie Lydia, last December.

I regret with you the inertia and the little interest which the Government shows in such cases, however it is nothing new and does not surprise me. Be assured that when the occasion comes, I shall establish your grievances and will try to obtain some explanation of the subject.

Believe me, Rev. Sir,

Yours respectfully,

PIERRE CASGRAIN.

The facts, in a nutshell, are as follows: A schooner called the Marie-Lydia was down the river St. Lawrence at Bergeronnes when it met with an accident. From the information contained in the letter it seems that the ice-breaker "Montcalm" was in the vicinity, and although the parish priest, the mayor, and prominent citizens of this place have asked for relief, have asked that the Montcalm be sent to the rescue of that schooner, they have received no satisfactory reply. Who pays for the maintenance of those ice-breakers? We have here to-day an item, $1,750,000, that we are asked to hand over to the Minister of Marine and Fisheries for the administration of ice-breakers in the navigable rivers, especially in the River and Gulf of St. Lawrence. Now, here is a concrete case where, through the inactivity and nonchalance of the department, justice and equity have not been done, and this schooner has not received the care and attention it was entitled to.

Yesterday, when I introduced my resolution setting forth the reasons why we are calling for a service between Tadoussac and Murray Bay in the county of Charlevoix, I deplored, as also did the hon. member for Chicoutimi-Saguenay, that the Government was neglecting entirely that part of the province of Quebec, which is a large maritime district. Those people are away from all communication and all sources of relief, and they look to this Government, to the Government of the day, whether Tory or Liberal, for relief and assistance. But we find that they only obtain such relief and assistance when a Liberal administration has charge of the affairs of the country. They have frequently asked this Government to establish communication between the two places I have mentioned, and we have had no satisfactory reply. Here again we have an instance of the department not acting properly. Yesterday I mentioned that I went personally to the department and asked the deputy minister to see that the lights should be maintained on three of the wharves of my county, as they had been in years past, and the deputy minister said that he was too busy to attend to me at that time. That is a matter that would cost the paltry sum of $1,000 and yet yesterday we were called upon to vote $3,800,000, and to-day we are called upon to vote $1,500,000 for ice-breakers and steamers. But when it comes to obtaining a little assistance for the people of my district in the lower part of Quebec we are refused.

Mr. BALLANTYNE: If my hon. friend will allow me, the Department of Marine and Fisheries has not treated him quite so badly as all that. The information has just been handed to me that the depart-

ment instructed Captain Bloise of the Stanley to pick out four men to go to the assistance of the Marie-Lydia which is reported off the Magdalen Islands. It does not give the hours at which she pas- Captain Dumont, the owner, has been so advised. So my hon. friend will admit, I think, that the department has paid the attention we always do pay in such cases.

Mr. CASGRAIN: I am glad to get that information from the hon. minister. When was that done? This letter is dated March 1.

Mr. BALLANTYNE: To-day, at 11 o'clock.

Mr. CASGRAIN: Well, I hope that those people have been rescued and have received assistance from the department. But I would point out that a long time has elapsed since I received the letter.

Mr. POWER: Before the item carries, I would like to call the minister's attention to something that has occurred in the past few months in the city of Quebec. Now, in accordance with the consideration which the Minister of Marine always gives to the labouring classes, and particularly to the unemployed labouring classes, the statement has been made that these ships were constructed in accordance with a programme which was simply carried out in order to afford employment, in view of the serious unemployment situation in Quebec, I applied to the minister to carry on the repairs of ships early in the beginning of the winter in order that the unemployment situation, which is undoubtedly very acute at that season of the year, might be relieved, and in order that the work would not have to be carried on late in the spring, thus delaying navigation. In that connection I wrote to the minister calling attention to the fact that the unemployment situation was acute in Quebec, and that the department had a large number of vessels which it intended to winter in Quebec, and asking that if possible orders should be given for the repairs to be carried on during the early part of the winter. I suggested that by taking this course, employment would be given to a large number of workmen at a period when work was difficult to obtain. This was on November 30, 1920. I thought it was a reasonable request to make of the minister. If ever there was an emergency in a small way, it was during that period, and had the minister acceded to my request it would not have involved the expenditure of one single extra cent to the department, the money would simply have been expended at a period of the year when it would have done the most good. I might say that at the present time these repairs are not made and that for well over a week, or I might say two weeks, or perhaps three weeks, navigation has been opened from the port of Quebec. I not only wrote to the minister on November 30, but I wrote him again. In answer to my letter of November 30, I received a letter on December 13, the minister, I might say, is apparently a very busy man, and takes a long time to answer letters, when he answers them at all. In his reply he stated that as soon as these ships were placed in winter quarters, they would be gone over in order to ascertain what repairs were required. On December 17, I again called his attention to the fact that the ships were in their winter quarters and that the repairs would give employment to 70 or 100 men for some six weeks, at a period of the year when it would be of very great assistance to the workman. To this the minister did not reply. On Dececmber 24 I received a letter from the secretary of the department acknowledging the receipt of my letter and stating that reports were expected from the inspectors. At that time a large number of people in Quebec city were literally starving, being unable to obtain employment. I corresponded with the inspector and was told that the inspection was completed, and that the ships were ready to have the repairs undertaken. At the same time a mass meeting of unemployed was held in Quebec, at which resolutions were passed stating that

> Whereas it is the announced policy of the Government to in as far as possible carry on Public Works in order to alleviate the present acute unemployment situation;
>
> Whereas There are in the Port of Quebec a large number of Government vessels which need overhauling and repairing;
>
> Be it resolved that this meeting requests the Right Honourable Arthur Meighen, Prime Minister, and the Honourable C. C. Ballantyne, Minister of Marine and Fisheries, to immediately proceed with the work of refitting and repairing these vessels as a Government undertaking and not by contract;
>
> That the work be begun at once in order that insofar as possible the worst season of the year, which is the present, may be passed over without undue suffering or hardship to the labouring classes of the City.

Copies of these resolutions were sent to the Prime Minister, the Minister of Marine and Fisheries and the members representing the districts surrounding Quebec. But no answer was received. On January 10,

not having received any answer to these representations, I telegraphed to the minister:

With reference to previous correspondence, department vessels wintering in Quebec. Important that decision to carry out repairs be carried out at once. Kindly reply.

CHARLES G. POWER, M.P.

To this the minister replied:

Our inpectors are now working on specifications, for repairs to vessels wintering Louise Basin, and will arrange put work in hand as soon as possible.

That was a month and a half afterwards. On January 26, having been given to understand from the Fisheries Department that preparations were completed, I wired to the minister as follows:

Re repairs to vessels Louise Basin. Understand all preparations made but no authority received here to employ labour. Could this not be given at once?

On the same day, January 26, the deputy minister replied:

Agent has been authorized to take on extra men required for repairs to vessel Louise Basin.

I might say that these extra men were three men and one boy. I stated in another telegram on January 27:

Authority given departement to employ labour for only one vessel. What about other vessels?

I received a reply that repairs were being carried out by the department, and that any additional help necessary would be taken on. I carried on this correspondence for a week or ten days, and the situation in Quebec became more and more acute. The vessels were lying there, all preparations apparently had been made for the repairs, and yet, for no reason I have been able to fathom, the repairs had not been undertaken. I sent numerous telegrams to which I received no answer until on February 3, I received a telegram from the minister's private secretary:

Your telegram February second received and will he submitted to hon. Mr. Ballantyne on his return to city next week.

Now, Sir, I have carried on correspondence with the deputy minister and with the minister, and one or the other invariably answered. But this time the private secretary refused to answer and stated that the minister would not return "until the next week." That, I may say, was during the famous Peterborough election. I suspected that the minister was busy, and I sent the following telegram to the minister's secretary:

Your telegram of February third—why not relay mine to the minister?

That would have been the logical thing for the secretary to do. I have no doubt, even if the minister were engrossed in his electoral labours, he could have had time to answer the telegram and to give instructions to have this work done. Anyway, the sum and substance of it all is this: That I repeatedly, as representative of an important constituency in the city of Quebec, —called upon the minister to do this work, asked him to do something which would not involve the expenditure of one single extra cent to the country, which, on the contrary, would possibly have saved some money to the Government,—which would have been a considerable utility to my constituency and the city of Quebec and the district in general,—which would have been a charitable act on the part of the Government since a large number of those who were seeking work had not been able to obtain employment since navigation closed; yet, in spite of all these appeals, and appeals made by the mayor and other people of the city, almost nothing was done during the whole winter. The work is now being carried on when a large number of people can find employment elsewhere, and it is not so necessary. I have called the minister's attention to this, because I am under the impression—and I warn him now, because next winter will be probably as hard as last winter and perhaps more so—that it will be a matter of policy for his department to have these repairs carried out at a season of the year when the workingmen need help from the Government in the worst way. It was the announced policy of the Government last autumn to carry on public works so far as possible, in order to relieve the situation. I would ask the minister, not only to make a promise and announce a policy, but as a matter of fact, to carry out that policy, and next winter, when the same situation or a worse situation arises, to take care that these necessary works shall be carried on?

Mr. LAVIGUEUR: May I ask the hon. minister why an increase of $450,000 has been made in these Estimates?

Mr. BALLANTYNE: That increase is principally for fuel labour, and repairs to ships.

Mr. LAVIGUEUR: May I ask what proportion of that amount is supposed to be spent in actual repairs?

Mr. BALLANTYNE: The following ships will be repaired at Quebec: The

Druid, the Lady Grey, the Montcalm, and the Rouville.

Mr. LAVIGUEUR: What is the amount of repairs on those ships?

Mr. BALLANTYNE: The repairs to hulls and engine of the Druid are estimated at $25,800; the Lady Grey $30,000; Montcalm $40,000 and Rouville $15,000.

Mr. LAVIGUEUR: I understand the Government boat gives a service from the Island to Quebec during the period of non-navigation—that is after the close of navigation. Can the hon. minister tell me if that is correct?

Mr. BALLANTYNE: Our icebreaker runs to the island of Orleans and also to Quebec bridge.

Mr. LAVIGUEUR: I would remind the hon. minister that every year there appears to be great difficulty in making the service, and it is only after a few days or weeks that we can manage to get the boat to make the service. I would like to have the department arrange for a service at the close of navigation next autumn, so as to give those people on the island communication with the city.

Mr. DOHERTY: We have now been over an hour—

Hon. MEMBERS: Carried, carried.

Mr. DOHERTY: I think that the hon. member for Quebec West (Mr. Parent) showed the proper appreciation when he expressed the view that it was time this item was disposed of. We have been over an hour on the item. I think it is no reflection on the hon. gentleman to say that the course of the discussion indicates that there is no very important question which ought to be raised now, and, even if we postpone now, or propose to move the further consideration of this question, if there is anything really important there will be, within the rules, an opportunity to bring it up. I beg to move that the further consideration—

Hon. MEMBERS: Carried, carried.

Mr. SINCLAIR (Guysborough): We are not wasting our time in getting this information. The hour was well spent. This is a large item,—million and three-quarters,—and when we remember that this department has increased enormously—

Mr. DOHERTY: Either the item is carried or not carried; if it is not carried my motion before the Chair is not debatable; so that in either event the hon. gentleman is out of order.

Item agreed to.

Investigation into wrecks, $12,300.

Mr. LAPOINTE: I suppose this item is debatable. I wish to make my position clear. Although I was quite willing, as far as I was concerned, to let the other item be carried, I do not think we deserved the lecture given us by the hon. Minister of Justice (Mr. Doherty), as to having spent too much time on the two preceding items. Those items were very important, asking for a large amount of money, and it was certainly the right of the Opposition to discuss them, and we have not trespassed upon our right in taking one hour to discuss it, and ask for information in regard to it.

Mr. DOHERTY: I did not say too much I said enough.

Mr. POWER: Might I ask the hon. minister how many minutes we will be allowed on this item?

An hon. MEMBER: One hour.

Mr. PARENT: Will the hon. minister say how many investigations into wrecks have taken place in the last year? I want to know all the names of the ships in regard to which investigations were held, and by whom the investigations were made.

Mr. BALLANTYNE: My hon. friend will not make much headway by asking all the names and that sort of thing. I am only too willing to give the information, but I think we ought to try to get along with the business in a friendly way, instead of hon. members endeavouring to embarrass the minister by asking him to read out a number of unnecessary names.

Mr. PARENT: I do not think I can be charged with asking unnecessary questions. On another item I wanted to discuss some matters, but I was prevented by the Minister of Justice by a motion which he moved.

Mr. BALLANTYNE: I have given the hon. gentleman the information that there were 34 wrecks, and while I am perfectly willing to give the names, I cannot see what useful purpose would be served by doing so.

Mr. PARENT: My object in asking by whom the investigations were held is that it has come to my knowledge that some of the parties in charge of the investigations

cannot understand the French language, and when they had to try captains and pilots, these men were not in a position to give the evidence they wanted because they did not understand English. I call the matter to the attention of the minister, so that steps may be taken to have those who sit on these tribunals understand both languages, in order that justice may be done.

Mr. BALLANTYNE: Can the hon. member cite one case in which the wreck commissioner or his assistants did not understand French?

Mr. PARENT: If they do understand French, that settles the case.

Mr. BALLANTYNE: Mr. Demers is the name of the wreck commissioner.

Item agreed to.

Expenses of schools of navigation, $8,000.

Mr. LAPOINTE: Where are the schools of navigation?

Mr. BALLANTYNE: Halifax, Yarmouth, North Sydney, St. John, N.B., Quebec, Kingston, Collingwood and Vancouver.

Mr. LAVIGUEUR: How long has the school at Quebec been established?

Mr. BALLANTYNE: About eight years.

Mr. PARENT: Who is in charge?

Mr. BALLANTYNE: Captain Napoleon Lachance.

Mr. PARENT: Is he a pilot?

Mr. BALLANTYNE: He used to be.

Mr. SINCLAIR (Guysborough): This looks like a very small item to carry on all the navigation schools in the Dominion of Canada. There has been for a few years an application for a navigation school at Canso, and my hon. friend has not yet taken any steps in that direction. I would like to place the matter before him again, because this is, as he knows, an important point. It is the greatest fishing point in the Dominion, and a large number of young sailors are brought up there. Some years ago something was done by the department in the way of establishing a navigation school at Canso but the project was abandoned and nothing has been done of late. It looks as if we are going to be a maritime country, and if we are to be able to navigate even my hon. friend's ships, we must pay a little more attention to the training of sailors and officers, and $8,000 for this purpose for the whole of Canada seems a very small amount when such large amounts are spent in other directions. The education of our seamen is very important, and I should like the minister to take note of the fact that this application of Canso is especially important for my constituency.

Mr. BALLANTYNE: I shall be glad to look into the matter.

Item agreed to.

Removal of obstructions in navigable waters, $18,000.

Mr. SINCLAIR: (Guysborough): What is the reason for increasing this item by $13,000?

Mr. BALLANTYNE: A serious wreck occurred at Port Weller, the entrance to the new Welland canal, and it has to be removed.

Mr. EDWARDS: In this connection I should like to call the minister's attention to a wreck at the entrance to what is called Collins' bay. Several years ago I took this matter up with the Hon. Mr. Hazen, and I regret to say that I did not make much progress. This is a case of an old vessel that was brought up from Kingston, and the owner of it apparently thought that was a very good place to drop it and leave it. It was left there as an old derelict, and some persons set fire to it. It was burned down to the water's edge, and the rest of it has remained there ever since, although the owner, Captain Donnelly, has been asked on several occasions to remove it. This wreck lies just a few inches below the surface of the water, and I know of one case where a pleasure yacht running into the bay ran up on this wreck. Inasmuch as the water in this bay is deep and vessels are apt, in case of a sudden storm arising, to run in there for shelter and this wreck is right at the entrance, steps should be taken to remove it or to compel Captain Donnelly, who, by the way, is manager and owner of the Donnelly Wrecking Company, to remove his old wreck out of this bay. I have taken this matter up with the Department of Public Works, and I am drawing it to the attention of the minister (Mr. Ballantyne) because it seems to come properly under this item. The order that was given by Mr. Hazen to remove the wreck should have been put into effect, and Captain Donnelly should have been made to remove it.

Mr. BALLANTYNE: This is the first time that I have heard of the matter. I am glad that the hon. member has brought it to my attention, and one of my assistants has made a note of it.

Mr. MURPHY: A few minutes ago the minister referred to the fact that the greater part of this appropriation was for the removal of a wreck at the entrance of the Welland canal. Is this a steamer, and by whom is it owned?

Mr. BUTTS: Would it not be well for the hon. member for Frontenac (Mr. Edwards) as well as the Minister of Marine and Fisheries (Mr. Ballantyne) to look a little further into the law of marine insurance and see if the marine insurance company is not the one which should remove the wreck?

Mr. BALLANTYNE: In answer to the hon. member for Russell (Mr. Murphy) I might say that the Muriel W. is the name of the vessel, and it is owned by Senator Webster, of Montreal. It is one of those large wooden hull ships.

Mr. MURPHY: Was she engaged in private business, or was she chartered by the Government at the time of the wreck?

Mr. BALLANTYNE: Private business. She was caught in a storm and became wrecked.

Mr. SINCLAIR (Guysborough): As I understand the law, if a ship sinks and obstructs navigation, the duty of removing the wreck is not necessarily that of the Government, but that of the owner. Have any further efforts been made to get the owner of the wreck to remove this obstruction?

Mr. BALLANTYNE: The hon. member is quite right. The owner of the ship should see to it that this wreck is removed. We are taking the matter up and intend to charge the owner for whatever expense may be incurred in connection with the removal.

Mr. MURPHY: I hope there is no question but that the private owner of this wreck will be made to reimburse the Government for the cost of removing it.

Mr. BALLANTYNE: Yes, we will do the best we can.

Mr. MURPHY: The minister says he will do the best he can, but I am not satisfied with that statement. I want an assurance that the hon. Senator Webster will be made to pay the cost of removing that wreck.

Mr. BALLANTYNE: My colleague, the Minister of Justice, advises me that we have a good legal claim against the owner, and therefore we will see that he does pay the cost.

Item agreed to.

[Mr. Ballantyne.]

To continue subsidies for wrecking plants—Quebec and British Columbia—$35,000

Mr. SINCLAIR (Guysborough): We ought to have some explanation of this item?

Mr. BALLANTYNE: This is an old item that has been voted every year while I have been Minister of Marine. The amount of subsidy paid to the Quebec Salvage & Wrecking Company, Limited is $25,000, and to the Pacific Salvage Company, Limited, $10,000. As far as the former company is concerned I notice that the contractors are required to pay to the Government fifty per cent of the amount of such excess which is over the rate of interest at 5½ per cent on a capital of $150,000.

Mr. SINCLAIR (Guysborough): The committee would like to know whether the Quebec Salvage & Wrecking Company rendered any service during the past year for the $25,000 they received. These subsidies are very apt to be continued from year to year without any investigation as to whether the company receiving the money are rendering service or not.

Mr. BALLANTYNE: I will be very glad to get a statement for the hon. member. I do not recall any serious wrecks in the river St. Lawrence, down the Gulf, or on the Pacific Coast, but in the interest of navigation the Government has always thought it wise to have these wrecking plants available. I will take a note and have the information which the hon. gentlemen or placed in his hands to-morrow.

Mr. SINCLAIR (Guysborough): Is there any return from these companies showing the service they performed during the year?

Mr. BALLANTYNE: Yes, there is an annual return. I will see that the return for the past year is mailed to the hon. gentleman or placed in his hands to-morrow.

Item agreed to.

Life saving Service including rewards for saving life—$90,000

Mr. CHISHOLM: Does this vote deal with the life saving stations?

Mr. BALLANTYNE: Yes. The life saving stations have now been transferred from the naval service to the Department of Marine and Fisheries.

Mr. CHISHOLM: I notice that the minister has closed several of these stations. I want to know where those that have

survived his destructive tendencies are located?

Mr. BALLANTYNE: In the province of Nova Scotia—Baker's Cove, Bay View, Blanche, Canso, Clark's Harbour, Devil's Island, Duncan Cove, Herring Cove, Scatari, Seal Island, and Westport; and the cost to the Government is $18,000. I have given orders to close up as many of these life saving stations as could be closed without running any risk of jeopardizing human life.

Mr. CHISHOLM: I am not going to discuss this question at all. I merely wish to say that I have had correspondence with the minister with regard to the Chéticamp station which was opened in 1911. It was unworthy of the minister and of his department to have closed that station, because it is the only contribution to the fishing industry in my constituency that I can credit the minister with. The only thing I wish to say now is that I am going to ask the minister to be good enough to leave the buildings there and not to sell them. I am sure the minister is convinced by this time that we are going to have a change of Government, and just as soon as that change comes we will see that this station is restored to its former status—

Mr. BALLANTYNE: Not for a while yet.

Mr. CHISHOLM: —and that the minister's destructive operations will be corrected by the successors of the present Government.

Mr. BALLANTYNE: I am not in a combative mood this afternoon, and therefore the only thing I will say to my hon. friend is, that he will have to wait for quite a few years before his hopes are realized.

Mr. CHISHOLM: We will see; the people will decide that question.

Mr. SINCLAIR (Guysborough): In former years there was a life-saving station at Whitehead in the county of Guysborough. Has it been closed?

Mr. BALLANTYNE: That has been closed also, I think. I may say, quite frankly, that when I became minister I found that a great many of these stations were really political life-saving stations and nothing more. I therefore felt it to be my duty in the public interest to close them up.

Mr. SINCLAIR (Guysborough): I want to say to my hon. friend that Whitehead is a very dangerous point on the coast where a good many wrecks occur. The station that was located there was doing very good work, and on very many occasions not only vessels but human lives have been saved by the efforts of the crew. Now as far as politics is concerned the moment my hon. friends opposite got into power they dismissed the crew. The men had been trained for some years in their duties, and had done good work; but within two or three weeks after the election of 1911 the crew were all dismissed, and a man who was not residing at Whitehead, but lived at the time in the town of New Glasgow, although he was a former Whitehead resident, was made captain of the crew.

Mr. CHISHOLM: That was not politics, though.

Mr. SINCLAIR (Guysborough): That is what happened. The new crew, of course, were not as good as the former men. I wish the minister would take note of the fact as to whether that station at Whitehead has been done away with, because, as I say, it is a very important point on the coast, and the station ought to have been continued.

Mr. EDWARDS: I would like to ask if the minister has received any request for the establishment of a life-saving station on the islands called Main Ducks, in the lower end of lake Ontario near Kingston, and if so, whether the matter has received any consideration from his department?

Mr. BALLANTYNE: The matter is now receiving the attention of the department.

Mr. LEGER: Is it the intention of the department to re-open the life saving station at Richibucto?

Mr. BALLANTYNE: I am sorry that I cannot give any encouragement to my hon. friend that it will be re-opened.

Item agreed to.

River St. Lawrence ship channel—Maintenance and operating dredging fleet, $528,000.

Mr. LAPOINTE: Will the minister explain the reason for the increase?

Mr. BALLANTYNE: The $50,000 increase is largely due to repairs to the dredging fleet.

Mr. PARENT: Are all the dredges employed on that part of the river the property of the Government?

Mr. BALLANTYNE: Yes.

Mr. PARENT: Are any contracts given at all to private individuals?

Mr. BALLANTYNE: None.

Mr. PARENT: Between what points was the main part of the money spent?

Mr. BALLANTYNE: Principally in the Cap à la Roche region between Montreal and Quebec, and also in the North Channel, below Quebec.

Mr. CASGRAIN: Last year when these Estimates were before the committee I asked the minister about certain dredging that ought to be done in the county of Charlevoix at Rivière St. Francois in the Baie St. Paul district. The approaches to the land are not very good, there being many rocks which make it very inconvenient to the people who travel from Quebec and Murray Bay to the various ports in that locality. If the Government would send one of their dredges to that district for a few days it would help the people a good deal. Last year the hon. minister promised to take the matter under consideration, but nothing has been done.

Mr. BALLANTYNE: It has not been done by the Department of Marine simply because the matter comes under the control of my colleague, the Minister of Public Works.

Mr. PARENT: Can the minister give the committee a statement as to the depth of the channel at the present time?

Mr. BALLANTYNE: We have a 30-foot channel, at low water, as my hon. friend probably knows, from Montreal to the sea. Some of the curves are 500 feet in width, and others as much as 1,100 feet. The dreding, of course, is going on constantly, but where prior to the war we had nine dredges operating, now we have only three. If I can get enough money from my colleague the Minister of Finance we may possibly put on another dredge.

Mr. PARENT: Was there not a time when the channel even so far as Three Rivers was 35 feet deep? Since then that depth has been gradually reduced to the extent just stated by my hon. friend.

Mr. BALLANTYNE: So far as I know the channel has not yet been dredged to a depth of 35 feet.

[Mr. Ballantyne.]

Mr. SINCLAIR (Guysborough): Is the river getting any deeper on account of this dredging?

Mr. BALLANTYNE: I am quite sure my hon. friend has travelled between Montreal and Quebec and from Quebec to the sea. The channel is so well lighted and buoyed that one might think one was going down a city street.

Mr. PARENT: The White Way of Ottawa.

Mr. BALLANTYNE: We are almost free of wrecks. When the dredging is done the channel does not refill, but it is a big contract to keep it open to the depth and width we think it ought to be. I suppose the dredging will go on as long as we live.

Mr. PARENT: Does it re-fill?

Mr. BALLANTYNE: No.

Mr. SINCLAIR (Guysborough): I do not think the minister quite understood my question. Are we simply dredging out the mud that comes in during the year, or are we deepening the channel year by year?

Mr. BALLANTYNE: Yes, the channel is getting deeper and wider every year.

Item agreed to.

For the maintenance and improvements of the Sorel shipyard, shops and offices as well as operating expenses, $75,000.

Mr. SINCLAIR (Guysborough): Will the minister explain the increase?

Mr. BALLANTYNE: The $10,000 increase is for the maintenance of the shipyard wherever it has become in a bad state of repair.

Mr. NESBITT: Is that the yard where the minister repairs his dredges and so forth?

Mr. BALLANTYNE: Yes.

Item agreed to.

To provide an icebreaker to be used in St. Lawrence river, including maintenance of same (revote), $2,000,000.

Mr. PARENT: Will the minister explain?

Mr. BALLANTYNE: This was voted last session, but when my department called for public tenders I was surprised and disappointed to find the lowest tender was $2,220,000.

Mr. PARENT: Where from?

Mr. BALLANTYNE: From the Wallace Shipbuilding company, of North Vancouver.

Mr. CASGRAIN: Come east—the tenders will be lower.

Mr. BALLANTYNE: That tender was more than double the cost of a similar icebreaker called the J. D. Hazen, built in 1912 and 1913 for less than $1,000,000. I did not think I was justified in letting a contract for more than double that amount. Therefore we rejected all the tenders. I am asking for a re-vote, and now that material and labour are coming down I hope we may be able to get tenders somewhat closer to 1912 prices. I am sure all hon. gentlemen, especially those from the province of Quebec, will recognize how necessary it is to have a very powerful icebreaker. Both the Montcalm and the Lady Grey are very old icebreakers. In 1919 the Canadian Spinner and the Canadian Recruit were both caught in the ice, and had the department an icebreaker similar to the one intended to be covered by this re-vote we would have had no difficulty at all in releasing both those vessels. It is of the highest importance in the interest of navigation that we should have an icebreaker of this type, as she will enable us to keep the channel open later in the winter and to clear it earlier in the spring.

Mr. PARENT: With such a powerful vessel, has the minister in mind to keep navigation open all the year round from Quebec to the sea?

Mr. BALLANTYNE: I would not like to be so ambitious as that, but we will be able to keep the channel open later in the winter and clear it earlier in the spring. If any ship should be caught in the ice, we will be able, with such a powerful icebreaker, to release her.

Mr. PEDLOW: What was the original cost of the Champlain? I see that she was sold last year for $61,000.

Mr. BALLANTYNE: The cost was $90,000.

Mr. PEDLOW: I find that during the year the department spent $46,000 on repairs to that icebreaker. Was that amount spent after the sale had been made to the Gulf Pulp and Paper Company, owned by Lord Northcliffe?

Mr. BALLANTYNE: No, I have just been informed by my deputy that no money was spent on the repairs of the Champlain by us. I do not know what the company did after purchasing the ship, which was very old. The Government has not used her for a number of years, and we think that the price we got was a very good one.

Mr. PEDLOW: According to the minister, it was a fairly good price, that is, if he obtains payment. I understand that the minister has received one payment on account of this icebreaker, the Champlain, and also holds two notes that have been endorsed by a firm which is considered excellent security for the amounts of those notes. But the notes have been protested. I would like to know, if I am in order, why it is that these notes, endorsed by a good endorser, have not been collected by the Government.

Mr. BALLANTYNE: I am afraid that my hon. friend is a little out of order. I do not know whether he was in the House when the hon. member for Charlevoix-Montmorency (Mr. Casgrain) and the hon. member for Quebec West (Mr. Parent) discussed this matter for half an hour or so. We are now on an entirely different item, to provide an icebreaker for the St. Lawrence river. The Champlain item was passed some time ago.

Mr. PEDLOW: I appreciate that position, but we are discussing the purchase of a new icebreaker. My first question was as to why the Government was buying this new icebreaker and selling the old one. The question follows as to the disposition of the icebreaker. If I am not in order, I would like to know.

The CHAIRMAN: I fear that the hon. member is not in order. The Chairman has always endeavoured to allow the widest possible discussion on any item, but believes such discussion should be limited to the most appropriate item. In this particular instance, the matter has already been discussed for some time, as was pointed out by the hon. minister. It relates to item 205, and not to the item now under consideration. By a series of questions my hon. friend could lead up to the formation of the company which signed the notes, and that would certainly not be in order.

Mr. CRERAR: Would the minister inform me how long the period of navigation from Quebec, and also from Montreal, extends?

Mr. BALLANTYNE: That depends altogether on the weather conditions. For instance, the opening of navigation this year from the port of Montreal was the

earliest for some fifty odd years, the first river boat having arrived at the port of Montreal somewhere around March 28 or 29. Below Quebec, owing to the very mild and favourable winter, navigation is quite open also. But as a general rule navigation closes at the port of Montreal about November 25 or 26, and opens anywhere from April 25 to 30. As the port of Montreal opens and closes, so does the port of Quebec.

Mr. CRERAR: To what extent would this period be extended by the operation of the icebreaker which the hon. minister is proposing to build?

Mr. BALLANTYNE: We hope to keep navigation open two weeks longer. We have not an icebreaker that can go through any considerable thickness of ice, and it is very necessary to have such an icebreaker. But I want hon. members to understand that unless we get a tender much lower than the one for $2,000,000 I shall not place the order.

Mr. PARENT: I think that if the hon. minister had been frank he would have told the hon. member for Marquette (Mr. Crerar) that the port of Quebec is generally open about fifteen days earlier than the port of Montreal.

Mr. BALLANTYNE: Quite so.

Mr. PARENT: And in that connection, if he had used the ships which are lying idle at Halifax, and sent them to Quebec we would have been doing business fifteen days earlier.

Mr. BALLANTYNE: When I made the statement in reply to the hon. member for Marquette, I meant ships bound to Montreal only. I quite realize that the port of Quebec is open nearly all the year round.

Mr. CASGRAIN: So is the port of Murray Bay.

Mr. FIELDING: As this is the only item I see for the construction of new icebreakers, I think I am in order if I again draw the attention of the minister to the desirability of the department having a better equipment for dealing with the occasional closing of the harbours on the south coast of Nova Scotia. I do not mean that there should be a two-million-dollar icebreaker for that purpose. But occasionally, in very sharp weather, some of the largest harbours are closed, and it has been found necessary to have some equipment to open them. I must do the minister the justice of saying that in every instance when the matter has been brought to the notice of the department, he has made the best use possible of the available ships, and has met the difficulty as best he could. But in other instances, we have found an inadequate equipment for that purpose. I do not propose that a powerful, expensive icebreaker should be equipped, but some vessel adapted for general service should be made sufficiently powerful to be used in that service in the winter, a vessel that would not be laid up in the summer, but would be useful all the year round, and would have sufficient power for that service when the occasional closing of those harbours occurred. I would ask the minister to keep that in mind.

Mr. BALLANTYNE: I would be only too happy to do so. We were able to open the harbour of Shelburne twice this spring with the Lady Laurier, and we hope to be able to do so next spring.

Mr. SINCLAIR (Guysborough): I would like to be assured by the minister that when this contract is let, public tenders will be called for.

Mr. BALLANTYNE: Oh, yes; I mentioned just a few moments ago that public tenders had been called for, and I thought my hon. friend was arising to compliment me upon not placing the order with the lowest tenderer because the department considered the price too high. I can assure my hon. friend that not only will tenders be called for, but that unless they are very much below $2,000,000, the Government would not feel justified in placing the contract.

Item agreed to.

Lighthouse and coast service—agencies, rents and contingencies, $215,000.

Mr. BALLANTYNE: The increase of $17,000 is explained solely by an increase in the salaries granted by the Civil Service Commission.

Item agreed to.

Salaries and allowances to lighthouse keepers, $650,000.

Mr. LEGER: I would like to draw the attention of the Government again to the remuneration of the lightkeepers. At the last session of Parliament I called the attention of the Minister of Marine and Fisheries to the matter, particularly to the nemuneration paid to part time employees, and we were told at that time that the $60,000, then being voted, was to increase

the salaries. I understand that their salaries have been increased to the extent of from $10 to $20 per annum, which is a very small increase. The range of salaries under the present Civil Service classification is from $210 to $270. The lightkeeper who was paid $250 in 1919 has had his salary increased by $20, which makes his salary for 1920, $270. In some other classes there have been larger increases of salary and in view of the fact that the salaries of these men are very low, that there has only been an increase of from $10 to $30 since 1911 whereas the cost of living has increased in that time 150 per cent, and that the judges required an increase in salary by reason of the increase in the cost of living there is cause for protest on the part of these men. In this particular instance, we have a large class of public servants, who perform duties for which they are deserving of great credit, and on their behalf, from a reasonable point of view, I do appeal to the Government to be more considerate towards these public servants, and to allow these hard-working employees sufficient compensation to provide properly for the support of their families. I therefore hope that this question will be taken into consideration by the Government and that justice will be done to the lighthouse keepers of Canada by increasing their salaries to such an extent that will be able to make a living, anyway, for the time for which they are employed.

Mr. EDWARDS: We have not very many lighthouse keepers in my part of the country, but there are a few, and I have felt for a long time that these men have not received the consideration that is due them in the matter of salary. I merely rise to give general endorsation to the remarks of my hon. friend who has just taken his seat.

Mr. J. E. S. E. D'ANJOU (Rimouski): (Translation.) Mr. Chairman, I would like to say a few words in support of the request which my hon. friend from Kent (Mr. Léger) has just made. The hon. Minister of Marine has referred to an increase of this item, an increase which is due to the re-classification of the Civil Service, and I desire to call the minister's attention to the necessity of an increase of salary for lighthouse-keepers.

Mr. Chairman, there is not in the Civil Service, a class which, in my opinion, is so poorly paid than that of the lighthouse-keepers. Such increases as have been granted by this department have not been adequate to the present high cost of living. Most of the lighthouse-keepers could not make a living, were it not for their large families, for their sons who are able to work and support them. I hope, Mr. Chairman, that the Minister of Marine will take my request into consideration and that he will make sure that these lighthouse-keepers are not ignored.

Mr. P. CASGRAIN (Montmorency-Charlevoix): (Translation.) Mr. Chairman, I wish to second the request made by the hon. member from Rimouski (Mr. d'Anjou) as to an increase of salary for the lighthouse-keepers. There are several in the country of Charlevoix-Montmorency. I do not think the Government should hesitate in granting a small increase of salary to those poor lighthouse-keepers who have so much to suffer during the winter and spring seasons.

Mr. Chairman, I would like to ask the hon. Minister of Marine to do something for this part of my county which is known as the river St. Francis. I have asked him to place an icebreaker there so that there would be an easier access to the port. This place is situated in a bay which explains the difficulty of reaching it. They are also obliged to keep lights at a high cost during the fall and the spring. I would ask the Government if it would not be possible to place a lighthouse there. If this were done, and it would not cost much, I think it might prove satisfactory to the Government.

Mr. Chairman, I do not wish to make any opposition, this is not the time, but I say that if the Government would accede to my request, I am sure that they would do well in erecting this lighthouse, it would be of such advantage to the county of Charlevoix-Montmorency which I have the honour to represent.

Mr. BALLANTYNE: I have listened very sympathetically to what hon. members have said about the low salaries that are paid to lighthouse keepers. The matter of the reclassification of lighthouse keepers, is in the hands of the Civil Service Commission, and I see that a sum of $40,000 has been added to the Estimates for the year 1920-21. That is all we will be able to do this year, but I am heartily in sympathy with what hon. members have said about the inadequacy of the remuneration to these lighthouse keepers. In regard to the light that my hon. friends wants, I will not put the "light in the window"

for him, but I will do my very best to see that it is placed on the wharf, and I hope it will guide him in the right direction.

Item agreed to.

Maintenance and repairs to lighthouse, $800,000.

Mr. POWER: Might I ask if this item includes repairs and light?

Mr. BALLANTYNE: Yes, it does; this is for all the lighthouses and all the lightships and the amount is just the same as last year.

Mr. POWER: Might I ask how many lights belonging to the St. Lawrence South district were repaired during the last winter, and where they were repaired?

Mr. BALLANTYNE: There were four repaired at Quebec and one at Halifax.

Mr. POWER: Were any repaired at Sorel?

Mr. BALLANTYNE: No, none.

Mr. POWER: Might I ask how much of this item is for maintenance and how much for repairs?

Mr. BALLANTYNE: My hon. friend will recognize that that would be pretty difficult to answer, depending altogether on the wear and tear and the condition that the lighthouses would be in. One year the maintenance might be more and another year the repairs might be less. It is rather too difficult a question to answer.

Mr. POWER: What destinction does the minister make between "maintenance" and "repairs?"

Mr. BALLANTYNE: About half and half.

Mr. POWER: Really, the "maintenance" is "repairs."

Mr. BALLANTYNE: No.

Mr. POWER: What actual expenditure is covered by the "maintenance?"

Mr. BALLANTYNE: The principal charge is for oil, for fuel and for light.

Mr. POWER: Where is the oil purchased?

Mr. BALLANTYNE: We have a War Purchasing Commission, and they make the purchase.

Mr. COPP: Does not the minister at Ottawa have his engineer make a report to him as to what repairs are necessary?

Mr. BALLANTYNE: Yes.

[Mr. Ballantyne.]

Mr. COPP: The minister made his general answer, "half and half."

Mr. BALLANTYNE: I have not the engineer's report, but of course, before this amount is placed in the Estimates we will have a more detailed report.

Item agreed to.

Construction of Lights and Aids to Navigation, including regulation of traffic in the Detroit river and such other places as may be necessary, $400,000.

Mr. PARENT: May I ask the hon. minister to whom aids to navigation have been granted? Are they to private companies or individuals?

Mr. BALLANTYNE: This item is for lights and buoys.

Mr. PARENT: And aids to navigation.

Mr. BALLANTYNE: That is the same thing.

Mr. POWER: Where are the lights and buoys constructed?

Mr. BALLANTYNE: I am informed these buoys are constructed at different points in the Dominion of Canada, depending on where they are going to be placed, and who is the lowest tenderer.

Mr. POWER: Where are the buoys desired to be placed on the Atlantic coast constructed?

Mr. BALLANTYNE: Most of them are made by the Robb Engineering Company, at Amherst, and some are made at Sorel.

Mr. POWER: By whom?

Mr. BALLANTYNE: By the Government shipyards.

Mr. FIELDING: There was a lightship at Barrington passage which outlived its usefulness. What is the minister doing about it?

Mr. BALLANTYNE: We have placed a gas buoy there.

Mr. FIELDING: It is not intended to renew the lightship.

Mr. BALLANTYNE: Not at the present time.

Mr. LAPOINTE: What is meant by "regulation of traffic in the Detroit river?"

Mr. BALLANTYNE: There is an international channel in the Detroit river, and the Canadian Government has an agreement with the American Government. We take care of one side of the channel and the

American Government takes care of the other.

Mr. CHISHOLM: This is for the construction of new lights and lighthouses?

Mr. BALLANTYNE: Yes.

Mr. CHISHOLM: The last two years I have been endeavouring to get the Government to build a small range light at Grande Etang. They assured me that this would be attended to, and I have some correspondence in my room where the officers of the Department inform me the work was to be undertaken "immediately." Well, "immediately" is quite a distance away.

Mr. BALLANTYNE: We would have put that light there before, but the department has been hard-up the last year or two. Our expenditures have been cut, but, as my hon. friend thinks we have not done what we should, I shall make a special inquiry about it and see what we can do.

Mr. CHISHOLM: The hon. gentleman is very kind. I got the same promise last year. My difficulty is this. I am always anxious to protect the Government. I told my people that such work was going to be undertaken, that the Government has provided the necessary money, and I gave them the assurance that it would be undertaken.

Mr. BALLANTYNE: I assure my hon. friend in all seriousness that we will put the light there if we can. Note has been taken of it, and it will come before the Lighthouse Board, and afterwards before me.

Mr. SINCLAIR (Guysborough): I find an item in the report of the Auditor General that a considerable sum of money out of this vote was paid to D. D. Swan, of Montreal, for services as consulting engineer, Victoria Harbour, B.C. This gentleman received payment at the rate of $75 a day. It struck me as a large figure to pay for consultations which appeared to last for fifty-five days. I should like to know the necessity for this large payment out of this fund. It does not seem strictly connected with the maintenance of lights.

Mr. BALLANTYNE: Well, it comes under the vote, Lighthouse and Coast Service. What we really employed Mr. Swan for was to send him out to Vancouver and look over the situation and make a complete detailed recommendation to the Department of Marine as to what developments should be provided for that most important port; and, not having any vote that we could charge it to, we thought it very properly came under Lighthouse and Coast Service, as expansion and development of navigation.

Mr. SINCLAIR (Guysborough): Is that a usual charge?

Mr. BALLANTYNE: It is the usual charge for a marine engineer of Mr. Swan's type. He is the best harbour and marine engineer we have in this country. The Montreal Harbour Commissioners Board brought him out from England ten or twelve years ago to carry out the large improvements that were undertaken at that time at the Port of Montreal, and I understand it is the usual charge for a man of his ability and skill.

At Six o'clock the committee took recess.

After Recess

The committee resumed at Eight o'clock.

Lighthouse and coast service—single service, $75,000.

Mr. MURPHY: Will the minister explain the increase?

Mr. BALLANTYNE: This increase of $10,000 is principally to cover increased telephone charges.

Mr. FIELDING: What is comprised in this item?

Mr. BALLANTYNE: Signal service stations have been established to report movements of ships by means of wireless telegraphy, telegraph and telephone signals, the system extending from St. John, New Brunswick, to Halifax and Cape Race.

Mr. SINCLAIR (Guysborough): Is the minister having new telephone lines put up along the coast, and, if so, where?

Mr. BALLANTYNE: The Department of Marine have a contract with the Bell Telephone Company who have put the rates up. This $10,000 covers the increased rates for the current year.

Mr. SINCLAIR: The money goes to the Bell Telephone Company?

Mr. BALLANTYNE: Yes.

Mr. FIELDING: Is there a signal station at Westport, Nova Scotia?

Mr. BALLANTYNE: Yes.

Mr. FIELDING: It has been alleged that some change has been made in that respect of late, and that the old signal station has been taken down and removed to another place.

Mr. BALLANTYNE: It has been removed from the old point down to the lighthouse, at the request of the shipping interests.

Mr. FIELDING: Is it generally assumed that the change is beneficial? It has been alleged that the change is by no means suitable to the place, and that the station is not convenient to shipping, but I do not like to make the statement too positively.

Mr. BALLANTYNE: The storm signal will remain where it is, but the signal service station has been moved down to the lighthouse, as I have said, at the request of the shipping interests.

Mr. FIELDING: What does the term "shipping interests" mean?

Mr. BALLANTYNE: Ocean liners and steamship companies, principally the Canadian Shipping Federation of Montreal.

Mr. FIELDING: The records, if necessary, will show that the change was made at their request; is that correct?

Mr. BALLANTYNE: Quite correct.

Mr. SINCLAIR (Guysborough): What are the places on the coast of Nova Scotia where storm signals are operated?

Mr. BALLANTYNE: This is the signal service. Storm signals come under the appropriation for meteorological service.

Mr. SINCLAIR: What is this for?

Mr. BALLANTYNE: As soon as a ship passes a signal station, the person in charge telephones to the next station giving the name of the ship and the time at which it passes the station, so that if my hon. friend were coming from Liverpool to Montreal, his friends in Montreal would know at what time the ship would reach Montreal, supposing she reached Sorel at such and such a time, and Three Rivers at such and such a time.

Mr. SINCLAIR: Are there any such stations on the coast of Nova Scotia?

Mr. BALLANTYNE: Partridge island, Camperdown and Westport.

Mr. PARENT: Does this item cover salaries to men in charge of the service?

Mr. BALLANTYNE: Yes.

Mr. LAVIGUEUR: Are there increases in salaries?

Mr. BALLANTYNE: There has been an increase in salaries to the extent of $2,000.

[Mr. Fielding.]

Mr. COPP: I understood the additional $10,000 was for extra allowance in connection with the telephone signal service.

Mr. BALLANTYNE: Telegraph and telephone, both.

Mr. COPP: I notice in the Auditor General's report of last year that $14,157.10 was paid to the Bell Telephone Company for these services. The total amount for this service after deducting provisional allowance, cost of living bonus, was only $59,000. If there is only $2,000 extra to be allowed for telephone service, I can hardly see the reason for the minister asking for an increase of $10,000 when the expenditure was only $59,000 last year.

Mr. BALLANTYNE: The increase in salaries is not $2,000 but $4,000; the telegraph charges are $4,000 more and the telephone charges are $4,000 more.

Mr. COPP: Who keeps up the private telephone line between Montreal and Quebec?

Mr. BALLANTYNE: The Bell Telephone Company.

Mr. COPP: They construct and keep it in repair?

Mr. BALLANTYNE: Yes.

Mr. COPP: Then this amount is to pay the operators along the line of this service?

Mr. BALLANTYNE: Yes.

Mr. POWER: What is the necessity for this private telephone line between Quebec and Montreal? Would it not be possible to get the same information by Marconi or otherwise?

Mr. BALLANTYNE: This is the promptest and most efficient service that the Department of Marine and Fisheries could possibly get. Wireless would not suit. If my hon. friend were on a ship, he would notice that the signal stations signal by flag as well as by telephone.

Mr. POWER: I am not familiar with signal service stations, but I understand the movements of ships are reported to the signal station at Quebec by wireless. Am I right?

Mr. BALLANTYNE: If the ship were coming from the ocean, she would be so reported; but when she would get into the river, the reports would be made by the signal service stations by telephone.

Mr. POWER: The signal service report is really only for ships between Quebec and Montreal.

Mr. BALLANTYNE: The telephone service is just from Montreal to Quebec, and the wireless from Quebec to cape Race.

Mr. POWER: If it is possible to give satisfactory service by wireless from the lower stations to Quebec, I am not opposing the item, but I do not see the urgency of having a special wire from Quebec to Montreal. The most important reports are those that come from below Quebec when a ship is approaching Canada. Why then should we have, for the sake of reporting movements between Quebec and Montreal, a special telephone line when we already have a Marconi service? Are there special reasons?

Mr. BALLANTYNE: This is not a new vote; it is one that has been made for a great many years. It is necessary for the ships to get this telephone service when they are passing each other in the river, and there are many special reasons for it.

Mr. PARENT: Is this telephone used for the services of the various departments?

Mr. BALLANTYNE: No, just for navigation.

Item agreed to.

Administration of Pilotage, $250,000.

Mr. COPP: I have great pleasure in offering my congratulations to my hon. friend upon the reduction of this item from $400,000, as it was last year, to $250,000, a decrease of $150,000, providing the reduction does not in any way endanger the public service. I would, however, draw his attention to the fact that in the Auditor General's report for the year ending March 31, 1920, there appears only to have been expended for the administration of pilotage the sum of $103,000 plus the cost of a Royal Pilotage Commission amounting to $11,000. If that is all that was expended in 1920 out of a vote of $400,000 I can hardly see the necessity of voting another $250,000 this year. Perhaps there is some explanation for this, and if so, I will be very glad to hear it.

Mr. BALLANTYNE: My hon. friend will remember that I put the Pilotage Act through the House three years ago taking over the pilotage districts of Halifax and St. John. That accounts for the increase in expenditure as regards those ports. The decrease shown is due to the fact that we no longer have the British Columbia Pilotage Association, it having been abolished.

Mr. PARENT: What is meant by "The Administration of Pilotage"? By whom, and in what way is this work done in the several districts of Montreal, Quebec, Halifax and St. John?

Mr. BALLANTYNE: A few years ago the pilotage district of Halifax and St. John was administered by a local pilotage commission. The department have taken those districts over and, like the districts of Montreal and Quebec, they are now under the Marine and Fisheries Department. The general superintendent of pilots stationed at the marine office here, I refer to Captain Robertson, has supervision of the pilotage districts of Montreal. All the pilotage districts of Canada are now directly under the Minister of Marine and Fisheries.

Mr. PARENT: Has not Mr. Wiallard been appointed superintendent for the district of Quebec?

Mr. BALLANTYNE: He is acting superintendent for the districts of Montreal and Quebec.

Mr. PARENT: Has the minister received any communications from the Shipping Federation suggesting a decrease in the number of pilots for the district of Quebec?

Mr. BALLANTYNE: Well, I have not seen the communications myself but my deputy tells me they have been received, and that the Shipping Federation are under the impression there are too many pilots.

Mr. PARENT: Upon what grounds do the Shipping Federation base that opinion? For years the pilots have given good service in the country but now it appears the Shipping Federation are asking for a reduction in their number, and suggesting that no more apprentice pilots be admitted. I think the minister should give further information as to the recommendations of the Shipping Federation and the grounds upon which they are based.

Mr. BALLANTYNE: I will be very glad to tell my hon. friend that the Government and the Minister of Marine have to stand as impartial judges between the demands of the pilots on the one hand, and the demands of the shipping people on the other. Ever since I have been Minister of

Marine the shipping interests have claimed there are too many pilots in the districts of Montreal and Quebec and they have urged me very strongly to reduce the number. So far the department have not done so. Furthermore the shipping people think the pilotage charges are too high, whereas the pilots themselves consider they are too low. The shipping people think there are too many pilots, and the pilots consider there are enough. That, briefly, is the situation.

Mr. PARENT: How many pilots do the Shipping Federation think would be necessary for the service?

Mr. BALLANTYNE: There are sixty pilots below Quebec and the Shipping Federation think there should only be fifty.

Mr. PARENT: Do they suggest any means whereby the number can be reduced to fifty.

Mr. CASGRAIN: Yes.

Mr. BUTTS: Would my hon. friend suggest cutting the number down to forty.

Mr. CASGRAIN: I am not a minister.

Mr. BUTTS: No, but you are making a lot of noise.

Mr. SINCLAIR (Guysborough): When this matter was up last year we drew the attention of the minister to the fact that while the pilots of the St. Lawrence are pensioned, the pilots in other ports of Canada draw no pension. Has the minister any plan for treating the pilots in the other great ports of Canada in the same way as the pilots in the St. Lawrence are treated? In this connection I would like to point out that in answer to a question that I placed on the Order Paper about a week ago—it was stated there are thirty-four retired pilots in Quebec, and that some of them are officially described as " decayed " pilots. I would like the minister to define what a " decayed " pilot is?

Mr. BALLANTYNE: The term "decayed" pilot is an old nautical term that we got from Trinity House very many years ago. The Quebec pilots have no more reason, on general principles, to receive a pension than the pilots in any other district of Canada, but when Mr. Justice Brodeur was Minister of Marine and Fisheries, an Order in Council was passed to the effect that when any of the Quebec pilots reached the age of sixty-five they should be placed on the retired list and given a pension of $300 a year. I do not see how the Government can relieve themselves of the responsibility devolving upon them under the agreement that was entered into at that time between the then Minister of Marine and the Quebec pilots. My own opinion is that the agreement ought to be continued.

Mr. FIELDING: Is there not a system of pensions in the case of some of the other pilots? According to my recollection the pensions of the Halifax pilots are chargeable to the pension fund, and the only difference would be that the pensions in one case would come from the pilots' own fund, and in the other case from the Dominion treasury. In that respect there is inequality. I remember when this item was put in by the hon. gentleman's predecessor it was a settlement of a long standing trouble. I have forgotten the details, but I quite agree that the minister can not do otherwise than uphold that settlement.

Mr. SINCLAIR (Guysborough): I did not expect the minister to upset the agreement made with the Quebec pilots. My point was: had the minister any plan to put that system in force in the other ports. If the pilots in other ports contribute to a pension fund of their own, that is a very good thing, but the Government do not help that fund so far as I know, and I do not see that those men would be on the same level as the Quebec pilots who are paid out of government funds. Who appoints the pilots in Quebec?

Mr. BALLANTYNE: The pilots of Quebec, like the pilots of other districts, serve an apprenticeship; then on passing the prescribed examinations, they are made branch pilots, and as vacancies occur they are taken on the strength.

Mr. SINCLAIR (Guysborough): Do they get their papers from the department?

Mr. BALLANTYNE: Yes.

Mr. SINCLAIR (Guysborough): Then, if there are too many pilots, the trouble can be very easily corrected by the department restricting appointments.

Mr. BALLANTYNE: This is an old-standing difficulty, and is one of the reasons why my predecessor, Mr. Brodeur, agreed to give the pilots at Quebec a pension of $300 a year, providing that their number was reduced from 75 to 65, and that is gradually being done. On the other hand, it is rather hard to say to a young man after he has served seven years as an apprentice pilot and is ready to become a branch pilot that he cannot become one. We

are meeting the difficulty by not taking on any more apprentice pilots.

Mr. PARENT: Did I understand the minister to say that the corporation of Quebec pilots is now entirely under the control of the department? If so, when did that corporation effectively disappear?

Mr. BALLANTYNE: An Act was put through the House in 1914 making the Minister of Marine the pilotage authority. That is the time when the Quebec Pilotage Association really disappeared.

Mr. PARENT: Is the minister aware that there is now a union composed of the Quebec pilots to take the place of the corporation of pilots?

Mr. BALLANTYNE: I heard so.

Mr. PARENT: Is he aware that the charter of the Quebec pilots is still in existence?

Mr. BALLANTYNE: I do not know.

Mr. PARENT: Perhaps he can find out from his deputy minister or from the latter's assistant?

Mr. BALLANTYNE: Neither of them knows.

Mr. COPP: I notice in the Auditor General's Report that during the fiscal year ending March 31, 1920, we expended about $115,000 under this item of administration of pilotage. This year we are asked to vote $250,000. The reason for that increase, as I understood the minister, was because the department had taken over the pilotage business at the ports of St. John and Halifax. The expenses of the Montreal Pilotage Board amounted to $15,525 last year, and the Quebec Pilotage Board to about $5,000, and I submit that the expenses of the ports of Halifax and St. John would not equal those of the ports of Montreal and Quebec. Therefore we would not expect an increase of over $5,000 in each of the Maritime Province ports, besides, while we have taken over the Halifax and St. John pilotage we have relinquished the Victoria, which last year cost $19,000; consequently we should not have any increase at all.

Mr. BALLANTYNE: The system is quite different in the districts of Halifax and St. John as compared with that in the districts of Quebec and Montreal. In the former we pay the salaries of the pilots, and they collect the pilotage dues; but in the latter districts the pilotage associations pay their own salaries and collect the pilotage dues.

Mr. COPP: Were the ports of St. John and Halifax under the direction of the minister during last year ending March 31?

Mr. BALLANTYNE: Halifax was.

Mr. COPP: What was the expenditure last year at Halifax?

Mr. BALLANTYNE: The St. John pilotage district was taken over on October 1, and to December 31, 1920, I see the revenue amounted to $9,379. I will try to get the expenditure in a moment or two.

Mr. COPP: If my hon. friend has not the information perhaps he would send me a memorandum of it.

Mr. BALLANTYNE: I will be very glad to do that.

Mr. PARENT: On April 4, the member for Dorchester put the following question to the Minister of Marine:

> What is the amount of superannuation paid to former pilots from Montreal-Quebec division, or to widows and dependents of same? What is the number of those pensioners? What are their names and respective ages?

This was the answer given by the minister:

> Pensions to Montreal-Quebec retired pilots and widows of retired pilots are paid out of the Montreal Decayed Pilots' Pension Fund, and is administered for the Montreal pilots by the Department of Finance.

And here follows a list. Then we come to No. 18 and we find:

> Decayed Pilot, Jean Arcand.

I would suggest to the hon. gentleman that when speaking of pilots who are still alive and enjoying pretty good health they should not be called decayed pilots; it sounds very bad.

Item agreed to.

RESOLUTION FOR ONE-SIXTH OF AMOUNT REQUIRED FOR NEXT FISCAL YEAR

Sir Henry Drayton moved:

> That a sum not exceeding $71,499,703.70, being one-sixth of the amount of each of the several items set forth in the main Estimates for the fiscal year ending March 31, 1922, and one-sixth of the amount of the item for a provisional bonus allowance for the Inside and Outside Services of the Civil Service set forth in the supplementary Estimate for the fiscal year ending March 31, 1922, be granted to His Majesty for the fiscal year ending March 31, 1922.

Mr. FIELDING: I think, Mr. Chairman, it is practically impossible to carry a resolution of this character except by common

consent of the House. I would be glad to know whether my hon. friend the Minister of Finance (Sir Henry Drayton) is prepared to receive the suggestions which we offered the other day in what I think was a friendly spirit. If it be that the suggestions then made are not to receive any consideration, why, of course, we must take advantage of whatever the rules of the House will permit. I do not think it is wise for my hon. friend to try to get this motion otherwise than by that common consent which has accompanied such motions in times past.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: Mr. Chairman, I entirely agree with the hon. gentleman that this is a matter which ought to be covered by consent. I would go further —I would entirely agree with him that the consent which ought to be now given should be characterized by the same terms and in the same manner as the consents which at his requests were so frequently given during the many years he was Minister of Finance.

A suggestion was made when this matter was first under discussion that salaries should be paid and that other accounts should be stopped. I think it went further than that afterwards—to the extent that essentials should be paid. But we do not intend to pay anything except what is essential and is required to be paid. We certainly did not intend to launch out into expenditures in connection with undertakings which we are not bound to discharge when we have not got a sufficient vote to carry them through. But my position is exactly the same as the position of my hon. friend on many occasions; it is extremely hard to say in advance what is exactly necessary and what is not. On a former occasion when the same question was put my hon. friend said that he would like to know just exactly what items the Opposition were objecting to when he would consider the matter. We have not, of course, that information as yet.

I would like to point out very briefly some of the difficulties, because I think all hon. gentlemen will realize them. Suppose you take the Department of Soldiers' Civil Re-Establishment. Of course, you have the salaries of your officials, but you have also your pay and allowances to the veterans who are receiving treatment or education; you have your unemployment relief; you have your operating expenses, consisting of cash advances for disbursements to meet current expenses, and so on; you have your vocational expenses, payments for supplies in connection with vocational training, tuition fees and the like; you also have your vocational loans which are being made to returned soldiers under certain circumstances.

The truth of the matter is that the country's business is a pretty big one, perhaps entirely too big a business, but it is impossible to stop it. Take for example your immigration; are we to stop all the work in connection with the Immigration Department, with the exception of payments for salaries and bills already approved? You have your rent of offices all over the country. You have the travelling expenses of agents. I suppose they would have to be stopped. You have your expenses in connection with the deportation of undesirables which has been going on all the time. You have your telegraph and telephone expenses and the necessary alterations to buildings which ought to be done this year. These alterations should be started very soon if we are going to properly look after immigration. You have your running expenses at border points of entry on the international boundary. You have all your expenses in connection with the detention and feeding of immigrants at these border points. Then in regard to the Health Department you are exactly in the same position. Going through all the departments, where there is any work to be done, this simply provides for salaries. If the money is not voted, it means for one thing that you might just as well discharge your employees, because unless these things can be looked after, unless they have something to work with and for, you are getting nothing for your salaries.

The position this year, it seems to me, is exactly the same as in any other year. There have been a great number of these votes. I have already pointed out to the House that English authority states that interim supply is an integral and necessary part of parliamentary and national finance. I have given already one authority for it; but if there is any doubt in the mind of anybody that what is asked here is not what is necessary, I am going to fortify it with another authority. I will now read from May's Parliamentary Practice, 12th edition, page 448. May says:

> Owing to our financial system, and the conditions of parliamentary business, the presentation of estimates for grants in advance upon the estimated departmental expenditure of the year, before a complete sanction has been given to that expenditure, is an annual necessity. These grants are known as "votes on account." It was hoped that the vote of the committee of

supply would be taken upon the bulk of the annual estimates during the earlier portion of each session, as the financial year closes on the 31st March, and begins on the 1st April. The futility of a hope centred on the 1st April is the experience of every session. When that day comes round, session after session, very slender provision has been made for the requirements of the new financial year. Moreover, as every grant of supply is limited to the service of the financial year for which it is made, the grant lapses, if it has not been utilized before the 31st March; and under the provisions of the Exchequer and Audit Departments Act, 1866, all unexpended sums in the hands of the departments are surrendered to the exchequer. Thus, obviously, during the first quarter of each calendar year, a vote on account must be demanded; for if no grant in advance has been made upon the 31st March, the maintenance of the public service in the early part of the new financial year will be wholly unprovided for.

It seems to me it is unnecessary to refer to further authority. The matter is one which is well within the recollection and knowledge of any member of this House who has sat here any length of time. It is certainly well within the memory and recollection of my hon. friend the ex-Minister of Finance. Something was said the other day that conditions were entirely different, that at the present time there were large deficits, while, when previous interim supplies were voted, there were large surpluses. I am looking now at the Public Accounts, page 63, which gives the tabulated statement of surpluses and deficits. While I do not think the question of surpluses or deficits has anything to do with it, nevertheless I notice that in the year 1911 there was a net deficit between receipts and expenditues of $3,773,505.70.

Mr. FIELDING: A net deficit in 1911?

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: Yes.

Mr. FIELDING: It is only by adding the capital expenditure that the hon. gentleman can make that statement.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: The hon gentleman's point is well taken, just as well taken as was the statement made by the hon. gentleman from Gaspé (Mr. Lemieux) because if we deal with the matter in the way suggested by hon. gentlemen, then of course there was a surplus. Going back to the year 1911 again, if you forget all about capital there was a surplus of $30,000,000. Let us treat this year in the same way as the hon. gentleman thinks the matter should be treated. Treating it in the same way for 1920, there is a surplus of $45,900,000. For the present year the surplus is a great deal larger than that. If we are going to talk about surpluses, we have at least to get on common ground. We have no surpluses when we look at our capital account. We have large surpluses on our ordinary expenses and on our ordinary receipts. The hon. gentleman had surpluses on his ordinary expenditure and on his ordinary receipts. The only difference is that ours is much larger in so far as those items of the account are concerned. On the other hand, our capital expenditures are also much larger. As I was pointing out, there was a deficit in 1911 of three million odd; a deficit in 1910 of $12,338,000; a deficit in 1909, in times of peace with no war debt, of $45,969,000; and a deficit in 1908 of $14,000,000. Let us see now about interim Supplies. Take the year of the big deficit $45,969,000, that occurred in 1909. In that year the interim Supply was allowed to go, not for a sixth, but for a quarter. It seems to me the thing is too plain really to require further elaboration. If it was necessary to carry on the business of the country during the year that I am referring to, during the years my hon. friend moved interim Supply in proper conformity with Canadian practice and with British practice, if it was necessary to decently carry on public business, it is just as necessary in order to decently carry on public business now. If it was necessary to pay Canada's commitments, to observe good faith to carry on our obligations, it is just as necessary to-day. My hon. friend says it should be done by consent. I entirely agree him, and I hope this matter will be carried through by consent, as indeed, it ought to be.

Mr. FIELDING: I think some hon. gentlemen on this side of the House made some references to surpluses which perhaps justified the hon. gentleman's comment. I did not, however, and so I pass from that. I pause only to say that, if I am not mistaken, my successor in office came down to this House and announced a very handsome surplus and did not find it necessary to draw the line that my hon. friend draws now. However, there is no difference between us in substance in that respect. I am going to suggest to my hon. friend that when he is spending his time pouring over the pages of history he should not deal so much with what the late Minister of Finance said. It would be exceedingly interesting if he told us what the Prime Minister of to-day, and the late Prime Minister and what another hon. gentleman sitting on that side of the House, said at this time. It might be as interesting as

what I said. After all, I think the question is not to be determined in that way. My hon. friends need not quote any authorities to prove that interim Supply is the proper thing. I have never said anything to the contrary. I quite agree that there are occasions where interim Supplies are necessary to carry on the public business, and I say now the hon. gentleman should have the interim Supply to carry on the public business, so far as he can show real urgency for it. He asks what difference there is between now and former times. There is a pretty large difference. In the times to which he referred the gross disbursements of Canada were in the vicinity of over one hundred million at the highest. Last year our disbursements were $743,000,000, they are not likely to be any less this year, and, therefore, I think there is a material change in the situation. I think what was a fourth or a fifth or a sixth some years ago is a different thing from what is a fourth, fifth or sixth to-day. I think the vast difference between the sums involved in the expenditures of former years, and the sums involved in the expenditures to-day create a very serious difference which my hon. friend ignores. I quite agree that there should be an interim Supply, and I do not confine it to salaries and labour, though they are the most urgent things. A man enjoying a modest income from the Government has not anything laid aside, and it is important that he should get his wages, and he should have priority. I would go further, and say that where my hon. friend can show that there are claims which should be paid in the interest of the Administration and fair play, I should like to have a statement of these claims, and I would like to help the hon. gentleman to get the assistance.

As to how that might be brought down there may be a difference of opinion. I have heard the suggestion made that there should be a committee, whether formal or informal, for a conference between the two sides, to agree upon the matter. I would think it might be quite possible to come to an understanding whereby we could agree on the passing of those votes. I still offer the suggestion to my hon. friend that he should try to come to some arrangement. As to the form in which it should be done, I am not prepared to say anything at the moment. But if my hon. friend is not going to get this by consent, he will find it an exceedingly difficult job to get it at all. I think the rules and practice of Parliament will virtually prevent him from getting it, except at very great trouble, inconvenience and embarrassment. I cannot recall a case where such Supply was passed, unless it was a matter of friendly agreement. I would suggest again that, by some means, my hon. friend should endeavour to satisfy us as to what are the most urgent cases, and I should like to assist him in getting Supply through to that extent.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: I should should like to supplement what my friend the hon. member for Shelburne and Queen's (Mr. Fielding) has said, by drawing the attention of the Prime Minister (Mr. Meighen), and the Minister of Finance (Mr. Henry Drayton), to the concluding remarks which I made when speaking on this subject in this House on April 7. I pointed out at that time that we of the Opposition had no desire to embarrass the Government in the matter of any amount which might be necessary to pay salaries and wages, and, indeed, to carry on the public service to the extent that might be absolutely necessary. I pointed out that it was customary, when interim Supply was desired, for a conference to be held between both sides of the House, and I left the door open very wide to hon. gentlemen opposite to meet the Opposition in a friendly and courteous way in that connection. May I read the remarks with which I concluded what I said on April 7? and which will be found in Hansard at page 1743 (unrevised edition):

> But in taking this stand we have no desire to in any way embarrass or penalize the Civil Service because of any neglect on the part of the Government, we will be perfectly willing to consider any arrangement with a view of providing what may be necessary in the way of salaries both for the Inside and Outside Services. As respects other expenditures, however, we contend that except as agreed upon, this Parliament should have the full right of examining in the closest detail every item of the Estimates before voting any portion of them.

In asking this, Mr. Chairman, we are only maintaining the right of the people, through their representatives, to exercise due control over public expenditures.

My hon. friend has mentioned that there was no difference between what the Government is asking to-day and similar requests as made in previous years. May I point out to hon. gentlemen opposite that the amount which we are being asked to vote at the present time is $71,499,703.70. The total expenditure for the carrying on of the whole public service of this Dominion in the year 1902, did not reach $50,000,000; yet

9 p.m.

we are being asked by hon. gentlemen opposite to pass, within an hour or less time, a sum amounting to over $71,000,000. Until 1908, the total expenditure chargeable to Consolidated Revenue Account did not reach $70,000,000, an amount less than that which we are being asked to vote now. In 1909, the total expenditure chargeable to Consolidated Fund reached $84,000,000, plus a few thousands; in 1910, $79,000,000; and in 1911, $87,000,000 odd. Eighty seven million was the highest point reached for expenditure on Consolidated Revenue Account, prior to the change of Government which took place in 1911, an amount not very much greater than the amount which we are being asked to vote now for the purposes of interim Supply. That being the case, we feel that, in the public interest, it is absolutely necessary that due control should be exercised by the people's representatives in this Parliament over the vast expenditures which the Government are making.

I wish to draw the attention of my right hon. friend to the fact that this House has been debating, for the last day or more, one item of some $8,000,000, which it has not seen its way to pass. Yet hon. gentlemen opposite propose now that we shall be forced to vote one-sixth of that amount, and thereby reverse the position which we, on this side, have taken, namely, that that expenditure is not justified under existing circumstances.

May I repeat in a word the position which we take? We are ready at any time to meet hon. gentlemen opposite in conference, to agree to give them what is necessary in the way of meeting salaries and wages for employees of the public service. We are prepared to go further and to give them what is needed to carry on the public service of this country in a manner which will not embarrass public business, which will help to maintain the good faith of the Government, and its credit, which will enable the Government to carry out commitments to which my hon. friend has referred; but this must be as a result of a conference between both sides of this House, surrounding whatever may be granted with such conditions as, in the public interest, seem to be absolutely necessary at the present time.

Mr. MEIGHEN: I sympathise with hon. gentlemen opposite in the rather awkward efforts which they are making to distinguish between conditions that obtain this year and those that have obtained for many years gone by in relation to this vote. The distinction was put on one basis last week; it is put on a wholly different basis to-day. Last week we were told: "We could not agree to interim Supply this year because, when interim Supply was voted under a former Government, there were surpluses, whereas now there are large deficits." The facts fell from under that contention, so the contention was abandoned. The facts were the contrary. The surpluses as calculated by hon. gentlemen are much greater now than they were then.

Some hon. MEMBERS: Oh, oh.

Mr. MEIGHEN: Yes, the difference between ordinary expenditure and revenue is much greater to-day than it has ever been before, and hon. gentlemen opposite have asked and obtained interim Supply when there was no surplus at all, but a huge deficit amounting to a large proportion of the whole annual revenue. The facts fell from under that contention, so the whole footing was shifted to-night. To-night we are told: "It cannot be agreed to, because there is so much money needed;" or to put the matter in other words: The necessities are so great, the reason for objecting is all the greater. In Great Britain there is interim Supply voted where the necessities are ten times as great as ours, and I have not heard of any hon. gentleman in the British House of Commons putting forward that ground for refusing interim Supply, nor do I know of any interim Supply being refused anywhere or any time upon grounds such as suggested by hon. members opposite to-night. I have looked the records back over many years to find whenever conditions were such in this, or any other House, and I know of no such case.

Hon. gentlemen opposite have shifted their grounds in other respects very materially. The leader of the Opposition (Mr. Mackenzie King), read what he said on April 7, to the effect that he was not so very much opposed to interim Supply to the extent that the public service be paid. But when he spoke in this House on March 15, that was not the position he took; he did not hold open any door then, so far as I could see. If any hon. gentleman can see any hole or opening in this door, his mental eyesight is better than mine. This is the ultimatum that the leader of the Opposition gave to the House when the question was up on March 15:

> This delay on the part of the Government is the less excusable inasmuch as the matter was

expressly brought to its attention on two or three occasions during our last session.

He goes on to show that, the session before, he had told us there could be no more interim Supply:

When we were discussing Supplementary Estimates on June 7 last I took occasion to speak to the hon. Minister of Finance (Sir Henry Drayton) as follows:

I want to say, not by way of threat but simply that hon. gentlemen opposite will understand the position of the Opposition, that if the government of the day should by any possibility be in office next year we shall not be willing to make these advances.

I was referring then—and I think the Government would do well to consider this particular feature at the moment—to the practice which my hon. friend asked us to adopt of voting a portion of the Supply en bloc at the end of the fiscal year before there had been any opportunity of considering the Estimates.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: Hear, hear.

Mr. MEIGHEN: Does the hon. gentlemen say that he meant there that we had asked Supply en bloc last year before any Estimates had been considered? That was not the fact. He meant that he would object this year to any vote en bloc; that is interim Supply.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: Without consideration.

Mr. MEIGHEN: Nobody is asking him to vote this without consideration. We have given him time for consideration since last Thursday; in fact, we notified him first on Tuesday night, so that he has had a week for consideration now and he can have still longer. There will be an hour or so to-night, or, perhaps, still more, for consideration to be given to the matter. His statement, quoting what he said on June 7, is that he would not be willing to vote interim Supply this year. That was the ultimatum which he gave to the House.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: En bloc, yes.

Mr. MEIGHEN: Is this not en bloc?

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: One-sixth without consideration would be en bloc.

Mr. MEIGHEN: Who is talking about no consideration; we have never refused consideration, never suggested such a thing. This is an interim Supply vote which is a vote en bloc, which he told us on March 15, supplementing what he said on June 7 of last year, he would not agree to vote. Now he complains because we did not go to him and beg him to recede from his position. If the hon. gentleman had not made that statement, it would have been our duty to approach him; but he notified us twice from his place in the House that he would not grant interim Supply. Now he complains that we have taken him at his word. Such is the first shift. Then when this came up on the seventh it was suggested by hon. gentlemen opposite that they were not ready to vote interim Supply, but they would vote to pay the public servants. That was as far as they were ready to go then. That is to say they were ready to pay wages and salaries to the civil servants of this country as long as the civil servants did not work—as long as we could not supply them with the material to work with. They would, for example, pay the nurses and the doctors, and other employees in the hospitals under the Department of the Soldiers' Civil Re-establishment but they would not buy medicines for the patients, they would not heat the buildings, and they would not pay the rent. They would vote the money to pay the salaries of engineers on irrigation works but they would not vote them supplies to go on their trips. In a word they would pay civil servants money for their services as long as they gave no value therefor. That was the position hon. gentlemen took on the seventh. But to-day they go further: They say we will vote the salaries of the civil servants but nothing else except what is necessary to be voted in order to carry on the public service. But they want to surround even such a vote of interim Supply with some conditions. I ask why surround with conditions this year when conditions were never suggested before? Is it because the amount is larger? Is it because we have to pay $15,000,000 a year on the war debt? Is that the reason for surrounding interim Supplies with conditions? Is it because we have to maintain hospitals for our soldiers at an expenditure of twenty millions or more a year? Is that a reason for surrounding interim Supplies with conditions? Is it because we have to have from forty to fifty million dollars for the land settlement of our soldiers? Is that a reason why there should be conditions? Is it because we spend thirty millions a year or more for pensions? Is that another reason? I hope hon. gentlemen opposite realize in that regard how formidable was their position on the seventh when they were ready to pay the pension commissioners, and all the officers of the commission, but they were not ready to pay any pensions.

Now what is it in the Estimates that hon. gentlemen think should be held up? What is there in those Estimates that is

not necessary for the public service? If hon. gentlemen to-night—and there is yet time—will go through the Estimates and lay their finger on something that they think can profitably wait for a month or two months we are ready to consider it. But they have had plenty of time to do that. Since a week ago they have known that interim Supply would be introduced. I venture to say that never since interim Supply was first asked in this House has it been left as long—in order to enable supplies to be voted in the regular way, if possible—as it has been done in this case. We are now twelve days past the end of the fiscal year and no interim Supply has been voted. We are one week past the time when notice was given that a motion for interim Supply would be introduced. My hon. friends have had all that time to search out an item of some nature—I do not know what it could be—that is in the Estimates to which they want to take exception. We will give them a little longer time, and if there is such that it can, without any injustice at all to the public service, be omitted I have no desire to go on therewith. But we must have interim Supply or there will be paralysis of the public service of this country, and it is interim Supply that we have been notified by the leader of the Opposition officially, on two occasions, that will be denied. Consequently I ask hon. gentlemen from every side of the House what it is that has occurred that justifies an attitude never before assumed in Parliament, that justifies defiance—frank defiance first, modified defiance next, and conditional defiance now—of a practice essential to the business of Parliament. We ask only for the rights that every Government has had in other times; and while we have a majority in this House—while we have a majority ready to support us in that position—we are prepared to give all reasonable time for consideration of every reasonable suggestion, but that done we intend that the majority shall rule.

Hon. CHARLES MURPHY (Russell): If the Prime Minister intends to secure interim Supply, he has, I submit, adopted the wrong tone and the wrong language for securing it. Personally, I do not intend to have my position misrepresented by the right hon. gentleman, any more than the member for Marquette (Mr. Crerar) permitted him to misrepresent his position. The right hon. gentleman spoke of facts having dropped from under the position taken by hon. gentlemen on this side. Well, Sir, if anything dropped from under anybody, the ground dropped from under the right hon. gentleman this afternoon when he made an accusation against my hon. friend from Marquette, an accusation that was refuted by that hon. gentleman's reference to Hansard and by his quoting words that fell from a member of the present Government.

Now I would have thought that the generous offer that was made from this side of the House with regard to securing interim Supply by a conference, and subsequently by unanimous consent, would have been met in a very different spirit from that displayed by the Prime Minister. He has endeavoured to ridicule the language used by the leader of the Opposition by twisting the words that the latter hon. gentleman used when he referred to his statement that he would decline to grant interim Supply. Without question the words used by my hon. friend (Mr. King) on that occasion referred to the fact that he would not grant interim Supply for any of the Estimates which had not been considered and the Prime Minister, I submit, must have so understood him. In any event that is the way in which we on this side of the House understood the statement. Personally, I repeat that language and, speaking for myself, and for myself only, I decline to be a party to granting interim Supply for any item in these Estimates which, up to the present time, we have not considered. Now analogies have been sought to be drawn between conditions that exist now and those that existed in times past; and the hon. gentleman who now occupies the position of Finance Minister undertook to re-write the bookkeeping of this country for the last ten years and to make it appear to-night in this House for the first time that there were deficits in years past in which the Finance Minister occupying the position he does, and belonging to the same party that he does, declared that there were surpluses. One notable example of that was referred to by my hon. friend from Shelburne and Queen's (Mr. Fielding), who quoted what was said by the minister who occupied that position in the Borden Government in 1912 when, speaking in this House in the spring of that year, he announced a surplus of thirty odd millions and, in a spirit of playfulness, said he would give credit for one-half of it to the Laurier Administration and credit for the other half to the new administration. I refer to that only by

the way. But this is the kind of argument that is used, and this is the spirit in which the generous offer from this side of the House is met.

As I mentioned a moment ago, attempts have been made to prove that conditions now differ in no respect from conditions in the past when interim Supply was asked and granted. Mr. Chairman, conditions differ vastly now from those which prevailed in times past. Generally, conditions differ to the extent which has been alluded to by the two hon. gentlemen who have preceded me in this debate. But there is another important difference which I wish to bring to the attention of the committee, and in regard to which I wish to define my own position whether any other hon. gentleman on this side agrees with me or not. The proposal has been made to pay the salaries of the civil servants. So far as I am concerned I want to qualify that. In as much as it may be regarded as expressing my personal agreement I want to qualify it to this extent—that I will not agree to vote any interim Supply which covers salaries for any of the six hundred and ninety-two new positions which are set forth in these Estimates; I will not be a party to that.

Mr. BUTTS: The labourer is not worthy of his hire.

Mr. MURPHY: According to the Estimates the Department of Insurance has 2 new positions, the Department of Health 6, the National Art Gallery 9, the Naval Service 9, the Finance Department 12, the Fisheries Department 13, the Marine Department 17, the Civil Service Commission 19, Patents and Copyright Office 19, Secretary of State's Office, 24, Department of Immigration 24, Auditor General's Office 24, Post Office Department 185 and the Department of Militia and Defence 309. I decline to be a party to granting interim Supply to cover one-sixth, or whatever the fraction may be, of the salaries provided for these new offices created in these various departments.

I decline further in view of the discussion that took place between six o'clock yesterday evening and six o'clock this evening—a discussion for which the thanks of this country are due to the gentlemen on this side who participated in it and thereby focussed attention upon this expenditure, this indefensible expenditure, in connection with this mad shipbuilding programme of the Minister of Marine and Fisheries.

Speaking as one member on this side, I decline to be a consenting party to interim Supply that will commit me to the principle involved in that item that was discussed for that length of time and which was suspended on the motion of the Prime Minister. Now I have shown a few particulars in which present conditions differ from those in times past. I have done so simply because of a challenge thrown out by the Prime Minister. I do not do so for the purpose of preventing the Government from getting the moneys which they should get in order to carry on the public business of this country. Now, Mr. Chairman, just let me point out how much the members of the Opposition can dig out of these Estimates when left to themselves and with no further information than that which is disclosed on their face. Just let me refer to a little incident of this afternoon. On page 48 of the Estimates there appears item 211 "Removal of obstructions in navigable waters, $18,000", an increase of $13,000 over last year. The Minister of Marine was asked to explain that increase. He first of all said that it was on account of a wreck in Weller's bay in the entrance to the Welland canal. I asked the minister what this wreck was. I was told it was a large vessel as though the size of the vessel would explain the increased vote. I then asked him for the name of the vessel and the name of its owner. He gave me the name of the vessel, and then said the name of the owner was the Hon. Lorne Webster, a senator supporting this Government in the other branch of Parliament. So this Government was voting public money to benefit a supporter of theirs in the other House to the tune of $13,000, and that was a thing that was exposed this afternoon. That exposure having been drawn from the Government, the Minister of Marine was forced to promise the House that he would see that the Hon. Lorne Webster returned to the Government the money that was expended in removing the wreck of his boat. Now, that is a sample of the amount of information contained in the Estimates. If it is impossible for the Opposition—

Mr. EDWARDS: If my hon. friend will allow me. Take the item my hon. friend mentions, and suppose that interim Supply had been granted yesterday, would the granting of that have prevented this committee from refusing to pass that item.

Mr. MURPHY: I am not contending that it would, but it places those who consent in

an embarrassing and very difficult position. If they criticise an item, and still more if they move to strike it out, they are liable to be told: You consented to a portion of that. I submit that hon. members should not be put in that position.

Mr. MEIGHEN: No.

Mr. MURPHY: My right hon. friend says no. I am quite prepared to accept his statement. When my hon. friend from Frontenac asked me a very proper question, I was about to say that the Prime Minister should not taunt this side of the House with having had ample time to know what they are prepared to consent to. The Government itself should make it clear to members on this side of the House what items cover matters of urgent public business, and having done that they would be met in a fair and generous spirit by the Opposition. It is impossible for hon. members on this side of the House, for the reason I have pointed out in connection with the item which I have cited, to know what moneys are urgently required and what are not. There may be some general sums in connection with certain departments, the very phrasing descriptive of which would indicate that they were urgently required, but I submit there are a great many other items in regard to which the Opposition cannot have any information unless that information is furnished by the Government. So I submit that if the Government desire to secure by unanimous consent a percentage of these Estimates necessary to carry on the public business of the country, then the whole matter should be approached in a very different manner from that in which the Prime Minister has seen fit to approach it.

The CHAIRMAN: Is it the pleasure of the committee to adopt the resolution?

Mr. FIELDING: No, Mr. Chairman, I had hoped that a general discussion would lead to some friendly understanding, because whether the Minister of Finance will credit me or not, I am sincerely anxious that we shall come to a good understanding in this matter. I regret that I have seen no signs of that, and therefore I am obliged to take the point of order that this motion is out of order and cannot be entertained. When motions are made for Supply en bloc they can only be carried by waiving all the rules of the House, and that is what I had in mind when I said that only when there was mutual agreement could such motions be passed. There is no Estimate before the House which permits this motion to be made. The Estimates contain many hundreds of votes, each of those votes is an individual resolution, and each of those resolutions must be considered separately and individually. If the hon. gentleman can come in and move that one-sixth be voted en bloc, then he could move that the other five-sixths be voted en bloc. I submit that unless there be an agreement by common consent this motion cannot be entertained. No record, I think, can be found of any such motion in previous years. When we say we will take a sixth or a fourth, as the case may be, that is not a part of any motion, although it is interesting by way of information. I submit, Sir, that my hon. friend cannot proceed in this way; he must take each one of these items and move with regard to one-sixth of that item, and we have a right to debate every one of them.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: Mr. Chairman, I would like very much if I could to accommodate the hon. gentleman, but I fear it is entirely impossible to do so at this hour.

The CHAIRMAN: As the hon. member (Mr. Fielding) has raised the point of order, I would ask other hon. members to confine their remarks to the point of order now before the Chair.

Mr. MEIGHEN: Mr. Chairman, on many grounds it is impossible that the point of order can stand. The burden is on the hon. gentleman to show that a resolution on Estimates submitted to this committee cannot take any form that an hon. member chooses to put it in. It is true the practice of the House is to move one item after another. In fact, no motion is usually put; it is implied that each item is under consideration by way of motion.

Mr. FIELDING: The item is always called by the Chairman.

Mr. MEIGHEN: But to say that the motion because it takes another form is out of order so long as it relates to the Estimates that are before this committee, seems to me to be asserting something that there is no reason behind at all. If the Chair is to rule that no interim Supply in this House—and the same rule applies to the British House—can go through unless every member agrees, then it is in the power of any individual member to prevent the passing of interim Supply and to tie up the whole business of the country indefinitely. The suggestion seems to me absurd, and the consequences of it are so

appalling that it is impossible to assume that it is embodied in the rules at all. The hon. gentleman said that if we voted one-fifth en bloc could also vote the remaining four-fifths. So we could, if the House chooses to go that way, but the Government never would be justified in introducing such a motion. Any Government which asked for interim Supply beyond the necessities of the State would very soon loose the confidence of the country. But it is for this committee to decide in what form it deals with the Estimates put before it, and it can deal with them in this form the same as in any other form. It is for the committee to decide by its majority whether the motion which is now before the Chair —and which is the same motion which has been before the Chair in former years— is in proper form.

Mr. FIELDING: I admit, as my right hon. friend says, that it is the same motion as has been before the Chair in former years, but with this vital difference. In former years an agreement had been come to and no exception was taken to the motion. That being the case the ordinary rules were waived. My right hon. friend says this committee can deal as it likes with these Estimates but I submit that it can only deal with them in accordance with the rules of the House. These Estimates which I hold in my hand contain several hundred items. I say the practice follows a simple principle, and if my right hon. friend can move for one-sixth en bloc he can also move for the remaining five-sixths. That is so preposterous that I am sure that my right hon. friend in his graver moments would not consider it. I make the assertion that in no case will it be found that a motion for interim Supply is in the form in which this is now presented. I think it will be found in every instance that the items are taken individually, and if they are not separately voted upon it is because the House has come to an understanding. What usually follows? There being an understanding— such an understanding as I would be glad to have now—we agree that we will take one-sixth and we allow the Clerk of the House the responsibility of preparing the items, but in no case is the motion submitted in the form in which it is now before the Chairman of this committee.

Mr. LAPOINTE: Mr. Chairman, I desire to say a word or two in support of the point of order raised by my hon. friend from Shelburne and Queen's (Mr. Fielding). The rule is perfectly clear: Every item of the Estimates must be brought before the committee by way of resolution. That is what Bourinot lays down very plainly. As my hon. friend from Shelburne and Queen's states, if it can be done otherwise for one-sixth, it can be done for the whole. That is why every year this interim Supply when granted has been granted by consent after a preliminary conference. I will call the your attention, Mr. Chairman, to the language of the right hon. member for King's, N.S. (Sir Robert Borden) who was Prime Minister for several years after having been leader of the Opposition for a lengthy period. Speaking on April 7, he said, at page 1747 of the Unrevised Hansard:

> It is perfectly obvious that you can get a vote on account only by consent, because on every item with respect to a vote on account, you could take up just as much time as you could in passing the entire Estimates. Therefore, it goes without saying that this must be by consent.

Of course my right hon. friend the present leader of the Government is more arbitrary than his predecessor was, and does not care about obtaining consent from his opponenets when he wants something to be done, but with all his cleverness he has no right to twist the rules of the House. If he will not resort to the ordinary courtesy of coming to the leader of the Opposition for a conference and consent in this matter, we certainly have the right to object to the passing of this interim Supply, and, Mr. Chairman, undoubtedly you must rule out of order the motion which is before you.

Mr. MEIGHEN: I desire to refer to one feature of the hon. gentleman's remarks. First, I observe that he still does not quote any rule upon which he asks for this rather remarkable ruling; and, next, in his references to the speech of the former Prime Minister he quotes remarks to the effect that because of the right of any hon. member, under a motion for interim Supply, to debate any item affected by that motion, it would be practically impossible to proceed except by consent. So by an abuse of the rule, there would be that practical impossibility, which abuse fortunately now can be overcome by the amendment of rule 17. That is what the former Prime Minister had in view. I have never heard it suggested in this House that the motion for interim Supply must be by unanimous consent. It never was put in that way at any time, and never was so intended by

the former Prime Minister. The consequence of any such ruling would indeed be so appalling, as I said before, that I cannot conceive of its being made.

Mr. LAPOINTE: My right hon. friend said that I had not quoted any rule upon which I based my argument. I cite the following from page 416 of Bourinot:

> All these Estimates are divided into votes or resolutions, which appropriate specified sums for services specially defined. They are arranged under separate heads of expenditure, so as to give the full information upon all matters contained therein. The blue book is made up in several columns; one showing the amount, if any, voted during the previous year; another, the amount to be voted for the next year; another (where necessary), the increase or decrease of expenditure for the same service. Each resolution specifies, when necessary, every item on which there is to be a particular expenditure. For instance, under the head of a vote for harbours for a province there will be a number of distinct items, one for each harbour for which money is required. When the resolutions are under consideration in committee, it is the duty of the minister (whose Estimates are under consideration), to explain each item that appertains to his department, and in this way the House is able to come to a conclusion as to its necessity.

Nowhere can you find that it is possible to avoid this by bringing in a general resolution covering all the items of the Estimates.

Mr. DOHERTY: The hon. gentleman's citation from Bourinot has reference to how these things are done, but there is not one word suggesting that the committee is not at liberty to deal with all of these things that have been referred to it. Bourinot has told us but we all know by our own experience how this thing is done.

Mr. McMASTER: Why was it always done by consent, if the right existed in the Government to do it without consent?

Mr. DOHERTY: Because in the past Oppositions were more reasonable. I do not think I need labour what I have just pointed out. The hon. gentleman has failed to cite any authority which is opposed to us.

Mr. FIELDING: What, would my hon. friend claim that if the Minister of Finance, instead of bringing all these details from day to day, came in with a motion, and said "I move that the whole Estimate be passed en bloc," it would be a proper motion, and that we could not take exception to it under the rules of the House?

Mr. DOHERTY: I think you will recognize that the Minister of Finance in doing that would be acting most unwisely.

Mr. FIELDING: That is not the question.

Mr. DOHERTY: But if you ask me if there is any rule against doing it, I would reply with the question; where is the rule? There is a method in which the Estimates are usually dealt with, but we always come back to the question: Where is the rule that deprives the committee of the right of dealing with them en bloc?

Mr. FIELDING: Where there is a multitude of resolutions before a body, you cannot bulk the resolutions and move their adoption all at once.

Mr. ARCHAMBAULT: The Minister of Finance has cited page 448 of May in support of this contention. I would like to turn to page 446 of the same volume where you find the following:

> The demand by the Crown for grants of aid and supply for the service of each financial year is made in the speech from the throne at the opening of Parliament. The Sovereign addresses the Commons, demands the annual supply for the public service, and acquaints them that estimates will be laid before them of the amount that will be required. Further demands may be made during the progress of the session by messages from the Crown desiring pecuniary aid (see p. 454), by a demand for a vote of credit (see page 454), or by the presentation of an estimate. The form in which the Commons vote those supplies is a resolution that each sum be granted to His Majesty.

Mr. DOHERTY: Hear, hear.

Mr. ARCHAMBAULT: Therefore, the inference is clear that they cannot be passed en bloc, because there must be a resolution for each sum granted to His Majesty.

The CHAIRMAN: The point of order raised by the hon. member for Queen's and Shelburne (Mr. Fielding) is that the Estimates which appear in the printed volume for the current year cannot be bulked together for the purpose of voting en bloc on account a certain proportion of the said Estimates. The hon. members who have spoken on the point of order have referred to the rule of the House, but none of the members has cited the rule. As a matter of fact, there is no rule of the House of Commons of Canada relating to the manner in which the Estimates shall be submitted to the House. There is however, a general rule, rule 1, which says:

> In all cases not provided for hereinafter or by Sessional or other Orders, the rules, usages and forms of proceeding of the House of Commons of the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Ireland in force on the first day of July, 1867, shall be followed.

Referring to Bourinot and May in order to find the precedents and the customs then in force, I find that my hon. friend the member for Quebec East did not, in citing Bourinot, cite the strongest statement in Bourinot in support of his contention. Bourinot at page 425 says:

> When the House goes into committee of supply, the Speaker will call on the chairman of committees, or in his absence, on an experienced member, to take the chair of the committee. The rules that obtain in other committees prevail also in this. Each resolution will be formally proposed from the Chair, and amendments may be made thereto. Each member is provided with a printed copy of the estimates, and the Chairman reads the vote at length from a written set of resolutions, each of which he signs when it has been adopted by the committee. As in other committees, each resolution must be proposed and discussed as a distinct question, and when it has been formally carried, no reference can be made again thereto. Neither is it regular to discuss any resolution before it has been formally proposed from the Chair. Each vote or resolution is necessarily a question in itself to be proposed, amended and put as any motion or Bill in the House.

That would make it quite clear that the Government would not have the right to vote en bloc the total Estimates for any one year. But provision has been made for an interim vote, and if hon. members will turn to page 450 of Bourinot they will see there the following statement:

> "It is an established rule," says a high authority, "that a vote on account should involve no new principle, but should merely provide for the continuation of services which had been sanctioned in the previous year; and it is the practice not to take more than two or three months' Supply, except in certain particular cases of public emergency, so that the committee in agreeing to vote on account are not pledged to the Estimates for the year in anticipation of the opportunity to be afterwards afforded of voting them in detail."

That is not very clear, but by referring to the 12th edition of Erskine May's Parliamentary Practice, at page 479, hon. members will find the following:

> The motion by which a grant on account is proposed follows the customary form. The motion states the total sum required; and the various amounts needed for each department, which compose that sum, are stated in a schedule appended to the resolution. The question proposed thereon from the Chair follows the terms of the resolution, and places the total sum, the aggregate grant, before the committee for its decision; and upon that question amendments can be moved for the reduction of the whole grant, or for the reduction or omission of the items whereof the grant is composed.

I certainly must follow the precedent just cited and rule that the resolution is quite in order.

[The Chairman.]

Mr. FIELDING: I wish to avoid any confusion, Mr. Chairman, and I understand you rule the motion is in order. In the terms of the ruling I understand we can deal by discussion and by amendment with every individual item which is included within that motion.

The CHAIRMAN: The citation upon which I base my ruling, reads as follows:

> The motion by which a grant on account is proposed follows the customary form. The motion states the total sum required; and the various amounts needed for each department, which compose that sum, are stated in a schedule appended to the resolution. The question proposed thereon from the Chair follows the terms of the resolution, and places the total sum, the aggregate grant, before the committee for its decision; and upon that question amendments can be moved for the reduction of the whole grant, or for the reduction or omission of the items whereof the grant is composed.

Mr. McMASTER: I understood from the Prime Minister's argument that he thought as this interim Supply had been granted in times past, it should, without question, be granted now, and in connection with his argument the Prime Minister endeavoured to make out that the financial condition of this country was not a serious one. He endeavoured to convey to the House the impression that we had on ordinary account a very large surplus of revenue over expenditure. I cannot think that the Prime Minister, with the sense of responsibility which that position entails, would wish to convey to this House and this country anything but the real fact, that the country's financial condition merits the serious attention of every patriotic Canadian citizen. What has been done in the past is not a precedent as to what should be done at this time, because our financial condition is so different from what it was in days gone by.

I think that perhaps members of the House may be interested in a every brief consideration of the following figures: the total expenditure of Canada for the fiscal year in which Confederation took place, 1867-68, amounted to just under thirteen and a-half millions on ordinary and on capital account. If you estimate the population of Canada at that time as three and a-half millions—and I think that is a fair computation for the purpose of my argument—you will find that the expenditure per head during that year, both on capital and ordinary account, was $3.84. Ten years afterwards, our expenditures had gone up to twenty-three and a-half millions. Our population had gone up to about four and a-half millions, and the

per head expenditure amounted to $5.43. In 1887-88 our expenditure had risen to almost thirty-seven millions. The population was then over four and three-quarter millions, and the per capita expenditure—and those figures always relate to capital as well as ordinary account—amounted to $7.63. In 1897-98 the expenditure amounted to thirty-nine millions and the average per capita expenditure to $7.24 and at the end of the next decennial period, 1907-8 it had risen to just over seventy-six and a-half millions. Our population was estimated then at about seven and a-quarter millions and the per head expenditure to $10.63. In 1910-11 the former Prime Minister of this country stated that an expenditure of just over eighty-seven and three-quarter millions was a fair indication or prima facie evidence, if I remember his terms correctly, of corruption. Our population was then about seven and a-quarter millions, and the yearly expenditure amounted to $12.18 per capita. In the last year before the war the total expenditure on capital and ordinary account amounted to about one hundred and twenty-seven and a-quarter millions, and, estimating our population at seven and a-quarter million, we find an annual per head expenditure of $17.68. Last year our per head expenditure was just about $74.20, and it will be just as high this year. It is true, as the Prime Minister said, that money is badly needed; but is it not even more true that reduction in the Estimates is required, and that we must cut down the expenditures of this country?

I know that complaint against extravagance of governments by Oppositions is not a new note to be sounded in legislative halls, but the Minister of Finance has asked us to point to some expenditures to which we object, and as regards which we do not wish to take the responsibility of voting even one-sixth. I would like the representatives of business on the other side of the House, who, I trust, have some feeling of responsibility for the financial condition of the country, to do me the honour of following me in what I say and, if necessary, to turn over the Estimates and look at the figures to which I very respectfully invite their attention. On page 37 of the Estimates, I find a new drydock at Esquimalt, B.C., amount $300,000. Is that a necessary expenditure? I should like to enlist, if I could, on my side the Minister of Finance whose responsibility is very great in the premises at the present time. I would ask him whether he believes a new drydock at Esquimalt, at a cost of $300,000, is a proper expenditure in the present condition of the country's finances. I said $300,000; I was wrong; I should have said $1,300,000. It is just one million times worse than I thought it was. Then we find Toronto harbour improvements, amount $1,000,000. I have put upon the Order Paper a request for a return of the quantity of tonnage which comes into and goes out of every port in Canada, and I say that the tonnage that comes into and goes out of Toronto harbour cannot justify for one moment an expenditure of $1,000,000. The expenditure there is a great scheme of civic improvement to give a fine marine driveway or lake driveway for the people of Toronto. It is not in any degree an expenditure for the purpose of bettering the shipping of Canada. One million seven hundred thousand dollars was spent on this last year, and we are asked to spend $1,000,000 this year. I would ask hon. members who are interested in this question, which is, after all, the most important question that we have in Canada to-day—the bread and butter question, the question of expenditures of the Government—to look at page 44 of the Estimates where they will find it is proposed to spend $20,000 more on the National Gallery of Canada. No doubt it is a splendid thing to develop art and the artistic qualities and perceptions of our people; but, after all, the first thing that Canadians have to do at the present time is to cut down expenditures.

10 p.m.

I would ask hon. members to refer to page 61 of the Estimates where they will find this item: Civil aviation, $700,000. During the war, I understand that one-half of the British Air Force was manned by Canadians and that they made a grand name for themselves on the western front in air operations. With the advantage of a number of young men who have qualified themselves for work in the air, it should not have been necessary for the Government to propose to spend this amount on civil aviation, and it is a mistake to propose to spend this money because the question is not a pressing one. Then we have a Canadian air force at an amount of $825,000, and again I object to such an item. I cannot pretend to be exhaustive in this discussion; I am only picking out items here and there. I pick out this item on page 63: The Canadian Press, Ltd., $50,000. I have on previous occasions criticised this item, and it is a great mis-

take, for the sake of the Government and the press of this country, that one should be under any obligation to the other. The press of Canada should stand on its own feet, pay its own expenses, and look to no Government, no matter what political complexion that Government may have, for any aid. In days gone by, in the time of Queen Anne, the Grub street scribblers used to be retained by one party or the other in order to help themselves to remain in power or to get into power, I am utterly opposed to this subsidizing of the press by the Government.

I have tried to answer very briefly the challenge of the Prime Minister to indicate in the Estimates anything that fault could be found with. I cannot think, having the pleasure of the personal acquaintance of hon. gentlemen opposite, that they are altogether lost to a sense of responsibility; but may I say, in all seriousness, that the financial condition which confronts our country is of the most serious nature, and economy must be not only preached, but practised.

Mr. GUTHRIE: May I be permitted to say just one word in reference to a statement made a short time ago by the hon. member for Russell (Mr. Murphy), regarding the apparent increase in the number of employees in the Department of Militia and Defence? When the Estimates were tabled about a month ago, there was some comment in the press and in the corridors of this House, because there was a large apparent increase in the number of officials in the department. But if hon. members had read the Estimates as prepared on page 8, they would have received notice, by means of an asterisk, that the votes now submitted, and the votes previously submitted for the same purpose, differ in this respect, that in former years during the war, those who held many of the positions now tabulated under the Militia Department, were paid, not out of the funds of the Militia Department, but out of the War Vote and the Demobilization Vote which were granted from year to year. As a matter of fact, there has been, during the past year, a tremendous decrease in the employment of the Militia Department. It might well be expected that since the end of the war, employment in that department would rapidly decrease, and such being the case, a short table of figures shows the employment in that department during the war. I give these figures now to correct any misapprehension that may have arisen on the part of hon. members who hastily read the Estimates as printed.

The total number of civilian employees, temporary and permanent, at Ottawa, and in the various military districts throughout Canada for the war years, was as follows:

1914	558
1915	1,231
1916	2,875
1917	4,092
1918	5,201
1919	8,105
1920	5,900

At the present date, there are 1,386 both at headquarters and throughout the eleven military districts of Canada. When I assumed office in this department a little over a year ago, there were approximately 5,900 employees. To-day at Ottawa and throughout the districts, there is a total of 1,386. In Ottawa we have still temporary employees to the number of 805. We propose, through the Civil Service Commission, to have a list for some years to come of permanent employees to the number of 339, not 441, as printed in the Estimates. This arises for this reason: Many of these positions, which have arisen only since the war, will have to become permanent for a number of years yet to come. We shall have to maintain a staff in our record office of approximately 74 additional permanent clerks; in our separation allowance and assigned pay branch, of 50 additional permanent clerks; in the central registry, of 43 additional permanent clerks, and in other branches, of 92 additional permanent clerks. Just how long the services of these permanent clerks will be necessary one cannot more than surmise, but I should fancy for a few years, perhaps five, or in extreme cases, seven or eight years. These clerks have not been employed this year for the first time; they have been carried throughout the war. We have reduced the number now to what we believe is a minimum number for future years; but for the first time we propose to pay those clerks this year out of Militia Department vote while, during former war years, they were paid directly out of War Appropriation and Demobilization votes. The Demobilization vote this year has been reduced to some $6,000,000 or $7,000,000; last year the House will remember that it was $38,000,000. I think the explanation which I have now given will be satisfactory to the committee. I merely wanted to demonstrate that there has been no increase, but a tremendous decrease; in fact, at the present moment in the city of

Ottawa, we have only 805 temporary employees; we propose to have 399, which will make a total of 1,204, and our total in the districts outside of Ottawa will be 184 temporary employees, making a total of 1,386, which we have to-day as against the total of 5,200 which we had fourteen months ago.

Mr. FIELDING: Mr. Chairman, would you be good enough to either read the resolution, or permit the clerk to do it, or kindly send it to me to read—whichever you prefer.

Resolution read by the Chairman.

Mr. FIELDING: That is the whole resolution; there is nothing more? Very well, I want to call the attention of the committee—although I do not wish to be at all technical—to the ruling given. The rule laid down by the Deputy Speaker, Sir, before you took the Chair, was that this resolution should be accompanied by a schedule. The part of the rule to which I have reference reads as follows:

The motion by which a grant on account is proposed follows the customary form.

In this case there is no customary form so I will waive that.

The motion states the total sum required; and the various amounts needed for each department, which compose that sum, are stated in a schedule appended to the resolution.

There is no schedule appended to the resolution and it is for you to consider, Sir, whether you can proceed to deal with it when it is not in conformity with the ruling of the Deputy Speaker.

The CHAIRMAN (Mr. Steele): The Deputy Speaker, as I understood him, did not rule that the schedule must be attached to the resolution, but he read an extract from May which said that was customary in England. It has never been the custom in Canada to annex a schedule to the resolution for votes on account and it is considered here that the printed Estimates distributed to members are sufficient for the purpose of adopting such votes on account. I would therefore consider that we can quite properly proceed with the resolution as it is before the committee.

Mr. FIELDING: I would like you to permit me, Mr. Chairman, and I bow to your ruling, to say that the ruling of the Deputy Speaker was in the words of May. He read the words from May and upon that he based his decision.

Mr. LAPOINTE: I suppose we have a right to ask questions in regard to any item in the Estimates? There is an item, number 325, asking for a vote of $80,442, to provide for salaries and contingencies for a purchasing commission. If I remember well, a Bill was introduced two years ago to create a purchasing commission but the Government had to withdraw it owing to the opposition it evoked, especially from their own supplies. Last session the Bill was again introduced for the purpose of creating a purchasing commission. Once more strong opposition to that Bill was expressed on both sides and the measure was not pressed to a vote. However we all read in the press, some time after the session was through, that an Order in Council had been passed creating such a commission. I now desire to know if the vote which is covered by this item is to pay the expenses of that purchasing commission created by Order in Council, and I would like to have all the details and particulars surrounding the creation of that body.

Mr. DOHERTY: It is quite true that there was a Bill before the House last year looking to the creation of a statutory purchasing commission with authority conferred upon it to do certain things in virtue of the provisions of that measure. However the proposed Bill did not pass and did not become law. Nevertheless, last session Parliament voted money to provide for the expenses of a purchasing commission to be constituted by the Government. That purchasing commission was constituted by Order in Council, but the Order in Council did not purport to confer upon the commission so named any qualities, functions, or powers special to itself as a distinct and independent body. It was a commission appointed by the Governor in Council —who had the general responsibility for the supervision and direction of the purchasing to be done by the different departments—to exercise, under the authority of the Governor in Council, powers of supervision and direction. For a commission of that kind money was voted at the last session of Parliament and the present item, as I understand it, is to provide for the expenses of a commission of that nature—a body quite distinct from what had been proposed to be created under statutory authority with independent powers of its own.

Mr. LAPOINTE: Then this commission does not exist under any statutory authority?

Mr. DOHERTY: There is no specific statute creating that body but, as I have endeavoured to point out, the Government has the responsibility for all the purchasing that is done. Having that responsibility it has the power to direct and the power to supervise, and it has constituted the body which I have just mentioned to exercise these powers of supervision and direction under the authority of the Governor in Council.

Mr. LAPOINTE: But the will of Parliament—as expressed last year and in the preceding year by members on both sides of the House—was that the purchasing ought to be done as formerly for every department. I would like to know from the minister what is the difference between this purchasing commission, appointed by Order in Council against the will of Parliament, and the commission that it was proposed to create under the Bill that was withdrawn last year?

Mr. DOHERTY: The hon. gentleman talks about a commission being appointed against the will of Parliament. He completely ignores what I have twice stated, and what he will find to be the fact if he refers to the Estimates of last year and to the Hansard reports of the discussion on the item which provided for the expenses of a purchasing commission. That item was adopted by Parliament after it was quite clear that the Bill was not being proceeded with. It was voted after an explanation which—as nearly as one can affirm when speaking from memory—was identical with the explanation I have given now. It was not a vote to provide for a statutory commission, because there had been no statute, but it was explained to the House what was sought to be done.

Mr. LAPOINTE: What I am anxious to know is the difference between the functions and the work of this commission and the one whose appointment Parliament refused to sanction?

Mr. DOHERTY: The difference is in the powers and authority to be exercised. The commission which it was proposed to create by statute was one upon which Parliament—if the statute had been passed—would have conferred directly the power of doing the purchasing, to be exercised independently of authority from the Government; whereas the body that is now constituted is delegated by the Governor in Council to carry out its duties of supervising and directing the purchasing, and has no independent authority derived from Parliament.

Mr. ARCHAMBAULT: Who are the present members of the purchasing commission?

Mr. DOHERTY: The commission as at present constituted, is composed of the Minister of Interior, Mr. Howard, and Colonel Affleck.

Mr. ARCHAMBAULT: Who is the Minister of Interior?

Mr. DOHERTY: Sir James Lougheed.

Mr. McMASTER: Would it not have been better, Mr. Chairman, when Parliament had expressed itself so emphatically against the formation of one sort of body—I hope the minister will not be impatient with me because I am always very good natured, respectful and polite towards him—

Mr. BUTTS: Do not lay it on too thick now.

Mr. McMASTER: I will endeavour to be nothing less than courteous and polite to the Minister of Justice, and I hope that equal courtesy and politeness will be shown by hon. members opposite. The point I wish to make is this: We had a debate upon the purchasing commission last year, and I think the session before, and we all remember the eloquent and businesslike speech made by the member for Lanark (Mr. Stewart) upon the subject. Now the Minister of Justice says this purchasing commission is, in some way or another, different from the purchasing commission which it was proposed to create by the Bill of last session, and if I mistake not by the Bill of the session before. Well, as I understand it, a purchasing commission must of necessity be a commission having to do with purchasing or buying, whether created by a Bill or by an Order in Council. The question I would like to put to the minister with all respect is this: Would it not have been well when Parliament declined to authorize it not to have endeavoured to introduce this purchasing commission—even though it differs somewhat from its predecessor—through a side door by way of Order in Council rather than through the front door by way of a Bill in this House?

Mr. DOHERTY: That must be done by a Bill, but Parliament having intimated that it did not desire the appointment of this statutory commission, the idea was aban-

doned. Parliament then said by its vote: We do authorize you to create a commission acting under the authority of the Governor in Council, and we are so satisfied you should do it that we vote you some $80,000 for the purpose. Could there be any clearer expression of the will of Parliament? They are two perfectly different things, Parliament realized that, and consequently while Parliament did not want a statutory commission, it did vote to the Government the money to provide this supervisory body to assist it in the performance of the duty that lies upon it to see that the purchasing is done to the best advantage, subject of course to any statutory rules there may be with regard to it which we have not sought to interfere with.

Mr. McMASTER: Would the minister explain the modus operandi followed by this new and alleged unobjectionable purchasing commission?

Mr. DOHERTY: I am not in a position to give the details of their operations, but in substance their functions are supervisory, if I may so express it, and advisory to the different bodies connected with each of the departments. I may say, as being that branch of it which comes most under my cognizance, that the purchasing in my own department proceeds in this way. The officers, say, in charge of the penitentiaries make requisitions for what they require, and those requisitions go in the first instance to the superintendent of the penitentiary. If he approves then they go to the purchasing agent of the Department of Justice.

Mr. McMASTER: The requisitions are made out by whom?

Mr. DOHERTY: By the warden of the penitentiary. He requires certain things, and he forwards his requisitions to the superintendent. Each requisition is sent to him for his approval or criticism. From him it goes to the purchasing agent, who also goes over it and—

Mr. McMASTER: Is that purchasing agent an officer of the commission or of the department?

Mr. DOHERTY: He is an officer of the Department of Justice. If my memory serves me right, there is a distinction in amount, and where the amount involved is under $500 the requisition goes to the deputy minister, and if he approves, it is returned to the superintendent. It is then submitted by the purchasing agent to the supervision of this purchasing commission, and the calling for tenders and so forth is done under and by the advice of that commission. When the tenders come in they are opened by one or the other purchasing agents of the department or the commission, but both are present or are represented. That, so far as I understand it is the modus operandi.

Mr. McMASTER: As so many shifts are made are not the papers likely to be lost?

Mr. DOHERTY: We are not anxious about the papers getting lost, but we are anxious to provide every possible check to see that we have our purchasing made with as close an eye to the public interest as is possible. If the hon. gentleman would reflect for a moment I think he would see the utility of having the co-operation of a body which comes into contact with all the purchasing of all the departments and with the individual officers of those departments. By this means you put at the service of all departments the united knowledge of all the transactions and you get the whole experience derived from the purchasing for all of the departments put at the service of each of them. Surely that is a very substantial advantage; at least it seems so to the Government. When Parliament authorized the Government to provide that additional protection for the public purse the Government felt it was doing nothing but its duty in providing it.

Mr. McMASTER: As far as I have followed the minister I understand the modus operandi to be this. For instance, the warden of the penitentiary wants, say, twenty beds. He writes out his requisition, which would amount to less than $500 I presume. Then he submits that first of all to the superintendent of the penitentiary; the superintendent sends the requisition along to the department's purchasing agent, and as it is under $500 it goes to the deputy minister, and is finally returned to the superintendent. Am I right?

Mr. DOHERTY: It is returned to him for the purpose of reaching the commission. That is the machinery.

Mr. McMASTER: Then does it go to the purchasing commission?

Mr. DOHERTY: I am not in a position to say whether the purchasing agent carries the document there or not, but it gets to the purchasing commission. The purchasing agent proceeds then under the direction of and with the cooperation of the purchasing commission. Let me point

cut that perhaps for our purposes I have begun too far back. There are two substantial things to be decided; in the first place, should these articles be bought; in the second place, if they are to be bought, what is the most advantageous way of buying them.

Mr. LEMIEUX: It seems to me, Mr. Chairman, that you have created a body which would not be needed at all if the departments were administered as they should be with honesty and efficiency. I do not see why we should spend $90,000 a year to create an outside body from the various departments to control those departments. I have had some experience in the administration of public affairs as the head of a large spending department, and I know it was not necessary to have an outside body to judge whether or not the expenditure proposed in that department was needed. In those days they proceeded in this way. Suppose in the Post Office Department paper or ink or stamping machines or letter boxes were required, these were looked after by the officer in the department itself in charge of equipment. The requisition was made by that officer to the deputy minister, and the deputy minister presented it to the minister. If relatively a small amount not over $5,000, it was not necessary that the minister should bring the requisition before his colleagues in council; if over that amount he would have to get an Order in Council. It is the same in all departments. In the Public Works Department, for instance, you cannot go over that amount of $5,000 unless you get special authority in the Estimates or from Council.

Mr. JACOBS: Except in the Marine Department.

Mr. LEMIEUX: Except in emergency cases, and then we know how the Audit Act provides: So I do not see the reason why the Government when it had a number of officers trained in the service since confederation, should consider it necessary to spend this large sum of $90,000 on that outside body particularly when the House on two occasions declined to permit the creation of such a body. Even on the other side of the House I remember hon. gentlemen objected very strenuously to its creation. In spite of that the Government, after being refused that authority last session, created a purchasing commission. Now during the period of the war as expenditure was due, when there was really an emergency and you had no time to consider very much the prices, for time was the essence of all the contracts, I am ready to admit that under those conditions it was a good thing to have such a commission. I have already said that, as to the personnel of that commission during the war, certainly I found no fault, but the war being over, and departments having resumed their natural functions, the various departments came within the normal conditions, as we all did, and it was the duty of the Government to do away with any such expenditure. Such was the desire of Parliament, because on two occasions the then President of the Privy Council was very insistent that this vote should carry, and that this authority be given to this new body. Parliament refused. The members on this side of the House fought as strenuously as we did those on the other side of the House. I say, then, this lack of confidence is in their own followers, but I would place the lack of confidence above the followers. It is a lack of confidence in the authority of Parliament that has been shown in the present instance by the Government, and I have no hesitation in proposing to do away with that expenditure. I would, therefore, move that that item be struck out.

The CHAIRMAN (Mr. Steele): I would like to point out that a motion to strike out would not be in order.

Mr. BELAND: For what reason? The Deputy Speaker has ruled, quoting May, that a sheet and schedule should be annexed to the resolution, specifying every amount and each amount from each department. That would carry with it permission for the committee to discuss any of these special items mentioned in the list that should be annexed to the resolution, and if we grant to the committee the right of discussing each item included in the list that should be annexed, then it goes without argument that we have the right equally to move for a reduction, of the striking out, of such an item in that list. I think that my hon. friend the member for Maisonneuve, has a perfect right, and that it is in keeping with the ruling of the Deputy Speaker to move that one-sixth of the amount in the main Estimates for the purchasing commission should be struck out. I would like to have your ruling upon that.

The CHAIRMAN: A motion of that nature is purely a negative motion which,

under the rules of the House, is never in order.

Mr. LAPOINTE: I would like to discuss the point of order before you give a ruling. I quite understand that if we were moving to strike out the whole resolution it would be a purely negative motion, but that is not what my hon. friend for Maisonneuve is doing. The resolution is general. It asks to us to vote $70,000,000 en bloc, and my hon. friend for Maisonneuve asks that out of this amount of $70,000,000 an amount of $80,000 be struck out. Surely this is not a motion to negative the whole resolution, and the chairman specifically stated in his ruling that we would have to move to strike out any of the items forming the whole resolution.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: I think the hon. gentleman is not quite right as to what is before the committee. In order to get a clear appreciation of it, let us understand what the real practice is, what we are talking about, what we are voting on and what flows from that. In the first instance, we do not, by this vote, either challenge, approve or endorse a single item in the Estimates. The whole of them are left open absolutely. I will take what has been the practice of this House. At page 5595 of the Hansard of 1903 the then Finance Minister said:

> I propose that the House give us a vote of credit for one-fifth of the total sum. The effect of this will be to give us a Supply for about two months. All the matters that can be discussed in connection with these votes will, of course, still remain before the House, and we will have to take these up item by item for the purpose of obtaining the remaining four-fifths of the Estimates. So that the course we now propose does not in any way restrict the fullest and freest discussion. It simply facilitates the granting of a partial supply which will be very much needed before the end of the present month.

And the then leader of the Opposition said:

> The only question which suggests itself to me is as to the effect of the proposed resolution upon items which there might be a motion to strike out, or upon items which eventually might be dropped.

That is the furthest the hon. gentleman ever went. The Minister of Finance said:

> I admit that would be a proper criticism; and if any particular item were indicated as likely to be the subject of debate I would strike it out of the present motion, but if such a motion should be presented later it would apply to the four-fifths.

Mr. CAHILL: That is all based on understanding.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: To this effect: that every item is open to the fullest discussion.

Mr. JACOBS: What are we here for?

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: To enable business to be carried on; to try to get money to continue to do business here. There has been ten times more discussion this year than there has ever been before.

Mr. LEMIEUX: Will my hon. friend allow me to say that if he were debating this point with the decision of the Chairman in his mind he would probably alter his judgment. What I am asking now of this committee is that a certain specified amount be omitted from the schedule which is supposed to be annexed to the motion which was made by my hon. friend a moment ago. Suppose that my motion is ruled out, my hon. friend will realize that one-sixth of an item which I want completely omitted will be voted upon. Is that logical? I am against this whole amount which gives life to a commission and a body, the existence of which was refused on two previous occasions by this Parliament, and if we now vote one-sixth of the $80,000 the principle is admitted, and later on it will be absolutely illogical for me to comment and propose its omission. But my friend, as I submit with all due courtesy, has not lived up to the decision of the Chair. The Chairman quoted from May at page 479 as follows:

> The motion by which a grant on account is proposed follows the customary form. The motion states the total sum required; and the various amounts needed for each department, which compose that sum, are stated in a schedule appended to the resolution. The question proposed thereon from the Chair follows the terms of the resolution, and places the total sum, the aggregate grant, before the committee for its decision; and upon that question amendments can be moved for the reduction of the whole grant, or for the reduction or omission of the items whereof the grant is composed.

I claim, Mr. Chairman, with all due deference to my hon. friend, that when I proposed to have this item 325 omitted from the schedule, I am simply living up to the decision which was rendered by my hon. friend the Chairman of the committee, because if I vote one-sixth now, without being allowed the privilege, which under ordinary circumstances I could not be denied, it is no use discussing it in any shape or form at any later date.

Mr. EDWARDS: If the hon. member votes one-sixth interim Supply, does he say that he is precluded, if that vote carries,

from moving to strike out the whole of this item subsequently.

Mr. LEMIEUX: When one-sixth is voted, yes.

Mr. EDWARDS: It has been done from time immemorial. I have noticed session after session, when I was on the Opposition side, that the interim Supply was voted and whole items were subsequently cut out or reduced. I can refer to items in regard to which that was done.

Mr. LEMIEUX: When this one-sixth is voted, if it is voted, without giving opportunity to move an amendment, if one-sixth is voted on this particular item, there will be a Bill based on the resolution. It will be sanctioned by His Excellency the Governor General, it will be the law of the land, and no power on earth can do away with that one-sixth. It will be voted, and it can be spent at the sweet will of the Government. I object, not to the whole grant—because we recognize His Majesty's Government must be carried on—but I object to that particular item; so did my hon. friend from Simcoe (Mr. Currie). I am not sure if my hon. friend did not object to that item at the previous session. My hon. friend from Brantford (Mr. Cockshutt) objected to it. Several of the hon. gentlemen on the other side objected to it. That is not factious opposition.

Mr. EDWARDS: Absolutely.

Mr. LEMIEUX: No.

Mr. EDWARDS: My hon. friend takes objection—

Mr. LEMIEUX: To one item.

Mr. EDWARDS: And the hon. gentleman behind him takes exception to another item, and so each one goes ahead and absolutely nullifies the vote we propose to put through, keeping the thing going for a month, if necessary, in regard to this interim Supply—absolute obstruction, nothing else.

Mr. BUTTS: My hon. friend from Maisonneuve is a lawyer, I understand,—perhaps like myself, not very much of a lawyer. He knows, however, that old expression of the law that speaks about the omnipotence of Parliament.

An hon. MEMBER: Where is that?

Mr. BUTTS: In Blackstone. If we pass a vote to-night, what difference does it make whether we are right or wrong? Parliament is omnipotent.

[Mr. Edwards.]

The CHAIRMAN: If I may be allowed, it will, perhaps, be easy for me to meet the wishes of hon. gentlemen on both sides of the House by slightly changing the wording of the amendment as proposed. I understand, before I entered the chamber, that an amendment was moved by the hon. member for Maisonneuve (Mr. Lemieux) to strike out item 325 from the schedule to the Bill. Strickly speaking, as was pointed out by the hon. member who occupied the Chair, the amendment in that form would not be in order because you would be omitting $80,442.96 from the total vote, whereas I think the intention of the hon. member is to omit one-sixth of that amount. He certainly has a right to omit from the total amount, one-sixth of the amount of this item.

Mr. LEMIEUX: That is correct.

The CHAIRMAN: I would suggest that the amendment be made in this form:

That the total amount mentioned in the resolution be reduced by the sum of $13,407.16, being one-sixth, of the amount of item No. 325 for salaries and contingencies of the Purchasing commission and that said item be not included in the schedule to said resolution.

Mr. LEMIEUX: That meets my intention. I had not made the calculation, but I certainly said that I moved to reduce this item by one-sixth.

Mr. BELAND: The Chairman has figured this out accurately; I made it out myself that one-sixth amounted to $13,-407.16. I have to differ with the hon. member for Frontenac (Mr. Edwards), in his contention that, when these $13,000 odd is voted, if later, when the House is in Committee of Supply and item No. 325, amount $80,442.96, is under consideration, an hon. member should move to strike it out and the committee should support the amendment, the amount of $80,442.96 would be struck out of the public expenditure of this country. I will try to explain to my hon. friend how this may come about. It is intended now to get from the committee a vote equal to one-sixth of the total amount of the Estimates. This vote would cover about two months of the fiscal year which commenced on April 1. Let us suppose now that the session lasts until July, and further, that the item in question is brought down for the consideration of the committee some time in July. Is it not probable that the $13,407.16 that we would vote to-night, might be expended? What recourse will my hon. friend have to get this money back into the treasury, if, in accord-

ance with a Bill passed by this Parliament to-night, or to-morrow, or next week, the minister is permitted to expend the money? There is no recourse whatever. The $13,000 will be spent.

Mr. EDWARDS: My answer is, that in voting one-sixth of the total Supply, you are not separating each individual amount. If you were separating each individual amount in the one-sixth and applying the vote to each individual item, my hon. friend's contention would hold good. You are voting one-sixth of the total amount, and as I understand the ruling of the Chairman, that does not preclude any person from subsequently striking out any item in the Estimates in whole or in part.

Mr. STEVENS: This amount is largely for salaries of clerks and officials of this commission, so-called. Two weeks have already passed since the beginning of the fiscal year and there is no money to pay them for the two weeks. This institution is carrying on business. By this amendment, if it carries, we refuse Supply for amounts already in a sense expended, and so close this institution right up. When I say "already expended" I mean that services have been rendered to the country by these officials and nothing has been paid. So much for that part of the matter. I hesitate to delay the committee, but I am a member who is wholly in favour of this purchasing department, and I will give one or two simple illustrations of its value. I have not, under my hand, information that I had on a former occasion. Take, for instance, the question of purchasing of bedding. I understand some of my hon. friends say that they do not want a general discussion of this item, but in view of the opposition made to it, I have a right to express my views in support of it. I am opposed to the striking out of this item for the reasons already mentioned, and this additional reason, that this commission has given good service and has saved a good deal of money to the country, and that if the item were under proper consideration, we might have full information to that effect. Before the committee passes upon this item, we ought to have before us full information as to the value of the services of the commission. For those reasons I support the passing of this one-sixth vote to pay the expenses of the commission up to the present time and to continue it until the item is under consideration.

11 p.m.

Mr. LEMIEUX: My hon. friend says that he is in favour of this body called the purchasing commission. I respect his views; but unfortunately, he was in a minority, and the Government chose to ignore the will of Parliament expressed during two different sessions. My hon. friend says: "The poor officers of that body are awaiting their salaries." I have much sympathy for them, but the responsible party is the Government. Why did the Government, in spite of Parliament, in spite of the expression of opinion on both sides of the House, immediately after the session was over, ignore the will of Parliament and create that body? Parliament is supreme. The hon. member for Cape Breton South and Richmond (Mr. Butts), said a moment ago that Parliament was omnipotent. I do not like that expression, but let us say that it is the true expression. Parliament has not been omnipotent in the present instance; the will of Parliament has been disregarded.

Mr. BUTTS: The opposition was weak.

Mr. LEMIEUX: The Government assumed to itself the will of Parliament and created that body. I have much sympathy for the officers of the commission, who, as my hon. friend says, are awaiting their salaries, but the country is entitled to be respected. Members on both sides represent the electors of this country, we have been sent here to check the expenditures of the Government, and not a cent can be spent by this Government without its being voted by Parliament. Parliament has refused on two occasions to vote that amount, to create that body.

Mr. DOHERTY: A vote was passed last year.

Mr. LEMIEUX: But the vote was to meet a condition to be created by Parliament. An amount was put in the Estimates, but along with this amount a Bill was introduced, and that Bill was combatted by both sides of the House and was finally withdrawn. Yet as soon as Parliament prorogued and the members dispersed, the Government took upon itself to create that body, ignoring the will of this House.

Mr. DOHERTY: I am sure the hon. member would not want to mislead intentionally. Parliament voted that amount of money, after Parliament knew that no Act was going to be passed, for the purpose of providing for the totally different body which, I have pointed out, was explained at the

time and has been explained since. When the hon. gentleman persists and will persist in saying that this commission was created against the will of Parliament, he persists in absolutely confusing two totally different things, one thing which Parliament said it would not have, and another thing which Parliament said it was willing to provide for, one thing that took the absolute control out of the hands of the executive Government to put it into the hands of a body created by statute, and a totally different thing which, leaving the control and the responsibility in the hands of the executive Government, provided for their having suitable agents to aid in the carrying out of that business. Whatever may be right or may be wrong about the principle of the commission, when Parliament comes to deal with the other five-sixths, it will have that principle before it to deal with. What is it that the hon. members' amendment asks us to do? It asks us to say that these clerks and employees, who are engaged in a presently existing service, as regards which it is not anticipated that we may for some time reach the consideration of the item as a whole providing for that expenditure, and who will necessarily go on working in the interval, shall work for two months for nothing. Parliament will be in a position to decide upon the entire principle when we come to deal with the five-sixths. It does not commend itself to my judgment to suggest that, before we come to deal with the entire principle and to determine it, we should take off that two months' pay from those persons whose operations will go on in the meantime. Let us get down to common sense and realize what it is that is before us, however we may technically discuss this matter. One thing is beyond peradventure, that the worst that can happen in regard to anyone of these items is that two months expenditure could be made even though Parliament should ultimately determine not to carry on the operation at all. And when it is the case, as in this particular instance, that the worst thing that can happen is that two months' pay will go to officers who will have done two months' work—even if Parliament finally decided not to carry on this work for the future—I do sumbit to the common-sense judgment of the House that the right time to settle the principle is when you are dealing with the great and substantial vote, and when you can deal with it and settle it once and for all, and not endeavour to do so when it is merely a question of voting two months' pay for all these employees.

Mr. LEMIEUX: Surely my right hon. friend would not think that I would misrepresent the facts of the case.

Mr. DOHERTY: I did not say so.

Mr. LEMIEUX: I inferred that from the argument my right hon. friend advanced a moment ago.

Mr. DOHERTY: I think the hon. gentleman does misunderstand the facts of the case.

Mr. LEMIEUX: I do not misunderstand them and I am young enough to have a good memory. I tell my hon. friend that during the period of the war a commission was instituted by the Government with a view to the purchase of the various equipments that were necessary, and in order to review some of the war contracts. That was the commission presided over by Sir Hermisdas Laporte. After the commission had completed its work, and after the war was over, it made a report asking the Government to make it a permanent body, representing that it would be an excellent idea if there was a permanent purchasing commission. That idea was embodied in a Bill which was introduced two years ago by the then President of the Privy Council (Mr. Rowell). It was combatted with much vigor by gentlemen on both sides and the measure was withdrawn. Last year it was decided to re-introduce the Bill embodying the exact principles cited a moment ago by my hon. friend and, under the assumption that Parliament this time would not oppose the legislation, an amount was placed in the Estimates for the purpose of creating the organization. But Parliament—with a persistence that I can only admire—again made its opposition felt, and again members on both sides stood firm in their objections. I see my hon. friend from Dufferin (Mr. Best) shaking his head but he was one of those who continued to oppose the Bill—in fact there were many on the Government side who took that course. Have not the various ministers in the Government the necessary authority to control the expenditures in their departments, and have they not enough confidence in their own personal honesty to exercise that control? Why should they have such an external body as this to purchase the supplies needed by their departments and to supervise the acts of their employees? There is in every department the necessary machinery

to supervise the purchasing of supplies and the purchasing of equipment, and there is no need for such a body as this. Mr. Chairman, we cannot understand how the Minister of Justice can so explain this item, in view of the withdrawal of the Bill referred to, as to make it clear, in his own way, that it is a totally different body from the one contemplated last year and the year before. I see hon. gentlemen opposite me who expressed opposition to this proposal, and I trust their memory and their honour in this matter. Is not this item regarded as a way out of the impasse in which the former President of the Privy Council found himself after the experience of the last two sessions of Parliament? He could not succeed in passing the legislation because it was opposed as much by members on the Government side as by members on this side. And yet the Government now comes forward with this proposal. They have ignored and disregarded the opinion of Parliament, but they now come here and say "You must pass this item because we have decided by Order-in-Council to create this body in spite of your opposition." I have more regard for the authority of Parliament than to expect that such a proposition will be successful. I say that Parliament is the supreme master in this question, and we have the right to say now if we approve of the principle involved. I say further that if we now vote one-sixth of the Estimate we are committed to the principle which Parliament last year, and the year before, opposed. Therefore, let us reduce this item by one-sixth, and Parliament will then have expressed its opinion as to the necessity of having such an external body foisted on the country when the country is simply hungry for economy and still more economy. My right hon. friend may think I am lacking in sincerity, but I hope not, because from what is happening outside and from what news he may receive—not only from Canada but from Great Britain—he must realize that this great country of ours is in very serious difficulties at this very moment. Why, Mr. Chairman, is it not a time not only to speak of economy but to practise it? There is a payment due and overdue in London—

Hon. Mr. REID: Oh, no.

Mr. LEMIEUX: Yes, that payment was not contingent on the arbitration in connection with the Grand Trunk. I remember well the legislation passed by Parliament, and this payment of the coupons of the Grand Trunk was not contingent on the arbitration now going on. Yet the shareholders of that company are denied their payments—a payment guaranteed by the Dominion of Canada. People say that there is no money in the Exchequer to meet the obligation of Canada. I do not believe that but at all events, be that as it may, in view of that circumstance, and in view of many others, is it not time for us not only to speak of economy but to practise it? The Minister of Finance should not only practise economy in the ordinary sense of the term but he should adopt a policy of cheese-paring. We are living in a fool's paradise. We have been so accustomed to speak of millions, and even billions, during the last few years that we have lost all sense of proportion, and the country is facing a very heavy bill of taxation. If you do not cut down the expenditure when it is useless expenditure, as in the present instance, how can you ask the people of this country to tax themselves to the limit as they are doing? They have taxed themselves last year and they are ready to do it again provided there is adequate justification. But who is there in the Government who is practising economy, instead of merely preaching it? Look at the volume of the Estimates with which Parliament is now called upon to deal—the figures are simply appalling. We are spending our time looking at each other and deprecating the huge financial commitments of the country and yet no one applies the pruning knife. Why not begin by applying the pruning knife to this very unnecessary appendage to the various departments of the Government?

Mr. NICHOLSON (Algoma): I would like to concur in the idea that it is impossible for the committee, with the information at present available to discuss such items as this with intelligence. If we did so in regard to this item we would necessarily have the right to discuss every other item in the Estimates in the same way. The question has been raised here as to whether we commit ourselves to the whole of the items in the Estimates by simply passing one-sixth. Hon. members opposite have said that we cannot consistently move to reduce a single item if we pass this one-sixth to-night. But I would remind hon. gentlemen that on June 30, last, as will be seen by a reference to page 4549 of last year's Hansard, the leader of the Opposition, when the Committee of Supply were considering an item of $6,500,000 for the Permanent Force in the Estimate of the Department

of Militia, moved to reduce the item by $1,000,000. Was he within his rights in doing so or was he not? Without presuming to give an opinion as to what the parliamentary practice is, I submit that common-sense would suggest that the hon. gentleman was within his rights and yet interim Supply had previously been voted on this item as well as on all other items. I think, if my memory serves me right, without referring to the records, the leader of the Opposition, subsequent to that date last year, voted to reduce several other items in the Estimates. I presume he will do the same this year; it will be his right to do so. There are items in the Estimates which hon. members may wish to scrutinize, and even to criticise, and they can only do that when the minister in charge of the department, with his officials, is here to explain why the vote is being asked and what work is being accomplished in connection with the expenditures for which authority is sought. Again I say that if the contention is sound that we cannot reduce or change any item because of voting this interim Supply of one-sixth, then the committee might just as well vote the one-sixth and go home, because there is no use discussing the Estimates in any shape or form.

Mr. BELAND: I am absolutely unable to see the point that is being made by the hon. gentleman. We never contended that we could not move later on to strike out five-sixths of the total amount. Of course, we can do it because five-sixths have not been voted. But our contention is that once you have voted one-sixth, and it is expended, surely my hon. friend will not pretend that you can strike it out. That is the point we are making.

Mr. CURRIE: That is not the point.

Mr. BELAND: My hon. friend says that it is possible for you later to move that one-sixth or a certain amount or any portion of an item may be stricken out; we know that very well. In the case my hon. friend has quoted of the leader of the Opposition last year moving that an item of, I think he said, $6,000,000 should be reduced by $1,000,000 we have an example that it can be done. There is no objection to that, and we have never said anything to the contrary. He could have moved that the $6,000,000 be reduced by $5,000,000 for that matter, because the $5,000,000 had not been voted; but as to the sixth million, he could not have moved to reduce or strike it out because probably it had been expended by that time. My hon. friend sees the point?

[Mr. Nicholson.]

Mr. DOHERTY: It seems to me quite clear from the line that is now being adopted, and while I have respect for the sincerity of hon. gentlemen, from what seems to me to be quite manifest as the end if not sought to be obtained, the end that will be reached by this method of dealing with a motion for interim Supply, namely, to prevent us dealing with this motion within the time in which it is required. If hon. gentlemen persist in ignoring what is clear I think beyond the possibility of doubt, that every principle remains intact, even after we have voted this one-sixth, and every resolution and the principle underlying it is still open for discussion to everybody concerned—

Mr. ARCHAMBAULT: Will my hon. friend allow me a question? If we vote this one-sixth for instance for this purchasing commission, which is $13,000, will the Government have the right to spend that $13,000?

Mr. DOHERTY: Certainly there would be a right to spend that $13,000, which will involve this awful thing—

Mr. ARCHAMBAULT: Will he allow me another question?

Some hon. MEMBERS: Order.

Mr. DOHERTY: I do not propose to be cross-examined.

Mr. RINFRET: You cannot stand it.

Mr. ARCHAMBAULT: We are in committee.

Mr. DOHERTY: The hon. gentleman says I cannot stand it. I am a man of pretty equable temper and considerable patience—

Mr. JACOBS: Hear, hear.

Mr. DOHERTY: But I am in the face of opposition that can wear out even my patience when it becomes so perfectly manifest that we are having an attempt simply to defeat the purpose of this motion for interim Supply. The motion is valuable only on condition that it is promptly passed. The only thing that justifies it is that we are called upon to take immediate action, even at the risk of paying a few men's salaries for a couple of months where we might decide in the future to abolish their office. We are asked to take that risk. Why? Because the public business must be carried on, and because we have behind us

the experience of parliaments from time immemorial. Interim votes of this kind, without splitting them up and trying to cut down particular items, have been passed year after year, and it has been so conceded that hon. gentlemen have thought that it was necessarily a matter of common consent. Now, in the face of that I beg to move, Mr. Chairman, that the further consideration of this resolution be postponed.

Mr. PARENT: The old trick.

The CHAIRMAN: Mr. Doherty moves that the further consideration of the proposed resolution be now postponed. Is it the pleasure of the committee to adopt the motion?

Motion agreed to.

Mr. LAPOINTE: I understand that we are prevented asking any questions about advance Estimates?

The CHAIRMAN: The motion made by the Minister of Justice is not debatable under the new rule 17a, and therefore, it cannot be debated.

Mr. RINFRET: It is just a question of debate.

Mr. LAPOINTE: Is this fair treatment of Parliament?

Mr. RINFRET: It is gagging.

Mr. LEMIEUX: What becomes of my amendment?

The CHAIRMAN: When the resolution is again before the committee the amendment must be disposed of.

Mr. LAPOINTE: The Government will not gain anything by this harsh action.

Some hon. MEMBERS: Order, order.

Mr. RINFRET: The Tories are in.

Mr. ARCHAMBAULT: The Germans are here now.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: Mr. Chairman, may I be allowed to ask a question?

Some hon. MEMBERS: Order, order.

The CHAIRMAN: The hon. leader of the Opposition has made a request that he be allowed to ask a question of the Government. Strictly speaking he would not have the right to do so, as there is now no resolution under consideration, but I feel sure that the privilege will be granted to him by unanimous consent of the committee.

Some hon. MEMBERS: Carried.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: I would like to ask my right hon. friend if the Government has any obligation to meet these payments before the end of the present month?

Mr. DOHERTY: I am not in a position to say on what dates all of these payments come due but certainly there must be innumerable payments which will become due before the end of this month.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: Perhaps I could give some information which I know the hon member for Maisonneuve (Mr. Lemieux) would be glad to get. He says that we are ignoring our responsibilities in the English money market. We want to be able to discharge them. He has expressed great anxiety that Canada's fair name is suffering in England. I may tell him and the committee that as a matter of fact payments there will become due within two days, and this interim Supply is to enable those payments to be discharged.

Canals—Welland ship canal construction, $5,000,000; Trent canal—construction and betterments, $339,000.

Mr. ARCHAMBAULT: Will the minister tell us what construction has been done this year on the Welland ship canal?

Hon. Mr. REID: Four contractors have been working for the last two or three years.

Mr. ARCHAMBAULT: Were the contracts given by tender, and what were the amounts?

Hon. Mr. REID: The original contracts were given by tender, but shortly after the war broke out those contracts were cancelled. Last year the officials of the department did not think that it was in the public interest to call for tenders on account of the very high cost of labour and materials, and contracts were given on a cost plus basis, terminable at any time and not to extend longer than December 31, last. At that time we again extended the contract for 1921 on the same basis. When we decided to do that last January we believed it would be far better if we could let the work by public tender. Accordingly the officials of the department were instructed to prepare plans and call for tenders at the earliest possible date. Plans were ready for section five and three tenders were received last Thursday.

Mr. BELAND: Did the minister say there were five sections or four?

Hon. Mr. REID: No. There are nine sections altogether, but prior to the war ten-

ders were called for and contracts let for sections 1, 2, 3 and 5, which were cancelled later as I have stated, and the contractors were allowed to continue on a cost plus basis. We received tenders for section 5 last Thursday, and an Order in Council will be passed to-morrow or next day awarding the contract. The other three sections on which work is continuing, on the cost plus basis, will be let by tender within a very short time just as soon as the officers of the department can get the specifications ready.

Mr. ARCHAMBAULT: What are the names of the present contractors?

Mr. DOHERTY: If the hon. gentleman will pardon me for interrupting. It has been suggested to me that we had a fairly long session last night we should not unduly prolong the sitting this afternoon. However, before moving that the committee rise, I desire Mr. Chairman, to give the following notice:

That at the next sitting of the Committee of Supply I shall move that the further consideration of Resolution No. 218 as printed at page 49 of the Estimates for the current fiscal year and the further consideration of the resolution proposed this day for interim Supply, shall be the first order of business of the committee and shall not further be postponed.

Progress reported.

On motion of Right Hon. Mr. Doherty the House adjourned at 11.45 p.m.

INDEX

FIFTH SESSION — THIRTEENTH PARLIAMENT, 1921

Abbreviations.—1r., 2r., 3r.,=first, second, or third reading. Admn.=Administration. Amdt.=Amendment. Com.=Committee. Dept.=Department. Div.=Division. Govt.=Government. M.=Motion. Neg.=Negatived. Qu.=Question. Ref.=Reference. Rep.=Report. Res.=Resolution. Sec.=Section.

Abbatoirs. *See* Health of Animals; Live stock

Abitibi District, 3075
Grievances of settlers, 2510

Accounts. *See* Finance; Public Accounts

Accredited Herd. *See* Health of Animals

Adams, Capt. Henry C., and Canadian Navy Enquiry, 901; qu. 1237

Address in reply to Governor General's Speech, 5, 40, 66, 110, 154, 188, 230, 244, 262, 313, 351, 397, 448, 479. Amdt. to Amdt. (Mr. Campbell), adjournment, neg.; Amdt. (Mr. Mackenzie King) non-confidence, neg. Address agreed to, 561

Ad Hoc Judge, 1084. *See also* Judges Act Amdt.

Adjournment. *See* House of Commons

Administration of Justice. *See* Justice

Admiralty Courts. *See* Vice Admiralty

Adulteration of Food Act Amdt.
Administration, 3129
Maple Products, 888. *See also* that title

Advisory Council of Scientic Research. *See* Research

Aeronautics, etc. *See* Air

Aeroplanes. *See* Air

Age of Consent. *See* Criminal Code Amdt.

Age Limit. *See* Prisons

Agenda. *See* Prime Ministers' Conference

Agrarian Party. *See* Progressive Party

Agricultural Colleges, 1034

Agricultural Gazette, 1074

Agricultural Implements, 91, 492, 417, 583, 666, 3179, 3372, 3394, 3492-6, 3508, 3631
United Grain Growers, and, 418-9

Agricultural Instruction, 1029

Agricultural Machinery (Standardization of Parts) 584; Res. (Mr. McCoig) 666; Amdt. (Mr. Henders) 670

Agricultural Shows, grants to,
M. (Mr. Archambault) 1238; withdrawn, 1247

Agricultural Societies, 1074. *See also* Exhibitions

Agriculture. *See also* Immigration; Soldier Settlement; Unemployment
Agriculture Act in Great Britain, 3186
Aids to, 1245
Appropriations limited, 1029
Butter. *See* Dairying Industry
Cold Storage warehouses, 1038
Conservation Commission, 3964
Cow-testing associations, 1036
Deputy Minister, salary, 950
Dairying. *See* that title
Decline of in Great Britain, 3186, 3237
Department
Civil Service appointments, 1045
County fairs, assistance to, 1123
Deputy Minister, salary, 950
Estimates, 917, 1024, 1074, 1116, 4506-13
Destructive insect and Pest Act, 4512. *See also* that title
District Representatives, 1033-4
Duff, the late Hon. James, work of, 1033
Eggs. *See* that title
Experimental Farms, 4512. *See also* that title
Fruit inspection, 1041. *See also* Fruit
Grasshopper plague, qu. 838, 1027
Health of Animals. *See* that title
International Institute of, 1116
Land suitable for, 845, 872
Live stock. *See* that title

Agriculture.—*Con.*
National Dairy Council, 1126
Potato-growing and diseases, 1032-3, 3224, 3442-73, 3525
Production, 135-6, 872
Products, decline in value, 3487
Publications, 1073
Seed and Feed Control, 1125, 4513
Seed fairs, 1126
Seed Grain. *See* that title
United States, in, 3188
Wright County, condition in, 922

Air Board, estimates, 3776

Air Force,
Camp Borden, qu. 1820, 3777
Preference in Civil Service appointments, 4483

Air Service, 3776
Forest patrol, 4495
Topographic Survey of Northern Canada, 856

Alaska boundary, 4494

Alberta
Coal, price at mine, 1251
Coal production. *See* Fuel Supply Problem, Natural Resources
Highways, grants, qu. 821
Industrial Research Commission, 1267
Penitentiary. *See* Penitentiaries
Prohibition plebiscite, 3901, 4374-88
Supreme Court, qu. 576

Alcohol. *See also* Customs and Excise; Inland Revenue; Prohibition; Proprietary; Special War Revenue
Certificate of provincial analyst, 3786
Customs duty, 3705
Excise duty, 2725-6
For medicinal purposes, 3729, 3957

Alderson, Mr. George B.
Claim of for compensation, 924, 1052, 2270-4, 4508. *See also* Health of Animals

Algernon Rock pier, qu. 1383

Alice Arm, wharf, 3976

Aliens. *See also* Canadian Nationals; Dominion Elections; Immigration; Naturalization;
Franchise, and, 3103
Naturaliation, 2441
Wives of British Subjects. *See* Dominion Election Act Amdt. Bill

All Night Sitting. *See* House of Commons

All Saints' Day. *See* Civil Service Holidays

Alpine Club, 4494

Alward, Mr., and Transcontinental, 1657

Ambassador at Washington, 185, 357, 525, qu. 671, 2400-23, 3635. *See also* Canadian Representation in the United States; Prime Ministers' Conference
Delay in appointment, 786
Fordney Bill, 512. *See also* United States

Amendments to Supply. *See* Supply

American Consuls. *See* Customs and Excise Bill; Trade; Trade Commissioners

American Markets. *See* Customs and Excise Dept. Bill; Trade; United States

Amery, Col. L. S., 1532

Ames, Sir Herbert B. (St. Antoine)
Resignation
Enquiry as to date, 1069
Received, 1001
Reported, 464, 469, 478, qu. 577
See also Representation

Amherst drill hall, 2739

Amqui Station, 382, 1176, 1233

Anderson, Mr. R. K. (Halton)
Address in reply to Governor General's Speech, 235. Demand that Government resign—amendment introduces no new issue, 235; congratulations to mover and seconder—tributes to former Prime Ministers—speech of Leader of Opposition—Unemployment insurance—old age pensions—League of Nations; tariff, 238; Alliance with Agrarian party; leader of Agrarians an out-and-out free trader—by-election in Peterborough—principles of Liberalism, 239; invitation to Liberal Unionists to cross floor—mandate of Government—immediate election would delay redistribution; increased representation, 240; seceders should have consulted their electors—Laurier administration and the tariff, 241; Daniel Webster and the clamourers, 242
Budget, 3348. Canada's debt and annual growth of expenditures, 3348; increase in trade, 3349; increase in population, 3349; Canada's present and future growth and progress, 3351; moderate protection necessary, 3351; reciprocity with United States, 3353; home market and transportation, 3354; fruit growing, 3354; Opposition and protection, 3355; Farmers' Party platform, 3356;

Anderson, Mr. R. K.—*Con.*
Budget—*Con.*
Grain Growers' Grain Company, 3357, 3360; Winnipeg strike, 3359; Depopulation of rural sections and increased price of commodities, 3361
Feeding Stuffs Act, qu. 965
Inspection districts, qu. 1624
Toronto-Guelph-Sarnia highway, etc., qu. 4252

Andrews, Mr. George W. (Centre Winnipeg)
Address in reply to Governor General's Speech, 469. Congratulations to Prime Minister; free trade and protection—the "yellow peril", 471—markets of the world, 472; exports; Farmers' Platform; abuse of tariff no argument against protection, 473; free trade in England; armaments do not prevent war; Assembly of the League of Nations—the amendment; redistribution; election, 474
Canadian National Railways
Special Committee reference to, M. (Mr. Meighen), 1803
Housing, 1152
Oleomargarine Act Amdt., 3881
Prime Ministers' Conference, 2678
Proportional representation, 1537

Anglo-Japanese Alliance, 2637-9, 2357-60

Animal Contagious Diseases Act
Administration, 1048
Powers under, 4508
See also Health of Animals

Animal Contagious Diseases Act Amdt. Bill
Res. 2031; 1r., 2942; 2r., com., 3r., 3011

Animals, Cruelty to. *See* Criminal Code Amdt.

Annapolis County
Fruit growing in, 1046
Inspectors, 1041

Annapolis public building, 2741

Annexation. *See* United States

Annual Drill. *See* Militia

Annuities Branch, 4524

Anodynes, elixirs, etc., duty on, 3709

Anse Aux Gascons wharf, 3991

Anse St. Jean, wharf, 4536

Antelope in Western Canada, qu. 1134

Anticosti Island, squatters on, 1514

Antigonish Public Works office, 2818

Appendices
Canadian National Railways
Employees' pay, qu. 1737, 1815

Apples. *See also* Fruit
Export to Great Britain, 1501, qu. 1714
Markets for, 1469
Tariff on, 126

Appropriation Acts
1. Bill No. 42 (for 1921-2, for $71,499,703.70). Res. 1674; 2001; 1r., 2045; 2r., com., 2100; 3r., 2116
2. Bill No. 222 (for 1920-1, for $14,681,810.-14; and for 1921-22, $371,044,471.26). Res., 1r., 2r., com., 3r., 4577

Arbitration. *See* Grand Trunk

Arbitrations and Awards, Railways, 3015

Arbitrators, Judges as. *See* Judges Act Amdt.

Archambault, Mr. Joseph (Chambly and Verchères)
Address in reply to Governor General's Speech, 244. Grand Trunk employees' pensions, 244—omissions from Speech—dissolution—election, 1917; "Knots and Lashings"—railway problem, 245; Can. Govt. Merchant Marine—Prime Ministers' Conference, 246; Imperial relations; League of Nations; no mandate—Purchasing Commission, 247—overtures to Quebec, 248; Mr. Gauthier, severance of connection with Liberal party, 250; inconsistent attitudes towards tariff, 251; Lafontaine and Cartier, 252; Minister of Immigration, 253
Agricultural Shows, M., 1238-46; withdrawn, 1247
Auditor General's Report, 1385
Banff National Park, 4495
Bankruptcy Act Amdt. Bill, 2911
Board of Commerce, qu. 599, 602
Budget, 3557. Financial operations, 3557; rigid economy in national expenditure necessary, 3558; military expenditure, 3558; Winnipeg strike, 3560; Grand Trunk shareholders, 3560; Prime Minister playing the game, 3562; Credits to Greece and Roumania, 3563; Members of Parliament directors of companies selling to Government, 3564
Canada Grain Act, 1442
Canada Shipping Act Amdt. Bill, 2230
Canada-West Indies Trade Agreement, 2252

Archambault, Mr. Joseph—*Con.*
Canadian Government Merchant Marine
Proposed Special Committee, 1440
"Squatter" and "Pioneer," Ss., qu. 1382
Canadian Nationals Definition Act, 2032
Canadian National Railways
French language, 4331-3
Special Committee, reference to, M. (Mr. Meighen) 1767-97
Canadian Press Limited, qu. 564
Civil Service, religious holidays, 1384; qu. 1499
Confidential messengers, 1334
Criminal Code Amdt. Bill, 3007, 3919-36
Customs and Excise Dept. Bill
Amalgamation of departments, Dr. Cartier, 3821
Debates, translation of French Speeches, Res. 698
Defamatory libel; publication of judicial proceedings, 2149, 3933
Dominion Elections Act Amdt. Bill, 4237-40
French Trade Agreement, 1174
Grand Trunk Railway
Loan, 4138
Shareholders, list of, 3320, 3560, 3740
Harbours and rivers, 3975-81
Highways, grants to provinces, qu. 2098
Inland Revenue Act Amdt. Bill, 2247
Inland Revenue Collector at St. Hyacinthe, Dr. Cartier, qu. 3904
Inquiry into public services, qu. 604
Interim Supply, voting of, 2011
Kirkwood Steamship Company, qu. 564
Militia supplies, sale to Roumania, 2245
Mondou, Mr.—Yamaska election, 3594
Montreal and South shore bridge, M. 2211-19
Montreal, public service, qu. 604
Naturalization Act, 1914 Amdt. Bill (Aliens who served in Allied Armies) 2441
"Niobe" and "Rainbow," sale, 4031-34
Oil, leases, qu. 564
Opium and Narcotic Drugs, 2265
Paintings in Senate Chamber, qu. 566
Parliament Buildings, 3994-4002
Pierreville postmistress, qu. 3423
Prime Ministers' Conference, qu. 564; 3320
Privilege, correction of Official Report Société des Artisans, 230
Public Accounts, 1069
Public Buildings, Nova Scotia, 2758
Public documents, destruction of, qu. 599
Purchasing Commission, 2024
Returns, enquiries for, 2009, 2775, 3320
Ross rifle, statement of Rev. Canon Scott, qu. 599

Archambault, Mr. Joseph—*Con.*
Roumania and Greece
Dominion Canners, purchases, qu. 1001
Interest on loans, 1072
Loans to, qu. 478, 564
Militia stores, sale to, 2245
Tappert, Rev. N., qu. 1673
Welland canal, 2025, 2979-98

Architect. *See* Parliament Buildings

Archives, 4533. *See also* Public Records
Biggar, Mr. H. P., qu. 2343
Doughty, Dr. Arthur, 2947
Provision for, 2945

Arctic Expedition, 4106, 4113

Argentine, Beef, competition with, 1039

Argue, Mr. Ira E. (Swift Current)
Address in reply to Governor General's Speech, 367. Congratulations to Prime Minister—Mandate of Government and its supporters, 367; redistribution, representation of West; freight rates; Wheat Board, 368; price of wheat—grain investigation, 369
Canadian National Railways, 3038
Civil Service Act Amdt. Bill, 4467
Gravelbourg-Swift Current Railway, 3053

Armistice Day
Shipbuilding contracts after, 1683
Thanksgiving, 2555

Armistice Day Bill (Mr. Mowat) 1r., 2618; Transferred to Govt. Orders, 3207; 2r., com., 3773; 3r., 3776

Armouries for Public Meetings, qu. 901

Armstrong, Mr. J. A. M. (North York)
Civil Service bonus, 2109

Armstrong, Mr. Joseph E. (East Lambton)
Budget, 3424. Western Ontario industries, 3424; Imports of manufactured goods and exchange, 3425; canning factories, 3426; manufacturing industries generally, 3427
Business of the House
Bills reported by Standing Coms., 3761
Butter substitutes, material for, 3745
Canal tolls, 2969
Civil Service Retirement Act Amendment Bill, 4273
Flax Industry, 1401
Great Lakes-St. Lawrence Waterway, 744
Highways west of London, 4307
Illustration stations in Western Ontario, 948
Immigrants along national railways, 3070

Armstrong, Mr. Joseph E.—*Con.*
Inland Shipping
Canadian Government Merchant Marine, qu., 2192
Rates—control, 1497, 2557, 2966-9
Inspection of Gas and Gas Meters, 607
Lake of the Woods Regulation Bill, 4193
National Research Council, 2702
Ocean shipping, Govt. control, qu. 3530
Quebec Union Electric Telephone Co., 3343, 3421
Railway Act Amdt. Bill (Inland Shipping Rates), 1497, 2556
United States railways, 1576
Welland canal, 2969

Army Worms, 1028

Arsenic, 1027

Arthur Young Company, 2781, 4465. *See also* Address; Civil Service; Post Office; Printing Bureau
Employment of, 551
Payments to, qu., 4251

Arthurs, Mr. James (Parry Sound)
Criminal Code Amdt. Bill, firearms, 3900-6
Dominion Elections Act Amdt., 309
Imports for home consumption in 1920, qu., 602
Pensions, widowed mothers, 637
Polish battalion for service in French army, 4056
Soldiers' Pensions, insurance and re-establishment committee, final report, 4056

Artisians, Canadiens Francais, La Société des, 82

Ascension Day, 2626, 2775. *See also* Civil Service
Adjournment. *See* House of Commons

Ashley, Sergt. T., C.M.S.C., qu., 3090

Assembly. *See* League of Nations

Atholstan, Lord, 1515
La Presse and, 3248

Atikokan, additional tracks, 1017

Atlin District, B.C., Judge, 1080

Auditing. *See* Canadian Government Merchant Marine; Canadian National Railways

Auditor, Independent. *See* Canadian National Railways

Auditor General
Railways, audit by, 1189

Auditor General's Report, 597, 958, 2247
Comparison with Estimates, 1108
Delay in bringing down, 737, 903, 1791
Penitentiaries, purchases for, 1104-5
Travelling expenses of judges, 1088
Unprovided items, 4535
Vols. I and II, 642; Vol. III, 788, 1396; Vol. IV, 737, 1176, 1385, 1388

Australia and New Zealand
Trade and steamship services, 1223, 1468, 1493

Austrian and German Imports. *See* Customs Act Amdt. Bill; Customs and Excise Dept. Bill

Authors. *See* Copyright

Automobiles.—*See* Criminal Code Amdt.
Driving while intoxicated, 3911
Theft, 3913

Backus, Mr. E. W., 4173-4224. *See also* Lake of the Woods

Baie Ste. Catherine Steamship Service, 1822, 1971

Baie St. Paul liquor seizure, qu., 696; qu. 1132

Balance of Trade, 97, 3219, 3264, 3366, 3397 *See also* Address, Budget, Trade.

Baldwin, Mr. W. K. (Stanstead)
Budget, 3201. Tariff question, 3201; war indemnity, 3202; Roumanian and Greek loans, 3202; present economic conditions, 3202; financial situation, 3202; Laurier Government, 3204; railway problem, 3204; taxation, 3204; Easterr Townships, 3205; military and nava expenditure, 3205; League of Nations, 3208; military service, 3206; immigration policy, 3206
Dairy Products Grading Bill, 4446
De Martigny divorce, 4112
Great Lakes-St. Lawrence waterway, 741
Housing, 1143-9
Lake of the Woods Regulation Bill, 4224
Unemployment and Labour, 1373

Balfour, Hon. A. J., and protection, 3417

Ball, Mr. Robert J. (Southeast Grey)
Pierreville postmistress, qu., 3208

Ballantyne, Hon. C. C. (Minister of Marine and Fisheries and Minister of the Naval Service)

Ballantyne, Hon. C. C.—*Con.*
Brant, steamer, 1982
British preference, 3485, 3553
Liberals, and, 3616
Budget, 3209. Revenue, 3209; Imaginary letters and Mr. McMaster, 3209; private business of ministers, 3210; tariff revision, 3210; position of Mr. Fielding on tariff, 3211; Naval affairs and expenditure, 3212; fiscal policy of Farmers' and Liberal parties, 3213; boot and shoe industry in Quebec East, 3214; Mr. King's speeches in Eastern and Western Canada, 3214; position of Mr. Gauthier, 3215; Quebec representation in Cabinet, 3216; attitude of Quebec, 3216
Business of the House
For tomorrow, 2148
Canada Shipping Act Amdt. Bill (Public harbours) 2229
Canada-West Indies Trade Agreement, 2259-60
Canadian Government Merchant Marine
Balance sheet, 1920, errors in, 1697-8
Canadian Press comment, 1704
Creation of company, 1908
Dominion Iron and Steel Company, 1710
First annual report, 1694
General statement, 1272; shipbuilding, 1272, 1279; shipping rates, decline in, 1273; cost of construction, 1274; operating costs, 1275; routes and sailings, 1275; exports, 1276-77; operating results, 1277; assets, 1277; liabilities, 1278
Halifax-Newfoundland route, 1686
Information, 1440
Operating profit, 1867
Preference to Canadian products, 1280
Quebec port, alleged discrimination against, 1271
Sailing routes, 1275, 1733
Ships on Great Lakes, 1914
Vessels, names of, 1962
Canadian "Inventor" 1890
"Champlain," 1980, 1995
Canadian Nationals Definition Bill, 786
Champlain, steamer, 1980, 1995
Chicago Drainage Canal, 1851
Civil Service Act Amdt. Bill, 4475-84
Naval Service, preference, 4484
Dry docks, 1690
"Esperanto," wreck, 4341
Fisheries
Breeding establishments, 4036
Dominion and Provincial jurisdiction, 2105

Ballantyne, Hon. C. C.—*Con.*
Fisheries—*Con.*
Inspection of pickled and canned fish, 2183
Lobster hatcheries, 4036
Overseers in Lunenburg, 2179
Salmon fishing licenses, 4342
Icebreakers and steamers, repairs, 1979, 1994
Imaginary letters, 3209, 3174
Johnston, Mr. Alex., re-appointment, 644
Life-saving service, 1990, 1991
Lighthouse and coastal service, 1996, 2174
Signal service, 1997, 4040
Lightkeepers' salaries, 1995
"Marie Lydia," schooner, 1985
"Narbethong," steamer, 2175
Naval Service estimates, 4010-36
Navigation, season of, 1994
"Niobe" and "Rainbow," sale, 4010-36
Ocean and River service, 1736
Pilotage, administration of, 1999
Pilots, pensions, 2000
Public Harbours, 2229
Repairing of ships at Quebec, 1988
St. Lawrence channel, dredging, 1992
Senate and House of Commons Act Amdt. (Ministers and directorships) 652
Sherwin-Williams Paint Co., 372, 3484
Shipbuilding, 1272, 1683, 2081
Contracts, 1872, 1884, 1972, 1902
Correction as to value, 1683
Depreciation, 1886
Details of construction, 1874
Dominion Steel Company, 1691
Extra fittings, 1894
Figures, 1931
Imperial Munitions Board, 1869
Interest on cost, 1887
Lemieux, Mr., speech on, 1684
Newspaper comment, 1934
Operating profit, 1866
Opposition to, 1892
Price per ton, 1873
Progress in debate on, 1729, 1931
Sinking fund, 1885
Shipyards, Government loan to, 1883
Swan, Mr. D. D., Consulting engineer, 1997
Tariff—speech, Montreal, Nov. 15, 1920, 363
Welland canal obstruction, 1990
Wrecking plants, 1990
Wrecks, investigation, 1988
Yamaska by-election, 3251

Ballot Boxes, Convicts working on, 1092

Banff National Park, 3986, 4495

Banking and Commerce, Com., 962

Bankruptcy Act Amendment Bills
1. Bill No. 36 (notice to creditors of suspension) 1r., 1069; 2r., com., 2556. (See No. 3)
2. Bill No. 37 (French Version) 1r., 1069; m. for 2r., 2557. (See No. 3)
3. Bill No. 118. 1r., 2618; 2r., com., 3909, 3143; 3r., 3146. Senate amendments. 3772-4068

Subjects and sections discussed:
Additional security by trustee, 2913
Adjustment of rights of contributories, 2929
Affidavit upon registration, 2910
Alternative powers—court to await prior action, 2937
Assignment of book debts, 2922
Available Act of bankruptcy, 2909
Claims, priority, 2935
Commencement of bankruptcy, 2910
Discharge of Trustee, 2934
Dismissal of petition, 2910
Dividend, 2930-31
French version; correction, 4170
Jurisdiction of Dominion and provinces, 2924
Leased premises, 2935
Liability of officer, director or agent of company, 2940
Local newspaper, 2909
New trustee may be substituted, 2916
Penalty for removing goods, 2938
Permission limited, 2920
"Person," 2910
Procedure in Quebec under Civil Code, 2924
Proof, power to admit or reject, 2935
Proposal of composition or management, 2911
Removal of goods; bank deposits, 2920
Remuneration, expenses and costs, 2930
Remuneration of trustee, 2933
Search warrants, 2936
Securities—secured creditor to value, 2935
Stay of proceedings, 2912
Trustee may apply for directions, 2918
Trustee may apply for sale of property, 2920
When misrepresentation or fraud, a defence for contributory, 2928

Bankruptcy Act, Judges under, 1084

Banks. *See also* Finance; loans
Canadian, deposits outside Canada, qu. 1623
Dominion Notes and gold reserve, qu. 1234
Taxation, and, qu. 2192, 3664

Banner Oats, 1033

Bar Association. *See* Canadian Bar Association

Barbed Wire, 3328, 3495

Barnard, Mr. C. A., 1846, 1930

Barnhill, Mr. A. P., 1609-10. *See also* Canadian National Railways
Business interests, 3610

Bass River, wharf, 3989

Battlefields Memorials Commission, competitive designs, 2566

Beatty, Mr. E. W., and immigration, 1127, 1356

Beauce, appointment of Judge, 1081

"Beaver" Canadian, Ss., qu. 1673

Beef Cattle. *See* Cattle Embargo; Live Stock

Beef, Dressed, export of, 1039. *See also* Cattle Embargo

Beer Containers, Marking, 3786

Beet Sugar, 301, 3426, 3456

Béland, Mr. H. S. (Beauce)
Address in reply to Governor General's Speech, 157; Election, League of Nations, 157; speeches of Sir George Foster and Mr. Rowell; International Justice; Article X; registration of treaties; expenses, salaries of officials. 158; Canada's share; Imperial federation; centralization; local control; Lord Burnham, 159; unrest and dissatisfaction, 160; Government has outlived mandate; representation, redistribution will not greatly help Agrarians; tariff issue, 161, 162; Quebec situation, 162; Canadian National Railways, Board of Commerce, 163; Board of Pension Commissioners; International Joint Commission; Peace Conference; Assembly of the League of Nations, 164
American implements at Experimental Farms, qu. 492
Auditor General's Report, 914
Brunelle, Sergt. Major N., 1519
Business of the House
Monday, Government business, 2148
Public Bills and Orders, 2819
Second reading by consent, 2889
Saturday sittings, 2818
Canada Year Book, 1425
Canadian Association for Prevention of Tuberculosis, 3142

Béland, Mr. H. S.—*Con.*
Canadian National Railways
Private ownership, 1498
Canadian representation in the United States, 2400-28
Civil Service Act Amdt. Bill, 2780
Civil Service Retirement Act Amdt. Bill, 2492-2502, 4268-73
Coal importation, 1248
Cocaine and morphine imports, 3130
Coffee, adulteration of, 3141
Conservation Act Repeal Bill, 3146, 3958-71
Dairy Produce Grading Bill, 4437-42
Demobilization, 2285
Dominion Lands Act Amdt. Bill, 4065
French Trade Agreement, 1175
Fuel Supply, Special Committee, evidence in French, 4251
Government railways, boards of management, 1658
Governor General—reported appointment of Lord Byng, 4435
Grain elevators, 1442
Health
Medical officers, 3133
Immigrants, for, 3132
Housing loan, 4552
Immigration, 2575
Income Tax Act Amdt. Bill, 4351-5
Income Tax, extension of time, 1272
Maple Products Act Amdt. Bill, 2150, 2193, 2557-60, 2618, 2890
National Catholic Labour Unions, 1652
National Resources, 892
Maple industry, 892
Opium and Narcotic Drugs, 2263-7
Parliament Buildings, 4000
Permanent Court of International Justice, 2096, 2709-11
Polish Battalion for service in French Army, 4055
Pootmans, Mr. G., and Belgian loan, 3379
Purchasing Commission, 2018, 2020, 2024
Quebec riots, 1508
Quebec Union Telephone Company, 3343
Returned Soldiers
Pensions, insurance and re-establishment Special Committee, 732, 4055
Relief for, 2688
Revenue, expenditure and debt, qu. 2099
Scientific Research, 1430. *See also* Research
Statutory expenditures, 1422
Unemployment, 4551

Belfast, linen yarns. *See* Linen yarns

Belgo-Canadian Pulp & Paper Company, 3049

Belgium. *See also* Loans
Credit to, qu. 577, qu. 1001, 3347, 3377
Pootmans, Mr. G., 3379
Purchases in Canada, qu. 736

Bell, Dr. Graham, secretary, 2377

Bell, Major Graham A., 1609-10, 1666, 3610. *See also* Canadian National Railways

Bell Telephone Company, Signal Service, 1998

Belly River water rights, qu. 2943. *See also* Irrigation

Bermuda
Steamship service to, 1488
Trade agreement, rejection of, 1271. *See also* Canada-West Indies
Trade relations, 2253

Berne Convention. *See* Copyright

Berry Boxes and Currant Boxes
Amendment of Inspection and Sale Act M. (Ethier), 4106, 4114

Berthierville telephone, qu. 1233

Bertrand, Mr. Joseph Tetu, 4079

Best, Mr. John (Dufferin)
Agricultural Shows, 1244
Chief Justice, income tax, 1565
Civil Service Act Amdt. Bill, 4468-80
Experimental Farms, 940
Flax-growing, 1392, 1395
Fruit inspectors and Civil Service Commission, 1045
Highway construction in Ontario, 3027, 3033, 4295
Lake of the Woods Regulation Bill, 4214-18
Oleomargarine Act Amdt. Bill, 3855-88
Parliament Buildings, 4075

Bi-Cameral System. *See* Ministers

Bienfait, Briquetting plant at, qu. 673, 4499. *See also* Coal; Lignite; Natural Resources

Biggs, Hon. F. C. and Highways, 3036, 3037, 4290, 4448. *See also* Highways

Bills. *See also* Deputy Speaker; House of Commons; Private Bills Discussed; Speaker. For Public Bills see individual titles

Binder Twine, 3227, 3328, 3365, 3481, 3493, 3505. *See also* Special War Revenue Act Amdt.
Exemption of fibre, 3746

Biological Board, 2189

Birchard, Dr., grain laboratory at Winnipeg, 1228

Birds. *See* Migratory Birds

Bituminous. *See* Coal; Fuel Supply

Blair, Mr. William J. (Battle River)
Address in reply to Governor General's Speech, 376; General election unfair to West; no demand; marketing of farmers' grain; at mercy of grain dealer; elevator practices, 377; position of elevator operator; screenings and dockage, 378; overages; Winnipeg Grain Exchange; Wheat Board; participation certificates, 379; Mr. Woods' statement; investigation necessary
Canadian Wheat Board, qu. 1343

Blake, Mr. Matthew R. (North Winnipeg)
Address in reply to Governor General's Speech, 313; Congratulations to Prime Minister; unjust criticism of Government, 313; effective prosecution of war; trade expansion; merchant marine; re-establishment, 314; Soldiers' Settlement Act; soldiers' insurance; expenditure of Ontario Government, 315; trade with United States; exchange; declaration of policy by leader of Agrarians; investigation of grain trade, 316; performances not promises; leader of the Opposition, 317
Alcohol, tax on, 3731
Criminal Code amendment, 3899
Debates, translation of French speeches, 702
Lake of the Woods Regulation Bill, 4201
Opium and Narcotic Drug Act Amdt. Bill, 2267

Blondin, Hon. P. E., 536, 552. *See also* Postmaster General
Payments to, qu. 567. *See also* Ministers, Post Office

Blood Indian Reserve. *See* Indians

Blood-Testing of Animals, 1050

Blouin, Mr. Joseph. *See* Quebec Riots

Blue Books, printing of, 1485. *See also* Printing Bureau

Board of Commerce, 163, 401, 441, 3169, 3604. *See also* Address, Budget
Appointment and work, qu. 602
Total cost, qu. 599

Board of Directors. *See* Canadian National Railways; Management

Board of Railway Commissioners. *See* Railway Commission

Board of Trade Reports
French forms, 2819, 3320, 3375

Boards of Trade, 1465. *See also* Trade

Boivin, Mr. George H. (Shefford). *See also* Deputy Speaker
James McLaren Company, Limited, 665
Speaker's Chair, presentation, 3688, 3691

Bolshevism, 27, 3451
Pamphlet issued by Labour Department, 4548

Bolton, Mr. Ferris (Lisgar)
Address in reply to Governor General's Speech, 396; Grain trade—drying up of lakes in Prairie Provinces—duration of Parliament, 396

Bombs. *See* Criminal Code Amendment

Bonds. *See also* Finance; Loans; Victory Bonds
Canadian Government, qu. 1620, 3289
Comparative return on Dominion and Nova Scotia, 4165
Outstanding War, Victory, tax free and taxable, qu. 2821
Tax-exempt, 3398

Bonus. *See* Civil Service

Boot-making. *See* Penitentiaries

Boots and Shoes
Industry, 1222, 3214, 3230, 3386, 3484, 3637
Trade in, 1225

Borax, Manufacture of, 3365

Bordeaux Mixture, 1033

Borden, Right Hon. Sir Robert L. (King's, N.S.)
Archives, provision for, 2947-53
Armistice Day Bill, 3773
Business of the House
Complaint of undue haste, 4452
Prorogation—important business immediately preceding, 4452
Canadian Constitutional Development, 2378
Canadian National Railways, Special Com., reference to, M. (Mr. Meighen), 1777
Canadian Representation in the United States, 2436
Civil Service Act Amdt. Bill, 4488
Religious holidays, 4488
Returned soldiers, 4259
Copyright Act Amdt. Bill, 3838-50
De Martigny divorce, 3765-70
Disarmament, views on, 3418
Estimates on Thursdays and Fridays, Rule 17c, 2104
Governor General—Address to on retirement, 4435
Interim Supply, 1678
Judges' salaries, 1563

Borden, Right Hon. Sir Robert L. —*Con.*
Maisonneuve and Gaspé, representation, 2329
Nauru Island phosphate deposits, 4542
Prime Ministers' Conference, 2626
Privileges and Elections Com., 2373
Speaker's Chair, 3693

Borden, Camp
Air Force, qu. 1820, 3777

Borrowing. *See* Housing; Loans

Boswell, wharf, 3977

Bosworth, Mr., and value of ships, 1706

Boucher, Mr. Aime, ques. 3422, 3423. *See also* Pierrevile; Yamaska

Boucher, Mrs. *See* Pierreville Postmistress

Bounties, 3085. *See also* Natural Resources; Trade and Commerce
Beet Sugar, 3456
Iron and Steel, 874
Linen yarn, 1389
Petroleum, crude, 1385, 1413

Bourassa, Mr. J. B. (Levis)
Canadian National Railways, superannuation, qu. 2344
Civil Service
Appointments, qu. 572
Returned soldiers, qu. 3259
Dredge Internationale, qu. 2192, 2506
Motor-bus tax, remission, qu. 603
Printing Bureau, destruction of documents, qu. 603
St. Romuald public building, qu. 577, qu. 604

Boxed Goods. *See* Special War Revenue Act Amdt.

Boyce, Mr. George (Carleton)
Arthur Young Company and Griffenhagen, payments, qu. 575
Housing, 1146
Immigration to Northern Ontario, 3077
Oleomargarine Act Amendment Bill, 3859
Unemployment and immigration, 1362

Boyer, Mr. Gustave (Vaudreuil-Soulanges)
Dairy products grading Bill, 4444
Maple Industry, 887
Natural resources, 887
Road from Cascades Point to Coteau Junction, qu. 576
Tobacco licenses, 2554
War History, qu. 1625

Boys, Mr. William A. (South Simcoe)
Customs and Excise Dept. Bill
Provincial analyst's certificate, 3789
Still—innocent manufacture of part, 3788
Grand Trunk loan, 4148-58

Bradley, Mr., Vice-Admiralty registrar, 1086

Bran, for destructive insects, 1027

Brandram-Henderson, Limited, 1611

"Brant," steamer, 1982

Brantford-Hamilton Highway. *See* Highways.

Bridges. *See also* Canadian National Railways; Public Works; Railways and Canals
Banff, 3986
Bryson-Calumet Island, 3986
Campbellton-Cross Point, qu. 573, 2937
Edmundston, 2810
Grand Etang, 3987
Jacques Cartier County, 3678
Joliette, 4320
Kingston, 3973
Lachine Canal, 3675, 4308
Longueuil, 300
Montreal-South shore, M. (Archambault) 2213
Perrot Island, qu. 576, qu. 603
Quebec highway, 4333
Railway, 1664
St. Annes-Vaudreuil, 3677
Victoria, 300

Briquettes, 1251, 1267, qu. 673, 4499. *See also* Fuel; Lignite

Bristol, Mr. Edmund (Toronto Centre)
Canadian Government Merchant Marine, 1288
Cattle embargo, 728
Grand Trunk Arbitration Bill, 2464
Great Lakes-St. Lawrence waterway, 743
Senate and House of Commons Act Amdt. (Ministers and directorships) 594
Shipbuilding, 1288

British Board of Trade and Immigration, 3133

British Cattle, 1049. *See also* Cattle Embargo

British Chamber of Shipping, 1716

British Columbia
Buoys and Lighthouse service, 2175
Fisheries, 861, 883
Fruit industry, 9-10
Hog cholera in, 1059
Lumber trade, 1725

British Columbia.—*Con.*
Natural resources, 861
Poultry, 3750
Shipment of ties to Egypt, 1725
Vancouver Island railways, qu. 3422

British Embassy at Washington, 1221. *See also* Canadian Representation.

British Empire Steel Corporation, 1691. *See also* Halifax Graving Dock

British Flag, protection under. *See* Burnham, Dr.

British Foreign Office. *See* French Trade Agreement

British Funds, disbursement in Canada, qu. 733

British Goods, importation of. *See* Customs Tariff Act Amdt. (Marking of Imported Goods)

British Manufacturers. *See* Trade

British North America Act
Proposed amendments. *See* Address; Ministers
With regard to Judges, 1082

British Precedents. *See* Address; Ministers

British Preference, 3699

British Remount Commission, 4341, qu

British Subjects, foreign-born wives of. *See* Dominion Elections Act

British Traditions. *See* Ministers

Brookfield, Mr., and Halifax Graving Dock, 1699

Brouillard, Mr. J. O. (Drummond and Arthabaska)
Archives, Mr. H. P. Biggar, qu. 2343
Canadian National Railways, Hornepayne division, qu. 1624
George, Mr. A. D., qu. 1233
Newcombe, Mr. E. F., and G. T. Arbitration, qu. 1002
Printing Bureau, destruction of documents, qu. 1621
Judge Snider's report, qu. 2028
Tilley, Mr. W. N., K.C., qu. 1001

Brown, Hon. George, 172, 1167-8
Letter to Sir John A. Macdonald, 4002

Brown-Tail Moth, 1027. *See also* Destructive Insects

Brunelle, Sergt. Major N.
M. (Mr. Lemieux) for papers, 1518

Brussells, International Financial Conference, qu. 1237, 3148, 3150, 3157, 3268, 3276, 3452, *See also* Military Expenditure

Buchanan, Mr. W. A. (Lethbridge)
Address in reply to Governor General's Speech, 475; congratulations to Prime Minister; explanation of personal position; not prepared to support Government; people voted on war not domestic questions; new parties, policies and leaders, 475; redistribution and election; Western Canada entitled to increased representation, 476; tariff; the parting of the ways, 477
Antelope in Western Canada, qu. 1134
Customs revenue by provinces, qu. 1622
Irrigation
Belly river water rights, qu. 2943
Milk river water rights, qu. 2099
Natural resources, 857
Transfer to Western Provinces, 2535
Trade agents in United States, qu. 1001

Buckley, Mr. Charles P., qu. 966

Budget. *See also* Ways and Means
Date of
Announcement of, 2943
Inquiry, 738, 903, 1270, 1555, 2151, 2568, 2818, 2890
Debate on, 3127, 3146, 3209, 3262, 3322, 3343, 3375, 3423, 3476, 3531, 3584
Amdt. (Mr. Fielding) 3155; neg., 3686-7; resolution agreed to, 3688
Resolutions, 3121
Speech, 3114

Bud Worm, destruction in spruce forests, 1031

Building Conditions. *See* Housing

Building Material, tax on, 3734, 3736. *See also* Special War Revenue Act Amdt.

Building Trades. *See* Labour

Building Trades Conference, 1498, 1556

Bulk Freighters. *See* Fuel Supply

Buoys. *See* Navigation, aids to

Bureau, Mr. Jacques (Three Rivers and St. Maurice)
Armistice Day Bill, 3773
Automobile theft, 3916
Business of the House, 1330, 1340
Definite statement as to, 1025
Estimates—method of voting, 1073
Morning sittings—prorogation, 4339
Previous debate, 3562

Bureau, Mr. Jacques—*Con.*
Business of the House—*Con.*
Supply
Procedure, 1024, 1025, 1073, 1217
Thursdays and Fridays, 958, 1217
Canada Temperance Act
Cases pending, 3902
Exemption of, 4376
Proclamation, 4876
Retroactive legislation, 4376
Supreme Court case, 4376
Canadian Forestry Association, 4494
Canadian Nationals Definition Act, 645, 647, 767
Canadian National Railway Company, damage to property, 3049
Canadian National Railways
Forest fires—Transcontinental, 4335
Operation of, 1004
Saskatoon, switch engines, qu. 3090, 3903
Cattle embargo, 729
Civil Service Act Amdt. Bill, 3901-4267
Conservation Act Repeal Bill, 3959-68
Containers, 3956
Copyright Amdt. and Consolidation Bill, 3830-7
Criminal Code Amdt. Bill, 3900-36
Customs and Excise Dept. Bill
Invoice certificate, 3798
Fee, 3798
Form of, 3798
Proclamation, 3798
Trade agents, 3798
Dominion Elections Act Amdt. Bill (Prohibition plebiscite), 261
Dates of proclamation, assent and voting, 303
Names eliminated, 304
Dominion Elections Act Amdt. Bill, 4246-8
Election officers, disqualification, 4246
Nomination paper, 4247
Exchequer Court Act Amdt., 624
Fuel Supply Co. evidence in French, 4251
Harbours, and rivers, estimates, 3973
Vote in Com., 3979
Highway construction in Ontario, 4297
Hudson Bay Railway, motion involving expenditure, 984
Income Tax Act Amdt. Bill, 4344-54
Inspection of Gas and Gas Meters, Bill, 608
Interior Department
Messenger clerks, 1333
Salaries, 1330
James MacLaren Company, Limited, Bill, 598
Justice Department
Law officers, 1078
Juvenile delinquents—spanking, 3918

Bureau, Mr. Jacques—*Con.*
Lake of the Woods Control Bill, 1176
International Joint Commission, and, 1071
Lake of the Woods Regulation Bill, 4171-4226
National Research Institute, 2692
"Niobe" and "Rainbow", sale, 4012-34
Park St. Charles Company, proposed payment to, 4575
Patent Act Amendment Bill, 4456-9
Penitentiary Act Amdt. Bill, 3739
Railway statistics, qu. 3422
West Durham election, 1324
Wines, sparkling, tax on, 3734

Burnham, Dr., treatment of by Serbian Government, qu. 576
M. (Mr. Lemieux), 1520

Burnham, Mr. J. H., resignation of, 1

Burnham, Lord, 159
Suggested appointment as Governor General, 599

Business Depression, 3213. *See also* Address; Budget; Trade

Business Profits War Tax, 3120, 3253, 3445. *See also* Address; Budget; Taxation
Expenditure, 4533

Butter. *See* Dairying Industry; Dairy Products, grading of; Oleomargarine

Butts, Mr. Robert H. (Cape Breton South and Richmond)
Budget, 3524. Attitude of Government supporters on tariff, 3524; comparison with attitude of Opposition, 3525; protection and the fiscal policy, 3525; foreign trade development under protection, 3526; steel trade, 3526; Dominion Coal Company and strike—Mr. E. M. Macdonald, 3528
Cost of operation of ships, 1799
Criminal Code Amdt. Bill, theft of automobiles, 3917
Ingonish, Macleod's breakwater, 4087
Interim Supply, 2020
Judges, power to suspend sentence, 1857
Post Office Act Amdt. Bill, 2124
Reciprocity agreement with United States, 2066
St. Lawrence coal trade, 1495
Wrecks, removal of, 1990

By-Elections. *See* House of Commons; Representation in Parliament
Bill respecting, 1310
Holding of. *See* Representation in Parliament

Byng, Lord, New Governor General. *See* Governor General

Cabinet
French Canadian Minister, alleged offer of position to, 3638. *See also* Veniot; York-Sunbury
Gauthier, Mr. L. J., M.P., and, qu. 1131
Ministers. *See also* that title
Post Office Dept. and, qu. 1349
Quebec, representation in, 3216

Cabot Strait, 3297

Cahill, Mr. Frank S. (Pontiac)
Air Board, 3777-83
Annapolis public building, 2741
Binder twine fibre, 3756
Bounties, 1386. *See also* under this title; Natural Resources; Oil
Bureau of Statistics, 2142
Business of the House, 1344
Estimates
Announcement of business for to-morrow, 1344
Rule 17C
Right to call dept. when in Com. of Supply, 2889
Thursdays and Fridays, 1215, 2889, 3001
Calumet Island bridge, 3986
Canada Year Book, 1425
Canadian Nationals Definition Act, 776
Canadian National Railways
Auditing of accounts, 1189, 1668
Board of Directors, 4314
Correspondence with directors, 1003
Lord Shaughnessy's letter, 2503
Management—Information, M. (Mr. King) 1189
Officials, payment of, 1669
Report, qu. 902
Special Committee, reference to
M. (Mr. A. K Maclean), 1615
M. (Mr. Meighen) 1769
Amdt. (Mr. Crerar) 1813
Canadian Northern Railway, Directors, 1664
Canadian Representation in the United States, 2378
Census—appointment of enumerators in Pontiac, 828, 1127
Civil Service and patronage, 828
Customs and Excise Dept. Bill
Cost of production, 4426
Imports from European countries, 2811-19
Proclamation, 4407
"Reasonable profit in the circumstances" 4415
Valuation for duty, 4415

Cahill, Mr. Frank S.—*Con.*
Customs and Excise Dept. Bill—*Con.*
Valuation of currency, 3811-19
Customs Tariff Amdt. Bill, imported goods, marking, 3952
Dominion Elections Act Amdt. Bill, 4245
Dominion Police Force, withdrawal from Mounted Police, qu. 601
Dominion Statistician, 1231
Estimates. *See also* under this title Business of the House
Consideration of, 1666
Objection to, 1074
Flax industry, 1396
Georgian Bay Canal, 688
Gilmour and Hughson, Limited, 1096
Grand Trunk Arbitration, qu. 2030, 2445-79
Grand Trunk Loan, 4145-68, 4314
Motion to reduce, 4151, neg. 4167
Grand Trunk Railway, directors, 3741
Great Lakes and St. Lawrence waterway, 688
Harbours and rivers, 3973-80
Homesteads, 1346
Housing, 1145
Immigration, 2578-84, 3057
Abitibi country, in, 3075
Immigration Act Amdt. Bill, 3826
Imperial Mineral Resources Bureau, 4499
Interim Supply Bill, 2103-2116
Interior and Immigration Depts. 1331
Inspection of Gas and Gas Meters Bill, 609
Kapuskasing illustration station, 949
Live cattle industry, 1474
Manufacturers, protection, 1492
Militia, annual drill, 2294
Montreal Harbour Commission, 2268
Mounted Police,
Recruits, qu. 601
Strength, 2798-2800
National Research Institute, 2705
National resources, 849
Oil
Bounties, 1418, 1424
Lands, General Lindsay and, 1342
Leases, 1340
"Niobe" and "Rainbow," sale, 4028-34
Oleomargarine Act Amdt. Bill, 3883-92
Opium and Narcotic Drug Act Amdt. 2267
Parliament Buildings, 3996-4001
Penitentiaries, 1116
Increase in cost, 1112
Permanent Court of International Justice, 2096
Pontiac Census Commissioners, 1127
Printing of Publications, 1438
Purchasing Commission, 1098, 1102, 1114, 2142

Cahill, Mr. Frank S.—*Con.*
Railway Commission, 3016
Railway Department, record searcher, 1672
Railways
Deputy Minister of, 1665
Parliamentary control, 1603
Return, inquiry for, 2688
Riding Mountain Park, 1343
Rule 17C (Estimates on Thursdays and Fridays) and Interim Supply Bill, 2103-2105. *See also* under this title Business of the House
St. John and Quebec Railway Bill, 2155-7
Shipbuilding, 1935
Contracts, 1902, 1911
Export trade, 1927
Sinking fund, 1885
South Africa steamship service, 1491
Steamship subsidies, 1491
Transcontinental Railway
Colonization along, 3075
Winnipeg-Quebec service, 2511
Transportation of grain, 2982. *See* under this title Georgian Bay Canal; Great Lakes-St. Lawrence waterway
Welland canal construction, 2981-90
West India cable, 1438
West Indies-Canada Trade Agreement, 1467
West Indies Steamship service, 1488, 1490

Calder, Hon. J. A. (Minister of Health, Immigration and Colonization; President of the Council)
Canadian Nationals Definition Act, 779
Chinese Immigration Act Amdt. Bill, 3207. 3827-9. *See also* under this title, Immigration
Civil Service
Retirements, list of, 1817
Superannuation
Increased allowances, 4275
Civil Service Act Amdt. Bill, 4461-93, 4281-88
Civil Service Retirement Act Amdt. Bill, 2486-2503, 4119, 4266-78
Dominion Lands Act Amdt. Bill, 3903, 4062-8
Debates, Official, distribution of, 2224
Esmonde, Mr. Osmonde Grattan, 1557
Health
Adulteration of food, 3142
Department, 3127
Report, 1852
Research work, 3135
Drugs, traffic in, 3130 *See also* Opium and Narcotic Drugs
Medical officers, 3133
Mental Hygiene Council, 3143

Calder, Hon. J. A.—*Con.*
Health—*Con.*
Sick mariners, 3135, 4039
Immigration Act Amdt. (Deportation), 1858
Immigration Act Amdt. Bill, 3007, 3822-7
Money qualification, 3825
Persons guilty of sedition, 3826
Senate amendments, 4343
Immigration
British inspectors, 3067
Care of immigrants, 3069
Chinese, 3207, 3827-9, 4131
Department, 3055
Estimates, 2568-2602, 4127, 4131
Postponement of consideration, 3077
Exhibits decorator, 3066
General statement, 2568
Head tax, 3056
Medical officers at ports of departure, 3132
Mental defectives, 3583
Officials, 3057
Policy, 3063
Railways and, 4130
Typhus fever, precautions, 644
Unemployment, and, 1380
United States, 3065
Women, 3061
Inspection of Gas and Gas Meters Bill, 620
Langley, Hon. George, statement by, 456
Langlois, Mr. George Arnoult, 4128
Military District No. 12, 2797
Opium and Narcotic Drugs Act Amdt. Bill, 2263-8, 2346, 2897, 3009, 4062
Special Committee, report, 2708
Proportional Representation, 1541
M. for Special Com., 1542
References to, 363, 438, 452
Royal Canadian Mounted Police, strength, 2798
Royal Canadian Mounted Police Act Amdt. Bill, 2343, 2481-6
Sales tax, 3757
Sick and distressed mariners, 3135, 4039
Smallpox on Scandinavian, 1499
Tuberculosis, prevention of, 3142

Caldwell, Mr. Thomas W. (Victoria and Carleton, N.B.)
Abattoirs and cold storage plants, 1125
Agricultural implements, 3496
Budget, 3441. Farmers' party, attitude of, 3441. Protective tariff and duty on fertilizers, 3441; potato crop, 3442; Roumanian loan, 3444; revenue from Victory Bonds, 3444; luxury taxes and business profits tax, 3445; Canadian manufacturers and tariff, 3446; sales tax, 3447

Caldwell, Mr. Thomas W.—*Con.*
By-election, York-Sunbury, 2151
Canadian National Railways, directors, 1672
Civil Service Act Amdt. Bill, 2781, 4467-89
Cow-testing, 1037
Customs Tariff Amdt. Bill—imported goods marking, 3950
Dominion Elections Act Amdt. Bill, 4243
Fertilizer Act Amdt. Bill, 1497, 2231
Highways—New Brunswick, 4306-8
Inspection of Gas and Gas Meters, 613
Lumber, tax on, 3744
Militia, Douglas, Mr., dismissal, 2277
Post Office Act Amdt. Bill, 2123
Railway Department, sundries, 1667
St. John and Quebec Railway Bill, 2154, qu. 837
Tobique reserve—timber, 4503
Widowed mothers' pensions, 639, 4370
Woodstock exhibition, 1125

Camp Borden. *See* Borden, Camp

Camp Grounds, Farnham, Que., 1132

Campbell, Mr. A. W. *See* Highways, Commissioner of

Campbell, Mr. J. A. (Nelson)
Address in reply to Governor General's Speech, 369; Congratulations to Prime Minister; review of the debate; personal position, 370; tariff, protection not main question before House, 371; adjustment of tariff schedules, necessaries of life; profits; Dominion Textile Company; Sherwin - Williams Paint Co.; duties on agricultural implements; Ford car; mining machinery, 373; Government formed for period of war; redistribution before election, 374; precedents; constituency of Nelson, a concrete proposal; adjournment till fall for redistribution, 375; amendment to the amendment proposed, 376; Amdt. negatived, 561
Aerial patrol, 4495
Budget, 3681. Natural resources of Western Provinces, 3681; tariff revision and protection, 3682; cement industry, 3683
Canadian Forestry Association, 4495
Canadian Wheat Board Bill, 2159
Criminal Code Amdt. Bill, 3915-38
Dominion Elections Act Amdt. Bill, 4233-43
Geological Survey, 2141-7
Grand Trunk Arbitration Bill, 3463
Highways
Manitoba, 4308
Ontario, 4298

Campbell, Mr. J. A.—*Con.*
Hudson Bay Railway, 2980
M. 974, 1852
Lake of the Woods Regulation Bill, 4187-4207
Musk Ox and Reindeer, 4543
National Research Institute, 2699
Natural Resources, 869
Transfer to Western Provinces, M. 2519, 2541-53
Parliament Buildings, 3999
Railway Commission, cases before, 3022
Reference to, 495
Shipbuilding contracts, 1955
Trent Canal, 2606-16, 2953-8
Welland canal, 2966-89
Witness fees, 3937

Canada Evidence Act Amdt. Bill
1r., 3318-9; 2r., com., 3r., 3758

Canada, Foreign Trade. *See* Trade

Canada Grain Act. *See also* Canadian Wheat Board; Grain; Administration, 1442

Canada Highways Act. *See* Highways

Canada Shipping Act Amendment Bill (Public Harbours)
1r., 1174; 2r., com., 2228; com., 2555; 3r., 2556

Canada Steamships, Limited, 1914

Canada Steel Company, 3407

Canada Temperance Act, 4533
Importation of liquor into provinces, qu.
Quebec city, petition for suspension, 3584, 4382
Where adopted, repealed and in force, qu. 4253

Canada Temperance Act, Bill. *See also* Dominion Elections Act Amdt; Prohibition Plebiscite
1r., 3901, 4061; 2r., com., 4373; 3r., 4388
Subjects and sections discussed:
Alberta, probibition plebiscite, 4376
Cases pending, 3902, 4373
Costs, 4377-81
Damages, 4387
Defect in form not to invalidate, 3902
Expenses under, 4533
Gold Seal Liquor Co. v. Dominion Express Co. 4375
Omission of date from proclamation, 4379
Pending litigation not to be affected
Amdt. (Mr. Maclean, Halifax) 4384

Canada Temperance Act Bill—*Con.*
Proclamation, 3901, 4375
Valid, 4373
Prohibition plebiscite, 4375
Retroactive legislation, 4374
Rights other than those of litigants, 4379
Vote, 4379

Canada-West Indies Trade Agreement, 1920, 563
Report tabled, 2191. *See also* Trade

Canada-West Indies Trade Agreement, 1920, Bill
Res. 1557; 1r., 1557; 2r., com., 2251; 3r., 2263

Canada Year Book, 1231, 1425

Canadian Air Force, qu. 965, 3776. *See also* Air
Camp Borden, qu. 1820, 3777
Regulations tabled, 350

Canadian Association for the Prevention of Tuberculosis, 3142

Canadian Bar Association, 1094. *See also* Private Bills Discussed

Canadian "Beaver," qu. 1673. For names of Canadian Government Merchant Marine vessels, *see* Vessels

Canadian Citizens, War Claims, qu. 1820. *See also* Germany, Reparation

Canadian Council of Agriculture. *See also* Progressive Party
Platform, 338, 489, 3356, 3358, 3569

Canadian Council of Women's Immigration, 3058-61. *See also* Immigration

Canadian Engineering Standards Association, 1426

Canadian Expeditionary Force. *See also* Returned Soldiers
Disability pensions, qu. 1235
Farmers and farm labourers in, qu. 1349
Polish battalion for service in French army, 4051

Canadian Forestry Association. *See* Forestry

Canadian Goods, sale of. *See* Customs and Excise Dept. Bill; Trade

Canadian Government Merchant Marine, 6, 314, 557, qu. 3089. *See also* Ballantyne, Hon. C. C.; Canadian National Railways, Special Committee; Insurance Act Amdt. Bill; Returned Soldiers; Shipbuilding; Vessels

Canadian Govt. Merchant Marine—*Con.*
Assets, 1277
Liabilities, and, for 1920, 1701
Auditing of accounts, 1694
Balance sheet for 1920, 1696
Bosworth, Mr., statement of, 3249
Business brokers, 1713
Coal for, 1861
Competition with other steamers, 1714
Construction costs, 1274
Contracts, proposed cancellation, 1727
Control of, 1908
Crews, 1275
Complaint of treatment, 1891
Depreciation, 1701
Directors, names of, 1934
Dominion Iron and Steel Company, 1710, 1723
Export trade, 1732
Fair wages, 4545
Financial operations, qu. 902
First annual report, 1692
General statement by Minister, 1272; shipbuilding, 1272, 1279; shipping rates, decline in, 1273; cost of construction, 1274; officers and crew, 1274-5; operating costs, 1275; routes and sailings, 1275; West Indies service, 1275-6; export trade expansion, 1276; results from operation, 1277; assets, 1277; liabilities, 1278;
Government shipbuilding programme, 2076. *See also* Shipbuilding
Great Lakes, ships on, 1913
Hall Engineering Co., Montreal, qu. 695
Information, 1164, 1440
Availability of, 1279, 1290, 1292
Special Committee. *See* Canadian National Railways, Special Committee
Inland navigation, and, qu. 2192
Insurance, 1278, 1703, 4359
Liabilities, 1278
Manager, 1934
Marcil, Mr. Louis T., compensation for injuries, qu. 2942
Marwick, Mitchell & Co., auditors, 1724. *See also* that title
Montreal, Bank of, opinion, 1895
Operating account, for 1921, 1969
Estimated, 1717
Operating costs, 1275; and wages, 1933
Operating losses, 1579
Operating profit, 1866
Operation, result of, 1277
Operation of boats, 1579
Press comment, 1705, 1707, 1709, 1718, 1808
Prime Minister, statement of, 1708

Canadian Govt. Merchant Marine—*Con.*
Quebec port, discrimination against, 1271, 1965
Reported sale of ships, qu. 570
Royal Bank, and, 1719
Sailing routes, 1275, 1732
Sick mariners, and, 3136. *See also* Health
State-owned fleets sold in other countries, 1718
Steamers, repairs to, 1979
Steamship services. *See also* that title
Australia-New Zealand, 1493
Canada-West Indies, 1275, 1489, 2259
Newfoundland, 1487
Vessels. *See also* that title
Cost of, 1799
In service, qu. 568
Liquor cargoes in, 1713, 1715
Names of, qu. 1499
Canadian "Beaver," qu. 1673, 1862
Canadian "Conqueror," qu. 1381
Canadian "Explorer," 1714
Canadian "Inventor," 1890
Canadian "Mariner," 1713, 1715
Canadian "Otter," qu. 1382
Canadian "Pioneer," qu. 1382, 1689, 1722, 1894
Canadian "Planter," qu. 2942
Canadian "Rancher," 1716
Canadian "Recruit," qu. 575, qu. 1381, 1382, 1703, 1868
Canadian "Runner," 1715
Canadian "Sapper," qu. 734
Canadian "Squatter," 1894
Canadian "Voyageur," qu. 1381, 1382, 1716, 1894
Registration of, 1720
Size of, 1732
Wages, 1921

Canadian Government Railways. *See* Canadian National Railways

Canadian Institute of Mining and Metallurgy, 2164

Canadian Law Library, 1090

Canadian Locomotive Company, Limited, 1610-11
Works, 3407

Canadian Manufacturers. *See* Trade and Commerce

Canadian Manufacturers Association and Tariff, 3445, 3645. *See also* Address; Budget; Manufacturers

Canadian National Committee for Mental Hygiene, 3143

Canadian National Express Company
Expenditure on Eastern lines, 3037

Canadian National Railways, 89, 163, 245, 269, 330, 344, 381, 387, 390, 4561. *See also* Grand Trunk; National Railways and Shipping; Railways; Reid, Hon. J. D.
Administration of. *See under this head* Management
Amqui station, 382, 1176, 1233
Annual statement by Minister, 1004
Auditing of accounts, 1669, 1792
Auditor
Independent, qu. 1133
Baie St. Paul—St. Urbain branch line, 4328
Betterments, 1015, 3037, 4316
Bonds
Flotation of in New York, 3288, 3298
Bridge between Montreal and South Shore, 2213
Canadian Government Railways. *See under this head* Intercolonial, Transcontinental
Branch railways, purchase of, 4338
Vote of $7,000,000 to meet working expenditure, 4335
Canadian National Express Company, 3037
Canadian National Railway Magazine, 4332
Canadian Northern Railway, 245, 3287
Bonds, issue and sale of, qu. 837
Borrowing, 3287
Certificates, issue and sale of, qu. 605
Cost of equipment, 1023
Deficits, 1189
Eastern lines, 1018
Guaranteed bonds, sale of, qu. 604
Loan of $50,000,000, 3037
Quebec-Loretteville, electrification, 4328
Salaried officials, qu. 2942
Vessels, qu. 1348
Western lands, 2583
Western lines, 1017
Cape Breton Coal and Steel, 3295
Car shortage, 512, 549, 3541, 4322
Caraquet-Gulf Shore extension, 4338
Carvell, Hon. F. B., speech of, 1202. *See also* that title
Cedar posts, tenders for, qu. 1130
Charlevoix county—station platforms, 4329
Claims against, 1657
Claims between Ste. Rosalie and Bagot, qu. 571
Disposition of unoccupied land between, qu. 572
Coal purchases, 1772
Committee proposed, 1201
Company, 3049
Conductors, qu. 569
French-speaking, lack of, 1782, 4329
Correspondence, production of, inquiry, 1003

Canadian National Railways—*Con.*
Deficit, 996, 1005, 1178, 1185, 1189, 1203-4, 1205, 1597, 1600, 4165, 4319
Payne, Mr. J. Lambert, 3017
Directors, 1664, 3407, 4314
Cantley, Col. Thomas, qu. 1501
Deputy Minister of Railways, 1666
Interested in other companies, 1609
Names, 1609
Private business interests, 1609, 3610
Responsibility, 1594
Salaries, 4315
Divisional points, qu. 574
Earnings, 1006
Eastern lines, Improvements, 1017
Electrification, 4327
Employees, 1011
Conductors and brakemen discharged, qu. 1622
Fraud and malpractice by, 1669
Reduction in, 1851
Remuneration, qu. 1673, 1737
Supplementary answer, 1755, 1815
Equipment, 1007, 1013
Expenditure, 1662
Betterments, on, 3037
Western lines, 3037
Explanation of increase, 1011
Fair wages, 4545
Family compact, 1610
Fences, 4569
Fire claims—Shelburne County, 4569
Fish, transportation of, 877, 883, 890, 962, 1038
Fixed charges, 1006, 1008
Flavelle, Sir Joseph, 4142, 4314. *See also* that title
Foremen of engines, qu. 1673
Freight
Cars, qu. 568
Nova Scotia points, qu. 1620
Rates, 4562
Tonnage, 1007, 1012
French language in Quebec and New Brunswick, 4328
Gaspé Railway service, 962, qu. 2623
Government business, 4130
Grading and track-laying, 1021
Grading in Western Provinces, qu. 570
Grand Trunk loan, 4131
Halifax and South Western
Extension to Lockeport, 4323
Station accommodation, 4327
Hanna, Mr. D. B., 4315. *See also* that title
Hornepayne division, qu. 1624
Ice supply at Mulgrave, qu. 963
Immigration, 4129
Improvements and new structures, 1017

Canadian National Railways—*Con.*
Independent auditor, qu. 1133
Information for Parliament. *See under this head,* Management; Special Committee
Insurance, 1772
Intercolonial Railways, 3041, 4561
Amqui, piling lumber in railway yard, 382
Auditing of accounts, 1189
Charny and St. Foy, work, qu. 1501
Deficit on, 1800
Expropriation of land at Lévis
M. (Mr. Fielding) for papers, 1846, 1851
Lévis station, 2957
Management, 1189
Maritime Provinces, improved transportation, 4561
Mileage, 1005
Ocean limited, 1976
Pensions, old employees, 387
Railway Board, and, 1655
Section men, dismissal, qu. 2028
Superannuation of employees, qu. 575
Train service, qu. 3903
Joliette bridge, 4320
Kelley, Mr. Howard D., 4315
Lake Superior Branch, 3050
Liabilities, 3300
Liquor, theft of, qu. 1132
Loans
$26,000,000, 4169, 4288, 4334
$89,687,633.39, 4131
Amended item, 4168, 4288, 4313
Locomotives, etc., 1007, 1203, 1611
Damage to at Parent, qu. 963
Lord Shaughnessy's letter, 2503, 2890
McAdoo award, 4325
Maintenance, 1005, 1006
Management, qu. 1132, 1654, 1659, 1668. *See under this head* Special Committee
Information laid before Parliament, M. (Mr. King), 1178
Neg. on division, 1214-5
Manitoba Government, correspondence, 2777
Maritime Provinces, improved facilities, 4516, 4561
Mileage, 1005, 1012
Ministerial statement by Hon. Mr. Reid, 1004; operation, loss in, 1005; mileage, 1005; earnings and operating expenses, 1006; general railway situation, 1007; Grand Trunk Railway, 1008; summary of operating results, 1010; Grand Trunk Pacific, 1014; new structures and improvements, 1017
Monastery, station at, 4324
Moncton shops, 1851
Montmagny—shed accommodation, 4570
Montreal Locomotive Company, qu. 696
Natural resources, development, 871

Canadian National Railways—*Con.*
National Transcontinental. *See* under this title, Transcontinental
New lines, 1023
Operation, 1005, 3300
Cancellation of trains, 1004
Operating deficits, 1013, 1189
Operating divisions
Eastern lines, qu. 1131
Western lines, qu. 1131
Operating expenses, 1006
Operating results, 1010, 4316-18
Parlor car receipts—French language, 4330
Passenger traffic, 1012
Payroll, comparison of, 1011
Political control, freedom from, 2828
Politics, participation in, 4502
Prince Edward Island Railway, 4565
Private cars, 4563
Private ownership, and, 1498
Provincial liabilities, qu. 2942
Publicity, 4332
Purchasing agent at Chicago, 1793
Quebec and Saguenay station agents, qu. 696, qu. 963
Quebec bridge—highway, 4333
Quebec, Oriental & Atlantic and Western Railways, qu. 573
Quebec—Shawinigan service, qu. 573
Questions on order paper, 1763, 1782, 1783, 1798
Rails
Price of, 1852
Transfer to France, 4569
Railway ties, 1772
Rate increases, 1007, 1191
Report, qu. 902
Rolling stock, 1007
St. Alexis station, qu. 2375; qu. 3582
St. Augustine, qu. 695
St. Foy round house, 767
Correspondence, 1502
Res. (Mr. Parent), 840, 967
St. John and Quebec Railway, qu. 837 *See also* that title
St. Hyacinthe shops, qu. 2821
St. Simon telegraph operator, qu. 3208
Saskatoon, shunting, qu. 3090, 3903
Section men, 1439
Special Committee, proposed reference to M. (Mr. A. K. Maclean), 1573; Amdt. 1582-83
Special Committee on National Railways and Shipping
M. (Mr. Meighen)
Agreed to as amended, 1814
Amdt. (Mr. King) 1761, neg. 1810
Amdt. (Mr. Crerar) accepted, 1812-14
Notice of, 1618

Canadian National Railways—*Con.*
Special Committee on National Railways and Shipping—*Con.*
Special Committee appointed, 1845
Reference to, 1817
Report of, 2095
Staff, 4562
Statements and summaries, 1010, 1024
Statistics, qu. 3422
Steamship services, 558
Subsidiary companies, 1907
Sully, Que., 1134
Summaries of operating results and trade statistics, 1009
Superannuated employees
Increase of allowance, qu. 575, qu. 2344
Toronto train connections, 4569
Tourist traffic in Gaspesian peninsula, qu. 2622
Train agents, qu. 1349
Transcontinental Railway, 280, 746, 1949, 3043
Expropriation of land, 1656
Forest protection, 4335
Freight rates on pulpwood and sawlogs, 2511
Management, 1189
Mileage, 1005
Montreal, and, qu. 574
Montreal-Winnipeg passenger traffic, qu. 2376
Winnipeg-Quebec service, 2509
Transportation of grain, 2984
Transfer of rails to France, 4569
Vancouver Island, qu. 3422
Western lines, 1017, 3039
Winnipeg-Quebec and East, qu. 569, 2509
Work done, 1019

Canadian National Railway Company, existence of, 3049

Canadian National Research Institute, 4555. *See also* Research

Canadian National Telegraphs, 1019

Canadian Nationals Definition Bill
1r., 397; 2r., 585, 644, 767; com., 767; 2031; 3r., 2151
Sections and Subjects discussed:
Canadian Nationals, 767
Declaration of alienage, 2031
Naturalization, 781
Renunication of nationality, 781

Canadian Navy. *See also* Naval Service
Adams, Capt. Henry C., 901, qu. 1237
Ex-members of, qu. 3422
Sale of "Niobe" and "Rainbow." *See* "Niobe"
Status of members of, 3686

Canadian Northern Railway. *See this title* under Canadian National Railways

Canadian North Prairie Lands Company, 1611

Canadian Pacific Railway Company, 1789. *See also references* in Canadian National Railways debates
Canadian notes refused in United States, qu. 599
Comparison with Government railways, 1780
Competition with Government railways, 1181, 1190, 1200
Patents to lands, qu. 2821
Shares, decline in price, 1195-6
Steamers, 1688, 1730, 1936
Stock, depreciation in, 1882

Canadian Postal Guide, qu. 1349

Canadian Press Limited, 4533. *See also* Press
Comment on Canadian Government Merchant Marine, 1704

Canadian Reconstruction Association, 3312

Canadian Representation in the United States, 2378-2436. *See also* Ambassador at Washington; Customs and Excise Dept. Bill; Prime Ministers' Conference; Trade
Correspondence, 2406, 2428
Press comments, 2408
Statement regarding, 2406

Canadian Trade Commission
Roumania and Greece, purchases, qu. 1236

Canadian Vickers, 1884. *See also* Shipbuilding

Canadian War Mission in the United States, 2388, 2400

Canadian Wheat Board, 240, 277, 343, 368, 379, 390, 487, 1452-63, 3566. *See also* Grain and Grain Trade; Wheat
Agrarian party and, 1455
Correspondence, qu. 1348
Discontinuance of, 513
Participation certificates, 340-1
Report, 150

Canadian Wheat Board Bill
Res. 2116; 1r., 2117; 2r., com., 2158-59; 3r., 2159

Canadians, Foreign decorations to, qu. 1132

Canal Boats. *See* Fuel Supply Problem

Canals, 2025, 2602, 2953, 2960, 2966-98
Carillon and Grenville, 2603

Canals—*Con.*
Chambly, 2602
Georgian Bay, 688, 745, qu. 2625
M. (Mr. Devlin) 679. *See also* that title
Lachine, 2603
St. Anne's lock; St. Ours lock, 2606
Tunnel, 302
Navigation by coal barges. *See* Fuel Supply Problem
Perrot Island bridges, qu. 576
Soulanges, 2604
Road from Cascades Point to Couteau landing, qu. 576
Tolls, 2962, 2972
Trent, 3374, 3415
Construction, 2025, 2966
Improvements, 2606, 2953
Nassau dam, 2954
Peterborough dam, 266
Wharf at Lindsay, 2616
Welland, 1968, 3374
Construction, 2025, 2493
Contracts, 2966-98
Cost plus system, 2966-98
Improvements, 2960
Retirement of superintendent, 2493
Sand contract, qu. 600

Cancellation of Trains. *See* Canadian National Railways

Canned Foods. *See* Meat and Canned Foods

Canners. *See* Dominion Canners

Cannon, Mr. Lucien (Dorchester)
Address in reply to Governor General's Speech, 531; Speech of the Minister of Militia; the new Prime Minister, 531; partizans and ultra Imperialists; big interests and protection; Government's mandate; struggle for constitutional and responsibile government, 532; election of 1911; controversial legislation following extension of 1916; the appeal in 1917; measures following the war; railway policy; Imperial Conference, 533; new Government leader and programme—the "Rump Parliament"—by-elections, 534; situation in Quebec—Mr. Gauthier—the Postmaster General—the Minister of Labour, 536—Quebec and the balance of power, 537
Annapolis public building, 2750
Arctic Expedition, 4113
Auditor General's report, 1388, 1396
Bankruptcy Act Amendment Bill, 2915-40
Judges under, 1085
Bounties, principle of, 1425

Cannon, Mr. Lucien—*Con.*
Business of the House
Estimates on Thursdays and Fridays—Rule 17C, 1218
Canada Year Book, 1231
Canadian Nationals, 769
Canadian National Railways
Management and expenditure, 1662
Management — Information, M. (Mr. King) 1197
Canal tolls, 2962
Chief Justice, salary, 1569
Civil Service Act Amdt. Bill, 4489-90
Religious holidays, 4489-90
Civil Service Commission, 1336
Outside service, 1653
Civil Service, Res. (Sir Sam Hughes) political patronage in; vicious principle; patronage rampant; judicial appointments, 811; census commissioners; Halifax platform, 813
Criminal Code Amdt. Bill, 3921-29
Dominion Elections Act Amdt., 305
Dominion lands and parks, 1334, 1343
Donner, Mr. W. A., ques. 1624
Estimates
Detail of item, 1226
French, in, 1386
Rule 17C, Thursday and Fridays, 1218
Post Office, date of submission, 4531
Statutory payments, 1414
Exchequer Court Act Amdt. Bill, 625
Expenditure
Necessity for reduction, 1336
Without consent of Parliament, 1415
Experimental farm in Dorchester county, 946
Flavelle, Sir Joseph, 4142
Government Railways, claims against, 1657
Governor General's cars, 3037
Grand Trunk loan, 4132-69
Halifax and Esquimalt dockyards, 4036
Highways, expenditure on, 3024, 3026, 3036
Houses, tax on, 3958
Imperial Oil Company, 1386-8, 1414
Intercolonial Railway, station at Lévis, 2757
Interim Supply. *See also under this head* Estimates
Discussion out of order, 1680
Notice, 1676
Interior Department Publications in French, 1333
Judges, conduct of, 1571
Live stock, distribution of pure-bred animals, 923
Ministers to sit in either Chamber, 1165
Montreal-Quebec pilots, superannuation, 1501

Cannon, Mr. Lucien—*Con.*
Motion pictures, artist, 1225
Parliamentary restaurant, 4536
Permanent Court of International Justice, 2716-36
Petroleum bounties, 1386, 1413, 1420
Point of order
Information, 1229
Statement of Member to be accepted, 2765
Railway Commission, 3020
Cases before, 3021
Chairman, 3017
Railway Congress, 3023
Railway Department
Deputy Minister's salary, 1666
Outside legal counsel, 1656
Solicitors and counsel, 1654
Work of, 1661
Railways. *See also* under this head Canadian National Railways
Lack of information, 1336
Minister, duties of, 1663
Railway employees, Civil Service Commission, 1653
Responsible Government, 1335
Royal Canadian Mounted Police, 2799
Ste. Rose de Watford mail contract, qu. 3209
Secretaries to executives, 1671
Senate and House of Commons Act Amdt. Bill, 653
Special War Revenue Act Amdt. Bill
Consideration of, 3956
Statutory expenditure, 1419
Trade with Russia, 1224
Trent canal, 2960
Unemployment and immigration, 1375

Canso
Harbour, 3983-9
Wharf, and, 3983-9
Marine hospital, 3138
Mulgrave steamship service, 1496

Canteen. *See* War

Canteen Funds, Expeditionary Force, qu. 1133

Cantley, Col. Thomas, qu. 1501, 1609-10, 3407, 3610. *See also* Canadian National Railways

Cape Tormentine, dredging, 1017

Cardin, Mr. P. J. A. (Richelieu)
Government shipyard at Sorel, qu. 568, 2028, 2618
Indian Commissioner at Regina, qu. 964
St. Lawrence river
Deepening, qu. 2028
Dredges and tugs, qu. 568

Cards. *See* Criminal Code Amendments; Three Card Monte

Carillon and Grenville Canals. *See* Canals

Carroll's Landing, wharf, 3977

Car shortage. *See* Railways

Cartier, Dr. A. P., St. Hyacinthe, 3821, qu. 3904

Cartier Square, Ottawa, storeshed, qu. 3208

Cartwright, Sir Richard, 3645

Carvell, Hon. F. B., Chairman of the Railway Commission, 451, 1202, 1690, 1725, 3017

Casgrain, Mr. Pierre F. (Charlevoix-Montmorency)
Baie Ste. Catherine-Tadoussac
Mail service, 4530
Steamship service, qu. 734
Business profits tax, qu. 576
Canadian Government Merchant Marine, 1907
Canadian National Railways
Baie St. Paul-St. Urbain branch line, 4328
Canadian National Railway magazine, 4332
Charlevoix station platforms, 4329
Directors' salaries, 4315
French language, 4329
Liquor
Seizure at Baie St. Paul, qu. 696
Theft at Baie St. Paul, qu. 1132
Montmorency county as tourist resort, 4332
Quebec and Saguenay station agents, qu. 696
Subsidiary companies, 1907
Canadian Nationals Definition Act, 2032
Canadian Northern Railway, 1909
Canadian Pacific Railway
Canadian notes refused in United States, qu. 599
Champlain steamer, 1980, 1983
Charlevoix County
Station platforms, 4329
Wharves, 1929, 4536
Civil Service Commission, proposed abolition, qu. 1381
Dredging—Baie St. Paul district, 1992
Embargo on Canadian cattle, qu. 566
Experimental station—Charlevoix-Montmorency, 943-5
Foodstuffs, hoarding of, qu. 1347
Gauthier, Mr. L. J., M.P., qu. 1131
Grand Trunk loan, 4152-66
Grand Trunk Railway, reported application for assistance, 1498

Casgrain, Mr. Pierre F.—*Con.*
Highways, 3032
Grants under Act, qu. 567
Quebec-St. Joachim-St. Simeon, 3026, 4313
Immigration Act Amdt. Bill, 3824
Isle aux Coudres telephone line, 4540
Lightkeepers' salaries, 1995
Montreal Post Office Mutual Benefit Association, qu. 567
Murray Bay-Tadoussac steamship service, 1528, 1822, 1828
Natural resources
M. to adjourn debate neg., 894
Payments to Postmaster General, qu. 567
Post Office
Mail Superintendents and postal inspectors, qu. 841
Religious holidays, 2626
Superintendents and inspectors, qu. 965
Public Works at Murray Bay, etc., qu. 604
Quebec and Saguenay Railway, qu. 963
Quebec (city) immigration officers, qu. 1131
Quebec riots, 1507
Quebec Steamship Company, 2775, 2941
Railway securities, provincial guarantees, 2619
Roumania, interest on advances to, qu. 566
St. Antoine, Montreal, representation, qu. 577
St. Catherines Bay-Tadoussac mail service, 4530
St. Vincent de Paul penitentiary, warden, qu. 575
Scott Act, suspension of, 3584
Shipbuilding, 1895, 1929
Tapley, W. H., case of, res. 970, neg. 974
Three Card Monte, 1439
Trent Canal, 2607-17, 2972
War indemnity, Canada's share, 3583

Casselman, Mr. Orren D. (Dundas)
Budget, 3195. Congratulations to Minister of Finance, 3195; general election, 3196; tariff a political issue, 3196; protection, 3196; milk products, 3197; free trade arguments, 2197; tariff protection increased in foreign countries, 3198; group system of Government, 3199; Farmers' party, 3200; price-fixing, 3200; conscription, 3200
Experimental stations in Dundas, 954, 956

Catellier, Mr. Ludger J., 1465

Catholic Electorate. *See* York-Sunbury

Catholic Labour Unions. *See* Labour

Cattle. *See also* Agriculture; Health of Animals
Blood Indian Reserve, qu. 1818-19; *see also* Indians
Feeding, 344
Feeds, exemption of, 3746
Industry, 335
Live, export to Great Britain, 1474
Prize. *See* Agricultural shows
Shipping, 1039
Slaughtered, compensation for, 1061. *See also* Health of Animals

Cattle Embargo, 757, 3532. *See also* Health of Animals; Live Stock; Prime Ministers' Conference
Commission, inquiry, 1072
Promise of removal, qu. 566
Res. (Mr. Smith) 702
Amdt. (Mr. Pedlow) 725
Sub-Amdt. (Mr. Steele) 758, agreed to, 766
Res. (Mr. Lemieux) dropped, 766

Causapscal illustration station, 947

Cedar Posts for Canadian National Railways, qu. 1130

Cement Industry, 3683

Census. *See also* Civil Service (Res. Sir Sam Hughes)
Commissioners and enumerators, qu. 696, 800-12, 1209, 1226, 2098, qu. 3260
Appointment of, qu. 735, 2779, 2843, 2874-82, 3807. *See also* Civil Service Commission
Missisquoi, qu. 1132, 4113
Moncton, 3972
Officials, appointment of, 527, 597, 813, 827, 828, 830, 832
Pontiac, qu. 1127, 1231
Returned soldiers, as, qu. 2097
Industrial, 3490

Cent Coin, 2161

Central Railway Company of Canada, 3716. *See also* Private Bills Discussed

Chabot, Mr. J. L. (Ottawa)
Civil Service, Res. (Sir Sam Hughes) patronage in, 796; Civil Service Commission; ill-founded assertions; importance and variety of duties; organization attitude of Civil Service, 797

Chair. *See* Speaker's Chair

Chairman. *See* Deputy Speaker; Mr. Steele

Challies, Mr. J. B., 1346

Chambers of Commerce. *See* Trade

Chambly Canal. *See* Canals

"Champlain" steamer, 1980, 1983, 1995

Charlevoix County
Station platforms, 4329
Wharves, 1929, 4536

Charny, work at, qu. 1501

Chartered Banks. *See* Banks; Finance

Charters, Mr. Samuel (Peel)
Budget, 3410. Comment on Speech of Mr. W. C. Kennedy, 3410; Rural depopulation, 3411; production per man in agriculture, 3412; tariff and free agricultural implements, 3413; sales tax, 3413; outside capital, 3414

Chaudiere Junction, 1017

Cheese. *See* Dairying Industry

Chemicals for Fertilizers, 3441-2

Cheticamp Fishing station, 1991

Chicago Drainage Canal, 185, 1851, 2225

Chicoutimi
Customs collections, qu. 698
Labour Convention. *See* Labour
Pier, qu. 967
Wharves, 1921

Chief Electoral Officer, 4534. *See also* Dominion Elections Act Amdt. Bill
Reports, qu. 577
To be printed, 731

Chief Justice. *See* Judges Act Amdt. Bill

Chief Whip. *See* Ames

Child Prisoners, 3011

Child Welfare, 3130

China, Importation of Eggs from, qu. 568

Chinese Immigration, 4131. *See also* Immigration

Chinese Immigration Act Amdt. Bill
1r., 3207-3208; 2r., com., 3827; 3r., 3830
Subjects and Sections discussed:
Identity to be established, 3827
Power to arrest, 3829
Prohibited persons, 3839

Chippewa Power Canal, 2444

Chisholm, Mr. Alexander W. (Inverness)
Alcohol for medical purposes, 3729
Bernasconi, Mr., 4088

Chisholm, Mr. Alexander W.—*Con.*
Canadian "Spinner," "Leader," etc., qu. 1382
Census commissioners—returned soldiers, qu. 2097
Chartered banks, taxes paid by, ques. 2192
Cheticamp station, 1991
Dredging, 3983
Fraser, Mr., Collector of Customs, 3082
Grand Etang
Bridge, 3987
Light, 1997, 3987
Harbours and Rivers, estimates, 3975
Highways inspectors, 3023
Illicit liquors, 3082
Inspection of Gas and Gas Meters Bill, 622
Inspectors under Destructive Insect and Pest Act, 1043
Inverness
Fishery overseer, 2178
Harbour, 3985
Public building, 2817
Lobster hatcheries, 4037
Marine hospitals, 3138
Port Hood, wharf, 4104
Port Margaree wharf, 2174
Public Works—Engineering Branch, 4088
Relief of distressed seamen, 4039
Roy Building, Halifax, qu. 3089
Sheridan, Mr. John, resignation, 4503
Trent canal, 2958

Chlorine Gas, 1027

Churchill, Right Hon. Winston and Shipbuilding, 1288. *See also* Prime Ministers' Conference

Cigars and Cigarettes, duty on, 3698. *See also* Tobacco

Citizens' Liberty League, 304

Civil Aviation, 3776. *See also* Air

Civil Service. *See also* Arthur Young & Company; Griffenhagen; Civil Service Act Amdt. Bill; Civil Service Political Patronage; Supply
For individual departments *see* their titles
Appointments
As result of notices sent Members in Quebec, qu. 572
Competitive principle, on, 798
Distribution of, 1045
Dominion Lands Act, under, 4062
Dorchester penitentiary, Warden, 1092, 4467
Fruit inspectors in Nova Scotia, 1042
Gas and Gas Meters Act, Inspectors, 618, 619
Health of Animals, Inspectors, 1057, 1067

Civil Service—*Con.*
Appointments—*Con.*
Justice Department—lawyers, 1077
Member's recommendation, on, 2851-60-79
Militia appointments and dismissals, 2234
Order in Council, by, 1114
Purchasing Commission, 1100
Toronto post office, qu. 734
Trade Commissioners, 1464. *See also* Trade; Customs and Excise Dept. Bill
Veterinary inspectors, 925. *See also* under this head Health of Animals
Woman Supervisor of Immigration, 3058-62
Bonus, qu. 901, qu. 967, 1176, qu. 1350, 1463, qu. 1623, 1948, qu. 2029, 2108-2115, 2236, qu. 3089, 3531, 4120, 4534
Health of Animals, Inspectors to, 1057, 1067
Lightkeepers, qu. 1622
Statement by Prime Minister, 1233
Classification, 817, 1660, 2236, 2842-8, 4465, 4475. *See also* under this title, Reorganization. For classification of the several departments, see their titles
Arthur Young Company, 551, 793, 799, 802, 816, 833, 2781
Board of Hearing, 823, qu. 2820
Bonus and, 1463
Civil Service Executive, 1671
Employment of foreigners, 825
Griffenhagen and Associates, payments to, qu. 575, 793, 833, qu. 4251. *See also* that title
Increase in salaries, 4541
Justice Department, in, 1076
Lightkeepers' salaries, 1995
Public Works, engineers, 2682
Record searcher, 1672
Commission, 825, 829, 835, 836. *See also* Civil Service Act Amdt.; Res. (Sir Sam Hughes); Retirement
Abolition, proposed, qu. 1381
Administration of Retirement Act, 2486-2503
Appointments by, 814, 822, 824. *See also* under this title, Appointments
Bland, Mr. C. H., 2861
Buffer, used as, 830
Certificate of competency, 2832
Cost, 794
Curtailment of jurisdiction, 815. *See also* Civil Service Act Amdt. Bill
Establishment of, 798
Fraser, Mr. Roy, 2860-8
Good work of, 817
Information from, 1336
Nelson, Mr. Christian, 2880

Civil Service—*Con.*
Commission—*Con.*
Organization and duties, 797
Outside Service, and, 794, 815
Promotions, and, 827, 2833-9, 2847-50, 2867-2878, 2885, 4125
Removal of power to make certain appointments, 2778
Report tabled, 4449
Secretary, 2860-9, 2875-81
Competitive examinations, 817
Disabled soldiers, preference, 4049
Dismissals, 2234, 2884
Economy in, 3194, 3439
Efficiency and discipline, 2865
Employees, number, name and classification, 4255
Employment of women, 2286
Examinations, 2178
Competitive, 798, 817
Federal Union No. 66, 795
Fishery overseers, Lunenburg county, 2179
Grain inspectors, 1444
Griffenhagen and Associates. *See under this title* Classification; Reorganization
Halifax platform, 2844
Holidays, religious, 1384, qu. 1499, 2626, 2775, 4484. *See also* Civil Service Act Amdt. Bill
Interim Supply and. *See* Interim Supply
Labour employment bureau, 2852
List, qu. 1349
Manual labourers, 2830-9, 2841-69, 2877-84, 4278-4460
Meetings in Government buildings, qu. 3421
Naval veterans, and, 3686
Organizations, 797, 2850
Outside Service, qu. 2820, 2876-80
Cost of placing under Commission, 794
Railway Department, 1653
Should be taken from Commission, 815
Political partisanship, 828
Political patronage, 2778-81, 2824-40, 2843-6, 2855-83, 3248. *See also* Civil Service Act Amdt. Bill; Speeches on Res. (Sir Sam Hughes)
Census appointments, 800, 806, 808, 809
Committee to investigate, 790
Declaration against, 822
Opposed to, 797
Res. (Sir Sam Hughes) 789; withdrawn, 836
Preference to disabled soldiers, 4049
Prevailing rates of pay, qu. 3089
Printing Bureau, qu. 1234, 2827. *See also* that title
Professional, scientific and technical officers, 2830-43; 2866-84

Civil Service—*Con.*
Reform, 2844-71
Religious holidays, 1384, qu. 1499, 2626, 2775, 4484. *See also* Civil Service Act Amdt. Bill
Reorganization, 1335, 4465, 4541, 4555. *See also* under this title Classification
American firm, employment, 517
Griffenhagen and Associates, 551, 799, 802, 813, 816, 2242, 2623, 2781, 2827, 4117
Officers detailed to assist, 600
Post Office Department, 4514. *See also* that title
Retirement, 2826, 4266. *See also* Civil Service Retirement Act Amdt. Bill
Barsalou, Mr., 2490
Customs and Inland Revenue Dept., 4117
Postmaster at Montreal, qu. 566
Provincial service, 2487-98
Report of Commission on, 1817
Survey staff, 2143
Returned Soldiers and, qu. 963, 2828, qu. 3259, qu. 3531, 4257, 4482. *See also* that title
Rural postmasters, 2829, 2833-41, 2866-84. *See also* Post Office
Superannuation, qu. 734, qu. 967, 2489, 2820. *See also* debates under Civil Service Retirement Act Amdt. Bill; Retirement Fund, taxation of, qu. 1237
Increased allowances to meet cost of living, 2112, 2491, qu. 3903, 4275, 4541
Application for, qu. 2099
Permanent Superannuation Act, 4277
Postmaster at Toronto, 566
Transfers, 2847-85
Unrest in, 795
Federal Union No. 66, 795
Whitley Councils, qu. 2820
Women in, employment, 2286

Civil Service Act, 1918, Amendment Bill
1r., 2865; m. for 2r., 2778, 2823; amdt. (Mr. Maclean, Halifax) 2835; neg. 2887, 2r., 2887; com., 4278-80; 4460; 3r., 4493
Special Committee
Appointed, 2776
Discussed, 2778
First report, 2940
Concurred in, 3005
Second report, 3088
Third and final report, 3901
Discussed, 4278-80
Subjects and Sections Discussed:
Air Force, preference, 4483
Annual report, 4473-81; Amdt. 4482
Commission, jurisdiction of, 4460-82
Commission may make regulations, 4461
Customs officials, 4268

Civil Service Act, 1918, Amdt. Bill—*Con.*
Subjects and Sections Discussed—*Con.*
Dorchester penitentiary, appointment at, 4467
Employees on railways and ships, Act not to apply, 4278-83
Evidence before Special Committee, 4469-80
Exclusion of certain positions from operation of Act, 4281
Foran, Mr. William, 4286
Health Department—Research, 4464-78
Holidays, religious, Amdt. (Mr. Trahan) 4484; neg. 4492
Manual labourers, 4278-4460
Method of procedure, 4257-9
Naval Service, preference, 4482
"Nor in the public interest" Amdt. (Mr. Euler) 4283; 4460-81
Political patronage, 4280
Postmasters, 4278-4460
Professional, scientific and technical officers, 4279-4460
Provisions recommended by Pensions Committee, Res. 4257
Returned soldiers, preference, 4577
Amdt. (Mr. Cronyn) 4482; agreed to, 4484
Roche, Dr., 4287
Section 38, 4460
Senate amendments, 4577
Stayner, postmaster, 4470

Civil Service Association of Canada, 797. *See also* Civil Service

Civil Service Federation of Canada, 797. *See also* Civil Service

Civil Service Retirement Act Amdt. Bill
Res. 2486; 1r., 2503; 2r., com., 4275; 3r., 4278
Subjects and Sections discussed:
Commission to report, 4266, 4277
Continuous employment, Res. 4266
Customs officials, 4268-72
Employees in post offices, 4268
Militia and Defence Dept., 4267-70
Notification of retirement, 4275
Officer, 4277
Officers of House of Commons, 4274
Officials
Permanent Superannuation Act, 4277
Receiving daily wage, 4267-70
Senate amendments, 4544
Sessional employees, 4268-71-74
Special circumstances, 4277
Working part time, 4267

Civil Service Retirement Act, qu. 734

Clapp, Miss S., 1332

Clark, Mr. Hugh (North Bruce)
Civil Service Act Amdt. Bill, 4485
Holidays, religious, point of order, 4485
Income Tax Act Amdt. Bill, 4350
Payments to Justices Riddell and Latchford, qu. 1500

Clark, Mr. Michael (Red Deer)
Address in reply to Governor General's Speech, 397; sympathy with and congratulations to Mr. Bolton; the home market argument, 397; congratulations to Prime Minister—protection, narrow, sectional and local; "National Policy" a misnomer, 398; condition of the country—request for Grain Commission, 399; League of Nations—relations with United States—finance, trade, tariff, "luxury" taxes; production, markets; daylight saving; Board of Commerce; direct taxation; free wheat; Prime Minister's speech on Budget, 1920, 401; taxes difficult to collect, 402; rural depopulation, 403; fiscal policy of Great Britain; excess imports not necessarily adverse balance of trade; excessive borrowings, 405; labour conditions in Great Britain and United States; industries of Ireland; emigration from British Isles; iron and steel, 408; fiscal policy of United States; statement by Mr. Thomas W. Lamont, 409; antiquity of protection; Solomon a free trader; Britain has blazed the trail, 410; amendment to the amendment (Mr. Campbell); the amendment want of confidence in Government; redistribution; proportional representation, 411; the tariff issue, 412; sinking ship, 413; election; Progressive platform; the question before the country, 414
Agricultural publications, 1074-5
Bounties, principle of, 1424
Budget, 3218. Raises a clear issue; Canadian strawberries and grapes, 3218; fiscal condition of Britain; adverse balance of trade, 3219; National policy, debts, and deficits; tariff revision, 3220; taxes upon consumable commodities; three main principles of taxation, 3221; Mr. Fielding's amendment; Protection and Toryism, 3222; needs of the country; trade, increase in necessary, 3223; British trade increased, 3225; cost of living, 3226; building up of in-

Clark, Mr. Michael—*Con.*
Budget—*Con.*
dustries, 3227; taxation of land values, 3229; income tax, 3229; direct taxation, 3230; boots and shoes, 3230; tariff burdens, 3231
Business of the House
Complaint of undue haste, 4451
Duration of sittings, 1330
Wednesday evening adjournment, 1830
Canada-West Indies Trade Agreement, 2253-9
Canadian Government Merchant Marine, 1283
Canadian National Railways
Management, Information, M. (Mr. King) 1191, 1806
Special Committee, reference to, M. (Mr. Meighen) 1769, 1801
Canadian representation in the United States, 2396-2436
Cattle embargo, 704, 728
Civil Service Act Amdt. Bill
Holidays, religious, 4492
Civil Service Retirement Act Amdt. Bill, 4268-73
Criminal Code Amdt. Bill
Crime and sin, distinction between, 3910
Customs and Excise Dept. Bill
Expense, 4395-4400
Fee, who pays? 3806
German reparation, 4429
Imports and exports, 4397
Increase in tariff, 4398
Invoice certificate, fee, 4397
Officials, appointment of more, 4398
Prohibitive legislation, 4420
Prohibitive tariff, 4429
Reparation Act in Great Britain, 4429
Restriction of trade, 4398
Roumania, 4429
Trade agents, 3805
Trade of other countries, 4430
Trade with United States, 4397-4400
Valuation for duty, 4419
Valuation of currency, 4429
Customs Tariff Act, 1907, Amdt. Bill
Imported goods, marking of, 3724, 3939-51
District Engineer's Office, Edmonton, 4543
Estimates, Committee on, 2201
French Trade Agreement, 2131
Highways, 3029, 3032
Construction in Ontario, 4294, 4305
Immigration, 2579-93, 3056-66
Income Tax Act Amdt. Bill, 4344-54
Latitude in debate, 1451
League of Nations, contribution to, 2370

Clark, Mr. Michael—*Con.*
Maisonneuve and Gaspé representation, 2315, 4437
Naval holiday, 4020
Naval Service, 4016-19
"Niobe" and "Rainbow," sale—point of order, 4031
Oleomargarine Act Amdt. Bill, 3853-88
Opium and Narcotic Drug Act Amdt. Bill, 2902
Polish battalion for service in Frency army, 4059
Prime Ministers' Conference, 2639-58
Privilege—report in Ottawa Citizen, 448
Protected industries and export, 3631
Protective policy, 1288
Reciprocity agreement with United States, 2045
Reparations—difficulties between Allied Powers and Germany, 599
Representation in Parliament, 1314
Senate and House of Commons Act Amdt. Bill (Ministers and directorships), 655
Shipbuilding, 1283, 1683, 1866, 1874, 1880. 1917, 1924
Closure, 1931
Newspaper comment, 1934
Progress in discussion, 1938
Soldiers' pensions, insurance and re-establishment, 4059
Taxation, incomes of $200,000 or over, qu. 838
Wheat Board, 1453, 1458

Clarke, Mr. W. A. (North Wellington)
Criminal Code Amdt.—docking animals, 3923

Clark's Harbour, public building, 2817

Classification. *See that title* under Civil Service

Clay. *See also* Natural Resources
Crockery for, 3384-5
Deposits in Saskatchewan, 846

Clements, Mr. H. S. (Comox-Alberni)
Fisheries of British Columbia, 890
Halibut industry, 891
Natural resources, 890

Closure, Rule 17B. 1844. *See also* Interim Supply; Shipbuilding
Government Shipbuilding Programme, 1979-2094
Interim Supply, 2025
Formal motion, 2026; agreed to, 2076
2 a.m. rule, 2094

Clover and Grass Seed, 1109

Coal. *See also* Fuel Supply Problem; Lignite; Mines and Minerals; Natural Resources

Coal—*Con.*
American competition with Nova Scotia, 3295
Canadian-owned railway mines in United States, 4316
Carriage of. *See* Fuel Supply; Railways; Transportation
Consumption in Canada, 1249
Deposits, Alberta penitentiary, 1092
Development, 842, 848
Maritime Provinces in, 1281, 3295
Prices at mine, 1251
Production and value, 3515
Railway rates on, 390. *See also* Railways, Freight rates
Railways, duty on, 1184, 1187
Reserve, 1247-8
Resources in Alberta, 857
St. Lawrence route, by, 1731. *See also* Great Lakes-St. Lawrence
Scarcity of. *See* Fuel Supply Problem
Trade, 1936. *See also* Canadian Government Merchant Marine; Shipbuilding
Wales, from, 1716
Wasting of. *See* Fuel Supply Problem
Water carriage, 2963. *See also* Great Lakes-St. Lawrence

Coastal Trade, 1494. *See also* Shipping

Coats, Mr. R. H., 801, 1231. *See also* Census; Dominion Statistician

Cocaine Imports, 3130, 3170. *See also* Opium and Narcotic Drugs

Cockshutt, Mr. W. F. (Brantford)
Address in reply to Governor General's Speech, 91; tribute to new Prime Minister, 91; speech of Mr. Gauthier, a "family fight"; stability and self-respect of Quebec, 92; price of agricultural implements, 93; Opposition—amendment—the Government's mandate, 94; census, redistribution and appeal to country, 95; Agrarian party; expenditure of Ontario Government, 96; tariff and exchange situation—League of Nations, 97; disarmament, reparations, indemnities—taxation, 98; relations between Canada and the Mother Country—Judicial Committee of Privy Council—Governor General; agitation and unrest, 99; modern fads, 100
Binder twine, 3746, 3493
Brantford Customs office, 3086
Budget, 3488. Congratulations to Finance Minister, 3488; taxation severe, 3488; Leader of Agrarian party and manufacturers, 3489; co-operation between

Cockshutt, Mr. W. F.—*Con.*
Budget—*Con.*
farmers and manufacturers, 3489; industrial census, 3490; agricultural implements and Western Grain Growers, 3492; Binder twine and free trade, 3493; home market, 3494; free trade with Britain, 3494; agricultural implement industry, 3496
Canadian National Railways
Special Committee, reference to, M. (A. K. Maclean), 1612
Canadian representation in the United States, 2402-11
Cattle embargo, 718
Customs and Excise Dept. Bill
Express parcels, 4403
Fee—who pays? 3802, 4402
Invoice certificate, 3802, 4401
Toronto Board of Trade, 4402
Trade
Agents and commissioners, 3802, 4402
Extension, 4403
Director of exporting company, 3564
Dominion Elections Act Amdt. Bill, 308
Dr. Graham Bell's secretary, 2377
Housing, 1150
Income Tax Act Amdt Bill, 4350-3
League of Nations, contribution to, 2360-7
North American Trust Co., 1128
Parliament buildings, 3999
Pensions, widowed mothers, 637
Permanent Court of International Justice, 2724
Proportional representation, 1546
Reciprocity agreement with United States, 2058
References to, 451, 491
Senate and House of Commons (Ministers and directorships) Act Amdt. Bill, 660
Shipbuilding, 1878, 1881

Cocoa
Cocoa paste and chocolate, 3703
Duties on, 3170

Coffee Adulteration, 3141

Coinage. *See also* Currency Act Amdt. Bill
Cent coin, 2161
Gold, melting down, 2160, 2269
Gold, standard, 2269
Nickel, five cent coin, 2160, 2269
Redemption of, 2160

Cold Storage. *See also* Dairying Industry; Health of Animals
Foodstuffs in, qu. 1347
Fruit, 1041
Meat of, 1125
Plants. *See* Live Stock
Warehouses, 1038

Collingwood breakwater, 3973

Collingwood Shipbuilding Company, 1884, 1890, 1902. *See also* Shipbuilding

Colonial Conferences, 3432. *See also* Prime Ministers' Conference

Combines, 3293-5, 3382

Combines and Fair Prices Act, 3606

Commercial Exhibits, director of, 1225

Commercial Feeding Stuffs. *See also* Stock feed

Commercial Intelligence, Director of, 1219

Commercial Museum, 1227

Commercial Relations. *See* Address; Budget; Canadian Representation; Customs and Excise; Reciprocity; Trade

Commercial Treaties, 2378. *See also* Canada-West Indies; French Trade Agreement; Reciprocity

Commission of Conservation. *See* Conservation Commission

Commissioner of Patents, 623
Report, 107

Commissioners, Judges as. *See* Judges Act Amdt. Bill

Commissions of Inquiry. *See* Printing Bureau; Grain Trade

Committee of Supply. *See* Supply

Committee on Imperial Defence, 2637-49. *See also* Imperial Defence; Prime Ministers' Conference

Committee on Railways and Shipping. *See* Canadian National Railways

Committees, Standing. *See* House of Commons

Commodities, Taxes on, 3221. *See also* Special War Revenue Act

Compensation for Slaughtered Animals. *See* Health of Animals

Condensed Milk, tax, 3737, 3956

Confederation. *See* Ministers

Conference on International Finance, report tabled, 962

Confidence Games. *See* Criminal Code Amdt. Bill

Confidential Documents. *See* Canadian National Railways

Confidential Information. *See* Canadian National Railways—Management

Confidential Messengers, 1079-80

Conscription, 3200, 3517, 3528. *See also* Military Service Act; Quebec riots

Consent of the House. *See* House of Commons; Deputy Speaker; Speaker

Consequential Amendments. *See* Corrupt Practices at Elections

Conservation Act Repeal Bill
1r., 3739; 2r., 3958; com., 3970; 3r., 3971

Conservation Commission
Abolition of, 2, 875, 3146, 3739, 3958, 3970-1
Illustration farms, 949-954

Consolidated Revenue Fund, surplus from Grain Board, 1447

Constituent and Subsidiary Companies. *See* Canadian National Railways; Railways

Constitutional Development. *See* Address; Canadian Representation; Ministers; Prime Ministers' Conference

Consular Agents. *See* Customs and Excise Dept. Bill; Trade

Consular Certificates. *See* Trade, Agents and Commissioners

Consuls. *See also* Customs and Excise Dept. Bill
Serbian, at Montreal, qu. 605
United States, in Canada, 2405

Contracts. *See* Purchasing Commission; Shipbuilding

Controverted Elections Act. *See* Corrupt Practices at Elections

Convicts. *See* Penitentiaries

Cook, Mr. Fred, 4541, 4557-60. *See also* Printing Bureau

Cooper, Col. John A., qu. 697, 1713

Cooper, Mr. Hugh L., of New York. *See* Chippewa Power Canal

Cooper, Mr. R. C. (Vancouver South)
Soldiers' pensions, insurance and re-establishment, report, 4055-60

Co-operative Marketing. *See* Live Stock

Copp, Mr. Arthur B. (Westmorland)
Address in reply to Governor General's Speech, 445; Minister of Militia; his

Copp, Mr. Arthur B.—*Con.*
Address—*Con.*
position from 1911 to 1917; an exponent of free trade in natural products; speeches of mover and seconder, 446; the amendment—constitutional position of Government; the written and unwritten laws—Bourinot; moral obligation to appeal to people; Ministers in disagreement—public opinion demands election; the precedent of 1911, 449; War election of 1917—formation of Union Government—retirements, 451; responsibility implies public confidence; Mr. Calder; Mr. Spinney; Postmaster General; Minister of Customs and Inland Revenue, 452; St. John Standard, 453; political conditions 1891 to 1896, 454; returned soldiers calling for election; Great War Veterans Association, 455; strength of the Liberal party, 456
Agricultural estimates, increases in, 951
Air Board, 3783
Amherst drill hall, 2739
Canadian National Railways, 4561, 4338
Employees, reduction in number, 1851
Freight rates, 4562
Maritime Provinces, 4561
Private cars, 4563
Staff, 4562
Census enumerators in Moncton county, 3972
Census officials, 830
Civil Service, political patronage, 830
Civil Service Retirement Act Amdt. Bill, 2489-90
Customs
Belyea, Mr., retirement of, 3082
Offices, amalgamation of, 3083
Customs and Excise Dept. Bill
Amalgamation of departments, 3820
Inland Revenue Act—administration, 3820
Customs Tariff Act Amdt., marking of imported goods, 3949
Debates, translation of French speeches, 701
Dominion Lands Act Amdt. Bill, 4068
Dorchester penitentiary
Purchases for, 1108
Salaries, 1096
Warden, 1092
Dredging, 3982
Forts Cumberland and Moncton, care of, 4540
Fredericton experimental farm, qu. 1131
Grand Trunk loan, 4136-67
Harbours and rivers, 3973

Copp, Mr. Arthur B.—*Con.*
Highways, 3023, 3034, 4290, 4303
Immigration, salaries, 3059
Imperial Mineral Resources Bureau, 2166
Inspection of Gas and Gas Meters Bill
Intercolonial Railway, 4561
Judges Act Amdt. Bill, 2119-20, 2151
Justice Department, private secretaries, 1079
"Laurentian," Government steamer, qu. 1348
Marine signal service, 1998
Moncton, examining warehouse, 2815
"Niobe" and "Rainbow," sale, 4031-2
Parliament Buildings, 4070
Partridge Island quarantine station, 2810
Pilotage, 1999, 2001
Railway Department
Purchasing agent, 1670
St. John and Quebec Railway Bill, 2153, 4564
St. John Rolling Mills. *See* "Niobe" and "Rainbow"
Sackville public building, 2816
Shediac and Cape Tormentine Railway, 4564
Sheridan, Mr. John, resignation of, 4505
Shipbuilding, 1905, 1931, 1935
Wednesday evening adjournment, 1837
Welland canal, construction, 2996

Copyright Amendment and Consolidation Bill, 2, 649
1r., 350; 2r., ref. to Special Com., 2909; com., 3830. 3r., 3850; Senate Amdts. concurred in, 4256
Special Com. appointed, 2941
Report, 3761
Subjects and Sections discussed:
Acts of United Kingdom, 3833-46
Berne Convention, 3833
License to print, 3831-7
Phonographic discs, 3832
Publication in serial form, 3844
Royalty, 3831
Second or succeeding editions, 3840
Suppression of works, 3838

Corn Borer, 1025, 1027, 1031

Corning, W. H., cattle purchases, qu. 1624

Cornmeal, 3546

Correspondence. *See also* Canadian National Railways
Availability to Parliament, 1290-1

Corrupt Practices Inquiries Act
Bill withdrawn, 1126

Corrupt Practices at Elections Bill
1r., 1126-7; 2r., 2036; com., 2036; 3r., 2151
Subjects and Sections Discussed:
Avoidance of election, 2037
Exoneration of candidate from consequence of illegal practices, 2037
Exoneration of any person from consequences, etc., 2037
Illegal practices, 2036
Judge's report published, 2037
Presenting petition, 2037
Punishment of corrupt or illegal practices, 2037

Cory, Mr. W. W., and Immigration Department, 3056

Cost of Living, 3169, 3226, 3256, 3548, 3606, 4551. *See also* Address; Budget; Civil Service Bonus; Customs and Excise Dept. Bill; Superannuation, Increased allowances

Cote, Hon. Mr., Provincial Secretary, Alberta, 1266

Coughlan Shipbuilding Company, 1890

County Fairs. *See* Agricultural Shows; Live Stock

Courtenay Bay, improvements, 4097. *See also* St. John Harbour

Cowan, Mr. G. H., K.C., legal expenses, 2187

Cowan, Mr. Walter D. (Regina)
Address in reply to Governor General's Speech, 165; Canada at Assembly of League of Nations—election—agitation and unrest, 165; abnormal business conditions—visit of leader of Opposition to western provinces; the tariff, 166; newspaper comment; opinions of business men and returned soldiers, 167; omission of tariff from amendment; unfair to hold election before redistribution, 168; duty on fruit; express rates; Scientific and Industrial research, 164
Agrarian party and Wheat Board, 1455
Briquetting plant at Bienfait, qu. 673
Budget, 3375. Congratulations to Minister of Finance, 3375; attitude of Opposition and Agrarian party, 3376; Agrarian party and free trade, 3376; loan to Belgium, 3377; agricultural machinery and the tariff; 3379; Customs duties and manufacturers, 3380; free trade and combines, 3382; price-fixing ring in Great Britain, 3383; protective tariff and Western Canada, 3384; agricultural implements, duty on, 3386-7

Cowan, Mr. Walter D.—*Con.*
Canadian Northern, Craven line, 3053
Canadian Wheat Board, qu. 340, 341, 1452, 1455
Flax-growing, 1396
Fuel Supply Problem, 1266
Great Lakes-St. Lawrence waterway, 685
Natural resources, 845
Saskatchewan militia organization, 2795-6
Trade commissioners, 1392

Cow-Testing Associations, 1036

Creamer, Dr. J. P., qu. 1236

Creameries. *See* Dairying Industry

Cream Separators, 3328, 3364, 3495, 3481, 3508. *See also* Agricultural Implements

Credits. *See* Finance; Housing; Loans

Crerar, Hon. T. A. (Marquette)
Address in reply to Governor General's Speech, 262; congratulations to Prime Minister; to mover and seconder; the Speech a meagre bill of fare—freedom from unrest; Speeches of the Prime Minister; fishing in Quebec; unemployment insurance and old age pensions; tariff revision, 263; protection to agriculture; revenue, 264; finances; necessity for economy; expenditures, 265; naval and militia votes; trade and exchange; Great Britain, Australia, and United States, 266; need for extended markets; reciprocity, 267; commercial agents, 268; national railways; deficit; special committee suggested; reorganization of board of directors; immigration, 269; Prime Ministers' Conference; Imperial defence; the amendment; Government has lost confidence of country; by-elections; reorganization of Government, 271; redistribution; serious problems, 272
Archives, provision for, 2951
Budget, 3476. Reference to previous speakers in debate; national debt and Finance Minister's surplus, 3476; revenues and expenditures, 3477; maturing loans, provision for, 3478; Agrarian party—"servile tools and minions"—3479; York-Sunbury election, Government platform, 3480; Binder twine industry, 3481; cream separators, 3481; tariff revision, 3482; adverse exchange and protection, 3482; export trade, 3483; boot and shoe industry, 3484; Sherwin-Williams Paint Company, 3484; sales tax, 3485; income taxes in

Crerar, Hon. T. A.—*Con.*
Budget—*Con.*
Canada and Great Britain, 3486; land taxation, 3486; agricultural products; restricted market and decline in value, 3487; rigid economy in expenditure necessary, 3487
Business of the House
Audibility of debates, 1625
Saturday sittings, 2818
By-elections
Medicine Hat, 2151
York-Sunbury, 3480, 3628
Canada Temperance Act, 4379
Canadian National Railways
Lord Shaughnessy's letter, 2503
Management — Information, M. (Mr. King) 1187
Special Committee
M. (Mr. Maclean) 1184
M. (Mr. Meighen) 1776, 1804
Amdt. 1812, 1813
Canadian Representation in the United States, 2412-17
Canal tolls, 2964
Civil Service Act Amdt. Bill, 2835-66
Deceased members, tribute to, 153
Destruction of documents, 2951
Dominion Elections Act Amdt. Bill, 4239-41
Additional courts, 3111
Alien wives of British subjects, 3106
Certificate of naturalization qualification, 4240
Forms, 4240
Government terminal elevators—overages, 3634
Governor General, address to on retirement, 4434
Grain Growers Grain Company, 3180
Grain inquiry
Proposed commissioners, 1674
Grand Trunk Arbitration Bill, 2449-59
Great Lakes-St. Lawrence waterway, 689
Highway construction in Ontario, 4294-6
Hudson Bay Railway, 998
Income Tax Act Amdt. Bill, 4345
Judge Snider's report, 4436
Lake of the Woods Control Board Bill, 2351-2
Lake of the Woods Regulation Bill, 4184-4224
Migratory Birds Convention Act Amdt. Bill, 2891
Natural resources—transfer to western provinces, 2529-46
Navigation, season of, 1994
Owens, the late Thomas P., Editor of Debates, 259
Post Office Department, 4519

Crerar, Hon. T. A.—*Con.*
Proportional representation, 1545, 1546
Railway Commission, vacancy, 3021
References to, 367, 372, 390, 395, 438, 450, 515. *See also* Speeches on Address; Budget
Resignation of, letter, Sir Robert Borden, 516
Senate and House of Commons Act Amdt. (Ministers and directorships) 662
Senate Committee, leave to attend, 3207, 3259
Shipbuilding, attitude on, 1978, 2082
Speaker's Chair, presentation of, 3694
Trent canal, 2971-8
Welland canal, 2974
Wheat Board, position with regard to, 1452
York-Sunbury election, 3480
Debates, official report of, changes in, 3628
Reference to by Mr. Stevens, 3627-8

Criminal Cases
Appeals, 3006
Procedure, 3006

Criminal Code Amendment Bills
1. Aliens and Firearms (Mr. Currie) 1r., 2373; Bills withdrawn, 2560; (See Bill No. 7)
2. Excessive or Inadequate Punishments (Mr. Tweedie) 1r., 695; M. for 2r. stands, 1856, 1857, 2228
3. Defamatory Libel. (Mr. Archambault) 1r., 2149, 3933
4. Probation of Offenders. (Mr. Mowat) 1r., 2097. (See No. 7)
5. Three Card Monte (Mr. Lafortune) 1r., 1439; 2r., 1857; com., 1857-58; 2555; (See No. 7)
6. Warrant of Commitment (Mr. Mewburn) 1r., 2686
7. Age of Consent; Firearms; Motor Car Theft; Recorder's Court Jurisdiction; Seduction; etc. (Mr. Doherty) 1r., 3005-7; 2r., 3830; com., 3830-96; 3906; 3r., 3938; Senate Amdts, concurred in, 4342

Subjects and Sections discussed:
Animals, docking, 3922-36, 4343
Carnally knowing, 3912, 4342
Chattels, $25 in value, fraudulently burning, 3922, 4343
Clerk or Deputy Clerk of Peace, 3936
Commencement of Act, 3932
Concealed weapons, pistols, ammunition, etc., 3900-33
Disorderly house, 3925
Dogs—docking, 3936
Driving motor vehicles while intoxicated, 3911

Criminal Code Amendment Bills—*Con.*
Subjects and Sections Discussed—*Con.*
Falsely registering at hotel as man and wife, 3909
Feeble-minded, 3896-3932
Forms, 3932
Horses, docking, 3923
Illicit connection with Indian woman, 3907
Indecent assault—age raised from 14 to 16, 3911, 4342
Location of land, 4343.
Marks made on public stores, 3921
Metal tokens used as money. 3923
Offender under suspended sentence may be placed on probation, 3931
Officials stealing fares, 3925
Penalty for injuring oil wells, etc., extended to gas wells, 3922
Publication of Judicial Proceedings—Defamatory libel, 3933
Rape—whipping added to punishment, 3912
Reading depositions on preliminary inquiry, 3924
Recorder's Court, 3899
Revising of sentences, 4343
Seduction and carnal knowledge, 3899, 4342
Spanking—persons under 21 and guilty of theft, liable to, 3918
Stealing automobiles, minimum sentence for, 3913
Three Card Monte, 3921
Whipping for robbery and assault with intent to rob, 3922
Witness fees, 3937

Cromwell's Navigation Act, 1872

Cronyn, Mr. Hume (London)
Bankruptcy Act Amdt. Bill, 2922
Civil Service Act. Amdt. Bill
Air Force, preference, 4483
Returned Soldiers, preference, Amdt. 4482, 4493, 4577
Housing, 1146
National Research Institute, 886, 2695
Natural resources, 885
Pension Act Amdt. Bill, 4366-73
Pensions, widowed mothers, 633, 4369
Polish battalion for service in French army, 4055
Returned Soldiers' Insurance Act Amdt. Bill, 4262, 4356
Returned Soldiers
Special Committee on Pensions, Insurance and Re-establishment

Cronyn, Mr. Hume—*Con.*
Returned Soldiers—*Con.*
Motion for adoption of report, 4041-55. *See also* Returned Soldiers, Special Committee Civil Service
Quorum, 901

Crop Reports, 1116

Crops, Loss of through insect pests, 1028

Crowe, Mr. S. J. (Burrard)
Currency Act Amdt. Bill, 2269

Crown, taxation of the, 3742

Cruelty to Animals. *See* Criminal Code Amendment Bill

Currant Boxes. *See* Berry Boxes

Currency Act Amendment Bill
Res. 2160; 1r., 2162; 2r., com., 2269; 3r., 2270

Currie, Mr. J. A. (North Simcoe)
Adams, Capt. Henry C., qu. 1237
Armistice Day Bill, 3776
Australian and New Zealand trade, 1223
Automobile theft, 3914
Bankruptcy Act Amdt. Bill, 2925
Berry Boxes, 4115
Business of the House, 1831
Supply, procedure,
Discussion not in order, 1217
Hypothetical questions, 1217
Canadian Manufacturers and American markets, 1223
Canadian National Railways
Management—Information, M. (Mr. King) 1194
Cattle embargo, qu. 714
Chief Justice, income tax and, 1566
Chinese Immigration Act Amdt. Bill, 3828
Civil Service Act Amdt. Bill, 2825-48-83, 4283, 4466-93
Annual report, 4473
Holidays, religious, point of order, 4485
Returned soldiers—preference, 4493
Stayner postmaster, 4471
Copyright Amendment and Consolidation Bill, 3835-41
Criminal Code Amdt. Bill, 3900-34
Firearms, 2373, 2560
Customs and Excise Dept. Bill
Commercial agencies, 4408
Consular certificate, 4408
"Dick Turpin"—point of order, 4421
Dumping of goods, 4412
Invoice certificate, fee, 4391

Currie, Mr. J. A.—*Con.*
Customs and Excise Dept. Bill—*Con.*
Trade, extension, 4408
Valuation for duty, 4412
De Martigny divorce, 3764-9
Destruction of documents, 2950-3
Dominion Elections Act Amdt. 309
Dredging, 3982
Foreign trade commissioners, 1223
French Trade Agreement, 1175
Gaspé Peninsula, railway facilities, 2509
Geodetic survey, 2806
Geological survey, 2145-7
Grain
Grain Growers Grain Company, 1462
Open market in, 1452
Harbours and rivers, 3979
Highland regiments, 2307
Highway construction in Ontario, 4296
Income Tax Act Amdt. Bill, 4353-5
Lake of the Woods Control Board Bill, 2355
League of Nations, contribution to, 2365-73
Letter rate, 4517
Linen trade, 1391
Maple Products Act, 1920, Amdt. Bill, 2558, 2890
Militia
Command pay, 2292
Purchasing Commission, 2239
Topographic Survey, 2806
National Expenditures Committee, 1835
National Transcontinental Railway—Winnipeg-Quebec service, 2516
"Niobe" and "Rainbow," sale,—point of order, 4030
Opium and Narcotic Drug Act Amdt. Bill, 2899-2905
Parliament buildings, 4076
Letter of Hon. George Brown, 4001
Post Office, Col. Verret, 4525
Potato growing and diseases, 1033
Press—publication of court proceedings, 3933
Prime Ministers' Conference, 2669
Soldiers' pensions, insurance and re-establishment, 4059
Spruce forests, bud worm, 1031
Trade agents, 1478
Trade with Fiji Islands, 1465
United States, exports to, 1222
Wednesday evening adjournment, 1831
Welland canal, construction—point of order, 2989
Wheat Board, loss under, 1457-9
Wheat, purchase by Great Britain, 1449

Customs. *See also* Customs and Excise Dept. Bill; Customs Tariff, 1907, Amdt. Bill; Tariff

Customs—*Con.*
Brokers'
Licenses, 3786
Payments to by departments, 1090
Drawbacks, qu. 2375
On fish from United States, qu. 600
Entry, 3786
Foreign monetary standards, qu. 1133
Importations
Foreign goods, 3119
From Germany, qu. 696
Marking of, 3120
Reported increase in, 597
Revenue by provinces, qu. 1622
Value for duty, 3786-3819
Valuation of currency, 3786-3818

Customs and Excise Dept. Bill
Res. 3785; 1r., 3822; 2r., com., 4388; 3r., 4453
Subjects and sections discussed:
Certificate, form of, 3788
Certificate of trade or consular agent, 4389
Commission, 4388
Consular agents, 3791
Cost of production in foreign country, 4411
Customs house brokers, 4432
Department constituted, 4388
Entry, 4389
Exchange—tariff rates on foreign goods, 4421
Express parcels, 4400
Fee for invoice certificate, 4389
Who pays?—3792-9, 4391-5, 4400-9
German competition, 4423
German mark, depreciation, 3810-19
Invoice certificate, 3786-3809, 4391-5, 4400-9
Minister's duties, powers and functions, 4389
Molasses wash, for hog feed, 3787-3820
New or unused goods, 3813
Proclamation of Act, 3798, 4391-4
Provincial analyst, certificate, 3786
"Reasonable profit under the circumstances," 4415
Restriction of trade, 4398
Letter of Gillies Bros., Limited, 4418
Revenue, expenditure, 4397-9, 4403
Still—innocent manufacture of part or possession, 3788-3820
Third reading, complaint of haste, 4449
Trade agents, 3786-3809
Trade, extension of, 4389
United States Customs regulations, 4417
Valuation for duty at not less than wholesale price, 4411
Valuation of currency, 4420

Customs and Inland Revenue
Department
Board of Customs, 4126
Consolidation of offices, 3083
Estimates, 2889, 3077, 4117
Inspectors, 4126
Officials
Merchandise, branding of. *See* Customs Tariff Act Amdt. Bill
Overtime, 4123-5
Reorganization, 804
Retirement, 2490-7, 2502, 4268-72
Salaries and contingent expenses, 2889, 3081, 4117
Staff, reduction, 4117
Toronto, 1351
Revenue cruisers and preventive service, 4127
Minister, private business connections, 3077, 3172

Customs Tariff Act, 1907, Amdt. Bill
Res. 3121, 3698; 1r., 3725; 2r., com., 3938; 3r., 3955
Subjects and sections discussed:
Anodynes, elixirs, etc., 3709
Imported goods to be marked, branded or labelled, 3711-19, 3938
Spirituous liquors, 3708-8
Sugar, 3699
West Indian importations, preference, 3698
Wines
Medicinal, 3709
Other than sparkling, 3710
Sparkling, 3711

Dairy Cattle. *See* Health of Animals; Live Stock

Dairy Herds, testing of, 1118

Dairying Industry, 1036, 3118. *See also* Address; Budget; Dairy Produce, Grading; Oleomargarine
Butter
Material for substitutes, 3745
Price of, 3190, 3256
Production, 3118
Butter and Cheese
Exports and imports, 1037, 1470, 1471, 3747-50, 3852-88, 4438
Cheese factories, 1472
National Dairy Council, 1126

Dairy Produce, Grading Bill
Res., 1r., 3760; 2r., com., 4439; 3r., 4448
Subjects and sections discussed:
Butter and cheese, export, 4437
Complaint of undue haste, 4449
Definitions, 4437

Dairy Produce Grading Bill—*Con.*
Subjects and Sections Discussed—*Con.*
Demand for legislation, 4437
Regulations, 4448

d'Anjou, Mr. Emmanuel (Rimouski)
Address in reply to Governor General's Speech, 137; right of Mr. Mackenzie King to lead Liberal party—overtures of Government to Province of Quebec; the French language, 138; Government without authority to carry on administration; Prime Minister the author of iniquitous laws, 139
Agricultural shows, 1240
Debates, translation of French speeches, 700
Experimental station in Rimouski, 954
Lightkeepers' salaries, 1995
Military expenditure, 2801
Shipbuilding, 1924

Dark Lantern Brigade, 1187, 1192, 1209, 1282

Davidson, Mr. A. L. (Digby and Annapolis)
Annapolis public building, 2743
Apple-growing counties of Nova Scotia, 1046
British preference and free trade, 3666
Canada Temperance Act—relevancy, point of order, 4383
Canadian Wheat Board, participation certificates, 341
Guernsey cattle at Nappan, qu. 2686
Highways expenditure, 2555
Proportional representation, Special Com., 2027
Reference to Hon. Mr. Mackenzie King in speech, 2443

Davie Shipbuilding Company, qu. 1348, 1846, 1972

Davis, Mr. F. L. (Neepawa)
Address in reply to Governor General's Speech, 483; congratulations to Prime Minister; "no man's land"; formation and composition of Government; out of touch with electorate, 483; Progressive platform; Liberal party; tariff "opportunism"; transportation; Committee on Estimates; Imperial relations; excess profits tax; demand by western provinces for natural resources, 484; redistribution and election, 485
American immigration, 3064
Budget, 3262. Business and financial depression, 3262; business profits and income tax, 3262; heavy freight rates, 3263; adverse balance of trade, 3264; exchange variation, 3264; debts and

Davis, Mr. F. L.—*Con.*
Budget—*Con.*
obligations, 3265; United States, borrowings from, 3266
Canadian National Railways
Management—Information, M. (Mr. King) 1193
Special Committee, reference to, M. (Mr. Meighen) 1793
Civil Service Act Amdt. Bill, 4283
Customs and Excise Dept. Bill
Cost of production, 4413
English bankers on trade restriction, 4412
Exchange, 4413
Foreign goods, cost of production, 3814
German goods via Holland, England and the United States, 4427
Money—purchasing power and exchange value, 4427
New and unused goods, 3815
Valuation for duty, 4412
Valuation of currency, 3816, 4427
Wages, 4428
Customs Tariff Act, 1907, Amdt. Bill, imported goods, marking, 3940
Estimates, Committee on, 484, 2197
Grand Trunk Arbitration Bill, 2458-70
Grand Trunk loan, 4146
Hudson Bay Railway, 994, 2969
Lake of the Woods Regulation Bill, 4220
Militia—reduction of staff, 2241
Natural resources—transfer to western provinces, 2537
Proportional representation, 1542
Welland canal construction, 2967-8
Wheat Board, unified buying, 1459

Dawson, Judge at, 1088

Daylight Saving, 401, qu. 1817
Ottawa, in, qu. 2687, 2776

Dease and Stikine Rivers, qu. 1133

Debates, Official, Report of. *See* House of Commons

Decayed Pilots, 2000. *See also* Pilots

Dechene, Mr. A. M. (Montmagny)
Agricultural Gazette, 1076
Agricultural shows, 1243
Board of Trade forms in French, 2819, 3320
Budget, 3466. Government system of taxation; war profits tax and large companies; income tax, 3467; Yamaska election, 3467; railway administration, 3469; fire insurance in foreign firms, 3469

Dechene, Mr. A. M.—*Con.*
Butter
Exports, 1037
Price of, 3256
Butter and cheese exports, 1471
Civil Service
Bonus, 4535
Classification, 4541
Dairy Products Grading Bill, 4446
Government shipbuilding programme, 2094
Immigration, salaries, 3057
Militia employees, 2241
Montmagny—railway shed accommodation, 4570
Oleomargarine Act Amdt. Bill, 3759, 3860
Post Office, Isles aux Grues-Montmagny service, 4529
Potato diseases, 1032
Public Works—Nova Scotia, 2754
Special War Revenue Act Amdt.
Missals and prayer books, 3756
Prayer beads and crucifixes, 3756
Sales tax, 3757
Supply—point of order, 2759

Decorations, foreign, to Canadians, qu. 1132

Defamatory Libel. *See* Criminal Code Amdt. Bills

Delinquent Children, 3012. *See also* Juvenile Delinquents

Delisle, Mr. M. S. (Portneuf)
Cabinet Ministers and Post Office Dept., qu. 1349
Canadian National Railways
Conductors and brakemen discharged, qu. 1622
Post Office Department—reorganization, 3772

De Martigny Divorce. *See* Private Bills Discussed

Demers, Mr. M. J. (St. Johns and Iberville)
Address in reply to Governor General's Speech, 232; congratulations to mover and seconder; general election, inevitable, 232; circumstances under which Government was formed; manipulation of soldier votes in 1917; no relief until constitutional government restored; Prime Minister's attitude towards Quebec, 233; all classes anxious for general election; necessity for rigid economy, 234
Budget, 3437. Financial and economic condition of country, 3437; railway deficit,

Demers, Mr. M. J.—*Con.*
Budget—*Con.*
3438; shipbuilding, 3438; military expenditure, 3440; economy in public affairs, 3440
Deposits outside Canada in Canadian banks, qu. 1623
Fort Lennox, Isle-aux-Noix, sundial, qu. 2097
Pecuniary Claims Convention, qu. 736, qu. 1817; qu. 2027
Permanent Court of International Justice, 2718-22
St. Jean Post office, receipts, qu. 576

Demobilization, 2285, 3523. *See also* Soldiers Civil Re-establishment; Special Committee on Pensions, Insurance and Re-establishment.
Canadian claims against Germany, 4534. *See also* Germany
Enemy debts, 4534
Public Works, 3989

Democratic Government. *See* Ministers

Demography, Chief of, 1232

Denis, Mr. J. J. (Joliette)
Address in reply to Governor General's Speech, 539; French language; speech of Prime Minister a document without fragrance, flavour or taste, 540; the new Government and the old; Prime Minister's tour; general election; position of Government precarious and humiliating, 541; province of Quebec, 542; League of Nations; French speaking representatives; International Labour Conference, 544; financial position of Canada, 545; amendments, 546; ten years without an election; the one issue of 1917; fiscal policy, 547
Alcohol, tax on, 3732
Budget, 3575. Approved by industrial interests, 3575; sales tax bears heavily on working classes, 3576; tax on spirits, 3576; railway situation, 3577; immigration policy, 3580; military expenditures, 3580
Business of the House
Duration of sittings, 3733
Private Bills, 3971
Canada-West Indies Trade Agreement, 2257-8
Canadian National Railways
Joliette bridge, 3038, 4320
Canadian Representation in the United States, 2419-21
Census commissioners in province of Quebec, 832

Denis, Mr. J. J.—*Con.*
Chinese Immigration Act Amdt. Bill, 3828
Civil Service Act Amdt. Bill, 2865
Civil Service, political patronage, 831
Criminal Code Amendment Bill, 3830
Customs and Excise Dept. Bill
Valuation of currency, 3818
Dairy Produce, grading Bill, 3760
Debates, official, distribution of, 2221
De Martigny divorce, 4002-6
Estimates in French, 1385
Grand Trunk loan, 4159-62
Highways, Quebec, 4308
Immigration, 2598, 3088
Immigration Act Amdt. Bill, 3825
Income Tax Act Consolidation, 2819, 3905
Oleomargarine Act Amdt. Bill, 3759, 3877, Amdt. to 2r., 3879, neg. 3886
Privilege—Immigration, remarks on, 3088
Proportional representation, 1543
Quarantine stations, 2811
Special War Revenue Act Amdt. Bill
Amendments, 3755
Lumber, tax on, 3756-7
Sales tax, 3755

Departmental Expenditures. *See also* Supply, Depts.
Detailed information, 1186-7

Departments
Purchasing Commission, 1099
Supply, right of discussion, 1215. *See also* Supply

Deportation of Undesirables. *See* Immigration Act Amdt. Bill

Depot Harbour, wharf, 3973

Deputy Governor General, 1559

Deputy Speaker and Chairman of Committees (Mr. George H. Boivin)
Rulings and Statements of. *See also* House of Commons; Speaker
Amendment
Changing destination of vote, 4169, 4289
Mover may not speak second time without consent, 727
Sent across floor, 764
To Public or Government Bill, 4485
Announcement by Minister in Committee, of Governor General's assent, 4169
Bills
Amendments
Involving or increasing charge on public revenue, 4359, 4485-91
Negativing principle, 3895
Which do not alter principle, 4355
Committee
Discussion of principle in, 779
Notice of amdt. to public or government Bill not required, 4485

Deputy Speaker and Chairman of Committee (Mr. George H. Boivin)—*Con.*
Rulings and Statements of—*Con.*
Bills—*Con.*
Committee—*Con.*
Principle having been adopted discussion must be relevant to clause 4466
Question put and declared carried, 4488
Title cannot be changed in, 2033
Two questions cannot be considered at same time, 4229
Consideration of clauses en bloc, 3956
Introduction of
No debate allowed, 3007
Motion to strike out section not in order, 3952
Permissible to move consideration clause by clause, 3956
Private
Com. must first report progress and motion to refer back will be in order, 1130
Precedence only for first hour on Friday night, 4010
Recommendation for change of title, 1096
Right
To hear evidence, 3768
To refer back, 1130, 3768
To review action, 4004
Senate amendments, non-concurrence in, reasons, 3010
2r.,
Analysis of clauses on, 2832
Objection to Bill not being printed in both languages must be raised before, 1095
Order for, stands, 1857
Questions and comments not in order, 2834
3r.,
Amendment, notice of, 3421
Change of title, 1096
Chair
Cannot oblige Minister to give answer unless he so desires, 1908
Rulings of subject to judgment of House, 3562
To be addressed by Members, 1066, 1896, 3468, 3530
Closure. *See that title*
Minister's right to speak exhausted, 2080
2 a.m. rule, 2094
Committee
Discussion must be strictly relevant, 1570, 1995

Deputy Speaker and Chairman of Committee (Mr. George H. Boivin)—*Con.*
Rulings and Statements of—*Con.*
Committee—*Con.*
Evidence taken in Court not to be used as argument, 3769
Forms adopted can only be reconsidered by unanimous consent, 4229-49
Having agreed to report, member's opportunity to speak has passed, 4275
Item declared carried after question put, 1091
No item before Com., debate not in order, 1090
Principle of Bill may not be discussed, in, 779
Vote in, 2756
Correspondence reflecting on members, 2176
Debate
Confined to specific items in Com. of Supply, 944
Details of railway administration, 747-8
Interjection of remarks during, 914
Limitation on Appropriation Bill, 2103
Motion for adjournment negatived, mover precluded from continuing, 894
Motion to adjourn by member closing discussion, 999
Debates, Official report of
Statement not read, insertion of, 472, 3270
Decorum—conversation, 272, 528, 3619, 3832, 3982, 4145
Interruptions—members should ask permission, 3215
Language
"Flippant" and "disrespectful", 2746
"Gentlemanly", 3553
"Misstatement", 2321
Letter already read may not be read again, 3080
Member
Attack or reflection on, 4297
Exhausting right to speak, 1650
Has no right to consent to irregularity in debate, 914
Lecturing another, 4078
May comment on letter but not read it again, 3080
May not question ruling, 3003
May speak to point of order, 1217
Minister having floor, member may not ask questions, 1867
Misstatement or untruth, 3615
Must accept statement of Minister, 3080

Deputy Speaker and Chairman of Committee (Mr. George H. Boivin)—*Con.*
Rulings and Statements of—*Con.*
Member—*Con.*
Must not entirely forget subject under discussion, 996
Must rise to ask questions, 3216, 3553
Putting question without giving opportunity for reply, 4471
Right to close debate, 1528
Right to state point of order, 2322
Should speak to question, 1898
Sitting not entitled to answer question until member speaking yields floor, 4402
Two members cannot occupy floor at same time, 4467
Message from Governor General, 4169, 4289
Ministers
Comparison between, 3944
Official conduct of, 3079
Motions
Amended
Purchasing Commission, 2020
In absence of notice require unanimous consent, 3088, 3259, 3582
Mover to close debate, 2206, 2210
Negative, not in order, 2920, 3952, 4411
Non-debatable
Adjournment, for, 2148
That Committee rise, 2230, 2774, 4203
That further consideration be postponed, 1389, 2025, 3716
To refer back, 1130
Non-debatable subjects
Already debated, 2406
Notice of Motion
Action on does not imply acceptance of principle, 584
Order—Point of
Attacks or reflections on judiciary, 1570
Denial does not constitute, 2322
Discussion, 1218
Interim Supply, 2011
When raised members must confine remarks to it, 2009
Pairs—none in Committee, 4531
Previous debate, 3533, 3562, 4212, 4401
Questions
Not relevant, may be asked by consent, 2113
Not in order on item, 3065
Relevancy, 1035, 1345, 1571, 1772, 1898, 2113, 2175, 2405, 2747, 2751-59, 2761, 2916, 2966, 2990, 3003, 4158, 4313
Canadian National Railways, directors, 1667

Deputy Speaker and Chairman of Committee (Mr. George H. Boivin)—*Con.*
Rulings and Statements of—*Con.*
Relevancy—*Con.*
Discussion of "Niobe" and "Rainbow" on estimate for Royal Canadian Navy, 4031
Highway construction in Ontario, 4293-6
Income Tax Act Amdt. Bill, 4354-5
Interrogation of Govt. on estimates to be taken up, 1218
Question not in order on item before Chair, 1669, 3065
Resolutions
Amendments to not reported, 3755
Consideration, item by item, 3026
Ruling may be appealed but not questioned, 779
Speaker's Chair, speech on presentation, 3691
Notice of presentation, 3688
Statement not a question, 4056
Supply
Agreement as to contentious items, 4538
Amendment changing destination of vote, 4169, 4289
Amendments in—discussion must be relevant, 1191, 1583
Announcement of consent of Governor General, 4169, 4289
Discussion confined to specific item, 944, 919, 3066
Government orders may be called in sequence as Government think fit, 962
Individual items, motion to strike out, 3015
Interim
Further consideration of item postponed, 1682
Motion, 1674
Notice not required, 1676
Resolution can only be considered by unanimous consent, 1680
Item by item, 3014, 3132
Item disposed of discussion not in order, 1090
Latitude of discussion, 3014
Liberty to discuss any subject on item allowed to stand, 4033
Minister in order in asking that item be called, 961
Mounted Police not to be discussed on Militia Estimates, 2799-2801
Motion that item be struck out, not in order, 2617
Questions not in order, 1653, 3056

Deputy Speaker and Chairman of Committee (Mr. George H. Boivin)—*Con.*
Rulings and Statements of—*Con.*
Supply—*Con.*
Railway items to be considered separately, 3048
Reverting to previous item, 2163
Rule 17C, Estimates on Thursdays and Fridays, 959, 961, 962, 1677
Unanimous consent, 1026, 1074-6, 1677, 1680, 3088, 3259, 3582, 3725, 3849, 3936, 4245, 4489-92
Vote in Com., hearing question, 2756
Vote, to be counted, five members should rise, 1068

De Salaberry, Miss, 4070

Desaulniers, Mr. Arthur L. (Champlain)
Military Service Act—Mr. R. A. Stewart, qu. 2028
Privilege—name omitted from division list, 4255
Rural Mail routes, qu. 605
Stewart, Mr. R. A., qu. 2028, qu. 2343

Desjardins, "Ti-Noir," 1515, 3562

Deslauriers, Mr. Hermas (St. Mary)
Bonus to letter carriers, qu. 967
Canadian National Railways, locomotives at Parent, qu. 963
Prime Ministers' Conference, 2554, 2672
Shipbuilding, 1966
Unemployment, suspension of immigration, M, 1351

Destructive Insect and Pest Act, 1027, 4512. *See also* Entomology

Destruction of Public Documents. *See* Printing Bureau

Desy, Mr. Justice, 1569

Detroit River, 1996

Devlin, Mr. Emmanuel (Wright)
Address in reply to Governor General's Speech, 57; complimentary reference to Minister of Trade and Commerce, 57; official languages, League of Nations; reply to Prime Minister; status of the Government; no precedent for present situation; the tariff, 58; financial, agricultural and industrial conditions consequent on war; Government by Order in Council; voice of the people stifled; agricultural growth of Quebec, 59
Dominion Elections Act Amdt. Bill, 260
Experimental Station in Wright, 922
Georgian Bay Canal, 679
Great Lakes-St. Lawrence waterway, 679

Devonshire, Duke of. *See* Governor General

Dick Turpin, 4421

Dillon, Mr. Gerald, Purchasing Agent, 1079

Direct Taxation. *See* Taxation

Directors. *See* Canadian National Railways

Directorships. *See* Ministers and Directorships

Disarmament, 98, 3150, 3418. *See also* League of Nations

Discrimination in Rates. *See* Railway Act Amdt. Bill

Diseased Herds. *See* Health of Animals

Disfranchising Act, 1r., 1126. Bill withdrawn, 1126

Disputed Accounts. *See* Pecuniary Claims Convention

Disraeli, Benjamin, and Proportional Representation, 1552

Divisions. *See* House of Commons

Divorce, 228, 4474. *See also* De Martigny

Dockages, 3633-34. *See also* Grain and Grain Trade; Wheat

Docking Animals. *See* Criminal Code Amdt. Bill

Dockyards, 4017-36. *See also* Drydocks

Documentary Evidence. *See* Canada Evidence Act Amdt. Bill

Documents
Access to, 1286
Production of. *See* Canadian National Railways
Public, destruction of. *See* Printing Bureau

Doherty, Right Hon. C. J. (Minister of Justice)
Address in reply to Governor General's Speech, 188; speech of Mr. Lemieux; Canada's status; a voice in foreign affairs; Mr. Asquith's declaration, 189, 190; development of inter-imperial relations, 190; equality amongst the nations of the British Commonwealth; signature of Peace Treaty, 191; consular service; Ambassador at Washington; the ghost of Imperial centralization; declaration of Prime Minister, 192; general election before Prime Ministers' Conference, 193; Assembly of the League of Nations, 195; alleged violation of constitution by continu-

Doherty, Right Hon. C. J.—*Con.*
Address—*Con.*
ance of Government, 196; authority derived from people and parliament; countries in which elections have been held, 197; Sir Wilfrid Laurier, 198; by-elections, 199; requisitioning of ships; cattle embargo; merchant marine; the Gold Coast and Nigeria, 200; "deadly parallels"; reciprocity; election in England after South African War, 201; declaration of Prime Minister at Montreal, 202
Ambassador at Washington, 185. *See also* Canadian Representation
Ames, Sir Herbert, resignation of, 1323
Bankruptcy Act Amdt. Bill, 2914-39
Judges under, 1085
Business of the House
Adjournment, 1173
Closure,
Motion under Rule 17B—Govt. shipbuilding programme, 2076
Notice of, 2026
Estimates, Rule 17C, Thursdays and Fridays, 958, 3001
Interim supply, 2011
Morning sittings, prorogation, 4338
Order of, 1672
Supply, procedure, 1073
Justice Dept., 1073
By-elections Bill, 1310
Canada Evidence Act Amdt. Bill, 3318
Canada Temperance Act Amdt. Bill, 4061
Alberta Court of Appeal, decision, 4375
Constitutional question, 4375
Costs, 4378-81
Court cases pending, 4374
Gold Seal Company vs. Dominion Express Co., 4375-8
Pending litigation not to be affected Amdt. (Mr. A. K Maclean) 4384
Prohibition plebiscite, 3901
Public vs. private interests, 4374
Canada Temperance Act
Quebec, petition for suspension of Act, 3584, 4382
Canadian Bar Association, 1095
Canadian Nationals Definition Act, 397, 585, 644, 768
Declaration of alienage, 2031-2033
Canadian National Railways
Special Committee
M. (Mr. A. K. Maclean) 1598
M. (Mr. Meighen) 1766
"Champlain" steamer, 1980
Civil Service Act Amdt. Bill, 2835-72, 4467-89

Doherty, Right Hon. C. J.—*Con.*
Civil Service, Political patronage in, (Res. Sir Sam Hughes) 809
Conservation Act Repeal Bill, 3146
Copyright Amdt. and Consolidation Bill, 350, 649, 2908, 3830-50
British Copyright Acts, 3833
Explanation of provisions, 3830
License to print, 3831
Phonographic discs, 3832
Royalty, 3831
Criminal Code Amdt. Bills, 3005, 3830, 3896-3901; 3906-38
Automobile theft, 3913
Defamatory libel, publication of judicial proceedings, 3934
Firearms, 3900-6
Juvenile deliquents, spanking, 3918
Senate amendments, 4256, 4343
Witness fees, 3937
Excessive or inadequate punishments, 1856
Exchequer Court Amdt. Bill, 563, 623
Extradition treaty, 3008, 3319, 3740, 3741
Hearst publications, 4171
Inspection of Gas and Gas Meters, 614
Judges
Exchequer Court, 1083
Judicial district of Quebec, 1081
Resignation of, 1093
Retirement and superannuation of, 1082
Vice-admiralty, 1084
Yukon, 1088
Judges Act, 1920, correspondence, 1851
Judges Act Amendment Bill, 1559, 1561, 3009
Free Conference with Senate, 3972, 4061, 4250
Retiring allowance, 1562
Judge Snider's report, 3905
Judicial districts, division of, 1083
Justice
Administration of
Northwest, 1080
Yukon, 1087
Department
Litigated matters, 1089
Private secretaries, 1079
Purchasing agent, 1079, 1115
Salaries, 1076
Juvenile deliquents Act Amdt. Bill, 3319, 3758. *See also* under this head Criminal Code Amdt. Bill
Law stamps, tax, 1090
League of Nations. *See also* under this title Address
Contribution to, 2362-9
Permanent Court of International Justice, 2096. *See also* that title under this head

Doherty, Right Hon. C. J.—*Con.*
Legal expenses, 4497
Madrid Postal Conference, 3001
Maisonneuve and Gaspé representation, 2315
Marine estimates, closure notice, 1988
Migratory Birds Convention Act Amdt., 2892
Militia Dept., sale of surplus supplies, 1098
Ministers to sit in either Chamber, 1160
National Catholic Labour Unions, 1650
Natural resources, transfer to western provinces, 2551
Nauru Island phosphate deposits, 4255, 4542
"Niobe" and "Rainbow" sale, 4018
Opium and Narcotic Drug Act Amdt. Bill, 2905-8, 3009
Park St. Charles Company, 4571
Patent Act Amdt. Bill, 4456-60
Penitentiaries Act Amdt. Bill, 3738, withdrawn, 3973
Penitentiaries. *See also* that title
Alberta, closing of, 1115
Ballot boxes, labour on, 1092
Detailed statement of expenditure, 1105
Dorchester
Purchases for, 1109
Salary and retiring allowances, 1096
Warden, 1092, 4467
Flour purchases, 1107
Increase in crimes, 1091
Maintenance and cost, increase in, 1111
Prisoners, remission of sentences, 1094
Purchasing system, 1108
St. Vincent de Paul, warden, 1078
Salaries and retiring allowances, 1097, 1110
Saskatchewan, 1091
Stony Mountain, release of prisoners, 478
Supplies for, 1104
Pensions, widowed mothers, 638
Permanent Court of International Justice, 2708-36, 2096, 3014
Post Office Act Amdt. Bill, 1619
Post Office Department
Annuities Branch, 4524
Fiset, Dr. Michel, 4523
Isles aux Grues service, 4529
Letter rate, 4519
Maritime Provinces, 4522
Outside service, 4529
Parcel post rates, 4527
Purchasing agent, 4527
Railway mail service, 4519
Reorganization and administration, 4518
Griffenhagen and Associates, 4519
Rural mail carriers, 4524

Doherty, Right Hon. C. J.—*Con.*
Post Office Department—*Con.*
St. Catherine Bay-Tadoussac mail service, 4530
Verret, Col. Hector, 4525
War tax, 4519
Prisons and Reformatories Act Amdt. Bill, 3011
Privy Council appeals, 1090
Proclamation—enforcement of Acts of Parliament, 3758
Provincial legislation, reports on, 2373
Public Works estimates, 2737
Purchasing Commission, 1080, 2015, 2021
Appointment, date of, 1102
Authority appointing, 1098
Civil Service Commission, and, 1100
Details of contracts, 1104
Reduction, 2024
Staff, 1113
Statutory authority, 1113-1114
Tenders—statute applying, 1106
Quebec riots, 1512
Representation in Parliament, 1321
Scott Act, suspension of, 3584, 4382
Three Card Monte, 1837. *See also* Criminal Code Amdt.
Vice-Admiralty Courts, registrars, 1086
Winding Up Act Amdt. Bill, 2095
Yorkton judicial district, 1080

Dollar, Mr. Robert and shipbuilding, 1707, 1725

Dominion Alliance, 304
Use of armoury at Windsor, 902

Dominion Arsenal, Lindsay, 2439

Dominion Canners
Greek and Roumanian purchases, qu. 1001, 1072

Dominion Coal Company, 3528

Dominion Controverted Elections Act. Bill withdrawn, 1126

Dominion Elections Act Amendment Bill. (Prohibition Plebiscite in Ontario). *See also* Prohibition Plebiscite. 1r., 150-2; 242; 2r., com., 244; 259; 3r., 313
Subjects and Sections discussed:
Agents, names of eliminated, Amdt. (Mr. Bureau) 304
Lists, preparation of, 307
Proclamation, assent and voting, 303, 311
Residential requirement, Amdt. (Mr. Steele), 306; neg. 311

Dominion Elections Act Amdt. Bill
1r., 2775; m. for 2r., 2994; 2r., 3090; com., 3090-3114; 4227; Amdt. (Mr. Euler) to 3r., 4249; 3r., 4250

Dominion Election Act Amdt. Bill—*Con.*
Subjects and sections discussed:
Administration of oaths, 3091
Advance polls, 3099
Amendment to writ, 3100
Certificate, 3100
Certified copy of list, 3094
Chief Electoral Officer, 4288-48
Consent of person nominated, 4246
Election officers, disqualification of, 4245
Foreign born wives and children of British subjects, 4229
Forms, 4227-40
Hours of polling—Amdt. (Mr. Fraser) 4245
Indexed copies of Act for election officers, 3094
Name added to list, 3092
Naturalization—certificate of qualification. Amdt. (Mr. Euler) 3103, 4249
New forms substituted, 3100
Nomination day, postponement of, 3094
Nomination paper, 4246
Oath of qualification, 4228-39
Oath of secrecy, 3095
"Personally naturalized", 4244
Polling divisions, urban, 3091
Polls, holding of, 3095
Qualifications, 3096
Recount, application for, 3097
Returning officer's report, 3098
Revising officers, 3091, 3101, 4250
Smith, Mr. Alexander, 4228-40
Voting, if disqualified, 3098

Dominion Elections Act
Chief Electoral Officer's reports, qu. 577; 731

Dominion Express Company. *See* Canada Temperance Act

Dominion Franchise Act, 361

Dominion Iron and Steel Company, 1710, 1723
Contract for ship plates, qu. 733, 1233. *See also* Shipbuilding

Dominion Lands, 1334
Aerial exploration and survey, 3778
Oil leases and, 1340. *See also* Oil
Pre-emptions and purchased homesteads, qu. 2506
Reclamation, 4495

Dominion Lands Act Amdt. Bill (Appointments). 1r., 3903; 2r., com., 4062; 3r., 4113

Dominion Lands and Parks, 1334, 1343, 4494
Antelope for parks, qu. 1134

Dominion Linens, Limited, 1398. *See also* Flax

Dominion Notes
And gold reserve, qu. 1234
Circulation of, qu. 1001
Securities, qu. 1383

Dominion Securities
Assignments of grain and produce, 1443

Dominion Shipbuilding Company, 1884, qu. 3423. *See also* Shipbuilding

Dominion Statistician
Census commissioners and enumerators, 801, 1232. *See also* Census

Dominion Textile Company, profits, 372

Donner, Mr. W. A., qu. 1624

Don Pacifico, case of, 1522

Dorchester Penitentiary. *See* Penitentiaries

Douglas, Mr., dismissal of from Militia, 2246, 2277

Douglas, Mr. J. C. (Cape Breton South and Richmond)
Canadian National Railways—rails, 1852
Fuel Supply Problem, 1270

Douglas, Mr. James M. (Strathcona)
Oil and Gas rentals, qu. 672
Unemployment and immigration, 1366
As Chairman
Member must show what bearing question has on estimates, 3078

Doukhobors, 1365

Dourine among range horses, 1050

Drainage. *See* Reclamation; Irrigation

Draper, Mr. P. M., and Labour, 1632, 1637

Drayton, Hon. Sir Henry L. (Minister of Finance)
Auditor General's Report, 737
Delay, 911-17
Fourth volume, 1385
British taxation of spirits, 3706
Budget
Date of, 738, 903, 1555, 2151
Speech, 3114. Luxury taxes, 3114; exports and imports (aggregate trade) 3115; trade with Great Britain, 3116; revenue and expenditure, 3116; liabilities, 3117; revenue and expenditure estimated, 1921-22, 3117; Grand Trunk acquisition, 3118; tariff changes, 3119; imports, marking of, 3120; Business profits war tax, 3120; excise taxes, 3120; sales tax, 3120; resolutions, 3121

Drayton, Hon. Sir Henry—*Con.*
Business Profits War Tax, 2100, 3120
Canadian loans in New York, 3289
Canadian National Railways
Directors, responsibility of, 1604
Special Committee, reference to
M. (Mr. A. K. Maclean) 1602
M. (Mr. Meighen) 1762
Civil Service
Bonus, 2108-10, 4535
Superannuated officials, payments to, 4541
Coal prices, 3295
Combines, 3293
Comparative return on Dominion guaranteed and Nova Scotia bonds, 4165
Currency Act Amdt. Bill, 2160-2, 2269
Customs and Excise Dept. Bill
Dumping clause, 3815
Exchange, 4424
German
Agents of exporters, 4426
Competition, 3811-19, 4424
Labour, cost of, 4425
Mark, 3810, 4423
Policy, 4423
Reparation, 4423
New and unused goods, 3815
Roumanian loan, 3811
Unemployment, 3811
Valuation of currency, 3810, 4423
Customs Tariff Act, 1907, Amdt. Bill, 3698
Alcohol, 3705, 3725
Cocoa imports, 3704
Date of coming into force, 3724
Imported goods, marking of, 3711, 3714, 3719, 3722, 3938-54
Date of coming into force, 3724
Liquor, tax on, 3708
Medicated wines, 3709
Whiskey, 3706, 3707
Estimates, Committee on, 2202
Grand Trunk loan, 4165-6
Income tax, 2102, 2107
Exemptions, 3466
Forms, 1176
Penalties, 2100
Returns, 2625
Income Tax Act Amdt. Bill, 3905, 4251
Consolidation, 4353
Penalties, 4343
Self-assessment and payment, 4344-50
Provincial Ministers' salaries, and indemnities, 4352
Railwaymen's expenses while absent from home, 4353
Inland Revenue Act Amdt. Bill
Alcohol, 3727, 3729, 3732
Distilled spirits, 3726

Drayton, Hon. Sir Henry—*Con.*
Inland Revenue Act Amdt. Bill—*Con.*
Molasses, 3726
Patent medicines, 3728
Spirits, excise duty on, 3726
Insurance Act Amdt. Bill, 2625, 4339
Insurance Conference, 3088
Interim Supply, 1675, 1680, 1681, 2095, 2100-10
Former votes, 1681
Necessity for voting, 2002
Notice, 1676
Payments due, 2025
Montreal Harbour Commission Bill, 2159, 2268
Reciprocity agreement with the United States, Amdt. (Mr. Fielding) 2041
Reduction of drink consumption, 3705
Returns, inquiries for, 1176
Roumania, Canadian loan to, 3811
Interest on, 478, 1072
Repayment of, 3811
Russian currency, 1072
Sales tax, 3120, 3372
Senate Committee, attendance of Mr. Crerar, 3259
Special War Revenue Act. Amdt. Bill
Alcohol, tax on, 3957
Amendments, 3742
Binder twine, 3751, 3756
Butter importations, 3749
Containers, 3754, 3956
Farmers, no tax on sales by, 3956
Fishing boats, 3745, 3751
Houses, tax on, 3959
Lumber, tax on, 3743
Farmers exempt, 3744
Missals and prayerbooks, 3756
Mixed grains, 3744
Sales tax, 3735, 3752, 3754
Change in clause, 3957
Tailors, 3955
Sparkling wines, 3734
Spirits, 3742
Sugar, duty on, 3699
Supplementary estimates, 3741
Supply, partial, 2019
Tariff revision, 903
Taxation. *See under this title* Business Profits; Income; Special War Revenue
Tobacco, duty on, 3698
United States tariff and Canadian duties, 4255
Whiskey, importation and taxation, 3706, 3707
Young Emergency Tariff, 3905

Drayton-Acworth report, 3042

Dredges and Dredging, 3982. *See also* Harbours and Rivers; Marine; St. Lawrence Channel
Baie St. Paul district, 1992
Cape Tormentine, 1017
"Internationale," qu. 2192, qu. 2506
Inverness harbour, 3985
Maritime provinces, 3982
Ontario and Quebec, 3985
Quebec dredging fleet, 2605
St. Lawrence river, qu. 568. *See also* that title

Druggists. *See also* Customs Tariff; Inland Revenue Act Amdt.
Alcohol tax, and, 3727
Prescriptions, 3725

Drugs. *See* Customs and Excise; Customs Tariff; Health; Inland Revenue; Opium and Narcotic Drugs

"Druid" steamer, repairs, 1980, 1984

Drury, Hon. E. C., and Drury Government, 96, 315, 335, 421, 3199, 4172-4221, 4301. *See also* Address; Budget; Highways; Lake of the Woods
Patronage, 2876
Position on tariff, 421

Drydocks, 1690, 3987, 4017-36. *See also* Shipbuilding
Esquimalt, 3149, 3648
Expropriation of, 1698
Halifax, qu. 567
Montreal Dry Docks and Ship repairing, limited, qu. 2191
Prince Rupert Dry Dock Engineering Company, qu. 3423
Victoria, contract for, qu. 565

Duff, Mr. Justice, 1561

Duff, the late Hon. James, 1033

Duff, Mr. William (Lunenburg)
Air Board, 3782
Apple-growing in Lunenburg county, 1042
British Chamber of Shipping, 1716
Canadian citizens' war claims, qu. 1820
Canadian Government Merchant Marine, 1686
Assets and liabilities, 1920, 1701
Balance sheet for 1920, errors in, 1698
Business brokers, 1713
Depreciation in value of vessels, 1701
Dominion Iron and Steel Company, 1711
Hall Engineering Company, qu. 695
Insurance, 1703
Officers, and seamen, 4357-60
Operating account, 1717

Duff, Mr. William.—*Con.*
Canadian Govt. Merchant Marine—*Con.*
Prime Minister and, 1708
Registering of ships at Halifax, 1720
Reported sale of ships, qu. 570
State-owned fleets in other countries, 1718
Vessels, qu. 1499
"Canadian Conqueror," qu. 1381
"Canadian Explorer," 1714
"Canadian Inventor," 1890
"Canadian Mariner," 1715
"Canadian Pioneer," 1689
"Canadian Recruit," qu. 575
Canadian National Railways and Montreal Locomotive Co., qu. 696
Canadian Northern and Grand Trunk bonds, qu. 837
Cantley, Col. Thomas, qu. 1501
Civil Service Commission
Appointments, distribution of, 1045
Fruit inspectors, 1042
Civil Service Retirement Act Amdt. Bill, 2496-2502
Cold Storage, 1040
Customs and Excise Dept. Bill
Consular certificates, 4404
Invoice certificate, 3791, 4407
Fee—who pays? 4399, 4403
Proclamation, 4407
Trade agents, 3791-4, 4404
Drydocks
Halifax, ques. 567
Expropriation of, 1698
Victoria, contract for, qu. 565
"Esperanto," wreck of, 4341
Fish and Fisheries
Canned and pickled, inspection of, 2182
Cold storage for, 1039
Drawback on from United States, qu. 600
Fish breeding establishments, 2188
Lunenburg overseers, 2179
Tax on fishing boats, 3745
French speech by Sir George Foster, translation, 1230
Fruit inspectors, 1041, 1047
Halifax-Newfoundland service, 1713
Highways, 4303
Johnston, Mr. Alexander, re-appointment, 644
Marine hospitals—Lunenburg, 3139
Montreal Drydock and Ship-repairing, Limited, qu. 2191
Natural resources, 881
"Niobe" and "Rainbow," qu. 671
Prince Rupert
Public building, qu. 567
Purchase of land from Mr. V. W. Smith, qu. 963
Railway Department, salaries, 1671

Duff, Mr. William—*Con.*
Railways, auditors, 1661
Returned Soldiers Insurance Act Amdt. Bill, 4355-60
Shipbuilding, 1710, 1867, 1932
Advances at Victoria, qu. 599
Contractors' percentage, 1902
Contracts, 1689
Depreciation, 1886
Dominion Steel Company and Government, 1691
Exchange, 1894
Interest, 1869, 1886
Operating costs and wages, 1933
Opposition to policy by newspapers, 1892
Point of order, 1898
Programme, 2091
Trade routes, opening of, 1888
Sick mariners, 3129, 3139
Steel plates for ships, qu. 1233
Steel ships, contracts for, qu. 565
Trade and Commerce estimates, 1231

Duguid, Mr., naval architect, 1280

Dumping Act. *See* Customs and Excise Dept. Bill

Du Tremblay, Mr. P. R. (Laurier-Outremont)
Bankruptcy Act Amdt. Bill, 2921-7
Budget, 3191. Tariff revision, 3191; congratulations to Minister upon moderate changes, 3192; public debt, 3192; golden era of Liberal party, 3193; get rid of railroads, 3193; merchant marine, 3194; military and naval expenditures, 3194; Civil Service, 3194; war indemnity, 3195
German reparation, Canada's claim, qu. 643
Loan to shipyards, 1883
"Niobe" and "Rainbow", sale, 4032
Oleomargarine Act Amdt. Bill, 3881
Opium and Narcotic Drug Act Amdt. Bill, 2266-8, 2903
Tobacco, duty on, 3698.

Easter Adjournment. *See* House of Commons, Adjournments

East Elgin, 1293. *See also* Address

Eastern Car Company, Limited, 1611

Ebert, Mr. Justice, report of, qu. 4254

Economic Development Commission, 869

Editorial Committee, 4557. *See also* Printing Bureau
Printing of Civil Service list, qu. 1349
Statement, 4551

Edmonton
Deputy postmaster, 827
District Engineer's office, 4535-43

Edmundston
Bridge, 2810
Post office, qu. 3422

Educational Statistics, 1231

Edwards, Mr. J. W. (Frontenac)
Address in reply to Governor General's Speech, 126; congratulations to Prime Minister; the tariff on apples, 126; speech of the leader of the Opposition; right of the Government to hold office; resignation of Ministers or defection of supporters no reason for dissolution, 127; Liberal party a thing of shreds and patches, 128; by-elections, 128; leader of the Opposition a usurper; issue of the 1917 election, 129; right of Parliament to deal with tariff; the soldier vote, 130; analysis of civil and soldier vote in Ontario and Quebec, 131; the amendment not specific, 131, 136; record of Liberal party on the tariff, 132; Government defeat would mean accession to power of leader of the Opposition, 133; province of Quebec, 134; record of the Government, finances, debt, expenditure, agricultural and industrial production, loans, savings, 135, 136
Agricultural shows, 1239, 1241
Budget, 3175. Liberals and free trade, 3175; Ministers of the Crown and business enterprises, 3176; German goods, 3177; public debt, 3177; other budgets, 3178; budget of 1919, 3178; tariff reductions on agricultural implements. 3179; Progressive party, attitude of, 3179; Mr. Crerar and Grain Growers Company, 3180; Prime Minister on tariff, 3182; member for Red Deer and free trade, 3182; Liberals and tariff reduction, 3183; fiscal policy of Great Britain, 3185; agriculture in Great Britain, 3185; pig iron industry, 3188; Ontario, progress in, 3188; United States, progress in farming, 3188
Business of the House
Wednesday evening adjournment, 1840
Butter and cheese, imports and exports, 3852, 4438. *See also under this title,* Oleomargarine
Cattle embargo, 715
Chief Justice, salary of, 1562
Civil Service Act Amdt. Bill, 2874, 4286
Air Force, preference, 4483
Holidays, religious, 4490
Returned soldiers, preference, 4483
Civil Service (res. Sir Sam Hughes), political patronage in; Judicial appointments; Halifax programme; Lib-

Edwards, Mr. J. W.—*Con.*
Civil Service—*Con.*
eral platforms, 1893 and 1919; census enumerators, 813; Civil Service Commission; an illogical and undemocratic system, 814; outside service; inside service, 815
Civil Service Retirement Act Amdt. Bill, 4274-6
Collins' Bay, wreck, 1989
Dairy Products Grading Bill, 4438-46
Debates, translation of French speeches, 700
De Martigny divorce, 4203
Great Lakes-St. Lawrence waterway, 680
Health of Animals—glanders in Frontenac, 926
Hearst publications, 4170
Highway construction in Ontario, 4290-4303
Interim supply, 2008, 2020
Judges Act Amendment, 1560
Judicial appointments, 813
Kingston, bridges and wharves, 3974
Langlois, Mr. George Arnoult, appointment, qu. 2505
Lightkeepers' salaries, 1995
Main Ducks life-saving station, 1991
Maisonneuve and Gaspé, representation, 1302, 2247, 2310-2339
Militia
Annual drill, 2295
Military expenditures, 2792
Ministers to sit in either Chamber, 1171
Oleomargarine Act Amdt. Bill, 3852-88
Opium and Narcotic Drugs Act Amdt. Bill, 2904
Polish battalion for service in French army, 4061
Privilege, Maisonneuve-Gaspé representation, 2247
Proportional representation, 1537
Reciprocity agreement with United States, 2048
Representation in Parliament, 1316
Royal Military College, 2803
Shipbuilding, 1953
Soldiers Pensions, Insurance and Re-establishment, 4054-61

Eggs, 1122
Chinese, importation of, qu. 568, 3751
Export and marketing of, 1122
Production, 3190, 3473

Egypt, shipment of railroad ties to, 1725

Elections. *See also* By-elections; Canadian Nationals; Controverted Elections; Corrupt Practices; Dominion Elections; Proportional Representation; Representation in Parliament

Elections—*Con.*
Foreign agitators at, qu. 903
General, necessity for. *See* Address; Budget; Representation in Parliament
Officers' fees, 188
Yamaska, arrangements for, 4534. *See also* Yamaska
York-Sunbury. *See that title*

Elective Senate. *See* Ministers

Electoral System. *See* Proportional Representation

Electric Power. *See* Fuel Supply; Great Lakes and St. Lawrence; Lake of the Woods, Water Powers

Elevators, 1442. *See also* Canada Grain Act; Canadian Wheat Board; Grain and Grain Trade; Terminal Elevators

Eleven O'Clock Adjournment. *See* House of Commons

Elkin, Mr. S. E. (St. John City and Counties of St. John and Albert)
De Martigny divorce, 3764
St. John and Quebec Railway Bill, 2156
Shipbuilding, 1888
Sick mariners benefit fund, 4039

Embargo on Cattle. *See* Cattle

Empire Cabinet, proposed, 1385. *See also* Prime Ministers' Conference

Empire Insurance Company. *See* North American Insurance

Empire Parliamentary Association. *See also* Speaker's Chair
Address by Sir Herbert Ames, 1311

England. *See also* Great Britain
Linen manufacturers, 1390
Railway situation in, 1008

English River. *See* Lake of the Woods

Entomology, 1024. *See also* Destructive Insects

Epiphany, 2626. *See also* Civil Service, Religious holidays

Esmonde, Mr. Osmonde Grattan, 1556

"Esperanto", wreck of, 4341

Esquimalt
Dockyard, 4017-36
Drydock, 3149, 3648, 3651
Naval College, 4010-16

Essences, tax on, 3709

Estimates. *See also* Deputy Speaker; House of Commons; Interim Supply; Speaker; Supply. For departments, *see their titles*

Estimates—*Con.*
Closure. *See that title*
Consent of House necessary, 1073
Consideration after midnight, 2736-75
Current necessities—Redlich, 1675
Discussion of, opportunity for, 1026. *See also* Labour Dept.; Ministers; Post Office Dept
Form of voting objected to, 1674
Holding up of, 1941. *See also* Shipbuilding
Lengthy debate, 1832
Main (1921-22) tabled, 644
Notice of amendment in Com., 4168
Obstruction in. *See* Shipbuilding
One-sixth of amount, 1674 *See also* Interim Supply
Passing of without information, 1616
Procedure in, 1676
Railways, deferring of, 1652
Right of Opposition to attack items, 1678
Scrutiny of by Special Committee, 484, 1503. M. (Mr. Lemieux) 2193
Statutory payments, 1414
Supplementary, tabled, 3901, 4170, 4453
Inquiry as to, 3741, 4070
Thursdays and Fridays, Rule 17C. *See* House of Commons
Unreliability of figures, 1203-4
Voting en bloc, 2006, 2012
Voting, method of, 4538, 4540

Ethier, Mr. J. A. C. (Laval-Two Mountains)
Berry Boxes, 4106, 4114-16
Canada Temperance Act, 4383
Central Railway Company of Canada, 3715, 3716
Civil Service Retirement Act Amdt. Bill, 4277
Civil Service Act Amdt. Bill, 4278-85
Classification and reorganization, 4465
Dorchester penitentiary, appointments at, 4467
Exemption of certain classes from jurisdiction of Commission, 4460-83
Returned soldiers, preference, 4358, 4483
Special Committee, evidence, 4461
Civil Service
Bonus, qu. 1350
Number of civil servants, names, and classification, 4255
Daylight saving, qu. 1817
De Martigny divorce, 3766-8
Griffenhagen and Associates, qu. 1821
Highways—Montreal—Hull, 4306
Inspection and Sale Act Amdt.—Berry Boxes, 4106, 4114-16
Veniot correspondence, 3719

Ethyl Alcohol, 3705. *See also* Inland Revenue

Euler, Mr. William D. (North Waterloo)
Air Board, 3777-85
Bounties, principle of granting, 1423
Budget, 3569. Business profits tax and sales tax, 3570; economy in expenditure necessary, 3570; income tax, 3570; methods of raising revenue, 3571; national railways, 3572; Mr. Fielding's amendment, 3573; Prime Minister's remarks on Budget, 3574
Canadian Nationals, 647, 770
Canadian National Railways
Independent auditor, qu. 1133
Canadian Press, Limited, 4533
Civil Service Act Amdt. Bill, 4280-5, 4469-82
"Nor in the public interest," amdt., 4283
Returned soldiers, 4258
Civil Service Bonus, 2110-15, 3531
Coal consumption, 1258
Convicts, increase in number, 1091
Copyright Amdt. and Consolidation Bill, 3844-6
Customs Tariff, 1907, Amdt. Bill—imported goods, marking, 3953
Dominion Elections Act Amdt. Bill (prohibition plebiscite), 259
Dominion Elections Act Amdt. Bill, 4227-49
Foreign-born wives and children of British subjects, 3103, 3113, 4209. *See also* Naturalization
Forms, 4227-46
Naturalization—certificate of qualification, 4229
Amdt. in Com., 3103, 4227; neg. 4342
Amdt. to 3r., 4249
"Personally naturalized", 4244
Fuel Supply Problem, 1263
Grand Trunk Arbitration Bill, 2461-3
Great Lakes-St. Lawrence waterway, 694
Highways, 3028
House of Commons Chamber, temperature of, 1071
Hudson Bay Railway, 979, 988
Illustration stations in Ontario, 950
Immigration, 2574-92
Income Tax Act Amdt. Bill, 4344
Income Tax returns, 2567, 2625
Industrial Disputes Investigation Act, 4549
Kingston penitentiary, 1097, 1107
Lake of the Woods Regulation Bill, 4175
League of Nations—labour, 4547
Linen yarn factories, 1397
Ministers to sit in either Chamber, 1161
"Niobe" and "Rainbow", sale, 4025
Oleomargarine Act Amdt. Bill, 3870
Opium and Narcotic Drug Act Amdt., 2267
Royal Canadian Mounted Police, 2483-4
Royal Military College, 2802

Euler, Mr. William D.—*Con.*
St. John and Quebec Railway Bill, 2154
Shipbuilding, assistance to, qu. 603
Smith, Mr. Sydney, qu. 1236
Suggested resignation of Opposition, 223. *See also* Stevens, Mr. H. S.
Surplus war supplies, disposal of, qu. 736
Trent canal, 2613-15, 2989
Welland canal, construction, 2988-96; amdt. 2989

European Corn Borer. *See* Corn Borer

European Credits, 3160. *See also* Belgium; Greece; Loans; Roumania

Excessive or Inadequate Punishments. *See* Criminal Code Amdt. Bill

Exemptions. *See* Taxation

Exchange, rate of, 96, 267, 316, 416, 545, 3087, 3160, 3167, 3264, 3571, 3599. *See also* Customs and Excise; Finance; Loans
Comparative return on Dominion guaranteed and Nova Scotia bonds, 4165
German mark, 3810-19
Money—purchasing power and exchange value, 4427
Shipbuilding, 1894
Tariff rates on foreign goods, 4421
Trade with Russia, 1093
Valuation for duty, qu. 733
Valuation of currency, 3786-3818
Valuation of the pound and dollar, qu. 577

Exchequer Court Act Amdt. Bill
1r., 563; m. for 2r., 623; com., 625; 3r., 644
Subjects and sections discussed:
Appeals, 623
Commissioner of Patents, 623
General rules and orders, 258
Judges, 1083

Excise. *See* Customs and Excise; Inland Revenue; Special War Revenue

Exhibitions, 1123. *See also* Agricultural Shows; County Fairs; Live stock; Trade
Film productions, 1558
Seed fairs, 1126

Exhibition Train, 1557-8

Exhibits Branch, 1466

Expeditionary Force. *See* Canadian Expeditionary Force

Expenditure in Departments. *See* Ministers

Experimental Farms, 922, 928, 931, 932-36, 945, 1949, 4215. *See also* Agriculture; Live Stock
American implements at, qu. 492
Charlevoix-Montmorency, 945
Distribution of, 1076
Dorchester county, 946
Fredericton, qu. 1131
Hours and pay, 932
L'Assomption, 918
Nappan, Gureney cattle, qu. 2686
Ontario, 948
Rimouski, 954
Ste. Anne de la Pocatière, 948
Seed inspection, 1125
Wright county, 922

Explosives, 2162

Exports. *See also* Address; Budget; Customs and Excise Dept. Bill; Trade
Canadian, for last year, 3483
Canadian Government Merchant Marine, by, 1276-7
Freight rates, 1224

Export Trade, Expansion of. *See* Shipbuilding; Trade

Express Companies, 3469

Express Rates, 169

External Affairs
Conservation Commission, 3960
Department, creation of, 2588
Estimates, 2437
Legal adviser, opinion as to correspondence *re* Canadian Representation in the United States, 2406, 2428
Passport office, 2436
Report of Secretary of State for, 397

Extradition Convention with the United States, Bill
1r., 3319; withdrawn, 3741

Extradition Treaty with the United States (Wife desertion.) *See also* Extradition Convention
Copies tabled, 3207
Inquiry, 3008, 3740

Fabian Pamphlets, 1034

Fafard, Mr. J. Fernand (L'Islet)
Algernon Rock pier, qu. 1383
Bonus to lightkeepers, qu. 1622
County fairs, 1123
Fruit inspection, 1043
St. John harbour, qu. 1383
Upper Crossing St. Roch light, qu. 1383

Fares, theft of, 3925

Farm Implements. *See* Agricultural Implements; Machinery

Farm Labour, 3412. *See also* Labour; Unemployment

Farm Lands, price of, 1034

Farmers
Agricultural publications, and, 1075
Canadian Expeditionary Force, in, qu. 1349. *See also* Military Service Act
Exemption, 3597
Income tax collections, 569, qu. 838
Organizations, 791
Prosperity of, 1035
Protection for, 3748-49

Farmers' Clubs, 1034. *See also* Live Stock

Farmers' Movement and Party. *See* Progressive Party

Farming, competition in, 3188

Farnham, Que., camp grounds, qu. 1132

Fat Stock Shows. *See* Live Stock

Federal Housing Board. *See* Housing

Federal Union No. 66. *See also* Civil Service
Agitation by, 825
Organization of, 795
Policy of, 823

Feeding Stuffs Act
Enforcement, qu. 965
Inspection districts, qu. 1624

Feeds, Mill, 1126
Adulteration of, 3589
Exemption of, 3745
Stock, 289
Mixed grains, 3745
Transportation charges on, qu. 2686

Female Suffrage, 173, 527, 4474. *See also* Dominion Elections Act Amdt. Bill

Ferrer, Execution of, 1523

Ferries. *See* Marine

Ferryman. *See* Post Office

Fertilizer Act, 1909. Administration of, 4513

Fertilizer Act, 1909, Amdt. Bill, 1r., 1497; 2r., 2231; ref. to Com. on Agr., 2234

Fertilizers, duty on, 3441

Fielding, Hon. W. S. (Shelburne and Queen's)
Address in reply to Governor General's Speech, 518; political possibilities—Liberal, Farmer or Tory Government—congratulations to Prime Minister; leaders of Liberal and Farmers parties; League of Nations, 518; Canada's participation; independence; expenses of League, 519; difference between British and Canadian representatives, 520; Article X, 521; the Government's mandate; change of leadership, name, party and policy, 522; individual understandings and experiences; conclusion of war ends Government's mandate, 523; Cabinet reorganization; Government's record, 524; Ambassador at Washington, 525; Imperial Conference, Cattle embargo, 526; votes to women; patronage, 527

Fielding, Hon. W. S.—*Con.*
Alcohol, tax on, 3705, 3727, 3730, 3732
Armouries for public meetings, 901
Auditor General's report, delay, 909
Bankruptcy Act Amdt. Bill, 2919-34
Bolshevism, pamphlet, 4548
Budget, inquiry as to date of, 1270
Approximate date, qu. 738
Speech, 3127, 3146; severe depression result of war, 3146; advantage of direct taxation, 3147; income tax returns, 3147; disposition of public funds, 3148; naval and military expenditures, 3149; disarmament, 3150; tariff revision, 3150; protection of industries, 3153; American tariff, 3154; free trade, 3155; Amdt. moved, 3155; neg. 3686-7
Business of the House. *See also* under this head Estimates; Interim Supply; Supply
Adjournment moved by member closing debate, 999
Agriculture Estimates, proceeding with, 1074
Announcement of, for to-morrow, 1026, 1073, 2148
Division after a recess, 1383
Easter, after, 1270
Further discussion, 1068
Meeting at two o'clock, 447
Motion requires longer notice, 1672
Prorogation, 4068
Sittings
Saturday, 2777
Wednesday, 1384
Adjournment at eleven o'clock, 1828
Evening sittings, 1174, 1844
Two o'clock rule, on, 447
Undue haste, 4449
Butter "dumped" into Canada, 3750
Canada Shipping Act. Amdt. Bill (Public Harbours) 2230-1

Fielding, Hon. W. S.—*Con.*
Canada Temperance Act Amdt. Bill
Cases pending, 3902, 4373-6
Canada-West Indies Trade Agreement, 1557, 2254-63
Canadian Government bonds, qu. 1620
Canadian Nationals Definition Act, 647, 768, 2033
Canadian National Railways
Board of Directors, 1653
Correspondence with directors, 1003
Fire claims—Shelburne County, 4569
Halifax and Southwestern line, 3052
Extension to Lockeport, 3054, 4323
Station accommodation, 4327
Management — Information, M. (Mr. King) 1184
Special Committee, reference to
M. (Mr. A. K. Maclean) 1606
M. (Mr. Meighen) 1764, 1846
Amdt. (Mr. King) 1794
Canadian Representation in the United States, 2391-2436
Cattle embargo, 713, 729, 762
Chief Justice, income tax, and, 1566
Civil Service Act Amdt. Bill, 2780, 3901
Religious holidays, 4491
Returned Soldiers, 4259
Civil Service Retirement Act Amdt. Bill, 2489-90, 4268-78
Civil Service, political patronage, Res. (Sir Sam Hughes) 807
Clark's Harbour, public building, 2817
Conservation Act Amdt. Bill, 3959-71
Copyright Amdt. and Consolidation Bill, 3834-48
Currency Act, 1910, Amdt. Bill, 2161
Customs and Excise Dept. Bill
Brokers' fee, 4432
Cost of production, 4411-14
Dick Turpin, 4421
Dumping clause, 3816, 4412
Exchange—tariff rates on foreign goods, 4421
German trade, 3813
Invoice certificate, 3801
Fee—who pays? 3801-3, 4389
New or unused goods, 3813
Tariff, increase, 3813
Third reading; undue haste, 4449
Trade agents, 3800-13, 4389
Valuation for duty, 4411
Valuation of currency, 3813, 4420
Customs Tariff, 1907, Amdt. Bill, imported goods—marking, 3712, 3714, 3722, 3953
Dairy Products Grading Bill—undue haste, 4449

Fielding, Hon. W. S.—*Con.*
Dominion Elections Act Amdt. Bill (Prohibition plebiscite) 243
Dominion Elections Act Amdt. Bill, 2944
Revising officers, 3092, 3101
Dominion Lands Act Amdt. Bill, 4063-5
Dredging, 3984
Election petitions, 3934
Entomology Bureau, 1025
Estimates
Expenditures not appearing in, 1423
Statutory, 1417-18
Thursdays and Fridays, Rule 17C, 1676
Voting of fixed sums, 1417-18
Extradition Treaty, 2687, 3008, 3740, 3741
French Trade Agreement, 1351, 1558, 2127-41, 2152
Grand Trunk Arbitration Bill, 2376, 2448-80, 2777
Harbours and Rivers
Estimates, 3976-82
Nova Scotia, 3990
Highways, 1664, 3023
Hudson Bay Railway, M. involving expenditure, 982
Imports, regulations, 3709
Income tax, Chief Justice, and, 1566
Income Tax Act Amdt. Bill, 4344-52
Intercolonial Railway—land at Lévis, 1846
Interim Supply. *See also* under this title, Estimates; Supply
Motion out of order, 2009
Procedure, 1677, 2012
Resolution should have schedule, 2015
Unanimous consent required, 2002
Urgency of, 2003
Judges' Act Amdt, Bill, 2118, 3010
Judges as revising officers, 3092-3101
King's birthday, 4450
Lake of the Woods Regulation Bill, 4224-6
League of Nations, Assembly, request for papers, 188
Lighthouse signal service, 4040
Lobster season, 2188
Lockeport-Froude's Point service, 1496
Lockeport railway extension, 3054, 4323
Luxury taxes, abolition, 1185
Macallum, Dr., 1432
Manufacturers and protection, 3660
Migratory Birds Convention Act Amdt. Bill, 2891, 4496
Montreal Harbour Commission Bill, 2159
National Catholic Labour Unions, 1649
National Research Institute, 1432, 2701-07, 2893-6. *See also* Research
National resources—transfer to Western Provinces, 2549

Fielding, Hon. W. S.—*Con.*
"Niobe" and "Rainbow", sale, 4011
Nova Scotia harbours and icebreakers, 1994
Oleomargarine Act Amdt. Bill, 3531, 3863-90, 3906
Opium and Narcotic Drug Act Amdt. Bill, 2898-2903
Ottawa Improvement Commission Act Amdt. Bill, 2941
Parliament Buildings, 3992-8
Pensions to pilots, 2000
Pensions, widowed mothers, 638
Pensions Act Amdt. Bill, 4365-73
Permanent Court of International Justice, 2097
Polish battalion for service in French army, 4061
Prime Ministers' Conference, 2637-8
Privileges and Elections Committee, 2373
Protection and, references to former speeches, 3332
Public Accounts Committee, information, 1805
Public Works Engineering Branch, 4083-4
Railway Commission, 3019, 3022
Railway estimates, deferring of, 1652
Reciprocity agreement with the United States, Amdt. to Supply, 2038
Representation in Parliament, 1318
Research Council, 1432. *See also* under this title National Research Institute
Returned Soldiers, 4365
Returned Soldiers Insurance Act Amdt. Bill, 4261
Right of Dominion to tax provinces, 3742
Royal Canadian Mounted Police Act Amdt. Bill, 2482
St. John and Quebec Railway Bill, 2155-6
St. John harbour, 4079
Soldiers pensions, insurance and re-establishment, 4061
Special War Revenue Act Amdt. Bill
Alcohol, 3705, 3730, 3727, 3732
Fishing boats, 3737, 3745
Patent medicines, 3728
Sales tax, 3754
Spirituous liquors, 3711
Sugar, duty on, 3699
Supply. *See also*, under this title, Estimates, Interim Supply
Amendments, non-confidence, 1184
Comprehensive items, 3015
Motions in, 1683
Tariff revision, 3749
Taxation, right of, 3706, 3742
Trade agents in United States, 1476
Trade with United States, 1468
Unemployment, 4549

Fielding, Hon. W. S.—*Con.*
Vacancies, 1324
Victoria Day, 3697
Vote on capital account, 1464
West Indies importations, 3704
West Indies steamship service, 1488
Westport signal service, 1998
Women workers, 4547

Fiji Islands, trade with, 1465
Catellier, Mr. Ludger, 1465

Films, Educational. *See* Trade and Commerce; Exhibitions

Finance. *See also* Address; Banks; Bonds; Brussels International Financial Conference; Budget; Canadian Government Merchant Marine; Canadian National Railways; Currency Act Amdt. Bill; Customs and Excise Dept. Bill; Exchange; Grand Trunk; Housing; Loans; Taxation
Accounts with Great Britain, qu. 2191; qu. 2622
Canadian currency discount, 3115
Canadian dollar, value in United States, 3087
Canadian Government bonds, 3289
Chartered banks, taxes paid by, qu. 2192
Credits, 3160. *See also* Loans
Roumania and Greece, to, qu. 1236. *See also* Roumania
Department
Purchasing Commission, and, 1102
Deposits outside Canada in Canadian banks, qu. 1623
Dominion Notes
Circulation, qu. 1001
Gold reserve, and, ques. 1234
Issues, qu. 2621
Securities, qu. 1383
Expenditure accounts, qu. 2621
Expenditure and debt per capita, 2013
Expenditure, revenue and debt, qu. 2099
Foreign monetary standards and Customs, qu. 1133. *See also* Customs and Excise Dept. Bill
Government bonds, purchase of, qu. 1620
Investments, "other" and "non-active," qu. 2691
Minister
Miscellaneous estimates, passing of, 1116
Public debt—non-active, miscellaneous and banking accounts, qu. 2621
Repayment of, $25,000,000 loan, qu. 2622
Revenue accounts, qu. 2620
Revenue, expenditure and debt, qu. 2099
Victory bonds, 1920
Expenses, qu. 1620

Firearms, possession of. *See* Criminal Code Amdt. Bills

Fire Insurance, 3469

Fiscal Policy of Government. *See* Address; Budget; Customs and Excise Dept. Bill; Tariff

Fiset, Dr. Michel, qu. 963, 4523

Fish and Fisheries
Biological Board, 2189
Breeding establishments, 2185, 4036
Saskatchewan, in, 2185
British Columbia, 882, 890
Conservation Commission, 3965-9
Cowan, Mr. G. H., K.C., legal expenses, 2187
Development of, 856, 861
East Coast Fisheries drawback, qu. 600
Ebert, Mr. Justice, report, qu. 4254
Fish bait, 1038
Fish consumption, 1038
Gulf, Gaspé and Magdalen Islands, 877
Halibut industry in British Columbia, 883
Halifax award, qu. 2191
Inspection, 2182
International Fisheries Commission, Fraser River, 2189
Jurisdiction of Dominion and Provinces, 2104
Lobster hatcheries, 2188, 4036
Net fishing in Missisquoi Bay, qu. 570
Officers and guardians, 2177
Oyster culture, 2177
Patrol service, 2177
Problems, scientific investigation, 2188
Protection service, 4036
Quebec fisheries reference, 4040
Refrigerator cars, 1038
Salmon licenses, 2104, 4341. *See also* Privy Council
Quebec, qu. 1381, qu, 2506
Transportation of fish, 883, 877
Gaspé, 962

Fishing Boats, exemption of material, 3737. *See also* Special War Revenue Act Amdt. Bill

Flavelle, Sir Joseph, 4142, 4314. *See also* Canadian National Railways

Flax. *See also* Bounties; Linen Yarn
Bounty, 1389
Decline in prices, 1389
Growers, Convention, 1391
Industry, experimental work, 931-2
Patent process of retting, 4455

Fleming, Sir Sanford, 3046

Florence & Son. *See* Printing Bureau, Destruction of Documents

Flour. *See also* Wheat
Moisture in, 1446
Penitentiaries for, 1107
Price of, 1448

Flour Bags, tax on, 3754. *See also* Special War Revenue Act Amdt. Bill

Flynn, Mr. Harry, 217

Fontaine, Mr. J. E. (Hull)
Address in reply to Governor General's Speech, 210; congratulations to new Prime Minister, 210; change in name of Unionist party; the tariff; neglect of agriculture; the working classes; consumer finally pays the taxes; the cost of living, 211; Georgian Bay Canal; national debt, expenditure; old age pensions and unemployment; insurance; province of Quebec, 212
Alcohol, tax on, 3725, 3728, 3732
Georgian Bay Canal, 745
Great Lakes-St. Lawrence waterway, 745
Hull-Wakefield road, 3033
National Catholic Labour Unions, 1646
Patent medicines, 3728
Shipbuilding, 1941

Food Adulteration of. *See* Health
Maple Products, 887. *See also* that title

Foodstuffs, 3589, 3734
Hoarding of, qu. 1347
Tax on, 3546. *See also* Special War Revenue Act Amdt. Bill

Foran, Mr. William. *See* Civil Service

Ford Motor Company, 3409

Fordney Bill. *See* Budget; Tariff; United States

Foreign Agitators and Elections, 903

Foreign-Born Wives and Children of British Subjects. *See* Dominion Elections Act Amdt.

Foreign Business. *See* Trade

Foreign Currency Inflation. *See* Customs and Excise Dept. Bill

Foreign Decorations to Canadians, qu. 1132

Foreign Imports, value, 3310

Foreign Loans. *See* Greece; Loans; Roumania

Foreign Manufacture. *See* Customs and Excise Dept. Bill; Customs Tariff, imported goods—marking

Foreign Monetary Standards and Customs, qu. 1133. *See also* Customs and Excise Dept. Bill, Valuation of Currency

Foreign Shipments, Invoice Certificate. *See* Customs and Excise Dept. Bill

Foreign Tariffs Division, 1437

Forest Reserves
Porcupine, 538
Winter grazing, 383

Forestry. *See also* Natural Resources; Research
Aerial patrol and survey, 3776, 4495
Bud worm, 1031
Canadian Forestry Association, 4494
Conservation Commission, 3960-9
Director of, 1346
National Transcontinental Railway, forest protection, 4335
Protection of forests, 870, 4335, 4494
Spruce forests—bud worn, 1031

Forfeitures and Penalties. *See* Inland Revenue

Forman, Mr. H., 1672

Fortier, Mr. H. A. (Labelle)
Address in reply to Governor General's Speech, 169. Amendment—duty of Government to hold election; the Agrarian movement; West Peterborough; attitude of Quebec; National Liberal Conservative Association in no sense national, 170; change of electoral map will not change sentiments of the people; western representation; unconstitutionality, tyranny and despotism, 171
Air Board, 3785
Bankruptcy Act Amdt. Bill, 2912-34
Budget, 3417. Deplorable condition of finances, 3418; military expenditures, 3418; national debt, 3420; tariff revision, 3420
Canadian Bar Association, 1094
Canadian Wheat Board, 2116-17
Civil Service bonus, 2112
French, Bill not printed in, 1095
Highways projected in Quebec, 3025, 3029
Judges—reorganization of districts, 1083
National Research Institute, 2897
Oleomargarine Act Amdt. Bill, 3876
Railway Commission, French secretary. 3018

Fortier, Mr. H. A.—*Con.*
Royal Canadian Mounted Police Act Amdt. Bill, 2486
Shipbuilding, 1946

Fort Cumberland and Fort Moncton, care of, 4540

Fort Frances Post Office site, qu. 1233

Fort Garry Hotel, Winnipeg, qu. 1348

Fort Lennox, Isle-aux-Noix, sundial, qu. 2097

Fort Smith Railway Company. *See* Private Bills Discussed

Fort William
Harbour improvements, 4536
Terminals, 3050

Fortifications of the City of Quebec. *See* Quebec

Fortin, Abbe. *See* Labour, National Catholic Labour Unions

Foster, Mr. A. De Witt, 90, 3509

Foster, Right Hon. Sir George E. (Minister of Trade and Commerce)
Address in reply to Governor General's Speech, 46; the tariff; First Assembly of the League of Nations; work and purpose of League, 47; development of national life; enlarged ideals and sympathies; the problem of world peace, 48; Covenant of League of Nations and Treaty of Versailles; Peace Treaty signed by 47 nations; the United States; duties and obligations of League; its organization; the Council, 49; respective jurisdictions of Assembly and Council, 50; the Secretariat, reduction of armaments and arbitration of differences; registration of Treaties; mandatories, 51; social and economic reforms; technical organizations; meeting of assembly in Geneva, 52; election of permanent president; rules of procedure; official languages, 53; spirit of courtesy; the smaller nations, 54; publicity of proceedings; financing of the League, 55; Article X; Permanent Court of International Justice, 56
Auditor General's Report, delay, 915
Bounties, 1386
Flax and linen yarn, 1389, 1393, 1394
Brunelle, Sergt. Major N., 1519
Budget, 3156. Income tax, 3156. Brussels Conference, 3157; League of Nations, 3157; debt, increase in, 3158; tariff revision, 3159; exchange and credits

Foster, Right Hon. Sir George E.—*Con.*
Budget—*Con.*
system, 3160; Young Emergency Bill, 3160; protection, 3161
Business of the House
Announcement of for to-morrow, 1026
Legislation pending, 4068
Progress in, 1230
Butter and cheese exports, 1470
Canada Grain Act, administration, 1442
Canada-West Indies Trade Agreement, 1557, 2191, 2251-62, 3703. *See also* West Indies steamship service
Canada Year Book, 1231, 1425
Canadian Engineering Standards Association, 1426
Canadian National Railways
Management — Information, M. (Mr. King) 1207
Cattle embargo, 711
Census commissioners and enumerators, 597, 696, 735, 806, 1209, 1226, 2098, 3260, 2843, 2874, 3807
Missisquoi, 1132, 4113
Moncton, 3972
Pontiac, 1127, 1231
Civil Service Act Amdt. Bill, 2842-74
Civil Service
Bonus, 1463
Griffenhagen and Associates, 1555, 4555
Reorganization, 4555-6
Civil Service, Political Patronage, Res. (Sir Sam Hughes) 802-3
Customs and Excise Dept. Bill
Invoice certificate, 3791-3809
Fee—who pays? 3792-9, 3804, 4389-95
Form of, 3799
Imports and exports, 4398
Proclamation of Act, 4394; Amdt. 4407
Revenue and expenditure, 4399
Trade agents, 3791-3809
Certificate of, 4389-94
Trade commissioners, 4394
Trade, extension of, 4394-8
Debates, translation of French speeches, 701
Dominion Elections Act Amdt. Bill (Prohibition plebiscite) 307
Dominion Lands Act Amdt. Bill, 4062-6
Editorial Committee, 4559
Estimates
Committee on, 2206-8
Procedure, 1385
Statutory payments, 1414
Exhibitions, 1466
Canadian goods, 1227
Flax bounty, 1403. *See also* under this title Bounties
Fox breeding, 1429
French Trade Agreement, 1174, 1573, 1557, 2125-41, 2152

Foster, Right Hon. Sir George E.—*Con.*
French Trade Agreement—*Con.*
Printing, 1380
Fruit, co-operative effort, 1470
Grain Act, administration, 1442
Grain
As security for Dominion notes, 1443
Chemistry—Dr. Birchard, 1228
Elevators, 1442
Grading, 1230
Inquiry, remuneration of Commissioners, 3972
Griffenhagen and Associates. *See* under this title Civil Service.
Hides, inspection, 1437
Income Tax Act Amdt. Bill, 4345-51
Industry
Encouragement of, 1469
Government aid to, 1397
Inspection of Gas and Gas Meters Bill, 351, 607, 2944
International Customs Tariff Bureau, 1437
International Trade Conference, 2151
Judge Snider's Report, 3761, 4062
Labour—Mr. Lapointe, 3584
League of Nations, 47, 2356-73
Macallum, Dr., 1433
Motion picture films and exhibits, 1232, 1466
National Research Institute, 2688, 2708, 2892-7. *See also* Research
Newfoundland railways, 1485
Patent Act Amdt. Bill, 4453-60
Patents of Invention Act Consolidation Bill, 303, 2890-1
Pensions Act Amdt. Bill, 4368
Petroleum bounties, 1413
Prime Ministers' Conference, 2662
Printing Bureau, destruction of documents, 4559
Publications, printing, 1438
Research, industrial and scientific, 1426
Research Council Act Amdt. Bill, 2566; 2688, 2892. *See also* under this title, National Institute
Returned Soldiers Insurance Act Amdt. Bill, 4355
Searls, Mr. George, Chief Grain Inspector, 1444
Shipbuilding, 1938, 1972
Statistical Department, 1231
Statistics Act Amdt. Bill, 3007
Statutory expenditure, 1420
Steamship Services
Australia-New Zealand, 1493
Murray Bay-Tadoussac, 1826
West Indies, 1488, 1491
See also under this title Trade
Terminal elevators, 1463, 1464, 1442
Timber culling, 1426

Foster, Right Hon. Sir George E.—*Con.*
Trade
Australia, 1468
Russia, 1003, 1072
South Africa, 1491
United States, 1219, 1468, 1475. *See also* Customs and Excise Dept. Bill
Trade and Commerce
Department
Director of Commercial Exhibits, 1226
Educational films, 1225, 1466, 1558
Patent and Copyright Branch, 1496
Salaries, 1218
Tariffs division, 1226
Weights and Measures, 1485
Trade Commissioners, 1219, 1224, 1391, 1464, 1479. *See also* under this title Customs and Excise Dept. Bill
Trade Mark and Design Act Amdt. Bill, 229; 2891
War Indemnity—Canada's share, 3583
West Indies
Cable, 1438
Steamship service, 1488, 1491
Trade agreement. *See* under this title Canada-West Indies
York-Sunbury, French-Canadian Minister, 3638

Foundation Company of Montreal, payment to, qu. 4541

Fournier, Mr. C. A. (Bellechasse)
Address in reply to Governor General's Speech, 203; speech from the Throne a "negligible document"; Government incapable of dealing with pressing issues; unemployment and soup kitchens; 203; League of Nations an ideal distant and unattainable; disarmament, 204; Administration's arguments for retaining office; inconsistency of Minister of Immigration; issue not the tariff but vindication of constitutional rights, 205; no general election held on last redistribution; crime of the junkers, fire-eaters and reactionaries; assault on national unity, 206
Agricultural expenditures, 1029
Bankruptcy Act Amdt. Bill, 2910
Canadian National Railways
Special Committee, reference to, M. (Mr. Meighen) 1799
Civil Service, Political Patronage, 836
Highways in Quebec, 3030
Opium and Narcotic Drug Act Amdt. Bill. 2266
Parliament buildings, expenditure, qu. 4341
St. Michel wharf, Res. 967, 3991
Weekly bulletins, 1231

Fox Bay, squatters, 1514

Fox-Breeding, grant for, 1428

France
Amount of credit to, qu. 2622
Ministers, appointment of, 1154
Senate in, 1165
State-owned fleet sold by, 1718
Treaty with. *See* French Trade Agreement

Franchise. *See also* Canadian Nationals; Dominion Elections Act Amdt. Bill; Naturalization; Proportional Representation

Franco-Canadian Commercial Agreement. *See* French Trade Agreement

Fraser, Mr. Evan E. (Welland)
Dominion Elections Act Amdt. Bill
Hours of polling in municipalities near international boundary, amdt. 4245
Returned Soldiers, employment on Welland Canal, 3001

Fraser, Mr. Roy, 2860-8

Fraser River
International Commission, 2189
Snag boat, 3978

Fredericton Experimental Farm, qu. 1131

Free Trade, 4419. *See* Address; Budget

Freight Rates, 214, 484, 3474. *See also* Railways; Transportation; Canadian Government Merchant Marine; Canadian National Railways
Discrimination in, 1232
Increase in, 341, 389, 538, 3263
Ocean, 1734, 1946
Pulpwood and saw logs, 2511

Freight Ships. *See* Canadian Government Merchant Marine; Shipbuilding

French Canadians, 3594
Appointments to office, 355, 510
League of Nations, representation on, 552
United States in, 1483, 3675

French Language, 3824, 3972, 4543
Address not moved or seconded in, 138, 223, 280, 385, 539.
Bankruptcy Act Amdt. Bill, French Version. *See* that title
Bill not printed in, 649, 1095
Board of Trade reports, forms, 2819, 3320-75
Canadian National Railways
Conductors,, waiters, printing, 1782, 4329-33
In Quebec and New Brunswick, 4328

French Language—*Con.*
Debates, Official Report of, translation of French speeches M. (Mr. Archambault) 698; agreed to, 702
Election proclamation, 553
Estimates, printing and discussion in, 1386
Fuel Supply, Special Committee, evidence, 4251
Income tax instructions, 2626
Interior Dept. publications, 1333
Parliament buildings
Inscriptions
Central column, qu. 568
Tower, 3995-8, 4543
Pensions, application forms, qu. 965
Questions to immigrants, 779, 3824
Use of in debate, 539

French Parliament. *See* Ministers

French Purchasing Commission, 3172
Letter of Minister of Customs to, 3079

French Trade Agreement
Copy of
M. for, 578, 607, 766, 2193
Tabled, 1271
Inquiry as to date of, 1174
Printed copies, 1351, 1380
Terms and signature, 1185

French Trade Agreement Bill
Res. 1557; 1r., 1573; 2r., com., 2125; 3r., 2152

French Version, 3144. *See also* Bankruptcy Act Amdt. Bill

Fripp, Mr. A. E. (Ottawa)
Canada Highways Act, qu. 1237
Cartier square, Ottawa, stores shed, qu. 3208
Civil Service
Political patronage in, Res. (Sir Sam Hughes) 792; Civil Service Act; patronage not abolished, 792; classification, Arthur Young & Company; Griffenhagen; Printing Bureau; Mr. Wolffe; destruction of documents; patronage exercised by irresponsible persons, 793; outside service; cost; efficiency not increased, 794; unrest; Federal Union No. 66; reorganization by deputy ministers, 795
Reorganization, qu. 600
Superannuation, application for increased allowances, qu. 2099
Civil Service Act Amdt. Bill, 4481
Daylight saving in Ottawa, qu. 2687
De Martigny divorce, 3715, 4004
Gilmour and Hughson Bill, 1096
"Niobe" and "Rainbow," sale, 4010-15
Right of House to review action of Private Bills Com., 4004

Frontenac Breweries, Limited, 1611

Fruit. *See also* Apples
Berry boxes, 4106, 4114
Cold Storage, 1041
Duty on, 126, 164-8
Growing, 1469, 3354
In British Columbia, 9-10
Inspectors, 1041, 1042-3, 1045
Preserved, 3703

Fruit Marks and Sale Act, 1041

Fuel Control, 2944. *See also* Coal

Fuel Supply Problem. *See also* Coal; Lignite; Mines and Minerals; Natural Resources
Special Committee, M. (Mr. Steele) 1247; appointed, 1439; withdrawn, 1857; Mr. Chisholm substituted for Mr. Lemieux, 2148; Evidence, printing and distribution, 2027, 4250

Fulton, Mr. F. J. (Cariboo)
Address in reply to Governor General's Speech, 206; issues proposed by Opposition, 206; congratulations to mover and seconder; reasons for opposing amendment; no demand for immediate election; assertion that Government has usurped powers, 207; war not only issue of 1917 election; problems arising out of war; changes in personnel of Government; constitutional right of Government to carry on; British and other precedents, 208; conduct of Sir Wilfrid Laurier in 1911; the reciprocity question, 209

Fumigation of Nursery Plants, 1028, 1031

Fur-bearing Animals, Conservation Commission, 3965

Furness-Withy Company, 1712

Gambling. *See* Criminal Code Amdt. Bill

Game
Conservation Commission, 3965. *See also* Migratory Birds; National Parks

Gaols. *See* Prisons

Garbage Feeding. *See* Hog Cholera; Health of Animals

Gas and Gas Meters, Inspection of. *See* Inspection

Gaspé
Railway facilities, 2507
Railway from Amqui to Gaspé Basin, 876, 881
Service, qu. 962
Timber and mineral resources, 875

Gaspé and Bonaventure
Fishing communities, 1038

Gaspé and Maisonneuve. *See* Maisonneuve

Gauthier, Mr. L. J. (St. Hyacinthe-Rouville)
Address in reply to Governor General's Speech, 74; comment on remarks of Mr. McMaster; demand for election in advance of redistribution; free trade, protection and the tariff, 74; fiscal policy of the Liberal Government; the late Hon. M. Tarte, 75; the Government's mandate ;increase of indemnity; precedents for retaining office; Liberals members occupying dual positions; member for Maisonneuve and Gaspé; "traitors and renegades"; Agrarianism a class movement, 79; Labour element, 80; isolation of Quebec; alliances of Laurier and Cartier, 81; Ontario natural ally of Quebec, 81; accusations answered; La Société des Artisans Canadiens Francais, 82; a "solid bloc" no longer possible; Quebec must have representation in public affairs, 86; the hour of Quebec has struck; Lafontaine, Cartier, Laurier; the Baptist preaching the coming of the Saviour, 87; gospel of toleration and self-respect, 88
Canadian National Railways
Management, Information — M. (Mr. King) 1196
Special Committee, reference to, M. (Mr. A. K. Maclean) 1583
Highways; Quebec-Montreal-Sherbrooke, 4305
Maisonneuve and Gaspé, representation, 2338
References to, 421, 446, 514, 535, 559, 3215

Gauthier, Mr. L. J., and Montreal Progressive Club, qu. 1131

Gauvreau, Mr. C. A. (Temiscouata)
Address in reply to Governor General's Speech, 385; address not moved or seconded in French; Government has not confidence of country; voice of the people; the Press and by-elections, 385; unpopularity of Government; usurpation of power; Prime Minister's attitude towards Quebec, 386; Canadian National Railways deficit; treatment of old employees; clamour for general election, 387
Business of the House
Monday, Government business, 2148

Gauvreau, Mr. C. A.—*Con.*
Canadian National Railways
Intercolonial
Section men, qu. 2028
Superannuation of employees, qu. 575
Section men, 1439
Canadian Nationals Definition Act, 2033
Census officials, 597
Civil Service Retirement Act, qu. 374
Civil Service Superannuation, qu. 734, qu. 967
Customs officer, Riviere du Loup, 3083
Farmers' sawlogs, 3743-4
Indians at Temiscouata, 2168
Macdonald, Hon. Senator, appointment of, qu. 577
Post Office Act Amdt. Bill, 2121
Sully station, 1822

Geodetic Survey, 2806
Report, 4340

Geological Survey, 2141-62. *See also* Mines and Minerals
Below normal strength, 870
Survey of Northern Canada, 856

George, Mr. A. D., qu. 1233

Georgetown wharf, 4564

Georgian Bay Canal, 212, 298, 679, 688, 745, 751, 755, qu. 2625, 3678. *See also* Great Lakes-St. Lawrence
Montreal, Ottawa and Georgian Bay Company, 229, 598, 1270

Germany
Commodity prices, 4431
Competition from, 3177, 4424
Cost of labour in, 4425
Enemy debts, 4534
Exports to Canada, 4426
Imports from, qu. 696, 838
Holdback, qu. 1350
Marking of. *See* Customs Tariff, Imported Goods
Labour conditions, 4425, 4428
Mark, 3810-19, 4421, 4431. *See also* Customs and Excise Dept. Bill
Reparation, 98, 599, 4423-9
Canadian claims, 643, 3583, 4534
Trade with. *See* Customs and Excise Dept. Bill

Gervais, Mr. Theodore (Berthier)
Berthierville telephone, qu. 1233
Tobacco
Excise taxes on, qu. 1236
Growing, qu. 1500

Gilmour and Hughson, Limited. *See* Private Bills Discussed

Gladstone, Mr., and Thrift, 1169, 3640

Gladu, the late Mr. Joseph E. O., tribute to, 3, 153, 292, 430

Glanders. *See* Health of Animals

Glass, Mr. S. F. (East Middlesex)
Experimental farms, 938
Flax industry, 931, 1399, 1408, 4455-8
Imports, per capita, 3415
Income Tax Act Amdt. Bill, 4349-52
Oleomargarine Act Amdt. Bill, 3868-95
Patent Act Amdt. Bill
Flax, process of retting, 4455-8
Nolan Act, 4454
Right to continue to manufacture, 4454
Right to revive patent, 4454
Treaty of Versailles, 4453
Poultry industry, 939

Glass Industry, 3484

Gold
Melting down, 2160, 2269
Reserve, Dominion notes and, qu. 1234
Standard, 2269. *See also* Currency

Gold Seal Liquor Company, 4375. *See also* Canada Temperance Act

Good Roads Convention, 4300. *See also* Highways

Goods, new and unused. *See* Customs and Excise Dept. Bill

Gordon, Mr. G. N. (West Peterborough)
Bankruptcy Act Amdt. Bill, 2915-22
Budget, 3543. Will affect milling industry, 3543; packing business in cereals, 3544; sales tax and package business, 3545; Minister of Immigration and Liberal party, 3547; Mr. W. F. O'Connor, 3548; Peterborough strike, 3549; unrest and wages, 3549; inconsistency of taxation, 3550
Civil Service Bonus, 2111
Criminal Code Amdt. Bill, 3910-20
Juvenile deliquents, spanking, 3920
Military and civilian caretakers, qu. 4340
Militia Department
Employment of women, 2286
"Niobe" and "Rainbow," sale, 4024
Oatmeal and package foods, 3543, 3736
Permanent Court of International Justice, 2727
Shipbuilding, 1968
Trent Canal, 2953-9, 2976
Unemployment relief to returned soldiers, qu. 4253

Gouin, Sir Lomer, 1825

Gould, Mr. Oliver R. (Assiniboia)
Address in reply to Governor General's Speech, 335; speech of Mr. Scott; quotation from speech of Mr. Clark (Red Deer); Premier of Ontario; dissolution, 335; speech of Mr. Crerar; congratulations to Prime Minister; members elevated to Cabinet rank, 336; Mr. Stacey; Tariff Commission, 337; the amendment; "want of confidence" argument; faith with the people broken; suggested fusion of Liberals and Progressives; platform of Canadian Council of Agriculture; Liberal platform of 1919, 338; agreements and differences, 339; Canadian Wheat Board; decline in price of wheat; participation certificates, 340; freight rates; Advisory Council of Scientific 3666; manufacturers and United Farmers, 3667
Budget, 3662. United Grain Growers, 3662; Mr. Steven's remarks on York-Sunbury election, 3662; new methods of taxation, 3663; taxation and large banking institutions, 3664; land taxation, 3664; agricultural losses from insect pests, 3665; Tariff Commission, 3666; manufacturers and Grain Growers' Association, 3667
Export liquor licenses in Saskatchewan, qu. 838
Farmers in Canadian Expeditionary Force, qu. 1349
Grasshopper plague, qu. 838, 1028, 3665
Horse clubs, 1120
Income tax, 2107
Insect pests, 930, 3665
Military district No. 12, 2379
Military expenditures, 2792
Military preparations, 2298
Natural Resources, transfer to western provinces, 1339
Reciprocity agreement with United States, 2072
References to election, 368, 391, 438
Saskatchewan Militia organization, 2792
Smallpox on Scandinavian, 1498
Wheat Board and Progressive party, 1455

Governor General
Acknowledgment of address in reply to Speech, 3830
Address to on retirement, 4433, 4493
Cars, 3037
Lord Burnham, suggested appointment of, qu. 599

Governor-General—*Con.*
Lord Byng—reported appointment, 4435
Announcement of appointment, 4541
Message from, 4169, 4289
Prorogation, 4577
Speaker's Chair, speech on presentation, 3696
Speech on opening of Parliament, 2; relative prosperity of country; revenue maintained; taxes remitted; measures to relieve unemployment; unemployment insurance and old age pensions; British West Indies; Assembly of League of Nations; Tariff revision; Commission of Conservation; Dominion Elections Act; Canada Temperance Act; Copyright; Income War Tax Act; Scientific Research, 2

Governor in Council, specific power to pass Orders in Council, 1098

Government
Attitude of in regard to information, 1739
Borrowing from. *See* Housing; Loans
Buildings, Civil Service, meetings in, qu. 3421
Control of steamships, qu. 3530
Policy with regard to Estimates, 1026
Railways and ships, 1895. *See also* Canadian Government Merchant Marine; Canadian National Railways
Responsibility to Parliament, 1197, 1098, 1192, 1213, 1186
Shipbuilding programme, 1858. *See also* Shipbuilding
Ships. *See* Canadian Government Merchant Marine

Grade Cattle. *See* Health of Animals

Graham, wharf, 3978

Graham, Mr. A. M., 2618

Grain Act. *See* Canada Grain Act

Grain and Grain Trade, 316, 335, 390, 395, 396, 399. *See also* Agriculture; Address; Budget; Canada Grain Act; Canadian Wheat Board; United Grain Growers
Assignments of grain and produce as note securities, 1443
Car shortage, 512, 549. *See also* Railways; Transportation
Carriage on Great Lakes, 1915, 3371. *See also* Great Lakes
Certificates, 1451
Commission to investigate, 342, 493, 510, 513, 539, 549, 2247. *See also* Grain Inquiry Commission
Crushed grain, 3745
Dockages, 3633-34
Elevators, 277, 278
Country, 278

Grain and Grain Trade—*Con.*
Elevators—*Con.*
Overages, 3634
Quebec, 282, 1443
Saskatchewan So-operative Elevator Co., 391
Terminal, 278, 1442
Weed seeds in, 289
Exchange, 277. *See also* Winnipeg Grain Exchange
Export, 3045
Freight rates, 999, 3392
Lake, 1915, 2963, 3371. *See also* Canals; Canadian National Railways; Great Lakes-St. Lawrence; Hudson Bay Railway
Grain Growers' Grain Company, 288, 391, 3180, 3357, 3587, 3662, 3667. *See also* Address; Budget; Progressive Party; United Grain Growers
Agricultural implements and, 418, 491, 3372, 3492
Grain Growers' Guide, 391, 420, 3360, 3393
Inspection. *See* Canada Grain Act
Marketing, 346, 377, 383, 438
Moisture in grain, 1445
Montreal, handling at, 3371
Northwest Grain Dealers' Association, 277, 297, 379
Overages, 316, 1463, 3181, 3634
Screenings, 3182
Seed Grain Advances, 4498, 4506
Shipments
By American ports, 1975
Freight cars for, 3541
Staples, Mr. W. D., 3260
Supervisors, 439
Surplus fund, 1446
Tests, 1228
Transportation, 999, 2962, 2963, 2984, 3370. *See also* Canadian National Railways; Canals; Great Lakes-St. Lawrence; Hudson Bay Railway
United Grain Growers' Company. *See under* this title Grain Growers
Winnipeg laboratory, 1228

Grain Inquiry Commission, 278, 279, 441, 493, 1447, 1674, 2116, 2295, 3417
Counsel, Secretary, cost of, qu. 2625
Remuneration of Commissioners, 3972
Staples, Mr. W. D., qu. 3260
Winnipeg laboratory, 1228
See also Grain and Grain Trade

Grand Etang
Bridge, 3987
Light, 1997

Grand Trunk Arbitration
Board, salary of, qu. 1130

Grand Trunk Arbitration—*Con.*
Correspondence, 1619
Exchequer Court, Chief Justice, 1084
Expenses, 4335
Extension of time, 1498
Newcombe, Mr. E. F., qu. 1002
Obligations under agreement, 2030
Pensions, qu. 964
Progress of, 3321
Revival, 4436
Subsequent correspondence tabled, 3738
Taft, Hon. W. H., 4158
Tilley, Mr. W. N., K.C., qu. 1001
White, Sir Thomas, 464, 1294

Grand Trunk Arbitration Bill
1r., 2247; M. for 2r., 2346; 2r., 2445; com., 2450, 2560; 3r., 2566; Senate amdts. 2977, 2821
Agreement to revive and continue Arbitration to be made before May 16, 1921, 2474
Extension of time, 2450
Immediate possession and control, 2248
Letter of Messrs. Kelley and Phippen, 2454
Power to continue arbitration, 2248
Powers and duties of arbitrators to continue if Governor in Council extend time, 2476
Preamble, 2450
Request for delay, 2376

Grand Trunk Pacific Railway. *See also* Canadian National Railways; Grand Trunk
Betterments, 1015
Borrowing, 3291
Cost of, 1614
Deficit, 1005
Equipment, details of, 1015
Improvements, 1018
Loan of $89,687,633.39, 4331
Amended item, 4168, 4288, 4313
Loan of $26,000,000, 4169, 4288, 4334
Mileage, 1005
Operating results, 1014

Grand Trunk Railway
Acquisition of, 3118
Alleged request for assistance, 1498
Amount due by United States Government, 4135
Board of Directors, 4142, 3741
Bonds, issue and sale, qu. 837
Building of, 1584
Coal mines in United States, 4316
Control, qu. 697
Details of expenditure of $25,000,000 advance, 4143
Employees
Pensions, qu. 964

Grand Trunk Railway—*Con.*
Equipment trust certificates, qu. 604
Estimated cash requirements, 4140
Estimates for, 1864
Guaranteed advances to, 4139
Guaranteed bonds, sale of, qu. 604
Interest, alleged default, 1498
Lines in the United States, 4326
Central Vermont, 4327
Loan of $89,687,633.39, 4131, 4334
Amended item, 4168, 4288, 4313
Details of, 4144
McAdoo award, 4143
Management and details, 1008
Operating charges, qu. 1132
Operating results, 4319
Portland terminus, 1384, 4316-27
Running rights Richmond to Quebec, qu 964
Shareholders
List of, 3320, 3560, 3740
Voluminous return, 3697

Grasshopper Plague, qu. 838, 930, 1027, 3665. Insect Pests. *See also* Destructive Insect and Pest Act

Graving Dock Company. *See* Halifax

Grazing
Blood Indian reserve, qu. 1817-19, qu. 2098, 2618, 2374. *See also* Indians
Leases, 335
Forest reserves, 383

Great Britain. *See also* Shipping; Trade
American wheat, sale to, 1449
Apple exports to, qu. 1051, qu. 1714
Butter and cheese exports, 1471
Cattle, live, export to, 1474. *See also* Cattle Embargo
Decline of agriculture in, 3185
Tonnage, disposal of, 1718
Trade agreement with Russia, 1003

Great Lakes
Canadian Government Merchant Marine, and, 1913, 2192, 2969

Great Lakes and St. Lawrence Waterway
Chicago Drainage Canal diversion, 186, 2225
Motion (Mr. Keefer) for Special Com., 674-95, 738
Withdrawn, 757

Great Northern and Lake St. John Railways, 281

Great War Veterans Association, 105, 214
Civil Service Act Amdt. Bill, 2855-81. *See also* that title
Dominion Housing scheme, 4049. *See also* Housing
Early General election, 455

Greece and Roumania. *See also* Roumania
Dominion Canners, purchasers from, qu. 1001
Loans to, qu. 1236

Grenville Canal. *See* Canals

Griesbach, Mr. W. A. (Edmonton West)
Alberta Supreme Court, qu. 576
Canadian National Railways
Provincial liabilities, qu. 2942
Civil Service Act Amdt. Bill, 4284-7
Civil Service (Res. Sir Sam Hughes) political patronage; present system preferable; Civil Service Commission; Federal Union No. 66, 825
Disability pensions, qu. 1235
Immigration, 3070
Migratory Birds Convention Act Amdt. Bill, 2891
Military preparations, 2299
Militia staff, 2793
Oil and Gas leases
Bounties, 1387, 1413
Delay in issuing, 2029
Payments under, qu. 734, qu. 673
Surface rights, 579
Prime Ministers' Conference, 2639
Ross Rifle, 2784
Royal Military College, 2805
Y.M.C.A., qu. 1625

Griffenhagen and Associates, 1555, 2781, 2827, 4277, 4465, 4514, 4555. *See also* Civil Service Act Amdt. Bill; Civil Service, Reorganization, Post Office, Printing Bureau
Employment of, 517, 551, qu. 1821
Officials detailed to assist, qu. 600
Payments to, qu. 4251
Penitentiaries, 1111

Griffin-Boscawen, Sir Arthur, 1156

Gulf of St. Lawrence Navigation Company, 1981

Gutelius, Mr., Intercolonial Railway, 1847

Guthrie, Hon. Hugh (Minister of Militia and Defence and Acting Solicitor General)
Address in reply to Governor General's Speech, 415; divergence between reasons advanced by leader of the Opposition and Mr. Clark (Red Deer) in support of amendment; the fiscal question, 415; trade policy of Great Britain; adverse balance of trade; exchange situation, 416; purchasing from United States; United Grain Growers; tariff, policy of Farmers' party; South York speech; Mr. Rice Jones; statement

Guthrie, Hon. Hugh—*Con.*
Address—*Con.*
compared with evidence before Tariff Commission; United Grain Growers machinery almost all from the United States, 418; farmers demand for free implements; millions going out of country; why not buy in Canada; 419; did not say Farmers party a "menace"; tariff; position of Farmers' party, 420; Mr. Drury; the official Opposition; Mr. Gauthier; balance of trade; Canada's indebtedness largely to her own people, 421; Liberal Convention of 1919; tariff plank; Liberal Government was protectionist, 423; the amendment; British and Canadian precedents for Government's continuance in office, 424; who is clamouring for election? 426; by-elections; leader of Opposition represents only remnant of Liberal party, 427; amendment to the amendment (Mr. Campbell) 428; redistribution; rural and urban representation, 429
Air Board, 3776-85
Armistice Day Bill, 3773-5
Armouries for public meetings, 902
Bankruptcy Act Amdt. Bill, 2618, 2909-40, 3143, 4170
French version, 2557
Budget, 3267. Congratulations to Minister on financial showing; former surpluses did not reduce national debt, 3268; Brussels Conference; military expenditure, 3269; comparison of military expenditure by countries, 3271; returned soldiers and military training, 3279
Chief Electoral Officer, reports, 731
Civil Service Act Amdt. Bill, 2780
Civil Service classification and bonus, 2237
Civil Service Retirement Act Amdt. Bill, 4270
Corrupt Practices at Elections Bill, 1126, 2036
De Martigny divorce, 3771, 4203
Demobilization, 2286
Dominion Elections Act Amdt. Bill (Prohibition Plebiscite) 244, 259, 303
Dominion Elections Act Amdt. Bill 2775, 2944, 3091, 4228-48
Advance polls, 3099
Amendments to writs, 3100
Certificate to women voters, 3111
Disqualified voters, 3099
Election officers, disqualification, 4245
Foreign-born wives and children of British subjects, 3109, 4233

Guthrie, Hon. Hugh—*Con.*
Dominion Elections Act Amdt. Bill—*Con.*
Naturalization—certificate of qualification
Amdt. (Mr. Euler) 4233
New forms, 3100
Nomination and polling day, 3096
Nomination paper, 4246
"Personally naturalized," 4244
Polls, hours of, 3095
Qualified voters, 3096
Recount, 3097
Returning officers' report, 3098
Revising officers, 3091, 3101
Voters, identification of, 3093
Franchise Act—foreign agitators and elections, 903
Judges' Act Amdt. Bill, 2118
Military expenditure, 2301, 3269, 3551
Military Service Act, claim for services, 2807
Militia
Annual drill, 2294
Cadet services, 2296
Command pay, 2290
Employees, increase in number of, 2014
Employment of women, 2286
Estimates, 2234-46, 2275-2310, 2781
Permanent Force, 2239, 2788
Purchasing Commission, 2239
Record Office, 2280
Sale of supplies, 2244-5
Staff, 2787-95
North American Trust Company, 1094, 1129
Pensions
Deduction from pay of Permanent Force, 2236, 2275
South African, 2278
Polish battalion for service in French army, 4052
Post Office Act Amdt. Bill, 2120-25
Quebec citadel, 1442
Fortifications, 968
Returned Soldiers' Insurance Act Amdt. Bill, 4261
Ross rifle, 2783
Royal Canadian Mounted Police, strength, 2800
Royal Military College, 2802
Soldiers' pensions, insurance and re-establishment, 4052
Tapley, W. H., case of, 972
Winding-up Act Amdt. Bill, 2158

Halbert, Mr. Robert H. (North Ontario)
Address in reply to Governor General's Speech, 500; criticisms of Farmers' party; Colchester and East Elgin; election demanded by people; by-elections, 501; redistribution; great issues at stake; farmers' part in national development; unity and agreement as to national ideals, 502; equal rights to all; protection and class privilege, 503
Royal Canadian Mounted Police Act Amdt. Bill, 2485

Half Island Cove, breakwater, 3981

Halifax
Canadian Government Merchant Marine, registration of vessels, 1720
Dockyards, 4017-36
Explosion, 1699
Fisheries award, qu. 2191
Graving Dock Company, qu. 567, 1690, 1698, 1861. *See also* Drydocks; Shipbuilding
Harbour, government ships at, 1940
Naval College, 4010
Newspapers and merchant marine, 1705, 1706, 1928
Ocean terminals, 1017
Quarantine station, 2754
Roy Building, qu. 3089
Shipbuilding at, 1689, 1921. *See also* Shipbuilding
Shipyards. *See* Shipbuilding

Hall Engineering Company, qu. 695

Halladay, Mr. H. H. (Bow River)
Address in reply to Governor General's Speech, 334; congratulations to Prime Minister; the amendment; mandate of the Government; election; the ins and outs; redistribution; Grain Commission, 334; price of wheat; the cattle industry; grazing leases, 335
Canadian Northern Railway, Hanna-Calgary line, 3048
Destruction of documents, qu. 604
Immigration, 2590

Halladay, Mr., Canada Cycle and Motor Company, address, 1227

Hamilton-Brantford Highway. *See* Highways

Hanna, Mr. D. B., 381, 1191, 1609, 1658, 1774, 1801, 1852, 3051, 3406, 3499, 4315, 4328. *See also* Canadian National Railways
Business interests, 3610

Hansard. *See* House of Commons, Debates

Hanson, Mr. R. B., and York-Sunbury election, 3639. *See also* York-Sunbury

Harbours. *See* Canada Shipping Act. For Individual harbours, *see their titles*

Harbours and Rivers, 3973-82, 4097, 4536
Estimates, amdt (Mr. Pardee) 3979
Manitoba, 3975
Nova Scotia, 3959
Ontario, 3973
Prince Edward Island, 3990
Quebec, 3991

Harding, Mr. R. T., payments to Judges, qu. 1500

Harling, Mr. Thomas, 1981

Harold, Mr. John (Brant)
Binder twine fibre, 3746, 3756, 3505
Budget, 3500. Canada's financial position; manufacturing industries, 3501; tariff problems, protection and free trade, 3502; manufacturers' profits, 3503; tax upon profits, 3504; customs tariff, binder twine, 3505
Customs and Excise Dept. Bill
Express parcels, 4400
Impediment to business, 4400
Invoice certificate, fee, 4399
Trade agents, 4399
Proportional representation, 1544
Sales tax, 3754

Harrison, Mr. Charles R. (Nipissing)
Address in reply to Governor General's speech, 230; Grand Trunk strike in 1910, 230; the tariff; effect of Opposition policy on wage-earner; United States industries in Canada; unemployment, insurance and old age pensions, 231; what Government has done for labour; the Mathers Commission, 232
Canadian Northern Railway
Salaried officials, qu. 2942
Income Tax Act Amdt. Bill
Railwaymen's expenses while absent from home, 4352

Harrow Tobacco Station, 1076

Hawkins, Dr. Charles, and immigration, 3068

Hay, Mr. Thomas (Selkirk)
Address in reply to Governor General's Speech, 393; congratulations to Prime Minister; no great demand for election; side-stepping of Opposition, 393; tariff; office seekers and usurpers; the home market, 394; the grain trade; commission of inquiry; old age pensions and unemployment insurance; Prime Minister should carry on, 396
Dominion Elections Act Amdt. Bill, 4242
Disfranchising, 3112

Hay, Mr. Thomas—*Con.*
Dominion Elections Act Amdt. Bill—*Con.*
Naturalization—certificate of qualification
Amdt. 4242; agreed to, 4245
Hog cholera, compensation, 1065
Hudson Bay Railway, Amdt. 994
Imaginary letters, point of order, 3173
Oleomargarine Act Amdt. Bill, 3883

Hay and Straw Inspection. *See* Inspection and Sale Act

Hayter, Mr., auditor, 1668

Head Tax. *See* Chinese Immigration

Health. *See also* Immigration; Opium and Narcotic Drugs; Quarantine
Adulteration of food, 3129
Estimates, 2940-3127
Minister's statement, 3127
Medical inspection of immigrants, qu. 573 3128
Opium and Drug Act Amdt, convictions under, 3134
Quarantine stations, 3128
Report of, 1852
Research, 4464-78
Salaries, etc., 3127
Sick mariners, 3129, 3155
Smallpox on Scandinavian, 1498, 1556
Typhus in Europe, 643, 4534

Health of Animals, 926, 1048, 4506-13. *See also* Agriculture; Cattle Embargo; Live Stock
Accredited herd, 4506-13
Alderson, Mr. G. B., claim of. *See that title*
Compensation for slaughtered cattle, 1061
Glanders outbreak in Frontenac, 926
Hog cholera, 1050-9. *See also* Alderson
Increase in amount of item, 1064
Indemnity for diseased herds, 1048
Motions (Mr. Sutherland)
To reduce item, 1068
To strike out item, 4513
Tuberculosis, 4506-13
Veterinary system, 1058, 4508-13. *See also* Alderson

Hearst Publications, 4170

Heating. *See* House of Commons, Chamber

Henders, Mr. Richard C. (Macdonald)
Address in reply to Governor General's Speech, 272; protection of agriculture; tariff changes in the United States; the tariff, 273; the Government's mandate, issues of the election of 1917, 274; record of the Government; important measures passed, 275; the "want

Henders, Mr. Richard C.—*Con.*
Address—*Con.*
of confidence" cry; no popular demand for an election; no charges of maladministration or corruption; progressive legislation, 276; Canadian Wheat Board; Grain Exchange; Northwest Grain Dealers' Association, 277; uniform price quotations; elevators; profits; overages, screenings; enquiry suggested, 279
Agricultural machinery, standardization of parts, 669; Amdt. 670
Binder twine, 3748
Butter and oleomargarine, 3748
Civil Service Act Amdt. Bill, 2868-83
Dominion Elections Act Amdt. Bill, 4232
Lake of the Woods Regulation Bill, 4187
Wheat Board, 1454

Hepburn, Mr. W. B. R. (Prince Edward)
Dairy Produce Grading Bill, 4441

Hewitt, Dr. Gordon, the late, 1030

Hickman, Mr., alleged deportation of, qu. 575

Hides
Inspection, 1437
Prices of, 3317, 3370, 3491, 3667. *See also* Budget Speeches

High Commissioner in London, 2437

High Cost of Living. *See also* Address; Budget; Civil Service Retirement; Customs and Excise
Superannuated civil servants, 2491, 4275.

Highland Regiments. *See* Militia

Highways
Alberta, grants to, qu. 1821
Canada Highways Act, administration of, 4289
Approval of projects in Ontario, qu. 1237
Grants, qu. 567, qu. 2098
Commissioner, Mr. A. W. Campbell, 3023-4289
Expenditure, 2555
Good Roads Convention, 4300
Manitoba, proposed, 4308
Metapedia valley, qu. 2505
New Brunswick, approved, 4306
Nova Scotia
Approved and applied for, 4307
Highways Board, 4304
Ontario
Approved, 4295
Biggs, Hon. F. C., 4290, 4448
"Charge of the Road Brigade," 4300
Dundas Street, qu. 4252, 4299

Highways—*Con.*
Ontario—*Con.*
Dundas-Waterloo, 4298
Expenditure, 4289
Extravagance, charges of, 4304
Hamilton-Brantford, qu. 3582, 3904, 4252-3, 4290
Hamilton-Dundas, 4290
Hamilton-Kitchener, 4292
Hogarth, Mr., 4298
London-St. Thomas, 4307
London-Stratford-Sarnia, 4307
Maclean, Mr., 4298
Peel and Halton, qu. 4252
Price paid for expropriated land, 4291
Purchase of trucks, 4292
Relevancy of discussion, 4293-6
"The Roads that Biggs Built," 4302
Toronto-Guelph-Sarnia, etc., qu. 4252
Toronto-Kingston, 4306
Town of Dundas, 4298
Wages, 4291
Warren Paving Company, qu. 4252; 4291
Ottawa-Point Fortune, 4306
Overhead charges, qu. 4252
Prince Edward Island, aid to, qu. 2345
Projected roads, 3025
Quebec
Approval of, qu. 2098
Federal aid to, qu. 2344, 2375
Hull-Montreal highway, 3029, 4306
Hull-Wakefield highway, 3033-34
Lachine bridge, 4308
La Salle, repairing road in, 4313, 4333
Montreal-Sherbrooke, 4305
Quebec-St. Joachim-St. Simeon, 4313
Rougemont-St. Hyacinthe, 4305
St. Hyacinthe-Richmond, 4305
Saskatchewan, approved, 4307
Grants to, qu. 1820
Statement of highways under agreement or consideration, 4309
Width of, 4306

Hillsboro river dredging, 3984

Historical Publications, Board of, 2947

Hobson, Mr. Robert, 1609-10, 3407, 3610. *See also* Canadian National Railways

Hocken, Mr. H. C. (West Toronto)
Chief Justice, salary of, 1565
Civil Service Act Amdt. Bill, 2859-66
Copyright Amdt. and Consolidation Bill, 3844-50
De Martigny divorce, 4006-8
Fraser, Mr. Roy, and Civil Service Commission, 2860-8
Fuel Supply Problem, 1261

Hocken, Mr. H. C.—*Con.*
Housing, 1134, 1136, 1857
Judges Act Amdt. Bill, 1565
Lake of the Woods Regulation Bill, 4209-18
Parliament Buildings, book on, inquiry, 1175
Printing Bureau employees, qu. 1234
Quebec riots, 1510
Toronto post office, promotions, qu. 1673
Unemployment and immigration, 1378
Wednesday evening adjournments, 1838

Hog Cholera. *See* Health of Animals; Alderson

Holt, Sir Herbert, and shipbuilding, 1900

Home Brewing, 3788

Homesteads. *See* Dominion Lands

Hooper, Mr. Ronald, 1539. *See also* Proportional Representation

Horses. *See also* Live Stock
Blood Indian reserve, qu. 1817-19
Diseased. *See* Health of Animals
Docking of, 3922
Purchase of by British Remount Commission, qu. 4341

Hospitals
Alcohol, use of by, 3726. *See also* Inland Revenue
Marine. *See* Health

House of Commons. *See also* Deputy Speaker; Speaker
Adjournment to discuss matter of public importance, 4106
Adjournments
Ascension Day, 2688, 2941, 2998-3000
Easter, 1002
Victoria Day, 3531, 3698, 3738
Audibility of debates, 1625, 2252, 2269, 2385, 2892, 2941, 2989, 3998-4000, 4307, 4381, 4489
Bills
Introduction by consent, 2247
Private
Extension of time, 1625
Placed on order paper same day as reported, 3971
Procedure, 1128
Suspension of rule, 3582, 3715
Reported by Standing Com., 3761
Second reading by consent, 2889
Senate, delay in 1r., 1619
Business of the House
Alleged desire to hasten prorogation, 4068
British Practice to announce, 1026

House of Commons—*Con.*
Business of the House—*Con.*
Closure. *See* that title
Complaint of undue haste, 4068, 4449
Definite statement necessary, 1025
Division after a recess, 1383
For to-morrow, definite statement, 1025
Government, 1318, 1384, 2148
Legislation pending 2150, 2818-9, 4068
Mondays and Fridays, 1830, 1845
Government business, 2148
Order of, return incomplete, 2250, 2270
Progress of, 1842
Public Bills and Orders, 2819
Restriction of discussion, 1318
Rule 17C—Estimates on Thursdays and Fridays. *See* under this title Estimates
Saturday, on, 2777
Suspension of Rule, 103, 3582
To-morrow, for, 1025, 2148
By-elections, 217. *See also* under this title Vacancies
Dates, 903
East Elgin, 1293
Medicine Hat, 1174, 1293, 2151
Peterborough, 504
Yamaska, 4534, 4572-6. *See also* that title
York-Sunbury, 2151. *See also* that title
Chamber, temperature of, 1071
Closure. *See* that title
Committees, Select Standing, 3, 107, 303, 2776. For proceedings and reports, *see* titles of the several Committees
Liberty to sit during sessions of the House, 4338-40
Powers of, 110
Correspondence, unsigned, 2175
Debate, motion to adjourn by member closing discussion, 999
Debates, Official Report of,
Canadian Government Merchant Marine, errors in, 1697-8
Changes and corrections in 3716
Crerar, Hon. Mr., 3628
Documents not read, insertion of, 4308. *See also* Deputy Speaker; Speaker
Distribution of, M. (Mr. Prevost) 2220
French speeches, translation of, M. (Mr. Archambault) 698; agreed to, 702
Motion in different form from Votes and Proceedings, 1130
Owens, the late Thomas P., Editor, 258, 430
Speaker's Chair, address to be printed in, 3696
Staff—strain of long sittings, 2887
Decorum, conversation, 528. *See also* Deputy Speaker; Speaker

House of Commons—*Con.*
Divisions
Address, Amdt. (Mr. Mackenzie King) non-confidence, neg. 561
Budget, Amdt. (Mr. Fielding) neg. 3686-7
Canadian National Railways
Management, Information—M. (Mr. Mackenzie King) neg. 1215
Special Com., reference to M. (Mr. Meighen); Amdt. (Mr. Mackenzie King) neg. 1810; Main motion agreed to as amended, 1814
Civil Service Act Amdt. Bill
Amdt. (Mr. Maclean, Halifax)—six months' hoist, neg. 2886
De Martigny Divorce Bill
M. (Mr. Stein) agreed to, 4107
Dominion Elections Act Amdt. Bill (Mr. Guthrie)
Amdt. to 3r. (Mr. Euler) neg. 4249
Lake of the Woods Regulation Bill
Amdt. to 3r. (Mr. Pardee)—six months' hoist, neg. 4226
Oleomargarine Act Amdt. Bill
Amdt. (Mr. Denis) 3886—six months' hoist, neg. 3886
Prime Ministers' Conference
Amdt. (Mr. Mackenzie King) neg. 2679
Reciprocity—Amdt. to Supply (Mr. Fielding) neg. 2075
Representation in Parliament Amdt. (Mr. King) neg. 1329
Senate and House of Commons Act Amdt. Bill (Mr. McMaster) 665
Estimates. *See aslo* that title
Method of voting, 4033, 4117, 4569
Post Office, late date of submission, 4531
Rule 17C—Thursdays and Fridays, 958, 1004, 1073, 1215, 1217, 1385, 1682, 2103-4, 2887, 3001, 4544
Effect of passage of Interim Supply Bill, 2103, 2105
Right to call department when in Com. of Supply, 2888
Supplementary, inquiry, 4070
Imaginary letters, 3172. *See also* that title
Indemnity of Members, 4450-52
Internal Economy Commission, 3
Members
Attendance of, 1829, 1832, 1838
Deceased, tributes to
Gladu, the late Mr. Joseph E. O. (Yamaska) 3, 153, 292, 430
McLeod, the late Col. H. F. (York-Sunbury) 4, 153
Sifton, the late Right Hon. Arthur (Medicine Hat) 3, 153

House of Commons—*Con.*
Members—*Con.*
Deceased—*Con.*
Wallace, the late Mr. Thomas G. (West York) 152
Money resolutions, and, 1135
New
Election and introduction
Gordon, Mr., 258
MacKelvie, Mr., 1
McCurdy, Hon. Mr., 1
McDermand, Mr., 1
Wigmore, Hon. Mr., 1
Non-attendance on Mondays and Fridays, 1832-8
Resignation of. *See also* Representation in Parliament
Ames, Sir Herbert, 1001. *See also* that title
Maharg, Mr., 4340
Rowell, Hon. Mr., 4340
White, Sir Thomas, 1619. *See also* that title
Ministers to sit in either Chamber. *See* Ministers
Motions
For returns in general terms, 1555
Notices of sent in Advance, 1307
Pairs, correction of list, 563. *See also* under this title Divisions
Parliamentary Restaurant. *See* that title
Privilege
Archambault—Société des Artisans, 230
Clark, Mr., (Red Deer)—Address, incorrect report in Ottawa Citizen, 448
Denis, Mr.,—Immigration, misinterpretation of speech by Quebec newspapers, 3088
Desaulniers, Mr.
Correction, Montreal Gazette, 644
Name omitted from division list, 4255
Edwards, Mr.,—representation of Maisonneuve-Gaspé, 2247, 2310
Kay, Mr.,—Oleomargarine Act Amdt. Bill, vote on, 3971
Lapointe, Mr.
Alleged statement of Mr. Davidson regarding Liberal leadership, 2443
Correction of report in Ottawa Journal, 477
Explanation of remarks on Dominion Elections Act Amdt. Bill, 4543
National Catholic Unions, 3584
Meighen, Right Hon.,—York-Sunbury election, Hon. Mr. Veniot, 3716
Pedlow, Mr.,—Amendment incorrectly printed in Votes and Proceedings, 737

House of Commons—*Con.*
Privilege—*Con.*
Power, Mr.,—Withdrawal from Special Committee, Returned Soldiers, 789
Robb, Mr.,—Quebec bloc, 3261
Turgeon, Mr.,—Hon. Mr. Veniot, 3740
Wilson, Mr., (Wentworth)—Challenge to Hon. F. C. Biggs, 4448
Questions
Inquiry as to, 2943
Not answered, 1621, 1502
Returns
Alleged disobedience or neglect of order, 3320
Alleged imperfect, 2250-70
Inquiry for, 1176, 1499, 1502, 2688, 2775, 2777, 3008, 3320, 4255
Motions for in general terms, 1555
Reason for delay, 1555
Rules
Suspension of, 3582, 3715
Bills, first reading, 3716
17C. *See under this title* Estimates
Sergeant-at-Arms; Deputy Sergeant-at-Arms, 3
Sittings
Attendance at, 1844. *See also* under this title Wednesday evening
Duration of, 1330, 1828, 2438, 2736, 2750, 2772, 2887, 2998, 3000, 3900, 4169, 4420, 4449, 4531
All night
Government shipbuilding programme, 1858-2026
Saturday, 2777, 2818, 2941, 4338-40
Two o'clock, 2941, 3737
Wednesday
Two o'clock, 447
Evening, 1002, 1174, 1384
M. (Mr. Fielding) 1828; withdrawn, 1845
Staff
Law Branch, changes, 2685
Long sittings, 2887
Organization and compensation, 2441, 2685
Retirement Act, 4266-78. *See* Civil Service Retirement Act
Women workers, 4547
Supply. *See also* that title
Interim—Redlich, authority on, 1675
Procedure, 1215
Thursdays and Fridays—Rule 17C
See under this title, Estimates
Vacancies. *See also* under this title By-elections
Filling of, 1293. *See* Representation in Parliament

House of Commons—*Con.*
Vacancies—*Con.*
Leeds, 1293, 1619. *See also* White, Sir Thomas
Medicine Hat, 478, 1174, 1293
St. Antoine, 1001, 1069, 1293. *See also* Ames
Yale, 1
Yamaska, 478, 643, 1293. *See aslo* that title
York-Sunbury, 478,643, 1293
York, West, 478, 643, 1293
Writs, 643

House of Lords. *See* Ministers

Housing, 4362-8. *See aslo* Labour; Returned Soldiers; Unemployment
Dominion Housing scheme, 4049
Loan to provincial governments, 4552
Proposed establishment of a Federal Housing Board
M. (Mr. Hocken) 1134, 1152
M. as amended withdrawn, 1857

Howard, Mr. *See* Purchasing Commission

Hudson Bay Railway, 330, 538, 1578, 1961, 1966, 2969-80. *See also* Canals
Early resumption and completion, M. (Mr. Campbell) 974
Amdt. (Mr. Hay) 994; agreed to, 999
M. (Mr. Campbell) as amended, withdrawn, 1852-6
Expenditure actual and estimated, qu. 2623
Fort Churchill, 1966
Port Nelson, 1966
Selection of lands, qu. 672

Hudson, Hon. A. B., 4184-4213

Hughes, Hon. Sir Sam (Victoria)
Civil Service—Res.—Political Patronage in; fads and freaks, 789; uplifters; Outside Service; Civil Service Commission; Inside Service; Committee to investigate, 790; trust and mistrust; autocracy, 791

Hungry Bay road, 1661

Hunter, Dr. Andrew, fox-breeding, 1428

Hydro-Electric Power. *See* Fuel Supply Problem; Great Lakes-St. Lawrence

Hyndman, Judge, and Grain Inquiry Commission, 1674

Icebreakers, 1979
"Lake Champlain", 2174
"Montcalm", 1985
New, 1994
Thunder Bay, at, 2174

Ice-cream, tax, 3737, 3956

Iles aux Grues-Montmagny mail service 4529

Illegal Practices. *See* Corrupt Practices at Elections Bill

Illicit Still, innocent manufacture of part, 3788-3820

Imaginary Letters
Hon. Mr. Ballantyne, 3174-3209
Mr. McMaster, 3173
Speaker's ruling, 3260

Immaculate Conception, 2626. *See also* Civil Service, Religious Holidays

Immigration, 269, 3580. *See also* Canadian Nationals Definition Act; Chinese Immigration; Health; Unemployment
British, Inspector of, 3067
Central European, 2575-85
Chinese, 4131. *See also* Chinese Immigration
Continuous passage, 2580-6
Co-operation of railways, 4129
Emigration to the United States, 3068
Esmonde, Mr. Osmonde Grattan, arrest for sedition, 1556
Exhibitions, 3067, 4129-31
Expenditure, qu. 2943
German and Austrian, 3206
Halifax Quarantine Station, 2754
"Hand picking" of immigrants, 3203
Head tax, 3056
Hickman, alleged deportation of, qu. 574
Immigrants rejected, qu. 1624
Infection, danger of, qu. 272
Inspectors, 3067
Land settlement policy, 2581, 2588-9
Liberal administration, under, 3245
Loss of in Western Canada, 3373-4
Medical inspection of immigrants, 3128
Medical offices at ports of departure, 3132
Mental defectives, of, 3055, 3523
Money qualification, 2579-85
Nationality of, 3071
Oriental, 2584-94, 2595. *See also* Chinese Immigration
Partridge Island Quarantine station, 2808-15
Policy, 850, 861, 872, 879, 3205, 3249, 3256, 3580
Polish immigrants rejected, qu. 964
Restriction of, 507, 1127, 2568-77, 2585
Statistics, 3071-3073
Suspension of. *See* Unemployment
Typhus fever, precautions, 643, 4534
Western Canada Colonization Association, 2583

Immigration Act Amdt. Bill
1r., 3007; 2r., com., 3822; 3r., 3955; Senate amdts. 4343

Immigration Act Amdt. Bill—*Con.*
Subjects and Sections discussed:
Bill of health, 3824
Costs of appeal, 3823
Deportation after five years—cost, 3827
Hearing of cases, 3823
Investigation of complaints—deportation—cost, 3826
Landing of passengers, 3824
Medical examination, 3824
Non-immigrant classes, 3822
Possessing prescribed amount of money, 3825
Powers of Board exercised by officers in charge, 3823

Immigration Act Amdt. Bill (Deportation of Undesirables)
1r., 1497; order for 2r., stands, 1858. *See above* Bill

Immigration and Colonization
Department
Contingencies and general expenses, 4127
Deputy Minister, 3057
Estimates, 2568
Contingencies, 4131
Postponement of consideration, 3077
Quebec, officers at, qu. 1131
Salaries, 2568-2602, 3055, 3068

Imperial Bureau of Entomology, 1025

Imperial Conference, 526, qu. 564, 1073. *See also* Prime Ministers' Conference

Imperial Defence, 228, 270. *See also* Prime Ministers' Conference
Committee on, 2637-49

Imperial Federation, 159, 2423. *See also* Prime Ministers' Conference

Imperial Institute, 4499

Imperial Mineral Resources Bureau, 2164, 4498

Imperial Munitions Board, 1284. *See* Research
Shipbuilding, and, 1730, 1859, 1875

Imperial Oil Company, 3206. *See also* Oil; Petroleum Bounties

Imperial Relations, 247, 484, 519. *See also* Prime Ministers' Conference

Imperial War Conference, 1917, 2389
Res. 2626-36-48. *See also* Prime Ministers' Conference

Implement Manufacturers, 91. *See also* Agricultural implements

Imported Goods, Marking of, 3120, 3938. *See also* Customs Tariff Act, 1907, Amdt Bill

Imports. *See also* Budget; Customs; Trade
Foreign, value of, 3310
For home consumption, 1920, qu. 602
From Germany, qu. 838
From United States, 3409
German goods, holdback, qu. 1350
Invoice Certificates. *See* Customs and Excise Dept. Bill
Marking. *See* Customs Tariff Act, 1907, Amdt. Bill

Income Tax, 98, 402, 3229, qu. 3260, 3422. *See also* Budget; Taxation; Ways and Means
Canada and Great Britain, in, 3486
Chief Justice and. *See* Judges Act Amdt. Bill
Corporations, on, 3262
Exemptions, 1567
Forms, inquiry, 1176
Regulations, 1272
Returns, difficulty of making up, 3147

Income Tax Act Consolidation Bill, 3905
1r., 4251; 2r., com., 4343; 3r., 4355
Subjects and Sections discussed:
Administration, 4533
Direct taxation, 4344
Members' travelling expenses, 4349
Method of self-assessment and payment, 4345
Notice of assessment, 4353
Penalty for failure to file returns, 4343
Penalty for short payment, 4344
Railway men, expenses when absent from home, 4352
Salaries and indemnities of provincial ministers, 4351
Tax upon tax, 4349
Victory bonds, taxation of, 4353

Indemnity of Members. *See* House of Commons

Independence of Judges. *See* Judges Act Amdt. Bill

Independence of Parliament. *See* Representation in Parliament

Indian Affairs

Department of
Estimates, 2167, 2171, 4501

Indian Ford, 1055

Indians
Blood Reserve
Grazing leases, qu. 1817, 1818, 1819, 2098

Indians—*Con.*
Blood Reserve—*Con.*
Live stock, starvation of, qu. 2618
Sale of cattle, qu. 2374-5
Commissioner at Regina, qu. 964
Muscowegan reserve, 2171
New Brunswick, 4501
Prince Edward Island, 4505
Riding Mountain reserve, 2172
Sheridan, Mr. John, resignation and reinstatement, 2173, 2618, 4501-5
"Shows" for distinguished visitors, 2169
Tobique reserve—timber cut, 4503
Women, 3907

Indirect Taxation. *See* Taxation

Industrial Disputes Investigation Act, 4549

Industrial and Scientific Research. *See* Research

Industrial Councils. *See* Labour

Industrial Production. *See* Fuel Supply Problem

Industrial Property, International Convention for protection of, 230

Industrial Research Commission, Alberta, 1267

Ingonish-MacLeod's Breakwater, 4087

Inland and Coastwise Shipping Rates, 1497, qu. 2192, 2969. *See also* Railway Act Amdt. Bill

Inland Navigation, qu. 2192. *See also* Great Lakes-St. Lawrence

Inland Revenue. *See also* Customs and Excise Dept.; Customs Tariff

Inland Revenue Department. *See also* Customs and Excise Dept.; Customs Tariff
Excise taxes on tobacco, qu. 1236
Montreal officers, qu. 1820
St. Hyacinthe—Dr. Cartier, 3821, qu. 3904

Inland Revenue Act Amdt. Bill. (Forfeitures and Penalties—Mr. Archambault)
1r., 2247

Inland Revenue Act Amdt. Bill
Res. 3726; 1r., 3733; 2r., com., 3r., 3955
Subjects and Sections discussed.
Beer containers—marking, 3786
Illicit stills, 3786-3820
Increased jurisdiction in proceeding in summary convictions, 3786
Liquor, tax on, 3708
Tobacco and cigars—unlawful sale, 3786

Inquiry for Returns, House of Commons. *See* Returns

Insecticides, 1027

Insect Pests, 930, 1024, 3665. *See also* Destructive Insect and Pest Act; Entomology; Grasshoppers

Inspection and Sale Act
Administration, 1437

Inspection and Sale Act Amdt. Bills
Berry Boxes, 4106, 4114
Hay and Straw. 1r., 3319-20; 2r., com., 3r., 3759
Root vegetables, 4343

Inspection of Animals. *See* Cattle Embargo; Health of Animals

Inspection of Gas and Gas Meters Bill
1r., 351; 2r., 607; 3r., 2944

"Insular" Tribunal of England, 1090

Insurance. *See also* Fire Insurance; Returned Soldiers; Unemployment
Canadian, in foreign firms, 3469
Canadian Government Merchant Marine, 1278
Officers and seamen, 4359
Canadian National Railways, 1772
Fire, 3469
Fort Garry Hotel, Winnipeg, qu. 1348
La Société des Artisans Canadiens Français, 82
Marine, 1703. *See also* Shipbuilding
Registered mail matter, 2120-24
Registered parcels. *See* Post Office Act Amdt. Bill
Returned Soldiers, 4041. *See* that title; also Pensions
Returned Soldiers Insurance Act Amdt. Bill, 4260, 4355. *See also* that title
Sickness, 2554
Taxation of Mutual Companies, qu. 605
Unemployment. *See that title*

Insurance Act
Proposed amendments, inquiry, 2625
M. for res. 4339; withdrawn, 4453

Insurance Conference, 3088

Intercolonial Railway. *See that title* under Canadian National Railways

Interim Supply. *See also* Supply
Closure. *See that title*
Debate postponed, 1682
Former votes, of, 1681
Motion withdrawn, 1683
Point of Order—Res. to be preceded by notice, 1676

Interim Supply Bill. *See also* Appropriation Acts
Res. 1674; objected to, 1674; notice, Rule 17B, unanimous consent, 1676-82; withdrawn, 1683; Res. 2001; Amdt. (Mr. Lemieux) 2018-20; closure, notice of under Rule 17B, 2025-6
1r., 2095; 2r., com., 2100; 3r., 2116

Interior Department
Draughtsmen, 1334
Minister, necessity for presence in Commons, 1155
Salaries, 1330
Surveys Branch, 1332
Surveyor General, 1342

International Association of Railways Congress, 3023

International Boundary Commission, 1342, 4494
Joint report, 4340

International Commission, Fraser River, 2189

International Convention for the Protection of Industrial Property, adherence to, 230

International Customs Tariff Bureau, 1437

International Financial Conference. *See* Brussels

International Harvester Company, 3394. *See also* Agricultural machinery

International Institute of Agriculture, 1116

International Joint Commission, 164, 2388, 2421, 2435. *See also* Great Lakes-St. Lawrence; Lake of the Woods
Appointment of Sir William Hearst, 510
Lake of the Woods Control, 1071, 1176, 1233, 4172
St. Lawrence waterway, 691, 3960-70

International Justice. *See* Permanent Court

International Labour Conference, 544. *See also* Labour

International Labour Union. *See* Labour, National Catholic Unions

International Trade Conference, qu. 2029. *See* Trade

"Internationale," dredge, qu. 2192, qu. 2506

Inventors. *See* Patent Act Amdt. Bill

Inverness
Fishery overseers, 2178
Harbour, 3985
Public building, 2817

Invoice Certificates. *See* Customs and Excise Dept. Bill

Ioco, wharf, 3979

Ireland, Parliament for South of, qu. 603

Iron and Steel Industry
Development of, 873-4. *See also* Natural Resources; Steel

Irrigation. *See also* Natural Resources
Belly river water rights, qu. 2943
Milk river water rights, qu. 2099
Southern Alberta and Saskatchewan, 858

Isaac, Mr. *See* French Trade Agreement

Italy
Cargoes of wine from, 1715
Lira, exchange value of, 3816-4227
Trade with. *See* Customs and Excise Dept. Bill

Jacobs, Mr. S. W. (George Etienne Cartier)
Address in reply to Governor General's Speech, 503; congratulations to Prime Minister; by-election in Peterborough, 504; National Liberal and Conservative party; Mr. Bourassa, 505; Mr. R. B. Bennett; Government saturated with war spirit, 506; shipbuilding; immigration; restrictive loans and regulations, 507; railways and public ownership; Department of Trade and Commerce, 508; Departments not directly represented in House; military expenditures, 509; Royal Commission to investigate grain trade; conciliatory overtures to Quebec; appointments that violate the traditions, 510
Agriculture Dept.—Salary of Deputy Minister, 950
Air Board, 3780-3
Alpine Club, 4494
American immigration, 3065
Ames, Sir Herbert, resignation, 1327
Animal Contagious Diseases, 1048
Armistice Day Bill, 3773
Bankruptcy Act Amdt. Bill (Mr. Jacobs)—French Version, 1069, 2256
Bankruptcy Act Amdt. Bill (Mr. Guthrie) 2910-39, 3144
Bankruptcy Act, Judges under, 1085
British Remount Commission, qu. 4341
Canada Temperance Act
Damages, 4387
Invasion of the province of the courts, 4379
Proceedings pending, 4378
Canadian Bar Association, 1094
Canadian Forestry Association, 4494

Jacobs, Mr. S. W.—*Con.*
Canadian National Railways, Special Com., reference M. (Mr. Meighen) 1785
Cattle embargo, 1072
Chief Justice, salary of, 1568
Criminal Code Amdt. Bill, 3896-8, 3906-30, 4342
Customs and Excise Dept. Bill
Commissioner, 4388
Reflections on legal profession, 4406
Trade commissioners, 4406
De Martigny divorce, 3763
Dominion Elections Act Amdt. Bill
Foreign-born wives of British subjects, 3105
Esmonde, Mr. Osmonde Grattan, 1556
Foundation Company of Montreal, payments to, qu. 4341
Fox-farming, 1433
Governor General's cars, 3037
Grand Trunk Arbitration expenses, 4335
Grand Trunk loan, 4158
Great Lakes-St. Lawrence waterway, 749
Immigration, 2574-92, 3055
Exhibit decorator, 3066
Officials, 3057
Juvenile delinquents—spanking, 3918
League of Nations, contribution to, 2357-69
Liquor, tax on, 3708
Maisonneuve and Gaspé, representation, 1325, 2333
Medicinal preparations, 3709
Militia, cadet services, 2297
National Transcontinental, Winnipeg-Quebec service, 2513
Natural Research Institute, 2894
"Niobe" and "Rainbow", sale, 4018-31
Oleomargarine Act Amdt. Bill, 3880-2
Opium and Narcotic Drugs Act Amdt. Bill, 2898-2905
Amdt. to amdt., 2903
Parliament buildings, 4075
Patent Act Amdt. Bill, 4456
Penitentiaries, 1092
Permanent Court of International Justice, 2709-35
Permanent Force, 2278
Private Bills—extension of time, 1625
Quarantine, typhus, 4170
Representation in Parliament, 1327
Roumanian loan, interest, 1441, 2030
Supreme Court and Privy Council appeals, 1089-1090
Tariff revision, qu. 903, 2346
Trade commissioners, 1219, 1465
Trent canal, 2607
Unemployment and immigration, 1358
Wines—British colonies, 3710

James MacLaren Company, Limited. *See* Private Bills Discussed

Jameson, Mr. Clarence, 799. *See also* Civil Service

Japan
Foreign credit, balance of, 1227-8

Johnston, Mr. Alex., 1280
Reappointment, 644

Johnston, Mr. J. Fred. (Last Mountain)
Address, 437. Congratulations to Prime Minister, 437; Canadian Wheat Board; statement of Minister of Immigration at Regina; attitude of Progressives, 438; definite stand taken on "enabling legislation", the farmers and wheat control; report of grain supervisors, 439; objections to Wheat Board, 440; scarcity of cars; increase in freight rates; commission to investigate grain trade; Board of Commerce, 441; Mr. G. M. Murray and the press, 442; the West anxious for an election, 444
Agricultural shows, 1245
Budget, 3550. Military expenditures; shifting of taxation, 3551; tariff revision, 3552; Government policy of moderate protection, 3553; agriculture, area and revenue, 3553; Soldier Settlement Board, operations, 3554; natural resources of prairie provinces, 3555; Ambassador to Washington, 3556; Farmers' party, 3556
Civil Service Act Amdt. Bill, 4469-72
Cow-testing, 1037
Dominion Elections Act Amdt. Bill, 4241
Naturalization—Certificate of qualification, 4241
Grain Commission, 1449
Grand Trunk Railway, operating charges, qu. 1132
Immigration, restriction of, 1127
Indian Commissioner at Regina, 2167-9
Live stock breeding, 1117
Muscowegan reserve, 2171
Oil development in Mackenzie district, 2162
Post Office, outside service, 4528
Public Works, expenditures in Saskatchewan, 2818
Reciprocity agreement with United States, 2070
Stayner postmaster, 4470
Wheat Board, 1454

Joliette Bridge, 3038

Jones. *See* Rice Jones

Judge Snider. *See* Printing Bureau

Judges. *See also* Bankruptcy Act Amdt. Bill; Dominion Elections Act Amdt. Bill, Revising Officers

Judges—*Con.*
Appointment of, 801, 811, 813
Chandler, Judge, Moncton, 2119
Chief Justice, Supreme Court, exemption of salary, 2188
Exchequer Court, 1083-4
Latchford, Judge, payment to, qu. 1500
Macleod Judicial district, qu. 2344
Number of, 1081
Riddell, Judge, payments to, qu. 1500
Salaries, 3680
Saskatchewan King's Bench, additional Judge, 1559
Travelling expenses, 1559, 2118
Vice-Admiralty, 1084
Wilson, Judge, qu. 1622
Yukon Territory, salaries and living allowance, 1087-8

Judges Act, 1920
Correspondence, M. (Mr. Lemieux) 1851

Judges Act Amdt. Bill
Res. 1559; Amdt. (Mr. Lanctot) neg. 1572; 1r., 1573; 2r., com., 2117; 3r., 2151; Senate amdts. 3009; Free Conference with Senate, 3972; 4040-61; 4250

Judicial Committee. *See* Privy Council

Judicial Districts, Quebec, 1081-3

June Bugs, 1030

Justice
Administration of, Yukon Territory, 1087
Department
Counsel employed in, 1077, 3523
Legal cases referred to, 1655
Litigated matters, expenses, 1089
Newcombe, Mr. E. F., qu. 1002
Purchasing agent, 1079, 1115, 2017
Salaries, 1076
Taxation forms, revision by, qu. 1237
Law stamps, tax, 1090
Penitentiaries, estimates, 1091, 1096. *See also* Penitentiaries
Privy Council appeals, 1089. *See also* that title

Juvenile Courts. *See* Juvenile Delinquents

Juvenile Delinquents, 3013
Spanking, 3918

Juvenile Delinquents Act Amdt. Bill
1r., 3319; 2r., com., 3r., 3758

Kamouraska, plum-growing, 1048

Kamouraska and Temiscouata Telephone Co., 2175

Kapuskasing Illustration station, 949

Kay, Mr. W. Fred. (Missisquoi)
Camp Grounds, Farnham, Que., qu. 1132
Canada Temperance Act, qu. 4253

Kay, Mr. W. Fred.—*Con.*
Census enumerators, qu. 735, qu. 1132, 4113
Income tax forms, 1176
Missisquoi
Census enumerators, qu. 735, qu. 1132, 4113
Net fishing in Missisquoi Bay, qu. 570
Oleomargarine Act Amdt. Bill, 3854
Privilege—vote on Oleomargarine Bill, 3971
Special War Revenue Act—condensed milk and ice-cream, 3956
Victoria Day, 3531

Keefer, Mr. Francis H. (Port Arthur and Kenora)
Africa, trade with, 1965
Bankruptcy Act Amdt. Bill, 2925
Canada-West Indies Trade agreement, 2259
Canadian representation in the United States, 2424-6
Canal tolls, 2963
Cattle embargo, 730
Civil Service Retirement Act Amdt. Bill, 2487-8
Fuel Supply Problem, 1257
Grain transportation rates, 2982
Grand Trunk Arbitration Bill, 2479
Great Lakes-St. Lawrence waterway, Res. 674, 753
Kingston, wharves and bridges, 3973
Lake of the Woods Control Board Bill, 2346-54
Lake of the Woods Regulation Bill, 4184-98
Parliament buildings, 3999
Royal Canadian Mounted Police Act Amdt. Bill, 2483-4
Senate and House of Commons Act Amdt. Bill (Ministers and directorships) 593

Kemp, Hon. Sir Edward (East Toronto)
Senate and House of Commons Act Amdt. Bill (Ministers and directorships) 590

Kenora
Board of Trade, 4184-6
Dam, 4172

Kennedy, Mr. J. Wilfred (Glengarry and Stormont)
Cattle, embargo, 720
Cattle feeds, 3744
Customs and Excise Dept. Bill
New and unused goods, 3814
Grading of cheese, 1037
Hudson Bay Company, selection of land, qu. 672
Oleomargarine Act Amdt. Bill, 3866
Unemployment and immigration, 1372

Kennedy, Mr. W. C. (North Essex)
Budget, 3404; deficit and annual debt; militia expenditures; mercantile marine, 3405; railway situation, 3406; Canadian National Railways, directors, 3407; manufacturers and home and foreign markets, 3408; importations from United States, 3409; amdt. of Mr. Fielding, 3410
Canadian National Railways, Board of Management, qu. 1132
Civil Service bonus, 2111-13
Great Lakes-St. Lawrence waterway, 684

King, Hon. W. L. Mackenzie (Leader of the Opposition)
Address in reply to Governor General's Speech, 10; congratulations to Prime Minister; usurpation of authority by Government; changes in Ministry; elected as a war administration—has it a mandate?—comparison with former administrations, 12; retirement of ministers principally responsible for Government's war record, 13; aims of present and former administrations different, 15; the tariff, 17; issue excluded in formation of Union Government, 19; no right to legislate without consulting the people; grounds for continuance of Government examined; limitation of parliamentary term, 20; supremacy of Parliament, 22; no pledge given in 1917, 23; withdrawal of Ministers who believed administration had fulfilled its mandate, 24; desire of Leader of Opposition for an election; significance of by-elections, 25; Canada alone in denying to people right of general election, 26; violation of fundamental principles of free government, 28; non-confidence amendment, 28
Air Board, 3782
Ames, Sir Herbert, resignation, 478, 1069, 1295
Archives, provision for, 2949
Arctic expedition, 4106
Armistice Day, 3775
Auditor General's Report, 737, 903, 915
Bankruptcy Act Amdt. Bill, 2909
Budget, 3596. Tariff revision and the Government; tariff inquiry, 3598; Republican party in the United States—barriers to trade between two countries; exchange rate, 3599; comparison of Budget speech and policy and principles of National Liberal and Conservative party, 3600; inter-Imperial

King, Hon. W. L. Mackenzie—*Con.*
Budget—*Con.*
trade, 3601; association between interests and Government during war period, 3602; political power united with plutocracy of self-interest, 3603; Board of Commerce—Mr. Murdock, 3604; lack of constructive legislation, 3607; protection of the interests, 3607; expenditure on National Railways and Merchant Marine, 3608; directors of National Railways and business interests, 3609; loans to foreign countries, 3611; Members of Parliament and sales to foreign countries, 3611; Minister of Crown soliciting business from foreign government, 3612; Prime Minister and misrepresentation of attitude of Opposition, 3612; free trade and protective tariffs, 3613; methods of taxation, 3614; downward revision of tariff, 3616; election necessary, 3618
Budget, date of, inquiry, 1555, 2151
Business of the House
Estimates—alleged agreement, 4569
For to-morrow, 2145
Interruption of debate on Address, 151
Legislation
Pending, 2150, 2819, 3972
Undue haste, 313
Lengthy discussions, 1230
Monday—Government business, 2148
Order of, 1619
Prorogation, 4069
Sittings
Duration of, 897, 900, 1330, 2887
Saturday, 2818
Wednesday evening, 1002
Supply, procedure, 1216
Victoria Day, 3689
By-elections, dates, 903. *See also* under this title Representation in Parliament
Canadian Government Merchant Marine, 1292
Canadian Nationals Definition Act, Bill, 585, 648
Canadian National Railways
Government-owned railways, correspondence, 1004
Information—attitude of the Government, 1759
Management, 1440
M. that information be laid before Parliament, 1178
Special Committee, reference to
M. (Mr. A. K. Maclean) 1188, 1594; M. (Mr. Meighen) 1758; Amdt. (Mr. King) 1761; Amdt. (Mr. Crerar) 1813

King, Hon. W. L. Mackenzie—*Con.*
Canadian Representation in the United States, 2378-2429
Chinese Immigration Act Amdt. Bill, 3828
Civil Service Retirement Act Amdt. Bill, 2486
Civil Service Act Amdt. Bill
Amdt. (Mr. A. K. Maclean) 2844; M. for 2r., 2778
Commission
Annual report, 4477
Jurisdiction of, 4286-8
Returned soldiers, 4258-9
Special Com.
Quorum, 2940
Reference to, 2776
Copyright Amdt. and Consolidation Bill, 2908, 3843-50
Cost of Living, 4551
Criminal Code Amdt. Bill, 3830
Date of summoning Parliament, 311
Daylight saving in Ottawa, 2776
Deceased members, tributes to, 4, 153
Dominion Elections Act Amdt. Bill (Prohibition Plebiscite) 151, 309
Dominion Elections Act Amdt. Bill
Bill not printed, 2944
Certificate of qualification, 3090, 3107-10, 4238-9
Foreign-born wives and children of British subjects, 3090
Forms, 3100
Voters' lists, registration, 3092
Dominion Lands Act Amdt. Bill, 4062-6
Estimates. *See also* under this head Business of the House, Interim Supply
Committee on, 2207-9
Time of taking up, 1330
French Trade Agreement, 2125
Governor General—address to on retirement, 4434
Grand Trunk Arbitration Bill
Agreement of March 8, 1920, 2377
Committee of five, 2479
Legal consequences, 2451
Liquidation, 2451
Position of Opposition on taking over Grand Trunk, 2560
Ratification of new agreement, 2450
Request for delay, 2346
Senate amendments, 2777, 2823
Submission of agreement to Parliament, 2476
House of Commons staff, 2887
Income Tax Act Amdt. Bill, 4343
Interim Supply, 1679, 2115
Attitude of Opposition, 2004
Objected to, 1674
Obligations for payment, 2025

King, Hon. W. L. Mackenzie—*Con.*
Judge Snider's report, 3697, 3761, 3905
Judges Act Amdt. Bill, 2117-18
Kamloops, speech at, 3623
Labour Department
Alleged combines, 4551
Bolshevism—pamphlet, 4548
Fair wages, 4545
Industrial Disputes Investigation Act, 4552
Minister—letter of in Gazette, 1643
Lake of the Woods Control Board Bill, 2033
Lake of the Woods Regulation Bill, 3903, 4211-17
League of Nations, contribution towards, 2356
Ministers to sit in either Chamber, 1163
Montreal Harbour Commission Bill, 2159
National Research Institute, 2894. *See also* Research
Natural resources
Adjournment of debate, 894
Transfer of to western provinces, 2546-52
Nauru Island, phosphate deposits, 4255, 4541
Newsprint, alleged combine, qu. 2099
Opium and Narçotic Drug Act Amdt. Bill, 2898-2907
Owens, the late Thomas P., Editor of Debates, 258
Park St. Charles Company, proposed payment, 4573
Peterborough speech, 134
Post Office Act Amdt. Bill, 2123
Press Gallery, 2887
Prime Ministers' Conference, 2631
Amdt. to Supply, 2634-58
Prisons and reformatories, 3011
Privilege—alleged statement of Mr. Davidson regarding Liberal leadership, 2443
Privileges and Elections Committee, 2373
Proportional representation, 1552
Public money, accounting for, 1292
Purchasing Commission, 1099
Statutes
Limiting power, 1101
Providing for tenders, 1105
Representation in Parliament
Vacancies (Amdt. to Supply), 1293, 1300, neg. 1309
By-elections, 1306
Rockefeller Foundation, 2443
Royal Canadian Mounted Police Act Amdt. Bill, 2481, 2801
Shipbuilding, 1292

King, Hon. W. L. Mackenzie—*Con.*
Speaker's Chair, 3693
Supplementary Estimates, inquiry for, 3741
Tariff inquiry, 3055
Tariff revision, 3622-3
Unemployment, 4549
Vacancies, 478. *See also* under this head Representation
War Times Election Act, 4238
White, Sir Thomas, qu. 477

King's Bench. *See* Judges Act Amdt. Bill Judges, 1081

King's Birthday, 4450

King's County, fruit inspectors, 1041

Kingston
Fortifications, 969
Penitentiary. *See* Penitentiaries
Wharves and bridges, 3973

Kino Hill, silver discovery, 856

Kirkwood Steamship Company, qu. 564

Knox, Mr. Andrew (Prince Albert)
Address in reply to Governor General's Speech, 537; congratulations to Prime Minister; the amendment; Soldiers' Settlement Board; Porcupine Forest Reserve; lack of transportation facilities—freight rates—Hudson Bay Railway, 538; investigation of grain trade; farmers' movement
Budget, 3414. Government has reverted to indirect taxation, 3414; militia expenditures, 3415; expenditures on canals; northern Saskatchewan transportation facilities, 3416; protection and the farmers; grain inquiry, 3417
Canadian National Railways, passenger traffic, Montreal-Winnipeg, qu. 2376
Chinese immigration, 3056
Civil Service Act Amdt. Bill, 2855
Cordwood for fuel, 3748
Credits to Roumania and Greece, qu. 1236
Hudson Bay Railways, 538, 982
Immigration, 2589-90
Income tax payers—farmers, qu. 838
Saskatchewan railway lines, 3054
Senate representation—Saskatchewan, 2567
Trent canal, 2608-9, 2958

Kuskanook, wharf, 3979

Labour. *See also* Building Trades Conference; Housing; Immigration; Industrial Disputes; Shipbuilding; Returned Soldiers; Unemployment
Alleged combines, 4551

Labour—*Con.*
Bolshevism, pamphlet, 4548
Canadian Government Merchant Marine, wages, 1921
Civil Service, prevailing rates, qu. 3089
Conditions in Great Britain and United States, 408
Discontent and unrest, 3439
Department
Emergency relief, 4535
Employment offices, 2852, 4363
Estimates, 4170, 4535
Draper, Mr. P. M., 1632, 1637
Fair wage clause, 1910, 2955, 4545
Germany, cost in, 4425, 4428
Industrial Disputes Investigation Act, 4549-52
International Conference at Washington, 544
Status of Canada, 2629
Unemployment insurance, 4547
Washington and Geneva, conventions and recommendations, 4041
Women workers, 4547
League of Nations, 4547
Manual labourers. *See* Civil Service Act Amdt. Bill
Mathers Commission, 232
Minister in Senate, criticism of, 1154-5, 1162, 1169, 4544
Moore, Mr. Tom, 1627, 1632, 1636
National Advisory Council, 4363
National Catholic Labour Unions, 1625, 3584
Chicoutimi Convention, 1626
Letter of Minister in Gazette, 1642
Minister of Labour and, 1625
Platform of, 1627
Wright, Mr. A. A., letter of, 1647
National Industrial Conference, 2101, 4549
Railways, and, 1179, 1190, 1587. *See also* that title
Shipbuilding, Government, 1273, 1727, 1889, 1897, 1902, 1909, 1974
Strikes
Cape Breton in, 3528
Grand Trunk, 230
Number of, qu. 569
Peterborough, 3549
Winnipeg, 3359, 3360, 3560
Trades and Labour Congress, platform of, 1634
Unemployment relief, 4535. *See also* Unemployment
Wages and prosperity, 3514
Women workers—overtime, 4547

Labour Gazette, 1155

Lachine Canal. *See* Canals

Ladysmith, wharf, 3980

Lafleche, Col. *See* Purchasing Commission

Lafortune, Mr. D. A. (Jacques-Cartier)
Address in reply to Governor General's Speech, 292; tribute to late Mr. Gladu; the debate reviewed, 292; Mr. Gauthier, 293; the amendment; Government's mandate executed; Prime Ministers' Conference, 294; Government in danger when it turns to Opposition for help; new name of Government party, 294; change of Government in 1896; issues of the election; promises made and kept; Manitoba school question; St. Lawrence river channel; revising barristers; contracts, men's wages; deficits; Sir Wilfred Laurier; the tariff, 296; reciprocity, 297; things the Liberals will do when returned; Georgian Bay canal; bridge between Vaudreuil and Ste. Anne, 298; will demand accounting; Quebec not isolated but badly represented, 299; widening of Victoria bridge; bridge at Longueuil; tobacco growers, 300; sugar beet industry, 301;
Automobile theft, 3915
Budget, 3669; historical and political review, 3669-70; Mr. Bourassa, 3671; Laurier administration; prosperity of manufacturers and agricultural interests under Liberal Government, 3673; Post Office Department—deficit, 3674; Lachine canal bridge, 3675; immigration of French Canadians to United States, 3675; protection of tobacco growers, 3676; Ville Emard tunnel, 3677; bridge at Ste. Anne's-Vaudreuil, 3677; bridges in Jacques Cartier county; Georgian Bay canal, 3678; Military Service Act, 3678; Liberals returning to Opposition after war, 3679; Judges' salaries, 3680
Criminal Code Amdt. Bill, 3910-32
Lachine canal bridge, 3675, 4308
La Salle—road repair, 4313-33
Perrot Island bridge, qu. 576, qu. 603
Pointe Claire, wharf, 4312
Three Card Monte, 1858

"Lake Champlain", icebreaker, 1985

Lake Freights, 3371. *See also* Canals; Great Lakes-St. Lawrence; Transportation

Lake of the Woods and Other Waters, 3903. *See also* Lake of the Woods Regulation Bill

Lake of the Woods Control, International Joint Commission, 1176, 1233

Lake of the Woods Control Board, estimates, 2437

Lake of the Woods Control Board Bill
1r., 788; 2r., com., 2033, 2346, 3r., 2445
Subjects and Sections Discussed:
Board
Creation of, 2033-2346
Immunity from actions, 2355
Powers—enforcement of
By order of court, 2350
By taking possession of property, 2353
Purposes, 2350
Correspondence — International Joint Commission, 1176, 1233
Norman dam, English river, Winnipeg river, 2347
Statement by Prime Minister, 2033

Lake of the Woods Regulation Bill
1r., 3903; 2r., com., 4171; Amdt. (Mr. Pardee), six months' hoist—to 3r., 4226; 3r., 4227
Subjects and Sections Discussed:
Backus, Mr. E. W., 4173-4224
Boundary award, 4181
Concurrent legislation, 3903
Correspondence between the Prime Minister and Hon. Mr. Drury, 3971, 4170, 4182
English river, 4172
Hudson, Hon. A. B., 4184, 4213
Kenora dam, 4172
Norman dam, 4173
Rivers and Streams Act, 4174-4225
Sioux Lookout, 4191
Statement by Prime Minister, 4171
Technical Board, 4173
White Dog Falls, 4172
Winnipeg river, 4172

Lalor, Mr. F. R. (Haldimand)
Budget, 3656. Change in official Opposition, 3657; free trade and farmers, 3658; manufacturers help to lower prices, 3659; Roumanian and Greek loans and contracts, 3661; protection proper policy for Canada, 3661
Civil Service Retirement Act Amdt. Bill, 2492-4
Customs and Excise Dept. Bill
Dumping clause, 3817
Invoice certificate, fee, 4391
Position of Agrarian group, 4400
United States Customs regulations, 3817, 4417
Valuation for duty, 3817, 4417
Dominion Elections Act Amdt. Bill (Prohibition plebiscite) 307

Lalor, Mr. F. R.—*Con.*
Highway construction in Ontario, 4300
Hon. F. C. Biggs, 3037
Immigration, 2582
Income Tax Act Amdt. Bill, 4351

Lambert, Mr. Norman P., 289, 3329, 3363, 3685.
See also Grain Growers' Grain Company

Lanctot, Mr. Roch (Laprairie and Napierville)
Budget, 3516; tariff revision; Canada's participation in the war, 3517; imports and exports, 3518; revenue; expenditures, 3519; military expenditure, 3519; railway situation, 3520; Grand Trunk Railway, 3522; lawyers and Justice Department, 3523
Chief Justice, income tax, 1572
Civil Service bonus, 2107, 2114
Income Tax Act Amdt. Bill, 4352
Interim Supply Bill, 2107
Judges Act Amdt. Bill
Amdt. to res. neg. 1572
Montreal and South Shore traffic bridge, 2216
Post Office, outside service, 4531
Shipbuilding, 1959

Land.—*See also* Soldier Settlement; Immigration
Settlement, western, 3249
Location, 4343
Tax, 3229, 3317, 3453, 3486, 3511, 3634-35, 3664

Lang, Mr. Norman (Humboldt)
Address in reply to Governor General's Speech, 342; the amendment; desire for election confined to one side; questions affecting West; investigation of Grain Trade, 342; marketing conditions; series of unfavourable years; Wheat Board; Wheat pool; better understanding between East and West; live stock industry harvest help; National Railways, branch lines, 344

Langlois, Mr. George Arnoult, appointment, qu. 2505, 2875, 4128

Lapointe, Mr. Ernest (Quebec East)
Address in reply to Governor General's Speech, 457; congratulations to Prime Minister; special circumstances under which Parliament meets; House must reflect national will; public confidence withdrawn from Government, 457; justification of amendment; Union Government formed for duration of war—continuance in office injustice to Canada; democracy; the soldiers' vote;

Lapointe, Mr. Ernest—*Con.*
Address—*Con.*
war mandate used for other purposes, 458; new Administration without public endorsation; origin of National Liberal and Conservatice party; no mandate given in 1917 to present Government, 459; withdrawal of Ministers who gave prestige to Administration; sincerity of Liberals who support Government, 460; Government no longer in harmony with public opinion; by-election, 461; the Government's majority, 463; Sir Thomas White; Sir Herbert Ames; constitutional duty of Government; British precedents, 464; Imperial conference, 467
Alcohol, tax on, 3705
Ames, Sir Herbert, resignation, 464, 1296, 1310
Business of the House
Estimates on Thursdays and Fridays—Rule 17C—958, 1073, 1218, 1385, 2103-4, 4544
Canadian Nationals Definition Bill, 769
Canadian National Railways
Board of directors, 1605
Canadian Representation in the United States, 2429
Cattle embargo, 727
Civil Service Act Amdt. Bill, 2779, 4487-90
Religious holidays, 4487-90
Civil Service (res. Sir Sam Hughes) Political Patronage, 800; census commissioners and enumerators, 800; Judges, 801; commissions, 802
Closure, 2025
Criminal Code Amdt. Bill, 3907
Customs Tariff, 1907, Amdt. Bill
Imported goods—marking, 3939-41
Dominion Elections Act Amdt. Bill (Prohibition plebiscite) 310
Dominion Elections Act Amdt. Bill, 4246-50
Nomination paper, 4246
Revising officers, 4250
French Trade Agreement, 2137-8, 2152
Harbours and Rivers, estimates, 3977-80
High Commissioner's Office, 2437
Immigration Act Amdt. Bill—(Deportation) 1497, 1858
Imperial Mineral Resources Bureau, 2165
Interim Supply, 2010-11; 2101-4
Judges
Judicial District of Quebec, 1081-2
Justice Department
Counsel employed, 1076
Lake of the Woods Control Board Bill, 2033
Lake of the Woods Regulation Bill, 4210

Lapointe, Mr. Ernest—*Con.*
League of Nations, contribution to, 2357-67
Maisonneuve and Gaspé representation, 2314, 2342
Marine estimates, length of debate, 1988
Minister of Labour, 4544
National Catholic Labour Union, 1625, 3584
National Industrial Conference, 4549
Naval policy, 4023
Oleomargarine Act Amdt. Bill, 3891
Order, point of, word of member should be accepted, 1641
Parliament buildings, 3994, 4075-8
Inscription on tower, 4544
Polish battalion for service in French army, 4060
Prime Minister's Conference, 2505, 2637-67
Naval defence—contribution of Dominions to, 4256
Privilege
Alleged statement of Mr. Davidson regarding Liberal leadership, 2443
Correction of report in Ottawa Journal, 477
Explanation of remarks on Dominion Elections Bill, 4543
National Catholic Labour Unions, 3584
Provinces as traders, 3706
Purchasing Commission, 2015
Negative motion, 2019
Quebec riots, 1506
Railway Department employees, 1654
Representation in Parliament, 1307
Revenue from duty on wines, 2711
Soldiers' pensions, insurance and re-establishment, 4055-60

Laporte, Sir Hormidas, 1609-10, 4315. *See also* Canadian National Railways
Business interests, 3610

La Presse, 3217
Canadian Government Merchant Marine, criticism, 1709
Lord Atholstan, and, 3248
Yamaska by-election—Mr. Mondou, 3251

LaRochelle, Mr. M. G., 799. *See also* Civil Service; Civil Service Act Amdt. Bill

La Salle road, 4313-33

L'Assomption Experimental Station, 918, 946

Latchford, Mr. Justice, payments to, qu. 1500

"Laurentian", Government steamer, qu. 1348, 1863

Laurentide Pulp & Paper Company, 3049

Laurier, Sir Wilfrid, 3670. *See also* Address; Budget; Prime Ministers' Conference
Imperial Conferences, and, 3431-34
South African War, 1527
Tariff, 3614, 3642

Laval University. *See* Research

Lavigueur, Mr. Henri E. (Quebec County)
Address in reply to Governor General's Speech, 280; congratulations to Prime Minister; the French language; demand for general election; changed attitude towards Quebec; unfulfilled obligations to city of Quebec; equipment for Transcontinental railway; grain elevators, docks, workshops; Great Northern and Lake St. John railways; St. Charles river dam; the Quebec riots of 1918, 282
Canadian National Railways
Directors, 4315
Quebec bridge—highway, 4333
Civil Service bonus, 2112-13
Great Lakes-St. Lawrence waterway, 686
Harbours and rivers, estimates, 3977
Income tax, 2106
Marine estimates, 1987
National Catholic Labour Unions, 1649
Park St. Charles Company, proposed payment to, 4575
Post Office
Fiset, Mr. Michel, 963, 4523
Loretteville, 4523
Quebec elevator, 282, 1443
Quebec-Loretteville line, 4328
Shipbuilding, 1971
Telegraph line, Loretteville-St. Gerard, 4539

Lavoie, Mr., and Canadian National Railways, 1659, 1670

Law Library, Canadian, 1090

Law Stamps, 1090

Lawyers. *See* Canadian Bar Association; Justice Department

League of Nations, 97, 110, 125, 157, 164, 186, 188, 195, 204, 227, 229, 237, 247, 285, 357, 400, 435, 474, 2629-50-52, 2789, 3157, 3205. *See also* Canadian Nationals Definition Act; Prime Ministers' Conference; Permanent Court of International Justice
Ames, Sir Herbert, 464. *See also* that title
Article X, 158, 1967
Elimination of, qu. 575
Assembly, 164, 436, 2629, 2710, 543
Canadian representatives, 188, qu. 602, 785

League of Nations—*Con.*
Assembly—*Con.*
French Canadians unrepresented, 552
Request for papers, 188
Aviation, 3782
Burnham, Dr., case of, 1521. *See also* that title
Canada's participation, 519
Canadian Nationals, 397. *See also* that title
Constitutional questions, 113
Council, 2709
Expenses, Canada's share, qu. 1235, 2356
Labour, 4547. *See also* that title
Nauru Island, 4255, 4541
Permanent Court of International Justice. *See that title*
Permanent Secretariat, maintenance, 2356

Leases of Federal Oil Lands. *See* Oil

Lecours, Mr. A. J. *See* Quebec Riots

Leduc, Mr. J. Alfred (Westmount-St. Henry)
Budget, 3463. Comparison of present with Liberal administration; Government economy in expenditure necessary, 3464; methods of taxation, 3465; income tax, 3465
Oleomargarine Act Amdt. Bill, 3882
Public buildings, Nova Scotia, 2770

Lee-Enfield Rifle, 2783-7. *See also* Militia; Ross Rifle

Leeds
Status of member for, 464, 1294, 1326. *See also* White, Sir Thomas
Resignation of member for, 1619
Vacancy, 1293

Legal Responsibility. *See* Quebec Riots

Leger, Mr. A. T. (Kent, N.B.)
Agricultural publications, 1074
Beef production, 1039
Cold storage—delegation from Maritime Provinces, 1038
Dairying, 1036
Dredging, 3982
Fruit growing, 1041
Harbours and rivers, 3990
Lightkeepers' salaries, 1994
Oleomargarine Act Amdt. Bill, 3759
Partridge Island quarantine station, 2206-14
Public Works—transfer of district engineer's office from Chatham, 4081-5
St. John harbour, 4078
Sheridan, Mr. John, resignation and reinstatement of, 1499, 2173, qu. 2618, 4501-5
Veterinaries in New Brunswick, 1050

Lemieux, Hon. Rodolphe (Maisonneuve; Gaspé)
Address in reply to Governor General's Speech, 177; Mr. Mowat; platform of Liberal Convention of 1919; Speech of Mr. Gauthier a "degrading incident", 178; the amendment; Government possible only with consent of governed; the "Khaki" election in England; Balfour administration, 178; no general election for ten years; issue in 1911; dissolution and election; only issue in 1917 was "Win the War"; that election a "sham" and "official debauchery"; tariff, 181; coalition illogical after the war; Cabinet changes; distinction between Tory and Liberal, 182; justification of amendment; Imperial Conference, naval defence; British foreign policy; Canada will never surrender rights; Government without mandate to discuss naval defence; organic change in constitution, 183; Canada a nation? Right denied to conclude commercial pact; consular agents, 184; Ambassador at Washington, 185; Chicago Drainage Canal; levels of the Great Lakes and St. Lawrence river; League of Nations; increasing desire for national unity, 187
Air Board, 3778
Archives, provision for, 2949
Arctic expedition, 4106
Ascension Day, adjournment, 2688
Bankruptcy Act Amdt. Bill, 291c
Belgian Immigration, 4128
Berry boxes, 4116
Bertrand, Mr. Joseph Tetu, 4079
Brunelle, Sergt. Major N., 1518
Budget, 3241. Tariff Commission; free trade and protection, revenue, raising of, 3242; income tax; two normal periods of recent history, 1879-1896, 1896-1911, comparison of, 3243; British preference, establishment of, 3244; relations with the United States, 3245; benefits of Liberal administration, 3245; war loans, debts and deficits, 3246; a free press, 3247; naval and military expenditure, 3248; vigorous policy of immigration and land settlement, 3249; mining industry; attitude of Quebec, Yamaska by-election, 3250
Burnham, Dr., and Serbian Government, M., 1520, 1528
Business of the House, 1851
Morning sittings, prorogation, 4338-40
Previous debate, 3627

Lemieux, Hon. Rodolphe—*Con.*
Business of the House—*Con.*
Wednesday evening adjournment, 1833
Canada Temperance Act Bill
Costs of litigation, 4385
Canada-West Indies Trade Agreement, 1557, 2254-7
Canadian dollar in the United States, 3087
Canadian Government Merchant Marine, 1286
Canadian National Railways
Deficit--Mr. J. Lambert Payne, 3017
Foremen of engines, qu. 1673
St. Hyacinthe shops, qu. 2821
Special Committee, reference to M. (Mr. Meighen) 1774
Train agents, qu. 1349
Canadian Representation in the United States, 2396, 2430
Cattle embargo, 710; motion withdrawn, 766
Chicago Drainage Canal, 185, 1851, 2225
Chinese Immigration Act Amdt. Bill, 3827-9
Civil Service
Bonus, qu. 901, 1176
Griffenhagen and Associates, 799, 4555. *See also* under this title, Post Office
Outside Service, qu. 2820
Res. (Sir Sam Hughes) Political Patronage in, 798; Liberal principles; Civil Service Commission; competitive principle; worries of patronage system; experience in England, United States and India; Hon. Sydney Fisher; confidence in Commissioners; Arthur Young and Company; Griffenhagen and Associates, 799
Reorganization, 4555
Superannuation, increase of allowances, 2112
Civil Service Act Amdt. Bill, 2855-71, 4258-60, 4280-88, 4466-86
Religious holidays, 4485
Returned Soldiers, 4258-60
Civil Service Retirement Act Amdt. Bill, 2490-2; 4275
Copyright Act Amdt. and Consolidation Bill, 3838-49
Customs
Minister of
Letter to French Purchasing Commission, 3079
Private business connections, 3079, 3080
Montreal port officers, 3086
Dairy Products Grading Bill, 4448
De Martigny divorce, 3767-71, 4008, 4203, 4477
Destruction of documents. *See also* under this title Printing Bureau

Lemieux, Hon. Rodolphe—*Con.*
Divorce evil, 4474
Dominion Elections Act Amdt. Bill, 3092, 4246
Naturalization, 3112
Dominion Lands Act Amdt. Bill, 4064
Editorial Committee, 4557-9
Estimates, Scrutiny of, Special Committee, M., 1503, 2193, 2210
Expenditure
National Committee on, 1835
Statutory, 1557
French Trade Agreement, 1557, 2127-41, 2193
Gaspé Peninsula railway facilities, 2507-9
Georgian Bay Canal, qu. 2625
Germany
Canadian claims against, 4534
Grand Trunk Arbitration Bill, 2450-80, 2564
Highways
Construction in Ontario, 4290-3
In Quebec, 3029
Housing
(Amdt.) 1135-36
Point of order, 1135
Immigration
Central European, 2575-85
Deputy Minister, 3057
Exhibits, 3067
Inspectors, 3067
Immigration Act Amdt. Bill, 3822-7
Income tax
Instructions in both languages, 2626
Penalties, qu. 2100
Regulations, 1272
Income Tax Act Amdt. Bill, 4345-53
Insurance Act, proposed amendments, 2625, 4339
Insurance Conference, 3088
Interim Supply, 1679
Bill, 2101-2112
Motion to reduce, 2095
Judges Act Amdt. Bill, 1561, 3010
Judges Act, 1920, Correspondence, 1851
Judge Snider's report. *See* under this title Printing Bureau
Lake of the Woods Regulation Bill, 4207-10
Langlois, Mr., 4128
Magdalen Island steamship service, 767
Maisonneuve and Gaspé, representation, 2328
Military expenditure, South Africa, 3273
Ministers to sit in either Chamber, M., 1152; withdrawn, 1172
Murray Bay-Tadoussac Steamship service, 1825
National Research Institute, 4555. *See also* under this title, Research

Lemieux, Hon. Rodolphe—*Con.*
National Transcontinental, Winnipeg-Quebec service, 2509-19
Natural resources, 874
North American Trust Company, 1129
Oil and Gas permits and leases, 899
Oil bounties, 1421
Oleomargarine Act Amdt. Bill, 3883-94
Opium and Narcotic Drug Act Amdt. Bill, 2906, 3009
Park St. Charles Company, proposed payments to, 4570
Parliament buildings, 4077
Pension Act Amdt. Bill, 4367
Pensions
Etienne, Mde., claim, 4367
Martel, Mde., claim, 4367
Permanent Court of International Justice, 2712-14
Pierreville postmistress, qu. 2624
Polish battalion for service in French army, 4053
Post Office Act Amdt. Bill, 1619, 2123-25
Post Office Department
Anderson, Mr., 4556
Annuities, 4524
Griffenhagen and Associates, 4556
Letter rate, 4515
Postmaster General, 4514
Railway mail service, 4516
Reorganization and administration, 4514-24, 4556
Verret, Col., 4525-56
Prime Ministers' Conference, 2642
Printing Bureau—destruction of documents, 2950-3, 4557
Judge Snider's report, 1625, 2444, 2943, 3905, 4062, 4436
Private members and money resolutions, 1135
Prohibition, 4474
Public moneys, expenditure of, 1678
Public Works in Gaspé, 4088
Purchasing Commission, 2021, 2018-22
Motion to strike out item, 2018
Quebec riots, 1514
Question not answered, 1621
Railways
Freight rates on, 2018
Refrigerator cars for fish, 1038
Revenue and expenditure, 4515
Salmon fishery licenses, 4341
Sandy Beach wharf, qu. 965
Senate and House of Commons Act Amdt. Bill (Ministers and directorships) 591
Senate Bills, delay in first reading, 1619
Shipbuilding, 1286, 1686, 2078

Lemieux, Hon. Rodolphe—*Con.*
Shipbuilding—*Con.*
Speech referred to, 1684
Soldiers pensions, insurance and re-establishment, 4053
Speaker's Chair, 3694
Stony Mountain penitentiary, release of prisoners, 477
Thanksgiving day, date, qu. 2098
Trade with United States, 1481
United States tariff, Canadian duties, 4254
War tax, 4515
Woman suffrage, 4474
Yamaska election
Speech at St. François du Lac, 3528
Unsatisfactory arrangements for, 4534
Young Emergency tariff, 2905

Le Pas wharf, 3975-6

Letter Carriers. *See also* Post Office
Bonus, 2109-15. *See also* Civil Service, Bonus

Letter Rate. *See* Post Office

Letters. *See* Imaginary Letters

Levels, Great Lakes, 186. *See also* Chicago Drainage Canal; Great Lakes-St. Lawrence Waterway

Lévis, expropriation of land at, 1846

Libel. *See* Criminal Code Amendments

Liberal Bloc, 3216

Liberal Convention, 1919, 73, 175, 218, 338, 3637. *See also* Address; Budget
Fiscal policy, 3213
Tariff resolution, 3643

Library of Parliament
Joint Committee, 110
Joint Librarians' Report, 3
Noise, 4000

Life Assurance Companies. *See* North American

Life-saving Service, 1990

Lighthouses and Lightkeepers, 1994, 2174
Bonus, 1622, qu. 1623
Signal service, 4040

Lignite. *See also* Coal, Natural Resources
Briquetting plants
Bienfait, qu. 672, 673, 848, 4499
Estevan, 2689
Conservation Commission, 3965
Utilization Board, qu. 672, 673, 1269, 4499

Lindsay
Arsenal, 2782
Wharf, 2616

Lindsay, General
Oil lands, 1342
Tar sand rights, 671

Linen Yarn, Bounty on, 1389. *See also* Flax

Liquor. *See also* Alcohol; Canada Temperance Act; Customs and Excise Dept. Act; Inland Revenue; Prohibition; Special War Revenue
Canada-West Indies Trade Agreement, 2258-9
Canadian Government Merchant Marine, cargoes, 1713, 1715
Export licenses in Saskatchewan, qu. 838
Illicit traffic, 4388
Seizure of at Baie St. Paul, qu. 696
Tax on, 3705, 3708
Theft of at Baie St. Paul, qu. 1132

Lira, exchange value of. *See* Italy

Live Stock, 344, 846, 923, 1116. *See also* Agriculture; Health of Animals
Abattoirs and cold storage, 1125
Accredited Herd, 4506-13
Breeding, aids to, 1117, 1245
Cattle embargo. *See that title*
Corning—cattle purchases, 1624
County fairs and exhibitions, 1123
Dairy herds and cow testing, 1118
Distribution of pure-bred animals, 923, 948
Eggs and poultry, 1122. *See also* Eggs
Farmers' Clubs, 1117
Feed. *See that title*
Guernsey cattle at Nappan, qu. 2686
Health of Animals, 4506-12. *See also* that title
Marketing, 1039, 1119
Molasses wash for hogs, 3787-3820
Saskatchewan, distribution, qu. 1236
Transportation charges on feed, qu. 2686
Wool grading, 1121

Living Conditions. *See* Housing

Loan Companies. *See also* Housing

Loans. *See also* Address; Budget; Credits; Finance; Housing
Belgium to, qu. 577, qu. 1001, 3379. *See also* that title
Canadian National Railways, 4131-68, 4288, 4313, 4334
Canadian Northern Railway, 3037
Domestic, qu. 566
European credits, qu. 2622
Foreign, 3286, 3347, 3611
Grand Trunk Railway, 4131-68, 4288, 4313, 4334
Grecian, 2812
Roumanian, and, qu. 564. *See also* under this head Roumanian

Loans—*Con.*
Maturing, 3478
Repayment in New York, $25,000,000 loan, qu. 2622
Roumanian, 478, 564, qu. 566, 1072, 1441, qu. 2030, qu. 2344, 3811, 4430
Tax exempt, qu. 575

Lobsters. *See* Fish

Lockeport-Froude Point
Steamship service, 1496
Railway extension, 3054, 4323

Locomotives. *See* Railways

Long, Mr. C. E. (North Battleford)
Hudson Bay Railway, 996
Live stock commission men, 1123

Longueuil Bridge, 300

Loretteville, post office, 4523

Lowther, Right Hon. J. W.
Speaker's Chair, presentation, 3689
Expression of thanks, 3697

Lumber
Pacific coast trade, 1725
Piling of near stations, 1177
Profits on, Grain Growers' Grain Company, 3180, 3633
Sales tax on, 3449, 3736, 3742-3, 3751-7
Ties, railway, for Egypt, 1725
Tobique reserve, cutting on, 4503

Lunenburg County
Fishery overseers, 2179
Fruit inspectors, 1041, 1047

Luxury Taxes. *See* Taxation

Lynch, Mr. Frank, 4541

Macallum, Professor, 1328, 1432, 2144, 2688, *See also* Research

Dacdonald, Mr. E. M., 3529

MacDonald, Hon. Senator, appointment of, qu. 577

MacKelvie, Mr. John A. (Yale)
Address in reply to Governor General's Speech, 7; (seconder) retirement of Hon. Mr. Burrell; acceptance by Hon. Mr. Tolmie portfolio of Agriculture; new Prime Minister; unrest; agitation and unemployment; re-establishment of returned men; old age pensions and unemployment insurance; the tariff; fruit-growing industry; amicable relations between two great races forming bulk of population, 10

Mackenzie and Mann, 1960, 3206, 3288. *See also* Canadian National Railways

Mackenzie District
Oil Development, 2162. *See also* Oil, Petroleum

Mackie, Mr. H. A. (East Edmonton)
Cattle embargo, qu. 714
Civil Service—(res. Sir Sam Hughes)—Political Patronage in; abuses of system; promotions; deputy postmaster at Edmonton; census commissioners, 827; transfer of patronage to officials; political partisanship, 828
Debates, official, distribution of, 2224
Natural resources, 878
Oil and Gas
Expenditure for discovery, qu. 695
Permits and leases, res. 894
Leases, issue of, 598
Rights, 2555
Point of order—member reading speech, 544
Tar Sand rights, qu. 671
General Lindsay, qu. 671

Mackie, Mr. H. J. (North Renfrew)
Pembroke wharf, 4539

Maclean, Hon. A. K. (Halifax)
Address in reply to Governor General's Speech, 318; Prime Minister, congratulations to; tenure of Parliament; early dissolution desirable; life of Government measured by war, 319; attitude of members towards dissolution; Military Service Act and coalition, 320; understanding of electorate in 1917; War Times Election Act; redistribution, 322
Canada Shipping Act Amdt. Bill (Public harbours) 1174, 2228-30, 2556
Canada Temperance Act
Pending litigation not to be affected (Amdt.) 4384
Rights of litigants, 4377
Canada-West Indies Trade Agreement, 2255-61
Canadian National Railways
Management, Information—M. (Mr. King) 1204
Proposed reference to Special Committee, M., 1573
Civil Service Act Amdt. Bill, 2823-75
Amdt. to M. for 2r., 2835, 4464-93
Commission—exclusion of certain positions, 4477
"In the public interest," 4477
Naval Service—preference, 4484

Maclean, Hon. A. K.—*Con.*
Civil Service Act Amdt. Bill—*Con.*
Returned Soldiers—preference, 4492
Civil Service Retirement Act Amdt. Bill, 2490-2502
Customs and Excise Dept. Bill
Consular agents, United States, 3792
Consular certificates, 4390
Invoice certificate, 3792, 4389
Fee—who pays? 4390
Proclamation of Act, 4391
Trade agents, 3792
Customs Tariff Act, 1907, Amdt. Bill
Imported goods—marking, 3954
Dominion Elections Act Amdt. Bill (Prohibition plebiscite) 307
Dominion Elections Act Amdt. Bill, 4240-5
Naturalization—certificate of qualification, 4240
Dominion Lands Act Amdt. Bill, 4067
Fuel supply problem, 1264
Grain inquiry—remuneration of Commissioners, 3972
League of Nations—Canada's contribution, 2362
Ministers to sit in either Chamber, 1154-9
National Research Council, 2896
Oleomargarine Act Amdt. Bill, 3895
Opium and Narcotic Drug Act Amdt. Bill, 2264-5, 2898-2908
Parliament buildings, 3995-7
Public harbours, 1174, 2228-30, 2556
Royal Canadian Mounted Police Act Amdt. Bill, 2482-6
Unanimous consent, 1173
War Times Election Act, 322, 4240

Maclean, Mr. W. F. (South York)
Canadian Nationals Definition Bill, 769
Dominion Elections Act Amdt. Bill, 3113
Great Lakes-St. Lawrence waterway, 747
Hudson Bay Railway, 985, 996
National railways and telegraphs—Government business, 4130
Railways and immigration, 4129
Returned soldiers in Civil Service, qu. 963
Toronto post office, appointments, qu. 734

MacLeod Judicial District, qu. 2344

MacLeod's Breakwater, 4087

MacNab's Island. *See* Halifax Quarantine station

MacNutt, Mr. Thomas (Saltcoats)
Address in reply to Governor General's Speech, 527; congratulations to Prime Minister; tariff; new Prime Minister but same old policy; position of parties uncertain; fusion; "moderate protection," 528; settlement of soldiers on the land, 529; high prices for seed and stock—low prices for products; suggestions for relief of returned men; housing; exchange, 530; amendments; no confidence in Government, 531
Budget, 3685. Budget a protectionist one; eminent men changing political opinions; Canadian navy, status of officers and men, 3686
Canadian navy, status of officers and men, qu. 3422, 3686
Census appointments, qu. 3260
Dominion Elections Act Amdt. Bill, 4234-5
Naturalization—certificate of qualification, 4234
Hudson Bay Railway—expenditure, qu. 2623
Immigration, 2584
Pre-emptions and purchases of homesteads, qu. 2506
Soldiers' Land Settlement Board, dismissal of Mr. Graham, 2618

MacPhail, Mr. E. S., 1232

McAdoo Award, 1588, 4325

McCallum, Miss Mary P., 3108

McCoig, Mr. A. B. (Kent, Ont.)
Address in reply to Governor General's Speech, 88; reply to Mr. Gauthier—almost identical argument by Mr. his attack on Hon. Mr. Lemieux; anxious to be taken into the Government; almost identical argument by Mr. Gauthier and Prime Minister; election, census, and redistribution, 89; Canadian National Railways; Mr. De Witt Foster, 90; Board of Commerce; profiteering; combines; Tobacco Buyers' Association; agricultural machinery, 91
Agricultural machinery, standardization of parts, 584, Res. 666
Apple exports to Great Britain, qu. 1501
Budget, 3506. Taxation of necessaries of life, 3506; rural mail contractors' remuneration, 3507; agricultural implements, 2508; military expenditure, 3508; Government war scandals, 3508; tractors, 3509
Civil Service, bonus, 2029, 2109, 2115
Experimental farms, 943
Flax industry, 1397
Highway construction in Ontario, 4293-5
Inspection of Gas and Gas Meters, 622
Interior Department—salaries, 1333

McCoig, Mr. A. B.—*Con.*
Militia
Annual drill, M. to reduce, 2296
Pensions, 2278

McCrea, Mr. F. N. (Sherbrooke)
Amherst drill hall, 2752
Grand Trunk loan, 4166
Income Tax Act Amdt. Bill, 4348
Lake of the Woods Regulation Bill, 4221
Military preparations, 2298
"Niobe" and "Rainbow," sale, 4013
Shipbuilding, 1944

McCurdy, Hon. F. B. (Minister of Public Works)
Bryson-Calumet Island bridge, 3986
Clark's Harbour, public building, 2817
Commons Chamber, temperature of, 1071
Courtenay Bay improvements, 4097
Dredging, 3982
Drydocks, 3987
Fort Cumberland and Fort Moncton, care of, 4540
Halifax quarantine station, 2754
Harbours and rivers, estimates, 3973-82
Montreal-South shore traffic bridge, 2217
Parliament Buildings, 3992-4001
Partridge Island Quarantine station, 2808-15
Pembroke wharf, 4536-8
Port Hood, wharf, 4104
Public Works
Amherst drill hall, 2739
Annapolis public building, 2741
Demobilization, 3989
Engineering Branch, 4080-90
Estimates, 2737-73, 3973
Expenditures, 4102
Nova Scotia, 4086
Return, inquiry for, 3008
St. John harbour, 4078
Telegraphs and Telephones
Isle aux Coudres, 4540
Loretteville-St. Gerard, 4540

McDermand, Mr. S. S. (East Elgin)
Apples, profit on, 1470
Encouragement of fruit-growing, 1469
European corn-borer, 1031
Inspection of Gas and Gas Meters Bill, 613

McDonald, Mr. Angus (Timiskaming)
Civil Service
Board of Hearing, qu. 2820
Bonus, qu. 3089
Meetings in Government buildings, qu. 3421
Prevailing rates, qu. 3089
Reorganization—Griffenhagen and Associates, qu. 2623

McDonald, Mr. Angus—*Con.*
Civil Service—*Con.*
Superannuation, qu. 2820
Whitley Councils, qu. 2820
Judge Snider's report, 3209
Returned Soldiers—civil servants, qu. 3531
Shipbuilding, 1884
Unemployment and immigration, 1377

McGibbon, Mr. Peter (Muskoka)
Address in reply to Governor General's Speech, 154; the amendment; Opposition has no policy and no case against Government; taxation, debt, railways, repatriation, pensions; unemployment insurance; old age pensions; the tariff; vacillation of Opposition on question of the tariff, 155; the Government's record; war taxation, repatriation, pensions, expenditure, production—election; mistakes—who has not made them? 156; Government justified by its record—redistribution and representation—congratulations to Prime Minister, 157
Agricultural shows, 1242
Automobile theft, 3914
Budget, 3510. Business conditions of country; revenue by taxation; direct and land taxation, 3511; protection and industries, 3512; iron and steel industry; plate glass; pineapples; wire nails and sugar industry, 3513; prosperity and wages, 3514; exemption of farmers, 3516
"Canadian Inventor," 1891
Cattle embargo, 727
Civil Service Act Amdt. Bill, 2829-67, 4478
Criminal Code Amdt. Bill—firearms, 3907-14
Customs and Excise Dept. Bill
Home brewing, 3788
Restrictive legislation, 3790
Dominion Elections Act Amdt. Bill (Prohibition plebiscite) 308
Dominion Elections Act Amdt. Bill, 4239-41
Revising officers, 3102
Farmers, protection for, 3748
Health Department
Report, 1852
Scientific branch, 3134
Highways, construction in Ontario, 4293
Hog cholera, compensation, 1060
Illustration stations and farms in Northern Ontario, 955
Inspection of Gas and Gas Meters Bill, 618
Military preparation, 2304
National Research Institute, 2895
Ontario timber limits, 3391

McGibbon, Mr. Peter—*Con.*
Opium and Narcotic Drug Act Amdt. Bill, 2264-7, 2901
Convictions under, 3134
Pensions Act Amdt. Bill, 4373
Pensions
Widowed mothers, 634
Record of member for Lunenburg, 1903
Returned Soldiers' Insurance Act Amdt. Bill, 4356
Shipbuilding, 1903, 1904
Trent canal, 2955-65

McGibbon, Mr. Peter R. (Argenteuil)
Questions, inquiry as to, 2943
Railway bridges, 1664

McGill University. *See* Research

McGilvray, Dr. C. D., 1055

McIntosh, Mr. J. C. (Nanaimo)
Fisheries—Mr. Justice Ebert's report, qu. 4254

McIsaac, Mr. James (King's, P.E.I.)
Address in reply to Governor General's Speech, moved, 5; congratulations to Prime Minister; tribute to Sir Robert Borden; after-war problems and conditions; Canadian Government Merchant Marine, 6; Customs Tariff, 7
Budget, 3397; congratulations to Minister of Finance; Canada's trade; financial position of country, 3398; revenue, raising of, 3399; sales tax; tariff revision, attitude of Opposition on tariff, 3400; Fielding, Mr., former speech on tariff, 3401; Amdt. of Mr. Fielding, 3403
Georgetown wharf, 4564
Harbours and rivers, 3990
Highways, expenditure, 4306
Prince Edward Island Railway, 4564

McKean, Mr. Melville, 4083

McKenzie, Mr. D. D. (Cape Breton North and Victoria)
Address in reply to Governor General's Speech, 40; mover and seconder; congratulations to Prime Minister; tribute to leader of Opposition, 40; disappointed in speech of Prime Minister; should place himself in the "hands of the country"; election before redistribution; position of West, 41; quotations from Calgary Albertan and Montreal Gazette; newspaper comment on by-election results, 43; amendment necessary to expression of views; the tariff; wait until report of Tariff Committee of Cabinet produced, 44; a government of the "big interests"; restoration of confidence in parliamentary institutions impossible while Government remains in power, 45; position and policy of Liberal party, 46
Agricultural publications, 1075
Alcohol, tax on, 3957
Alderson, Mr. George B., claim for compensation, 2273
Amherst drill shed, 2739
Australia-New Zealand service, 1494
Bankruptcy Act Amdt. Bill, 2925-9
Budget, 3280. Minister of Militia and military expenditure, revenues and expenditures, 3283; speeches on Government side of House, 3284; luxury taxes, 3285; unfairness of taxation, 3286; foreign loans; Canadian Northern system borrowings, 3287, 3288; Grand Trunk borrowings, 3291; trade outlets; railway business, handling of; shipbuilding, 3292; combines, Nova Scotia coal, 3295; lack of railway facilities in Cape Breton
Burnham, Dr., treatment of by Serbian Government, 1526
Canada Temperance Act, costs, 4381-88
Canadian Government Merchant Marine, shipbuilding, 1280
Canadian Nationals Definition Bill, 778
Ruling of Chairman, 779
Canadian National Railways
Management — Information M. (Mr. King) 1210
Operating expenses and receipts, 4316
Special Committee
M. (Mr. A. K. Maclean) 1600
Canadian Representation in the United States, 2416
Cattle embargo, 763
Civil Service Act Amdt. Bill, 2781, 2844, 4287
Civil Service bonus, 4120, 2236
Civil Service (Res. Sir Sam Hughes) Political patronage; election officers in North Cape Breton and Victoria; census officials, 832; service overmanned and underpaid, 11,000 dismissed, 25,000 appointed; classification and reorganization, 833; Printing Bureau; Civil Service Commission, 834; patronage and the party system; appointments, 835
Civil Service Retirement Act Amdt. Bill, 4274
Coal supply in Maritime Provinces, 1281

McKenzie, Mr. D. D.—*Con.*
Comparative return on Dominion guaranteed and Nova Scotia bonds, 4165
Criminal Code Amdt. Bill, 3912-38
Currency Act Amdt. Bill, 2269
Customs and Excise Dept. Bill
Invoice certificate, 3806
Fee—who pays? 3807
Preventive service in Victoria county, 4388
Customs and Inland Revenue—payments for overtime, 4123
Customs officers, 3086
Customs Tariff, 1907, Amdt. Bill—imported goods, marking, 3947-55
Dairy products grading, 3760
Delinquent children, 3012
De Martigny divorce, 3766
Destructive insects, 1027, 1032, 1075
Dominion Elections Act Amdt. Bill (Prohibition plebiscite) 311
Dominion Elections Act Amdt. Bill 3091, 4243-6
Election officers, disqualification, 4246
Naturalization—certificate of qualification, 4243
Nomination day, 3096
Recount, 3097
Revising officers, 3102
Dominion Lands Act Amdt. Bill, 4066
Flax industry, 1402
Flour, high price of, 1448
Fruit inspectors, location in one county, 1046
Fuel supply problem, 1260
Gas and Gas Meters, Inspection of, Bill, 609, 2944
Grand Trunk Arbitration Bill, 2458-80, 2446
Position, 3321, 4436
Grand Trunk Railway
Coal mines in the United States, 4316
Default of interest, 1498
Loan, 3291, 4152-69, 4315
Portland terminus, 4316
Great Lakes-St. Lawrence waterway, 695, 738
Immigration, 2584-96
Income Tax Act Amdt. Bill, 4343-55
Ingonish-Macleod's breakwater, 4087
Insect pests, 1027, 1032, 1075
Judges Exchequer Court, 1083
Lake of the Woods Control Board Bill, 2350-5
Lake of the Woods Regulation Bill, 4224-6
Lignite, 4500
Migratory Birds Convention Act Amdt. Bill, 2891

McKenzie, Mr. D. D.—*Con.*
Military Service Act, claim for services, 2807
Montreal Harbour Commission, 2269
National Research Institute, 2703
Naval policy, 4034
Newfoundland railways, 1485
"Niobe" and "Rainbow," sale, 4032-6
North Sydney, removal of Public Works officials, 2817
Nova Scotia judges, 1572
Opium and Narcotic Drug Act Amdt. Bill, 2264-5, 2908
Partridge Island Quarantine Station, 2813-15
Pension Act Amdt. Bill, 4372
Pensions, widowed mothers, 639, 4372
Permanent Court of International Justice, 2720-33, 3014
Prisons and reformatories, 3011
Proclamation—enforcement of Acts of Parliament by, 3758
Public buildings—Nova Scotia, 2736-71
Public harbours, 2229-31
Public Works—Engineering branch, 4083
Purchasing Commission, 1102
Quebec riots, 1511
Reid Newfoundland Company, 1486
Relief of distressed seamen, 4039
Returned Soldiers Insurance Act Amdt. Bill, 4262
Ross Rifle, 2783-7
Royal Canadian Mounted Police Act Amdt. Bill, 2484
Russian currency, 1072
Senate and House of Commons Act Amdt. Bill (Ministers and directorships) 659
Sheridan, Mr. John, resignation and reinstatement, 4503-4
Shipbuilding, 1280
Statistics Act Amdt. Bill, 3758
Steamship routes, new, 1494
Welland canal, construction, 2994
West Indies steamship service, 1490
Wharves and breakwaters, Cape Breton, 4103
Wheat Board, loss under, 1461
Witness fees, 3937

McLean, Mr. H. H. (Royal)
Chief Justice, salary of, 1562
Income tax, Chief Justice, 1561

McLennan, Professor, 1428. *See also* Research

McLeod, Late Col Harry, tribute to, 3-4, 153

McMaster, Mr. A. R. (Brome)
Address in reply to Governor General's Speech, 65; congratulations to mover

McMaster, Mr. A. R.—*Con.*
Address—*Con.*
and seconder; criticism of speech of Mr. Nesbitt; unemployment insurance; the tariff, 65; Minister of Trade and Commerce and League of Nations; speech of the Prime Minister, 66; right of the Government to carry on—pledged to hold office only during war and demobilization; evidence of the agreement, 67; no difference between parties in desire to win war—conditions in 1904 and 1917 not comparable; Brown-Macdonald coalition; National Liberal and Conservative party, 70; Ministry not united on tariff question; position of the Minister without portfolio (Mr. Spinney) 71; election of Minister of Customs; a portfolio for Quebec; tariff attitude of Liberal party, 72; platform adopted at Liberal Convention of 1919, 73; parliamentary institutions on trial—the Prime Minister a usurper; Liberal Unionists elected for war only, 73; fate of Government in their hands, 74
Air Board, 3779-83
Ames, Sir Herbert, resignation, 1301
Automobile theft, 3913
Bankruptcy Act Amdt. Bill, 2934-9
Bounties on oil, 1387
Budget, 3164. Income tax; League of Nations, 3165; war expenditure; protection of industries, 3166; debt and revenue; exports and imports, 3167; exchange rate; tariff schedule, raising of, 3168; short-sighted uneconomic policy, 3169; sales tax; cocoa, duties on, 3170; public men and private interests; St. John city, representation of, 3172; foreign governments; Ministers soliciting business, 3173; Imaginary letters
Business of the House
Estimates on Thursdays and Fridays—Rule 17C, 960
Progress of, 1230
Canada Temperance Act Amdt. Bill
Costs, 4377
Pending litigation, 4377-86
Rights of litigants, 4377
Canada-West Indies Trade Agreement, 2251-9
Canadian Nationals Definition Act, 649, 767
Canadian National Railways
Board of Directors, 1667
Questions on order paper, 1763
Special Com., M., (Mr. A. K. Maclean) 1608

McMaster, Mr. A. R.—*Con.*
Canadian Northern Railway
Certificates, issue and sale of, qu. 605
Guaranteed bonds, sale of, qu. 604
Canadian representation in the United States, 2395
Cattle embargo, 765
Compensation for slaughtered animals, 1062
Criminal Code Amdt. Bill, 3900, 3913-17
Customs and Excise Dept. Bill
Purchasing power of European countries, 4430
Valuation of currency, 4430
Valuation for duty, 4412
Customs brokers, payment, 1090
Customs—foreign monetary standards, qu. 1133
Customs Tariff, 1907, Act Amdt. Bill—imported goods, marking of, 3944-54
Delinquent children, 3012
Documents placed on Hansard without being read, 1539
Dominion Elections Act Amdt. Bill, 4247-8
Election papers, 3098
New forms, 3101
Expenditures, curtailment of, 2978
Flax bounty, 1393
Fox breeding, 1428
French Trade Agreement, 2130-39
Fruit growing in Eastern Townships, 1043
Grand Trunk
Equipment trust certificates, qu. 604
Guaranteed bonds, qu. 604
Halifax Shipyards, Limited, 1698
Harbours and rivers, estimates, 3973-8
Health of Animals, diseased herds, 1048
Highway construction in Ontario, 4290-4302
Imaginary letters, 3173
Good taste, 3174
Immigration, 2572-82
Imperial Mineral Resources Bureau, 4499
Income tax, qu. 3260
Interim supply, 2012
Interior Department, reduction of estimates, 1334
Justice Department, purchasing agent, 1079
Lake of the Woods Control Board Bill, 2355
Lake of the Woods Regulation Bill, 4204-24
League of Nations, contribution, 2359-70
Lignite, 4499
Maisonneuve and Gaspé, representation, 2328
Maple Products Act, 1920, Amdt. Bill, 2559
Military preparation, 2295, 2303

McMaster, Mr. A. R.—*Con.*
Ministers of the Crown and directorships, 2228
Ministers to sit in either Chamber, 1169
Naval Service, 4022
"Niobe" and "Rainbow", sale, 4013-29
Parliament buildings, 3998
Penitentiaries
Saskatchewan, increase in, 1091
Point of order—irrelevancy, 1066
Post Office Act Amdt. Bill, 2120-22
Prisons and reformatories, 3012
Privy Council, limitation of appeals, 1089
Proportional representation, 1548
Purchasing Commission, 2016
Railway Board and Intercolonial, 1655
Reciprocity agreement with the United States, 2054
Research, 1427
Return, inquiry for, 3008
Returned Soldiers' Insurance Act Amdt. Bill, 4360
Senate and House of Commons Act Amdt. Bill (Ministers and directorships) 258, 585, 662
Statutory expenditures, 1423
Trent canal, 2953
University professors and scientific research, 1436

McNeil, Archbishop, and Housing, 1137

McPhail, Sir Andrew, 1353-55-60

McQuarrie, Mr. W. G. (New Westminster)
Farmers, protection for, 3748
Fisheries of British Columbia, 861
Housing, 1144
Natural resources, 861
Poultry industry in British Columbia, 3750
Unemployment and immigration, 1364

Machinery. *See* Agricultural machinery; implements

Madrid Postal Conference, 3001

Magdalen Islands
Steamship service, 557, 767

Magill, Dr., 1451, qu. 1624

Magrath, Mr. C. A., and Fuel Supply, 1256

Maharg, Mr. John A. (Maple Creek)
Address in reply to Governor General's Speech, 485; congratulations to Prime Minister—statement attributed to Prime Minister; allegation that farmers in alliance with Bolshevists; what farmers did in the national crisis, Wheat Board, 487—results of discontinuance, 488; platform of Canadian

Maharg, Mr. John A.—*Con.*
Address—*Con.*
Council of Agriculture, 489; fiscal policy of Great Britain—Government's record—elections; United Grain Growers, sale of agricultural implements; pamphlet attributed to Mr. Cowan, 491; Government supplies purchased in the United States, 492; Canadian manufacturers refuse to sell to farmers' co-operative organizations; Commission to inquire into grain trade, 493; British Columbia apples, 494; the amendment, 495
Agriculture Dept., salaries of officials, 1036
Budget, 3362. Reference to Prime Minister's speech; Mr. Norman P. Lambert and his article, 3363; cream separators and the free list, 3364; protection and Great Britain, binder twine industry, 3365; imports and revenue, adverse balance of trade, 3366; tariff reduction, 3368; home market, 3369; western grain shipments, 3370; freight rates, 3371; implement manufacturing, 3372; sales tax, 3373; railway situation; canal expenditure, 3374
Canadian Government Merchant Marine, West Indies trade, 1913
Canadian Wheat Board, 1449
Flour, cost of, 1450
Fruit inspection in the West, 1043
Government marketing of wheat, 1460
Grain
Chemistry expert, 1228
Commission, 1447, 1462
Overages, 1463
Transportation rates, 999
Great Lakes-St. Lawrence waterway, 749
Great Lakes, ships on, 1913
Ocean freights, 1936
Magill, Dr., and Agrarian group, 1451
Point of Order—political sagacity, 1066
Resignation of, 4340
Returned soldiers, employment on Welland canal, 3001
Saskatchewan
Co-operative Elevator Company, qu. 391
Militia organizations, 2794-6
Searls, Mr. George, grain inspection, 1445
Shipbuilding, 1920
Steamship subsidies, 1492
Terminal elevators, 1463
Wednesday evening adjournment, 1842
Welland canal, construction, 2999-3003

Mail Bags, repairing of. *See* Penitentiaries

Mail Contracts, 1823. *See also* Post Office; Rural Mail

Mail Contracts—*Con.*
Ste. Rose de Watford, qu. 3209
White Horse-Dawson contract, qu. 2686

Mail Subsidies, 1485. *See also* Steamship subsidies

Main Ducks, life-saving station, 1991

Maisonneuve and Gaspé, Representation of, 2247, 2310, 4437
M. (Mr. Edwards) 2314; agreed to, 2343
See also Privileges and Elections

Majority of Votes. *See* Proportional Representation

Management. *See* Canadian National Railways

Mange. *See* Health of Animals

Manion, Mr. R. J. (Fort William and Rainy River)
Address in reply to Governor General's Speech, 351; congratulations to Prime Minister; Liberal-Unionists not weak-kneed, servile or subservient, "Liberals" and "Conservatives", 352; the tariff, historical alignment of parties on, 353; the Farmers' party and free trade; position of Mr. McMaster: agricultural and industrial interests; the Government's mandate, 354; demand for election; no criticism of policies, principles or legislation; personal criticisms of Prime Minister and Quebec, 355; representation of French Canadians on Boards and Commissions, Supreme Court; friendship between Quebec and rest of Canada; Military Service Act; sane elements do not want election; the Government's record, 356; Canada's status, League of Nations; no charges against Government; the country prosperous, 357; social conditions; Canada's problems, 358
Alcohol and medicinal preparations, 3731
Budget, 3231. Speech of Mr. Clark (Red Deer) 3231; taxing of necessaries of life, 3232; attitude of Mr. Fielding on tariff; free trade policy in the United Kingdom, 3233; tariff policy for Canada a vital one, 3234; tariff and revenue, 3235; cheap countries; moderate tariff, 3236; carrying trade of Great Britain; adverse balance of trade; Great Britain's exports and imports, 3237; agriculture declining in the United Kingdom; United States manufactures and shipping, 3238; Great Britain suffering under free trade policy, reciprocity and the Fordney Bill, 3239
Canadian National Railways
Lake Superior Branch and Fort William, 3050
Canadian Representation in the United States, 2414-32
Civil Service Act Amdt. Bill
Religious holidays, 4491
Grand Trunk Arbitration Bill, 2474
Great Lakes-St. Lawrence waterway, 682
Macallum, Professor, 1435
Natural resources, Res, 841
Oleomargarine Act Amdt. Bill, 3879; Amdt. 3886
Opium and Narcotic Drug Act Amdt. Bill, 7, 2903

Manitoba
Grasshopper plague, 1027
Harbours and rivers, 3975
Highways, 4308
List of candidates and votes polled, 1539
Transfer of Natural Resources to. *See* Natural Resources

Manson's Landing, wharf, 3980

Manufacturers. *See* Address, Budget, Canadian Manufacturers Association, Customs and Excise, Labour, Trade Commissioners, Unemployment
Agricultural implements and United Grain Growers, 418, 491, 3372. *See also that title*

Maple Products Act Amdt. Bill
M. for leave to introduce: Speaker's ruling, 2150
Res. 2193, 2557; 1r., 2618; 2r., 2890, 3141, 3720

Maple Sugar, 887, 1047, 1474

Marcil, Hon. Charles (Bonaventure)
Baie des Chaleurs, steamship service, qu. 2506
Bonaventure-Gaspé mail service, qu. 577
Bonaventure wharves, 3992
Campbellton-Cross Point
Bridge, qu. 573, 3987
Ferry, qu. 573
Canadian Nationals, 777
Canadian National Railways
Gaspesian peninsula, train services, qu. 2623
Tourist traffic in Gaspesian peninsula, qu. 2622
Intercolonial—Campbellford train service, qu. 3903
St. Alexis, qu. 2375, qu. 3582

Marcil, Hon. Charles—*Con.*
Census commissioners and enumerators, qu. 696
Civil Service Act Amdt. Bill, 4284
Dredging, 3985
Gaspé Railway, qu. 962, qu. 2623
Inspection of Gas and Gas Meters, 608
Marcil, Mr. Joseph, pension, 3903
Marcil, Mr. Louis T., compensation for injuries, qu. 2942, qu. 3531
Metapedia valley highways, qu. 2505
Parliament buildings, 3993-8
Pensions, payment to Messrs. Louis T. and Joseph Marcil, qu. 2942
Quebec, Oriental and Atlantic and Quebec and Western Railways, qu. 573
Quebec salmon net licenses, qu. 1381, 2506

Marcil, Mr. Joseph, qu. 2942, 3903

Marcil, Mr. Louis T., qu. 2942, qu. 3531

Marcile, Mr. J. E. (Bagot)
Canadian National Railways
Ste. Rosalie-Bagot
Claims between, qu. 571
Disposition of unoccupied land, qu. 572
League of Nations, Canadian representatives, qu. 602

"Marie Lydia," schooner, 1985

Marine. *See also* Canada Shipping Act; Canadian Government Merchant Marine; Shipping. For vessels, *see that title*
Department
Estimates, 2190
Johnston, Mr. Alex., reappointment, 644
Marine insurance, 1703
Salaries, 1617
Shipbuilding, 1683. *See also* that title
Dredging
St. Lawrence Channel, 1991. *See also that title*
Hospitals, 3135. *See also* Health
Life-saving service, 1990
Lighthouses. *See* that title
Montreal Dry Docks and Ship Repairing, Limited, qu. 2191
Navigation
Aids to, 1996
Schools of, 1989
Ocean and river service, 1736, 1979
Pilotage, 1999
Shipbuilding. *See that title*
Signal service, 1997
Wrecking plants, 1990
Wrecks, investigation, 1988

Mariners, Sick, care of, 3129. *See also* Health

Maritime Provinces
Railway facilities, improvement of, 4516, 4561
Wooden ships, 1711

Marking of Goods. *See* Customs Tariff Act, 1907, Amdt. Bill

Marquis Wheat, 1033

Martin, Mr. Peter F. (Halifax)
Highways—Nova Scotia, 4304-7
Parliament buildings, 3993
Public Works—Engineers' Branch, 4090

Marwick, Mitchell and Company, Auditors, 1278, 1694, 1704, 1724, 1866, 1933. *See also* Canadian National Railways

Massey-Harris Company, 3393, 3496. *See also* Agricultural Implements

Massey, Hon. Mr., Prime Minister of New Zealand, interview with, 3008

Masters and Mates, Examination, 1736

Matane
Illustration station, 947
Wharves, 3992

Meat and Canned Foods Act
Administration of, 1048

Medicated Wines, 3709

Medicinal Preparations, 3709

Medicine Hat. *See also* House of Commons
By-election, 2151
Vacancy, 1174, 1293

Meighen, Right Hon. Arthur (Prime Minister)
Address in reply to Governor General's Speech, 28; mover and seconder of Address; personal and public relations with leader of Opposition; position of the Government; proposed amendment to the Address; right of the Government to retain office, 30; successor to and continuation of preceding government; issue in 1917; Government's duty in regard to war problems not yet done; the Government's right to retain office after principle upon which it was elected has been decided; appeal to people after Armistice, 32; no departure from policy justifying an appeal, 33; by-elections; reasons for the amdt., 35; leader of the Opposition seeking alliance with Farmers' party, 36; where Government stands on tariff; leader of Opposition evades issue, 37; no departure from historic policy proposed; challenge to dissolve Parliament; representation of the West, 38; duty of the Government to carry on; Opposition invited to make

Meighen, Right Hon. Arthur—*Con.*
Address—*Con.*
clear and specific statement on issue to be decided, 39
Agricultural machinery, standardization of parts, 584
Alderson, Mr. George B., claim for compensation, 2274
Amalgamation of departments, 1331
Amendment to Address, 348
Amendments, want of confidence, 1199
Ames, Sir Herbert, resignation of, 478, 1071, 1298, 1300, 1311
Archives, provision for, 2952
Arctic, expedition, 4106, 4113
Ascension Day adjournment, 2688, 2941
Audibility of debates, 1625
Auditor General's report, delay, 903
Bermuda, trade with, 1271
Board of Trade reports, forms in French, 2819, 3320, 3375
Bolsheviki and wreckers, 3451
Budget, 3322. Congratulations to Minister of Finance; revenue and expenditures; Mr. Fielding's amendment, 3323; Farmers' party servile tools and minions of Opposition, 3324; tinplate industry, 3325; Liberal party and free list, 3328; binder twine; Mr. Clark and free trade, 3330; Mr. Fielding's amendment and tariff reduction; protectionist speeches of Mr. Fielding, 3332; Liberal press and protection, 3336; Government's attitude on tariff matters, 3338; Prime Minister's speech at Sherbrooke, 3339; moderate protection the policy for Canada, 3341; United States tariff revision, 3342
Building Trades Conference, 1498, 1556
Burnham, Dr., treatment of by Serbian Government, 576, 1523
Business of the House, 1340. *See also* under this title, Estimates, Interim Supply
Adjournments, 1841
Ascension day, 2688, 2941
Eleven o'clock, 1841
Victoria Day, 3531, 3698, 3738
Agriculture and Justice estimates, procedure, 1074
Announcement, 1073
Closure, notice, of, 1979
Complaint of undue haste, 4450
Delay, 1618
Distinction between Ministerial statement and Amdt. in Supply, 1308
Estimates, lateness of hour, 1330
Estimates on Thursdays and Fridays—Rule 17C, 1074, 1215, 1682, 2103-6, 2887, 4544

Meighen, Right Hon. Arthur—*Con.*
Business of the House—*Con.*
Legislation pending, 2150, 2819, 3972
Monday—Government business, 2148
Non-debatable motions, 1320
Order of, 1618
Procedure, 1345
Prorogation, 4068, 4340, 4451
Public Bills and Orders, 2819
Second reading by consent, 2890
Questions
Inquiry as to, 2943
Subject matter of, 1071
Sittings
Long, 897
Morning, prorogation, 4340, 4451
Morning and Saturday, 4451
Saturday, 2818, 2777, 2941
Two o'clock, 3737
Wednesday, 1384
Evening, 1002, 1841
Supply, to-morrow, 1270
By-elections
Dates, 903
Medicine Hat, 2151
York-Sunbury, 2151. *See also* this title,
Canada Temperance Act Bill
Costs, 4386
Damages, 4387
Effect of proposed amendments on plebiscite, 4386
"Having in view the provisions of this Act", 4386
Pending litigation, 4386
Canada-West Indies Trade Agreement, 563
Canadian Government Merchant Marine, 1290
Insurance of officers and seamen, 4359
Special Com. proposed, 1440
Statement referred to, 1708
Canadian National Railways
Amqui station, 1177, 1233
Correspondence
Directors, with, 1004
St. Foy round house, 1502
Lord Shaughnessy's letter, 2503, 2890
Management, Information, M. (Mr. King) 1180
Private ownership, and, 1498
St. Foy round house, 767, 1502
Special Committee, reference to
Amdt. (Mr. A. K. Maclean) 1589
Notice of, 1618
Reference to, M. (Mr. Meighen) 1755, 1817, 1803
Amdt. (Mr. Crerar) 1812
Special Committee appointed, 1845
Sully, Que., 1134

Meighen, Right Hon. Arthur—*Con.*
Canadian National Railways—*Con.*
Transcontinental, Winnipeg-Quebec service, 2514
Canadian Representation in the United States, 2378-2431
Cattle embargo, 725, 730, 761, 4543
Commission, inquiry, 1072
Chicago Drainage Canal, diversion, 2226
Chief Justice, salary of, 1567
Chippewa Power Canal, 2444
Civil Service Act Amdt. Bill, 2776, 2778, 3901, 4485-7
Religious holidays, 4485-7
Returned Soldiers—preference—provisions recommended by Pensions Com., 4257, 4577
Civil Service
Bonus, 901, 1176; statement, 1233; 2029, 2113-15, 3531
Number of civil servants, names, classification, 4255
Religious holidays, 1384, 2776, 4485-7
Superannuation, 2820
Allowances, 2112
Churchill, Rt. Hon. Winston, reported statement, 2567
Conservation Act Repeal Bill, 3958-70
Cost of living, 4551
Crerar, Mr., and attitude on shipbuilding, 1978
Customs, Minister of, private business relations, 3081
Dairy Produce Grading Bill, 3760
Daylight saving in Ottawa, 2776, 2800
Debate
Motion to adjourn by member, closing discussion, 999
Debates, translation of French speeches, 701
Deceased members, tributes to, 3, 152
Destruction of documents, 1625, 2943, 2953, 4558. *See also* under this head Judge Snider's report
District Engineer's office at Edmonton, 4543
Dominion Elections Act Amdt. Bill (Prohibition plebiscite) 150, 152
Motion to vary order of House, 152, 242
Dominion Elections Act Amdt. Bill, 2944
Dominion Parks, 1343
Editorial Committee, 4558
Empire Cabinet, proposed, 1385
Estimates. *See also* under this title Business of the House
Opportunity for studying, 1290
Scrutiny of by Special Com., 1503
Supplementary, inquiry, 4070
Extradition Treaty with United States, 2687

Meighen, Right Hon. Arthur—*Con.*
Fertilizer Act Amdt. Bill, 2231-4
Foreign trade, 3224
French Trade agreement, 767, 1271, 1351, 1559
Fuel Supply problem, 1268
Special Com. appointed, 1439
Evidence in French, 4251
Gaspé peninsula railway facilities, 2509
German reparation—Canada's claim, 643
Governor General
Address to on retirement, 4433-5
Lord Byng, reported appointment, 4436
Appointment, 4541
Grain inquiry, 1674
Grand Trunk Arbitration, 1498
Correspondence, 1619
Further, tabled, 3738
Progress of, 3321
Revival of, 4436
Grank Trunk Arbitration Bill, 2247, 2346, 2397, 2447-80, 2560-4; Senate amdts. 2777, 2822
Grand Trunk Railway
Assistance, 1498
Default of interest, 1498
Directors, 3741
Interest, alleged default of, 1556
Shareholders—return, 3697, 3740
Highway construction in Ontario, 4300
Homesteads, 1347
Housing, expenditure
Loan, 4552
Point of order, 1135
Hudson Bay Railway, M. involving expenditure, 982
Immigration, Restriction of, 1127
Income Tax Act Amdt. Bill, 2819, 4352
Regulations, 1272
Returns, 2568
Insurance Act Amdt. Bill, withdrawn, 4453
Interim supply, 1682. *See also* under this title Estimates; Supply
Necessity for, 2004
Point of order, 2009, 2010
Procedure under, 1676
Interim Supply Bill, 2101-2116
Interior Department
Editors, 1331
Employees, dismissals, 1345
Surveyor General and International Boundary Commissioners, 1343
International Joint Commission. *See also under this title*, Lake of the Woods
Lake of the Woods Control, and, 1072, 1176, 1233, 4172
Judge Snider's report, 1625, 2943, 2951, 2445, 3209, 3697, 3905, 4436-53. *See also* under this head Destruction of documents

Meighen, Right Hon. Arthur—*Con.*
Judges Act Amdt. Bill, 2117
Labour Department
Alleged combines, 4551
Bolshevism, pamphlet, 4548
Fair wages, 4545
Industrial Disputes Investigation Act, 4549-52
Minister, 4545
Letter of in Gazette, 1642
Lake of the Woods Control, 1233. *See also under this title* International Joint Commission
Board, 789
Inquiry, 1176
Lake of the Woods Control Board Bill, 2033-36, 2348-55
Lake of the Woods Regulation Bill, 3903, 4171-4226
Correspondence, 4170
League of Nations
Canada's contribution, 2356
Labour, 4547
Maisonneuve and Gaspé, representation, 2321-9, 4437
Massey, Hon. Mr., 3008
Ministers to sit in either Chamber, 1157
Ministers of the Crown and directorships, 2228
Musk-ox and reindeer, 4543
National Catholic Labour Unions, 1638
National Industrial Conference, 4549
National Research Institute, 4555.
Natural resources, adjournment of debate, 894
Transfer to western provinces, 1337, 2541-50
Natural Resources Branch, 1343
Naval Service, Capt. Adams' alleged statement, 901
Newsprint, alleged combine, 2099
Northwest Territories Act Amdt. Bill, 3903, 4113
Oil
Leases, 1340, 2377
Surface rights, 583, 666
Oil and Gas permits and leases, 898
Oleomargarine Act Amdt. Bill, 3759, 3889
Ottawa Improvement Commission Act Amdt., 2941
Owens, late Thomas P., Editor of Debates, 258
Park St. Charles Company, proposed payment to, 4574
Parliament buildings
Book on, inquiry, 1175
Inscription on tower, 4543
Pension Act Amdt. Bill, 4262, 4361-5

Meighen, Right Hon. Arthur—*Con.*
Pensions. *See also* under this title Soldiers; Returned Soldiers
Deductions for insurance, 629
Widowed mothers, 632
Polish battalion for service in French army, 4054
Prime Ministers' Conference, 564, 1073, 2504, 2634-42, 3320
Naval defence—contribution of dominions to, 4256
Reported statement of Mr. Churchill, 2567
Printing Bureau. *See* under this title, Destruction of Documents
Privilege
Veniot, Hon. Mr., alleged offer to, 3688. *See also* under this head York-Sunbury
Privileges and Elections Committee, 2373
Proportional Representation, Special Com. appointed, 1554-5
Quarantine, typhus, 4170
Quebec Steamship Company, 2941
Railway Commission, alleged statements of Chief Commissioner, 2030
Reparations—difficulties between Allied Powers and Germany, 599
Representation in Parliament, vacancies, 1300
Research. *See* under this title, National Research Institute
Returned Soldiers' Insurance Act Amdt. Bill, 4260, 4356-60
Returned Soldiers. *See also* under this title, Soldiers
Housing, 4362
Relief for, 2688
Review of question, 4361
Special Committee, 732
Unemployment, 4361-4
Returns, inquiries for, 3321
Loans to Greece and Roumania, 3009
Motions for in general terms, 1555
Sheridan, Mr. John, resignation and reinstatement, 1499, 1555
Riding Mountain Park, 1343
Roumania, loan to, 1441
Senate and House of Commons Act Amdt. Bill (Ministers and directorships) 657, 2228
Senate representation in Saskatchewan, 2567
Shipbuilding, 1290, 1976
M. that further consideration be postponed, 1979
Soldiers' insurance, pensions and reestablishment, 4054
Speaker's Chair, 3692

Meighen, Right Hon. Arthur—*Con.*
Statistics Act Amdt. Bill, 3758
Supply. *See* under this head Business of the House; Estimates; Interim Supply
Tariff Commission report, inquiry, 1127
Tariff Revision, 2346. *See also* under this head Budget
Unemployment relief, 4549
Vacancies, 478, 1304. *See also* under this head By-elections
Victoria Day adjournment, 3531, 3698, 3738
Water powers, director of, 1345
West Indies Trade—Bermuda, 1271
Western provinces, natural resources, 1338-7
White, Sir Thomas, 477
York-Sunbury election, 2151
Government platform, 3481
Hon. Mr. Veniot, alleged offer to, 3638, 3716, 3688
Correspondence, 3716
Reference to by Mr. Stevens, 3627-8

Meighen, Mr. William, Warden of Dorchester penitentiary, 1092

Members. *See* House of Commons

Mencius, political economy of, 3228

Mental Defectives, Immigration of. *See* Immigration

Mental Hygiene, 3143

Merchandise, Branding of. *See* Customs

Merchant Marine. *See* Canadian Government Merchant Marine

Merchant Shipping. *See* Railway Act Amendment

Merchant Ships. *See* Canadian Government Merchant Marine

Meredith-Duff Commission, 1788

Metal Tokens. *See* Criminal Code Amdts.

Metropolitan. *See* North American

Mewburn, Hon. S. C. (East Hamilton)
Battlefields Memorials Commission, competitive designs, 2566
Canadian National Railways and Shipping, Special Com., first report, 2095
Criminal Code Amdt. Bill (Warrant of Commitment) 2686
Fortifications of Quebec, 969
Militia
Cadet services, 2297
Command pay, 2291
Record office, 2281
Patent Act Amdt. Bill, 4457
Pensions
Widowed mothers, 635
Withdrawal from Government, 451

Mexico, compensation, 1507

Michaud, Mr. Pius (Restigouche and Madawaska)
Address in reply to Governor General's Speech, 436; Assembly of the League of Nations; Canada's war sacrifice; nations that profited should help the sufferers; immigration and repatriation; the tariff; early appeal to electors, 437
Canadian National Railways—cedar posts, qu. 1130
Cattle embargo, 566, 4543
Crosspoint-Campbellton bridge, 3987
De Martigny divorce, 3762
Dorchester penitentiary—farm, 1097
Dredging, Restigouche river, 3984
Edmundston post office, qu. 3422
Exchange, value of pound and dollar, qu. 3770
Fertilizer Act Amdt. Bill, 2233
Fisheries—Dominion and provincial jurisdiction, 2105
Grain elevators, 1443
Grand Trunk, Portland terminus, 1384
Madawaska, public building required, 2809
Parliament buildings, 3994
Pension Act Amdt. Bill, 4368
Potato seed inspectors, 1033
St. John and Quebec Railway, qu. 1501
St. John and Quebec Railway Bill, 2031
Sheridan, Mr. John, resignation and reinstatement, 4502
Shipbuilding, 1944
Tariff Commission, report, 1127
Transcontinental Railway
Claims against, 1656
Wilson, Judge, qu. 1622

Middlebro, Mr. W. S. (North Grey)
Ames, Sir Herbert, resignation, 1296
Bankruptcy Act Amdt. Bill, 2934
Civil Service (Res. Sir Sam Hughes) Political patronage, 831
Grand Trunk Arbitration Bill, 2467-71
Pairs—Correction of list, 563
Privileges and Elections Committee, 2373

Migratory Birds Convention Act Amdt. Bill
1r., 2442; 2r., 2891; 3r., 2892
Enforcement, 4496

Militarism, 2294-2305, 2789-93. *See also* Military Expenditures

Military Authority. *See* Quebec riots

Military Districts, 2788-92
No. 12, 2279

Military Expenditures, 266, 509, 2294, 2305, 2792, 3269
Comparison by years and countries, 3270
Defence figures of various countries, 3275

Military Preparation, 2294, 2305

Military Service Act, 320, 356, 2807, 3200, 3678. *See also* Quebec Riots
Employment of Mr. Stewart, qu. 2028
Exemption of farmers, 3516, 3592

Military Stores Shed, Cartier Square, qu. 3208

Militia and Defence
Annual drill, 2294, 3405
M. (Mr. McCoig) to reduce amount, 2296
Armouries for public meetings, 901
Associations, grants to, 2439
Cadet services, 2296
Command pay, 2290
M. (Mr. Power) to reduce amount, 2292
Department
Anderson, Mr. A. H., qu. 735
Ashley, Sergt. T., qu. 3090
Black, Mr. A. H., qu. 755
Brackenbury, Mr. G. B., qu. 735
Central registry, 2281
Chief Engineer and Controller of Military lands, 2241
Douglas, Mr. H. S., dismissal of, qu. 735, 2246, 2277
Employees
Female, 2286
Increase in number, 2014
Quebec, in, dismissal, 2237
Retirement of, 4267-70
Engineer services, 2439
Permanent force, strength, 2278, 2797, 2800
Photographers, 2245
Record office, 2241, 2278-80
Salaries, 2234, 2275
Separation Allowance and Assigned Pay Branch, 2281
Supplies, 2239, 3244-5
Sale of to Roumania and Greece, 2245, 3564
Transfer to other departments, 1098
Survey Division, 2243, 2284
Topographic Surveys, 2806
Estimates
M. (Mr. Pedlow) to reduce amount, 2287-8
Highland regiments, 2307
Lee-Enfield rifle, 2783
Military and civilian caretakers, qu. 4340
Military district No. 12, 2279, 2792-97
Ordnance Arms and Lands, 2441, 2781
Permanent Force, 2278, 2797, 3279, 3405
Pensions, 2278, 2236
Strength, 2235
Purchasing Commission and Supplies, 2239
Ross rifle, 2783

Militia and Defence—*Con.*
Royal Military College, 2802
Staff
Pay, 2787
Reduction, 2234-46, 2282
Warlike stores, 2807

Milk, Prices of, 3197

Milk River, water rights, qu. 2099

Milk-Testing, 1037

Mill Feed, 1126. *See also* Feeds, Live Stock

Milling Industry, 3543, 3544

Mines and Minerals, 2141, 2162, 3250. *See also* Coal; Geological Survey; Natural Resources; Lignite Research
Alberta penitentiary mining rights, 1092
Conservation Commission, 3965
Development of, 841
Federal mining legislation, 871
Imperial Mineral Resources Bureau, 4498
Machinery, duties on, 373
Returned soldiers, prospecting, 871
Zinc deposits of Gaspé, 876

Minister of Customs and Excise, 3785

Ministers and Directorships, 258, 585, 650 2228. *See also* Senate and House of Commons Act Amdt. Bill

Ministers
Cabinet, and Post Office Department, qu. 1349. *See also* Blondin, Hon. P. E.; Minister of Labour; Postmaster General
Personal business, 3079, 3173-6, 3612
Proposed right to sit in either Chamber
M. (Mr. Lemieux) 1152; withdrawn, 1173
Upper Chamber in, 1154

Minority Representatives. *See* Proportional Representation

Missals. *See* Special War Revenue Act Amdt. Bill

Missisquoi Bay, net fishing. qu. 570

Missisquoi County
Census commissioners, qu. 1132. *See also* Census
Income tax forms in, 1176

Mitchell, Mr. A. J., 1609-10. *See also* Canadian National Railways
Business interests of, 3610

Model Villages. *See* Housing

Molloy, Mr. J. P. (Provencher)
Address in reply to Governor General's Speech, 495; congratulations to Prime Minister; demand for an election; the sub-amendment; redistribution and representation, 496; the amendment; soldiers, farmers, and business men; women against the Government; changed conditions, 497; danger in Government delaying; the Minister of Militia; Liberal and Agrarian platforms; the recall, 498; the acid test; Government must satisfy the manufacturers; tyranny and terrorism in 1917; people calling for an election, 499
Blood Indian reserve, qu. 1817, 1818
Live stock and grazing leases, qu. 1819, 2098, 2374, 2618
Fort Garry hotel, Winnipeg, qu. 1348
Grain Inquiry, Counsel, Secretary, cost, qu. 2625
Health of Animals
Glandered horses, 1054
Hog cholera, 1053
Inspectors, 1054
Lake of the Woods Regulation Bill, 4199
Manitoba harbours and rivers, 3975
Western farmers, 1035

Molasses
For destructive insects, 1027
For hog feed, 3787

Monastery station, 4324

Moncton
Canadian National shops, 1851
Census enumerators, 3972
Engine terminal site, 1017
Examining warehouse, 2815

Mondou, Mr. A., and Yamaska by-election, 3251

Monetary Standards, qu. 1133. *See also* Finance

Monsarrat, Mr. C. N., and Quebec bridge, 1653, 1670-71

"Montcalm," icebreaker, 1985

Montenegro Hospital Mission. *See* Burnham, Dr.

Montizambert, Dr., 3133

Mont Joli, 1800

Montmorency County, Tourist traffic, 4332

Montreal
Bank of, and Government ownership, 1895
Customs revenue, 3086
Grain handling at, 3371. *See also* Grain and Grain Trade

Montreal—*Con.*
Inquiry into public services, qu. 604
Post Office, Mutual Benefit Society, qu. 567
Registration of Government ships at, 1720
Revenue offices, qu. 1820
Transcontinental railway, qu. 574. *See also* Canadian National Railways

Montreal and South Shore Bridge, M. (Mr. Archambault) 2211

Montreal Dry Docks and Ship Repairing, Limited, qu. 2191

Montreal Gazette
Canadian Government Merchant Marine, comment on, 1707
National Catholic Labour Unions, 1627. *See also* Labour
Shipbuilding, criticism, 1893, 1900, 1917

Montreal Harbour Commission
Cold storage plants, 1041

Montreal Harbour Commission Bill
Res. 2151; 1r., 2160; 2r., com., 2268; 3r., 2269

Montreal Locomotive Company, 1203

Montreal Progressive Club and Mr. L. J. Gauthier, M.P., qu. 1131

Montreal-Quebec Pilots, superannuation, qu. 1501. *See also* Pilotage

Moore, Mr. Tom, and Labour, 1627, 1632, 1636

Morley, Alberta, air station, 3780

Morphine Imports, 3130. *See also* Opium and Narcotic Drugs Act Amdt. Bill

Morphy, Mr. H. B. (North Perth)
Air Board, 3780
Bankruptcy Act Amdt. Bill, 2931-3
Budget, 3454. Congratulations to Minister; free trade and protection; United Kingdom and Customs duties, 3455; United States protective tariff; beet sugar industry, 3456; Great Britain and world trade, 3457; protection of industries, 3459; trade with the United States, 3460; trade agents; Canadian Merchant Marine, attack on, 3462
Canada-West Indies Trade Agreement, 2261-2
Canadian Nationals Definition Bill, 768
Canadian National Railways, Toronto train connections, 4569
Canadian representation in the United States, 2404-30
Civil Service Act Amdt. Bill, 2827-79

Morphy, Mr. H .B.—*Con.*
Civil Service Retirement Act Amdt. Bill, 4119
Copyright Amendment and Consolidation Bill, 3841
Criminal Code Amdt. Bill, 3923-31
Customs and Excise Dept. Bill
Invoice certificate, fee, 4393
Molasses wash for hog feed, 3787
Trade agents, 3788-95
United States consular service, 3796
Customs Tariff Act, 1907, Amdt. Bill
Imported goods, marking of, 3952
Customs officer at Listowel, 3084
Debates, Official, distribution of, 2223
Entomology Bureau, 1025
Fuel Supply Problem, 1265
Geological survey, 2144-7
Grand Trunk Arbitration Bill, 2457
Great War Veterans, qu. 455
Highways
Construction in Ontario, 4304
London-Stratford-Sarnia, 4307
Hog cholera—Alderson claim, 1063
Illustration farms and stations in Ontario, 952
Inspection of Gas and Gas Meters Bill, 615
Linen yarn, bounty on, 1389
Maisonneuve and Gaspé, representation, 2331
Militia—photographers, 2245
Military districts, 2788-9
Polish battalion for service in French Army, 4056
Rulings and statements as Chairman
Estimates, vote to be dealt with as a whole, 2750
Senate and House of Commons Act Amdt. Bill (Ministers and directorships) 654
Stratford customs office, 3085
Trade agents and commissioners, 1475-77, 3460, 3788-95
Tuberculosis and pleuro-pneumonia in cattle, 1051
Wednesday evening adjournment, 1835
Wheat market, 1452

Morrison, Mr. J. J., rural depopulation, 403

Mortgages. *See* Housing

Motor Cars, Theft of. *See* Criminal Code Amendment Bill

Mounted Police. *See* Royal Canadian Mounted Police

Moving Pictures. *See* Trade and Commerce

Mowat, Mr. H. M. (Parkdale)
Address in reply to Governor General's Speech, 171; Liberal-Unionists; conditions of 1864 and 1917; George Brown; no difference in principle between parties, 172; municipal and common rights v. rights of corporations; temperance legislation; woman suffrage; Liberal measures sponsored by Government; nationalization of railways; the game of politics, 173; amendment; election; leader of the Opposition wants power; ambitions that came to naught, 174; no reason for want of confidence vote; the tariff; policy of Sir Wilfrid Laurier; tariff resolution of Liberal Convention of 1919, 175; "substantial reductions", 176; National Liberal and Conservative party; Canada's status as a nation, 177
Armistice Day and Thanksgiving, 2555
Armistice Day Bill, 2618
Bankruptcy Act Amdt. Bill, 2926
Canada Temperance Act
Costs, 4378
Rights of litigants, 4378
Commercial agents in the United States, 1473
Copyright Amdt. and Consolidation Bill, 3834-48
Criminal Code Amdt. Bill, 3931-36
Probation of Offenders, 2097, 3931
Dogs, docking of, 3936
Dominion Elections Act Amdt. (Prohibition plebiscite) 311
Fortifications at Kingston, 969
Grand Trunk Arbitration Bill, 2465
Great Lakes-St. Lawrence waterway, 687
Housing, 1148
Judges Act Amdt. Bill, 3010
Lake of the Woods Control Board Bill, 2350-2
Lake of the Woods Regulation Bill, 4225
Ministers to sit in either Chamber, 1167
North American Trust Company, 1127-8, 1130
Oleomargarine Act Amdt. Bill, 3865
Parliament buildings, 4000
Private Bills, extension of time, 1625
Probation of offenders, 2097, 3931
Railway Commission—alleged statement of Chief Commissioner, 2029
Senate and House of Commons Act Amdt. Bill (Ministers and directorships) 595

Mulgrave
Ice tenders, qu. 963

Mulgrave-Canso Steamship services, 1496

Municipal Cold Storage Plants, 1040

Murdock, Mr. James, 3603-4. *See also* Board of Commerce

"Muriel W.", steamer, 1990

Murphy, Hon. Charles (Russell)
Ambassador at Washington, qu. 671
Budget, date of, qu. 903
Budget, 3635; comment on speech of Mr. Stevens, 3636; Liberal Convention and Liberal platform, 3637; Mr. Crerar and York-Sunbury election, 3637; Budget born of necessities of Government, 3639; burden of taxation, 3640; Tariff Commission, 3640; speeches of Hon. Mr. Guthrie and Hon. Mr. Ballantyne, 3641; Hon. Mr. Calder and the Tariff, 3644; Canadian Manufacturers Association—Mr. G. M. Murray, 3645; newspapers—manufacturers, editorial control of, 3646
Building Trades Conference, 1498
Business of the House
Saturday sittings, 2941
Canadian Nationals Definition Act, 771, 2032
Canadian National Railways
Employees remuneration, qu. 1673, 1737
Lord Shaughnessy's letter, 2890
Management, Information — M. (Mr. King) 1198
Special Committee
M. (Mr. A. K. Maclean) 1573
M. (Mr. Meighen) 1806
Chief Electoral Officer's reports, qu. 577
Chippewa power canal, 2444
Civil Service Act Amdt. Bill, 2779, 2833-70, 2940
Returned soldiers, 4260
Customs and Excise Dept. Bill, foreign consular service, 3808-3995
Debates, translation of French speeches, 702
De Martigny divorce, 3765
Empire Cabinet proposed, 1385
Entomology—increase in item, 1024
Expeditionary force—Canteen funds, qu. 1133
Fox-breeding, 1430
French Trade Agreement, printing, 1380
Governor General, suggested appointment of Lord Burnham, qu. 599
Grand Trunk Arbitration Bill, 1498, 2448-77
Grand Trunk loan, 4135-7
Great Lakes-St. Lawrence waterway, 751
Griffenhagen and Associates, 1555. *See also* under this title, Civil Service Act Amdt. Bill

Murphy, Hon. Charles—*Con.*
Hickman, alleged deportation, qu. 574
Highways
Construction in Ontario, 4295
Hull-Wakefield, 3034
Imaginary letters, 3261
Immigration, 2570-5
Mental defectives, 3583
Officials, 3060
Woman supervisor, position, 3058, 3062
Imperial Conference, 1073
Income and Business Profits Taxes, qu 837
Inspection of Gas and Gas Meters Bill, 609
Interim Supply, granting of, 2007
Judge Snider's report, 4436
Lake of the Woods Control Board Bill, 2034-36
Lord Byng, appointment, 4541
Luxury tax, qu. 600
Macallum, Professor, 1431
Massey, Hon. Mr., 3008
National Gallery, 2684
National Research Institute, 2962-2708
Naval Service, Capt. Adams, alleged statement, 901
Parliament buildings, 4071-6
Pension Act Amdt. Bill, 4373
Prime Ministers' Conference, reported statement of Mr. Churchill, 2567
Printing Bureau
Employees in, qu. 1131
Extension to building, qu. 1383
Quebec riots, 1510
Questions, inquiry for, 1502
Research Council, industrial chemistry, 1434
Royal Canadian Mounted Police Act Amdt. Bill, 2481-2
Royal Canadian Mounted Police at Thorold, qu. 574
Royal Military College, 2805
Trade with Russia, 1003
Veniot, Mon. Mr., 3637, 3688
Welland canal, obstruction, 1990

Murray, Mr. G. M.
Editorial control of newspapers, 330, 442, 2622, 3645-7

Murray Bay public works, qu. 604

Murray Bay-Tadoussac Steamship Service, M. (Mr. Casgrain) for papers, 1528, 1822, 1825, 1930

Musk Ox and Reindeer. *See* Reindeer

Musselman, Mr. J. B., 3382

Myers, Mr. E. T. W. (Kindersley)
Address in reply to Governor General's Speech, 388; Amendment to amendment (Mr. Campbell); congratulations Prime Minister; tariff; policies of the parties; alliance between Liberals and National Progressives; reform of Senate; freight rates, 389; Canadian National Railways; coal; the grain trade; Wheat Board, 390; Royal Commission to inquire into marketing; shipment through Canadian ports; no urgent demand for election; redistribution, 392
Canadian Wheat Board, qu. 340
Income tax collections in Saskatchewan, qu. 2028

Nadeau, Dr., 3133

Nagle and Wigmore, 3077, 3172. *See also* Customs, Minister of

Nantel, Hon. Mr., 3019

Napier, Mr. J. J., qu. 1624

Nappan, Gurnsey cattle at, qu. 2686

"Narbethong," steamer, 2175

Narcotic Drugs. *See* Opium and Narcotic Drugs

National Advisory Council, 4363. *See also* Research

National Assets. *See* Fuel Supply Problem; Natural Resources

National Battlefields Commission
Fort Cumberland and Fort Moncton, 4540
Fortifications of Quebec, 967

National Catholic Labour Unions. *See* Labour

National Dairy Council, 1126

National Expenditures, Committee on, 1835. *See also* Estimates

National Gallery, 2684

National Industrial Conference, 4549. *See also* Labour

National Liberal Convention. *See* Liberal Convention

National Parks, 4495. *See also* Dominion Lands and Parks

National Policy, 3220, 3569. *See also* Address; Budget

National Progressive Party. *See* Progressive

National Railways. *See* Canadian National Railways

National Railways and Shipping, Special Com., reference to
M. (Mr. Meighen) 1755; names substituted, 2776. *See also* Canadian National Railways

National Research Institute, 886, 2566, 2688, 2892, 4555. *See also* Research Council Act Amdt.
Annual report, 2897
Bequests and donations, 2896
Bursarships and studentships, 2894
Co-ordination, 2892
Council, 2892
Discoveries and inventions, 2895
Establishment of, 886
Materials, investigation and standarization, 2893
Trade agents, 2893

National Transcontinental Railway. *See* Canadian National Railways

Natural Gas, 879. *See also* Gas; Oil and Gas

Natural Resources. *See also* Coal; Fuel Supply problem; Mines and Minerals; Research
Aerial explorations and surveys, 3776
Canadian hinterland, 852
Conservation Commission, 3961
Control of, 857
Development of, Res. (Mr. Manion) 841; neg, 894
Drainage of flooded areas, 871
Intelligence Bureau, 1343
Investigation of, 845
Mackenzie Basin, 879
Maple industry, 887
National Research Institute, 886. *See also* that title
Ownership of, 879
Timber and minerals, 893
Western provinces, of, 3555
Transfer to, 1336-40
Demand for, 484
M. (Mr. Campbell) 2519-84

Naturalization, 781. *See also* Canadian Nationals; Dominion Elections Act Amdt. Bill

Naturalization Act, 1914, Amdt. Bill (Aliens who served in Allied Armies)
1r., 2441

Nauru Island, phosphate deposits, 4541, 4255

Naval Defence, 183, 227, 266. *See also* Naval Service; Prime Ministers' Conference
Contribution of Dominions, inquiry, 4256

Naval Service. *See also* Canadian Navy
Adams, Capt. Henry C., inquiry, 901, qu. 1237
Air stations, 3780
Appropriation, 4017-19
Cost of maintenance, 2107
Estimates, 4010
Esquimalt, Naval College, 4016
Fisheries protection, 4036
Halifax and Esquimalt, dockyards, 4017-36
Halifax naval college, 4010
Naval cadets in Imperial navy, 4017
Naval holiday, 4020
"Niobe" and "Rainbow," disposal of, qu. 671, 4010-36, 4041
Pacific coast, vessels on, 4016
Preference in Civil Service appointments, 4482
Royal Canadian navy, estimates, 4010
Vessels presented by British Admiralty, 4016-23

Navigable Waters, obstructions, 1989

Navigation. *See also* Marine
Aids to, 1996
Schools of, 1989

Navy. *See* Naval Service

Navy League of Canada, grant, 4535

Nelson, Mr. Christian, 2880

"Neophyte", steamer, 1966

Nesbitt, Mr. E. W. (North Oxford)
Address in reply to Governor General's Speech, 60. Government's term of office; no reason to seek re-election; group government versus the two-party system; War Times Election Act; Quebec most stable province; unemployment insurance; the labour situation, 61; extravagant living followed by curtailment; work the only salvation, 62; the "interests" all must work together; the Government not responsible for unemployment; the tariff—reasonable protection, 63; members not elected to promote partisan, selfish interests, 64
Agricultural shows, 1245
Alcohol for hospitals, 3706
Bankruptcy Act Amdt. Bill, 2933-6
Budget, 3252. Sugar, price of; congratulations to Minister of Finance, 3253; income and business profits tax; tariff

Nesbitt, Mr. E. W.—*Con.*
Budget—*Con.*
revision, 3254; reciprocity; free trade England, 3255; revenue and expenditure; cost of living, 3256; immigration; Great Britain and free trade, 3258
Canada Temperance Act
Cases pending, 4377
Canada-West Indies Trade Agreement, 2253
Canadian National Railways
Special Committee, reference to
M. (Mr. A. K. Maclean) 1607
M. (Mr. Meighen) 1784
Civil Service Act Amdt. Bill, 2863, 4267-73, 4493
Consular agents, 1479
Customs and Excise Dept. Bill
Dumping, 4414
Invoice certificate, fee, 4393
Trade agents in United States, 4393
Trade commissioners, 4393
Valuation for duty, 4415
Customs Tariff Act, 1907, Amdt. Bill
Imported goods, marking of, 3712, 3724, 3942-55
Dominion Elections Act Amdt. Bill (Prohibition plebiscite) 306
Experimental farms and stations in Ontario, 950
Grand Trunk Arbitration Bill, 2460-75
Great Lakes-St. Lawrence waterway, 741
Health of Animals, 4508
Hog cholera, compensation, 1060
Housing, 1142
Hudson Bay Railway, 992
Immigration, 2602
Imported goods, marking of, 3712, 3724, 3942-55
Inspection of Gas and Gas Meters Bill, 612
National Research Institute, 2693
North American Trust Company, 1130
Pension Act Amdt. Bill, 4367-73
Pensions, widowed mothers, 636
Polish battalion for service in French army, 4057
Returned Soldiers' Insurance Act Amdt. Bill, 4262, 4357
Senate and House of Commons Act Amdt. Bill (Ministers and directorships) 651
Soldiers' pensions, insurance and re-establishment, 4057
Special War Revenue Act Amdt. Bill
Containers, 3755
Sales tax, 3735
Unemployment and immigration, 1357

New Brunswick
Minister of Public Works and York-Sunbury election, 3480. *See also* Veniot; York-Sunbury

Newcombe, Mr. E. F., and Grand Trunk Arbitration, qu. 1002

Newfoundland
Sick mariners, 3139
Steamship service, 1485, 1686, 1712

Newport News, Canadian vessels at, 1689, 1722

New York
Immigration officers at, 3131
Loans on Canadian bonds, 3288
Shipping pool, 1713

New Zealand
Steamship service, 1493
Trade with, 1223

Newspaper Comments on Shipbuilding. *See* Canadian Government Merchant Marine; Montreal; Press; Shipbuilding

Newspapers. *See* Press

Newsprint, alleged combine, qu. 2099

Nickel, Coinage, 2160
Five cent coin, 2160, 2269

Nicholson, Mr. Donald (Queen's, P.E.I.)
Address in reply to Governor General's Speech, 556; congratulations to Prime Minister; speech of Mr. Cannon; the Government's mandate; soldiers' vote in 1917, 556; the charge of coercion; majorities of Mr. Wigmore and Mr. McCurdy; Prime Minister's Truro speech; Canadian Mercantile Marine, 557; Magdalen Islands, Prince Edward Island; revenue, expenditure and taxation; highway expenditure in Nova Scotia; Mr. Maclean, Halifax, 558; revenue requirements; Mr. Gauthier; Quebec and other provinces, 559; stand by the national policy; toleration, 560
Highways, Prince Edward Island, qu. 2345

Nicholson, Mr. George B. (East Algoma)
Address in reply to Governor General's Speech, 283; congratulations to Prime Minister; a unique debate; no constructive criticism by Opposition; "bloodless neutrality"; programme of legislation; unemployment insurance and old age pensions, 284; League of Nations; the tariff; the Government's mandate, 285; unrest amongst business men and soldiers, 286; suggestion that leader of Opposition should form Government a "flagrant insult" to returned men; election, 287; policy of Opposition; Farmers' party, 288; United Grain Growers; stock feed; attitude towards farmers and milling industry; Mr. Norman Lambert, 289; flour, agricultural implements, profits—Mr. Rice-Jones; payments to newspaper for educational propaganda; campaign of "blatant hypocrisy", 290; increased representation for Quebec; the Prime Minister and Quebec—harmony, not discord, 291
Budget, 3299. Flotation of Canadian National Railway bonds in New York; foreign loans, 3300; Canadian National Railways; railway merging, 3308
Canadian National Railways
Special Com., reference to M. (Mr. Meighen) 1794
Canal tolls, 2975
Dominion Elections Act Amdt. Bill
Foreign-born wives of British subjects, 3103, 3106
Grand Trunk Arbitration Bill, 2565
Great Lakes-St. Lawrence waterway, 690
Interim supply, reduction of items, 2023
Permanent Court of International Justice, 2797
Railways and ships, 1730
Research, 1432
Supply—point of order, 2757
Trent canal, construction, 3975

"Niobe" and "Rainbow," sale of, qu. 671, 4010-36, 4041. *See also* Naval Service

Nolan Bill, 3008

Non-Confidence Motions, 1184. *See also* House of Commons, Divisions

Non-Political Operation of Railways. *See* Canadian National Railways

Norman, Dam. *See* Lake of the Woods

Norris, Hon. Mr., 4198

Norrish, Mr., 1226

North American Trust Company, 1094, 1127. *See* Private Bills Discussed

Northcliffe, Lord. *See* Gulf Pulp and Paper Company

North Sydney
Port of, 1282
Public Works—removal of officials, 2817
Terminus, 1487

North West Grain Dealers Association, 277, 297, 379

Northwest Territories Act Amdt. Bill (Council)
1r., 3903; 2r., com., 3r., 4113

Northwest Territories Explorations, 4494

Nova Scotia
Canadian National Railways
Freight to certain points, qu. 1620
Coal supplies, 1261, 3295. *See also* Fuel Supply
Fruit inspectors in, 1041, 1045
Highways, 4304-7
Mines. *See* Fuel Supply; Great Lakes-St. Lawrence

Nova Scotia Steel and Coal Company, 1611, 3407

Norwegian Boats and coastal trade, 1494

Nursery Plants, fumigation of, 1028, 1031

Oatmeal, tax on, 3735

Oats, 3395
Banner, 1033
Quaker, 2954-76, 3455. *See also* Grain; Trent Canal

Obregon, General, 1507.

Ocean. *See also* Canadian Government Merchant Marine; Shipbuilding; Steamship services
Freight rates, 1936-61
Decline, 1273
Pacific steamship service, 1493
Shipments by United States ports, 1975
Shipping—Government control of, qu. 3530
Trade routes, 1888

Ocean and River Service, 1736, 1979

Ocean Limited, 1800

O'Connor, Mr. W. F., and cost of living, 3548, 3606

Ogilvie, Messrs. D. W., and Company, 1846

Oil. *See also* Oil and Gas; Natural Resources; Petroleum
Bounties, 1385, 1413. *See also* Trade and Commerce
Development, 844, 2162-4
Expenditure for discovery, qu. 695
Government regulation, 3539

Oil—*Con.*
Leases, qu. 564, 3539
Issuing of, 598, 2377
Delay, 2029, 2377
Payments under, qu. 673
Mackenzie district in, 879, 2162, 3206
Purchase from Great Britain, 1253
Regulations, 1340
Rentals, qu. 672
Stability of title, 854
Surface rights, res. (Mr. Griesbach) 578; withdrawn, 666
Wells, penalty for injuring, 3922

Oil and Gas
Leases and permits, qu. 734
Res. (Mr. Mackie, Edmonton) 894; withdrawn, 901
Rights, 2555

Oil Burning Steamers. *See* Canada Shipping Act Amdt. Bill

Old Age
Pensions, 2, 9, 231, 237, 263, 284, 395
Provision for. *See* Housing

Oleomargarine, 3384. *See also* Dairying
Importation of, 3852, 4439
Inquiry, 3531
Inspectors under, 1068
Materials for, importation, 3747

Oleomargarine, 3384. *See also* Dairying
Res. 563, 3759; 1r., 3760; m. for 2., 3850; Amdt. (Mr. Denis) 3879; neg. 3886; com., 3886; 3r., 3905
Subjects and Sections discussed:
Label with statement of ingredients
Amdt. (Mr. Robb) neg. 3896
Manufacture, importation and sale
Amdt. (Mr. Manion), limitation of one year, 3886
Agreed to, 3896
Amdt. to amdt. (Mr. Sutherland), oleomargarine not to contain milk or cream, 3887, neg. 3896

Ontario
Drury and Drury Govt. *See* that title
Duff, the late Hon. James, Minister of Agriculture, 1033
Government, expenditures, 3495. *See also* Drury
Highways, work on, qu. 1237. *See also* Highways
Prohibition plebiscite, 303
Referendum Committee, 304
Renfrew returning officer, 820
Voters' lists, 150, 242, 259, 303
Timber limits, 3391

One-sixth Vote. *See* Interim Supply

Open Market. *See* Canada Grain Act

Operation of Railways. *See* Canadian National Railways

Opium, imports of, 3130. *See also* Opium and Narcotic Drugs

Opium and Narcotic Drug Act. *See also* Health Department
Administration of, 3130
Convictions under, 3134

Opium and Narcotic Drug Act Amdt. Bill
Res. 1069, 2263; 1r., 2268; 2r., ref. to Special Com., 2346; com., 2897; 3009; 3r., 3009
Report of Special Committee, 2708
Senate amdts. concurred in, 4062
Subjects and Sections discussed:
Failure to pay fine, 2908
Household remedies, 2902
Indictable offence, 2897
Penalty, 2897-2907
Possession, 2903-6
Prescriptions not to be filled more than once, 2897
Sale or gift to minors, 2897
Whipping, 2897

Orders in Council. *See also* Purchasing Commission
Appointment of representatives to Assembly of League of Nations, 188
Immigration, 2585
Peace Conference, 397

Oriental Immigration. *See* Chinese

Ottawa
Cartier square, stores shed, qu. 3208
Daly building, rental, 4094
Daylight saving, 2687, 2776
Hunter building, 4094
Lighting roads and bridges, 4090
Noon gun, 4091
Newspapers and shipbuilding, 1925
Parliament buildings, 3992. *See also* that title
Public buildings, 4101
Rental of buildings in, 3989, 4092-6
The "Reno" of Canada, 4474

Ottawa Improvement Commission Act Amdt. Bill
1r., 2941; 2r., com., 3r., 3759

Overages. *See* Grain

Owen Sound, wharf, 3974

Owens, the late Thomas P., Editor of Debates, tribute to, 258, 430

Oyster Culture, 2177

Pacaud, Mr. L. T. (Megantic)
Belgium, credit to, qu. 577, qu. 1001
Purchases in Canada, qu. 736
Budget, 3343. Importance of debate; inefficiency of Administration, 3344; extravagance and economy, 3345; control by Parliament of necessary expenditures, 3346; credits to foreign countries; amendment of Mr. Fielding, 3347
Canadian Government Merchant Marine
"Canadian Ranger" and "Seigneur", qu. 1382

Pacific Ocean
Steamship service, 1493
Trade, 3649

Pacific Salvage Company, Limited, 1990

Packing Houses. *See* Health of Animals; Oleomargarine
Cold storage plants, and, amount collected, 607

Pagè, Dr., 3133

Paintings, in Senate Chamber, qu. 566

Pairs. *See* House of Commons, Divisions

Palmerston, Lord, and Don Pacifico, 1522

Panama Canal, Canadian shipments by, 3047

Panet, Mr. L. C., appointment as Deputy Sergeant-at-Arms, 3

Paper, Newsprint. *See* Newsprint

Papineau, Mr. L. J. (Beauharnois)
Canadian National Railway vessels, qu. 1349
Canadian Postal Guide, qu. 1349
Parliament buildings, furniture, qu. 2192
Staples, Mr. W. D., qu. 3260
War, adjustment of accounts, Canada-Great Britain, qu. 2191

Parasites. *See* Destructive Insects

Pardee, Mr. F. F. (West Lambton)
Address in reply to Governor General's Speech, 479; congratulations to Prime Minister; Minister of Militia, chameleon-like change of policy; the tariff red-herring; favoured free agricultural implements in 1914, 479; the Farmers' party, 480; reprisals against the United States; dissolution and appeal; by-elections; the "remnant" of Liberalism, 481; rural and urban representation; resignations of ministers; trust the people, 482

Pardee, Mr. F. F.—*Con.*
Budget, 3497. Tariff revision; luxuries tax; Great Britain, 3498; foreign trade; shipbuilding; railways and public ownership, 3499; position of Liberal and Agrarian parties, 3500
Civil Service Act Amdt. Bill, 2840
Civil Service bonus, 2111
Criminal Code Amdt. Bill, 3908-28
Customs and Excise Dept. Bill, brokers, 4432
Great Lakes-St. Lawrence waterway, 743
Harbours and rivers, amdt. 3979
Immigration Act Amdt. Bill, 3826
French language, 3824
Interior Department, draughtsmen, 1334
Lake of the Woods Regulation Bill, 4177-4226
Amdt. to 3r., 4226
"Niobe" and "Rainbow," sale of, 4018-32
Representation in Parliament, 1326

Parent, Mr. George (Quebec West)
Agricultural shows, 1242
Amherst drill hall, 2739
Annapolis public building, 2764
Boots and shoes, Canadian, 1225
Canadian Nationals Definition Act, 779
Canadian National Railways
Agents, 1605
Cancellation of trains, 1004
St. Augustin station, qu. 695, 3018
St. Foy round house, Res. 840, 967, qu. 1501
Correspondence, 1502, 1659
Shawinigan service, qu. 573
Chinese Immigration Act Amdt. Bill, 3829
Compensation for slaughtered cattle, 1050
De Martigny divorce, 3762-9, 4006
Director of Commercial Exhibits, 1226
Dominion Shipbuilding and Repair Company, qu. 3423
"Druid," steamer, 1984
Experimental farms, hours and pay, 932
Fruit inspection, 1047
Fuel Supply, Special Com., evidence in French, 4251
Highways, amount of vote, 3024
Icebreakers and steamers, repairs, 1979
Immigration Act Amdt. Bill, 3822-5
Inspection of Gas and Gas Meters Bill, 608
Intercolonial Railway
Work at Charny and St. Foy, qu. 1501
Interior Department, dismissal of employees, 1345
International Customs Tariff Bureau, 1438
Liquor, tax on, 3707
Militia
Dismissal of employees in Quebec, 2237
Surveys division, 2244

Parent, Mr. George—*Con.*
Montreal Harbour Commission, 2269
National Catholic Labour Unions, 1646
National Research Institute, 2896
"Niobe" and "Rainbow," sale, 4011-13
Pilotage, 1999
Post Office Act Amdt. Bill, 2120-24
Prince Rupert Dry Dock Engineering Company, qu. 3423
Printing, Government, 1439
Quebec riots, 1918, Res. 974, 1503
Railway Commission—jurisdiction, 3017
Railways, law costs, 3015
St. Augustin Station, qu. 695, 3018
St. Lawrence dredging, 1992
Supply—procedure, 3014
Surveyor General and Boundary Commissioners, 1342
Trent canal, 2606-16
Waterpowers, director of, 1346
Welland Canal, construction, 2990-3001
Wrecks, investigation, 1988

Paris Agency, 2437

Paris Green, 1030

Park St. Charles Company, Limited, proposed payment to, 4570

Parks. *See also* Dominion Lands and Parks
Antelope for, qu. 1134

Parliament
Availability of Information. *See* Canadian Government Merchant Marine; Canadian National Railways
Earlier sessions of, 1843
Information for. *See* Ministers
Prorogation. *See that title*
Representation in, 1293. *See also* House of Commons, Vacancies

Parliament Buildings, 3992, 4040, 4070-8
Acoustics, 3998-9, 4000
Architects' commission, 3995-4000
Brown, Hon. George—letter to Sir John Macdonald on former buildings, 4002
Building stone, 3994
Commons Chamber, 3996
Concrete, 3997
Cost, 3993-7, 4000
Draughts, 3998
Expenditure, qu. 4341
Furniture, qu. 2192
Inscription on central column, qu. 568
Inscription on tower, 3995-8, 4543
Library, 4000
Probable date of completion, 3992
Purchase of materials, 3994
Tower, 3993-9

Parliamentary and Departmental Printing, 1438. *See also* Printing Bureau

Parliamentary Control of Railways. *See* Canadian National Railways Special Committee

Parliamentary Elections. *See* Proportional Representation

Parliamentary Government. *See* Representation in Parliament

Parliamentary Guide, purchase of copies, 4533

Parliamentary Procedure. *See* Deputy Speaker; House of Commons; Speaker

Parliamentary Restaurant, 4536
Additional vote for, 4535
Joint Committee, 303
Manager, 2027

Participation Certificates, 340. *See also* Address; Canadian Wheat Board

Partridge Island Quarantine Station, 2808-15

Party Politics. *See* Canadian National Railways, Management

Passport Office, 2436

Pas, The, wharf, 3976

Patent Act Amdt. Bill
1r., 3007; 2r., 4453; com., 4456; 3r., 4460; Senate amdts. 4544
Subjects and Sections discussed:
Alien enemies, 4456
Fee, 4456
No patent void by failure to make or import between August 1, 1914, and Jan 10, 1922, 4457
Return of fees, 4457
Rights of those who have commenced to make, use, or sell, 4459
Time extended, 4457
United States legislation, 4454-60
Validity of patents protected during war, 4459

Patent Act Consolidation Bill, 4456

Patent Medicines, tax on, 3120, 3727-28

Patents, Commissioner of, 623. *See also* Exchequer Court Act Amdt. Bill

Patents of Invention Acts Consolidation Bill
1r., 303; M. for 2r., 2890; withdrawn, 2891

Patronage. *See* Canadian National Railways; Civil Service

Peace Conference, 164, 2629. *See also* Address; League of Nations; Permanent Court of International Justice; Prime Ministers' Conference
French Canadians, unrepresented, 552
Orders in Council, 397

Peat Industry, 2689. *See also* Supply problem

Peck, Mr. C. W. (Skeena)
Australian steamship services, 1495
Burnham, Dr., case of, 1526
Dease and Stikine rivers, qu. 1133
High Commissioner's office, 2438
Military districts, 2789
Militia, command pay, 2292
Rulings and Statements as Chairman
Decision of Chair must not be questioned, 1904
Members, reflections on, 1903
Shipbuilding, 1923
Interruption in debate, 1898
Special Committee on Returned Soldiers, 788

Pecuniary Claims Convention, qu. 736, qu. 1817, qu. 2027

Pedlow, Mr. Isaac E. (South Renfrew)
Air Board, 3778-82
Alberta penitentiary, 1115
Armistice Day Bill, 3773-6
Canadian National Railways
Purchasing agent, 1659
Cattle embargo, Amdt., 725, 758
"Champlain", steamer, 1995
Chief, Foreign Tariffs Division, 1437
Civil Service Classification
Filing clerks, 1660
Griffenhagen, 2242
Civil Service Retirement Act Amdt. Bill, 2488-2500
Civil Service (Res. Sir Sam Hughes) Political patronage; Liberal platform and administration, 815; defeated candidate should not control patronage; condition of civil service; discontent, dissatisfaction and unrest; classification and reorganization; Printing Bureau, 816; Civil Service Commission, competitive examination; census commissioners and enumerators, 817; prohibition plebiscite, returning officer at Renfrew, 820
Coats, Mr. R. H., salary of, 1232
Cocoa preparations, 3703
Confidential messengers, 1334
Customs and Excise Dept. Bill
Currency inflation and commodity prices, 4431
Fines, 4392

Pedlow, Mr. Issac E.—*Con.*
Customs and Excise—*Con.*
German bounty on sugar, 4432
German mark, 4431
Imports and exchange, 3810-12
Invoice certificate, 3799, 3803-04
Fee—who pays? 3804, 4391-4409
Obstacles to importation, 4410-16
Restrictions on trade—letter from Gillies Bros., Ltd., 4418
Trade agents, 4410
Valuation of currency, 3809-12-19, 4430
Customs Tariff Act, 1907, Amdt. Bill
Imported goods, marking of, 3938-55, Amdt. 3955
Customs estimates, 3087
Demography, chief of division, 1232
Fisheries, 2177-90
Flax industry, 1398, 1401
Free trade—Mr. Cockshutt, 3747
Halladay, Mr,, and Canada Cycle and Motor Co., 1227
Harbours and rivers, estimates, 3976-9
Horse-breeding, 1121
Imported goods, marking, 3712, 3720-23, 3938-55
Inspection of Gas and Gas Meters, 612
Interior Department, employees, 1343
Lignite, 4499
Militia
Estimates, 2239
M. to reduce, 2281-8
Purchasing Commission, 2239, 2287
Salaries, 2287
"Niobe" and "Rainbow", sale, 4015-19
Parliament buildings, 3994
Pembroke wharf, 4536-9
Penitentiaries, increases in estimates, 1109
Polish battalion for service in French army, 4051
Polish immigrants, rejected, qu. 914
Post Office
Letter rate, 4526
Parcel post rates, 4526
Purchasing agents, 4527
Rural mail carriers, 4527
Stamps, postage and revenue, 4526
Preferential tariff—West Indies, 3704
Preserved fruits, 3703
Royal Canadian Mounted Police Act Amdt. Bill, 2482
Shipbuilding, 1956
Soldiers' pensions, insurance and re-establishment, 4051
Special War Revenue Bill
Consideration en bloc, 3956
Houses, tax on, 3958
Lumber, tax on, 3743, 3957, 3958

Pedlow, Mr. Issac E.—*Con.*
Special War Revenue—*Con.*
Sales tax, 3755
Change in clause, 3957
Wholesalers opposed to, 3752
Steamship "Narbethong", 2175
Sugar imports, 3703
Trade and Commerce employees, 1226
Trade commissioners, 1399
Trent canal, 2606-16

Pelletier, Mr. F. J. (Matane)
Address in reply to Governor General's Speech, 381; previous arguments for dissolution endorsed; public ownership; Canadian National Railways; Board of Directors; employees and elections; sections granted privileges denied to others; Intercolonial, piling lumber in yard at Amqui; financial obligations due to nationalization; world-wide liquidation, 382; Prime Minister's duty to dissolve Parliament, 383
Canadian National Railways
Amqui station, 382, 1176
Illustration stations at Matane and Causapscal, 947
Matane, wharves, 3992
Quebec Union Telephone Company, 3343

Pembroke wharf, 4536

Penitentiaries, 1091, 1096. *See also* Justice; Prisons and Reformatories
Alberta, 1092, 1115
Appropriations for, 1104
Convicts
Number and cost of, 1092
Dorchester, 1092
Purchases locally, 1108
Salaries of officials, 1096
Warden, 1092, 4467
Flour purchases, 1107
Kingston, 1110
Staff and inmates, 1097
Trades at, 1092
Maintenance cost, increase in, 1111
Purchases, system of, 1108
Purchasing Commission, 1104
Report, 2027
Salaries and retiring allowances
Increases in, 1109-10
St. Vincent de Paul, 1078, 1091
Convicts, number of, 1091
Warden, qu. 575, 1078
Saskatchewan, 1091, 1110
Stony Mountain, release of prisoners, 477

Penitentiaries Act Amdt. Bill
1r., 3738-39; withdrawn, 3973

Pensions, 164, 2236-78. *See also* Returned Soldiers, Special Committee
Application forms in French, qu. 965
Assignment in payment of insurance premium, 4355
Board of Commissioners, 4366
British funds, disbursement in Canada, qu. 733
Brunelle, Sergt. Major N., 1518
Deduction from widows' pensions, 4369
Deductions for insurance premium, Res. (Mr. Power) 629; withdrawn, 630
Disability, qu. 1235
Etienne, Mde., claim, 4367
Marcil, Mr. Joseph, qu. 3903
Marcil, Messrs. Louis T. and Joseph, qu. 2942
Martel, Mde., claim, 4367
Old age. *See* Address
Permanent force, deductions from pay of, 2275
Refusal to soldier disabled by accident, 4366
Scale for deaths, 4266
Scale for disabilities, 4264
South African, 2278
Special Committee, final report, 4041
"Unmarried wife," 4369
Widowed mothers, Res. (Mr. Power) 630; withdrawn, 642, 4047, 4368

Pensions Act Admt. Bill
Res. 4262; 1r., 4266; 2r., com., 4361; 3r., 4373
Subjects and Sections discussed:
Board of Pension Commissioners, 4366
Deduction from widowed mothers' pensions, 4369
Housing, 4362
Increased sale, 4361
Interpretation of Act, 4366
Military Service, "as such," 4366
Statement by Prime Minister, 4361
Unemployment, 4361
Widowed mothers, 4368

Pentland, Mr., and Quebec Admiralty district, 1086

People's Representatives. *See* Ministers

Per Capita Expenditure and Debt, 2012, 3246

Permanent Court of International Justice Bill, 56, 285, 645. *See also* Canadian Nationals; League of Nations; Prime Ministers' Conference
1r., 2096; 2r., com., 2708; com., 3013; 3r.,

Permanent Force. *See* Militia; Pensions

Perrot Island bridge, qu. 576, qu. 603

Peterborough
By-election, 504
Milling industry, 3544
Trent canal, 2953. *See also* that title

Petitions. *See* Private Bills

Petroleum. *See also* Oil
Bounties, 1385, 1413
Government regulation, 3539
Leases, 3539
Natural gas, and, lease rentals, qu. 672

Pharmaceutical Compounds, 3726-7

Phonographic Discs. *See* Copyright

Pictou-Georgetown steamship services, 1496

Pierreville Postmistress, qu. 2624, 2858, qu. 3208; qu. 3422; qu. 3423. *See also* Yamaska

Pig iron industry, 3188

Pilotage, Administration of, 1999

Pilots, 1999
Montreal-Quebec, superannuation, qu. 1501

Pin, Mr. J. E. A., and Labour, 1642

Pipes, Mr., and Dorchester Penitentiary, 1093

Plate Glass Industry, 3513

Playing Cards. *See* Criminal Code Amdt. Bill—Three Card Monte
Tax on, 3126

Pointe Claire, wharf, 4312

Poisoning of Insects, 1028

Police Magistrates. *See* Judges

Polish Battalion for service in French Army, 4051

Polish Immigrants, rejected, qu. 964

Political Control of Railways. *See* Canadian National Railways

Political Patronage. *See also* Canadian National Railways; Civil Service
Lawyers selected by Government, 1077

Pollution of Harbour Waters. *See* Canada Shipping Act Amdt. Bill

Pontiac
Census commissioners and enumerators, 828, 1127

Population, increase of, 843

Pootmans, Mr. G., Vice-Consul for Belgium, 3347, 3379. *See also* Belgium, loan to

Porcupine Forest Reserve, 538

Portage du Fort, war record, 1928

Port Arthur and Fort William harbour improvements, 4536

Port Aux Basques, 1468

Port Colborne, breakwater, 3974

Port Hilford, dredging, 3983

Port Hood, wharf, 4088, 4104

Port Margaree, wharf, 2174

Port Nelson, dredging, 1853

Porter, Professor, 1427

Porter, Mr. George, Maycroft, Alta., 384

Portland Terminus, 1384, 3291. *See also* Grand Trunk

Postmasters. *See also* Civil Service Act Amdt. Bill; Post Office
Montreal and Toronto, qu. 566
Rural. *See also* that title
Appointment of, 2779, 4278-4460

Postmaster-General. *See also* Blondin, Hon. Mr.; Post Office
Election of, 1171
Necessity for presence in Commons, 1155, 4514
Payments to, qu. 567
Yamaska election, and, 3468

Post Office, 3003. *See also* Civil Service; Mail Carriers. For individual post offices, *see* their titles
Annuities, 4524
Canadian Postal Guide, qu. 1349
Department
Anderson, Mr., 4526
Cabinet Ministers, and, qu. 1349
Mail superintendents and postal inspectors
Res. (Mr. Casgrain) 841
Outside service
Maritime Provinces, Inspection Branch 4528
Parcel post rates, 4526
Postmen, bonus to, 3549
Purchasing agent, 4526
Railway mail service, 4516
Religious holidays, 2626

Post Office—*Con.*
Department—*Con.*
Reorganization, 804, 4514
Moon, Mr., 4518
Northrup, Mr., 4518
Retirement of officials, qu. 3772
Smith, Mr. Sydney, qu. 1236, 4518
Troop, Mr., 4518
Verret, Col., 4525
Superintendent and inspectors, qu. 965
Employees in post offices, retirement, 4268
Letter rate, 3571, 4515
Madrid Postal Conference, 3001
Montreal Mutual Benefit Society, qu. 567
Offices in Canada, qu. 1235
Parcelpost rates, 4526
Railway mail service, 4516
Bonaventure-Gaspé, qu. 577
Revenue and expenditure, 4515
Rural mail carriers, 4523. *See also* that title
Bonus, 2115
Saguenay district service, 1825
Stamps, postage and revenue, 4526
Statistical schedules, 3758
War tax, 4515

Post Office Act Amendment Bill
1r., 1619-20; 2r., com., 2120; 3r., 2944
Subjects and sections discussed:
Insurance of registered mail matter, 2120
Obligations of ferrymen, 2122
Unpaid or underpaid letters, 2121

Potato Bug, destruction by, 1932

Potatoes, 3224, 3525
Diseases, 1032
Export, 3442
Market for, 3473

Poultry Industry, 939, 1122
British Columbia, in, 3750-51
Egg production, 1242-3. *See also* Eggs
World's Poultry Congress, 4513

Power. *See also* Fuel Supply Problem; Great Lakes-St. Lawrence

Power, Mr. C. G. (Quebec South)
Address in reply to Governor General's Speech, 100. The new leader of the Government, 101; dissolution of Parliament and appeal to the people; different schools of thought; House of Commons "express image of the feeling of the Nation"; present parliament not representative, 102: history of the Government; power despotically used; Cabinet reconstruction: by-elections, 103; defections among Ministry and Government supporters, 104;

Power, Mr. C. G.—*Con.*
Address—*Con.*
Government has lost confidence of country; deficits from public ownership; Great War Veterans Association, 105; enforced isolation of Quebec, 106; the public conscience, 107
Administration of Justice, 1325
Alpine Club, 4494
Bankruptcy Act Amdt. Bill, 2918
Burnham, Dr., treatment by Serbian Government, qu. 576, 1525
Cabinet-maker, Interior department, 1342
Canada Temperance Act
Quebec petition for suspension of Act, 4382
Canadian Government Merchant Marine
Vessels, names of, 1962
Canadian Nationals Definition Act, 782, 2033
Canadian National Railways
Employes, fraud by, 1669
Canal tolls, 2976
Civil Service Act Amdt. Bill, 2780, 2881
Returned soldiers—preference, 4483
Superannuation—increased allowances, qu. 3903, 4541
Coats, Mr. R. H., 1232
Dominion Elections Act Amdt. Bill (Prohibition plebiscite) 304
Expenditures on public works, 2983
Fiji Islands, Mr. Catellier, 1465
Foreign agitators and elections, 903
Forestry
Canadian Forestry Association, 4494
Director of, 1346
Immigration, medical inspection, qu. 572
Interior Department law clerks, 1332
Ireland, South, Parliament for, qu. 603
Judges, Admiralty, 1086
Lights, repairs to, 1996
Marine signal service, 1998
Militia
Ashley, Sergt. T., qu. 3090
Command pay, 2290
M. to reduce, 2292
Estimates, 2275, 2310
Permanent Force, M. to reduce estimate, 2797
Record office, 2278-81
Staff, 2787-91
Military preparation, 2305
Miniature natural resources cabinets, 1342
Moving pictures, 599
Opium and Narcotic Drug Act Amdt. Bill, 2265
Pensions Act Amdt. Bill, 4366-73
Pensions
Application forms in French, qu. 965

Power, Mr. C. G.—*Con.*
Pensions—*Con.*
Deductions for insurance, res. 629; withdrawn, 630
Permanent Force, deductions from pay, 2236, 2275
Widowed mothers, res. 630, 640; withdrawn, 642, 4369
Public Works—Quebec district, 2983
Quebec
Citadel, 1441
Fortifications, res, 967
Port and Merchant Marine, 1271
Riots, 1509
Ship repairing, 1986
Returned Soldiers Insurance Act Amdt. Bill, 4355-7
Ross rifle, 2782
Serbian Consul at Montreal, qu. 605
Shipbuilding, 1962
Soldiers Civil Re-establishment
Loyola college building, Montreal, qu. 569
Supply—Public Works, point of order, 2758
Trent canal, construction, 2983-94
Unemployment relief, qu. 570
Union Service Fund, qu. 2192
Welland canal, construction, 2983-94

Prairie Provinces
Grasshopper plague, 1027
Transfer of Natural Resources. *See* Natural Resources

Preferential Vote. *See* Proportional Representation

Presentation of Speaker's Chair. *See* Speaker's Chair

Press
Bureau in New York, 2400
Canadian Press Limited, qu. 564, 4533
Comment on Shipbuilding. *See* Canadian Government Merchant Marine; Shipbuilding
Defamatory libel, publication of court proceedings, 2149, 3933
Murray, Mr. G. M., and, 330, 442, 2622, 3645-7
Propaganda, 290

Press Gallery
Long sittings of House, 2887

Preston, Mr. W. R. T., 3383

Prevost, Mr. Jules E. (Terrebonne)
Budget, 3427. National Liberal and Conservative Government; railway policy, 3428; expenditure, public debt and re-

Prevost, Mr. Jules E.—*Con.*
Budget—*Con.*
venues; taxation, 3429; military expenditures and conscription, 3430; Canadian policy and Imperialist doctrine, 3430; Laurier and Colonial Conferences, 3431; Prime Minister and Quebec, 3435; fiscal policy, 3436
Canadian National Railways
Montreal-Transcontinental, qu. 574
Census, appointment of officials, 696
Debates, Official, distribution of, M. 2220-5
Highways
Approval of in Quebec, qu. 2098
Federal aid to, qu. 2375
League of Nations
Article X, qu. 575
Canada's contribution to, 1235
Postmasters, Montreal and Toronto, 566

Price-Fixing, 3200

Prime Ministers. *See* Ministers

Prime Ministers' Conference, 183, 193, 227, 246, 254, 270, 294, 467, 526, qu. 564, 2626, 3320, 4304, 4449
Agenda, 2504, 2638-47
Anglo-Japanese Alliance, 2637-9-57
Canada and the United States, 2653. *See also* Canadian Representation in the United States
Canada's status, 2642
Committee on Imperial Defence, 2637-49
Constitutional conference, 2637-8-47-49
Constitutional development, 2626-47
Imperial Conference, 2628, 2633-36
Imperial defence, 2633-44
Imperial War Cabinet, 2636-48
Imperial War Conference, 1917, res. 2626-36-48
International relations, 2651
Lloyd George and Mr. Churchill, 2633-44
Military, naval and air defence, 2640-50
Naval defence
Contribution of the Dominions to, 4256
Peace Conference at Paris, 2637
Proposed instructions to Prime Minister, 2554
Reparations, 2653
Reported statement of Mr. Churchill, 2567
Statement by Prime Minister, 2504
Wireless Communications, 2640

Primeau, Mr., and Railway Commission, 3018

Prince Albert, Soldier Settlement Board, qu. 673

Prince Edward Island
Harbours and rivers, 3990
Highways, Federal aid to, qu. 2345

Prince Edward Island—*Con.*
Railway, 4565
Steamship service, 558

Prince Rupert
Dry Dock Engineering Company, qu. 3423
Public Building, qu. 567
Purchase of land from Mr. V. W. Smith, qu. 963

Princess Creek, wharf, 3980

Printing Bureau
Bailey and Wolffe, Messrs., qu. 603
Building, extension to, qu. 1383
Destruction of Public Documents, qu. 599, qu. 603, 793, qu. 1621, 1625, qu. 2028, 2943, 2950-3, 4062, 4436-53, 4465, 4557
Canadian Postal Guide, qu. 1349
Judge Snider's Report, qu. 2028, 2444, 2943, 2951, 2952, 3209, 3697, 3761, 3905, 4062, 4436-53, 4557
Statement of Messrs. Fred Cook and Frank Lynch, tabled, 4541
Statutes, plates of, qu. 603
Employees in, qu. 1131, qu. 1348
Additional, qu. 1234
Long sittings of the House, 2887
Reorganization, 793, 802, 816, 834, 836, 2827-79, 4465. *See also* Civil Service

Printing, Joint Committee, 110, 2618, 2889, 4041

Printing of Parliamentary and Departmental Publications, 1438

Prisons and Reformatories Act Amdt. Bill
1r., 1069; 2r., com., 3011; 3r., 3013

Private Bills. *See* House of Commons, Bills

Private Bills Discussed
Canadian Bar Association, 1094
Central Railway Company of Canada, 3715, 3716
De Martigny divorce, 3715, 3761, 4002-10, 4078, 4107, 4203, 4477
Fort Smith Railway Company, 3771
Gilmour and Hughson, Limited, 1096, 2442, 2503, 2800
James MacLaren Company, Limited, 598
North American Trust Company of Canada, 1094, 1127
Quebec Steamship Company, 2775, 2941
Quebec Union Electric Telephone Company, 3343, 3421, 4105

Privilege. *See* House of Commons

Privileges and Elections Committee, 2314, 2373, 2617, 2685, 2775
Representation, Maisonneuve and Gaspé, 4437
Substitution of names, 2441

Privy Council, 99, 2105
Appeals, limitation of, 1089, 1090
"Insular" tribunal of England, 1090
Judges. *See* Judges Act Amdt. Bill
Law library, 1090
Salmon fishery licenses, qu. 104, qu. 1381, 2104, qu. 2506, 4341

Prize Money. *See* Agricultural Shows

Probation, system of. *See* Criminal Code Amendment

Progressive Party, 331, 539, 1531, 1546, 3324, 3356. *See also* Address, Budget, Canadian Council of Agriculture, Crerar, United Grain Growers
Abolition of patronage, 822, 3163
Attitude on Tariff, 3212. *See also* Budget Speeches
Canadian Council of Agriculture. *See* that title
Railway problem, and, 1789
Wheat Board, and, 1451. *See also* Grain and Grain Trade; Canadian Wheat Board

Prohibition, 4474

Prohibition Plebiscite, 303. *See also* Canada Temperance Act; Dominion Elections Act Amdt.
Alberta, 3901, 4374-88
Ontario
Renfrew returning officer, 820
Voters' lists, 150, 242, 259, 303

Proportional Representation, 346, 411
M. (Mr. Sexsmith) for adoption of, 1528
Amdt. (Mr. Calder) for Special Com., 1542
M., as amended agreed to, 1554; Special Com. appointed, 1554-5
Special Com., authority to print report, 2027

Proprietary and Patent Medicines, tax on, 3120

Prorogation, 4577
Alleged undue desire to hasten, 4068
Governor General's Speech, 4579
Probable date of, 4238-40, 4551

Protection. *See* Address; Budget; Customs and Excise Dept. Bill

Proulx, Mr. Edmond (Prescott)
British funds, disbursement in Canada, qu. 733
Buckley, Mr. Charles P., qu. 966
Canada Temperance Act
Pending litigation, 4384
Canadian Air Force, qu. 965
Canadian Bar Association, 1095
Cattle embargo, 766
Chief Justice, salary of, 1571
Civil Service
Bonus, 2115
List, qu. 1349
Res. (Sir Sam Hughes) Political patronage; amendments to Civil Service Act; Civil Service Commission; appointments in cities and rural districts; census commissioners and enumerators, 829
Clapp, Miss S., 1332
Condensed milk, tax, 3737
Cooper, Col. John A., qu. 697
Dairy Products Grading Bill, 4442
De Martigny divorce, 3765
Dominion Elections Act Amdt. Bill, 4247-8
Elections in France, 1552
Highways
Construction in Ontario, 4290-4306
Width, 4306
Judges
Exchequer Court and Grand Trunk arbitration, 1084
Superannuation and retirement, 1082
Justice Department
Lawyers in, 1077
Purchasing agents, 1079, 1115
Live stock breeding, 1116
Militia supplies, sale of, 1098
National Catholic Labour Unions, 1647
Post Office Act Amdt. Bill, 2121
Roumanian loan, interest, qu. 2344
Senate and House of Commons Act Amdt. Bill (Ministers and directorships) 593
Unemployment and immigration, 1356
Welland canal, sand contracts, qu. 600

Provinces doing business, and taxation, 3705-6, 3742

Provincial Legislation, reports on, 2373

Provincial Responsibility. *See* Housing

Provincial Rights. *See* Canadian Bar Association; Lake of the Woods

Publications, Government, 1438
Editorial Committee, annual report, 901

Public Accounts Committee, 3582, 4105
Motion for reference to Com., 1069
Report, 397

Public Buildings
Estimates, 4090
Ottawa. *See also* that title
Charwomen, 4092
Elevator attendants, 4090
Nova Scotia, 2737-42
Toronto customs house, 4095
Yukon, 4096

Public Documents, Destruction of. *See* Printing Bureau

Public Harbours. *See* Canada Shipping Act; Harbours and Rivers

Public Money, voting of. *See* Canadian National Railways; Estimates; Supply

Public Ownership of Railways, 381, 1187, 1196. *See also* Canadian National Railways

Public Printing and Stationery Department. *See* Printing Bureau

Public Records, provision for, 2947

Public Service Retirements. *See* Civil Service Retirement

Public Works
Bridges. *See* Bridges
Demobilization, 3989
Department
Accounts, paying of, 1606
Salaries, 2680, 2736, 2808, 2945, 4070, 4079
District Engineers' Office, Edmonton, 4535
Engineering Branch, reorganization, 4079
North Sydney, officials, 2817
Expenditures, 4101
Property, protection of. *See* Criminal Code Amendment Bill
Rents, repairs, etc., 3989
Shipbuilding, 1858. *See also* that title
Transfer of District Engineer's Office, Chatham-St. John, 4081

Pulp and Paper Industry, 873, 875. *See also* Natural Resources; Research
Freight rates on, 2511
Pulpwood, exportation, 3513, 3744

Punishments, Excessive or Inadequate. *See* Criminal Code Amdt. Bill

Purchasing Agents, 1079
Canadian National Railways, 1659

Purchasing Commission, 1080, 2015, 2142, 2163, 2190, 2287
Authority for appointment, 1114
Canadian National Railways, 1659

Purchasing Commission—*Con.*
Closure, notice of, 2025
Creation of by Order in Council, 551
Limit of $5,000 without tender, 1101
Members of, 2016
Militia supplies, 2239
M. (Mr. Lemieux) to strike out item, 2108; amended 2020
Penitentiary supplies, 1097, 1108
Post Office, 4527
Public Works, 2681-3
Staff of, 1113
Surplus War supplies, disposal of, qu. 736
Tenders, statute providing for, 1105

Pure-bred Cattle. *See* Health of Animals; Live Stock

"Pussyfoot" Johnston, 902

Quaker Oats Company, 2954-76, 3544. *See also* Trent Canal

Quarantine. *See also* Health; Immigration Stations, 3128
Halifax, 2754-68
Partridge Island, 2808-15
Typhus, 4170

Quebec (City)
Arsenal, bonus to employees, 2113, 2782
Canada Temperance Act, 4382
Citadel, 1441
Elevators, 282, 1443
Employees, Militia, dismissal of, 2237
Fiset, Dr. Michel, qu. 963, qu. 4523
Fortifications, ancient. Res. (Mr. Power) 967; withdrawn, 970
Immigration buildings, 2757
Immigration officers, qu. 1131
Mail collection and delivery, qu. 576
Post Office, 4523
Riots of 1918
M. (Mr. Casgrain) 974
M. (Mr. Lavigueur) for compensation, 282
Mr. (Mr. Parent) 1503; neg. on division, 1518
St. Charles dam, 281
Transcontinental Railway workshops, 281

Quebec (Port)
Canadian Government Merchant Marine
Discrimination against, 1965
Unfair treatment by, 1271
Elevator, 1443
Equipment, 687
Park St. Charles Company, proposed payment, 4570
Repairing of ships at, 1986
Shipbuilding, 1972
Transcontinental Railway facilities, 280
Wharves, 3977

Quebec (Province), qu. 570
Attitude towards Government, 551, 3216. *See also* Address
Census commissioners, 832
Highways in, 2098, 2344, 3025, 3029-34, 4305-13-33
Increased representation, 391
Judicial district, judges, 1081
Vice-Admiralty district, 1084-6
Labour in. *See* National Catholic Labour Unions
Natural resources, 875
Salmon fishery, qu. 1381, 2104, qu. 2506, 4040, 4341

Quebec and Saguenay Railway
Mileage, 1005
Station agents, qu. 696, 963

Quebec and Western Railway, qu. 573

Quebec Bloc, 3216

Quebec Bridge, 1653, 1670

Quebec Conference. *See* Ministers

Quebec-Montreal Pilots, Superannuation, qu. 1501. *See also* Pilotage

Quebec Oriental and Atlantic Railway, qu. 573

Quebec Salvage and Wrecking Company, Limited, 1990

Quebec Steamship Company, 2775, 2941
Petition presented, 3005

Queen's University. *See* Research

Questions, inquiry as to, 1502. *See also* House of Commons

Questions Passed as Orders for Returns, 578, 605, 606, 698, 839, 967, 1002, 1238, 1350, 1625, 1674, 1821, 2029, 2099, 2376, 2625, 2687, 2821, 3090, 3830, 3905

Quinlan and Robertson, 1972

Railway Act Amendment Bill (Inland Shipping Rates)
1r., 1497, order for 2r., stands, 2557

Railway Act Amendment Bill (Discrimination in rates) 1r., 1232-33

Railway Adjustment Board, 4547

Railway Commission
Cases before, 3021
Chief Commissioner, 451, 1690, 1725, 3017
Speech of with reference to Canadian National Railways, 1202, qu. 2029
Fuel Control, 2944
Inland Merchant Shipping, and, 1497. *See* Railway Act Amdt. Bill

Railway Commission—*Con.*
Maintenance and operation, 3016
Members, 3016
National Transcontinental Railway, fire protection, 4337
Railway mail service, 4517
Railway rates, and, 1803

Railway Problems. *See* Canadian National Railways, Special Committee

Railways, 484, 3014, 4131. For individual railways see their titles
Canadian National Railways. *See* that title
Canadian Northern and Grand Trunk bonds, qu. 837
Car shortage, 512, 548, 3541, 4322
Charges on dining cars, 921
Coal for, duty, 1183-4
Coal mines in the United States, 4317
Competition, 1181
Deficit, 1577, 1585, 1946
Employees, income tax, 4353
Employees' wages, 1803
Export freight rates, 1224
Financial condition of, 1574
Freight cars for coal, 1254
Freight rates, 1009
Coal on, 1249, 1976. *See also* Fuel Supply
Government. *See also* Canadian National Railways
Auditing by Auditor General, 1189
Lack of information, 1336
Ships, and, 1730
Grand Trunk. *See* that title
Locomotives
Cost of, 1587
Obsolete, 1587
Roumania and Greece, for, qu. 1236
Losses generally, 1008
Mail Service. *See* Post Office
Management. *See* Canadian National Railways
Merging of, 3308
Minister of and administration of Canadian National Railways, 1190
Party politics, and, 1179
Public ownership, 508
Quebec, Oriental & Atlantic and Quebec and Western Railways, qu. 573
Railway Commission, under, 3017
Requirements for, purchasing, 1610
Securities, provincial guarantees, qu. 2619
Situation generally, 1007, 3406
Statistics, qu. 3422
Taxation, 1008
Tourist traffic, 4495
Traffic and government ships, 1936
Utilization of, 844

Railways and Canals, Department of, 3014
Annual report, 697
Buckley, Mr. Charles P., qu. 966
Law costs, 3015
Minister of, duties, 1663
Outside service, 1665
Printing and stationery, 4335
Salaries, 1652, 3014, 4131, 4288

Railways and Shipping Committee. *See also* Canadian National Railways, Special Committee
M. for Standing Com. on (Mr. A. K. Maclean) 1555, 1582-3

Railways, Canals and Telegraph Lines, Committee, 1174, 2247, 2708, 3005

"Rainbow" and "Niobe." *See* Ballantyne; "Niobe"

Rates. *See* Railways, Freight; Shipping
Discrimination in. *See* Railway Act Amdt. Bill

Real Estate. *See* Housing

Reciprocity Agreement with the United States, 268, 297, 1487. *See also* Address; Budget, Customs and Excise Dept. Bill Amdt. to Supply (Mr. Fielding) 2038; neg. 2075, 2393

Reclamation. *See also* Natural Resources
Dominion lands, 4495
Moose Range area, 871

Recorder's Court Jurisdiction. *See* Criminal Code Amdt. Bill

Record Office. *See* Militia

Redemption of Gold. *See* Currency; Gold

Redistribution. *See* Address; Budget; Proportional Representation

Redlich on Procedure, 1675

Redman, Mr. D. L. (East Calgary)
Fuel Supply problem, 1253
Highway grants—Alberta, qu. 1821
Oil bounties, 1418
Tobin, Mr. W. J., qu. 1133

Re-Establishment, 314. *See* Returned Soldiers; Housing
Special Committee, final report, 4041

Referendum. *See* Prohibition Plebiscite

Reformatories. *See* Prisons and Reformatories

Refrigerator Cars for Transportation of fish, 1038

Regina
Indian Commissioner at, 2167-9

Regional Exhibitions. *See* Agricultural Shows

Registered Parcels, Insurance, 1619. *See also* Post Office Act Amdt. Bill

Registrars. *See* Bankruptcy Act Amdt. Bill; Judges

Regulations, Oil and Gas, 894. *See also* Oil and Gas, Petroleum

Reid, Hon. J. D. (Minister of Railways and Canals)
Annual railway statement, 1004
Business of the House
Estimates, alleged agreement, 4532, 4569
Canadian Government Merchant Marine, 1702
Statement to be made, 902
Canadian National Railways
Betterments, 4317
Board of Directors, 4314
Box cars ordered, 331
Canadian Government railways—vote of $7,000,000 for working expenditure, 4335
Canadian Northern Railway Company, 3049
Loan of $50,000,000 to, 3037
Car shortage, 4323
Claims against, 1658
Coal mines in the United States, 4317
Correspondence with directors, 1003
Deficit, 4319
Electrification, 4328
Employees, 1735
Reduction in number, 1851
Expenditure, 1616, 1662
Fire claims in Shelburne county, 4569
Flavelle, Sir Joseph, 4142, 4314
Fort William terminals, 3052
French language, 4331
Halifax and South Western line, 3053
Lockeport extension, 4324
Hudson Bay Railway, 985
Information, 1782
Intercolonial Railway, 1655
Land at Lévis, 1849
Transcontinental, and, management, 1189
Joliette bridge, 4322
Joliette county, 3038
Loan of $50,000,000 to Canadian Northern, 3037
McAdoo award, 4325
Management of, 1440, 1654
Manitoba, construction, 3053
Maritime Provinces, improved facilities, 4568

Reid, Hon. J. D.—*Con.*
Canadian National Railways—*Con.*
Monastery station, 4325
Operating results, 4318
Operation, cancellation of trains, 1004
Portland terminal, 4317
Rails, price of, 1852
Special Committee, reference to, M. (Mr. Meighen) 1771-4
Tenders for coal and ties, 1772
Transcontinental, forest protection, 4337
Transfer of rails to France, 4569
Western lines, 3039, 3048
Canal tolls, 2962
Fuel control, 2944
Government ships, 1731
Governor General's cars, 3037
Grain transportation rates, 2967
Grand Trunk arbitration, expenses, 4355
Grand Trunk loan, 4131-69, 4314-34
Grand Trunk railway
Lines in United States, 4326
Portland terminus, 1384
Great Lakes-St. Lawrence waterway, 690, 740
Halifax Graving dock, 1698
Highways, 3030, 4289-4313
Construction, 3127, 3036
Expenditure on, 3024
Inspectors, 3023
Projected roads, 3026
Work on, 1661, 1664
Purchasing agents, 1660, 1670
Questions, answers to, 1502
Railway Commission, 3016, 3020
Cases before, 3021
Railway department
Auditors, 1661-70
Deputy Minister, 1665
Estimates, procedure in, 1666
Officials, 1654, 1660, 1672
Staff reduction, 1672
Travelling auditors, 1661
Railway estimates, 1652; 2953
Railways
Annual report, 1770
Congress, 3023
Items in supply, 3015
Law costs, 3015
Politics, 1771
Railway Commission, under, 3017
Traffic and Government ships, 1936
Red Deer river line, 3048
Returned soldiers, employment on Welland canal, 3001
St. John and Quebec Railway Bill, extension of time, 2030, 2152-7
Soldier Settlement Board, Maritime Provinces, 4532

Reid, Hon. J. D.—*Con.*
Tariff investigation report, 3055
Trent canal, 2953-60, 2606-17
Welland canal, 2025, 2966-3003

Reid, Mr. John F. (Mackenzie)
Address in reply to Governor General's Speech, 329; congratulations to Prime Minister; leaders who were born on the farm; new name for an old party; Government allied to big interests, 329; Mr. G. M. Murray and the press; Hudson Bay railway; Canadian National Railways, scarcity of cars, 330; grain blockade, United Grain Growers, Limited; National Progressive party, 331; business methods of the company; Mr. Guthrie's charges, 332; Mr. Rice Jones; names and birthplaces of directors; American settlers and goods, 333; Progressive movement not confined to Western Canada, 334
Agricultural implements, 3492
Bonds, War, Victory, tax free and taxable, qu. 2821
Briquetting plant at Bienfait, qu. 672
Budget, 3388. Comment on speech of Mr. Cowan; Agrarian and Liberal parties, 3389; economy in expenditure, 3390; tariff on agricultural implements; Canadian National Railways and freight rates, 3392; tariff revision; Grain Growers Guide, 3393; attitude of Government towards big interests, 3395; sales tax, 3396
Canadian National Railways
Grading in western provinces, qu. 570
Canadian Wheat Board, 2117, 2158
Cattle clubs, 1120
Cattle embargo, 717
Civil Service
Bonus, 2110
Civil Service Act Amdt. Bill, 2879-80
Civil Service (Res. Sir Sam Hughes) Political patronage in; Civil Service Federation; Saskatchewan Customs Association; National Progressive party; Federal Union No. 66, 822; Board of Hearing; Printing Bureau, 823; British Civil Service, no fault to find with appointments, 824
Cold storage plants, 1040
Distribution of pure-bred stock in Saskatchewan, qu. 1236
Emigration, United States to, 3068
Hudson Bay railway, 991
Immigration
Expenditure, qu. 2943
Immigrants, care of, 3069
Income tax, qu. 3422

Reid, Mr. John F.—*Con.*
Live stock commission men, bonding of, 1124
Natural Resources, transfer to western provinces, 2539-45
Opium and Narcotic Drugs, 2266
Parliament buildings, 3995
Pensions Act Amdt. Bill, 4365-71
Pensions, widowed mothers, 4371
Post Office Act Amdt. Bill, 2123
Public buildings—Nova Scotia, 2771
Returned soldiers, housing, unemployment, 4365-8
Ross rifle, 2784
Sales tax collections, qu. 2506, qu. 3830
Trent canal, construction, 2987
United States, emigration to, 3066
Vancouver island railways, qu. 3422
Yorkton Judicial district, 1080

Reid Newfoundland Company, 1486

Religious and Racial Questions. *See* York-Sunbury

Religious Holidays. *See* Civil Service; Post Office

Reindeer and Musk Ox
Arctic regions, report on, 2940, 4543
Economic value of, 841, 871

"Reno" of Canada, 4474

Rentals, of buildings, 3989, 4092-6

Reorganization. *See* Civil Service

Reparations. *See* Germany; League of Nations; War

Reports Tabled, 3, 39, 107, 150, 188, 229, 258, 350, 397, 562, 597, 643, 788, 836, 962, 1001, 1069, 1174, 1347, 1380, 1496, 1619, 2027, 2095, 2247, 2566, 2889, 3146, 3259, 3582, 3697, 3971, 4041, 4105, 4340, 4449, 4541

Representation. *See* Proportional Representation

Representation in Parliament, 1293
Amdt. (Mr. King) in Supply, neg. 1329

Research. *See also* Natural Resources; National Research Institute
Advisory Council, 150, 341, 1426, 2688
Scientific and Industrial Research Bureau, 169, 2144

Research Council Act Amdt. Bill
1r., 2566; 2r., 2688; com., 2701, 2892; 3r., 2897

Resignations. *See* House of Commons

Responsibility to Parliament. *See* Government

Restaurant. *See* Parliamentary Restaurant

Retail Merchants Association and Sales Tax, 3446

Retiring Allowances. *See* Judges Act Amdt. Bill

Returned Soldiers. *See also* Civil Service; Dominion Lands; Pensions; Re-establishment; Soldiers' Settlement; Unemployment
Canteen funds, 4050
Census commissioners, 2097
Civil Service and, 963, 2828-38-49-53-68-81, qu. 3259, qu. 3531
Preference in, 4482
Civil Service Act, Amdts. proposed by Pensions Com., 4257
Employment on Welland canal, 3001
Gratuity—estimate of cost by Mr. Thomas Cox, 3559
Handicap, problem and tuberculosis cases, 4050
Highways, employment on, 3033
Housing, 4362-8
Loan, 4552
Insurance, 4355, 4361
Insurance Act, 629. *See also* Pensions
Land for, 1344
Military training, 3279
Pensions, 4361. *See also* that title
Prospecting for minerals, 871
Re-establishment, 4361. *See also* that title
Relief for, 2688
Shipbuilding and, 1273, 1727, 1903, 1921, 1974. *See also* that title
Special Committee moved, 731, agreed to, 733
Mr. Sutherland substituted for Mr. Peck, 788
Quorum, 901
Statement by Prime Minister, 4361
Sympathy with, 1903-4
Unemployment, 4048, 4361. *See also* that title
Relief in Peterboro, qu. 4253

Returned Soldiers Insurance Act Amdt. Bill
Res. 4260; 1r., 4262; 2r., com., 4355; 3r., 4361
Sections and subjects discussed:
Annuity, 4356
Assignment of pension, 4355
Commencement of Act, 4357
Death of beneficiary during lifetime of insured, 4355

Returned Soldiers Insurance Act Amdt. Bill—*Con.*
Sections and Subjects discussed—*Con.*
Insurance and limits thereof, 4355
Mercantile Marine, officers and seamen, 4357
Old age and sickness insurance, 4357

Returns. *See* House of Commons

Reuter's and Imperial News Service, qu. 564

Revenue Bills
1. Customs and Excise Department Bill
Res. 3785; 1r., 3822; 2r., com., 4388; 3r., 4453
2. Customs Tariff Act, 1907, Amdt. Bill
Res. 3698; 1r., 3725; 2r., com., 3938; 3r., 3955
3. Income Tax Act Consolidation Bill. 1r., 4251; 2r., com., 4343; 3r., 4355
4. Inland Revenue Act Amdt. Bill
Res. 3726; 1r., 3733; 2r., com., 3r., 3955
5. Special War Revenue Act Amdt. Bill
Res. 3733, 3741; 1r., 3758; 2r., 3955; com., 3955-3958; 3r., 3958

Revising Officer. *See* Dominion Elections Act Amdt. Bill

Rhodes, Hon. Edgar N. *See* Speaker

Rice Jones, Mr. Cecil, Vice-President and General Manager, United Grain Growers, 289, 290, 333, 417, 3180, 3492

Richards, Mr. T. H., veterinary inspector, 1063

Riddell, Mr. Justice, payments to, qu. 1500

Right of Ministers to Sit in Either Chamber. *See* Ministers

Riley, Mr. R. T., 1609-10; 3610. *See also* Canadian National Railways

Rimouski
County Fairs, 1240
Customs office, qu. 839
Experimental station, 954

Rinfret, Mr. Fernand (St. James)
Address in reply to Governor General's Speech, 120; Prime Minister—right of Government to retain power, 120; formation of a new party to take place of Unionism—its misleading name, 121; the Prime Minister's Sherbrooke and Granby speeches, 122; by-elections; non-confidence amendment, 124; argument of Prime Minister analyzed; census and redistribution, 125; tariff; League of Nations; clamor for general election

Rinfret, Mr. Fernand—*Con.*
Budget, 3651. Dr. Tolmie and dry dock at Esquimalt, 3651; Prime Minister's discussion of the tariff, 3652; Tariff Commission and revision of tariff, 3653; St. James by-election, 3655; customs duties and rate of exchange; deficits and expenditures, 3656
Copyright Amdt. and Consolidation Bill, 3835-49
Dominion Iron and Steel Company contracts, qu. 733
Exchange, value for duty, qu. 733
Excise officers and sales tax, 3955
Foreign decorations to Canadians, qu, 1132
German goods, holdback, qu. 1350
Government candidates, 3336
Immigration, 2579-2602
Importations from Germany, qu. 696, qu. 838
Income tax collections
For 1919, qu. 3422
For 1920, qu. 2821
Insurance against sickness, 2554
Loans, tax exempt, qu. 575
Member making serious charge should retract, 1904
Montreal Inland Revenue offices, qu. 1820
Taxation, mutual insurance companies, qu. 605
National Research Institute, 2894
Naval Service, maintenance, 2107
"Niobe" and "Rainbow," sale, 4012-30
Pierreville postmistress, qu. 2624
Post offices in Canada, qu. 1233
Prime Ministers' Conference, 2677
Sales tax, 3955
Shipbuilding, 1898, 1908, 1926, 2094
Estimates, manner of bringing down, 1937
Holt, Sir Herbert, comment on, 1900
Unemployment, and immigration, 1367

Riordon Company. *See* Gilmour and Hughson

Riots. *See* Quebec Riots

Rivers and Streams Act. *See* Lake of the Woods

Roads, 3986. *See also* Bridges; Highways

Robb, Mr. James A. (Chateauguay-Huntingdon)
Agriculture, grasshopper plague, 1028, 1030
Business of the House
British practice as to, 1026
Canadian Government Merchant Marine
Preference to Canadian goods, 1280

Robb, Mr. James A.—*Con.*
Canadian National Railways
Transfer of rails to France, 4569
Canadian Wheat Board, 2116
Cattle embargo, 730
Cattle feeds, exemption of, 3746
Chief Justice, income tax and, 1565
Civil Service Act Amdt. Bill, 2778
Crushed grain, 3745
Customs and Excise Dept. Bill, brokers, 4432
Customs duties, increase in, 597
Dairy Produce Grading Bill, 3760
Estimates, supplementary, inquiry, 4070
Flax industry, 1404
Foodstuffs, tax on, 3736
Freight losses, 1658
Fruit inspectors, 1046
Grain trade, investigation of, 2116
Grand Trunk Arbitration Bill, 2563
Hungry Bay road, 1660
Immigration, 2582-94
Imported goods, marking of, 3714, 3723
Indian "Shows" for distinguished visitors, 2169
Interim Supply Bill, 2115
International Trade Conference, qu. 2029, 2151
Judges Act Amdt. Bill, 2118
Maple Products Act, 1920, Amdt. Bill, 2559
Montreal Harbour Commission Bill, 2160
Oleomargarine Act Amdt. Bill, 3759, 3850-96; Amdt. 3896
Politics—participation in by railway employees, 4502
Post Office Act Amdt. Bill, 2120
Province trading subject to taxation, 3705
Quebec Union Electric Telephone Company, 3421
Senate and House of Commons Act Amdt. Bill (Ministers and directorships) 656
Sheridan, Mr. John, resignation and reinstatement, 2173, 4502-5
Special War Revenue Act Amdt. Bill
Containers, tax on, 3754
Flour, 3755
Lumber, 3751-2, 3756
Trade agents, 1225
Trent canal, 2610-12
Unemployment and immigration, 1363
West Indies trade, 1271

Robertson, Hon. Senator G. D., 536. *See also* Labour, Minister of; Ministers

Roberval, air station, 3779

Robson, Judge, 3606. *See also* Board of Commerce

Robson, Mrs., and Immigration Department, 3058

Roche, Dr. *See* Civil Service Bill

Rockefeller Institute, 1433. *See also* Research

Rockefeller Interests and Mr. King. *See* Lapointe, Mr.

Rodrique, Mr. Didace, qu. 3208

Rondeau Harbour, 3975

Root Vegetables.. Res. withdrawn, 4343

Ross, Mr. D. C. (West Middlesex)
Budget, 3531. Reciprocity agreement great boon to Canada, 3532; attitude of various members on Budget, 3533; Minister of Militia and tariff reform; military expenditure, 3537
Customs—Strathroy office, 3085
Fuel supply problem, 1255
Harbours and rivers, estimates, 3980-1
Inspection of Gas and Gas Meters Bill, 618
Lake of the Woods Regulation Bill, 4187-91
Newfoundland steamship service, 1486
Parliament buildings, 3995
Railway Commission, members, 3019
Steamship passengers, 1495
Trade with Australia and South Africa, 1468
West Indies steamship service, 1490

Ross Rifle, 2783-7
Statement of Rev. Canon Scott, qu. 599

Rotation of Crops, 1033. *See* Agriculture

Roumania. *See also* Loans
Loan to, 478, 1441, 3444, 3811, 4430
Greece and, qu. 1236, 3563, 3611, 3620, 3661
Dominion Canners, purchases, qu. 1001, 1072
Interest on, 1072, qu. 2030, qu. 2344
Sale of military supplies to, 2245, 3564

Routhier, Late Judge, 1085-6

Rowell, Hon. N. W. (Durham)
Address in reply to Governor General's Speech, 110; League of Nations and Assembly at Geneva, 110; co-operation to prevent armed conflict; Covenant of League; public rights and wrongs in international affairs; war, or threat of war, concern of all nations, 111; purposes and functions of League; some phases of the work at Geneva, 112; constitutional questions;

Rowell, Hon. N. W.—*Con.*
Address—*Con.*
budget to be submitted annually; Council to report to Assembly; relations between Council and Assembly; Article XXIII, 113; vote to be not of a delegate but of the state he represents; proposed amendments to Covenant, 114; monopolies in and distribution of raw materials; admission of new states, Austria and Bulgaria, 116; questions of principle; case of Albania; minorities treaties, 117; Russian situation, 118; United States; attitude of representatives of self-governing minorities, 119; admission of Germany, 119
Canada-West Indies Trade Agreement, 2257
Canadian representation in the United States, 2394-2408
League of Nations, 110
Contribution towards, 2357
Letter of International Joint Commission, 691
Permanent Court of International Justice, 2722-24
Prime Ministers' Conference, 2647-67
Resignation of, 4340

Roy Building, Halifax, qu. 3089

Royal. *See* North American Insurance

Royal Assent, 486, 2160, 2899, 4578

Royal Bank of Canada
Canadian Government Merchant Marine and, 1719

Royal Canadian Mounted Police Act Amdt. Bill (Fines and forfeitures)
1r., 2343; 2r., com., 2481; 3r., 2486

Royal Canadian Mounted Police
Dominion police force, withdrawal from, qu. 601
Recruits from England, qu. 601
Strength, 2798-2800
Thorold, qu. 574

Royal Canadian Navy. *See* Naval Service

Royal Commissioners. *See* Judges Act Amdt. Bill

Royal Mail Steam Packet Company, 1712, 1714, 1870. *See also* Canadian Government Merchant Marine

Royal Military College, 2802
Road, 3973

Royalty. *See* Copyright

Ruddick, Mr. J. A., 1036

Rule 17C. *See* House of Commons, Estimates

Rulings. *See* Deputy Speaker; Speaker

Rural Homes. *See* Housing

Rural Mail. *See also* Post Office
Boxes, number of, qu. 1235
Carriers, qu. 964
Contractors, 3507
Delivery, 1156
Routes, qu. 605
Rural postmasters, 2829-33-41-84. *See also* Civil Service; Post Office

Russia
Currency, 1072
Flax. *See* that title
Trade with, 1003, 1072, 1224

Ruttan, Dr. *See* Research

St. Alexis, station, qu. 2375, qu. 3582

Ste Anne de la Pocatiere
Destruction of library at, 1075
Illustration station, 948

St. Antoine, Montreal, representation of, qu. 577, 1069, 1070, 1293, 1295. *See also* Ames

St. Antoine, wharf, 2616

St. Augustin station, qu. 695, 3018

St. Catherine's Bay-Tadoussac service, 4530

St. Charles de Bellechasse, 1801

St. Charles River dam, 282

St. Croix wharf, 2616

St. Foy
Artesian well, 1659
Engine house, 767, 840, 967, qu. 1501, 1502, 1659. *See also* Canadian National Railways

St. Francis Harbour, 3990

St. Francis River, 1992, 1995

St. Francois du Lac
Electoral list, 3468
Lemieux, Mr., Speech at, 3528

St. Hyacinthe
Inland Revenue collector, Dr. A. P. Cartier, 3821, qu. 3904
Shops, qu. 2821

St. Jean post office receipts, qu. 576

St. Joachim-St. Simeon highway, 3026

St. John (City)
Belyea, Mr., retirement of, 3082
Representation, 3171-2
Vacancy, 1293

St. John (Harbour and Port) 4097
Facilities for potato shipments, 3443
Harbour, 4097
Improvements, qu. 1383, 4078
Partridge Island quarantine station, 2808

St. John and Quebec Railway, qu. 1501, 4564

St. John and Quebec Railway Bill (Extension of time)
1r., 2030, 2097; 2r., com., 2152; 3r., 2157

St. John Rolling Mills. *See* "Niobe" and "Rainbow"

St. Lawrence, Gulf of
Fishing in, 1038

St. Lawrence Navigation Company, 1981

St. Lawrence River. *See also* Canals; Great Lakes-St. Lawrence
Coal trade, 1494
Conservation Commission, 3960-8-70
Diversion of water, 186
Dredges and tugs, qu. 568. *See also* Dredges
Power development, 1252, 1263
Route and Channel
Deepening, qu. 2028
Development, 674, 691, 1252-63
Dredging, qu. 568, 1991, 4541
Navigation for coal vessels, 1260, 1854. *See also* Fuel Supply; Great Lakes-St. Lawrence
Sorel shipyards, qu. 568, 1992, qu. 2618

St. Malo shops, 1017

St. Michel wharf, res. 967, 3991

St. Pascal, domestic science school, 1075

St. Roch, Upper Crossing light, qu. 1383

St. Romuald post office building, qu. 577, 604

Ste. Rose de Watford, mail contract, qu. 3209

St. Simon station agent, qu. 3208

St. Thomas de Pierreville, postmistress. *See* Pierreville

St. Valier wharf, qu. 965

St. Vincent de Paul. *See* Penitentiaries

Sackville public building, 2816

Saguenay river, crossing of, 1822

Sailors, Sick, care of, 3129. *See also* Health

Sales Tax. *See* Special War Revenue; Taxation

Salmon. *See* Fisheries; Privy Council

San Jose scale, 1028

Sandy Beach wharf, qu. 965

Saskatchewan
Clay deposits for pottery, 3384-5
Co-operative Creameries, Limited, 1040
Co-operative Elevator Company, 391
Fish-breeding, 2185
Grasshopper plague, 1027
Highways, qu. 1820, 4307
Penitentiary. *See* Penitentiaries
Pure-bred animals in, qu. 1236
Representation in Senate, 2567

Saskatoon, Canadian National engines, qu. 3090, 3903

Saturday Night, comment on shipbuilding, 1968

Savard, Mr. Edmond (Chicoutimi-Saguenay)
Address in reply to Governor General's Speech, 554; speech a "meagre dish"; non-confidence amendment justified; Government has lost confidence of country; by-elections—Government's mandate exhausted; precedents, 555; Liberal leaders record; Borden Government, 556
Chicoutimi
Customs collector, qu. 698
Pier, qu. 967
Murray Bay-Tadoussac steamship service, 1824
Rimouski customs office, qu. 839
Shipbuilding, 1969

"Scandinavian," smallpox on, 1498, 1556

Scientific Institutions, 4494

Scientific Research. *See* Research

Scott, Mr. F. S. (South Waterloo)
Address in reply to Governor General's Speech, 324; congratulations to Prime Minister; speech of Mr. Crerar; railway situation, economy in administration; financial situation in Ontario; Government's mandate; general elec-

Scott, Mr. F. S.—*Con.*
Address—*Con.*
tion, 325; business men opposed to dissolution; the amendment; confidence of the country; defections from Government; dissolution should be decided by Government not by leader of Opposition; Opposition and Agrarian party; Mr. Gauthier and province of Quebec, 327; Mr. Clark (Red Deer) and Liberal party, 328

Scott, Mr. W. D., and Immigration Dept., 3058

Scott Act, petition for suspension, 3584, 4382. *See also* Canada Temperance Act

Scottish Canadian Trust Company. *See* North American Trust

Screenings, 3182. *See* Elevators; Grain

Scrub Cattle. *See* Live Stock

Seamen, Sick, care of, 3129. *See also* Health

Search Warrants. *See* Bankruptcy Act Amdt. Bill

Searls, Mr. George, Chief Grain Inspector, 1444

Secretary of State. *See also* External Affairs
Enemy debts, demobilization, 4534
Estimates, 4557

Sedition
Esmonde, Mr. Osmonde Grattan, arrest for, 1556

Seed and Feed Control, 1125, 4513

Seed Fairs, 1126

Seed Grain
Advances, 4498
Inspectors, qu. 1624
Purchase, 4506

Seed Purchasing Commission, 1126

Seguin, Mr. P. A. (L'Assomption-Montcalm)
Budget, 3668. Administration of public business, 3668; tariff commission; tobacco-growing, 3668-9
Income tax—instructions in French, qu. 2624
L'Assomption
Experimental station, 918, 946
Pierreville postmistress, qu. 2624
Point of order—attack on members, 1904
Religious holidays, qu. 1499
Shipbuilding, 1916

Select Standing Committees. *See* House of Commons

Selkirk wharf, 3976

Senate
Age limit, 1171
Committee, leave for Mr. Crerar to attend, 3259
Free Conference—Judges Act Amdt. Bill, 3972, 4040, 4061, report 4250
Government representation in. *See* Ministers
Governor General—Address to on retirement, 4493
Macdonald, Hon. Senator, appointment, qu. 577
Members of to have seats in Commons. *See* Ministers
Members should be elected, 1163
Ministers in. *See* Labour; Postmaster General
Paintings in, qu. 566
Printing of Senate Bills, 3938
Reform, 389. *See also* Ministers
Representation of Saskatchewan, 2567

Senate and House of Commons Act Amdt. Bill (Ministers and directorships)
1r., 258; M. for 2r., 585, 650, neg. 665

Serbia
Consul at Montreal, qu. 605

Serbian Government, Dr. Burnham and M. (Mr. Lemieux) for papers, 1520

Sessional Employees. *See* Civil Service Retirement Act Amdt. Bill

Settlers' Relief, 4498

Sex Offences. *See* Criminal Code Amdt. Bill

Sexsmith, Mr. J. A. (East Peterborough)
Civil Service Act Amdt. Bill, 4283
Dairy Produce Grading Bill, 4442
Highways, 3031
Metal, 4307-8
Illustration farms and stations in Ontario, 954, 956
Proportional representation, M., 1528
Toronto-Kingston highway, 4306
Trent canal, 2959, 2971-3

Shaughnessy, Lord, 1195, 1896, 3046, 3572
Letter on railway situation, 2503, 2890

Shaw, Mr. H. M. (Macleod)
Address in reply to Governor General's Speech, 383; investigation of grain trade; winter grazing in forest reserves; letter from Mr. George Porter, Maycroft, Alberta; the Government's mandate, 384

Shaw, Mr. H. M.—*Con.*
Blood Indian reserve, qu. 1818, 1819
Canadian Wheat Board, qu. 340
Macleod judicial district, qu. 2344

Sheard, Mr. Charles (South Toronto)
Address in reply to Governor General's Speech, 253; Mr. Gauthier; Imperial Conference; Lord Beaconsfield; Imperial Council, 254; isolation of Quebec; pledges of 1917; no discontent regarding Government; urban and rural representation, 255; the tariff issue; seceding Liberal Unionists; Mr. Pardee; railway policy; Agrarians and free trade, 256; by-elections; union and harmony; Opposition policy, 257

Shediac and Cape Tormentine Railway, 4564

Shell Contracts, 1788

Sherbrooke, Prime Minister's speech at, 3339

Sheridan, Mr. John, Indian Agent
Resignation and reinstatement, 1499, 2173, qu. 2618, 4501-5

Sherwin-Williams Paint Company, profits, 372, 1897, 3484, 3565

Shipbuilding. *See also* Canadian Government Merchant Marine; Labour; Unemployment
Advances at Victoria, qu. 599
Amount required for, 1683, 1858
Assistance to, qu. 603
Auditing, 1933
British Government policy, 1865
Closure, 1979-2094. *See also* that title
Continuation of after the war, 506
Contracts, 1683, 1689
Cancellation, 1726
Cost plus basis, 1910
For steel ships, qu. 565
Details of construction, 1874
Dominion Iron and Steel Company, qu. 733, 1233
Freights, lack of, 1284
Government programme, estimate, 2076
Government shipyard at Sorel, qu. 568, 1992, qu. 2028
Interest on cost, 1886
Labour for, 1889. *See also* Labour
Newspaper comment, 1893, 1900, 1917, 1925, 1934, 1968
Returned soldiers and, 1727, 1909
Royal Bank, remarks of President of, 1900
Sinking fund, 1885
Steel and, 1876, 1884
Tonnage depreciation in value of, 1734
Trade routes, 1888

Shipbuilding—*Con.*
Unemployment, 1882, 1897, 1902, 1909. *See also* that title
Victoria, qu. 599
Wooden ships, 1711

Shipping. *See* Canadian Government Merchant Marine; Canals; Great Lakes; Shipbuilding
British Chamber of, 1716
Flag, recognition in foreign waters, 786
Great Britain and, 3236
Inland, 745, 1497, 2192
Rates, 2963-9
Ocean, decline in, 1273
Special Committee. *See* Canadian National Railways
Tonnage into Canadian ports, 3650
United States discrimination in tonnage dues, qu. 697

Ships
Deadweight value per ton, 1702
Private control of, 1717
Publicly-owned, disposal of, 1718
Repairing at Quebec, 1986
Steel plates for, 1233

Shipyards. *See also* Shipbuilding; Sorel
Construction at, 1927
Government loans to, 1883
Vickers, 1967

Shortt, Professor Adam, 799. 2948. *See also* Civil Service

Sick and Distressed Mariners, 3129, 4039

Sickness, Insurance against, 4357
M. (Mr. Rinfret) withdrawn, 2554

Sifton, Late Right Hon. Arthur, tributes to, 3, 153

Sifton, Sir Clifford, and immigration, 3245

Silver, discovery at Kino Hill, Yukon, 856

Simpson, Mr. T. W. (West Algoma)
Natural resources, 872
Pulpwood, 3744

Sinclair, Mr. J. E. (Queen's, P.E.I.)
"Brant," steamer, 1982
Budget, 3470. Liberal party's record when in power; comparative tables of imports, 3471; average customs duty on imports, 3472; tariff issue; Prince Edward Island, potato growing, 3473; high freight rates, 3474; York-Sunbury election; record of Government during war, 3475
Cold storage plants, 1041

Sinclair, Mr. J. E.—*Con.*
Co-operative marketing of live stock, 1124
Dairy Products Grading Bill, 4439-48
Dominion Lands Act Amdt. Bill, 4066
Dredging, Hillsboro river, 3984
Government shipbuilding programme, 2076
Health of Animals, 4506
Highway construction in Ontario, 4306
Migratory Birds Act, enforcement, 4496
Post Office, Maritime provinces reorganization, 4528
Prince Edward Island Railway, 4566
Soldiers Settlement Board, Maritime provinces, 4532
World's Poultry Congress, 4513

Sinclair, Mr. John H. (Antigonish and Guysborough)
Address in reply to Governor General's Speech, 358; congratulations to Prime Minister; duty of Opposition to criticise; National Liberal and Conservative party; same old party; "strange bedfellows"; Cabinet changes; retrenchment, 359; practical suggestions; nation builders and nation wreckers, 360; Dominion Franchise Act; withdrawals from Government, 361; tariff of special interests, revenue, protection; Mr. Calder's change of heart, 363; Liberals and Farmers; hazards of the farmers' calling; prices of farm produce, 365; price-fixing; forces of progress must unite; big interests behind Government, 366; amendment a challenge to Government, 367
Air Board, 3785
Alcohol for medicinal purposes, 3957-58
Amherst drill hall, 2739
Auditor General's report, 597, 913
Blue books, printing of, 1485
Camp Borden, aeroplanes, qu. 1820
Canada-West Indies Trade Agreement, 2259-62
Canadian Government Merchant Marine, 1729, qu. 3089
Information, 1440
Trade routes, 1733
Vessels
"Canadian Beaver," qu. 1673
"Canadian Otter," qu. 1382
"Canadian Recruit," etc., qu. 1381
"Canadian Sapper," 734
Canadian National Railways
Coal purchased, 1763
Freight, Nova Scotia points, qu. 1620
Monastery station, 4324
Mulgrave, ice supply, qu. 963

Sinclair, Mr. John H.—*Con.*
Canso
Harbour, 3983-9
Navigation school, 1989
Civil Service
Bonus, 2109-10
Payments to Arthur Young and Griffenhagen, qu. 4251
Civil Service Retirement Act Amdt. Bill, 2487-2503, 4270-77
Coal trade, 1936
Commercial exhibits, 1227
Copyright Amendment and Consolidation Bill, 3840
Corning, Mr. H., cattle purchases, qu. 1624
Currency Act Amdt. Bill, 2269
Customs and Excise Dept. Bill
Valuation of currency, 3812
Customs and Inland Revenue, overtime, 4123
Customs Tariff Act, 1907, Amdt. Bill
Imported goods—marking, 3712, 3941-54, 3954
Debates, Official report, distribution of, 4560
Dominion and provincial jurisdiction over fisheries, 2105
Dominion Elections Act Amdt. Bill
Polls, hours of, 3095
Qualified voters, 3096
Dominion Lands Act Amdt. Bill, 4065
Dominion notes
Circulation, qu. 1001
Securities, qu. 1383
Dominion securities—grain, 1443
Dredging, 3983
Drydocks, 3987
Editorial Committee, 4560
Estimates on Thursdays and Fridays, Rule 17C, 958, 1026
Export trade, development, 1732
Fish—breeding establishments, 4036
French Trade Agreement, 2135-40
Fumigation of nursery plants, 1031
Grand Trunk Arbitration Bill, 2452-69
Grand Trunk loan, 4162-5, 4317
Grand Trunk Railway, lines in United States, 4326
Half Island Cove, breakwater, 3981
Halifax fishery award, qu. 2191
Harbours and Rivers, estimates, 3976-82
Hoarded liquor, tax on, 3706
Horse breeding, 1120
Intercolonial branch railway in Guysborough county, 4567
Interior Department, editors, 1331
Job printers, taxation, 4123
Judges Act Amdt. Bill, 2118

Sinclair, Mr. John H.—*Con.*
League of Nations, Canada's contribution, 2357
Marine hospitals, 3130-36
Maritime Provinces, improved transportation facilities, 4567
Mercantile Marine, insurance of officers and seamen, 4359
Migratory Birds Act, enforcement, 4497
Military expenditure, 3278
Militia—surveys division, 2243
Montreal Harbour Commission, 2268
Moving picture films, 1226
Mulgrave, ice tenders, qu. 963
Murray, Mr. G. M., qu. 2622
Natural resources and western provinces, 1338
"Niobe" and "Rainbow", sale, 4012-14
Oleomargarine Act Amdt. Bill, 3851-94
Parliament buildings, 3994-8
Partridge Island quarantine station, 2808
Pension Act Amdt. Bill, 4366
Pensions, refusal to soldier disabled by accident, 4366
Permanent Court of International Justice, 2717-21
Pilots, pensions to, 2000
Port Hilford, dredging, 3983
Post Office Act Amdt. Bill, 2124
Post Office
Expenditure, 4521
Reorganization in Maritime Provinces, 4521
Rural mail, carriers, 4523
Public Works engineering branch, 4082-90
Purchasing Commission
Staff of, 1113
Statutory authority to appoint, 1113
Quebec riots, 1516
Returned Soldiers Insurance Act Amdt. Bill, 4359-60
Returns, inquiries for, 1176
Russia, trade with, 1003
St. Francis harbour, 3990
St. John and Quebec Railway Bill, 2152-4
St. Lawrence channel, dredging, 1992
Senate and House of Commons Act Amdt. Bill (Ministers and directorships) 591
Sheridan, Mr. John, resignation and reinstatement, 4504
Shipbuilding, 1858, 1869, 1920, 2085
Contracts, 1683, 1872
Excessive tonnage, 1873
Newspaper comment, 1932
Progress of debate on, 1727
Ships under construction, 1927
Sick mariners, 3130-36
Special War Revenue Act Amdt. Bill
Hospital supplies and medicines, 3957

Sinclair, Mr. John H.—*Con.*
Steamship services, 1493, 1489, 1495
Sugar, importation of, 3702
Swan, Mr. D. D., consulting engineer, 1997
Toronto Customs building, 3772
Trade with Russia, 1003
Trent canal, 2609-13
United States discriminatory tonnage dues, qu. 697
Vessels commandeered, qu. 2943
Victory bonds, expenses, qu. 1620
Whitehead life-saving station, 1991
Wrecking plants, 1990
Wrecks, removal of, 1990

Sioux Lookout, 4191

Six Months' By-Elections. *See* Representation in Parliament

Six Months' Hoist. *See* House of Commons, Divisions

Smallpox on "Scandinavian", 1498, 1556

Smith, Mr. Alexander. *See* Dominion Elections Act Amdt. Bill

Smith, Mr. Sydney. *See* Post Office Dept.

Smith, Mr. William (South Ontario)
Cattle embargo, res. 702
Eggs, importation from China, qu. 568
Oleomargarine Act Amdt. Bill, 3893

Smuggling
Aerial preventive service, 3778

Snider, Judge. *See* Printing Bureau, Destruction of Documents

Societè des Artisans Canadiens Francais, 82

Soldiers. *See also* Returned Soldiers
Pensions, Insurance and Re-establishment, 315
Polish battalion for service in French army, 4051
Settlement on land, 529
Special Committee, final report, 4041

Soldiers Civil Re-establishment
Department of, report, 836
Disabled unemployed, 4364
Estimates, 4532
Loyola College building, Montreal, qu. 569
Operating expenses and working capital, 4532

Soldier Settlement Board, 314, 529, 538, 3554, 4532
Advisory and Qualification Board at Prince Albert, qu. 673
Estimates, 4532
Graham, Mr. A. M., qu. 2618

Soldier Settlement Board—*Con.*
Maritime Provinces, 4532
Operation of, 529
Tobin, Mr. W. J., and, ques. 1133

Solicitor General. *See* Ministers

Sorel Dockyard, qu. 568, 1992, qu. 2028
Shipyards, qu. 568
Superintendent, qu. 2618

Soudan War, 1882

Soulanges Canal. *See* Canals

South Africa
Steamship service, 1491
Trade with, 1468

South African War, 1527
Pensions, 2278

South Gabriola Wharf, 3981

Soviet. *See* Russia

Speaker, Hon. Edgar N. Rhodes. *See also* Deputy Speaker, House of Commons
Rulings and Statements of
Address, debate on,
Tariff not excluded from discussion, 58
Adjournments
For purpose of discussing matter of urgent, etc.; question may be discussed on motion for Supply, 4106
Amendments
Must amend, not merely negative, 561
Put subject to consideration, 376
Ames, Sir Herbert
Resignation of, 469, 1001
Member (Hon. Mr. King) may go into matter on motion for Supply, 1070
Bills
Additions to, proposed, 4259
Com., referred to after second reading, 2776
Details properly discussed in Com., 624
Preceded by resolution
Notice not necessary, 2942
Trade Bills should be, 2150
Press interview not germane to principle of, 2870
Printing of Senate Bills, 3938
Private
Notice not required, 3971
Reference back by Com. of Whole, 1094
Suspension of Rules for, 3716
Second reading, order must be proceeded with or stand, 650

Speaker, Hon. Edgar N. Rhodes—*Con.*
Rulings and Statements of—*Con.*
Bills—*Con.*
Senate, motion for first reading not debatable but rule relaxed for Prime Minister and leaders, 151
Senate amendments, correction of error, 4068
To be disposed of by consent without discussion, 2890
1r.,
Senate Bills, unusual to explain, 151, 1619-20
3r.,
Debate on, 3343
Chair
Good taste, 3174
Ruling—exception to must be taken in constitutional manner, 3174
Should be permitted to exercise jurisdiction, 1308
Com.,
Standing, competent to consult Law Clerk, 598
"To-morrow" means next Government day, 563
Debate
Adherence to rules, 649, 2333
Closed by mover, 900, 2447, 2518, 3968
Questions not to be asked as in Com., 2450
Restriction of, 969, 2067
Debates, Official Report of
Insertion of documents
After reading, 1539
Not read, 2067
Unanimous consent necessary, 1009
Decorum, 3174
Conversation in Chamber and galleries, 2053
Debate cannot be conducted from seats, 287
Debate, in, 286
Good taste, 3173-4
Governor General
Acknowledgment of Address, 3830
Address to on retirement, 4493
Imaginary letters, 3173, 3260
Minister of Crown and, 3174
Substitution of names, 3174
Interruptions, 3228
Language
"Coward", 287
"Deliberately false and untrue", 2444
"Flagrant insult", 287
"Mean appellation", 463
Unparliamentary, 1516
Members
Asking question may not make statement, 77, 987, 1308, 2865

Speaker, Hon. Edgar N. Rhodes—*Con.*
Rulings and Statements of—*Con.*
Members—*Con.*
Comment on speech in other House not in order, 536
Debating, should be mindful of rule, 1758
Discussing principle of Bill on second reading restricted to one speech, 649
Having already spoken no right to speak again, 1307
How to be referred to, 69, 444
Leeds (Sir Thomas White) 69, 469
Limited to one speech on motion, 1177
May not reflect on judiciary, 812
Must be seated when Speaker rises, 3228
Not to be put on trial in House, 2443
One may give his own interpretation to remarks of another, 1197
Promises made by subject to rules of order, 4204
Reading from documents or newspapers when asking question, 736, 972
Reading speech, 544
Resignations, 1619. *See also* House of Commons
Ames, Sir Herbert, 469
Right to reply, 1245
Right to reply to reflection implied in question, 1172
Right to speak exhausted, 985, 1812, 2780, 3859, 4113, 4116
Should confine remarks to question before House, 816
Sitting, may ask question but may not make remarks, 127, 2225, 2867
Speaking, may not interrogate members sitting, 126, 2333
Speaking when no motion before House, 4203-4
To speak only once on motion, 2889
Speaking, has floor, 1794
Statement of must be accepted by House, 1197, 1641
Motions
Adjournment
Competency to withdraw, 1173
Adopted as amended, 1846
Amendment must amend not merely negative, 561
Committee
Not in order to discuss general railway problems, 1782
Error in, 1810
Involving expenditure
Housing, 1135
Hudson Bay railway, 985
Not in proper form, 4052

Speaker, Hon. Edgar N. Rhodes—*Con.*
Rulings and Statements of—*Con.*
Motions—*Con.*
Notice not given—unanimous consent necessary, 732, 1439, 2027, 2776, 2940, 4250
Notice not required with respect to Private Bills, 3971
Practically identical, 974
Strict application of rule would leave only portion debatable, 1758
To adjourn for purpose of discussing matter of urgent, etc., 4106
Withdrawal by unanimous consent, 2554
Non-debatable subjects
Evidence before Committee not reported to House, 2881
Subjects already debated, 2824
Orders of the Day
Debate limited, 110, 1271, 1439, 2250, 2377, 3972
Alleged incomplete return may not be discussed in detail, 2250
Appropriateness of matter, 2626, 2776
Argument improper, 1070
Argument under guise of question, 901
House reverting to certain motions, 1851
Latitude allowed, 1070, 4254
Local questions, 110, 1271
Member not to be put on trial in House, 2443
No cross-examination of Ministers, 1004, 1441, 3321
Optional with Government to give information, 478
Questions reflecting on Government's policy, 1441
Questions unanswered, attention directed to, 1621
Summarizing newspaper articles, 1441
Pairs, correction of list, 563
Parliament buildings, inscription on tower, 4544
Petitions, manner of presenting, 562
Previous debate, 2824
Privilege. *See also* this title under House of Commons
Matter not affecting member personally, 2443
Questions
Answer of Government to be accepted, 1004
Deferred until Com. of Whole, 1024
Reflecting on Parliament, improper, 736, 1441

Speaker, Hon. Edgar N. Rhodes—*Con.*
Rulings and Statements of—*Con.*
Questions—*Con.*
Supplementary answer to, 1755
Unanswered, member should direct attention to on Orders of the Day, 1621
Reference by way of illustration and not reflection, 3261
Relevancy, 1172, 1193, 1196
Civil Service Act Amdt. Bill, 2865
Resolution
Amended by avoiding mention of money, 1136
Latitude of discussion, 1135
Money, 1135
Propriety of form, 1146
Rules of the House
Discussion, widest possible measure of, 1135
17C, Thursdays and Fridays. *See* House of Commons, Estimates
Senate
Committee
Leave for Mr. Crerar to attend, 3207
Debates, reference to, 3968
Free Conference on Judges Act Amdt. Bill, 4040
Members of, reference in terms of disrespect, 536
Supply
Amendments to
Discussion confined, 2067
Irrelevancy, 1193
Questions of detail should be withheld for, 1280
Rule 17C—Thursdays and Fridays, 1004. *See also* House of Commons, Estimates
Unanimous consent, 1009, 1233, 3715, 4433, 4453. *See also* under this title, Debates, Official Report
Canada Temperance Act, 3902
Minister making statement while Speaker in Chair, 1024
Votes and Proceedings, correction of, 737
Warrant for election writ—Durham and Maple Creek, 4340

Speaker's Chair, presentation of, 3689, 3691
Addresses to be printed in Official Report of Debates, 3696
Expression of thanks to Empire Parliamentary Association, 3696
Presentation of, notice, 3688
Speeches, 3689

Speech from the Throne debated. *See* Address

Special War Revenue Act Amdt. Bill
Res. 3733, 3741; 1r., 3758; 2r., 3955; com., 3955-3958; 3r., 3958
Subjects and Sections discussed:
Amendments, 3742
Binder twine fibre, 3746, 3756. *See also* that title
Boxed goods, 3735
Condensed milk and ice cream, 3737, 3956
Containers, 3737, 3754, 3956
Excise taxes, 3955
Fishing boats, 3745
Foodstuffs, 3589, 3734
Lumber, tax on, 3734, 3736, 3742-3, 3756-57
Missals and prayer-books, 3756
Mixed grains for feed, 3745
Oatmeal and rolled oats, 3735-6
Oleomargarine, materials for, 3745-6
Package goods, 3735
Sales tax, 3120, 3170, 3399, 3996, 3735, 3752, 3957. *See also* Taxation
Opposition to change, 3752
Sparkling wines, 3734

Speedways. *See* Highways

Spinney, Hon. E. K. (Yarmouth and Clare)
Civil Service Act Amdt. Bill, 2685, 2778, 4278-80
Annual report, Amdt. 4482
Special Com., report, 3901
Civil Service Retirement Act Amdt. Bill, 4271

Spirits, Tax on, 3120, 3506, 3576, 3705, 3726. *See also* Alcohol; Customs Tariff; Customs and Excise; Liquor

Spirituous and Alcoholic Liquors, 3705-8

Sprays. *See* Insects

Spruce Bud Worm, 1031

Stacey, Mr. F. B. (Fraser Valley)
Address in reply to Governor General's Speech, 140; examination of reasons advanced in support of amendment; pre-election pledges of Government fulfilled or in process of fulfilment; no charge of maladministration, 141; Government policy in interest of country; unification of Canadian people, 142; class consciousness; by-elections in British Columbia; the Agrarians, 143; no demand for a change, 144
British Columbia, fishing regulations, 2180

Stacey, Mr. F. B.—*Con.*
Civil Service Retirement Act Amdt. Bill, 4268
Ministers to sit in either Chamber, 1163

Standardization. *See* Agricultural machinery

Standing Orders Committee, first report, 3005

Staples, Mr. W. D., and Grain Inquiry, 1674, qu. 3260

Statistical Department, 1231, 1672

Statistics Act Amdt. Bill, 1r., 3007, 2r., com., 3r., 3758

Statutes, destruction of plates, qu. 603

Statutory Officials. *See* Purchasing Commission

Stayner, postmaster, 4470

Steamers. *See* Vessels

Steamship Services
Australia-New Zealand, 1493
Baie des Chaleurs, qu. 734, qu. 2506
Baie St. Paul-Tadoussac, qu. 734
Halifax-Newfoundland, 1485, 1686
Halifax-St. John-Newfoundland, 1712
Magdalen Islands, 557, 767
Mulgrave-Canso, 1496
Murray Bay-Tadoussac, 1528, 1822, 1825, 1930
Newfoundland, 1485, 1686, 1712
Pacific, 1493
Pictou-Georgetown, 1496
Prince Edward Island, 558
South Africa, 1491
Supervision, 1496
West Indies, 1275, 1488, 1712, 1714, 2253-62

Steamships. *See also* Vessels
Government control of, qu. 2530
Subsidies, 1735

Steel
Nova Scotia, 3295
Plates for ships, 1283, 1884
Shipbuilding contracts, 1876. *See also* that title

Steel and Iron Industry, 3526

Steel Company of Canada, Limited, 1611

Steele, Mr. Michael (South Perth)
Cattle embargo, debate adjourned, 731
Sub-amendment, 757
Civil Service Retirement Act Amdt. Bill, 2497
De Martigny divorce, 3769
Dominion Elections Act Amdt. Bill (Prohibition plebiscite) 306

Steele, Mr. Michael—*Con.*
Fuel Supply Problem, Res. 1247
Special Committee, evidence to be printed, 2027, 4251
Highways in Ontario, 3034
Immigration
Immigrants rejected, qu. 1624
Typhus fever, precautions, 643
Point of Order, letter reflecting on Minister, 2176
Proportional representation, 1550
Strikes, number of, qu. 569
Rulings and statements as Acting Speaker and Chairman
(as Acting Speaker)
Member not precluded from quoting from same debate, 3627
Member must accept statement of another, 3628
(as Chairman)
Conversation, 4307
Debates, Official report of
Insertion of documents not read, 4309
Discussion not relevant to item, 1665
Interim Supply
Schedule customary, 2015
Language
"Misleading the House", 1457
Relevancy, 1451, 1452, 1456, 1665, 3766, 3808, 3821, 4090, 4123-4, 4306, 4312
Letter from Gillies Bros., Ltd., 4418
Supply motion to strike out item not in order, 2018, 4513

Stefansson, Mr. Vilhjalmar, 871
Northern lands, possibilities of, 841. *See also* Reindeer and Musk Ox; Natural Resources

Stein, Mr. Adolphe (Kamouraska)
Address in reply to Governor General's Speech, 550; charges of maladministration; war contract scandals; Purchasing Commission; feeling in province of Quebec; French Canadians not represented at Peace Conference; Assembly of League of Nations; other instances of discrimination; election proclamation in French, 553; election, 554
Agricultural publications, 1075
Bankruptcy Act Amdt. Bill, 2914-16
Bankruptcy Act Judges, 1084
County fairs, assistance to, 1123
De Martigny divorce, 3715, 3761, 3769, 4004-10, 4107
Illustration station at Ste. Anne de la Pocatière, 948
Judges, local, in criminal cases, 1085

Stevens, Mr. H. H. (Vancouver Centre)
Address in reply to Governor General's Speech, 212; the amendment; argument of the Opposition; Liberals and Agrarians, 213; Leader of Opposition's incentive is accession to power; redistribution before election; increased representation for West; freight rates, relative representation of urban and rural districts, 214; no general demand for an election; War Veterans, Mr. Harry Flynn; Peterborough by-election; Yale, Colchester, St. John, East Elgin; War Time Elections Act, 217; the tariff—Opposition dare not make it an issue; National Liberal Convention, 1919, 218; statement of leader of Opposition at Kingston; tariff a matter of vital interest; Opposition resolutions of 1919 and 1920, 221; Government will welcome campaign on fiscal policy; coalition between Liberals and Agrarians; leader of Opposition lacks sincerity in proposing amendment, 222
Average duty during Liberal regime, 3471
Budget, 3619; speech of Mr. King, comment on; Canadian National Railways, administration, 3620; loans to Roumania and Greece; members of Parliament and sale of goods to foreign countries, 3621; comparison of this year's expenditure and expenditure under Liberal administration, 3621; position of leader of Opposition on tariff, 3622; American tariff a factor in tariff revision, 3623; tariff for revenue only, 3625; Mr. Fielding and protection, 3626; Mr. Crerar and York-Sunbury election, 3627; Hansard, changes in Mr. Crerar's speech as delivered, 2627-8; tariff question, boot and shoe industry, 3631; agricultural implements, 3631; United Grain Growers and lumber combine, 3633; grain overages, 3634; taxation, 3634; land tax, 3634-35; Canadian representative at Washington, 3635
Canada Temperance Act, qu. 736
Canadian Government Merchant Marine, 1721
Dominion Iron and Steel Company, 1723
Canadian manufacturers and export trade, 1222
Canadian National Railways
Special Com. (Mr. Meighen) M., 1805
Chinese Immigration Act Amdt. Bill, 3828
Customs, Minister of, 3081
Private business of, 3078

Stevens, Mr. H. H.—*Con.*
De Martigny divorce, 3770, 4203
Government shipbuilding programme, 2088
Harbours and rivers, estimates, 3978-9
Immigration, 2595
Deputy Minister, 3056
Imperial Mineral Resources Bureau, 2166
Inspection of Gas and Gas Meters Bill, 619
Interim Supply, Purchasing Commission, 2021
Lake of the Woods Regulation Bill, 4195
Opium and Narcotic Drug Act Amdt. Bill Amdt. (Penalty—whipping) 2901
Oriental immigration, 2594
Railway Act Amdt. Bill (Discrimination in rates) 1232
Senate and House of Commons Act Amdt. Bill (Ministers and directorships) 596, 650
Wednesday evening sittings, 1829
Wheat Board, qu. 489

Stewart, Mr. J. A. (Lanark)
Alcohol, tax on, 3729, 3730
Civil Service Retirement Act Amdt. Bill, 4268-73
Customs and Excise Dept. Bill
Commercial agents, payments to, 4405
Dumping clause, 4413
Ports of entry, 4414
Trade extension, 4405
Valuation for duty, 4414
De Martigny divorce, 3765

Stewart, Mr. R. A., qu. 2343

Stewart, Mr. T. J. (West Hamilton)
Criminal Code Amdt. Bill (Automobile theft) 3916
Highways, 3028
Construction, 3036

Stikine and Dease Rivers, qu. 1133

Stock Feed. *See also* Feeds; Live Stock

Stockyards, 1124. *See* Live Stock

Strathroy
Customs, 3085
Destruction of pasture lands, 1030

Streams Bill. *See* Lake of the Woods
Strikes. *See* Labour

Submarines. *See* Shipbuilding

Sugar, 3699
Beet industry, encouragement to farmers, 301, 3426, 3456
Canada-West Indies trade, 2255-7, 3699
Customs tariff on, 3698, 3725, 3938, 3955

Sugar—*Con.*
German bounty on, 4432
Imports, 3703
Industry, 3513
Refiners, prices, 3245
Season, vessels for, 1489
West Indies, from, 2255, 3699

Sully, Quebec, station, 1822

Summary Cases, Fees, 3006. *See* Criminal Code Amdt.

Superannuation. *See* Civil Service, Superannuation; Civil Service Retirement Act Amdt. Bill

Supplementary Estimates, 1618. *See also* Estimates
Inquiry for, 3741

Supplementary Extradition Convention with the United States. *See* Extradition

Supreme Court. *See also* Canada Temperance Act Bill
Appeal to in Criminal cases, 3006
Appointment of Mr. Mignault, 356
Exemption of Salary of Chief Justice, 2118
See also Judges Act Amdt. Bill
Gold Seal Liquor Co., appeal. *See* Canada Temperance
Judges. *See* Judges Act Amdt. Bill
Privy Council appeals, 1089. *See also* that title

Supply Bills. *See* Appropriation Acts

Supply. *See also* Interim Supply
Committee of, 562, 917, 1215, 1330, 1385, 1442, 1617, 1652, 1736, 1979, 2076, 2234, 2270, 2275, 2356, 2378, 2568, 2680, 2736, 2781, 2800, 2889, 2940, 2945, 3014, 3055, 3068, 3127, 3776, 3973, 4010, 4070, 4117, 4288, 4494, 4544

Supply, Committee of
Amendments
Canadian National Railways—Information—M. (Mr. King) 1178, neg. 1215
Prime Ministers' Conference
Amdt. (Mr. King) 2626, neg. 2679
Reciprocity with the United States
Amdt. (Mr. Fielding) 2038, neg. 2075
Representation in Parliament
Amdt. (Mr. King) 1293, neg. 1329
Closure. *See that title*
Concurrence, 4541, 4576
En bloc, 2006
Estimates. *See also* that title
Committee on, 2193
Justice—without consent estimates cannot be considered, 1073

Supply—Committee of—*Con.*
Interim Supply. *See that title*
Non-confidence motions. *See* Representation in Parliament
One-sixth vote. *See* Interim Supply
Procedure in
Business for "to-morrow", 1025
Resolution introducing money bill should be preceded by notice, 1676
Rule 17C. *See* House of Commons
Subjects and items discussed:
Accredited herd, 4506-13
Agriculture, 4506
Entomology, 1024
International Institute of Agriculture, 1116
Live stock, 923, 1116
Publications, 1074
Salaries and contingencies, 917
Air Board, 3776
Alderson, Mr. George B., claim of. *See that title*
Archives, 4533
Canada Grain Act, 1442
Canada Temperance Act, 4533
Canadian Forestry Association, 4494
Canadian Government Merchant Marine, 1272, 2076
Canadian Institute of Mining and Metallurgy, 2164
Canadian National Railways, 1004, 4131, 4169, 4288, 4313, 4334, 4561
Canadian National Research Institute, 4555. *See also* under this title Scientific
Canadian Northern loan,, 3037
Canadian Press, Limited, 4533
Canadian representation in the United States, 2378
Canals, 2025, 2602, 2953, 2960, 2966-98
Civil Service
Bonus, 4534
Reclassification, 4541, 4555
Courtenay Bay improvements, 4097
Customs and Inland Revenue, 2889, 3077, 4117
Destructive Insect and Pest Act, 1027 4512
Dockyards, 4036
Dredging, 3982
Entomology, 1024
Exchequer Court, 1083
Experimental farms, 922, 928, 931, 932-36, 945, 4512
External affairs, 2437
Fish-breeding establishments, 2185, 4036
Fish inspection, 2182
Fishery officers and guardians, 2177
Fisheries patrol service, 2177

Supply—Committee of—*Con.*
Subjects and items discussed.—*Con*
Fishery problems, scientific investigation, 2188
Fisheries protection service, 4036
Flax, 931
Geological Survey, 2141-8, 2162
Government Shipbuilding Programme, 2076. *See also* under this title, Shipbuilding
Grand Trunk Loan, 4131, 4168, 4288, 4313, 4144, 4334
Harbours and Rivers, 3973-82, 4097, 4536
Nova Scotia, 3989
Prince Edward Island, 3990
Health, 2940, 3127
Health of Animals, 926, 1048, 4506-13. *See also* under this title, Live Stock
High Commissioner's office, 2437
Highways, 4289
Housing, 4552
Immigration and Colonization, 2568-2602, 3055, 3077, 4127, 4131
Imperial Mineral Resources Bureau, 4498
Indian Affairs, 2167, 2171, 4501
Interior, 1330
International Fisheries Commission, Fraser River, 2189
Justice, 1076
Labour, 4170, 4544
Emergency relief, 4535
Lake of the Woods Control Board, 2437
League of Nations, 2356
Lighthouse and coastal service, 1994, 2174, 4040
Lignite, 4499
Live Stock Branch, 923, 1116. *See also* under this title, Health of Animals
Marine, 1617, 1736, 1979, 2190
Marine Biological Board, 2189
Marine estimates, notice of closure, 1979
Migratory Birds, 4496
Militia, 2275, 2438, 2781
Annual drill, 2294
Cadet services, 2296
Clothing and necessities, 2305
Command pay
M. (Mr. Power) to reduce, 2291
Permanent Force, 2797-2800
Salaries, 2234, 2275
Mines, 2141, 2162
National Parks, 4495
Naval Service, 4010
"Niobe" and "Rainbow", sale, 4010-36
Northwest Territories, explorations, 4494
Ocean and River Service, 1736, 1979
Oyster culture, 2177
Paris agency, 2437
Parliament buildings, 3992, 4040, 4070

Supply—Committee of—*Con.*
Subjects and items discussed.—*Con*
Passport office, 2436
Penitentiaries, 1096
Pensions, 2236-78
Post Office, 3003, 4514
Outside Service, 4528
Public buildings, rents, repairs, etc., 4090
Public Works, 2680, 2736, 2808, 2945, 3973, 4070-9, 4535
Quarantine stations, 2754-68
Salaries, 2680, 4079
Shipbuilding, 1858
Railways and Canals, 1652, 3014, 4131, 4288
Railway Commission, 3016
Relief of distressed seamen, 4039
Roads and bridges, 3986
Royal Canadian Navy, 4010
Royal Military College, 2802
St. Lawrence Ship Channel, 4541
Scientific institutions, 4494
Secretary of State, 4534, 4557
Shipbuilding, 1857, 2076
Soldiers' Civil Re-establishment, 4532
Soldier Settlement, 4532
Telegraphs and Telephones, 3987
Telegraph lines, 4539
Trade and Commerce
Bounties, 1385
Canada Grain Act, 1442
Salaries, 1215
Trent canal, 2025, 2606, 2953, 2966
Welland canal, 2025, 2493, 2960-98
Yukon Territory, 1087

Sutherland, Mr. Donald (South Oxford)
Alderson, Mr. George B., claim of, 924, 1052, 2270-4, 4508
Animals slaughtered for export trade, 1051
Budget, 3584. Railway construction, 3585; industrial enterprise; class organization, 3586; Prime Minister and Progressive party, 3587; Grain Growers' Company, 3587; mill feeds, adulteration, 3589; foodstuffs and free list; farmers' sons and military service; Mr. King and the Government, 3593; Liberal platform of 1919, 3594; Farmers' party and record of Prime Minister, 3595
Butter importations, 3749
Cattle embargo, 706, 764
Dairy Products Grading Bill, 4441-8
Experimental farms, 928, 931-6
Agricultural publications and, 1076
Flax industry, 1395
Grasshoppers, destruction of, 1030
Health of Animals, 1052-67; 2270-4

Sutherland, Mr. Donald—*Con.*
Highway construction in Ontario, 4296-4306
Illustration farms and stations in Ontario, 953, 956
Inspection of Gas and Gas Meters Bill, 610
Lake of the Woods Regulation Bill, 4219
Oleomargarine Act Amdt. Bill, 3872-95: amdt. 3887
Oleomargarine, importation of materials, 3747
Parliament buildings, 3996
Return, alleged incomplete, 2250, 2270
Returned Soldiers, Special Committee, 788
Tubercular cattle, slaughtering of, 1051
Unemployment and Immigration, 1369
Veterinary Director General, 4508-13. *See also* under this title, Alderson
White grub, destruction by, 1030

Swan, Mr. D. D., consulting engineer, 1997

Tadoussac-Murray Bay Steamship Service
M. (Mr. Casgrain) 1528, 1822, 1825, 1930

Taft, The Hon. William H., 3205

Tailors, Sales Tax, 3955

Tampico, Government vessel at, 1716

Tappert, Rev. N., qu. 1673

Tariff, 7, 96, 125, 130, 132, 136, 147, 155, 161, 162, 167, 175, 181, 211, 218, 238, 241, 251, 256, 263, 272, 285, 296, 315, 322, 337, 350, 353, 371, 388, 394, 398, 412, 528, 559, 417, 437, 432, 570, 476, 479, 484. *See also* Address; Canada-West Indies; Customs; French Trade Agreement; Special War Revenue; Ways and Means
Changes, 2938-55, 3119, 3121, 3696, 3725. *See also* Customs and Excise Dept. Bill
Commission, 3055, 3241, 3640
Rice Jones, Mr. Cecil, evidence before, 418. *See also* Rice Jones
Report, inquiry for, 1127, 3055
Legislation, 3118
Policy, 1878
Preferential, with West Indies, 2251
Protective, 1285
Reciprocity Agreement with United States —Amdt. (Mr. Fielding) 2038, neg. 2075
Reduction of—Amdt. (Mr. Fielding) to Budget, 3155, neg. 3686
Resolutions, 3121. *See also* Customs Tariff; Ways and Means
Revision of, 2, qu. 903, 2346, 3150, 3159, 3160, 3220, 3342, 3392, 3420, 3482, 4254. *See also* United States, Young Emergency Tariff

Tar Sand Rights, General Lindsay, qu. 671, 834

Taxation. *See also* Revenue Bills
Banks, qu. 2192, 3664
Burdensome, 1292
Business profits, 484, qu. 576, 3120, 3253, 3445
Cost of collection, 2100
Direct, 3147, 4344
Excise, qu. 1236, 3120. *See also* Customs and Excise Dept. Bill
Forms—revision, qu. 1237
Income Tax. *See also* that title
Appointments to staff, 2106
Collections in Saskatchewan, qu. 2028
Farmers from, in each province, qu. 569
Incomes of over $200,000 qu. 838
Instructions in French, qu. 2624
Penalties, qu. 2100
Preparation of return and computation of tax, 2567
Regulations, 1272
Returns, 2625, 3147
And penalty, 2101
Tax-payers—farmers, qu. 838
Taxes for 1920, qu. 2821
Income and Business Profits, cost of administration, qu. 837
Inconsistencies in, 3550
Indirect, 3221
Land. *See* Land Taxation
Law stamps, 1090
Job printers, 4123
Luxury, qu. 402, 600, 1191, 3114, 3285, 3445
Abolition, 1185
Motorbus, remission, qu. 603
Mutual companies, qu. 605
Postal war tax, 4515
Provinces, 3705-6, 3742
Railways, 1008
Sales, 3120, 3372, 3485, 3545, 3735-52-54, 3957. *See also* Special War Revenue Act Amdt.
Collections, qu. 2506, qu. 3830
Sales by farmers, 3956
Three main principles of, 3221

Taxation of Judges. *See* Judges Act Amdt. Bill

Teakle, Mr. R. B., 1934

Telegraphs and Telephones, 3988, 4539
Cape Breton, 3987
Government business, 4130
Isle aux Coudres, extension, 4540
Loretteville-St. Gerard, 4539

Telephones. *See also* Marine Signal Service
Berthierville, qu. 1233
Kamouraska and Temiscouata Co., 2175
Service, 4093

Témiscouta
Indians 2168
Telephones 2175

Temperance Act, prescriptions under, 3730. *See also* Canada Temperance Act

Tenders. *See* Purchasing Commission

Terminal Elevators, 277-79, 1442. *See also* Canada Grain Act; Grain; Wheat
Maintenance, 1463
Overages, 3634

Textiles. *See* Trade

Thanksgiving Day, date of, qu. 2098. *See also* Armistice Day Bill

Theft, Motor cars of. *See* Criminal Code Amdt.

Thessalon wharf 3975

Thompson, Mr. Alfred (Yukon)
Civil Service Act Amdt. Bill 4480
League of Nations, 55
Mail contract, White Horse-Dawson, qu. 2686
National Research Institute 2698-2700
Natural resources, 851
Proportional representation, 1553
Rulings as Chairman:
Member in order in reading from newspaper, 1891
Tedious repetition, 1892

Thompson, Mr. T. H. (East Hastings)
Dairy Products Grading Bill, 4441-7

Thomson, Mr. Levi (Qu'Appelle)
Address in reply to Governor General's Speech, 345; congratulations to Prime Minister; country's obligations to returned soldiers; conscription; United Grain Growers, Limited, 345; marketing of grain; sale of implements and other commodities; two party vs. group system; proportional representation 346; the amendment; different premises but same conclusion; confidence of the country; by-elections; consequences of vote on amendment, 348; no confidence in Government; the tariff, 350
Agricultural shows, 1241
Ames, Sir Herbert, resignation, 1317
Automobile theft, 3914
Budget, 3310. Sales tax and valuation of foreign imports; Canadian Reconstruction Association, 3312; protective

Thomson, Mr. Levi—*Con.*
Budget—*Con.*
tariff for industries, 3315; free trade, 3315; raising of revenue; land tax, 3317
Cattle embargo, 714
Criminal Code Amdt. Bill, 3897-9, 3914-35
Crushed grains, 3746
Customs and Excise Dept. Bill
Free trade, 4419
Indirect increase in tariff, 4419
Trade agents, 3808
Valuation for duty, 4419
Customs drawbacks, qu. 2375
Dominion Elections Act Amdt. Bill
Candidate, death of, 3095
Disqualified voters, 3098
Foreign-born wives and children of British subjects, 3104
Forms, 4228-47
Naturalization—certificate of qualification, 4237
"Personal naturalization", 4245
Recount, 3097
Revising officers, 3102
Dominion notes and gold reserve, qu. 1234
Farmers and protected interests, 3751
Great Lakes-St. Lawrence waterway, 751
Justice Department
Law-clerk stenographers, 1078
Maisonneuve and Gaspé, representation, 2335
Military preparation, 2300
Point of order—member must accept statement, 3629
Proportional representation, 1534
Reciprocity agreement with United States, 2064
Representation in Parliament, 1317
Trade commissioners in the United States, 1465, 1484
Welland canal, construction, 2989
Wheat Board, 1453
Position of Mr Crerar, 1460

Three Card Monte. *See also* Criminal Code Amdt., 3921

Thunder Bay, Ice-breaking, 2174

Thursdays and Fridays, Rule 17C. *See* House of Commons, Estimates

Ticket-of-Leave, case of W. H. Tapley, res. (Mr. Casgrain) 970

Tilley, Mr. W. N., K.C., qu. 1001. *See also* Grand Trunk Arbitration

Timber. *See also* Forestry
Culling, 1426
Ontario limits, 3391
Tobique reserve, cutting on, 4503

Tinctures and Elixirs. *See* Customs Tariff

Tinplate Industry, 3326-7

Titaniferous Ores. *See* Research

Tobacco
Canada-West Indies Trade, 2254. *See also* that title
Cigars and, unlawful sale, 3786
Duty on, 3698
Excise taxes on qu. 1236
Experimental station at L'Assomption, 918, 946
Growing, 91, 1076, qu. 1500, 3669
Protection, 300, 3676
Harrow tobacco station, 1076
Licenses, 2554

Tobacco Buyers' Association, 91

Tobin, Mr. E. W. (Richmond and Wolfe)
Anderson, Mr. A. H., qu. 735
Black, Mr. A. H., qu. 735
Brackenbury, Mr. G. B., qu. 735
Civil Service bonus, qu. 1623
Douglas, Mr. H., qu. 735
Grand Trunk
Arbitrators, salaries, qu. 1130
Pensions, qu. 964
Taking over, qu. 838
Printing Bureau employees, qu. 1348
Quebec highways, aid to, qu. 2344
Rural mail carriers, qu. 964
Taxation forms, revision, qu. 1237

Tobin, Mr. W. J., and Soldier Settlement Board, qu. 1133

Tobique reserve, timber cutting, 4503

Tofino wharf, 3981

Tolmie, Hon. S. F. (Minister of Agriculture)
Accredited herd, 1049, 4506-12
Agricultural shows, 1245
Agriculture. *See also* under this title, Health of Animals, Live Stock
Benefits from agricultural bulletins, 1075
Department, estimates, 917
Publications Branch, 1074
Salaries, 1036
Seed inspectors, 1033
Alderson, Mr. George B., claim of, 925, 1052, 1059, 4512
Animal Contagious Diseases Act Amdt. Bill, 2031, 3011, 2942
Banff National Park, 4495
Berry boxes, 4115-16
Budget, 3648; dry dock at Esquimalt, 3648; Pacific coast trade, 3649; tonnage entering Canadian ports, 3650
Canadian Forestry Association, 4495

Tolmie, Hon. S. F.—*Con.*
Cattle
Embargo, 722
Feeding for export, 1120
Marketing, 1121
Cold storage, 1039
Montreal Harbour Commission, 1041
Municipally-owned plants, 1040
Dairying, 1036
Dairy herds, 1118
Dairy Products Grading Bill, 4437-48
Destructive insects, 1027
Dominion lands, 1334
Entomology, 1024
Esquimalt dry dock, 3648
European corn borer, 1032
Exhibitions and fairs, 1123
Experimental farms, 942
Farmers' clubs and cattle herding, 1117
Flax industry, 931
Forestry, 4494
Forests—aerial patrol, 4495
Fruit growing, development of hardy varieties, 1043
Fruit inspection, 1041
Inspectors, 1042; distribution of, 1045
Grasshopper and insect plagues, 1030
Health of Animals, 4506, 4513
Compensation for slaughtered herds, 1048
Diseases, 1048, 1051
Glanders in Frontenac, 926, 1058
Hog cholera, 1058
Garbage feeding, 1058-9
Procedure in dealing with, 1061
Alderson, case, 925, 1052, 1059, 4512
Increase in amount of item, 1057
Inspectors, 1067-8
Pleuro-pneumonia and tuberculosis, 1048
Slaughtering, 1048, 1051, 1062
Veterinary system, 1058
Horse breeding, 120, 1118
Illustration farms in Ontario, 952
Illustration station at L'Assomption, 947
Imperial Mineral Resources Bureau, 2166, 4498
Indian affairs, 2167-71
Insect and Pest Act, inspectors, 930, 1044
Inspection of root vegetables, 4343
Interior Department
Cabinet maker, 1342
Clapp, Miss S., 1332
Employees, 1332
Salaries, 1331
International Institute of Agriculture, 1116
Lignite Utilization Board, 4499
Live stock, 1116. *See also* under this title Agriculture, Health of Animals

Tolmie, Hon. S. F.—*Con.*
Live Stock—*Con.*
Commission men, 1122
Marketing, 1039
Pure-bred animals, distribution of, 948
Rescue policy, 1119
Migratory Birds Convention Act Amdt. Bill, 2442, 2891, 4496
Mines and Geological Survey, 2141, 2162-67
Municipalities—cold storage, 1040
Oleomargarine Act Amdt. Bill, 563, 3850-96, 3905
Pacific coast trade, 3649
Politics, participation in by public officials, 4503
Potato diseases, 1032
Refrigerator cars for fish, 1038
Seed Branch, 1125
Seed Grain 4506
Sheridan, Mr. John, resignation and reinstatement, 2173, 4501-5
Spruce bud worm, 1031
Surveyors, pamphlets for, 1335
Tourist traffic, 4495
Wool grading, 1121-2

Tonnage into Canadian ports, 3650. *See also* Shipping

Toronto
Customs building, qu. 3772, 4095
Customs officials, 1351
Harbour improvements, 687
Post Office
Appointments, qu. 734
Promotions, qu. 1673
Shipyards, 1889
University. *See* Research

Torrance, Dr. *See* Hog Cholera

Tourist Traffic, 4495.

Tractors, free, 3509. *See also* Agricultural Machinery

Trade. *See also* Board of Trade; Canada-West Indies Trade Agreement; Customs and Excise Dept. Bill; French Trade Agreement; Steamship services
Africa with, 1468, 1965
Agents and Commissioners, 525, 1392, 1464-77, 2893, 3460-2, 3785-3809. *See also* Customs and Excise Dept. Bill
Buenos Aires, 3794-8
Europe, in, 1473
United States, in, 512, qu. 1001, 1473, 3460. *See also* United States
Aggregate, 3115
Australia and New Zealand, 1223-4, 1468
British preference, 3699

Trade—*Con.*
Chamber of commerce, 1224
Development of, 1466
Export, 1688, 1712, 1732
Canadian Government Merchant Marine, by, 1276-77
Expansion, 1276
Figures, 3349
Foreign, 1221-1225
Canadian enterprise in, 3409
Imports, value, 3310
Invoice certificate, 4389
France, with. *See* French Trade Agreement
German. *See* Customs and Excise Dept. Bill; Customs Tariff
Gillies Bros., Limited, letter on restriction of, 4418
Great Brtain with, 3116
Imported goods, marking, 3938. *See also* Customs Tariff
International Trade Conference, 2151
Report, 4541
Restrictions, 4418
Routes, 1888
Rates on. *See* Canadian Government Merchant Marine
Russia, with, 1003, 1072, 1224
South Africa, with, 1468, 1965
Treaties. *See* Canada-West Indies; French Trade Agreement; Reciprocity
United States. *See* that title
West Indies 1271, 1275, 1870, 2251. *See also* Canada-West Indies Trade Agreement

Trade and Commerce
Department
Bounties. *See that title*
Canada Grain Act, administration, 1442
Demography, Chief of, 1232
Dominion Statistician, 1231
Employees, 1218
Moving pictures, 599, 1225, 1467, 1558
Artists and Lecturers, 1225, 1232
Patent and Copyright Branch, 1496
Salaries, 1215
Increases, 1218
Statistical Branch, 1231
Subsidized steamers, 1712. *See also* Steamship Services
Weekly bulletins, 1220
Weights and Measures, 1485

Trade Mark and Design Act Amdt. Bill
1r., 229; withdrawn, 2891

Trades and Labour Congress. *See* Labour, National Catholic Unions
Platform of, 1634

Trahan, Mr. Arthur (Nicolet)
Address in reply to Governor General's Speech, 223; disregard of rights of French language, 223; religious holidays; violation of pledge given by Sir Robert Borden; Prime Minister's professed friendship for Quebec, 224; attack on leader of Opposition and his supporters; military imperialism the mailed fist of commerce and industry; agriculture, the basis of industrial stability; industrialism fraught with danger; the "crisis of moral sense"; Pensions Act; the Prime Minister still a "downright imperialist"; Mr. Gauthier and the Minister of Marine; Quebec will remember 1917; War-time Elections Act; Government shows contempt for rights of Parliament and people; Peace Treaty; country's credit involved without the consent of Parliament, 226; Purchasing Commission; Canadian Navy; League of Nations; Prime Ministers' Conference, 227; Imperial defence; divorce; Quebec, 228; Government undeserving of confidence, 229
Civil Service
Ascension day, 2775
Civil Service Act Amdt. Bill, 4484-89
Holidays, amdt. 4484
European credits, qu. 2622
Finance. *See also* that title
Accounts with Great Britain, qu. 2622
Dominion note issues, qu. 2621
Expenditure accounts, qu. 2621
Investments "other" and "non-active", qu. 2619
Public debt—non-active miscellaneous banking accounts, 2621
Repayment of $25,000,000 loan, qu. 2622
Revenue accounts, qu. 2620
Income tax returns, 2625
International Financial Conference, qu. 1237
St. Simon station agent, qu. 3208

Trains, Cancellation of. *See* Canadian National Railways

Tramp Steamers. *See* Canadian Government Merchant Marine

Transcontinental Railway. *See* Canadian National Railways

Transferable Votes. *See* Proportional Representation

Translation of French Speeches. *See* House of Commons; Debates; French language

Transportation, 738. *See also* Canals; Grain and grain trade; Great Lakes-St. Lawrence; Railways; St. Lawrence river
Difficulties, 3567
Car shortage, 512, 548, 3541, 4322
Rail and water, 484
Res. (Mr. Keefer) 674; withdrawn, 756

Travelling Expenses of Judges. *See* Judges Act Amdt. Bill

Treaties. *See also* Canada-West Indies; Extradition; Canadian Representation in United States; French Trade Agreement
Extradition between Canada and United States, 2687
Migratory Birds Treaty, 2892. *See also* that title
Negotiation of, 2387

Tremblay, Edouard. *See* Quebec Riots

Trent Canal. *See* Canals

Tributes to Deceased Members. *See* House of Commons

Trowers, Miss Catherine, qu. 1131

Trustees, remuneration of. *See* Bankruptcy Act Amdt. Bill

Tubercular Cattle. *See* Health of Animals

Tuberculin Test, 1049

Tuberculosis, Prevention of, Canadian Association, grant, 3142

Turgeon, Mr. O. (Gloucester)
Address in reply to Governor General's Speech, 144; congratulations to mover and seconder; the new Prime Minister, 144; the "Great Liberal" dead but spirit survives; the world in an abnormal condition; Prime Minister's reasons for not holding general election; Government has forfeited confidence of country, 145; reasons for formation of Union Government; Government elected for term of war and demobilization, 146; people clamouring for election; tariff; increase of railway rates, 147; redistribution, representation of rural and urban communities, 148; increased production and population, 149
Budget, 3447. Financial conditions and Government policy, 3447; tariff revision, 3448; value of home market, 3449; luxury taxes; taxation of lumber; tariff and protectionist spirit. 3450; income tax, 3451; free trade and

Turgeon, Mr. O.—*Con.*
Budget—*Con.*
Agrarian party, 3452; Brussels Conference; taxation of unemployed land, 3453
Caraquet Gulf Shore Railway extension, 4338
Civil Service bonus, 2112
Civil Service (Res. Sir Sam Hughes) Political patronage in; Civil Service Commission; classification, 825; exercise of patronage by members; outside service, 826
Grain exported, 3054
Great Lakes-St. Lawrence waterway, 745
Intercolonial Railway, 4568
Lumber, sales tax on, 3450, 3743
Maritime Provinces, improved railway facilities, 4568
Privilege—Hon. Mr. Veniot, 3740
Railway situation, 3039
Shipbuilding, 1951

Turnover, Tax on. *See* Sales Tax

Tweedie, Mr. T. M. M. (Calgary West)
Canada Temperance Act Bill
Costs, 4387
Gold Seal Liquor Company vs. Dominion Express Co., 4379
Proclamation, omission of date, 4379
Rights of others than litigants affected, 4379
Strict compliance with statute, 4380
Vote, 4379
Canadian National Railways
Special Committee, reference to, M. (Mr. Meighen) 1789
Canadian representation in the United States, 2411-14
Cattle, slaughtered, compensation, 1061
Chief Justice, salary of, 1566
Civil Service Act Amdt. Bill, 2833-84
Criminal Code Amdt. Bill, 3926
Punishments, 695, 2228
Dairymen, loss to through destruction of cattle, 1061
De Martigny divorce, 3765-7
Estimates, Committee on, 2202
Excessive or inadequate punishments, 695, 1857, 2228
Inspection of Gas and Gas Meters Bill, 619
Opium and Narcotic Drug Act Amdt. Bill, 2904
Natural Resources—transfer to western provinces, 2547-49
Pensions, widowed mothers, 636
Public buildings in Nova Scotia, 2744
Tubercular cattle, destruction of, 1061

Typhus
Epidemic in Europe, 4534
Precautions, 643. *See also* Immigration

Under Secretaries. *See* Ministers

Unemployment, 2, 3203, 3259, 3367, 3811-12, 4361. *See also* Address; Budget; Customs and Excise Dept. Bill; Housing; Immigration; Labour; Returned Soldiers; Shipbuilding
Emergency relief for, qu. 2623, 4535
Employment offices, 4363
Extent of, 4549
Housing loan, 4552
Immigration, suspension of
M. (Mr. Deslauriers. 1351; withdrawn, 1380
Insurance, 2, 9, 231, 237, 263, 284, 395, 4547. *See also* Address
Labour and, 1373. *See also* Labour
National Advisory Council, 4363
Relief, qu. 570, 4550
Emergency, qu. 2623, 4535
Returned soldiers, 4048
Peterborough in, qu. 4253
Shipbuilding, 1727, 1882, 1897, 1902, 1909
Quebec at, 1986

Unified Buying. *See* Canada Grain Act

Union Service Fund, qu. 2192

United Farmers of Ontario, 791, 3199, 3592, 4297, 4301. *See also* Drury
Railway nationalization, 1787

United Grain Growers, Limited, 289, 316, 331, 346, 417, 3662. *See also* Grain and Grain Trade, Progressive Party
Commercial activities, 516
Dockages, 3633-34
Lambert, Mr. Norman. *See* Lambert
Lumber business, 3633
Rice Jones, Mr. Cecil, 289, 290, 333, 417, 3180, 3492
Sale of American implements, 346, 418, 491, 3372. *See also* Speeches on Address; Budget

United States. *See also* Ambassador; Canadian Representation; Customs and Excise Dept. Bill; Reciprocity; Trade
Annexation with, 1483
Attitude of Southern States on protection, 3458
Boots and shoes, Canadian in, 1225
Borrowings from, 3266
Canadian dollar, value in, 3087
Canadian Government Merchant Marine cargoes, 1689, 1722. *See also* that title
Canadian War Mission, 3388, 2400
Capital invested in Canada, 3219

United States—*Con.*
Coal from, 1248. *See also* Fuel Supply Problem
Coal mines owned by Canadian Rys., 4317
Commercial agents in, 1473
Constitution, comparison with, 1166
Consular service, 1475, 3460, 3796. *See also* Customs and Excise Dept. Bill; Trade
Customs regulations, 3817, 4417
Emigration to, 3068
Exchange rate, 3167
Extradition Treaty with, 2687, 3008, 3207. *See also* Extradition Convention
Tabled, 3207
Farming, competition in, 3187
Fordney Bill, 512, 3239, 3368, 3442. *See also* under this title Young Emergency Tariff
French Canadians in, 1483, 3675
Grand Trunk Railway
Amount due, 4135
Lines in, 4326
Immigration, 1360, 3064, 3068, 3072
Commissioner, 3059
Restrictions, 1357
Importation of farm implements from, 417, 492, 3372, 3409
Migratory Birds Treaty, 2892. *See also that title*
Nolan Act, patents, 4454
Patent legislation, 4454-60
Pecuniary Claims Convention, qu. 1817. *See also that title*
Premium on American money, 3087
Progress in farming, 3188
Pure bred cattle, 1049
Railways, 1007, 1576
Cost of operation, 1576
Government control, 1583
Systems and freight vessels, 1730-31
Reciprocity with. *See also* Address; Budget, 268, 297, 1481, 2038, 2045, 2058, 2066, 2075, 2393
Relations with, 400, 3245
Shipbuilding, 1288. *See also* that title
Tariff, 3456. *See also* under this head, Fordney, Young Emergency
Canadian duties, 4254
Tariff legislation, 3118, 3342
Tinplate industry, 3326
Trade agents in, qu. 1001, 1219. *See also under this title* Consular Service
Agents in Canada, 1221. *See also* Customs and Excise Dept. Bill; Trade
Trade with, 1482, 3460, 4397-4400. *See also* that title
Barriers to, 3599

United States—*Con.*
Young Emergency Tariff Bill, 2905, 3160, 3115, 3352, 3809
Rumoured new tariff resolutions, 3905

United States Transportation Act, 1007

Universities, Scientific work at. *See* Research

Unopposed Motions for Returns, 578, 606, 674, 767, 840, 1134, 1238, 1350, 1502, 1625, 1821, 2193, 2346, 2507, 2821, 3090, 3423, 2772

Upper Chamber. *See* Ministers

Upper Crossing, St. Roch light, qu. 1383

Uruguay, seizure of Nova Scotia vessel, 1527

Vacancies. *See* House of Commons

Vallée, Dr., case of, 3131

Vancouver Island
Canadian National Railways on, qu. 3422
Returned soldiers and shipbuilding, 1727

Vegetable Insects, 1027

Vegetables, Root, Inspection and Sale, 4343

Venereal Diseases, 3127

Veniot, Hon. P. J., 3637, 3688, 3717, 3740. *See also* York-Sunbury

Verret, Colonel Hector, 4525

Versailles Treaty. *See* League of Nations; Patent Act Amdt. Bill

Verville, Mr. Alphonse (St. Denis)
Housing loan, 4552
Income tax collections, qu. 569
Unemployment, 4550
Emergency appropriation for, qu. 2623

Vessel Rates. *See* Railway Act Amdt. Bill

Vessels. *See also* Canadian Government Merchant Marine; Shipbuilding
Canadian National Railway, qu. 1348
Commandeered, qu. 2943
Names of
"Brant", 1982
"Canadian Beaver," qu. 1673, 1862
"Canadian Conqueror," qu. 1381
"Canadian Explorer," 1714
"Canadian Inventor", 1890
"Canadian Mariner", 1713, 1715
"Canadian Otter," qu. 1382
"Canadian Pioneer," qu. 1382, 1689, 1722, 1894

Vessels—*Con.*
Names of—*Con.*
"Canadian Planter", qu. 2942
"Canadian Rancher", 1716
"Canadian Ranger," qu. 1382, 1863
"Canadian Recruit," qu. 575, qu. 1381, 1382, 1703, 1863
"Canadian Runner", 1715
"Canadian Sapper", qu. 734
"Canadian Seigneur," qu. 1382, 1863
"Canadian Squatter", 1894
"Canadian Voyageur", qu. 1381, 1382, 1716, 1894
"Champlain", 1980, 1983, 1995
"Druid", 1980, 1984
"Esperanto", 4341
"Lake Champlain", ice-breaker, 2174
"Laurentian", qu. 1348
"Marie Lydia", 1985
"Montcalm," ice-breaker, 1985
"Muriel W.", 1990
"Narbethong", 2175
"Neophyte", 1966
"Niobe", qu. 671, 4010-36, 4041
"Rainbow", qu. 671, 4010-36, 4041
"Scandinavian", 1498, 1556
Seagoing, tonnage, 3650
Service, in, qu. 568
Wooden, 1714, 1728, 1871

Veterinary Director General, 4508-13. *See also* Alderson; Health of Animals

Veterinary Inspector General, 4513

Veterinary Inspectors. *See* Health of Animals

Veterinary Surgeons. *See* Health of Animals

Vice-Admiralty
Judges, 1084
Registrar in Quebec district, 1086

Vickers' Shipyards, 1967

Victoria
Drydock, 265
Contract for, qu. 565
Shipbuilding, qu. 599

Victoria Day, adjournment. *See* House of Commons, Adjournments

Victoria Bridge, widening, 300

Victory Bonds, 1285, 3444. *See also* Finance
Expenses, qu. 1620
Government investment in, 1704

Vien, Mr. Thomas (Lotbiniere)
Address in reply to Governor Generals' Speech, 430; Tribute to the late Thomas P. Owens, Editor of Debates; the late Mr. Gladu; does majority in the House reflect public opinion?; the Government's mandate, 430; Government elected in 1917 to enforce Military Service Act; the question of confidence; Liberal members of Cabinet; tenure morally at an end; Prime Minister's argument, 431; tariff, 432; fiscal policy of Liberal party; Farmer's platform; refusal of Canadian Manufacturers to sell to farmers' organizations, 434; Minister of Immigration; Canada's status; unity a real element of nationhood; Sir Wilfrid Laurier; dissolution, 436

Vien, Mr. Thomas—*Con.*
Address—*Con.*
Administration of Justice, Yukon territory, 1087
Agricultural shows, 1240
Bankruptcy Act, Judges under, 1085
Canadian Bar Association, 1095
Canadian Government Merchant Marine
Administration, 1441
Insurance and value, 1278
Vessels in service, qu. 568
Canadian manufacturers and United States trade, 1222
Canadian nationals, 772
Canadian National Railways
Conductors, qu. 569
Divisional points, qu. 574
Freight cars, qu. 568
Operating expenses, qu. 1131
Policy and history of, not in order, 1773
Service between Winnipeg and Quebec, qu. 569
Special Committee, reference to M. (Mr. Meighen) 1768, 1779
Transcontinental, transportation of grain, 2984
Canadian Record, 1438
Canadian representation in the United States, 2386
Canadian Wheat Board Bill, 2159
Cattle and horse breeding, 1118
Cattle embargo, qu. 709
Civil Service
Bonus and reclassification, 1463
Copyright—Bill not printed in French, 649
County Fairs, assistance to, 1123
De Martigny divorce, 4078
Director of Commercial Intelligence, 1219
Dominion Lands Act Amdt. Bill, 4062-6
Estimates
Before item passes question should be put in Com., 1091
Discussion of, 1230
Experimental farms, 939
Flax industry, 1408

Vien, Mr. Thomas—*Con.*
Fortifications of Quebec, 970
Gilmour and Hughson Bill, 1096
Grand Trunk loan, 4134-51
Grand Trunk loan, 4134-51
Hudson Bay Railway, 989
Iron ores, 1436
Law stamps, tax, 1090
Linen yarns, 1407
Loans, domestic, qu. 566
Judges
Ad hoc, and Admiralty, 1084
Yukon territory, 1088
Justice Department
Purchasing Commission and, 1103
Maisonneuve and Gaspé representation, 2319
Parliament buildings, 4077
French inscription, qu. 568
Penitentiaries, 1115
Purchasing of supplies, 1097, 1104, 1107
Pierreville postmistress, qu. 3422
Point of order—statement misquoted, 2231
Polish battalion for service in French army, 4058
Privy Council—"Insular" tribunal of England, 1090
Purchasing Commission, 1098, 1103, 1114
Civil Service Commission and, 1100
Railways and Canals, annual report, qu. 697
Research Council, 1436
Russia, trade with, inquiry, 1072
St. Croix and St. Antoine wharves, 2616
Searls, Mr. George, grain inspection, 1444
Soldiers' pensions, insurance and re-establishment, 4058
Trade commissioners in United States, 1220
Trent canal, 2953, 2978, 2606-17
Veniot correspondence, 3719
Vice Admiralty, registrar, salary, 1086
Welland canal, construction, 2978
Wheat Board, 1454, 1463, 2159
Winding-up Act Amdt. Bill, 2158

Ville Emard Tunnel, 3677

Vote on Account. *See* Interim Supply

Votes. *See* House of Commons, Divisions

Walker, Sir Byron, 2684

Wallace, The Late Mr. Tom G., tribute to, 152

War. *See aslo* Demobilization; Germany, Reparations
Accounts, Canada-Great Britain, adjustment, qu. 2191
British Remount Commission, qu. 4341
Canada's share, 3583
Canadian Mission in the United States, 2388, 2400

War—*Con.*
Claim of Canadian citizens, qu. 1820
History, qu. 1625
Indemnity, 3195
Loans, 3246. *See also* that title
Reparations. *See* Germany
Scandals, 3509
Surplus supplies, disposal of, qu. 736
Union Service Fund, qu. 2192

War Measures Act, 4459. *See also* Purchasing Commission

War Purchasing Commission, 2309. *See also* Purchasing Commission

War Times Election Act, 217, 322
Perpetuation of, 4238-40

Washington. *See* Ambassador at; Canadian Representation in the United States; Prime Ministers' Conference

Water Powers. *See also* Lake of the Woods
Canadian General Electric Company, 2607
Conservation Commission, 3960-70
Development of, 844
Director of, 1346
Films showing, 1467
Great Lakes-St. Lawrence. *See that title*
Lake of the Woods, 4171. *See also* that title
Trent canal, 2954-64

Waterways. *See* Canals; Transportation Commission. *See* International Joint Commission
Great Lakes-St. Lawrence, 674, 738
Chicago Drainage Canal diversion, 186, 2225

Watson, Dr., Chief Pathologist, 1050

Ways and Means, Committee of, 562, 2100. 3688, 3698, 3719, 3726, 3733, 3741. *See also* Budget; Tariff
Resolutions, printing of, 3207

Webster, Hon. Senator, 1990

Wednesday Sittings. *See* House of Commons, Sittings

Weed Seeds, 289

Weekly Bulletins, 1220

Weights and Measures, 1485

Welland, Binder twine factory, 3227

Welland Canal. *See* Canals

West Durham Election, 1324

West Indies. *See also* Canada-West Indies Trade Agreement
Cable, 1438
Canadian Government Merchant Marine ships, 1913. *See also* that title

West Indies—*Con.*
Canadian ships for, 1870
Conference of 1920, 1870, 2252
Customs tariff, goods under, 3698. *See also* that title
Importations, preference, 3698, 3704
Preferential tariff, 3704
Proposed union with, 2254
Steamship service, 1275, 1488, 1712, 1714, 2253-62
Sugar imports from, 3699-3700
Trade with, 1271, 1275, 1870, 2251

West Indies Trade Agreement. *See* Canada-West Indies

Western Canada
Antelope in, qu. 1134
Colonization Association, 2583
Natural Resources. *See* that title

Western Dominion Railway Company, 3343. *See* Private Bills

Western Provinces and Natural Resources
M. (Mr. Campbell) 2519. *See also* Natural Resources

Wharves and Breakwaters, for individual wharves. *See* their titles
Cape Breton, 4103
Lighting of, 1929
Repairs to, 1971

Wheat. *See also* Canada Grain Act; Canadian Wheat Board; Elevators; Grain and Grain Trade; Transportation
Consumption and production, 3369
Credit to Belgium for purchase of, qu. 1001
Crop of 1920, 438
Marketing, 342, 346
Marquis, 1033
Milling in bond in United States, 3368
Pool, 391
Price of, 369, 3395
Rust, 341

Whipping. *See* Criminal Code Amdt.; Opium and Narcotic Drug

White, Sir Thomas, 451, 477. *See also* Leeds
Resignation of, 1619
Status of, 69, 463, 469, 477, 1294, 1326

White, Mr. W. H. (Victoria, Alta.)
Address in reply to Governor General's Speech, 548; congratulations to Prime Minister; grievances of the West; car shortage; Commission to investigate grain trade, 549; sentiment of the West; the Agrarian group, 550
Agricultural implements, 3394
Blood Indian reserve, qu. 1818, qu. 1819, qu. 2098, qu. 2374
Budget, 3538. Alberta's representation in House; Government regulation of oil

White, Mr. W. H.—*Con.*
Budget—*Con.*
and petroleum resources, 3539; inadequate transportation facilities in West, 3540; freight cars for grain shipments. 3541; agricultural implements, 3544
Canadian National Railways
Car shortage, 548, 3541, 4322
Western representation on Board, 4315
Canadian Pacific Railway, patents to lands, qu. 2821
Cattle embargo, 704
Dominion Elections Act Amdt. Bill, 4234-5
Naturalization—certificate of qualification, 4236
Immigration, 2574-9
Immigration Act Amdt. Bill, 3823-6
Reciprocity agreement with the United States, 2071
Royal Canadian Mounted Police Act Amdt. Bill, 2484
Soldier Settlement Board, qu. 673
Transportation charges on stock feed, qu. 2686

White Cross. *See* Burnham, Dr.

White Dog Rapids, 4172

White Grub, destruction by, 1030

Whitehead Life-saving station, 1991

White Horse, Judge at, 1088

Whitley Councils. *See* Civil Service

Wholesalers. *See* Sales Tax

Widowed Mothers. *See* Pensions

Wife Desertion. *See* Extradition

Wigmore, Hon. R. W. (Minister of Customs and Inland Revenue)
Civil Service Retirement Act Amdt. Bill, 2500-01
Customs and Excise Dept. Bill
Amalgamation of departments, 3821
Brokers, 4432
Certificate, form of, 3799
Explanation by Minister, 3786
New and unused goods, 3813
Preventive service, Victoria county, 4388
Provincial analysts' certificate, 3788-90
Valuation for duty, 4411
Customs and Inland Revenue Department
Belyea, Mr., retirement, 3082
Consolidation of offices, 3083
Estimates, 3077, 4117
Officers, 3083
Nova Scotia, 3096
Overtime, 4123-5
Retiring allowances, 3084

Wigmore, Hon. R. W.—*Con.*
Customs and Inland Revenue Dept.—*Con.*
Job printers, taxation, 4124
"Niobe" and "Rainbow," 4018-32
Personal business, Nagle & Wigmore, 3077, 3079, 3612
Shipyards, 1927
York-Sunbury election, Veniot correspondence, 3718

Wilson, Judge, superannuation of, qu. 1622

Wilson, Mr. Gordon C. (Wentworth)
Highway construction in Ontario, 4289-4300
Hamilton-Brantford highway, qu. 3582, qu. 3904, 4252-3
Privilege—Hon. F. C. Biggs, 4448
Purchase of trucks by Hon. F. C. Biggs, 4291
Warren company, qu. 4252

Wilson, Mr. J. R. (Saskatoon)
Highways—Saskatchewan, 4307
Income Tax Act Amdt. Bill
Prosecutions in Saskatchewan, 4347
Unemployment and immigration, 1373

Winding-up Act Amdt. Bill
1r., 2095-6; 2r., com.; 3r., 2158

Windsor, use of armoury, 902

Wines
Imported, duty on, 3126, 3705, 3710, 3734
Medicinal, 3709
Other than sparkling, 3710
Sparkling, 3711

Winnipeg
Fort Garry Hotel, insurance, qu. 1348
Grain Exchange, 277, 335, 343, 379, 440, 489, 513. *See also* Grain
Grain laboratory, 1228
Proportional representation in, 1532, 1535, 1538
Strike, 3359, 3360, 3560

Winnipeg river., 2347, 4172. *See also* Lake of the Woods

Winter Fairs. *See* Live Stock

Wireless Communications. *See* Prime Minister's Conference

Wire Worms, 1027

Wolffe, Mr., 793. *See also* Printing Bureau, Destruction of documents

Woman Suffrage, 173, 527, 4474

Women Voters. *See* Dominion Elections Act; Canadian Nationals

Wood, Mr. E. R., 1609-10, 3610. *See also* Canadian National Railways

Wooden Vessels, 1714, 1728, 1871. *See also* Shipbuilding

Woods, Mr. H. W., 288, 331, 380, 513

Woodstock Exhibition, 1125

Wool Grading, 1121.

Working Expenses. *See* Penitentiaries

World's Poultry Congress, 4513

Wrecking Plants, 1990

Wrecks, Investigation of, 1988

Wright, Mr. A. A., and Labour, 1647

Wright, Mr. H. O. (Battleford)
Address in reply to Governor General's Speech, 511; Congratulations to Prime Minister; Fordney Bill and its possible effect on Canada; Ambassador at Washington, 511; trade between Canada and the United States; adverse trade balance, 512; shortage of cars; Commission to investigate grain trade; foreign-born in Western Canada, 514; broader national spirit; national classification of census; leader of Progressive party, 515; commercial activities of organized farmers, 516; sale of American goods; purchases by Government in United States; Government's mandate, 517
Budget, 3565. Budget and taxation, 3566; Canadian Wheat Board; Agricultural and transportation difficulties, 3567; low price of farm produce and high price of farm implements, 3568; Farmers' platform, 3569
Civil Service bonus, qu. 967
Fish-breeding in Saskatchewan, 2185
Highways, Saskatchewan, qu. 1820

Yamaska By-Election, 1156, 1898, 3215, 3250, 3467, 4534
Boucher, Mr. Aime, 3422, 3423. *See also* Pierreville Postmistress; Park St. Charles
Mondou, Mr., 3251
Vacancy, 1293

Yarrows, Limited, 3649

York-Sunbury
By-election, 2151, 3475, 3480, 3627, 3630, 3662, 3637, 3717
Catholic Minister, and, 3480. *See also* Veniot
Vacancy in, 1293

Yorkton Judicial district, Judge, 1080

York, West, vacancy, 1293

Young. *See* Arthur Young and Company; Civil Service, Classification

Young Emergency Tariff. *See* United States

Yukon Territory
Administration of Justice, 1087